LOCKE'S
WORKS
VOL. I

LOCKE'S
WORKS
VOL. II

LOCKE'S
WORKS
VOL. III

12266

12266

12266

THE WORKS OF *JOHN LOCKE*, Esq;

VOL. II.

The SECOND EDITION.

CONTAINING,

Some Considerations of the Consequences of lowering of Interest, and raising the Value of Money. In a Letter sent to a Member of Parliament. 1691.

Short Observations on a printed Paper, entitled, *For encouraging the coining Silver Money in* England, *and after for keeping it here.*

Further Observations concerning raising the Value of Money. Wherein Mr. *Lowndes*'s Arguments for it, in his late Report concerning *An Essay for the Amendment of the Silver Coin*, are particularly examined.

Two Treatises of Government. In the Former, the false Principles and Foundation of Sir *Robert Filmer*, and his Followers, are detected and overthrown. The latter is an Essay concerning the true Original, Extent, and End of Civil Government.

A Letter concerning Toleration.

A Second Letter concerning Toleration.

A Third Letter for Toleration: To the Author of the Third Letter concerning Toleration.

The Reasonableness of Christianity, as deliver'd in the Scriptures.

A Vindication of *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, from Mr. *Edwards*'s Reflections.

A Second Vindication of *The Reasonableness of Christianity.*

LONDON:

Printed for AWNSHAM CHURCHILL. M.DCC.XXII.

12266

THE WORKS OF JOHN LOCKE, Esq;

12266

BIBLIOTEKA WYŻSZEJ SZKOŁY HANDLOWEJ WARSZAWA

Some Considerations
OF THE
CONSEQUENCES
OF THE
Lowering of Interest,
AND
Raising the Value
OF
MONEY.

In a Letter sent to a Member of Parliament,
1691.

Some Considerations
OF THE
CONSEQUENCES
OF THE
Lowering of Interest,
AND
Raising the Value
OF
MONEY.

SOME

CONSIDERATIONS

OF THE

Lowering of *Intereſt*,

AND

RAISING *the* VALUE

OF

MONEY.

SIR,

THESE *Notions, concerning* Coinage, *having for the main, as you know, been put into Writing above Twelve Months ſince; as thoſe other concerning* Intereſt, *a great deal above ſo many Years: I put them now again into your Hands, with a Liberty (ſince you will have it ſo) to communicate them farther, as you pleaſe. If, upon a Review, you continue your favourable Opinion of them, and nothing leſs than Publiſhing will ſatisfy you, I muſt deſire you to remember, That you muſt be anſwerable to the World for the Stile; which is ſuch as a Man writes careleſly to his Friend, when he ſeeks Truth, not Ornament; and ſtudies only to be in the right, and to be underſtood. I have ſince you ſaw them laſt Year, met with ſome new Objections in Print, which I have endeavoured to remove; and particularly, I have taken into Conſideration a Printed Sheet,* entituled, Remarks upon a Paper given in to the Lords, *&c. Becauſe one may naturally ſuppoſe, That he that was ſo much a Patron of that Cauſe would omit nothing that could be ſaid in favour of it. To this I muſt here add, That I am juſt now told from* Holland, That the States finding themſelves abuſed by Coining a vaſt Quantity of their baſe [*Schillings*] Money, made of their own Ducatoons, and other finer Silver, melted down; have put a ſtop to the Minting of any but fine Silver Coin, till they ſhould ſettle their Mint upon a new Foot.

I know the ſincere Love and Concern you have for your Country, puts you conſtantly upon caſting about on all hands for any Means to ſerve it; and will not ſuffer you to overlook any thing you conceive may be of any the leaſt Uſe, though offer'd you from the meaneſt Capacities: You could not elſe have put me upon looking out my old Papers concerning the reducing of Intereſt *to* 4 per Cent. *which have ſo long lain by forgotten. Upon this new Survey of them, I find not my Thoughts now to differ from thoſe I had near Twenty Years ſince: They have to me ſtill the Appearance of Truth; nor ſhould I otherwiſe venture them ſo much as to your Sight. If my Notions are wrong, my Intention, I am ſure, is right: And whatever I have fail'd in, I ſhall at leaſt let you ſee with what Obedience I am,*

Nov. 7.
1691.

SIR,

Your moſt humble Servant.

SIR,

I Have ſo little Concern in Paying or Receiving of *Intereſt*, that were I in no more Danger to be miſled by Inability and Ignorance, than I am to be biaſſed by Intereſt and Inclination, I might hope to give you a very perfect and clear Account of the Conſequences of a Law, to reduce *Intereſt* to Four *per Cent.* But ſince you are pleaſed to ask my Opinion, I ſhall endeavour fairly to ſtate this Matter of *Uſe* with the beſt of my Skill.

The firſt thing to be conſider'd, is, Whether the Price of the Hire of Money can be regulated by *Law.* And to that I think, generally ſpeaking one may ſay, 'tis manifeſt it cannot. For ſince it's impoſſible, to make a Law that ſhall hinder a Man from giving away his Money or Eſtate to whom he pleaſes, it will be impoſſible, by any Contrivance of Law, to hinder Men, skill'd in the Power they have over their own Goods, and the Ways of Conveying them to others, to purchaſe Money to be lent them at what Rate ſoever their Occaſions ſhall make it neceſſary for them to have it. For it is to be remembred, That no Man borrows Money, or pays *Uſe*, out of mere Pleaſure: 'Tis the Want of Money drives Men to that Trouble and Charge of Borrowing: And proportionably to this Want, ſo will every one have it, whatever Price it coſt him. Wherein the Skilful, I ſay, will always ſo manage it, as to avoid the Prohibition of your Law, and keep out of its Penalty, do what you can. What then will be the unavoidable Conſequences of ſuch a Law?

1. It will make the Difficulty of Borrowing and Lending much greater; whereby Trade (the Foundation of Riches) will be obſtructed.

2. It will be a Prejudice to none but thoſe who moſt need Aſſiſtance and Help, I mean Widows and Orphans, and others uninſtructed in the Arts and Management of more skilful Men; whoſe Eſtates lying in Money, they will be ſure, eſpecially Orphans, to have no more Profit of their Money, than what *Intereſt* the Law barely allows.

3. It will mightily encreaſe the Advantage of Bankers and Scriveners, and other ſuch expert Brokers: Who skill'd in the Arts of putting out Money according to the true and natural Value, which the preſent State of Trade, Money and Debts, ſhall always raiſe *Intereſt* to, they will infallibly get, what the true Value of *Intereſt* ſhall be, above the Legal. For Men finding the Convenience of lodging their Money in Hands, where they can be ſure of it at ſhort Warning, the Ignorant and Lazy will be forwardeſt to put it into theſe Mens hands, who are known willingly to receive it, and where they can readily have the whole, or a part, upon any ſudden Occaſion, that may call for it.

4. I fear I may reckon it as one of the probable Conſequences of ſuch a Law, That it is likely to cauſe great Perjury in the Nation; a Crime, than which nothing is more carefully to be prevented by Law-makers, not only by Penalties, that ſhall attend apparent and proved Perjury; but by avoiding and leſſening as much as may be, the Temptations to it. For where thoſe are ſtrong, (as they are where Men ſhall ſwear for their own Advantage) there the fear of Penalties to follow will have little Reſtraint; eſpecially if the Crime be hard to be proved. All which I ſuppoſe will happen in this Caſe, where Ways will be found out to receive Money upon other Pretences than for *Uſe*, to evade the Rule and Rigour of the Law: And there will be ſecret Truſts and Colluſions amongſt Men, that though they may be ſuſpected, can never be proved without their own Confeſſion. I have heard very ſober and obſerving Perſons complain of the Danger Mens Lives and Properties are in, by the Frequency and Faſhionableneſs of Perjury amongſt us. Faith and Truth, eſpecially in all Occaſions of atteſting it upon the ſolemn Appeal to Heaven by an Oath, is the great Bond of Society: This it becomes the Wiſdom of Magiſtrates carefully to ſupport, and render as ſacred and awful in the Minds of the People as they can. But if ever Frequency of Oaths ſhall make them be looked on as Formalities of Law, or the Cuſtom of

ſtraining

ſtraining of Truth (which Mens ſwearing in their own Caſes is apt to lead them to) has once dipt Men in Perjury, and the Guilt with the Temptation has ſpread it ſelf very wide, and made it almoſt faſhionable in ſome Caſes, it will be impoſſible for the Society (theſe Bonds being diſſolved) to ſubſiſt. All muſt break in Pieces and run to Confuſion. That ſwearing in their own Caſes is apt, by degrees, to lead Men into as little Regard of ſuch Oaths, as they have of their ordinary Talk, I think there is reaſon to ſuſpect, from what has been obſerved in ſomething of that kind. Maſters of Ships are a ſort of Men generally induſtrious and ſober, and I ſuppoſe may be thought, for their Number and Rank, to be equally honeſt to any other ſort of Men: And yet, by the Diſcourſe I have had with Merchants in other Countries, I find, That they think in thoſe Parts, they take a great Liberty in their Cuſtom-houſe Oaths, to that degree, that I remember I was once told, in a trading Town beyond Sea, of a Maſter of a Veſſel, there eſteemed a ſober and fair Man, who yet could not hold ſaying, *God forbid that a Cuſtom-houſe Oath ſhould be a Sin.* I ſay not this to make any Reflection upon a ſort of Men, that I think as uncorrupt as any other; and who, I am ſure, ought, in *England*, to be cheriſhed and eſteemed as the moſt induſtrious and moſt beneficial of any of its Subjects. But I could not forbear to give this here as an Inſtance, how dangerous a Temptation it is, to bring Men cuſtomarily to ſwear, where they may have any Concernment of their own. And it will always be worthy the Care and Conſideration of Law-makers, to keep up the Opinion of an Oath high and ſacred, as it ought to be, in the Minds of the People; which can never be done, where frequency of Oaths, biaſſed by Intereſt, has eſtabliſht a Neglect of them; and Faſhion (which it ſeldom fails to do) has given Countenance to what Profit rewards.

But that Law cannot keep Men from taking more *Uſe* than you ſet (the Want of Money being that alone which regulates its Price) will perhaps appear, if we conſider how hard it is to ſet a Price upon Wine or Silks, or other unneceſſary Commodities; but how impoſſible it is to ſet a Rate upon Victuals in a Time of Famine. For Money being an univerſal Commodity, and as neceſſary to Trade, as Food is to Life, every Body muſt have it, at what Rate they can get it; and unavoidably pay dear when it is ſcarce, and Debts, no leſs than Trade, have made Borrowing in Faſhion. The Bankers are a clear Inſtance of this: For ſome Years ſince, the Scarcity of Money having made it in *England* worth really more than Six *per Cent.* moſt of thoſe that had not the Skill to let it for more than Six *per Cent.* and ſecure themſelves from the Penalty of the Law, put it in the Bankers Hands, where it was ready at their Call, when they had an Opportunity of greater Improvement. So that the Rate you ſet, profits not the Lenders, and very few of the Borrowers, who are fain to pay the Price for Money, that Commodity would bear, were it left free; and the Gain is only to the Banker. And ſhould you leſſen the *Uſe* to Four *per Cent.* the Merchant, or Tradeſman, that borrows, would not have it one jot cheaper, than he has now; but probably theſe two ill Effects would follow. *Firſt*, That he would pay dearer; and *Secondly*, That there would be leſs Money left in the Country to drive the Trade. For the Bankers paying at moſt but Four *per Cent.* and receiving from Six to Ten *per Cent.* or more, at that low Rate could be content to have more Money lie dead by them, than now when it is higher: By which Means there would be leſs Money ſtirring in Trade, and a greater Scarcity; which would raiſe it upon the Borrower by this *Monopoly*. And what a part of our Treaſure their Skill and Management, join'd with others Lazineſs or Want of Skill, is apt to draw into their Hands, is to be known by thoſe vaſt Sums of Money, they were found to owe at the ſhutting up of the *Exchequer*. And though it be very true, yet it is almoſt beyond Belief, That one private Goldſmith of *London* ſhould have Credit upon his ſingle Security, (being uſually nothing but a Note under one of his Servants Hands) for above Eleven hundred thouſand Pounds at once. The ſame Reaſons, I ſuppoſe, will ſtill keep on the ſame Trade: And when you have taken it down by Law to that Rate, no Body will think of having more than Four *per Cent.* of the Banker, though thoſe who have need of Money to employ it in Trade, will not then, any more than now, get it under Five or Six, or as ſome pay, Seven or Eight. And if they had then, when the Law permitted Men to make more Profit of their Money, ſo large a Proportion of the

Caſh

Caſh of the Nation in their Hands, who can think, but that by this Law it ſhould be more driven into *Lombard-ſtreet* now? there being many now who lend them at Four or Five *per Cent.* who will not lend to others at Six. It would therefore perhaps, bring down the Rate of Money to the Borrower, and certainly diſtribute it better to the Advantage of Trade in the Country, if the *legal Uſe*, were kept pretty near to the *natural*; (by *natural Uſe*, I mean that Rate of Money which the preſent Scarcity of it makes it naturally at, upon an equal Diſtribution of it) for then Men being licenſed by the Law to take near the full *natural Uſe*, will not be forward to carry it to *London*, to put it into the Bankers Hands; but will lend it to their Neighbours in the Country, where it is convenient for Trade it ſhould be. But if you leſſen the Rate of *Uſe*, the Lender, whoſe Intereſt it is to keep up the Rate of Money, will rather lend it to the Banker, at the *legal Intereſt*, than to the Tradeſman or Gentleman, who when the Law is broken, ſhall be ſure to pay the full *natural Intereſt*, or more; becauſe of the Ingroſſing by the Banker, as well as the Riſque in tranſgreſſing the Law: Whereas were the *natural Uſe*, ſuppoſe Seven *per Cent.* and the *legal* Six; Firſt, the Owner would not venture the Penalty of the Law for the gaining one in Seven, that being the utmoſt his Money would yield: Nor would the Banker venture to borrow, where his Gains would be but One *per Cent.* nor the Money'd Man lend him, what he could make better Profit of legally at Home. All the Danger lies in this, That your Trade ſhould ſuffer if your being behindhand has made the *natural Uſe* ſo high, that your Tradeſman cannot live upon his Labour, but that your rich Neighbours will ſo under-ſell you, that the Return you make will not amount to pay the *Uſe* and afford a Livelihood. There is no way to recover from this, but by a general Frugality and Induſtry; or by being Maſters of the Trade of ſome Commodity, which the World muſt have from you at your Rate, becauſe it cannot be otherwhere ſupplied.

Now, I think, the *natural Intereſt* of Money is raiſed two Ways: *Firſt*, When the Money of a Country is but little in Proportion to the Debts of the Inhabitants one amongſt another. For ſuppoſe Ten thouſand Pounds were ſufficient to manage the Trade of *Bermudus*, and that the Ten firſt Planters carried over Twenty thouſand Pounds, which they lent to the ſeveral Tradeſmen and Inhabitants of the Country, who living above their Gains, had ſpent Ten thouſand Pounds of this Money, and it were gone out of the Iſland. 'Tis evident, that ſhould all the Creditors at once call in their Money, there would be a great Scarcity of Money, when that employed in Trade muſt be taken out of the Tradeſmens Hands to pay Debts; or elſe the Debtors want Money, and be expoſed to their Creditors, and ſo Intereſt will be high. But this ſeldom happening, that all or the greateſt part of the Creditors do at once call for their Money, unleſs it be in ſome great and general Danger, is leſs and ſeldomer felt, than the following, unleſs where the Debts of the People are grown to a greater Proportion; for that conſtantly cauſing more Borrowers than there can be Lenders, will make Money ſcarce, and conſequently *Intereſt* high. *Secondly*, That which conſtantly raiſes the *natural Intereſt* of Money, is, when Money is little in Proportion to the Trade of a Country. For in Trade every Body calls for Money according as he wants it, and this Diſproportion is always felt. For if *Engliſhmen* owed in all but One Million, and there were a Million of Money in *England*, the Money would be well enough proportioned to the Debts: But if Two Millions were neceſſary to carry on the Trade, there would be a Million wanting, and the Price of Money would be raiſed, as it is of any other Commodity in a Market, where the Merchandize will not ſerve half the Cuſtomers, and there are two Buyers for one Seller.

'Tis in vain therefore to go about effectually to reduce the Price of Intereſt by a Law; and you may as rationally hope to ſet a fixt Rate upon the Hire of Houſes, or Ships, as of Money. He that wants a Veſſel, rather than loſe his Market, will not ſtick to have it at the Market-Rate, and find Ways to do it, with Security to the Owner, though the Rate were limited by Law: And he that wants Money, rather than loſe his Voyage, or his Trade, will pay the *natural Intereſt* for it; and ſubmit to ſuch Ways of Conveyance, as ſhall keep the Lender out of the reach of the Law. So that your Act at beſt, will ſerve only to increaſe the Arts of Lending, but not at all leſſen the Charge of the Borrower: He, 'tis likely, ſhall with more Trouble, and going farther about, pay alſo the more for his

Money;

Money; unleſs you intend to break in only upon Mortgages and Contracts already made, and (which is not to be ſuppoſed) by a Law, *poſt factum*, void Bargains lawfully made, and give to *Richard* what is *Peter*'s Due, for no other Reaſon, but becauſe one was Borrower, and the other Lender.

But ſuppoſing the Law reach'd the Intention of the Promoters of it; and that this Act be ſo contriv'd, that it forced the Natural Price of Money, and hindred its being by any Body lent at a higher *Uſe*, than Four Pound *per Cent.* which is plain it cannot. Let us in the next Place ſee what will be the Conſequences of it

1. It will be a Loſs to Widows, Orphans, and all thoſe who have their Eſtates in Money, one third of their Eſtates: which will be a very hard Caſe upon a great Number of People, and it is warily to be conſider'd by the Wiſdom of the Nation, whether they will thus at one Blow, fine and impoveriſh a great and innocent Part of the People, who having their Eſtates in Money, have as much Right to make as much of their Money as it is worth, (for more they cannot) as the Landlord has to let his Land for as much as it will yield. To fine Men one Third of their Eſtates, without any Crime or Offence committed, ſeems very hard.

2. As it will be a conſiderable Loſs and Injury to the money'd Man, ſo it will be no Advantage at all to the Kingdom. For ſo Trade be not cramp'd, and the Exportation of our native Commodities and Manufactures not hindred, it will be no matter to the Kingdom, who amongſt our ſelves gets or loſes: Only common Charity teaches, that thoſe ſhould be moſt taken care of by the Law, who are leaſt capable of taking care for themſelves.

3. It will be a Gain to the borrowing Merchant. For if he borrow at Four *per Cent.* and his Returns be Twelve *per Cent.* he will have Eight *per Cent.* and the Lender Four: Whereas now they divide the Profit equally at Six *per Cent.* But this neither gets nor loſes the Kingdom in your Trade, ſuppoſing the Merchant and Lender to be both *Engliſhmen*: Only it will, as I have ſaid, transfer a third Part of the money'd Man's Eſtate, who has nothing elſe to live on, into the Merchant's Pocket; and that without any Merit in the one, or Tranſgreſſion in the other. Private Men's Intereſts ought not thus to be neglected, nor ſacrificed to any thing but the manifeſt Advantage of the Publick. But in this Caſe it will be quite the contrary. This Loſs to the money'd Men will be a Prejudice to Trade: Since it will diſcourage lending at ſuch a Diſproportion of Profit, to Riſque; as we ſhall ſee more by and by, when we come to conſider of what Conſequence it is to encourage Lending, that ſo none of the Money of the Nation may lie dead, and thereby prejudice Trade.

4. It will hinder Trade. For there being a certain Proportion of Money neceſſary for driving ſuch a Proportion of Trade, ſo much Money of this as lies ſtill, leſſens ſo much of the Trade. Now it cannot be rationally expected, but that where the Venture is great, and the Gains ſmall, (as it is in Lending in *England* upon low *Intereſt*) many will chuſe rather to hoard up their Money, than venture it abroad on ſuch Terms. This will be a Loſs to the Kingdom, and ſuch a Loſs, as here in *England*, ought chiefly to be looked after: For we having no Mines, nor any other Way of getting, or keeping of Riches amongſt us, but by Trade, ſo much of our Trade as is loſt, ſo much of our Riches muſt neceſſarily go with it; and the over-ballancing of Trade between us and our Neighbours, muſt inevitably carry away our Money, and quickly leave us poor, and expoſed. Gold and Silver, though they ſerve for few, yet they command all the Conveniences of Life, and therefore in a Plenty of them conſiſts Riches.

Every one knows, that Mines alone furniſh theſe: But withal 'tis obſervable, that moſt Countries ſtored with them by Nature are poor. The digging and refining of theſe Metals taking up the Labour, and waſting the Number of the People. For which Reaſon the wiſe Policy of the *Chineſe* will not ſuffer the Mines they have to be wrought. Nor indeed, things rightly conſidered, do Gold and Silver drawn out of the Mine equally enrich, with what is got by Trade. He that would make the lighter Scale preponderate to the oppoſite, will not ſo ſoon do it, by adding encreaſe of new Weight to the emptier, as if he took out of the heavier what he adds to the lighter, for then half ſo much will do it. Riches do not conſiſt in having more Gold and Silver, but in having more in Proportion, than the reſt of the World, or than our Neighbours,

whereby

whereby we are enabled to procure to our ſelves a greater Plenty of the Conveniencies of Life, than comes within the Reach of Neighbouring Kingdoms and States, who, ſharing the Gold and Silver of the World in a leſs Proportion, want the Means of Plenty and Power, and ſo are poorer. Nor would they be one jot the richer, if, by the Diſcovery of new Mines, the Quantity of Gold and Silver in the World becoming twice as much as it is, their Shares of them ſhould be doubled. By Gold and Silver in the World, I muſt be underſtood to mean, not what lies hid in the Earth; but what is already out of the Mine in the Hands and Poſſeſſions of Men. This, if well conſider'd, would be no ſmall Encouragement to Trade, which is a ſurer and ſhorter Way to Riches than any other, where it is managed with Skill and Induſtry.

In a Country not furniſhed with Mines there are but two Ways of growing rich, either Conqueſt or Commerce. By the firſt the *Romans* made themſelves Maſters of the Riches of the World; but I think that in our preſent Circumſtances, no Body is vain enough to entertain a Thought of our reaping the Profits of the World with our Swords, and making the Spoil and Tribute of vanquiſhed Nations, the Fund for the Supply of the Charges of the Government, with an Overplus for the Wants, and equally craving Luxury, and faſhionable Vanity of the People.

Commerce therefore is the only Way left to us, either for Riches or Subſiſtence: For this the Advantages of our Situation, as well as the Induſtry and Inclination of our People, bold and skillful at Sea, do naturally fit us: By this the Nation of *England* has been hitherto ſupported, and Trade left almoſt to it ſelf, and aſſiſted only by the natural Advantages above-mentioned, brought us in Plenty and Riches, and always ſet this Kingdom in a Rank equal, if not ſuperior to any of its Neighbours; and would, no doubt, without any Difficulty have continued it ſo, if the more enlarged, and better underſtood Intereſt of Trade, ſince the Improvement of Navigation, had not raiſed us many Rivals; and the amazing Politicks of ſome late Reigns, let in other Competitors with us for the Sea, who will be ſure to ſeize to themſelves whatever Parts of Trade our Miſmanagment, or Want of Money, ſhall let ſlip out of our Hands: And when it is once loſt, 'twill be too late to hope, by a miſtim'd Care, eaſily to retrieve it again. For the Currents of Trade, like thoſe of Waters, make themſelves Channels, out of which they are afterwards as hard to be diverted, as Rivers that have worn themſelves deep within their Banks.

Trade then is neceſſary to the producing of Riches, and Money neceſſary to the carrying on of Trade. This is principally to be looked after and taken Care of. For if this be neglected, we ſhall in vain, by Contrivances amongſt our ſelves, and ſhuffling the little Money we have from one anothers Hands, endeavour to prevent our Wants: Decay of Trade will quickly waſte all the Remainder; and then the Landed-Man, who thinks perhaps by the Fall of *Intereſt* to raiſe the Value of his Land, will find himſelf cruelly miſtaken, when the Money being gone, (as it will be if our Trade be not kept up) he can get neither Farmer to rent, nor Purchaſer to buy his Land. Whatſoever therefore hinders the Lending of Money, injures Trade: And ſo the reducing of Money to Four *per Cent.* which will diſcourage Men from lending, will be a Loſs to the Kingdom, in ſtopping ſo much of the Current of Money, which turns the Wheels of Trade. But all this upon a Suppoſition, that the Lender and Borrower are both *Engliſhmen.*

If the Lender be a Foreigner, by leſſening *Intereſt* from Six to Four, you get to the Kingdom one third Part of the *Intereſt* we pay yearly to Foreigners: Which let any one if he pleaſe think conſiderable. But then, upon leſſening *Intereſt* to Four *per Cent.* it is likely one of theſe things will happen. That either you fall the Price of your Native Commodities, or leſſen your Trade, or elſe prevent not the high *Uſe* as you intended. For at the time of leſſening your *Intereſt*, you want Money for your Trade, or you do not. If you do not, there is no need to prevent borrowing at a high Rate of your Neighbours. For no Country borrows of its Neighbours, but where there is need of Money for Trade: No Body will borrow more of a Foreigner to let it lie ſtill. And if you do want Money, Neceſſity will ſtill make you borrow where you can, and at the Rates your Neceſſity, not your Laws, ſhall ſet: Or elſe, if there be Scarcity of Money, it muſt hinder the Merchant's Buying and Exportation, and the Artiſan's Manufacture. Now the Kingdom

Kingdom gets or loſes by this (for no queſtion the Merchant by low *Intereſt* gets all the while) only proportionably (allowing the Conſumption of Foreign Commodities to be ſtill the ſame) as the paying of *Uſe* to Foreigners carries away more or leſs of our Money, than want of Money and ſtopping our Trade keeps us from bringing in, by hindring our Gains, which can be only eſtimated by thoſe, who know how much Money we borrow of Foreigners, and at what Rate; and too, what Profit in Trade we make of that Money.

Borrowing of Foreigners upon *Intereſt* it's true carries away ſome of our Gain: But yet, upon Examination it will be found, that our growing Rich or Poor depends not at all upon our borrowing upon *Intereſt* or not; but only which is greater or leſs, our Importation or Exportation of conſumable Commodities. For ſuppoſing two Millions of Money will drive the Trade of *England*, and that we have Money enough of our own to do it; if we conſume of our own Product and Manufacture, and what we purchaſe by it of Foreign Commodities, one Million, but of the other Million conſume nothing, but make a Return of Ten *per Cent. per Ann.* we muſt then every Year be one hundred thouſand Pounds Richer, and our Stock be ſo much Encreaſt: But if we import more conſumable Commodities than we export, our Money muſt go out to pay for them, and we grow poorer. Suppoſe therefore ill Husbandry had brought us to One Million Stock, and we borrow the other Million (as we muſt, or loſe half our Trade) at Six *per Cent.* If we conſume one Moiety, and make ſtill Ten *per Cent. per Ann.* Return of the other Million, the Kingdom gets forty thouſand Pounds *per Ann.* though it pay ſixty thouſand Pound *per Ann. Uſe.* So that if the Merchant's Return be more than his *Uſe*, (which 'tis certain it is, or elſe he will not Trade) and all that is ſo Traded for on borrowed Money be but the over-balance of our Exportation to our Importation, the Kingdom gets by this Borrowing ſo much as the Merchant's Gain is above his *Uſe.* But if we borrow only for our own Expences, we grow doubly poor, by paying Money for the Commodity we conſume, and *Uſe* for that Money; though the Merchant gets all this while, by making Returns greater than his *Uſe.* And therefore borrowing of Foreigners in it ſelf makes not the Kingdom rich or poor; for it may do either: But ſpending more than our Fruits or Manufactures will pay for, brings in Poverty, and Poverty Borrowing.

For Money, as neceſſary to Trade, may be doubly conſidered. Firſt, as in his Hands that pays the Labourer and Landholder, (for here its Motion terminates, and through whoſe Hands ſoever it paſſes between theſe, he is but a Broker) and if this Man want Money, (as for Example, the Clothier) the Manufacture is not made; and ſo the Trade ſtops, and is loſt. Or Secondly, Money may be conſidered as in the Hands of the Conſumer, under which Name I here reckon the Merchant who buys the Commodity when made to export: And if he want Money, the Value of the Commodity when made is leſſened, and ſo the Kingdom loſes in the Price. If therefore *Uſe* be leſſened, and you cannot tie Foreigners to your Terms, then the ill Effects will fall only upon your Landholders and Artiſans: If Foreigners can be forc'd by your Law to Lend you Money only at your own Rate, or not Lend at all, is it not more likely they will rather take it home, and think it ſafer in their own Country at Four *per Cent.* than abroad in a decaying Country? Nor can their overplus of Money bring them to Lend to you, on your Terms: For when your Merchants Want of Money ſhall have ſunk the Price of your Market, a *Dunchman* will find it more Gains to buy your Commodity himſelf, than Lend his Money at Four *per Cent.* to an *Engliſh* Merchant to Trade with. Nor will the Act of Navigation hinder their coming, by making them come empty, ſince even already there are thoſe who think, that many, who go for *Engliſh* Merchants, are but *Dutch* Factors, and Trade for others in their own Names. The Kingdom therefore will loſe by this lowering of *Intereſt*, if it makes Foreigners withdraw any of their Money, as well as if it hinders any of your People from Lending theirs, where Trade has need of it.

In a Treatiſe writ on purpoſe for the bringing down of *Intereſt*, I find this Argument of Foreigners calling away their Money to the Prejudice of our Trade, thus Anſwer'd, *That the Money of Foreigners, is not brought into the Land by ready Coin or Bullion, but by Goods or Bills of Exchange, and when it it paid muſt be returned by Goods or Bills of Exchange; and there will not be the leſs Money in the Land.* I could

not but wonder to ſee a Man, who undertook to write of Money and Intereſt, talk ſo directly beſides the Matter in the Buſineſs of Trade. *Foreigners Money*, he ſays, *is not brought into the Land by ready Coin or Bullion, but by Goods, or Bills of Exchange.* How then do we come by Bullion or Money? For Gold grows not, that I know, in our Country, and Silver ſo little, that one hundred thouſandth Part of the Silver we have now in *England*, was not drawn out of any Mines in this Iſland. If he means that the Monied Man in *Holland*, who puts out his Money at *Intereſt* here, did not ſend it over in Bullion or Specie hither: That may be true or falſe; but either way helps not that Author's Purpoſe. For if he paid his Money to a Merchant his Neighbour, and took his Bills for it here in *England*, he did the ſame thing as if he had ſent over that Money, ſince he does but make that Merchant leave in *England* the Money which he has due to him there, and otherwiſe would carry away. *No*, ſays our Author, *he cannot carry it away, for*, ſays he, *when it is paid it muſt be returned by Goods, or Bills of Exchange.* It muſt not be paid and exported in ready Money, ſo ſays our Law indeed, but that is a Law to hedge in the Cookoe, and ſerves to no Purpoſe. For if we export not Goods, for which our Merchants have Money due to them in *Holland*, How can it be paid by Bills of Exchange? And for *Goods*, one hundred pounds worth of *Goods* can no where pay two hundred pounds in Money. This being that which I find many Men deceive themſelves with in Trade, it may be worth while to make it a little plainer.

Let us ſuppoſe *England* peopled as it is now; and its Woollen Manufacture in the ſame State and Perfection, that it is at preſent; and that we, having no Money at all, Trade with this our Woollen Manufacture for the value of two hundred thouſand pounds yearly to *Spain*, where there actually is a Million in Money: Farther let us ſuppoſe that we bring back from *Spain* yearly in Oil, Wine and Fruit, to the value of one hundred thouſand pounds, and continue to do this Ten Years together: 'Tis plain we have had for our two Millions value in Woollen Manufacture carried thither, one Million returned in Wine, Oil, and Fruit: But what is become of t'other Million? Will the Merchants be content to loſe it? That you may be ſure they would not, nor have traded on, if they had not every Year Returns made anſwering their Exportation. How then were the Returns made? In Money it is evident. For the *Spaniards* having in ſuch a Trade, no Debts, nor the poſſibility of any Debts in *England*, cannot pay one Farthing of that other Million by Bills of Exchange: And having no Commodities that we will take off above the value of one hundred thouſand pounds *per Annum*, they cannot pay us in Commodities. From whence it neceſſarily follows, that the hundred thouſand pounds *per Ann.* wherein we over-balance them in Trade, muſt be paid us in Money; and ſo at the Ten Years end, their Million of Money, (though their Law make it Death to export it) will be all brought into *England*; as in Truth, by this over-balance of Trade, the greateſt part of our Money hath been brought into *England* out of *Spain*.

Let us ſuppoſe our ſelves now poſſeſſed of this Million of Money; and exporting yearly out of *England*, to the ſeveral Parts of the World, conſumable Commodities to the value of a Million, but Importing yearly in Commodities, which we conſume amongſt us to the value of eleven hundred thouſand pounds. If ſuch a Trade as this be managed amongſt us, and continue Ten Years, it is evident, that our Million of Money will at the end of the Ten Years be inevitably all gone from us to them, by the ſame way that it came to us; that is, by their over-balance of Trade, for we importing every Year one hundred thouſand pounds worth of Commodities more than we export, and there being no Foreigners that will give us one hundred thouſand pounds every Year for nothing, it is unavoidable, that one hundred thouſand pounds of our Money muſt go out every Year to pay for that over-plus, which our Commodities do not pay for. 'Tis ridiculous to ſay, that Bills of Exchange ſhall pay our Debts abroad: That cannot be, till Scrips of Paper can be made current Coin. The *Engliſh* Merchant, who has no Money owing him abroad, cannot expect to have his Bills paid there. Or if he has Credit enough with a Correſpondent, to have his Bills anſwered; this pays none of the Debt of *England*, but only changes the Creditor. And if upon the general Balance of Trade, *Engliſh* Merchants owe to Foreigners one hundred thouſand pounds, or a Million, if Commodities do not, our Money muſt go out to pay it, or elſe our Credit be loſt, and our Trade ſtop, and be loſt too.

A King-

A Kingdom grows rich or poor, juſt as a Farmer doth, and no otherwiſe. Let us ſuppoſe the whole Iſle of *Portland* one Farm; and that the Owner, beſides what ſerves his Family, carries to Market to *Weymouth* and *Dorcheſter*, *&c.* Cattle, Corn, Butter, Cheeſe, Wool or Cloth, Lead and Tin, all Commodities produced and wrought within his Farm of *Portland*, to the value of a thouſand pounds yearly; and for this, brings home in Salt, Wine, Oil, Spice, Linnen and Silks, to the value of nine hundred pounds, and the remaining hundred pounds in Money. 'Tis evident he grows every Year a hundred pounds richer, and ſo at the end of ten Years will have clearly got a thouſand pounds. If the Owner be a better Husband, and contenting himſelf with his native Commodities, buy leſs Wine, Spice, and Silk, at Market, and ſo bring home five hundred pounds in Money yearly, inſtead of a thouſand pounds, at the end of ten Years, he will have five thouſand pounds by him, and be ſo much richer. He dies, and his Son ſucceeds, a faſhionable young Gentleman, that cannot dine without *Champane* and *Burgundy*, nor ſleep but in a Damask Bed; whoſe Wife muſt ſpread a long Train of Brocard, and his Children be always in the neweſt French Cut and Stuff. He being come to the Eſtate, keeps on a very buſie Family; the Markets are weekly frequented, and the Commodities of his Farm carried out, and ſold, as formerly, but the Returns are made ſomething different: the faſhionable Way of Eating, Drinking, Furniture and Clothing for himſelf and Family, requires more Sugar and Spice, Wine and Fruit, Silk and Ribons, than in his Father's time; ſo that inſtead of nine hundred pounds *per Annum*, he now brings home of conſumable Commodioies, to the value of eleven hundred pounds yearly. What comes of this? He lives in Splendor, 'tis true, but this unavoidably carries away the Money his Father got, and he is every Year an hundred pounds poorer. To his Expences, beyond his Income, add Debauchery, Idleneſs, and Quarrels amongſt his Servants, whereby his Manufactures are diſturbed, and his Buſineſs neglected, and a general Diſorder and Confuſion through his whole Family and Farm: This will tumble him down the Hill the faſter, and the Stock, which the Induſtry, Frugality, and good Order of his Father had laid up, will be quickly brought to an end, and he faſt in Priſon. A Farm and a Kingdom in this reſpect differ no more than as greater and leſs. We may Trade, and be buſie, and grow poor by it, unleſs we regulate our Expences; if to this we are idle, negligent, diſhoneſt, malicious, and diſturb the Sober and Induſtrious in their Buſineſs, let it be upon what Pretence it will, we ſhall ruine the faſter.

So that whatever this Author, or any one elſe may ſay, Money is brought into *England* by nothing but ſpending here leſs of foreign Commodities, than what we carry to Market can pay for; nor can Debts we owe to Foreigners be paid by Bills of Exchange, till our Commodities exported, and ſold beyond Sea, have produced Money or Debts due there, to ſome of our Merchants. For nothing will pay Debts but Money or Money's worth, which three or four lines writ in Paper cannot be. If ſuch Bills have an intrinſick Value, and can ſerve inſtead of Money, why do we not ſend them to Market inſtead of our Cloth, Lead and Tin, and at an eaſier Rate purchaſe the Commodities we want? All that a Bill of Exchange can do, is to direct to whom Money due, or taken up upon Credit in a foreign Country, ſhall be paid: and if we trace it, we ſhall find, that what is owing already, became ſo for Commodities or Money carried from hence: and if it be taken up upon Credit, it muſt (let the Debt be ſhifted from one Creditor to another as often as you will) at laſt be paid by Money or Goods, carried from hence, or elſe the Merchant here muſt turn Bankrupt.

We have ſeen how Riches and Money are got, kept, or loſt, in any Country; and that is by conſuming leſs of foreign Commodities than what by Commodities or Labour is paid for. This is in the ordinary Courſe of Things: but where great Armies and Alliances are to be maintained abroad by Supplies ſent out of any Country, there often, by a ſhorter and more ſenſible Way, the Treaſure is diminiſhed. But this ſince the holy War, or at leaſt ſince the Improvement of Navigation and Trade, ſeldom happening to *England*, whoſe Princes have found the enlarging their Power by Sea, and the ſecuring our Navigation and Trade, more the Intereſt of this Kingdom than Wars or Conqueſts on the Continent; Expences in Arms beyond Sea have had little Influence on our Riches or Poverty. The next Thing to be conſidered, is, how Money is neceſſary to Trade.

The Neceſſity of a certain Proportion of Money to Trade, (I conceive) lies in this, That Money in its Circulation driving the ſeveral Wheels of Trade, whilſt it keeps in that Channel (for ſome of it will unavoidably be dreined into ſtanding Pools) is all ſhared between the Landholder, whoſe Land affords the Materials; the Labourer, who works them; the Broker, (*i. e.*) Merchant and Shopkeeper, who diſtributes them to thoſe that want them; and the Conſumer, who ſpends them. Now Money is neceſſary to all theſe ſorts of Men, as ſerving both for Counters and for Pledges, and ſo carrying with it even Reckoning, and Security, that he, that receives it, ſhall have the ſame Value for it again, of other Things that he wants, whenever he pleaſes. The one of theſe it does by its Stamp and Denomination; the other by its intrinſick Value, which is its *Quantity*.

For Mankind, having conſented to put an imaginary Value upon Gold and Silver by reaſon of their Durableneſs, Scarcity, and not being very liable to be counterfeited, have made them, by general Conſent, the common Pledges, whereby Men are aſſured, in Exchange for them to receive equally valuable Things to thoſe they parted with for any *quantity* of theſe Metals. By which Means it comes to paſs, that the intrinſick Value regarded in theſe Metals made the common Barter, is nothing but the *quantity* which Men give or receive of them. For they having as Money no other Value, but as Pledges to procure, what one wants or deſires; and they procuring what we want or deſire, only by their *quantity*, 'tis evident, that the intrinſick Value of Silver and Gold uſed in Commerce is nothing but their *quantity*.

The Neceſſity therefore of a Proportion of Money to Trade, depends on Money not as Counters, for the Reckoning may be kept, or transferred by Writing; but on Money as a Pledge, which Writing cannot ſupply the place of: Since the Bill, Bond, or other Note of Debt, I receive from one Man, will not be accepted as Security by another, he not knowing that the Bill or Bond is true or legal, or that the Man bound to me is honeſt or reſponſible; and ſo is not valuable enough to become a current Pledge, nor can by publick Authority be well made ſo, as in the Caſe of aſſigning of Bills. Becauſe a Law cannot give to Bills that intrinſick Value, which the univerſal Conſent of Mankind has annexed to Silver and Gold. And hence Foreigners can never be brought to take your Bills, or Writings for any part of Payment, though perhaps they might paſs as valuable Conſiderations among your own People, did not this very much hinder it, *viz.* That they are liable to unavoidable Doubt, Diſpute, and Counterfeiting, and require other Proofs, to aſſure us that they are true and good Security, than our Eyes or a Touchſtone. And at beſt this Courſe, if practicable, will not hinder us from being Poor; but may be ſuſpected to help to make us ſo, by keeping us from feeling our Poverty, which in Diſtreſs, will be ſure to find us with greater Diſadvantage. Though it be certain it is better than letting any part of our Trade fall for want of current Pledges; and better too than borrowing Money of our Neighbours upon *Uſe*, if his way of aſſigning Bills can be made ſo eaſie, ſafe and univerſal at home, as to hinder it.

To return to the Buſineſs in hand, and ſhew the Neceſſity of a *Proportion of Money to Trade*. Every Man muſt have at leaſt ſo much Money, or ſo timely Recruits, as may in hand, or in a ſhort diſtance of Time, ſatisfy his Creditor who ſupplies him with the Neceſſaries of Life, or of his Trade. For no Body has any longer theſe neceſſary Supplies, than he has Money, or *Credit*, which is nothing elſe but an an aſſurance of Money in ſome ſhort time. So that it is requiſite to Trade that there ſhould be ſo much Money, as to keep up the Landholders, Labourers and Brokers Credit: and therefore ready Money muſt be conſtantly exchang'd for Wares and Labour, or follow within a ſhort time after.

This ſhews the Neceſſity of ſome *Proportion of Money* to Trade: But what Proportion that is, is hard to determine; becauſe it depends not barely on the Quantity of Money, but the Quickneſs of its Circulation. The very ſame Shilling may at one time pay twenty Men in twenty Days, at another, reſt in the ſame hands one hundred Days together. This makes it impoſſible exactly to eſtimate the Quantity of Money needful in Trade: But to make ſome probable gueſs, we are to conſider, how much Money it is neceſſary to ſuppoſe muſt reſt conſtantly in each Man's Hands, as requiſite to the carrying on of Trade.

Firſt therefore the Labourers, living generally but from Hand to Mouth, and indeed, conſidered as Labourers in order to Trade, may well enough carry on their

their Part, if they have but Money enough to buy Victuals, Cloaths and Tools: All which may very well be provided, without any great Sum of Money lying ſtill in their Hands. The Labourers therefore, being uſually paid once a Week, (if the Times of Payment be ſeldomer, there muſt be more Money for the carrying on this Part of Trade) we may ſuppoſe there is conſtantly amongſt them, one with another, or thoſe who are to pay them, always one Weeks Wages in ready Money. For it cannot be thought, that all, or moſt of the Labourers pay away all their Wages conſtantly, as ſoon as they receive it, and live upon Truſt till next Pay-Day. This the Farmer and Tradeſman could not well bear, were it every Labourers's Caſe, and every one to be truſted: And therefore they muſt of neceſſity keep ſome Money in their Hands, to go to Market for Victuals, and to other Tradeſmen as poor as themſelves, for Tools; and lay up Money too to buy Cloaths, or pay for thoſe they bought upon Credit. Which Money thus neceſſarily reſting in their Hands, we cannot imagine to be, one with another, much leſs than a Weeks Wages, that muſt be in their Pockets, or ready in the Farmer's Hands. For he who employs a Labourer at a Shilling *per* Day, and pays him on *Saturday* Nights, cannot be ſuppoſed conſtantly to receive that ſix Shillings juſt the ſame *Saturday:* It muſt ordinarily be in his Hands one time with another, if not a whole Week, yet ſeveral Days before.

This was the ordinary Courſe, whilſt we had Money running in the ſeveral Channels of Commerce: But that now very much failing, and the Farmer not having Money to pay the Labourer, ſupplies him with Corn, which in this great Plenty the Labourer will have at his own Rate, or elſe not take it off his Hands for Wages. And as for the Workmen, who are employed in our Manufactures, eſpecially the Woollen one, theſe the Clothier, not having ready Money to pay, furniſhes with the Neceſſaries of Life, and ſo trucks Commodities for Work, which, ſuch as they are, good or bad, the Workman muſt take at his Maſter's Rate, or ſit ſtill and ſtarve: Whilſt by this Means, this new ſort of Ingroſſers or Foreſtallers, having the feeding and ſupplying this numerous Body of Workmen out of their Warehouſes, (for they have now Magazines of all ſorts of Wares) ſet the Price upon the poor Landholder. So that the Markets now being deſtroyed, and the Farmer not finding vent there for his Butter, Cheeſe, Bacon, and Corn, *&c.* for which he was wont to bring home ready Money, muſt ſell it to theſe Ingroſſers, on their own Terms of Time and Rate; and allow it to their own Day-Labourers under the true Market-price. What kind of Influence this is like to have upon Land, and how this way Rents are like to be paid at Quarter-day, is eaſy to apprehend: And 'tis no wonder to hear every Day of Farmers breaking and running away. For if they cannot receive Money for their Goods at Market, 'twill be impoſſible for them, to pay their Landlord's Rent. If any one doubt whether this be ſo, I deſire him to enquire, how many Farmers in the *Weſt* are broke and gone ſince *Michaelmas* laſt. Want of Money being to this degree, works both ways upon the Landholder. For, firſt, the ingroſſing Foreſtaller lets not the Money come to Market; but ſupplying the Workman, who is employed by him in Manufacture, with Neceſſaries, impoſes his Price, and Forbearance on the Farmer, who cannot ſell to the others. And the Labourer, who is employed by the Landholder in Husbandry, impoſes alſo his Rate on him, for the Commodities he takes. For there being a want of Day-Labourers in the Country, they muſt be humoured, or elſe they will neither work for you, nor take your Commodities for their Labourer.

Secondly, As for the Landholder, ſince his Tenants cannot Coin their Rent juſt at Quarter-day, but muſt gather it up by degrees, and lodge it with them till Pay-day; or borrow it of thoſe, who have it lying by them, or do gather it up by Degrees, which is the ſame thing, and muſt be neceſſarily ſo much Money for ſome time lying ſtill. For all that is paid in great Sums, muſt ſomewhere be gathered up by the Retail Incomes of a Trade, or elſe lie ſtill too in great Sums, which is the ſame ſtop of Money, or a greater. Add to this, That to pay the Creditor, that lent him his Rent, he muſt gather up Money by Degrees, as the Sale of his Commodities ſhall bring it in, and ſo makes a greater Stop, and greater want of Money: Since the borrowed Money that paid the Landholder the 25th of *March,* muſt be ſuppoſed to lie ſtill ſome time in the Creditor's Hand,

Hand, before he lent it the Tenant; and the Money, that pays the Creditor three Months after, muſt lie ſtill ſome time in the Tenant's. Nor does the Landlord pay away his Rent uſually as ſoon as he receives it, but by Degrees, as his Occaſions call for it. All this conſider'd, we cannot but ſuppoſe, that between the Landlord and Tenant there muſt neceſſarily be at leaſt a quarter of the yearly Revenue of the Land conſtantly in their Hands. Indeed conſidering, that moſt part of the Rents of *England* are paid at our *Lady-day* and *Michaelmas*, and that the ſame Money, which pays me my Rent from my Tenant the 25th of *March*, or thereabouts, cannot pay my next Neighbour his Rent from his Tenant at the ſame Time, much leſs one more remote in another Country, it might ſeem requiſite to ſuppoſe half the yearly Revenue of the Land to be neceſſarily employed in paying of Rent. For to ſay that ſome Tenants break, and pay not their Rent at all, and others pay not till two, three, four, five, ſix, *&c.* Months after Quarter-day, and ſo the Rent is not all paid at one time, is no more than to ſay, that there is Money wanting to the Trade. For if the Tenant fail the Landlord, he muſt fail his Creditor, and he his, and ſo on, till ſome Body break, and ſo Trade decay for want of Money. But ſince a conſiderable Part of the Land of *England* is in the Owner's Hands, who neither pay nor receive great Sums for it at a certain Day; and becauſe too, (which is the chief Reaſon) we are not to conſider here how much Money is in any one Man's, or any one ſort of Mens Hands at one time; for that at other times may be diſtributed into other Hands, and ſerve other Parts of Trade; but how much Money is neceſſary to be in each Man's Hands all the Year round, taking one time with another, (*i. e.*) having three hundred pounds in his Hand one Month, is to be reckoned as one hundred pound in his Hand three Months, (and ſo proportionably) I think we may well ſuppoſe a quarter of the yearly Revenue to be conſtantly in the Landlords or Tenants Hands.

Here, by the by, we may obſerve, that it were better for Trade, and conſequently for every Body, (for more Money would be ſtirring, and leſs would do the Buſineſs) if Rents were paid by ſhorter Intervals than ſix Months. For ſuppoſing I let a Farm at fifty two pounds *per Ann.* if my Rent be paid half yearly, there is required twenty ſix pounds to be employed in the Payment of it in one entire Sum, (if it be paid well, and if it be not paid well, for want of ſo much Money to be ſpared to that Purpoſe, there is ſo much want of Money, and Trade is ſtill endamag'd by it) a great Part whereof muſt neceſſarily lie ſtill before it come out of my Tenants Cheſt to my Hands: If it be paid once a Quarter, thirteen pounds alone will do it, and leſs Money is laid up for it, and ſtop'd a leſs while in its Courſe: But ſhould it be paid every Week, one ſingle twenty ſhillings will pay the Rent of fifty two pounds *per Ann.* whence would follow this double Benefit. *Firſt*, That a great deal leſs Money would ſerve for the Trade of a Country. And *Secondly*, That leſs of the Money would lie ſtill, the contrary whereof muſt needs happen, where growing Debts are to be paid at larger Diſtances, and in greater Sums.

Thirdly, As for the Brokers, ſince they too muſt lay up the Money coming in by Retail, either to go to Market, and buy Wares, or to pay at the Day appointed, which is often ſix Months, for thoſe Wares which they have already, we cannot ſuppoſe them to have leſs by them, one with another, than one twentieth Part of their yearly Returns. Whether the Money be their own, or they be indebted ſo much or more, it matters not, if it be neceſſary they ſhould have conſtantly by them, comparing one time with another, at leaſt one twentieth Part of their yearly Return.

Indeed in ſome great Towns, where the Bankers are ready at hand to buy Bills, or any other way to lend Money, for ſhort time at greateſt *Intereſt*, there perhaps the Merchant is not forced to keep ſo much Money by him, as in other Places, where they have not ſuch a Supply: But if you conſider, what Money to do this muſt neceſſarily be conſtantly lodged in the Bankers Hands, the Caſe will be much the ſame.

To theſe Sums, if you add, what part of the Money of a Country Scholars of all ſorts, Women, Gameſters, and great Mens menial Servants, and all ſuch that do not contribute at all to Trade, either as Landholders, Labourers, or Brokers, will unavoidably have conſtantly in their Hands, it cannot well be thought, that leſs than one fiftieth Part of the Labourer's Wages, one fourth

Part

Part of the Landholders yearly Revenue, and one twentieth Part of the Brokers yearly Returs in ready Money, will be enough to drive the Trade of any Country. At leaſt, to put it beyond Exception low enough, it cannot be imagin'd that leſs than one Moiety of this, *i. e.* leſs than one hundredth Part of the Labourers yearly Wages, one eighth Part of the Landholders yearly Revenue, and one fortieth Part of the Brokers yearly Returns, in ready Money, can be enough to move the ſeveral Wheels of Trade, and keep up Commerce in that Life and thriving Poſture it ſhould be; and how much the ready Caſh of any Country is ſhort of this Proportion, ſo much muſt the Trade be impair'd and hindred for want of Money.

But however theſe Meaſures may be miſtaken, this is evident, that the multiplying of Brokers hinders the Trade of any Country, by making the Circuit, which the Money goes, larger, and in that Circuit more ſtope, ſo that the Returns muſt neceſſarily be ſlower and ſcantier, to the Prejudice of Trade: Beſides that, they Eat up too great a Share of the Gains of Trade, by that Means ſtarving the Labourer, and impoveriſhing the Landholder, whoſe Intereſt is chiefly to be taken care of, it being a ſettled unmoveable Concernment in the Commonwealth.

If this be ſo, it is paſt queſtion, that all Encouragement ſhould be given to Artificers; and Things ſo order'd, as much as might be, that thoſe who make, ſhould alſo vend and retail out of their own Commodities, and they be hindred as much as poſſible from paſſing here at home, through divers Hands to the laſt Buyer. Lazy and Unworking Shopkeepers in this being worſe than Gameſters, that they do not only keep ſo much of the Money of a Country conſtantly in their Hands, but alſo make the Publick pay them for their keeping of it. Though Gaming too, upon the account of Trade (as well as other Reaſons) may well deſerve to be reſtrain'd: Since Gameſters, in order to their Play, keep great Sums of Money by them, which there lies dead. For though Gameſters, Money ſhift Maſters oftener than any, and is tumbled up and down with every caſt of a Die, yet as to the Publick it lies perfectly ſtill, and no more of it comes into Trade, than they ſpend in Eating or Wearing.

Here too we may obſerve, how much Manufacture deſerves to be incourag'd: Since that Part of Trade, though the moſt conſiderable, is driven with the leaſt Money, eſpecially if the Workmanſhip be more worth than the Materials. For to the Trade that is driven by Labour and Handicrafts-men, one two and fiftieth Part of the yearly Money paid them will be ſufficient: But to a Trade of Commodities of our bare native Growth, much greater Proportion of Money is requir'd.

Perhaps it will be wondred, why having given ſome Eſtimate (how wide I know not) of the Money neceſſary in the Hands of the Landholder, Labourer, and Broker, to carry on Trade, I have ſaid nothing of the Conſumer, whom I had mentioned before. To this I Anſwer. There are ſo few Conſumers, who are not either Labourers, Brokers, or Landholders, that they make a very inconſiderable Part in the Account. For thoſe who immediately depend on the Landholder, as his Children and Servants, come in under that Title, being maintain'd by the Rent of his Lands; and ſo of the reſt.

By what has been ſaid, we may ſee what Injury the Lowering of *Intereſt* is like to do us by hindering Trade, when it ſhall either make the Foreigner call home his Money, or your own People backward to lend, the Reward not being judged propoptionable to the Riſque.

There is another ſeeming Conſequence, of the reducing of Money to a low Price, which at firſt ſight has ſuch an Appearance of Truth in it, that I have known it impoſe upon very able Men, and I gueſs it has no ſmall Influence, at this time, in the promoting this Alteration, and that is, that the Lowering of *Intereſt* will raiſe the Value of all other Things in proportion. For *Money* being the *Counter-balance* to all other Things purchaſeable by it, and lying, as it were, in the oppoſite Scale of Commerce, it looks like a natural Conſequence, that as much as you take off from the Value of Money, ſo much you add to the Price of other things, which are exchang'd for it; the raiſing of the Price of any thing being no more but the Addition to its Value in reſpect of Money, or, which is all one, leſſening the Value of Money. For Example: Should the Value of Gold be brought

down

down to that of Silver, one hundred Guineas would purchaſe little more Corn, Wool, or Land, than one hundred Shillings, and ſo the *Value of Money* being brought lower, ſay they, the Price of other Things will riſe, and the falling of *Intereſt* from ſix pound to four pound *per Cent.* is taking away ſo much of the Price of Money, and ſo conſequently the leſſening its Value.

The miſtake of this plauſible Way of Reaſoning will be eaſily diſcovered, when we conſider that the *Meaſure* of the Value of Money, in proportion to any thing purchaſeable by it, is the quantity of the ready Money we have, in compariſon with the *quantity* of that Thing and its *Vent*; or which amounts to the ſame Things, the Price of any Commodity riſes or falls, by the proportion of the number of *Buyers* and *Sellers*; this Rule holds univerſally in all things that are to be bought and ſold, bating now and then an extravagant Fancy of ſome particular Perſon, which never amounts to ſo conſiderable a part of Trade as to make any thing in the Account worthy to be thought an Exception to this Rule.

The Vent of any thing depends upon its Neceſſity or Uſefulneſs, as Convenience, or Opinion guided by Fancy or Faſhion ſhall determine.

The Vent of any Commodity comes to be increaſed or decreaſed as a greater part of the running Caſh of the Nation is deſigned to be laid out by ſeveral People at the ſame time rather in that, than another, as we ſee in the change of Faſhions.

I ſhall begin firſt with the Neceſſaries or Conveniences of Life, and the conſumable Commodities ſubſervient thereunto; and ſhew, that the *Value of Money* in reſpect of thoſe, depends only on the Plenty or Scarcity of Money in proportion to the Plenty and Scarcity of thoſe Things, and not on what *Intereſt* ſhall by Neceſſity, Law or Contract, be at that Time laid on the borrowing of Money: And then afterwards I ſhall ſhew that the ſame holds in Land.

There is nothing more confirmed by daily Experience, than that Men give any portion of Money for whatſoever is abſolutely neceſſary, rather than go without it. And in ſuch Things, the Scarcity of them alone makes their Prices. As for Example: Let us ſuppoſe half an Ounce of Silver, or half a Crown now in *England*, is worth a Buſhel of Wheat: But ſhould there be next Year a great Scarcity of Wheat in *England*, and a proportionable Want of all other Food, five Ounces of Silver would perhaps in Exchange purchaſe but one Buſhel of Wheat: So that Money would be then nine Tenths leſs worth in reſpect of Food, though at the ſame Value it was before, in reſpect of other Things, that kept their former proportion, in their Quantity and Conſumption.

By the like Proportions of Increaſe and Decreaſe, does the Value of Things, more or leſs convenient, riſe and fall in reſpect of Money, only with this difference, that Things abſolutely *neceſſary* for Life muſt be had at any Rate; but Things *convenient* will be had only as they ſtand in preference with other Conveniences: And therefore in any one of theſe Commodities, the Value riſes only as its Quantity is leſs, and Vent greater, which depends upon its being preferr'd to other Things in its Conſumption. For ſuppoſing that at the ſame time that there is a great Scarcity of *Wheat*, and other Grain, there were a conſiderable Quantity of *Oats*, Men, no queſtion, would give far more for *Wheat* than *Oats*, as being the healthier, pleaſanter, and more convenient Food: But ſince *Oats* would ſerve to ſupply that abſolute Neceſſity of ſuſtaining Life, Men would not rob themſelves of all other Conveniences of Life, by paying all their Money for *Wheat*, when *Oats*, that are cheaper, though with ſome Inconvenience, would ſupply that Defect. It may then ſo happen at the ſame time, that half an Ounce of Silver, that the Year before would buy one Buſhel of *Wheat*, will this Year buy but one Tenth of a Buſhel: Half an Ounce of Silver, that the Year before would have bought three Buſhels of *Oats*, will this Year ſtill buy one Buſhel: And at the ſame time half an Ounce of Silver, that would the Year before have bought fifteen pounds of Lead, will ſtill buy the ſame Quantity. So that at the ſame time *Silver*, in reſpect of *Wheat*, is nine Tenths leſs worth than it was, in reſpect of *Oats*, two Thirds leſs worth, and in reſpect of *Lead*, as much worth as before.

The Fall therefore or Riſe of *Intereſt*, making immediately by its change neither more nor leſs Land, Money, or any ſort of Commodity in *England*, than there was before, alters not at all the Value of Money, in reference to Commodities.

Becauſe

Becauſe the Meaſure of that is only the *Quantity* and *Vent*, which are not immediately chang'd by the Change of *Intereſt*. So far as the Change of *Intereſt* conduces in Trade to the bringing in or carrying out Money or Commodities, and ſo in time to the varying their Proportions here in *England* from what it was before, ſo far the Change of *Intereſt*, as all other things that promote or hinder Trade, may alter the Value of Money in reference to Commodities. But that is not in this Place to be conſidered.

This is perfectly the *Value of Money in reſpect of conſumable Commodities*: But the better to underſtand it in its full Latitude, in reſpect both of conſumable Commodities, and Land too, we muſt conſider, *Firſt*, That the *Value of Land* conſiſts in this, that by its conſtant Production of ſaleable Commodities it brings in a certain yearly Income. *Secondly*, The *Value of Commodities* conſiſts in this, that as portable and uſeful things, they, by their Exchange or Conſumption, ſupply the Neceſſaries or Conveniencies of Life. *Thirdly*, In *Money* there is a double Value, anſwering to both of theſe, firſt as it is capable by its *Intereſt* to yield us ſuch a yearly Income: And in this it has the Nature of Land, (the Income of one being called *Rent*, of the other *Uſe*) only with this Difference, that the Land in its Soil being different, as ſome fertile, ſome barren; and the Products of it very various, both in their Sorts, Goodneſs and Vent, is not capable of any fixed Eſtimate by its Quantity: But Money, being conſtantly the ſame, and by its *Intereſt* giving the ſame Sort of Product through the whole Country, is capable of having a fixed yearly Rate ſet upon it by the Magiſtrate; but Land is not. But though in the Uniformity of its legal Worth, one hundred Pounds of lawful Money being all through *England* equal in its current Value to any other one hundred Pounds of lawful Money, (becauſe by virtue of the Law it will every where paſs for as much Ware or Debt, as any other hundred Pounds) is capable to have its yearly Hire valued better than Land: Yet in reſpect of the varying Need, and Neceſſity of Money, which changes with the Increaſe or Decay of Money or Trade in a Country) it is as little capable to have its yearly Hire fixed by Law, as Land it ſelf. For were all the Land in *Rumney-Marſh*, Acre for Acre, equally good, that is, did conſtantly produce the ſame Quantity of equally good Hay or Graſs, one as another, the Rent of it, under that Conſideration of every Acre being of an equal Worth, would be capable of being regulated by Law; and one might as well enact, that no Acre of Land in *Rumney-Marſh* ſhall be let for above forty Shillings *per Ann.* as that no hundred Pound ſhall be let for above four Pounds *per Ann.* But no body can think it fit (ſince by reaſon of the equal Value of that Land it can) that therefore the Rent of the Land in *Rumney-Marſh* ſhould be regulated by Law. For ſuppoſing all the Land in *Rumney-Marſh*, or in *England*, were all of ſo equal a Worth, that any one Acre, compared at the ſame time to any one other, were equally good in reſpect of its Product, yet the ſame Acre, compar'd with its ſelf in different times, would not in reſpect of Rent be of equal Value. And therefore it would have been an unreaſonable thing, if in the time of *Henry* 7. the Rent of Land in *Rumney-Marſh* had been ſettled by a Law, according to the judg'd Value of it at that time, and the ſame Law, limiting the Rent perhaps to 5 *s. per* Acre, have continued ſtill. The Abſurdity and Impracticableneſs of this every one ſees at the firſt Propoſal, and readily concludes within himſelf, that things muſt be left to find their own Price; and it is impoſſible in this their conſtant Mutability for human Foreſight to ſet Rules and Bounds to their conſtantly-varying *Proportion* and *Uſe*, which will always regulate their Value.

They who conſider things beyond their Names, will find, that *Money*, as well as all other Commodities, is liable to the ſame Changes and Inequalities: Nay in this reſpect of the Variety of its *Value*, brought in by time in the Succeſſion of Affairs, the Rate of Money is leſs capable of being regulated by a Law in any Country than the Rent of Land. Becauſe to the quick Changes, that happen in Trade, this too muſt be added, that Money may be brought in, or carried out of the Kingdom, which Land cannot; and ſo that be truly worth 6 or 8 *per Cent.* this Year, which would yield but 4 the laſt.

2. *Money* has a *Value*, as it is capable by Exchange to procure us the Neceſſaries or Conveniencies of Life, and in this it has the Nature of a *Commodity*; only with this Difference, that it ſerves us commonly by its Exchange, never almoſt by

its Conſumption. But though the Uſe Men make of Money be not in its Conſumption, yet it has not at all a more ſtanding ſettled Value in Exchange with any other thing, than any other Commodity has, but a more known one, and better fixed by Name, Number and Weight, to enable us, to reckon, what the Proportion of Scarcity and Vent of one Commodity is to another. For ſuppoſing, as before, that half an Ounce of Silver would laſt Year exchange for one Buſhel of Wheat, or for 15 *lb.* Weight of Lead; if this Year Wheat be Ten times ſcarcer, and Lead in the ſame Quantity to its Vent as it was, is it not evident, that half an Ounce of Silver will ſtill exchange for 15 *lb.* of Lead, though it will exchange but for one Tenth of a Buſhel of Wheat; and he that has Uſe of Lead will as ſoon take 15 *lb.* Weight of Lead, as half an Ounce of Silver, for on Tenth of a Buſhel of Wheat, and no more. So that if you ſay, that Money now is nine Tenths leſs worth, than it was the former Year, you muſt ſay ſo of Lead too, and all other things, that keep the ſame Proportion to Money which they had before. The Variation indeed is firſt and moſt taken notice in Money: Becauſe that is the univerſal Meaſure by which People reckon, and uſed by every body in the valuing of all things. For calling that half Ounce of Silver Half a Crown, they ſpeak properly, and are readily underſtood when they ſay, Half a Crown, or two Shillings and ſix Pence, will now buy One Tenth of a Buſhel of Wheat, but do not ſay, that 15 *lb.* of Lead will now buy one Tenth of a Buſhel of Wheat, becauſe it is not generally uſed to this Sort of Reckoning: Nor do they ſay Lead is leſs worth than it was, though in reſpect of Wheat, Lead as well as Silver be nine Tenths worſe than it was, as well as Silver; only by the Tale of Shillings we are better enabled to judge of it: Becauſe theſe are Meaſures whoſe Ideas by conſtant Uſe are ſettled in every *Engliſh* Man's Mind.

This I ſuppoſe is the true *Value of Money* when it paſſes from one to another in Buying and Selling; where it runs the ſame Changes of higher or lower, as any other Commodity doth: For one equal Quantity whereof you ſhall receive in Exchange more, or leſs of another Commodity at one time, than you do at another. For a Farmer that carries a Buſhel of Wheat to Market, and a Labourer that carries Half a Crown, ſhall find that the Money of one, as well as Corn of the other, ſhall at ſome times purchaſe him more or leſs Leather or Salt, according as they are in greater Plenty and Scarcity one to another. So that in exchanging Coin'd Silver for any other Commodity, (which is buying and ſelling) the ſame Meaſure governs the Proportion you receive, as if you exchang'd Lead, or Wheat, or any other Commodity. That which regulates the Price, *i. e.* the Quantity given for Money (which is called buying and ſelling) for another Commodity, (which is called Bartring) is nothing elſe but their Quantity in Proportion to their Vent. If then lowering of *Uſe* makes not your Silver more *in Specie*, or your Wheat or other Commodities leſs, it will not have any Influence at all to make it exchange for leſs of Wheat, or any other Commodity, than it will have on Lead, to make it exchange for leſs of Wheat, or any other Commodity.

Money therefore in buying and ſelling being perfectly in the ſame Condition with other Commodities, and ſubject to all the ſame Laws of Value, let us next ſee *how* it comes to be *of the ſame Nature with Land*, by yielding a certain yearly Income, which we call *Uſe* or *Intereſt*. For Land produces naturally ſomething new and profitable, and of Value to Mankind; but Money is a barren thing, and produces nothing, but by Compact transfers that Profit that was the Reward of one Man's Labour into another Man's Pocket. That which occaſions this, is the *unequal Diſtribution* of Money; which Inequallity has the ſame Effect too upon Land, that it has upon Money. For my having more Money in my Hand than I can, or am diſpoſed to uſe in buying or ſelling, makes me able to lend: And another's Want of ſo much Money as he could employ in Trade, makes him willing to borrow. But why then, and for what Conſideration doth he pay *Uſe?* For the ſame Reaſon, and upon as good Conſideration, as the Tenant pays Rent for your Land. For as the unequal Diſtribution of Land, (you having more than you can or will manure, and another leſs) brings you a Tenant for your Land; and the ſame unequal Diſtribution of Money, (I having more than I can or will employ, and another leſs) bring me a Tenant for my Money: So my Money is apt in Trade, by the Induſtry of the Borrower, to produce more than Six *per Cent.* to the Borrower, as well as your Land, by the Labour of the Tenant,

is

is apt to produce more Fruits, than his Rent comes to; and therefore deſerves to be paid for, as well as Land, by a yearly Rent. For though the Uſurer's Money would bring him in no yearly Profit, if he did not lend it, (ſuppoſing he employs it not himſelf) and ſo his ſix *per Cent.* may ſeem to be the Fruit of another Man's Labour, yet he ſhares not near ſo much of the Profit of another Man's Labour, as he that lets Land to a Tenant. For without the Tenant's Induſtry, (ſuppoſing as before, the Owner would not manage it himſelf) his Land would yield him little or no Profit. So that the Rent he receives is a greater Portion of the Fruit of his Tenants Labour, than the *Uſe* is at ſix *per Cent.* For generally he that borrows one thouſand Pounds at ſix *per Cent.* and ſo pays ſixty Pounds *per Annum Uſe*, gets more above his *Uſe* in one Year, by his Induſtry, than he that Rents a Farm of ſixty Pounds *per Annum* gets in two, above his Rent, though his Labour be harder.

It being evident therefore, that he that has Skill in Traffick, but has not Money enough to exerciſe it, has not only reaſon to borrow Money to drive his Trade, and get a Livelihood; but as much reaſon to pay *Uſe* for that Money; as he, who having Skill in Husbandry, but no Land of his own to employ it in, has not only reaſon to rent Land, but to pay Money for the *Uſe* of it: It follows, that borrowing Money upon *Uſe* is not only by the neceſſity of Affairs, and the Conſtitution of human Society, unavoidable to ſome Men; but that alſo to receive Profit for the Loan of Money, is as equitable and lawful, as receiving Rent for Land, and more tolerable to the Borrower, notwithſtanding the Opinion of ſome over-ſcrupulous Men.

This being ſo, one would expect, that the Rate of *Intereſt* ſhould be the Meaſure of the Value of Land in number of Years Purchaſe, for which the Fee is ſold; For 100 *l. per Annum* being equal to 100 *l. per Annum*, and ſo to Perpetuity; and 100 *l. per Annum* being the Product of 1000 *l.* when *Intereſt* is at 10 *per Cent.* of 1250 *l.* when *Intereſt* is at 8 *per Cent.* of 1666 *l.* or thereabouts, when *Intereſt* is at 6 *per Cent.* of 2000 *l.* when Money is at 5 *per Cent.* of 2500 *l.* when Money is at 4 *per Cent.* One would conclude, I ſay, that Land ſhould ſell in proportion to *Uſe*, according to theſe following Rates, *viz.*

When Money is at { 10, 8, 6, 5, 4 } *per Cent.* for { 10, 12½, 16⅔, 20, 25 } Years purchaſe.

But Experience tells us, that neither in Queen *Elizabeth*, nor King *James* the firſt Reigns, when *Intereſt* was at ten *per Cent.* was Land ſold for Ten; or when it was at eight *per Cent.* for twelve and an half years Purchaſe, or any thing near the low Rate that high Uſe required (if it were true, that the Rate of *Intereſt* govern'd the Price of Land) any more than Land, now yields twenty five Years Purchaſe, becauſe a great Part of the monied Men will now let their Money upon good Security at four *per Cent.* Thus we ſee in fact how little this Rule has held at Home: And he that will look into *Holland*, will find, that the Purchaſe of Land was not raiſed there, when their Intereſt fell. This is certain, and paſt Doubt, that the legal *Intereſt* can never regulate the Price of Land, ſince it is plain, that the Price of Land has never changed with it in the ſeveral Changes have been made in the Rate of *Intereſt* by Law: Nor now that the Rate of *Intereſt* is by Law the ſame through all *England*, is the Price of Land every-where the ſame, it being in ſome Parts conſtantly ſold for four or five Years Purchaſe more than in others. Whether you or I can tell the reaſon of this, it matters not to the Queſtion in Hand: But it being really ſo, this is plain Demonſtration againſt thoſe, who pretend to advance and regulate the Price of Land by a Law, concerning the *Intereſt* of Money.

But yet I will give you ſome of my Gueſſes, why the Price of Land is not regulated (as at firſt ſight it ſeems it ſhould be) by the *Intereſt* of Money. Why it is not regulated by the *legal Uſe* is manifeſt, becauſe the Rate of Money does not follow the Standard of the Law, but the Price of the Market; and Men not obſerving the legal and forced, but the natural and current *Intereſt* of Money, regulate their Affairs by that. But why the Rate of Land does not follow the current *Intereſt* of Money, requires a farther Conſideration.

All Things that are bought and ſold, raiſe and fall their Price in proportion, as there are more Buyers and Sellers. Where there are a great many Sellers to a few Buyers, there uſe what Art you will, the Thing to be ſold will be cheap. On the other ſide, turn the Tables, and raiſe up a great many Buyers for a few Sellers, and the ſame thing will immediately grow dear. This Rule holds in Land as well as all other Commodities, and is the Reaſon, why in *England* at the ſame time, that Land in ſome Places is at ſeventeen or eighteen Years Purchaſe, it is about others, where there are profitable Manufactures, at two or three and twenty Years Purchaſe: Becauſe there (Men thriving and getting Money by their Induſtry, and willing to leave their Eſtates to their Children in Land, as the ſureſt, and moſt laſting Proviſion, and not ſo liable to Caſualties as Money in untrading or unskilful Hands) there are many Buyers ready always to purchaſe, but few Sellers. For the Land being thereabout already poſſeſſed by that ſort of induſtrious and thriving Men, they have neither need, nor will, to ſell. In ſuch Places of Manufacture, the Riches of the one not ariſing from the ſquandring and waſte of another, (as it doth in other Places where Men live lazily upon the Product of the Land) the Induſtry of the People bringing in increaſe of Wealth from remote Parts, makes plenty of Money there, without the impoveriſhing of their Neighbours. And when the thriving Tradeſman has got more than he can well employ in Trade, his next Thoughts are to look out for a Purchaſe, but it muſt be a Purchaſe in the Neighbourhood, where the Eſtate may be under his Eye, and within convenient diſtance, that the Care and Pleaſure of his Farm may not take him off from the Engagements of his Calling, nor remove his Children too far from him, or the Trade he breeds them up in. This ſeems to me the Reaſon, why in Places, wherein thriving Manufactures have erected themſelves, Land has been obſerved to ſell quicker, and for more Years Purchaſe than in other Places, as about *Hallifax* in the North, *Taunton* and *Exeter* in the Weſt.

This is that then, which makes *Land*, as well as other Things *dear*: plenty of Buyers, and but few Sellers: And ſo by the Rule of Contraries, plenty of Sellers and few Buyers makes *Land cheap*.

He that will juſtly eſtimate the value of any Thing, muſt conſider its Quantity in proportion to its Vent, for this alone regulates the Price. The Value of any thing, compar'd with its ſelf, or with a ſtanding Meaſure, is greater, as its Quantity is leſs in proportion to its Vent: But in comparing it, or exchanging it with any other thing, the Quantity and Vent of that thing too muſt be allowed for in the computation of their Value. But becauſe the deſire of Money is conſtantly, almoſt every where the ſame, its Vent varies very little; but as its greater Scarcity enhanſes its Price, and increaſes the Scramble, there being nothing elſe that does eaſily ſupply the want of it. The leſſening its Quantity, therefore, always increaſes its Price, and makes an equal *portion* of it exchange for a greater of any other Thing. Thus it comes to paſs, that there is no manner of ſettled proportion between the Value of an Ounce of Silver, and any other Commodity: For either varying its Quantity in that Country, or the Commodity changing its Quantity in proportion to its Vent, their reſpective Values change, *i. e.* leſs of one will barter for more of the other: Though in the ordinary way of ſpeaking, 'tis only ſaid, that the Price of the Commodity, not of the Money is changed. For Example; half an Ounce of Silver in *England*, will exchange ſometimes for a whole Buſhel of Wheat, ſometimes for half, ſometimes but a quarter, and this it does equally, whether by *Uſe* it be apt to bring in to the Owner ſix in the Hundred of its own Weight *per Annum*, or nothing at all: It being only the change of the Quantity of Wheat to its Vent, ſuppoſing we have ſtill the ſame Sum of Money in the Kingdom; or elſe the change of the Quantity of our Money in the Kingdom, ſuppoſing the Quantity of Wheat, in reſpect to its Vent be the ſame too, that makes the change in the Price of Wheat. For if you alter the Quantity or Vent on either ſide, you preſently alter the Price, but no other way in the World.

For it is not the Being, Adding, Increaſing or Diminiſhing of any good quality in any Commodity, that makes its Price greater or leſs, but only as it makes its Quantity or Vent greater or leſs, in proportion one to another. This will eaſily appear by two or three Inſtances.

1. The Being of any *good*, and uſeful *quality* in any thing neither increaſes its *Price*, nor indeed makes it have any Price at all, but only as it leſſens its Quantity

or

or increaſes its Vent, each of theſe in proportion to one another. What more uſeful or neceſſary Things are there to the Being or Well-being of Men, than Air and and Water, and yet theſe have generally no Price at all, nor yield any Money: Becauſe their Quantity is immenſly greater than their Vent in moſt places of the World. But, as ſoon as ever Water (for Air ſtill offers it ſelf every-where, without Reſtraint or Incloſure, and therefore is no-where of any Price) comes any where to be reduced into any proportion to its Conſumption, it begins preſently to have a Price, and is ſometimes ſold dearer than Wine. Hence it is, that the beſt, and moſt uſeful Things are commonly the cheapeſt; becauſe, though their Conſumption be great, yet the Bounty of Providence has made their Production large, and ſuitable to it.

2. Nor does the adding to an Excellency to any Commodity, raiſe its Price, unleſs it increaſes its Conſumption. For ſuppoſe there ſhould be taught a way (which ſhould be publiſhed to the knowledge of every one) to make a Medicine of Wheat alone, that ſhould infallibly cure the *Stone*: 'Tis certain the Diſcovery of this Quality in that Grain, would give it an Excellency very conſiderable: And yet this would not increaſe the Price of it one Farthing in twenty Buſhels, becauſe its Quantity or Vent would not hereby, to any ſenſible degree, be alter'd.

3. Neither does the increaſing of any good Quality, in any ſort of Things make it yield more. For though Teaſels be much better this Year, than they were laſt, they are not one jot dearer, unleſs they be fewer too, or the Conſumption of them greater.

4. Nor does the leſſening the good Qualities of any ſort of Commodity leſſen its Price; which is evident in Hops, that are uſually deareſt thoſe Years they are worſt. But if it happen to be a Species of Commodity, whoſe Defects may be ſupplied by ſome other, the making of it worſe does leſſen its Price; becauſe it hinders its Vent. For if Rye ſhould any Year prove generally ſmutty or grown, no queſtion it would yield leſs Money than otherwiſe, becauſe the Deficiency of that might be, in ſome meaſure, made up by Wheat, and other Grain. But if it be a ſort of Commodity whoſe uſe no other known thing can ſupply, 'tis not its being better or worſe, but its Quantity and Vent is that alone which regulates, and determines its Value.

To apply this now to Money, as capable of different Rates of *Intereſt*. To Money conſidered in its proper Uſe, as a Commodity paſſing in exchange from one to another, all that is done by *Intereſt*, is but the adding to it by Agreement or publick Authority, a Faculty, which naturally it has not, of increaſing every Year ſix *per Cent*. Now if publick Authority ſink *Uſe* to four *per Cent*. 'tis certain it diminiſhes this good Quality in Money one Third. But yet this making the Money of *England* not one Farthing more than it was, it alters not the Meaſures upon which all changeable Commodities increaſe or ſink their Price, and ſo makes not Money exchange for leſs of any Commodity, than it would without this alteration of its *Intereſt*. If leſſening *Uſe* to four *per Cent*. ſhould at all alter the quantity of Money, and make it leſs, it would make Money, as it has the Nature of a Commodity, dearer, *i. e.* a leſs quantity of Money would exchange for a greater quantity of another Commodity, than it would before. This perhaps will appear a little plainer by theſe following Particulars.

1. That the intrinſick natural worth of any Thing, conſiſts in its Fitneſs to ſupply the Neceſſities, or ſerve the Conveniencies of human Life; and the more neceſſary it is to our Being, or the more it contributes to our Well-being, the greater is its Worth: But yet,

2. That there is no ſuch intrinſick natural ſettled Value in any Thing, as to make any aſſign'd Quantity of it, conſtantly worth any aſſigned Quantity of another.

3. The Marketable Value of any aſſign'd Quantities of two or more Commodities, are *pro hic & nunc* equal, when they will Exchange one for another. As ſuppoſing one Buſhel of Wheat, two Buſhels of Barley, thirty Pound of Lead, and one Ounce of Silver, will now in the Market be taken one for another, they are then of equal Worth: And our Coin being that which *Engliſhmen* reckon by, an *Engliſhman* would ſay, that now one Buſhel of Wheat, two Buſhels of Barley, thirty Pound of Lead, and one Ounce of Silver, were equally worth five Shillings.

4. The

4. The change of this Marketable Value of any Commodity, in reſpect of another Commodity, or in reſpect of a ſtanding common Meaſure, is not the altering of any intrinſick Value or Quality in the Commodity; (for muſty and ſmutty Corn will ſell dearer at one time than the clean and ſweet at another) but the alteration of ſome proportion, which that Commodity bears to ſomething elſe.

5. This proportion in all Commodities, whereof Money is one, is the proportion of their quantity to the Vent. The Vent is nothing elſe, but the paſſing of Commodities from one Owner to another in Exchange; and is then call'd quicker, when a greater quantity of any Species of Commodity, is taken off from the Owners of it, in an equal Space of Time.

6. This Vent is regulated, *i.e.* made quicker or ſlower, as greater or leſs quantities of any ſaleable Commodity are remov'd out of the way, and courſe of Trade; ſeparated from publick Commerce; and no longer lie within the reach of Exchange. For though any Commodity ſhould ſhift Hands never ſo faſt, and be exchanged from one Man to another; yet if they were not thereby exempted from Trade and Sale, and did not ceaſe to be any longer Traffick, this would not at all make, or quicken their Vent. But this ſeldom or never happening, makes very little or no alteration.

7. Things are removed out of the Market or Hands of Commerce, and ſo their Vent altered three ways; 1. By Conſumption, when the Commodity in its Uſe is deſtroy'd, as, Meat, Drink, and Cloths, *&c.* all that is ſo conſumed is quite gone out of the Trade of the World. 2. By Exportation; and all that is ſo carried away, is gone out of the Trade of *England*, and concerns *Engliſhmen* no more in the Price of their Commodities among themſelves for their own Uſe, than if it were out of the World. 3. By buying and laying up for a Man's private Uſe. For what is by any of theſe ways ſhut out of the Market, and no longer moveable by the Hand of Commerce, makes no longer any part of Merchantable Ware, and ſo in reſpect of Trade, and the quantity of any Commodity, is not more conſiderable than if it were not in Being. All theſe three terminating at laſt in Conſumption of all Commodities, (excepting only Jewels and Plate, and ſome few others which wear out but inſenſibly) may properly enough paſs under that Name. Ingroſſing too has ſome influence on the preſent Vent: But this incloſing ſome conſiderable Part of any Commodity, (for if the ingroſſing be of all the Commodity, and it be of general Uſe, the Price is at the will of the Ingroſſer) out of the free Common of Trade only for ſome time, and afterwards returning again to Sale, makes not uſually ſo ſenſible and general an alteration in the Vent as the others do: But yet influences the Price, and the Vent more, according as it extends its ſelf to a larger portion of the Commodity, and hoards it up longer.

8. Moſt other portable Commodities (excepting Jewels, Plate, *&c.*) decaying quickly in their Uſe, but Money being leſs conſumed or increaſed, *i.e.* by ſlower Degrees removed from, or brought into the free Commerce of any Country, than the greateſt part of other Merchandize; and ſo the proportion between its Quantity and Vent, altering ſlower than in moſt other Commodities, it is commonly look'd on as a ſtanding Meaſure to judge of the Value of all Things, eſpecially being adapted to it by its Weight and Denomination in Coinage.

9. Money, whilſt the ſame quantity of it is paſſing up and down the Kingdom in Trade, is really a ſtanding Meaſure of the falling and riſing Value of other Things in reference to one another: And the alteration of Price is truly in them only. But if you increaſe or leſſen the quantity of Money current in Traffick in any place, then the alteration of Value is in the Money: And if at the ſame time Wheat keep its proportion of Vent to quantity, Money, to ſpeak truly, alters its Worth, and Wheat does not, though it ſell for a greater or leſs Price than it did before. For Money being look'd upon as the ſtanding Meaſure of other Commodities, Men conſider and ſpeak of it ſtill, as if it were a ſtanding Meaſure, though when it has varied its quantity, 'tis plain it is not.

10. But the Value or Price of all Commodities, amongſt which Money paſſing in Trade is truly one, conſiſting in Proportion, you alter this, as you do all other Proportions, whether you increaſe one, or leſſen the other.

11. In all other Commodities, the Owners, when they deſign them for Traffick, endeavour as much as they can to have them vented and gone, *i.e.* removed out of the reach of Commerce, by Conſumption, Exportation, or laying up: But

But Money never lying upon Peoples Hands, or wanting Vent, (for any one may part with it in exchange when he pleaſes:) the provident Publick, and private Care, is to keep it from venting or conſuming, *i. e.* from Exportation, which is its proper Conſumption; and from hoarding up by others, which is a ſort of ingroſſing. Hence it is that other Commodities have ſometimes a quicker, ſometimes a ſlower Vent: For no body lays out his Money in them but according to the Uſe he has of them, and that has Bounds. But every body being ready to receive Money without Bounds, and keep it by him, becauſe it anſwers all things: Therefore the Vent of Money is always ſufficient, or more than enough. This being ſo, its Quantity alone is enough to regulate and determine its Value, without conſidering any Proportion between its Quantity and Vent, as in other Commodities.

12. Therefore the leſſening of *Uſe*, not bringing one Penny of Money more into the Trade or Exchange of any Country, but rather drawing it away from Trade, and ſo making it leſs, does not at all ſink its Value, and make it buy leſs of any Commodity, but rather more.

13. That which raiſes the natural *Intereſt* of Money, is the ſame that raiſes the Rent of Land, *i. e.* its Aptneſs to bring in yearly to him that manages it, a greater Overplus of Income above his Rent, as a Reward to his Labour. That which cauſes this in Land is the greater Quantity of its Product, in Proportion to the ſame Vent to that particular Fruit, or the ſame Quantity of Product, in Proportion to a greater Vent of that ſingle Commodity; but that which cauſes Increaſe of Profit to the Borrower of Money, is the leſs Quantity of Money, in Proportion to Trade, or to the Vent of all Commodities, taken together, *& vice verſa.*

14. The natural Value of Money, as it is apt to yield ſuch an yearly Income by *Intereſt*, depends on the whole Quantity of the then paſſing Money of the Kingdom, in Proportion to the whole Trade of the Kingdom, *i. e.* the general Vent of all the Commodities. But the natural Value of Money, in exchanging for any one Commodity, is the Quantity of the Trading-Money of the Kingdom, deſign'd for that Commodity, in Proportion to that ſingle Commodity and its Vent. For though any ſingle Man's Neceſſity and Want, either of Money, or any *Species* of Commodity, being known, may make him pay dearer for Money, or that Commodity; yet this is but a particular Caſe, that does not at the ſame time alter this conſtant and general Rule.

15. That ſuppoſing Wheat a ſtanding Meaſure, that is, that there is conſtantly the ſame Quantity of it in Proportion to its Vent, we ſhall find Money to run the ſame Variety of Changes in its Value, as all other Commodities do. Now that Wheat in *England* does come neareſt to a ſtanding Meaſure, is evident by comparing Wheat with other Commodities, Money, and the yearly Income of Land in *Henry* the VII*th*'s time and now. For ſuppoſing that *primo Hen. 7. N.* let 100 Acres of Land to *A.* for *6d. per Ann. per* Acre, Rack-rent, and to *B.* another 100 Acres of Land, of the ſame Soil and yearly Worth with the former, for a Buſhel of Wheat *per* Acre, Rack-rent, (a Buſhel of Wheat about that time being probably ſold for about *6d.*) it was then an equal Rent. If therefore theſe Leaſes were for Years yet to come, 'tis certain that he that paid but *6d. per* Acre, would pay now 50 *s. per An.* and he that paid a Buſhel of Wheat *per* Acre, would pay about 25*l. per An.* which would be near about the yearly Value of the Land, were it to be let now. The Reaſon whereof is this, That there being ten times as much Silver now in the World, (the Diſcovery of the *Weſt-Indies* having made the Plenty) as there was then, it is nine Tenths leſs worth now than it was at that time; that is, it will exchange for nine Tenths leſs of any Commodity now, which bears the ſame Proportion to its Vent as it did 200 Years ſince; which, of all other Commodities, Wheat is likelieſt to do. For in *England*, and this Part of the World, Wheat being the conſtant and moſt general Food, not altering with the Faſhion, not growing by Chance; but as the Farmers ſow more or leſs of it, which they endeavour to proportion, as near as can be gueſſed, to the Conſumption, abſtracting the Overplus of the precedent Year in their Proviſion for the next; and *vice verſa*, it muſt needs fall out, that it keeps the neareſt Proportion to its Conſumption, (which is more ſtudied and deſigned in this than other Commodities) of any thing, if you take it for ſeven or twenty Years together: Tho' perhaps the Plenty or Scarcity of one Year, cauſe by the

Acci-

Accidents of the Seaſon, may very much vary it from the immediately precedent, or following. Wheat therefore, in this Part of the World, (and that Grain which is the conſtant general Food of any other Country) is the fitteſt Meaſure to judge of the altered Value of things in any long Tract of Time: And therefore Wheat here, Rice in *Turkey*, &c. is the fitteſt thing to reſerve a Rent in, which is deſigned to be conſtantly the ſame for all future Ages. But Money is the beſt Meaſure of the alter'd Value of things in a few Years: Becauſe its Vent is the ſame, and its Quantity alters ſlowly. But Wheat, or any other Grain, cannot ſerve inſtead of Money; becauſe of its Bulkineſs, and too quick Change of its Quantity. For had I a Bond, to pay me 100 Buſhels of Wheat next Year, it might be a fourth Part Loſs or Gain to me; too great an Inequality and Uncertainty to be ventured in Trade: Beſides the different Goodneſs of ſeveral Parcels of Wheat in the ſame Year.

16. That ſuppoſing any Iſland ſeperate from the Commerce of the reſt of Mankind, if Gold and Silver, or whatever elſe (ſo it be laſting) be their Money, if they have but a certain Quantity of it, and can get no more, that will be a ſteady ſtanding Meaſure of the Value of all other things.

17. That if in any Country they uſe for Money any laſting Material, whereof there is not any more to be got, and ſo cannot be increas'd; or being of no other Uſe, the reſt of the World does not value it, and ſo it is not like to be diminiſhed; this alſo would be a ſteady ſtanding Meaſure of the Value of other Commodities.

18. That in a Country where they had ſuch a ſtanding Meaſure, any Quantity of that Money (if it were but ſo much that every body might have ſome) would ſerve to drive any Proportion of Trade, whether more or leſs, there being Counters enough to reckon by, and the Value of the Pledges being ſtill ſufficient, as conſtantly encreaſing with the Plenty of the Commodity. But theſe three laſt, being built on Suppoſitions that are not like to be found in the Practice of Mankind, ſince Navigation and Commerce have brought all Parts acquainted with one another, and introduced the Uſe of Gold and Silver Money into all trading Parts of the World, they ſerve rather to give us ſome Light into the Nature of Money, than to teach here a new Meaſure of Traffick. Though it be certain, that that Part of the World, which bred moſt of our Gold and Silver, uſed leaſt of it in Exchange, and uſed it not for Money at all.

19. That therefore in any Country that hath Commerce with the reſt of the World, it is almoſt impoſſible now to be without the Uſe of Silver Coin; and having Money of that, and Accounts kept in ſuch Money, it is impoſſible to have any ſtanding, unalterable Meaſure of the Value of things. For whilſt the Mines ſupply to Mankind more than waſtes and conſumes in its Uſe, the Quantity of it will daily grow greater in reſpect of other Commodities, and its Value leſs.

20. That in a Country that hath open Commerce with the reſt of the World, and uſes Money made of the ſame Materials with their Neighbours, any Quantity of that Money will not ſerve to drive any Quantity of Trade; but there muſt be a certain Proportion between their *Money* and *Trade*. The Reaſon whereof is this, becauſe to keep your *Trade* going without Loſs, your Commodities amongſt you muſt keep an equal, or, at leaſt, near the Price of the ſame Species of Commodities in the neighbouring Countries: which they cannot do, if your *Money* be far leſs than in other Couutries; for then, either your Commodities muſt be ſold very cheap, or a great Part of your *Trade* muſt ſtand ſtill, there not being Money enough in the Country to pay for them (in their ſhifting of Hands) at that high Price, which the Plenty, and conſequently low Value of Money makes them at in another Country. For the Value of Money in general is the Quantity of all the Money in the World, in Proportion to all the Trade: But the Value of Money in any one Country, is the preſent Quantity of the current Money in that Country, in Proportion to the preſent Trade. Suppoſing then, that we had now in *England* but half as much Money as we had ſeven Years ago, and yet had ſtill as much yearly Product of Commodities, as many Hands to work them, and as many Brokers to diſperſe them, as before; and that the reſt of the World we trade with, had as much Money as they had before, (for 'tis likely they ſhould have more of our Moiety ſhared amongſt them) 'tis certain, that either half our *Rents* ſhould not be paid, half our *Commodities* not vented, and

half

half our *Labourers* not employed, and ſo half the Trade be clearly loſt; or elſe, that every one of theſe muſt receive but half the Money, for their Commodities and Labour, they did before, and buthalf ſo much as our Neighbours do receive for the ſame Labour and the ſame natural Product, at the ſame time. Such a State of Poverty as this, though it will make no Scarcity of our native Commodities amongſt us, yet it will have theſe ill Conſequences.

1. It will make our native Commodities vent very cheap.

2. It will make all foreign Commodities very dear, both which will keep us poor. For the Merchant making Silver and Gold his Meaſure, and conſidering what the foreign Commodity coſts him (*i. e.* how many Ounces of Silver) in the Country where Money is more plenty, *i. e.* cheaper; and conſidering too, how many Ounces of Silver it will yield him in another Country, will not part with it here but for the ſame Quantity of Silver, or as much as that Silver will buy here of our Commodity, which will be a grear deal more than in another Place. So that in all our Exchange of native for foreign Commodities, we ſhall pay double the Value that any other Country does, where Money is in greater Plenty. This indeed will make a Dearneſs, and, in time, a Scarcity of foreign Commodities; which is not the worſt Inconveniency that it brings upon us, ſuppoſing them not abſolutely neceſſary. But,

3. It endangers the drawing away our People, both Handicrafts, Marriners, and Soldiers, who are apt to go where their Pay is beſt, which will always be where there is greateſt Plenty of Money, and in time of War muſt needs bring great Diſtreſs.

21. Upon this Meaſure too it is, that the Variation of Exchange of Money between ſeveral Countries does ſomewhat depend. For it is certain, that one Ounce of Silver is alway of equal Value to another Ounce of Silver conſidered in its intrinſick Worth, or in Reference to the univerſal Trade of the World: But 'tis not of the ſame Value at the ſame time, in ſeveral Parts of the World, but is of the moſt Worth in that Country, where there is the leaſt Money, in Proportion to its Trade: And therefore Men may afford to give twenty Ounces of Silver in one Place, to receive eighteen or nineteen Ounces of Silver in another. But this is not all: To this then, (to find out the Alteration of the Exchange) the over-balance of the Trade muſt be taken into Conſideration. Theſe two together regulate the Exchange in all the Commerce of the World, and in both the higher Rate of Exchange depends upon one and the ſame thing, *viz.* the greater Plenty of Money in one Country than in the other; only with this Difference, that where the over-balance of Trade raiſes the Exchange above the *Par*, there it is the Plenty of Money, which private Merchants have in one Country, which they deſire to remove into another: But where the Riches of the Country raiſes the Exchange above the *Par*, there it is the Plenty of the Money in the whole Country. In one the *Merchant* has more Money (or Debts, which is all one) in a foreign Country than his Trade there will employ, and ſo is willing to allow upon Exchange to him abroad, that ſhall pay him ready Money at home, 1, 2, 3, *&c. per Cent.* more or leſs, proportionably as his or his Countrymen's Plenty of ready Money abroad, the Danger of leaving it there, or the Difficulty of bringing it home in Specie, and his preſent Need of Money at home is greater or leſs: In the other, the whole Country has more Money than can well be employ'd in the Trade thereof, or at leaſt, the Proportion of the Money to the Trade is greater than in the neighbouring Country, where the Exchange is below the *Par*.

For, ſuppoſing the Balance of Trade to be equal between *England* and *Holland*, but that there is in *Holland* a greater Plenty of Money than in *England*, (which will appear by the Lowneſs of the natural *Uſe* in *Holland*, and the Height of the natural *Uſe* in *England*; and alſo by the Dearneſs of Food and Labour in general in *Holland*, and the Cheapneſs of it in *England*.) If *N.* has 10000 *l.* in *Holland*, which the greater Advantage he could make of it in *England*, either by *Uſe* or *Purchaſe*, tempts him to transfer into *England*, 'tis probable he will give as much to a Merchant in *Holland* to pay him 10000 *l.* in *England*, as the Inſurance at that time between *Holland* and *England* is worth. If this happens to be in a Country, where the Exportation of *Bullion* is prohibited, he muſt pay the more; becauſe his Venture, if he carry it in Specie, will be greater. And upon this Ground, perhaps, the Prohibiting the Exportation of Money out of *England*, under Penalties,

may be of ſome Uſe, by making the Rate of the Exchange greater to thoſe Countries, which import upon us more than they export in Commodities; and ſo retain ſome Part of the Money which their over-balance of Trade would carry away from us, tho' after all, if we are over-balanc'd in Trade it muſt go.

But, ſince the *Holland* Merchant cannot receive *N*'s 10000 *l.* in Money in *Holland*, and pay him 10000 *l.* in *England*, unleſs his over-balance of Trade make *Engliſhmen* indebted to him 10000 *l.* in Money, which he is not like to take in Commodities. I think the over-balance of Trade is that which chiefly raiſes the Exchange in any Country, and that Plenty of Money in any Country does it only for ſo much of the Money as is transferr'd either to be let out to *Uſe*, or to be ſpent there. And though lending to Foreigners, upon *Uſe*, doth not at all alter the Balance of Trade between thoſe Countries, yet it does alter the Exchange between thoſe Countries for ſo much as is lent upon *Uſe*, by not calling away the Money that ſhould follow the over-balance of Trade, but letting it reſt there, as if it were accounted for; all one as if the Balance of Trade were for ſo much altered. But this being not much, in Compariſon of the general Traffick between two Nations, or at leaſt varying ſlower, the Merchant too regulating the Exchange, and not the Uſurer. I ſuppoſe it is the preſent Balance of Trade, on which the Exchange immediately and chiefly depends, unleſs ſome Accident ſhall make a great deal of Money be remitted at the ſame time, from one Place to another, which will for that time raiſe the Exchange all one as an over-balance of Trade; and indeed, when examin'd, is generally very little *different* from it.

To be able to eſtimate the *Par*, with the Riſe and Fall of the Exchange, it is neceſſary to know the intrinſick Value, *i. e.* how much Silver is in the Coins of the two Countries, by which you reckon and charge the Bill of Exchange.

Sir, *If I have been led a little too far from one thing to another, in the Conſideration of Money, I beg your Pardon, hoping that theſe Particulars will afford ſome Light to our preſent Subject.*

To return to the Price of Land. 'Tis evident by what has been above-ſaid, That the Years Purchaſe of Land do not increaſe with the Fall of *Intereſt*, and the Abating that good Quality in Money, or yielding yearly Six *per Cent.* to Four, does not preſently ſo ſink its Value in reſpect of Land, that one third more is required in Exchange: Falling of *Intereſt* from Six to Four, will not raiſe Land from twenty to thirty Years Purchaſe, the riſing and falling of the Price of Land, as of other things, depends much on the Quantity of Land ſet to Sale, compar'd with the Quantity of Money deſign'd for that Traffick, or, which amounts to the ſame thing, upon the Number of Buyers and Sellers. For where there are many Sellers and few Purchaſers, tho' *Intereſt* be leſſened, Land will be cheap, as I have already ſhew'd. At leaſt, this is certain, That making a Law to reduce *Intereſt* will not raiſe the Price of Lands; it will only, by driving it more into the Bankers Hands, leave the Country barer of Money, whereby, if the Price of Land about *London* ſhould be accidentally raiſed, that of remoter Countries would thereby have fewer Purchaſers, and at lower Rates.

This being ſo, that the low Rate of Land depends much on the great Number of Sellers in Proprotion to Purchaſers, the next thing to be inquir'd into, is, What makes plenty of Sellers? And to that the Anſwer is obvious, general *ill Husbandry*, and the Conſequence of it, *Debts*. If a Neglect of Government and Religion, ill Examples, and depraved Education, have introduc'd Debauchery; and Art or Chance has made it faſhionable for Men to live beyond their Eſtates, Debts will increaſe and multiply, and draw with them a Neceſſity on Men, firſt of incumbring, and then ſelling their Eſtates. This is generally the Cauſe why Men part with their Land: And I think there is ſcare one in an hundred that thinks of ſelling his Patrimony, till Mortgages have pretty well eat into the Freehold; and the Weight of growing Debts force a Man, whether he will or no, out of his Poſſeſſions. When almoſt is there ever a clear and unincumbred Eſtate ſet to ſale? 'Tis ſeldom a thrivinng Man turns his Land into Money, to make the greater Advantage: The Example of it are ſo rare, that they are ſcarce of any Conſideration in the Number of Sellers.

This I think may be the Reaſon, why in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Days (Sobriety, Frugality, and Induſtry, brought in daily Increaſe, to the growing Wealth

of

of the Kingdom) Land kept up its Price, and ſold for more Years Purchaſe, than correſponded to the *Intereſt* of Money, then buſily employ'd in a thriving Trade, which made the natural *Intereſt* much higher than it is now, as well as the Parliament then ſet it higher by Law.

On the contrary ſide, what makes ſcarcity of Purchaſers?

1. The ſame Reaſon, *Ill Husbandry*. When the Tradeſman lives up to the heighth of his Income, and the Vanity of Expences either drains the Merchants Coffers, or keeps them from over-flowing, he ſeldom thinks of Purchaſing. Buying of Land is the Reſult of a full and ſatiated Gain: And Men in Trade ſeldom think of laying out their Money upon Land, till their Profit has brought them in more, than their Trade can well employ; and their idle Bags cumbring their Counting-Houſes, put them upon emptying them on a Purchaſe.

2. Another Thing that makes a Scarcity of Buyers of Land, are doubtful and ill Titles: Where theſe are frequent and fatal, one can no more expect, that Men who have Money ſhould be forward to purchaſe, than Ships richly laden to venture themſelves amongſt Rocks and Quickſands. 'Tis no wonder ſuch Seas ſhould not be much frequented, where the Examples, and Remains of daily Wrecks, ſhew the folly, and hazard of the Venture, in the number of thoſe who have miſcarried.

3. A general Decay of Trade diſcourages Men from Purchaſing: For this threatens an univerſal Poverty, which is ſure to fall firſt and heavieſt upon Land. The Merchant who furniſhes the improvident Landholder, will not fail to have Money for his Wares with Gain, whether the Kingdom get by his Trade or no; and he will keep his Money rather employed in Trade, which brings him in profit, (for the Merchant, may get by a Trade that makes the Kingdom poor) than lay it out in Land, whoſe Rents he ſees ſinking, and foreſees by the courſe of Trade, is likely to continue on to do ſo. When a Nation is running to Decay and Ruin, the Merchant and monied Man, do what you can, will be ſure to ſtarve laſt: Obſerve it where you will, the Decays that come upon, and bring to Ruin any Country, do conſtantly firſt fall upon the Land: And though the Country Gentleman, (who uſually ſecurely relies upon ſo much a Year as was given in at his Marriage Settlement, and thinks his Land an unmovable Fund for ſuch an Income) be not very forward to think ſo: Yet this nevertheleſs is an undoubted Truth, that he is more concern'd in Trade, and ought to take a greater care, that it be well manag'd, and preſerv'd, than even the Merchant himſelf. For he will certainly find, when a Decay of Trade has carried away one Part of our Money out of the Kingdom, and the other is kept in the Merchant and Tradeſman's Hands, that no Laws he can make, nor any little Arts of Shifting Property amongſt our ſelves, will bring it back to him again; but his Rents will fall, and his Income every Day leſſen, till general Induſtry and Frugality, join'd to a well-order'd Trade, ſhall reſtore to the Kingdom the Riches and Wealth it had formerly.

This by the Way, if well conſider'd, might let us ſee, that *Taxes*, however contriv'd, and out of whoſe Hand ſoever immediately taken, do in a Country, where their great Fund is in Land, for the moſt part terminate upon Land. Whatſoever the People is chiefly maintained by, that the Government ſupports it ſelf on: Nay, perhaps it will be found, that thoſe *Taxes* which ſeem leaſt to affect Land, will moſt ſurely of all other, fall the Rents. This would deſerve to be well conſidered in the raiſing of *Taxes*, leſt the neglect of it bring upon the Country Gentleman an Evil which he will be ſure quickly to feel, but not be able very quickly to remedy. For Rents once fallen are not eaſily raiſed again. A *Tax* laid upon Land ſeems hard to the Landholder, becauſe it is ſo much Money going viſibly out of his Pocket: And therefore as an Eaſe to himſelf, the Landholder is always forward to lay it upon Commodities. But if he will throughly conſider it, and examine the Effects, he will find he buys this ſeeming Eaſe at a very dear Rate: And though he pays not this *Tax* immediately out of his own Purſe, yet his Purſe will find it by a greater want of Money there at the End of the Year, than that comes to, with the leſſening of his Rents to boot; which is a ſettled and laſting Evil, that will ſtick upon him beyond the preſent Payment.

To make this clear, let us ſuppoſe in the preſent State of Affairs in *England*, that the Rents of *England* are Twelve Millions, and that the Charge and Neceſſities of the Government require a ſupply of Three Millions from the Parliament, which is laid on Land. Here is one fourth Part of his Yearly Income goes immediately out of the Landlords and Landholders Pocket. This is a Burthen very apt to be felt. The Country Gentleman, who actually pays the Money out of his Pocket, or finds it deducted out of his Rent at Quarter-day for *Taxes*, ſees and very ſenſibly obſerves what goes thus out of his Eſtate. But though this be a Quarter of his yearly Income, and out of an Eſtate of four hundred Pounds a Year, the publick *Tax* now openly takes away one hundred: Yet this influences not at all the yearly Rent of the Land, which the Rack-renter, or under Tenant pays: It being the ſame thing to him, whether he pays all his Rent to the King, or his Landlord, or half, or a quarter, or none at all to the King; the Caſe is all one to him, what Hand receives his Rent, when due: So Trade flouriſhes, and his Commodities go off well, he will be able to pay his Rent on. This leſſens not any more the Value of his Farm, than an high or a low chief Rent does paid out of it to the Lord of the Fee: The Tenant's Bargain and Profit is the ſame, whether the Land be charg'd, or not charg'd with an Annuity payable to another Man. We ſee this in College Leaſes, where though the College Tenant pays for it to the College in ſome Years five times as much as he does others, upon the varying Rate of Corn: Yet the Under-Tenant feels not this Alteration in the leaſt, nor finds a Reaſon to have his Rent abated, becauſe a greater Part of it is diverted from his Landlord. All this is but changing the Hand, that receives the Rent, without any influence at all upon the yearly Value of the Eſtate; which will not be let for one Penny more or leſs to the Renter, however or amongſt whomſoever, the Rent he pays, be divided. From hence it is evident, that *Taxes* laid on Land do not in the leaſt make Rents fall.

But ſuppoſe, to ſhift off the Burthen from the Land, ſome Country Gentlemen ſhould think fit to raiſe theſe three Millions upon Commodities, to let the Land go free. Firſt, it is to be conſider'd, That ſince the publick Wants require three Millions, (for that we ſuppos'd for Argument ſake; let it be three Millions, or one Million, that's all one;) and ſo much muſt go into the King's Coffers, or elſe the Neceſſities of the Government will not be ſupplied: That for raiſing theſe three Millions on Commodities, and bringing ſo much into the *Exchequer*, there muſt go a great deal more than three Millions out of the Subjects Pockets. For a *Tax* of that nature cannot be levied by Officers, to watch every little Rivulet of Trade, without a great Charge, eſpecially at firſt trial. But ſuppoſing no more Charge in raiſing it, than of a Land *Tax*, and that there are only three Millions to be paid, 'tis evident that to do this out of Commodities, they muſt to the Conſumer be raiſed a quarter in their Price; ſo that every thing, to him that uſes it, muſt be a quarter dearer. Let us ſee now who at long run muſt pay this quarter, and where it will light. 'Tis plain, the Merchant and Broker, neither will nor can; for if he pays a quarter more for Commodities than he did, he will ſell them at a Price proportionably raiſed. The poor Labourer and Handicraftſman cannot: For he juſt lives from Hand to Mouth already, and all his Food, Clothing and Utenſils, coſting a quarter more than they did before, either his Wages muſt riſe with the Price of Things, to make him live; or elſe, not being able to maintain himſelf and Family by his Labour, he comes to the Pariſh; and then the Land bears the Burthen a heavier way. If the Labourer's Wages be rais'd in proportion to the encreas'd Rates of Things, the Farmer, who pays a quarter more for Wages, as well as all other Things, whilſt he ſells his Corn and Wool, either at the ſame Rate, or lower, at the Market, (ſince the Tax laid upon it makes People leſs forward to buy) muſt either have his Rent abated, or elſe break and run away in his Landlord's Debt: And ſo the yearly Value of the Land is brought down. And who then pays the Tax at the Years end, but the Landlord? When the Tenant, not able to raiſe his Rent by his Commodities, either runs away in his Landlord's Debt, or cannot be continued in the Farm without abatement of Rent: For when the yearly Charge in his Farm is greater by the increaſe of the Labourers Wages, and yet his Product ſells cheaper by reaſon of the Tax laid on his Commodities; how will the Farmer be able to make up his Rent at Quarter-day? For this may be worth our Notice, that any Tax laid on

foreign

foreign Commodities in *England*, raiſe its Price, and makes the Importer get more for his Commodity: But, on the contrary, a *Tax* laid on your Native Product, and home-made Commodities, leſſens their Price, and makes them yield leſs to the firſt Seller.

The Reaſon whereof is plain. For the Merchant importing no Commodity but what the Neceſſity, or faſhionable Wantonneſs of your People gives him *Vent* for, will not only proportion his Gain, to the Coſt and Riſque which he has been at before Landing; but will expect profit of his Money paid here, for any Tax laid on it; and take advantage from thence to raiſe his Price above what his *Tax* comes to; and if he cannot do that, he will Trade no more in that Commodity. For it being not the Product of his Farm, he is not tied to bring it to Market, if he finds its Price not anſwer his Expectation there, but turns himſelf to other Wares, which he finds your Market take off better. A Merchant will never continue to trade in Wares, which the change of Faſhion, or Humour, amongſt your People, has made leſs vendible, though he may be ſometimes caught by a ſudden Alteration. But that ſeldom happens in the Courſe of Trade, ſo as to influence the great Bulk of it. For things of Neceſſity muſt ſtill be had, and things of Faſhion will be had as long as Men have Money or Credit, whatever Rates they coſt, and the rather becauſe they are dear. For it being Vanity, not Uſe, that makes the Expenſive Faſhion of your People, the Emulation is, who ſhall have the fineſt, that is, the deareſt Things, not the moſt convenient or uſeful. How many Things do we value or buy, becauſe they come at dear Rates from *Japan* and *China*, which if they were our own Manufacture or Product, common to be had, and for a little Money, would be contemned and neglected? Have not ſeveral of our own Commodities offered to ſale at reaſonable Rates been deſpiſed, and the very ſame eagerly bought and brag'd of, when ſold for *French* at a double Price? You muſt not think therefore that the raiſing their Price will leſſen the *Vent* of faſhionable foreign Commodities amongſt you, as long as Men have any way to purchaſe them, but rather increaſe it. *French Wine* is become a modiſh Drink amongſt us, and a Man is aſham'd to entertain his Friend, or almoſt to dine himſelf without it. The Price is in the Memory of Man rais'd from *6 d.* to *2 s.* and does this hinder the Drinking of it? No, the quite contrary, a Man's way of Living is commended, becauſe he will give any Rate for it: And a Man will give any Rate rather than paſs for a poor Wretch or a penurious Curmudgeon, that is not able or knows not how to live well, nor uſe his Friends civilly. *Faſhion* is for the moſt part nothing but the Oſtentation of Riches, and therefore the high Price of what ſerves to that, rather increaſes than leſſens its *Vent*. The Conteſt and Glory is in the Expence, not the Uſefulneſs of it; and People are then thought and ſaid to live well, when they can make a ſhew of rare and foreign Things, and ſuch as their Neghbours cannot go to the Price of.

Thus we ſee how foreign Commodities fall not in their Price by *Taxes* laid on them, becauſe the Merchant is not neceſſitated to bring to your Market any but faſhionable Commodities, and thoſe go off the better for their high Rate. But on the contrary, your Landholder being forced to bring his Commodities to Market, ſuch as his Land and Induſtry affords them, common and known Things, he muſt ſell them there at ſuch Price as he can get. This the Buyer knows; and theſe home-bred Commodities being ſeldom the Favourites of your People, or any farther acceptable, than as great Conveniency recommends them to the Vulgar, or down-right Neceſſity to all, as ſoon as a Tax is laid on them, every one makes as ſparing a uſe of them as he can, that he may ſave his Money for other neceſſary, or credible Expences. Thus the Price which our native Commodities yield the firſt Seller, is mightily abated, and ſo the yearly Value of the Land, which produces them, leſſen'd too.

If therefore the laying of *Taxes* upon Commodities does, as it is evident, affect the Land, that is out at Rack-Rent, it is plain it does equally affect all the other Land in *England* too, and the Gent. will, but the worſt way, increaſe their own Charges, that is, by leſſening the yearly Value of their Eſtates, if they hope to eaſe their Land, by charging Commodities. It is in vain in a Country whoſe great Fund is Land, to hope to lay the publick Charge of the Government on any thing elſe; there at laſt it will terminate. The Merchant (do what you can) will not bear it, the Labourer cannot, and therefore the Landholder muſt:

And

And whether he were beſt do it, by laying it directly, where it will at laſt ſettle, or by letting it come to him by the ſinking of his Rents, which when they are once fallen, every one knows are not eaſily raiſed again, let him conſider.

Holland is brought as an Inſtance of laying the Charge of the Publick upon Trade, and 'tis poſſible (excepting ſome few ſmall free Towns) the only Place in the World that could be brought to favour this way. But yet when examin'd, will be found to ſhew the quite contrary, and be a clear Proof, that lay the *Taxes* how you will, Land every-where, in Proportion, bears the greater Share of the Burthen. The publick Charge of the Government, 'tis ſaid, is, in the *United Provinces*, laid on Trade. I grant it is, the greateſt Part of it; but is the Land excus'd or eas'd by it? By no means, but on the contrary ſo loaded, that in many Places half, in others a quarter, in others one eighth of the yearly Value does not come into the Owner's Pocket: And if I have not been miſinformed, the Land in ſome Places will not pay the *Taxes:* So that we may ſay, that the Charge of the Government came not upon Commodities till the Land could not bear it. The Burthen unavoidably ſettles upon the Land firſt, and when it has preſſed it ſo, that it can yield no more, Trade muſt be brought in Aid to help to ſupport the Government rather than let all ſink: But the firſt Streſs is always upon Land, and as far as that will reach, it is unavoidably carried, lay your *Taxes* how you will. 'Tis known what a ſhare of the publick Charges of the Government is ſupported by the Trade of *Amſterdam* alone, as I remember that one Town pays Thirty-ſix in the Hundred of all the publick *Taxes* raiſed in the United Provinces. But are the Lands of *Guelderland* eas'd by it? Let any one ſee in that Country of Land more than Trade, what they make clear of their Revenues, and whether the Country Gentlemen there grow rich on their Land, whilſt the Merchant having the *Taxes* laid on his Commerce is impoveriſh'd? On the contrary, *Guelderland* is ſo low and out of Caſh, that *Amſterdam* has been fain for many Years to lay down the *Taxes* for them, which is, in effect, to pay the *Taxes* of *Guelderland* too.

Struggle and contrive as you will, lay your *Taxes* as you pleaſe, the Traders will ſhift it off from their own Gain; the Merchants will bear the leaſt Part of it, and grow poor laſt. In *Holland* it ſelf, where Trade is ſo loaded, who, I pray, grows richeſt, the Landholder or the Trader? Which of them is pinch'd, and wants Money moſt? A Country may thrive, the Country Gentleman grow rich, and his Rents encreaſe (for ſo it has been here) whilſt the Land is *Taxed:* But I challenge any one to ſhew me a Country, wherein there is any conſiderable publick Charge raiſed, where the Land does not moſt ſenſibly feel it, and in proportion bear much the greater Part of it.

We muſt not therefore impute the Falling of the Rents, or of the Price of Land, to high *Intereſt*; Nor, if ill Husbandry has waſted our Riches, hope by ſuch kind of Laws to raiſe them to their former Value. I humbly conceive we ſhall in vain endeavour it by the Fall of *Intereſt*. The Number of Buyers muſt be increaſed, and Sellers leſſen'd, which muſt be done by other ways, than regulating of *Intereſt*, or elſe the Landed-man will neither find Chapmen for his Land, nor for the Corn that grows on it, at the Rate he deſires.

But could an Act of Parliament, bring down *Intereſt* at four *per Cent.* and the lowering of that immediately raiſe the Purchaſers Fine from 20 to 25 Years Purchaſe; yet it may be doubted, whether this be fit to be made into a Law, becauſe it would be of no advantage to the Kingdom. For what profit would it be to the Nation to make a Law, that he who ſells Land ſhould inſtead of four have five hundred Pounds of the Purchaſer? This indeed a little alters the diſtribution of the Money, we have amongſt us *Engliſhmen* here at home, but neither helps to continue what we have, nor brings in more from abroad: Which being the only Concernment of the Kingdom, in reference to its Wealth, is apt to be ſuppoſed by us without doors to be the only care of a Parliament. For it matters not, ſo it be here amongſt us, whether the Money be in *Thomas* or *Richard*'s Hands, provided it be ſo order'd, that, whoever has it, may be encouraged to let it go into the current of Trade, for the improvement of the general Stock, and Wealth of the Nation.

As this Increaſe of the Fine in the Purchaſe of Land is not an Advantage to the Kingdom, ſo neither is it to the Landholder, who is the Perſon, that bearing the greateſt Part of the Burthens of the Kingdom, ought, I think, to have the greateſt Care taken of him, and enjoy as many Priviledges, and as much Wealth, as the Favour of the Law can (with Regard to the Publick-weal) confer upon him. But pray conſider: The riſing the Price of Land in Sale by increaſing the Number of Years Purchaſe to be paid for it, gives the Advantage not to the Landholder, but to him that ceaſes to be ſo. He that has no longer the Land has the more Money, and he who has the Land is the poorer. The true Advantage of the Landholder is, that this Corn, Fleſh, and Wool, ſell better, and yield a greater Price; this indeed is a Profit, that benefits the Owner of the Land, and goes along with it: It is this alone raiſes the Rent, and makes the Poſſeſſor richer: and this can only be done by increaſing our Wealth, and drawing more Money into *England*, which the Falling of *Intereſt*, and thereby (if it could effect it) raiſing the Purchaſe of Land is ſo far from doing, that is does viſibly and directly one way hinder our Increaſe of Wealth, that is, by hindring Foreigners to come here, and buy Land, and ſettle amongſt us. Whereby we have this double Loſs; Firſt, we loſe their Perſons, Increaſe of People being the Increaſe both of Strength and Riches. Secondly, we loſe ſo much Money. For tho' whatever an *Engliſhman* gives to another for Land, though raiſed to forty Years Purchaſe, be not one Farthing Advantage to the Kingdom; yet whatever a Foreigner, who purchaſes Land here, gives for it, is ſo much every Farthing clear Gain to the Nation: For that Money comes clear in, without carrying out any thing for it, and is every Farthing of it as perfect Gain to the Nation as if it drop'd down from the Clouds.

But farther, if Conſideration be to be had only of Sellers of Land, the lowering of *Intereſt* to four *per Cent.* will not be in their Favour, unleſs, by it, you can raiſe Land to thirty Years Purchaſe, which is not at all likely: And I think no body by falling of *Intereſt* to four *per Cent.* hopes to get Chapmen for their Land at that Rate. Whatſoever they have leſs, if Law can regulate *Intereſt*, they loſe of their Value of Land, Money being thus abaſed. So that the Landed-man will ſcarce find his Account neither by this Law, when it comes to Trial. And at laſt, I imagin, this will be the Reſult of all ſuch Attempts, that Experience will ſhew, that the Price of Things will not be regulated by Laws, tho' the Endeavours after it will be ſure to prejudice and inconvenience Trade, and put your Affairs out of Order.

If this be ſo, that *Intereſt* cannot be regulated by Law, or that if it could, yet the Reducing of it to four *per Cent.* would do more Harm than Good: What then ſhould there (will you ſay) be no Law at all to regulate *Intereſt?* I ſay not ſo. For,

1. It is neceſſary that there ſhould be a ſtated Rate of *Intereſt*, and in Debts and Forbearances, where Contract has not ſetled it between the Parties, the Law might give a Rule, and Courts of Judicature might know what Damages to allow. This may, and therefore ſhould, be Regulated.

2. That in the preſent current of running Caſh, which now takes its Courſe almoſt all to *London*, and is Ingroſſed by a very few Hands in Compariſon, young Men, and thoſe in Want, might not too eaſily be expoſed to Extortion and Oppreſſion; and the dextrous and combining Money Jobbers not have too great and unbounded a Power, to prey upon the Ignorance or Neceſſity of Borrowers. There would not be much Danger of this, if Money were more equally diſtributed into the ſeveral Quarties of *England*, and into a greater Number of Hands, according to the Exigencies of Trade.

If Money were to be hired, as Land is; or to be had Corn, or Wool, from the Owner himſelf; and known good Security be given for it, it might then probably be had at the Market (which is true) Rate, and that Rate of *Intereſt* would be a conſtant gauge of your Trade and Wealth. But what a kind of Monopoly, by Conſent, has put this general Commodity into a few Hands, it may need Regulation, tho' what the ſtated Rate of *Intereſt* ſhould be in the conſtant Change of Affairs, and Flux of Money, is hard to determine. Poſſibly it may be allowed as a reaſonable Propoſal, that it ſhould be within ſuch Bounds, as ſhould not on the one Side quite eat up the Merchants, and Tradeſmen's Profit, and Diſcourge their Induſtry; nor on the other hand ſo low, as ſhould hinder Men from riſquing their

Money

Money in other Mens Hands, and ſo rather chuſe to keep it out of Trade, than venture it upon ſo ſmall Profit. When it is too high, it ſo hinders the Merchants Gain, that he will not Borrow; when too low, it ſo hinders the Monied Man's Profit, that he will not Lend; and both theſe Ways it is an Hindrance to Trade.

But this being perhaps too general, and looſe a Rule, let me add, that if one would conſider Money and Land alone, in Relation one to another, perhaps it is now at ſix *per Cent.* in as good a Propottion as is poſſible, ſix *per Cent.* being a little higher than Land, at twenty Years Purchaſe, which is the Rate pretty near, that Land has generally carried in *England*, it never being much over nor under. For ſuppoſing 100 *l.* in Money, and Land of 5 *l. per Ann.* be of equal Value, which is Land at twenty Years Purchaſe: 'Tis neceſſary for the making their Value truly equal, that they ſhould produce an equal Income, which the 100 *l.* at 5 *l. per Cent.* Intereſt is not likely to do.

1. Becauſe of the many, and ſometimes long Intervals of Barrenneſs, which happen to Money, more than Land. Money at *Uſe*, when return'd into the Hands of the Owner, uſually lies dead there, till he gets a new Tenant for it, and can put it out again; and all this time it produces nothing. But this happens not to Land, the growing Product whereof turns to account to the Owner, even when it is in his Hands, or is allowed for by the Tenant, antecedently to his entring upon the Farm. For though a Man that Borrows Money at *Midſummer*, never begins to pay his *Intereſt* from our *Lady-Day*, or one Moment backwards, yet he who Rents a Farm at *Midſummer*, may have as much Reaſon to begin his Rent from our *Lady-Day*, as if he had then entred upon it.

2. Beſides the dead Intervals of ceaſing Profit, which happen to Money more than Land, there is another Reaſon, why the Profit and Income of Money let out, ſhould be a little higher than that of Land; and that is, becauſe Money out at *Intereſt* runs a greater Riſque, than Land does. The Borrower may break, and run away with the Money, and then not only the *Intereſt* due, but all the future Profit, with the Principal, is loſt for ever. But in Land a Man can loſe but the Rent due, for which uſually too the Stock upon the Land is ſufficient Security: And if a Tenant run away in Arrear of ſome Rent, the Land remains; that cannot be carried away, or loſt. Should a Man Purchaſe good Land in *Middleſex* of 5 *l. per Ann.* at twenty Years Purchaſe, and other Land in *Rumney-Marſh*, or elſewhere of the ſame yearly Value, but ſo ſituated, that it were in Danger to be ſwallowed of the Sea, and be utterly loſt, it would not be unreaſonable, that he ſhould expect to have it under twenty Years Purchaſe; ſuppoſe ſixteen and an half. This is to bring it to juſt the Caſe of Land at twenty Years Purchaſe, and Money at ſix *per Cent.* where the Uncertainty of ſecuring ones Money may well be allowed that Advantage of greater Profit; and therefore perhaps the legal *Intereſt* now in *England* at ſix *per Cent.* is as reaſonable and convenient a Rate as can well be ſet by a ſtanding Rule, eſpecially if we conſider that the Law requires not a Man to pay ſix *per Cent.* but ties up the Lender from taking more. So that if ever it falls of it ſelf, the Monied-man is ſure to find it, and his *Intereſt* will be brought down to it.

High *Intereſt* is thought by ſome a Prejudice to Trade: But if we look back, we ſhall find, that *England* never throve ſo well, nor was there ever brought into *England* ſo great an Increaſe of Wealth ſince, as in Queen *Elizabeth*'s and King *James* I. and King *Charles* I. time, when Money was at ten and eight *per Cent.* I will not ſay high *Intereſt* was the Cauſe of it. For I rather think that our thriving Trade was the Cauſe of high *Intereſt*, every one craving Money to employ in a profitable Commerce. But this I think may reaſonably infer from it, That lowering of *Intereſt* is not a ſure Way to improve either our Trade or Wealth.

To this I hear ſome ſay. That the *Dutch*, skilful in all Arts and promoting Trade, to out-do us in this, as well as all other Advancements of it, have obſerved this Rule, *viz.* That when we fell *Intereſt* in *England* from ten to eight, they preſently ſunk *Intereſt* in *Holland* to four *per Cent.* And again, when we lower'd it to ſix they fell it to three *per Cent.* thereby to keep the Advantage which the Lowneſs of *Intereſt* gives to Trade. From whence theſe Men readily conclude, That the Falling of *Intereſt* will advance Trade in *England*. To which I anſwer,

1. That this looks like an Argument, rather made for the preſent Occaſion, to miſlead thoſe who are credulous enough to ſwallow it, than ariſing from true Reaſon,

Reaſon, and Matter of Fact. For if lowering of *Intereſt* were ſo advantageous to Trade, why did the *Dutch* ſo conſtantly take their Meaſures only by us, and not as well by ſome other of their Neighbours, with whom they have as great or greater Commerce than with us? This is enough at firſt ſight to make one ſuſpect this, to be Duſt only raiſed, to throw in Peoples Eyes, and a Suggeſtion made to ſerve a Purpoſe. For,

2. It will not be found true, That when we abated *Intereſt* here in *England* to Eight, the *Dutch* ſunk it in *Holland* to four *per Cent.* by Law; or that there was any Law made in *Holland* to limit the Rate of *Intereſt* to three *per Cent.* when we reduced it in *England* to ſix. It is true, *John de Witt*, when he managed the Affairs of *Holland*, ſetting himſelf to leſſen the publick Debt, and having actually paid ſome, and getting Money in a readineſs to pay others, ſent notice to all the Creditors, That thoſe who would not take four *per Cent.* ſhould come and receive their Money The Creditors finding him in earneſt, and knowing not how otherwiſe to employ their Money, accepted his Terms, and changed their Obligations into four *per Cent.* whereas before they were at five, and ſo (the great Loans of the Country being to the State) it might be ſaid in this ſenſe, That the Rate of *Intereſt* was reduced lower at that time: But that it was done by a Law, forbidding to take higher *Intereſt* than four *per Cent.* that I deny, and require any one to ſhew. Indeed upon good Security one might lately have borrowed Money in *Holland* at three, and three and an half *per Cent.* but not by vertue of any Law, but the natural Rate of *Intereſt*. And I appeal to the Men learned in the Law of *Holland*, whether laſt Year (and I doubt not but it is ſo ſtill) a Man might not lawfully lend his Money for what *Intereſt* he could get, and whether in the Courts he ſhould not recover the *Intereſt* he contracted for, if it were ten *per Cent.* So that if Money be to be borrowed by honeſt and reſponſible Men, at three, or three and an half *per Cent.* it is not by the force of Statutes and Edicts, but by the natural Courſe of things; which will always bring *Intereſt* upon good Security low, where there is a great deal of Money to be lent, and little good Security, in proportion, to be had. *Holland* is a Country where the Land makes a very little Part of the Stock of the Country. Trade is their great Fund; and their Eſtates lie generally in Money: So that all, who are not Traders, generally ſpeaking, are Lenders: Of which there are ſo many whoſe Income depends upon *Intereſt*, that if the States were not mightily in Debt, but paid every one their Principal, inſtead of the four *per Cent. Uſe*, which they give, there would be ſo much more Money than could be uſed, or would be ventured in Trade, that Money there would be at two *per Cent.* or under, unleſs they found a way to put it out in foreign Countries.

Intereſt, I grant theſe Men, is low in *Holland*: But it is ſo, not as an effect of Law, or the politick Contrivance of the Government, to promote Trade; but as the Conſequence of great Plenty of ready Money, when their *Intereſt* firſt fell. I ſay when it firſt fell: For being once brought low, and the Publick having borrowed a great Part of private Mens Money, and continuing in Debt, it muſt continue ſo, though the Plenty of Money, which firſt brought *Intereſt* low, were very much decay'd, and a great Part of their Wealth were really gone. For the Debt of the State affording to the Creditors a conſtant yearly Income, that is look'd on as a ſafe Revenue, and accounted as valuable as if it were in Land; and accordingly they buy it one of another; and whether there be any Money in the publick Coffers or no, he, who has to the value of ten thouſand Pounds owing him from the *States*, may ſell it every Day in the Week, and have ready Money for it. This Credit is ſo great an Advantage to private Men, who know not elſe what to do with their Stocks; that were the *States* now in a condition to begin to pay their Debts, the Creditors, rather than take their Money out to lie dead by them, would let it ſtay in, at lower *Intereſt*, as they did ſome Years ſince, when they were call'd on to come and receive their Money. This is the ſtate of *Intereſt*, in *Holland*: Their Plenty of Money, and paying their publick Debts, ſome time ſince lowered their *Intereſt*. But it was not done by the Command and Limitation of a Law, nor in coſequence of our reducing it here by Law to ſix *per Cent.* For I deny, that there is any Law there yet, to forbid lending of Money for above three, or ſix, or ten *per Cent.* Whatever ſome here ſuggeſt, every one there may hire out his Money as freely as he does any thing elſe, for what Rate he can get; and the Bargain being made, the Law will inforce the Borrower to pay it.

I grant low *Intereſt*, where all Men conſent to it, is an advantage to Trade, if Merchants will regulate their Gains accordingly, and Men be perſuaded to lend to them: But can it be expected, when the Publick gives ſeven or eight, or ten *per Cent.* that private Men, whoſe ſecurity is certainly no better, ſhall have for four? And can there be any thing ſtranger, than that the ſame Men who look on, and therefore allow high *Uſe* as an encouragement to lending to the *Chequer*, ſhould think low *Uſe* ſhould bring Money into Trade? The States of *Holland* ſome few Years ſince, paid but four *per Cent.* for the Money they owed: If you propoſe them for an Example, and *Intereſt* to be regulated by a Law, try whether you can do ſo here, and bring Men to lend it to the publick at that Rate. This would be a benefit to the Kingdom, and abate a great part of our publick Charge. If you cannot do that, confeſs, that 'tis not the Law in *Holland* has brought the *Intereſt* there ſo low, but ſomething elſe, and that which will make the States, or any body elſe pay dearer now, if either their Credit be leſs, or Money there ſcarcer.

An infallible ſign of your decay of Wealth is the falling of Rents, and the raiſing of them would be worth the Nations Care: For in that, and not in the falling of *Intereſt* lies the true advantage of the Landed-man, and with him of the Publick. It may be therefore not beſides our preſent buſineſs, to enquire into the cauſe of the falling of Rents in *England*.

1. Either the Land is grown Barrener, and ſo the Product is leſs, and conſequently the Money to be received for that Product is leſs. For it is evident that he whoſe Land was wont to produce 100 Buſhels of Wheat *communibus annis*, if by long Tillage, and Husbandry it will now produce but 50 Buſhels, the Rent will be abated half. But this cannot be ſuppos'd general.

2. Or the Rent of that Land is leſſen'd. 1. Becauſe the Uſe of the Commodity ceaſes: As the Rents muſt fall in *Virginia*, were taking of Tobacco forbid in *England*. 2. Or becauſe ſomething elſe ſupplies the room of that Product: As the rate of Copis-lands will fall upon the diſcovery of Coal Mines. 3. Or, becauſe the Markets are ſupplied with the ſame Commodity, cheaper from another place. As the breeding Countries of *England* muſt needs fall their Rents, by the Importation of *Iriſh* Cattle. 4. Or, becauſe a Tax laid on your native Commodities, makes what the Farmer ſells cheaper; and Labour, and what he buys dearer.

3. Or, the Money in the Country is leſs. For the Exigencies and Uſes of Money not leſſening with its quantity, and it being in the ſame proportion to be imploy'd and diſtributed ſtill in all the parts of its Circulation, ſo much as its quantity is leſſen'd, ſo much muſt the ſhare of every one, that has a right to this Money, be the leſs; whether he be Landholder, for his Goods; or Labourer, for his Hire; or Merchant, for his Brokage. Though the Landholder uſually finds it firſt. Becauſe Money failing, and falling ſhort, People have not ſo much Money as formerly to lay out, and ſo leſs Money is brought to Market, by which the Price of things muſt neceſſarily fall. The Labourer feels it next. For when the Landholder's Rent falls, he muſt either bate the Labourer's Wages, or not imploy, or not pay him; which either way makes him feel the want of Money. The Merchant feels it laſt. For though he ſell leſs, and at a lower Rate, he buys alſo our native Commodities, which he exports at a lower Rate too: And will be ſure to leave our native Commodities unbought, upon the Hands of the Farmer, or Manufacturer, rather than export them to a Market, which will not afford him returns with Profit.

If one Third of the Money imployed in Trade were lock'd up, or gone out of *England*, muſt not the Landholders neceſſarily receive one Third leſs for their Goods, and conſequently Rents fall; a leſs quantity of Money by one Third being to be diſtributed amongſt an equal number of Receivers? Indeed, People not perceiving the Money to be gone, are apt to be jealous one of another; and each ſuſpecting anothers inequality of Gain to rob him of his ſhare, every one will be imploying his Skill, and Power, the beſt he can, to retrieve it again, and to bring Money into his Pocket in the ſame plenty as formerly. But this is but ſcrambling amongſt our ſelves, and helps no more againſt our want, than the pulling off a ſhort Coverlet will, amongſt Children, that lie together, preſerve them all from Cold. Some will ſtarve, unleſs the Father of the Family provide better, and ge the ſcanty Covering. This pulling and conteſt is uſually between the l-man and the Merchant. For the Labourer's ſhare, being ſeldom more than

than a bare ſubſiſtence, never allows that Body of Men time or opportunity to raiſe their Thoughts above that, or ſtruggle with the Richer for theirs, (as one common *Intereſt*,) unleſs when ſome common and great Diſtreſs, uniting them in one univerſal Ferment, makes them forget Reſpect, and emboldens them to carve to their Wants with armed Force: And then ſometimes they break in upon the Rich, and ſweep all like a Deluge. But this rarely happens but in the Male-adminiſtration of neglected or miſmanag'd Government.

The uſual Struggle and Conteſt, as I ſaid before, in the decays of Wealth and Riches, is between the *Landed-Man* and the *Merchant*, with whom I may here join the *Monied-Man*. The *Landed-Man* finds himſelf aggrieved, by the falling of his Rents, and the ſtreightning of his Fortune; whilſt the Monied-Man keeps up his Gain, and the Merchant thrives and grows rich by Trade. Theſe he thinks ſteal his Income into their Pockets, build their Fortunes upon his Ruin, and ingroſs more of the Riches of the Nation than comes to their ſhare. He therefore endeavours, by Laws, to keep up the Value of *Lands*, which he ſuſpects leſſened by the others exceſs of Profit: But all in vain. The Cauſe is miſtaken, and the Remedy too. 'Tis not the *Merchant*'s nor *Monied-Man*'s Gains that makes Land fall: But the want of Money and leſſening of our Treaſure waſted by extravagant Expences, and a miſmanag'd Trade, which the Land always firſt feels. If the *Landed-Gentleman* will have, and by his Example make it faſhionable to have, more *Claret*, *Spice*, *Silk*, and other foreign conſumable Wares, than our Exportation of Commodities does exchange for; Money muſt unavoidably follow to balance the Account, and pay the Debt. And therefore I fear that another Propoſal, I hear talked of, to hinder the Exportation of *Money* and *Bullion*, will ſhew more our need of care to keep our Money from going from us, than a way and method, how to preſerve it here.

'Tis Death in *Spain* to export Money: And yet they, who furniſh all the World with Gold and Silver, have leaſt of it amongſt themſelves. Trade fetches it away from that lazy and indigent People, notwithſtanding all their artificial and forced Contrivances to keep it there. It follows Trade againſt the rigour of their Laws; and their want of foreign Commodities makes it openly be carried out at Noon-Day. Nature has beſtowed Mines on ſeveral Parts of the World: But their Riches are only for the Induſtrious and Frugal. Whomever elſe they viſit, 'tis with the Diligent and Sober only they ſtay. And if the Vertue, and provident way of Living of our Anceſtors (content with our native Conveniencies of Life, without the coſtly Itch after the Materials of Pride and Luxury from abroad) were brought in Faſhion and Countenance again amongſt us; this alone would do more to keep, and increaſe our Wealth, and inrich our Land, than all our Paper helps about *Intereſt*, *Money*, *Bullion*, &c. which however eagerly we may catch at, will not, I fear, without better Husbandry, keep us from ſinking, whatever Contrivances we may have recourſe to. 'Tis with a *Kingdom*, as with a *Family*. Spending leſs than our own Commodities will pay for, is the ſure and only way for the Nation to grow Rich. And when that begins once ſeriouſly to be conſider'd, and our Faces and Steps are in earneſt turn'd that way, we may hope to have our Rents riſe, and the publick Stock thrive again. Till then, we in vain, I fear, endeavour with Noiſe, and Weapons of Law, to drive the Wolf from our own, to one anothers Doors: The Breed ought to be extirpated out of the Iſland. For Want, brought in by ill Management, and nurſed up by expenſive Vanity, will make the Nation poor, and ſpare no body.

If three Millions were neceſſary for the carrying on the Trade of *England*, whereof one Million were for the Landholder, to maintain him; another were for the Payment of the Labourer and Handicraftſman; and the third were the ſhare of the Brokers, coming to them for their care and pains in diſtributing; if one Million of this Money were gone out of the Kingdom, muſt not there be one third leſs to be ſhared amongſt them for the Product of their Land, their Labour and their Diſtribution? I do not ſay they will feel it at the ſame time. But the Landholder having nothing, but what the Product of his Land will yield; and the Buyer, according to the Plenty or Scarcity of Money he has, always ſetting the Price upon what is offered to Sale; the Landholder muſt be content to take the Market-Rate, for what he brings thither; which always following the Scarcity or Plenty of Money; if any Part of our Money be gone, he is ſure firſt to find it in the Price of

his Commodities. For the Broker and Merchant, though he ſell cheaper, yet he buys cheaper too: And he will be ſure to get by his Returns, or let alone a Commodity, which will not produce him Gain: And whatſoever is ſo alone, and left upon hands, always turns to the Landholders Loſs.

Suppoſing that of our Woollen Manufacture, foreign Markets took off one half, and the other half were conſumed amongſt our ſelves: If a ſenſible part (as one third) of our Coin were gone, and ſo Men had equally one third leſs Money than they had, (for, 'tis certain, it muſt be *tantamount*, and what I eſcape of one third leſs, another muſt make up) it would follow, That they would have leſs to lay out in Cloaths, as well as other things, and ſo would wear them longer, or pay leſs for them. If a Clothier finds a want of Vent, he muſt either ſell cheaper or not at all; if he ſell cheaper, he muſt alſo pay leſs, both for Wool and Labour; and if the Labourer hath leſs Wages, he muſt alſo pay leſs for *Corn*, *Butter*, *Cheeſe*, *Fleſh*, or elſe forbear ſome of theſe quite. In all which Caſes, the Price of *Wool*, *Corn*, *Fleſh*, and the other Products of Land are brought down, and the Land bears the greateſt Part of the Loſs. For where-ever the Conſumption or Vent of any Commodity is ſtopt, there the ſtop continues on till it comes to the Landholder. And where-ever the Price of any Commodity begins to fall, how many Hands ſoever there be between that and the Landholder, they all take Repriſals one upon another, till at laſt it comes to the Landholder; and there the Abatement of Price, of any of his Commodities, leſſens his Income, and is a clear Loſs. The Owner of Land which produces the Commodity, and the laſt Buyer who conſumes it, are the two Extreams in Commerce. And though the falling of any ſort of Commodity in the Landholder's Hand does not prove ſo to the laſt Conſumer, the Arts of intervening Brokers and Ingroſſers keeping up the Price to their own Advantage, yet whenever want of Money, or want of Deſire in the Conſumer, make the Price low, that immediately reaches the firſt Producer: No body between having any Intereſt to keep it up.

Now, as to the two firſt Cauſes of falling of *Rents*, falling of *Intereſt* has no Influence at all. In the latter it has a great Part, becauſe it makes the Money of *England* leſs, by making both *Engliſhmen* and Foreigners withdraw or withhold their Money. For that which is not let looſe into *Trade*, is all one whilſt hoarded up, as if it were not in being.

I have heard it brouget for a Reaſon, why *Intereſt* ſhould be reduced to four *per Cent. That thereby the Landholder, who bears the Burthen of the publick Charge, may be in ſome degree eaſed by falling of* Intereſt.

This Argument will be put right, if you ſay it will eaſe the Borrower, and lay the Loſs on the Lender: But it concerns not the Land in general, unleſs you will ſuppoſe all Landholders in Debt. But I hope we may yet think that Men in *England*, who have Land, have Money too; and that Landed Men, as well as others, by their Providence and good Husbandry, accommodating their Expences to their Income, keep themſelves from going backwards in the World.

That which is urged, as moſt deſerving Conſideration and Remedy in the Caſe, is, *That it is hard and unreaſonable, that one, who has mortgaged half his Land, ſhould yet pay* Taxes *for the whole, whilſt the Mortgagee goes away with the clear Profit of an high* Intereſt. To this I anſwer.

1. That if any Man has run himſelf in Debt for the Service of his Country, 'tis fit the Publick ſhould reimburſe him, and ſet him free. This is a Care that becomes the publick Juſtice, That Men, if they receive no Rewards, ſhould at leaſt be kept from ſuffering, in having ſerved their Country. But I do not remember the Polity of any Nation, who altered their Conſtitution in favour of thoſe whoſe Miſmanagement had brought them behind-hand; poſſibly as thinking the Publick little beholden to thoſe, who had miſemployed the Stock of their Country in the Exceſs of their private Expences, and, by their Example, ſpread a Faſhion that carries Ruin with it. Mens paying Taxes of mortgaged Lands, is a Puniſhment for ill Husbandry, which ought to be diſcouraged: But it concerns very little the Frugal and the Thrifty.

2. Another thing to be ſaid in reply to this, is, That it is with Gentlemen in the Country, as with Tradeſmen in the City. If they will own Titles to greater Eſtates than really they have, it is their own Faults, and there is no way left to help

help them from paying for them. The Remedy is in their own Hands, to diſcharge themſelves when they pleaſe. And when they have once ſold their Land, and paid their Debts, they will no longer pay Taxes for what they own without being really theirs. There is another way alſo, whereby they may be relieved, as well as a great many other Inconveniences remedied; and that is by a *Regiſtry*: For if Mortgages were regiſtred, Land-Taxes might reach them, and order the Lender to pay his Proportion.

I have met with Patrons of four *per Cent.* who (amongſt many other fine things they tell us of) affirm, *That if* Intereſt *were reduc'd to four* per Cent. *then ſome Men would borrow Money at this low Rate, and pay their Debts; others would borrow more than they now do, and improve their Land; others would borrow more, and employ it in Trade and Manufacture.* Gilded Words indeed, were there any thing ſubſtantial in them! Theſe Men talk as if they meant to ſhew us, not only the Wiſdom, but Riches of *Solomon*, and would make Gold and Silver as common as the Stones in the Street: But at laſt, I fear, 'twill be but Wit without Money, and I wiſh it amount to that. 'Tis without queſtion, that could the Countryman and the Tradeſman take up Money cheaper than now they do, every Man would be forward to borrow, and deſire that he might have other Mens Money to employ to his Advantage. I confeſs, thoſe who contend for four *per Cent.* have found out a way to ſet Mens Mouths a watering for Money at that rate, and to increaſe the Number of the Borrowers in *England*; if any body can imagine it would be an Advantage to increaſe them. But to anſwer all their fine Projects, I have but this one ſhort Queſtion to ask them: Will *four per Cent.* increaſe the Number of the Lenders? If it will not, as any Man at the very firſt hearing will ſhrewdly ſuſpect it will not, then all the Plenty of Money theſe Conjurers beſtow upon us, for *improvement of Land, paying of Debts*, and *advancement of Trade*, is but like the Gold and Silver, which old Women believe other Conjurers beſtow ſometimes, by whole Lapfuls, on poor credulous Girls, which, when they bring to the light, is found to be nothing but wither'd Leaves; and the Poſſeſſors of it are ſtill as much in want of Money as ever.

Indeed I grant it would be well for *England*, and I wiſh it were ſo, that the Plenty of Money were ſo great amongſt us, that every Man could borrow as much as he could uſe in Trade for four *per Cent.* nay, that Men could borrow as much as they could employ for ſix *per Cent.* But even at that rate, the Borrowers already are far more than the Lenders. Why elſe doth the Merchant, upon occaſion, pay ſix *per Cent.* and often above that rate for Brokage? And why doth the Country Gentleman of 1000 *l. per Annum* find it ſo difficult, with all the Security he can bring, to take up 1000 *l.* All which proceeds from the Scarcity of Money, and bad Security; two Cauſes which will not be leſs powerful, to hinder borrowing, after the lowering of *Intereſt*; and I do not ſee how any one can imagine that reducing *Uſe* to four *per Cent.* ſhould abate their Force, or how leſſening the Reward of the Lender, without diminiſhing his riſque, ſhould make him more forward and ready to lend. So that theſe Men, whilſt they talk, that at four *per Cent.* Men would take up, and employ more Money to the publick Advantage, do but pretend to multiply the Number of Borrowers among us, of which it is certain we have too many already. While they thus ſet Men a longing for the golden Days of four *per Cent.* methinks they uſe the poor indigent Debtor, and needy Tradeſman, as I have ſeen pratling Jack-Daws do ſometimes their Young, who kawing and fluttering about the Neſt, ſet all their young ones a gaping; but having nothing in their empty Mouths but Noiſe and Air, leave them as hungry as before.

'Tis true theſe Men have found out by a cunning Project, how, by the reſtraint of Law, to make the Price of Money one third cheaper, and then they tell *John a Nokes* that he ſhall have 10000 *l.* of it to employ in Merchandiſe, or Cloathing; and *John a Stiles* ſhall have 20000 *l.* more to pay his Debts; and ſo diſtribute this Money as freely as *Diego* did his Legacies, which they are to have, *even where they can get it.* But till theſe Men can inſtruct the forward Borrowers where they ſhall be furniſhed, they have perhaps done ſomething to increaſe Mens Deſire, but not made Money one jot eaſier to come by. And till they do that, all this ſweet jingling of Money in their Diſcourſes goes juſt to the Tune of, *If all the World were Oatmeal.* Methinks theſe Undertakers, whilſt they have put Men in hopes

of

of borrowing more plentifully at eaſier Rates, for the ſupply of their Wants and Trades, had done better to have bethought themſelves of a way, how Men need not borrow upon *Uſe* at all: For this would be much more advantageous, and altogether as feiſible. It is as eaſy to diſtribute twenty pair of Shoes amongſt thirty Men, if they pay nothing for them at all, as if they paid 4*s.* a pair; ten of them (notwithſtanding the Statute-Rent ſhould be reduced from 6*s.* to 4*s.* a pair) will be neceſſitated to ſit ſtill barefoot, as much as if they were to pay nothing for Shoes at all. Juſt ſo it is in a Country, that wants Money in Proportion to Trade. It is as eaſy to contrive how every Man ſhall be ſupplied with what Money he needs, (*i. e.* can employ in *Improvement of Land, paying his Debts,* and *Returns of his Trade*) for nothing, as for four *per Cent.* Either we have already more Money than the Owners will lend, or we have not. If part of the Money which is now in *England*, will not be lent at the rate *Intereſt* is at preſent at, will Men be more ready to lend, and Borrowers be furniſhed for all thoſe brave Purpoſes more plentifully, when Money is brought to four *per Cent.*? If People do already lend all the Money they have, above their own Occaſions, whence are thoſe, who will borrow more at four *per Cent.* to be ſupplied? Or is there ſuch Plenty of Money, and Scarcity of Borrowers, that there needs the reducing of *Intereſt* to four *per Cent.* to bring Men to take it?

All the imaginable Ways of increaſing Money in any Country, are theſe two: Either to dig it in the Mines of our own, or get it from our Neighbours. That four *per Cent.* is not of the nature of the *Deuſing-rod*, or *Virgula Divina*, able to diſcover Mines of Gold and Silver, I believe will eaſily be granted me. The way of getting from Foreigners, is either by Force, Borrowing, or Trade. And whatever Ways beſides theſe Men may fancy or propoſe, for increaſing of Money, (except they intend to ſet up for the Philoſophers Stone) would be much the ſame with a diſtracted Man's Device that I knew, who, in the beginning of his Diſtemper, firſt diſcover'd himſelf to be out of his Wits by getting together and boiling a great Number of Groats, with a Deſign, as he ſaid, to make them *plim*, *i. e.* grow thicker. That four *per Cent.* will raiſe Armies, diſcipline Soldiers, and make Men valiant, and fitter to conquer Countries, and inrich themſelves with the Spoils, I think was never pretended. And that it will not bring in more of our Neighbours Money upon loan, than we have at preſent among us, is ſo viſible in it ſelf, that it will not need any Proof; the Contenders for four *per Cent.* looking upon it as an undeniable Truth, and making uſe of it as an Argument to ſhew the Advantage it will be to the Nation, by leſſening the *Uſe* paid to Foreigners, who upon falling of *Uſe* will take home their Money. And for the laſt way of increaſing our Money, by promoting of Trade, how much lowering of *Intereſt* is the way to that, I have, I ſuppoſe, ſhew'd you already.

Having lately met with a little Tract, intituled, A Letter to a Friend concerning Uſury, *printed this preſent Year* 1690; *which gives in ſhort, the Arguments of ſome Treatiſes printed many Years ſince, for the lowering of* Intereſt: *It may not be amiſs, briefly to conſider them.*

1. A *High* Intereſt *decays Trade. The Advantage from* Intereſt *is greater than the Profit from Trade, which makes the rich Merchants give over, and put out their Stock to* Intereſt, *and the leſſer Merchants break.*

Anſw. This was printed in 1621, when *Intereſt* was at ten *per Cent.* And whether *England* had ever a more flouriſhing Trade, than at that time, muſt be left to the Judgment of thoſe, who have conſider'd the growing Strength and Riches of this Kingdom in Q. *Elizabeth*'s and K. *James* I's Reigns. Not that I impute it to high *Intereſt*, but to other Cauſes I have mention'd, wherein Uſury had nothing to do. But if this be thought an Argument now in 1690, when the legal *Intereſt* is ſix *per Cent.* I deſire thoſe, who think fit to make uſe of it, to name thoſe *rich Merchants*, who have *given over and put out their Stocks* to Intereſt.

2. Intereſt

2. Intereſt *being at ten* per Cent. *and in* Holland *at ſix, our Neighbour Merchants underſel us.*

Anſw. The legal *Intereſt* being here now at ſix *per Cent.* and in *Holland* not limited by Law, our Neighbour Merchants underſel us, becauſe they live more frugally, and are content with leſs Profit.

3. Intereſt *being lower in* Holland *than in* England, *their Contributions to War, Works of Piety, and all Charges of the State, are cheaper to them than to us.*

Anſw. This needs a little Explication. *Contributions*, greater or leſs, I underſtand: but *Contributions cheaper or dearer*, I confeſs I do not. If they manage their Wars and Charges cheaper than we, the blame is not to be laid on high or low *Intereſt.*

4. Intereſt *being ſo high, prevents the Building of Shipping, which is the Strength and Safety of our Iſland, moſt Merchant-Ships being built in* Holland.

Anſw. Though this Argument be now gone, ſuch Ships being prohibited by a Law, I will help the Author to one as good. The *Dutch* buy our Rape-ſeed, make it into Oil, bring it back to us, and ſell it with Advantage. This may be as well ſaid to be from high *Intereſt* here, and low there. But the truth is, the Induſtry and Frugality of that People, makes them content to work cheaper, and ſell at leſs Profit than their Neighbours, and ſo get the Trade from them.

5. *The high Rate of Uſury makes Land ſell ſo cheap, being not worth more than fourteen or fifteen Years Purchaſe; whereas in* Holland, *where* Intereſt *is at ſix, it is worth above twenty five. So that a low* Intereſt *raiſes the Price of Land. Where Money is dear, Land is cheap.*

Anſw. This Argument plainly confeſſes, That there is ſomething elſe regulates the Price of Land, beſides the Rate of *Intereſt*; elſe when Money was at ten *per Cent.* here, Land ſhould have been at ten Years Purchaſe, whereas he confeſſes it then to have been at fourteen or fifteen. One may ſuppoſe, to favour his *Hypotheſis*, he was not forward to ſpeak the moſt of it. And *Intereſt*, as he ſays, being at ſix *per Cent.* in *Holland*, Land there ſhould have ſold by that Rule for ſixteen and an half Years Purchaſe, whereas he ſays it was worth about twenty five. And Mr. *Manly* ſays, (*p.* 33.) *That Money in* France *being at ſeven* per Cent. *noble Land ſells for thirty four and thirty five Years Purchaſe, and ordinary Land for twenty five.* So that the true Concluſion from hence is, not what our Author makes, but this; That 'tis not the legal *Intereſt*, but ſomething elſe, that governs the Rate of Land. I grant his Poſition, That *where Money is dear, Land is cheap*, and *vice verſa.* But it muſt be ſo by the natural, not legal *Intereſt.* For where Money will be lent on good Security, at four or five *per Cent.* 'tis a Demonſtration that there is more than will be ventured on ordinary Credit in Trade. And when this Plenty becomes general, 'tis a ſign there is more Money than can be employed in Trade; which cannot but put many upon ſeeking Purchaſes, to lay it out in Land, and ſo raiſe the Price of Land by making more Buyers than Sellers.

6. *'Tis not probable Lenders will call in their Money, when they cannot make greater* Intereſt *any-where. Beſides, their Security upon Land will be better.*

Anſw. Some unskilful and timorous Men will call in their Money; others put it into the Bankers Hands. But the Bankers and Skilful will keep it up, and not lend it, but at the natural *Uſe*, as we have ſhewn. But how Securities will be mended, by lowering of *Intereſt*, is, I confeſs, beyond my Comprehenſion.

Of Raiſing our Coin.

BEing now upon the Conſideration of *Intereſt* and *Money*, give me leave to ſay one Word more on this Occaſion, which may not be wholly unſeaſonable at this time. I hear a Talk up and down of *raiſing our Money*, as a means to retain our Wealth, and keep our Money from being carried away. I wiſh thoſe that uſe the Phraſe of *raiſing our Money*, had ſome clear Notion annexed to it; and that then they would examine, Whether, that being true, it would at all ſerve to thoſe Ends, for which it is propos'd.

The *raiſing of Money* then ſignifies one of theſe two things; either *raiſing the Value* of our Money, or *raiſing the Denomination* of our Coin.

The *raiſing of the Value* of Money, or any thing elſe, is nothing, but the making a leſs quantity of it exchange for any other thing, than would have been taken for

it

it before. *v. g.* If 5 *s.* will exchange for, or, (as we call it) buy a Buſhel of Wheat; if you can make 4 *s.* buy another Buſhel of the ſame Wheat, it is plain the *Value* of your Money is *raiſed*, in reſpect of Wheat one Fifth. But thus nothing can *raiſe* or *fall the Value* of your Money, but the proportion of its Plenty, or Scarcity, in proportion to the Plenty, Scarcity, or Vent of any other Commodity, with which you compare it, or for which you would exchange it. And thus Silver, which makes the intrinſick Value of Money, compar'd with it ſelf, under any Stamp or Denomination of the ſame or different Countries, cannot be *raiſed*. For an Ounce of Silver, whether in *Pence*, *Groats*, or *Crown*-Pieces, *Stivers* or *Ducatoons*, or in Bullion, is and always eternally will be of equal Value to any other Ounce of Silver, under what Stamp or Denomination ſoever; unleſs it can be ſhewn that any Stamp can add any new and better qualities to one parcel of Silver, which another parcel of Silver wants.

Silver therefore being always of equal Value to *Silver*, the *Value of Coin*, compar'd with Coin, is greater, leſs or equal, only as it has more, leſs or equal *Silver* in it: And in this reſpect, you can by no manner of Way raiſe or fall your Money. Indeed moſt of the *Silver* of the World, both in Money and Veſſels being alloy'd, (*i. e.* mixed with ſome baſer Metals) *fine Silver*, *i. e. Silver* ſeparated from all *Alloy*) is uſually dearer than ſo much *Silver* alloy'd, or mix'd with baſer Metals. Becauſe, beſides the Weight of the *Silver*, thoſe who have need of fine (*i. e.* unmix'd Silver; as Gilders, Wyre-Drawers, *&c.*) muſt according to their Need, beſides an equal Weight of Silver mixed with other Metals, give an Overplus to reward the Refiner's Skill and Pains. And in this Caſe, *fine Silver*, and *alloy'd* or mixed Silver are conſidered as two diſtinct Commodities. But no Money being coin'd here, or almoſt any-where of pure fine Silver, this concerns not the Value of Money at all; wherein an equal quantity of Silver is always of the ſame Value with an equal quantity of Silver, let the Stamp, or Denomination be what it will.

All then that can be done in this great Myſtery of *Raiſing Money*, is only to alter the *Denomination*, and call that a Crown now, which before by the Law was but a part of a Crown. For Example: Suppoſing, according to the Standard of our Law, 5 *s.* or a Crown, were to weigh an Ounce, (as it does now, wanting about 16 Grains) whereof one twelfth were Copper, and eleven twelfths Silver, (for there-abouts it is) 'tis plain here 'tis the quantity of Silver gives the Value to it. For let another Piece be coin'd of the ſame Weight, wherein half the Silver is taken out, and Copper or other Alloy put into the place, every one knows it will be worth half as much. For the Value of the Alloy is ſo inconſiderable as not to be reckoned. This Crown now muſt be rais'd, and from henceforth our Crown Pieces coin'd one Twentieth lighter; which is nothing but changing the Denomination, calling that a Crown now, which yeſterday was but a part, *viz.* Nineteen twentieths of a Crown; whereby you have only raiſed 19 Parts to the Denomination formerly given to 20. For I think no body can be ſo ſenſeleſs, as to imagine, that 19 Grains or Ounces of Silver can be raiſed to the Value of 20; or that 19 Grains or Ounces of Silver ſhall at the ſame time exchange for, or buy as much Corn, Oil, or Wine, as 20; which is to raiſe it to the Value of 20. For if 19 Ounces of Silver can be worth 20 Ounces of Silver, or pay for as much of any other Commodity, then 18, 10, or 1 Ounce may do the ſame. For if the abating one twentieth of the quantity of the Silver of any Coin, does not leſſen its Value, the abating nineteen twentieths of the quantity of the Silver of any Coin, will not abate its Value. And ſo a ſingle Threepence, or a ſingle Penny, being called a Crown, will buy as much Spice or Silk, or any other Commodity, as a Crown-piece, which contains 20 or 60 times as much Silver; which is an Abſurdity ſo great, that I think no body will want Eyes to ſee, and Senſe to diſown.

Now, this *Raiſing your Money*, or giving a leſs quantity of Silver the Stamp and Denomination of a greater, may be done two Ways.

1. By raiſing one *Species* of your Money.

2. By raiſing *all your Silver Coin*, at once, proportionably; which is the thing I ſuppos'd, now propos'd.

1. The raiſing of *one Species* of your Coin, beyond its intrinſick Value, is done by coining any one Species, (which in Account bears ſuch a proportion to the other

other Species of your Coin) with leſs Silver in it, than is required by that Value it bears in your Money.

For Example, A *Crown* with us goes for 60 Pence, a *Shilling* for 12 Pence, a *Teſter* for 6 Pence, and a *Groat* for 4 Pence: And accordingly, the Proportion of Silver in each of them, ought to be at 60, 12, 6, and 4. Now, if in the Mint there ſhould be coin'd *Groats*, or *Teſters*, that being of the ſame Alloy with our other Money, had but two Thirds of the Weight, that thoſe Species are coin'd at now; or elſe, being of the ſame Weight, were ſo alloy'd as to have one Third of the Silver required by the preſent Standard chang'd into Copper; and ſhould thus, by Law, be made current; (the reſt of your Silver Money being kept to the preſent Standard in Weight and Fineneſs) 'tis plain, thoſe Species would be raiſing one Third part; that paſſing for *6 d.* which had but the Silver of *4 d.* in it; and would be all one as if a *Groat* ſhould by Law be made current for *6 d.* and every *6 d.* in payment paſs for *9 d.* This is truly raiſing theſe Species: But is no more in effect, than if the Mint ſhould coin clip'd Money. And has, beſides the Cheat that is put, by ſuch baſe or light Money, on every particular Man, that receives it, that he wants one Third of that real Value which the Publick ought to ſecure him, in the Money, it obliges him to receive as lawful and current; It has, I ſay, this great and unavoidable inconvenience to the Publick, That, beſides the Opportunities it gives to domeſtick Coiners to cheat you with lawful Money, it puts it into the Hands of Foreigners to fetch away your Money without any Commodities for it. For if they find that Two-penny weight of Silver, marked with a certain Impreſſion, ſhall here in *England* be equivalent to *3 d.* weight mark'd with another Impreſſion; they will not fail to ſtamp Pieces of that Faſhion; and ſo importing that baſe and low Coin, will, here in *England*, receive *3 d.* for *2 d.* and quickly carry away your Silver in Exchange for Copper, or barely the Charge of Coinage.

This is unavoidable in all Countries where any one *Species* of their Money is diſproportionate in its intrinſick Value, (*i. e.* in its due proportion of Silver to the reſt of the Money of that Country) an Inconvenience ſo certainly attending the Allowance of any baſe Species of Money to be current, that the King of *France* could not avoid it, with all his Watchfulneſs. For though, by Edict, he made his 4 *Sols* Pieces, (whereof 15 were to paſs for a *French* Crown, though 20 of them had not ſo much Silver in them, as was in a *French* Crown Piece) paſs in the Inland Parts of his Kingdom, 15 for a Crown in all Payments; yet he durſt not make them current in his Seaport Towns, for fear that ſhould give an Opportunity to their Importation. But yet this Caution ſerved not the Turn. They were ſtill imported; and by this Means, a great Loſs and Damage brought upon his Country. So that he was forced to cry them down, and ſink them to near their intrinſick Value. Whereby a great many particular Men, who had quantities of that Species in their Hands, loſt a great part of their Eſtates; and every one that had any, loſt proportionably by it.

If we had *Groats* or *Six-Pences* current by Law, amongſt us, that wanted one Third of the Silver which they now have by the Standard, to make them of equal Value to our other Species of Money; who can imagine, that our Neighbours would not preſently pour in quantities of ſuch Money upon us, to the great Loſs and Prejudice of the Kingdom? The *quantity* of Silver that is in each Piece or Species of Coin, being that, which makes it real and intrinſick Value, the due proportions of Silver ought to be kept in each Species, according to the reſpective Rate ſet on each of them by Law. And when this is ever varied from, it is but a Trick to ſerve ſome preſent Occaſion; but is always with Loſs to the Country where the Trick is play'd.

2. The other way of *raiſing Money* is by *raiſing all your Silver Coin at once*, the proportion of a *Crown*, a *Shilling*, and a *Penny*, in reference to one another, being ſtill kept, (*viz.* That a *Shilling* ſhall weigh one fifth of a *Crown* Piece, and a *Penny* weigh one twelfth of a *Shilling*, in Standard Silver) but out of every one of theſe, you abate one twentieth of the Silver, they were wont to have in them.

If *all the Species of Money*, be, as 'tis call'd *raiſed*, by making each of them to have one twentieth leſs of Silver in them than formerly; and ſo your whole Money be lighter than it was: Theſe following will be ſome of the Conſequences of it.

8. It will rob all *Creditors* of one twentieth (or 5 *per Cent.*) of their Debts, and all Landlords one twentieth of their quit Rents for ever; and in all other Rents as far as their former Contracts reach, of 5 *per Cent.* of their yearly Income; and this without any Advantage to the Debtor or Farmer. For he receiving no more Pounds Sterling for his Land or Commodities, in this new lighter Coin, than he ſhould have done of your old and weightier Money, gets nothing by it. If you ſay yes, he will receive more *Crown*, *Half-Crown*, and *Shilling* Pieces, for what he now ſells for new Money, than he ſhould have done if the Money of the old Standard had continued; you confeſs your Money is not *raiſed* in Value, but in Denomination; ſince what your new Pieces want in Weight, muſt now be made up in their Number. But which way ſoever this falls, 'tis certain, the Publick (which moſt Men think, ought to be the only reaſon of changing a ſettled Law, and diſturbing the common current Courſe of things) receives not the leaſt Profit by it: Nay, as we ſhall ſee by and by, it will be a great Charge and Loſs to the Kingdom. But this, at firſt ſight, is viſible; That in all Payments to be received upon precedent Contracts, if your Money be in effect raiſed, the Receiver will loſe 5 *per Cent.* For Money having been lent, and Leaſes and other Bargains made, when Money was of the ſame Weight and Fineneſs that it is now, upon Confidence that under the ſame names of *Pounds*, *Shillings*, and *Pence*, they ſhould receive the ſame *Value*, *i.e.* the ſame *Quantity* of Silver, by giving the Denomination now to leſs Quantities of Silver by one twentieth, you take from them 5 *per Cent.* of their due.

When Men go to Market to buy any other Commodities with their new, but lighter Money, they will find 20 *s.* of their new Money will buy no more of any Commodity than 19 would before. For it not being the *denomination*, but the *quantity* of Silver, that gives the Value to any Coin, 19 Grains or Parts of Silver, however denominated or marked, will no more be worth, or paſs for, or buy ſo much of any other Commodity as 20 Grains of Silver will, than 19 *s.* will paſs for 20 *s.* If any one thinks a Shilling or a Crown in Name has its Value from the Denomination, and not from the Quantity of *Silver* in it, let it be tried; and hereafter let a *Penny* be called a *Shilling*, or a *Shilling* be called a *Crown*. I believe no body would be content to receive his Debts or Rents in ſuch Money: Which though the Law ſhould raiſe thus, yet he foreſees he ſhould loſe eleven twelfths by the one, and by the other four fifths of the Value he received; and would find his new Shilling, which had no more Silver in it than one twelfth of what a Shilling had before, would buy him of Corn, Cloth, or Wine but one twelfth of what an old Shilling would. This is as plainly ſo in the *raiſing*, as you call it, your Crown to 5 *s.* and 3 *d.* or (which is the ſame thing) making your Crown one twentieth lighter in Silver. The only difference is, that the Loſs is ſo great, (it being eleven twelfths) that every body ſees, and abhors it at firſt propoſal; but in the other (it being but one twentieth, and covered with the deceitful name of *raiſing* our Money) People do not ſo readily obſerve it. If it be good to raiſe the Crown-piece this way one twentieth this Week, I ſuppoſe it will be as good and profitable to raiſe it as much again the next Week. For there is no reaſon, why it will not be as good to *raiſe* it again another one and twentieth the next Week, and ſo on; wherein, if you proceed but 10 Weeks ſucceſſively, you will by New-Years-Day next have every Half-Crown raiſed to a Crown, to the Loſs of one half of Peoples Debts and Rents, and the King's Revenue, beſides the Confuſion of all your Affairs: And if you pleaſe to go on in this beneficial way of *raiſing* your Money, you may, by the ſame Art, bring a Penny-Weight of Silver to be a Crown.

Silver, *i.e.* the *quantity* of pure Silver ſeparable from the Alloy, makes the real *Value* of Money. If it does not, coin Copper with the ſame Stamp and Denomination, and ſee whether it will be of the ſame Value. I ſuſpect your Stamp will make it of no more Worth, than the Copper-Money of *Ireland* is, which is its Weight in Copper, and no more. That Money loſt ſo much to *Ireland*, as it paſſed for above the rate of Copper. But yet I think no body ſuffered ſo much by it as he by whoſe Authority it was made current.

If Silver give the Value, you will ſay what need is there then of the charge of *Coinage?* May not Men exchange Silver by Weight, for other things; make their Bargains, and keep their Accounts in Silver by Weight? This might be done, but it has theſe Inconveniencies.

1. The

1. The *weighing of Silver* to every one we had occaſion to pay it to, would be very troubleſome, for every one muſt carry about Scales in his Pocket.

2. Scales would not do the buſineſs. For, in the next place, every one cannot diſtinguiſh between *fine* and *mix'd Silver*: So that though he receive the full weight, he was not ſure he received the full weight of Silver; ſince there might be a mixture of ſome of the baſer Metals, which he was not able to diſcern. Thoſe who have had the care, and government of Politick Societies, introduced Coinage, as a remedy to thoſe two inconveniencies. The *Stamp* was a *Warranty* of the publick, that under ſuch a denomination they ſhould receive a piece of ſuch a weight, and ſuch a fineneſs; that is, they ſhould receive ſo much Silver. And this is the reaſon why the counterfeiting the Stamp is made the higheſt Crime, and has the weight of Treaſon laid upon it: Becauſe *the Stamp is the publick Voucher* of the intrinſick Value. The Royal Authority gives the Stamp; the Law allows and confirms the denomination: And both together give, as it were, the Publick Faith, as a ſecurity, that Sums of Money contracted for under ſuch denominations, ſhall be of ſuch a value, that is, ſhall have in them ſo much Silver. For 'tis Silver and not Names that pay Debts and purchaſe Commodities. If therefore I have contracted for twenty Crowns, and the Law then has required, that each of thoſe Crowns ſhould have an Ounce of Silver; 'tis certain my Bargain is not made good, I am defrauded (and whether the Publick Faith be not broken with me, I leave to be conſidered) if, paying me twenty Crowns, the Law allows them to be ſuch as have but nineteen twentieths of the Silver, they ought to have, and really had in them, when I made my Contract.

2. It diminiſhes all the King's Revenue 5 *per Cent.* For though the ſame number of Pounds, Shillings, and Pence are paid into the Exchequer as were wont, yet theſe Names being given to Coin that have each of them one twentieth leſs of Silver in them; and that being not a ſecret concealed from Strangers, no more than from his own Subjects, they will ſell the King no more Pitch, Tarr, or Hemp, for 20 Shillings, after the *raiſing* your Money, than they would before for 19: or, to ſpeak in the ordinary Phraſe, they will raiſe their Commodities 5 *per Cent.* as you have rais'd your Money 5 *per Cent.* And 'tis well if they ſtop there. For uſually in ſuch changes, an out-cry being made of your leſſening your Coin, thoſe who have to deal with you, taking the advantage of the allarm, to ſecure themſelves from any loſs by your new Trick, raiſe their Price even beyond the *Par* of your leſſening your Coin.

I hear of two Inconveniencies complained of, which 'tis propoſed by this Project to Remedy.

The one is, The *melting down of our Coin*: The other, The *carrying away of our Bullion*. Theſe are both Inconveniencies which, I fear, we lie under: But neither of them will be in the leaſt removed or prevented by the propoſed alteration of our Money.

1. It is paſt doubt that our *Money is melted down*. The reaſon whereof is evidently the cheapneſs of Coinage. For a Tax on Wine paying the Coinage, the particular Owners pay nothing for it. So that 100 Ounces of *Silver Coin'd*, comes to the Owner at the ſame Rate, as 100 Ounces of Standard Silver in *Bullion*. For delivering into the Mint his Silver in Bars, he has the ſame quantity of Silver delivered out to him again in Coin, without any Charges to him. Whereby, if at any time he has occaſion for Bullion, 'tis the ſame thing to melt down our mill'd Money, as to buy *Bullion* from abroad, or take it in Exchange for other Commodities. Thus our *Mint* to the only advantage of our Officers, but at the publick Coſt, *Labours in vain*, as will be found. But yet this makes you not have one jot leſs Money in *England*, than you would have otherwiſe; but only makes you coin that, which otherwiſe would not have been Coin'd, nor perhaps been brought hither: And being not brought hither by an over-balance of your Exportation, cannot ſtay when it is here. It is not any ſort of Coinage, does, or can keep your Money here: That wholly and only depends upon the balance of your Trade. And had all the Money in King *Charles* the II. and King *James* the II's. time, been minted according to this new Propoſal, this rais'd Money would have been gone as well as the other, and the remainder been no more, nor no leſs than it is now. Though I doubt not but the Mint would have coin'd as much of it as it has of our preſent mill'd Money. The ſhort is this. An over-balance of Trade with

Spain brings you in Bullion; cheap Coinage, when it is here, carries it into the Mint, and Money is made of it; but if your Exportation will not balance your Importation in the other Parts of your Trade, away muſt your Silver go again, whether Monied or not Monied. For where Goods do not, Silver muſt pay for the Commodities you ſpend.

That this is ſo, will appear by the Books of the Mint, where may be ſeen how much mill'd Money has been Coin'd in the two laſt Reigns. And in a Paper I have now in my Hands, (ſuppoſed written by a Man not wholly ignorant in the Mint) 'tis confeſſed, That whereas one third of the current Payments were ſome time ſince of mill'd Money, there is not now one twentieth. Gone then it is: But let not any one miſtake and think it gone, becauſe in our preſent Coinage, an Ounce wanting about 16 Grains, is denominated a Crown: Or that (as is now propoſed) an Ounce wanting about 40 Grains, being coin'd in one piece, and denominated a Crown, would have ſtop'd it, or will (if our Money be ſo alter'd) for the future fix it here. Coin what quantity of Silver you pleaſe, in one piece, and give it the denomination of a Crown; when your Money is to go, to pay your foreign Debts, or elſe it will not go out at all) your heavy Money, *i. e.* that which is weight according to its Denomination, by the Standard of the Mint) will be that, which will be melted down, or carried away in Coin by the Exporter, whether the pieces of each Species be by the Law bigger or leſs. For whilſt Coinage is wholly paid for by a Tax, whatever your Size of Money be, he that has need of Bullion to ſend beyond Sea, or of Silver to make Plate, need but take mill'd Money, and melt it down, and he has it as cheap, as if it were in pieces of Eight, or other Silver coming from abroad; the Stamp, which ſo well ſecures the Weight and Fineneſs of the mill'd Money, coſting nothing at all.

To this perhaps will be ſaid, That if this be the effect of mill'd Money, that it is ſo apt to be melted down, it were better to return to the old way of *Coining by the Hammer*. To which I anſwer by no means. For,

1. Coinage by the *Hammer* leſs ſecures you from having a great part of your Money melted down. For in that way there being a greater inequality in the Weight of the Pieces, ſome being too heavy, and ſome too light; thoſe who know how to make their Advantage of it, *cull* out the heavy Pieces, melt them down, and make a Benefit of the over-weight.

2. Coinage by the *Hammer* expoſes you much more to the Danger of *falſe Coin*. Becauſe the Tools are eaſily made and concealed, and the Work carried on with fewer Hands, and leſs Noiſe than a Mill; whereby falſe Coiners are leſs liable to diſcovery.

3. The Pieces not being ſo round, even, and fairly ſtamp'd, nor mark'd on the Edges, are expos'd to *Clipping*, which mill'd Money is not.

Mill'd Money is therefore certainly beſt for the Publick. But whatever be the cauſe of melting down our mill'd Money, I do not ſee how raiſing our Money (as they call it) will at all hinder its being melted down. For if our Crown-pieces ſhould be coin'd one twentieth lighter. Why ſhould that hinder them from being melted down more than now? The intrinſick Value of the Silver is not alter'd, as we have ſhewn already: Therefore that temptation to melt them down remains the ſame as before.

But they are lighter by one twentieth. That cannot hinder them from being melted down. For Half-Crowns are lighter by half, and yet that preſerves them not.

But they are of leſs weight, under the ſame denomination, and therefore they will not be melted down. That is true, if any of theſe preſent Crowns that are one twentieth heavier, are current for Crowns at the ſame time. For then they will no more melt down the new light Crowns, than they will the old clip'd ones, which are more worth in Coin and Tale, than in Weight and Bullion. But it cannot be ſuppos'd that Men will part with their old and heavier Money, at the ſame rate that the lighter new Coin goes at; and pay away their old Crowns for 5 *s.* in Tale, when at the Mint they will yield them 5 *s.* 3 *d.* And then if an old mill'd Crown goes for 5 *s.* 3 *d.* and a new mill'd Crown (being ſo much lighter) go for a Crown, what I pray will be the odds of melting down the one or the other? The one has one twentieth leſs Silver in it, and goes for one twentieth leſs; and ſo being weight, they are melted down upon equal Terms. If it be a convenience to melt one,

one, it will be as much a convenience to melt the other: Juſt as it is the ſame convenience, to melt mill'd Half-Crowns as mill'd Crowns; the one having with half the quantity of Silver, half the Value. When the Money is all brought to the new Rate, *i.e.* to be one twentieth lighter, and Commodities raiſed as they will proportionably, what ſhall hinder the melting down of your Money then, more than now, I would fain know? If it be coin'd then as it is now *Gratis*, a Crown-piece, (let it be of what Weight ſoever) will be as it is now, juſt worth its own Weight in Bullion, of the ſame Fineneſs for the Coinage, which is the manufactury about it, and makes all the difference, coſting nothing, what can make the difference of Value? And therefore, whoever wants Bullion, will as cheaply melt down theſe new Crowns, as buy Bullion with them. The raiſing of your Money cannot then (the Act for free Coinage ſtanding) hinder its being melted down.

Nor, in the next place, much leſs can it, as it is pretended, hinder the Exportation of our Bullion. Any Denomination or Stamp we ſhall give to Silver here, will neither give Silver a higher Value in *England*, nor make it leſs prized abroad. So much Silver will always be worth (as we have already ſhew'd) ſo much Silver given in exchange one for another. Nor will it, when in your Mint a leſs quantity of it is raiſed to a higher denomination (as when nineteen twentieths of an Ounce has the ſame denomination of a Crown, which formerly belong'd only to the whole 20) be one jot rais'd, in reſpect of any other Commodity.

You have *rais'd the Denomination* of your ſtamp'd Silver one twentieth, or which is all one 5 *per Cent.* And Men will preſently *raiſe their Commodities* 5 *per Cent.* So that if yeſterday 20 Crowns would exchange for 20 Buſhels of Wheat, or 20 Yards of a certain ſort of Cloth, if you will to day coin current Crowns one twentieth lighter, and make them the Standard, you will find 20 Crowns will exchange for but 19 Buſhels of Wheat, or 19 Yards of that Cloth, which will be juſt as much Silver for a Buſhel, as yeſterday. So that Silver being of no more real Value, by your giving the ſame denomination to a leſs quantity of it; this will no more bring in, or keep your Bullion here, than if you had done nothing. If this were otherwiſe, you would be beholden (as ſome People fooliſhly imagine) to the *Clippers* for keeping your Money. For if keeping the old denomination to a leſs quantity of Silver, be raiſing your Money (as in effect it is all that is, or can be done in it by this Project of making your Coin lighter) the *Clippers* have ſufficiently done that: And if their Trade go on a little while longer, at the rate it has of late, and your mill'd Money be melted down and carried away, and no more coin'd; your Money will, without the charge of new Coinage, be, by that ſort of Artificers, raiſed above 5 *per Cent.* when all your current Money ſhall be clipped, and made above one twentieth lighter than the Standard, preſerving ſtill its former Denomination.

It will poſſibly be here objected to me, That we ſee 100 *l.* of *clip'd Money*, above 5 *per Cent.* lighter than the Standard, will buy as much Corn, Cloth, or Wine, as 100 *l.* in *mill'd Money*, which is above one twentieth heavier: Whereby it is evident, that my Rule fails, and that it is not the Quantity of Silver, that gives the Value to Money, but its Stamp and Denomination. To which I anſwer, That *Men make their Eſtimate and Contracts according to the Standard*, upon Suppoſition they ſhall receive good and lawful Money, which is that of full Weight: And ſo in effect they do, whilſt they receive the current Money of the Country. For ſince 100 *l.* of *clip'd Money* will pay a Debt of 100 *l.* as well as the weightieſt *mill'd Money*, and a new Crown out of the Mint will pay for no more Fleſh, Fruit, or Cloth, than five clip'd Shillings; 'tis evident that they are equivalent as to the Purchaſe of any thing here at home, whilſt no body ſcruples to take five clip'd Shillings in exchange for a weighty mill'd Crown. But this will be quite otherwiſe as ſoon as you change your Coin, and (to raiſe it as you call it) make your Money one twentieth lighter in the Mint; for then no body will any more give an old Crown of the former Standard for one of the new, than he will now give you 5 *s.* and 3 *d.* for a Crown: For ſo much then his old Crown will yield him at the Mint.

Clip'd and *unclip'd Money* will always buy an equal quantity of any thing elſe, as long as they will without ſcruple change one for another. And this makes, that the foreign Merchant, who comes to ſell his Goods to you, always counts upon the

the Value of your Money by the Silver that is in it, and eſtimates the quantity of Silver by the Standard of your Mint; though perhaps by reaſon of clip'd or worn Money amongſt it, any Sum that is ordinarily received is much lighter than the Standard, and ſo has leſs Silver in it than what is in a like Sum new coin'd in the Mint. But whilſt *clip'd* and *weighty* Money will equally change one for another, it is all one to him whether he receive his Money in clip'd Money or no, ſo it be but current. For if he buy other Commodities here with his Money, whatever Sum he contracts for, *clip'd* as well as *weighty* Money equally pays for it. If he would carry away the Price of his Commodity in ready Caſh, 'tis eaſily changed into weighty Money: And then he has not only the Sum in Tale, that he contracted for, but the quantity of Silver he expected for his Commodities, according to the Standard of our Mint. If the *quantity of your clip'd Money* be once grown ſo great, that the foreign Merchant cannot (if he has a mind to it) eaſily get *Weighty* Money for it, but having ſold his Merchandize, and received *clip'd* Money, finds a difficulty to procure what is Weight for it; he will, in ſelling his Goods, either contract to be paid in *weighty* Money, or elſe raiſe the Price of his Commodities, according to the diminiſh'd quantity of Silver in your current Coin.

In *Holland* (*Ducatoons* being the beſt Money of the Country, as well as the largeſt Coin) Men in Payments, received and paid thoſe indifferently, with the other Money of the Country, till of late the coining of other *Species* of Money, of *baſer Alloy*, and in greater quantities, having made the *Ducatoons*, either by melting down, or Exportation, ſcarcer than formerly, it became difficult to change the baſer Money into *Ducatoons*; and ſince that, no body will pay a Debt in *Ducatoons*, unleſs he be allowed half *per Cent.* or more, above the Value they were coin'd for.

To underſtand this, we muſt take notice, That *Guilders* is the denomination, that in *Holland* they uſually compute by, and make their Contracts in. A *Ducatoon* formerly paſſed at three *Guilders*, and three *Stuyvers*, or ſixty-three *Stuyvers*. There were then (ſome Years ſince) began to be coin'd another Piece, which was call'd a *Three Guilders Piece*, and was order'd to paſs for three *Guilders* or ſixty *Stuyvers*. But 21 *Three Guilders Pieces*, which were to paſs for 63 *Guilders*, not having ſo much Silver in them as 20 *Ducatoons*, which paſſed for the ſame Sum of 63 *Guilders*: the *Ducatoons* were either melted down in their Mints, (for the making of theſe *Three Guilders Pieces*, or yet baſer Money, with Profit) or were carried away by foreign Merchants; who when they carried back the Product of their Sale in Money, would be ſure to receive their Payment of the number of *Guilders* they contracted for in *Ducatoons*, or change the Money they received, into *Ducatoons*: Whereby they carried home more Silver, than if they had taken their Payment in *Three Guilders Pieces*, or any other *Species*. Thus *Ducatoons* became ſcarce. So that now he that will be paid in *Ducatoons* muſt allow half *per Cent.* for them. And therefore the Merchants, when they ſell any thing now, either make their Bargain to be paid in *Ducatoons*, or if they contract for *Guilders* in general, (which will be ſure to be paid them in the baſer Money of the Country,) they raiſe the Price of their Commodities accordingly.

By this Example, in a Neighbour Country, we may ſee how our new mill'd Money goes away. When foreign Trade imports more than our Commodities will pay for, 'tis certain we muſt contract Debts beyond Sea, and thoſe muſt be paid with Money, when either we cannot furniſh, or they will not take our Goods to diſcharge them. To have Money beyond Sea to pay our Debts, when our Commodities do not raiſe it, there is no other way but to ſend it thither. And ſince a weighty Crown coſts no more here than a light one, and our Coin beyond Sea is valued no otherwiſe than according to the quantity of Silver it has in it, whether we ſend it in Specie, or whether we melt it down here to ſend it in Bullion, (which is the ſafeſt way as not being prohibited) *the weightieſt is ſure to go.* But when ſo great a quantity of your Money is clip'd, or ſo great a part of your weighty Money is carried away, that the foreign Merchant or his Factor here cannot have his Price paid in weighty Money, or ſuch as will eaſily be changed into it, then every one will ſee (*when Men will no longer take five clip'd Shillings for a mill'd or weighty Crown*) that it is the quantity of Silver that buys Commodities and pays Debts, and not the Stamp and Denomination which is put upon it. And then too it will be ſeen what a *Robbery* is committed on the Publick by *Clipping*. Every

Grain

Grain diminiſhed from the juſt Weight of our Money, is ſo much Loſs to the Nation, *which will one time or other be ſenſibly felt*; and which, if it be not taken care of, and *ſpeedily ſtopt*, will in that enormous Courſe it is now in, quickly, I fear, break out into open ill Effects, and at one Blow depriye us of a great part (perhaps near one fourth) of our Money. For that will be really the Caſe, when the Increaſe of *clip'd* Money makes it hard to get weighty; when Men begin to put a difference of Value between that which is weighty, and light Money, and will not ſell their Commodities, but for Money that is Weight, and will make their Bargains accordingly.

Let the Country Gentleman, when it comes to that Paſs, conſider, what the Decay of his Eſtate will be, when receiving his Rent in the Tale of *clip'd* Shillings, according to his Bargain, he cannot get them to paſs at Market for more than their Weight. And he that ſells him *Salt* or *Silk*, will bargain for 5 *s.* ſuch a quantity, if he pays him in fair weighty Coin, but in *clip'd* Money he will not take under 5 *s.* 3 *d.* Here you ſee you have your Money without this new trick of Coinage, raiſed 5 *per Cent.* But whether to any advantage of the Kingdom, I leave every one to judge.

Hitherto we have only conſidered the *Raiſing of Silver Coin*, and that has been only by coining it with leſs Silver in it, under the ſame Denomination. There is another way yet of raiſing Money which has ſomething more of reality, though as little good as the former in it. This too, now that we are upon the Chapter of *Raiſing of Money*, it may not be unſeaſonable to open a little. The *Raiſing* I mean is, when either of the two richer Metals, (which Money is uſually made of) is by Law raiſed above its natural Value, in reſpect of the other. *Gold* and *Silver*, have, in almoſt all Ages, and Parts of the World (where Money was uſed) generally been thought the fitteſt Materials to make it of. But there being a great diſproportion in the Plenty of theſe Metals in the World, one has always been valued much higher than the other; ſo that one Ounce of *Gold* has exchang'd for ſeveral Ounces of *Silver*: As at preſent, our *Guinea* paſſing for 21 *s.* 6 *d.* in Silver, Gold is now about fifteen and an half Times more worth than Silver; there being about fifteen and an half Times more Silver in 21 *s.* 6 *d.* than there is Gold in a *Guinea*. This being now the Market Rate of *Gold* to *Silver*; if by an eſtabliſhed Law the Rate of *Guineas* ſhould be ſet higher, (as to 22 *s.* 6 *d.*) they would be raiſed indeed, but to the Loſs of the Kingdom. For by this Law *Gold being raiſed* 5 *per Cent.* above its natural true Value, Foreigners would find it worth while to ſend their Gold hither, and ſo fetch away our Silver at five *per Cent.* Profit, and ſo much Loſs to us. For when ſo much Gold as would purchaſe but 100 Ounces of Silver any where elſe, will in *England* purchaſe the Merchant 105 Ounces, what ſhall hinder him from bringing his Gold to ſo good a Market; and either ſelling it at the Mint, where it will yield ſo much, or having it coin'd into *Guineas*: And then (going to Market with his *Guineas*) he may buy our Commodities at the Advantage of 5 *per Cent.* in the very ſort of his Money; or change them into Silver, and carry that away with him?

On the other ſide, if by a Law you would raiſe your Silver Money, and make four Crowns, or 20 *s.* in Silver, equal to a Guinea, at which rate I ſuppoſe it was firſt coin'd; ſo that by your Law a Guinea ſhould paſs but for 20 *s.* the ſame Inconveniency would follow. For then Strangers would bring in Silver, and carry away your Gold, which was to be had here at a lower Rate than any where elſe.

If you ſay, that this Inconvenience is not to be fear'd; for that as ſoon as People found, that Gold began to grow ſcarce, or that it was more worth than the Law ſet upon it, they would not then part with it at the Statute-rate; as we ſee the Broad-Pieces that were coined in King *James* I. time for 20 *s.* no body will now part with under 23 *s.* or more, according to the Market Value. This I grant is true, and it does plainly confeſs the Fooliſhneſs of making a Law, which cannot produce the Effect it is made for: As indeed it will not, when you would raiſe the Price of Silver in reſpect of Gold, above its natural Market Value: For then, as we ſee in our Gold, the Price of it will raiſe itſelf. But on the other ſide, if you ſhould by a Law ſet the Value of Gold above its *Par*, then People would be bound to receive it at that high rate, and ſo part with their Silver at an under value. But ſuppoſing that having a mind to raiſe your Silver

in

in reſpect of Gold, you make a Law to do it, what comes of that? If your Law prevail, only this; that as much as you raiſe Silver, you debaſe Gold, (for they are in the Condition of two things put in oppoſite Scales, as much as the one riſes the other falls) and then your Gold will be carried away with ſo much clear Loſs to the Kingdom, as you raiſe Silver and debaſe Gold by your Law, below their natural Value. If you raiſe Gold in Proportion to Silver, the ſame Effect follows.

I ſay, *raiſe Silver in reſpect of Gold, and Gold in Proportion to Silver.* For when you would raiſe the Value of Money, fancy what you will, 'tis but in reſpect of ſomething you would change it for, and is done only when you can make a leſs quantity of the Metal, which your Money is made of, change for a greater quantity of that thing which you would raiſe it to.

The Effect indeed, and ill Conſequence of raiſing either of theſe two Metals, in reſpect of the other, is more eaſily obſerved and ſooner found in raiſing Gold than Silver Coin: Becauſe your Accounts being kept, and your Reckonings all made in Pounds, Shillings, and Pence, which are Denominations of Silver Coins, or Numbers of them; if Gold be made current at a rate above the free and Market Value of thoſe two Metals, every one will eaſily perceive the Inconvenience. But there being a Law for it, you cannot refuſe the Gold in payment for ſo much. And all the Money or Bullion People will carry beyond Sea from you, will be in Silver, and the Money or Bullion brought in will be in Gold. And the ſame juſt will happen when your *Silver* is is *raiſed* and *Gold debaſed* in reſpect of one another, beyond their true and natural Proportion: (*Natural Proportion or Value* I call that reſpective Rate they find any where without the Preſcription of Law) For then Silver will be that which is brought in, and Gold will be carried out; and that ſtill with Loſs to the Kingdom, anſwerable to the overvalue ſet by the Law. Only as ſoon as the Miſchief is felt, People will (do what you can) *raiſe their Gold* to its natural Value. For your Accounts and Bargains being made in the Denomination of Silver Money; if, when Gold is raiſed above its Proportion, by the Law, you cannot refuſe it in Payment (as if the Law ſhould make a Guinea current at 22 *s.* and 6 *d.*) you are bound to take it at that rate in Payment. But if the Law ſhould make Guineas current at 20 *s.* he that has them is not bound to pay them away at that rate, but may keep them if he pleaſes, or get more for them if he can: Yet from ſuch a Law one of theſe three things will follow. Either 1*ſt*, The Law forces them to go at 20 *s.* and then being found paſſing at that rate, Foreigners make their Advantage of it: Or, 2*dly*, People keep them up, and will not part with them at the legal Rate, underſtanding them really to be worth more, and then all your Gold lies dead, and is of no more uſe to Trade, than if it were all gone out of the Kingdom: Or, 3*dly*, It paſſes for more than the Law allows, and then your Law ſignifies nothing, and had been better let alone. Which way ever it ſucceeds, it proves either prejudicial or ineffectual. If the deſign of your Law takes place, the Kingdom loſes by it: If the Inconvenience be felt and avoided, your Law is eluded.

Money is the *meaſure* of Commerce, and of the rate of every thing, and therefore *ought to be kept (as all other meaſures) as ſteddy and invariable as may be.* But this cannot be, if your Money be made of two Metals, whoſe Proportion, and conſequently whoſe Price, conſtantly varies in reſpect of one another. Silver, for many Reaſons, is the fitteſt of all Metals to be this Meaſure, and therefore generally made uſe of for Money. But then it is very unfit and inconvenient that Gold, or any other Metal, ſhould be made current legal Money, at a ſtanding ſettled Rate. This is to ſet a Rate upon the varying Value of Things by Law, which juſtly cannot be done; and is, as I have ſhewed, as far as it prevails, a conſtant damage and prejudice to the Country where it is practiſed. Suppoſe fifteen to one be now the exact *Par* between Gold and Silver, what Law can make it laſting; and eſtabliſh it ſo, that next Year, or twenty Years hence, this ſhall be the juſt Value of Gold to Silver, and that one Ounce of Gold ſhall be juſt worth fifteen Ounces of Silver, neither more nor leſs? 'Tis poſſible, the *Eaſt-India* Trade ſweeping away great Sums of Gold, may make it ſcarcer in *Europe*. Perhaps the *Guinea* Trade, and Mines of *Peru*, affording it in greater Abundance, may make it more plentiful; and ſo its Value in reſpect of Silver, come on the one ſide to be as ſixteen, or on the other as fourteen to one. And can any Law

you

you ſhall make alter this Proportion here, when it is ſo every where elſe round about you? If your Law ſet it at fifteen, when it is at the free Market Rate in the neighbouring Countries, as ſixteen to one; will they not ſend hither their Silver to fetch away your Gold at one ſixteen Loſs to you? Or if you will keep its Rate to Silver, as fifteen to one, when in *Holland*, *France*, and *Spain* its Market Value is but fourteen; will they not ſend hither their Gold, and fetch away your Silver at one fifteen Loſs to you? This is unavoidable, if you will make Money of both Gold and Silver at the ſame time, and ſet Rates upon them by Law in reſpect of one another.

What then? (Will you be ready to ſay) would you have Gold kept out of *England?* Or, being here, would you have it uſeleſs to Trade; and muſt there be no Money made of it? I anſwer, Quite the contrary. 'Tis fit the Kingdom ſhould make uſe of the Treaſure it has. 'Tis neceſſary your Gold ſhould be coin'd, and have the King's Stamp upon it, to ſecure Men in receiving it, that there is ſo much Gold in each Piece. But 'tis not neceſſary that it ſhould have a fixed Value ſet on it by publick Authority: 'Tis not convenient that it ſhould in its varying Proportion have a ſetled Price. Let Gold, as other Commodities, find its own Rate. And when, by the King's Image and Inſcription, it carries with it a publick Aſſurance of its Weight and Fineneſs, the Gold Money ſo coin'd will never fail to paſs at the known Market Rates, as readily, as any other Species of your Money. Twenty Guineas, tho' deſigned at firſt for 20 *l.* go now as current for 21 *l.* 10 *s.* as any other Money, and ſometimes for more, as the Rate varies. The Value or Price of any thing, being only the reſpective Eſtimate it bears to ſome other, which it comes in Competition with, can only be known by the Quantity of the one, which will exchange for a certain Quantity of the other. There being no two things in Nature, whoſe Proportion and Uſe does not vary, 'tis poſſible to ſet a ſtanding regular Price between them. The growing Plenty or Scarcity of either in the Market, (whereby I mean the ordinary Places, where they are to be had in Traffick) or the real Uſe, or changing Faſhion of the Place, bringing either of them more into Demand than formerly, preſently varies the reſpective Value of any two Things. You will as fruitleſly endeavour to keep two different things ſteddily at the ſame Price one with another, as to keep two things in a *Æquilibrium*, where their varying Weights depend on different Cauſes. Put a Piece of Spunge in one Scale, and an exact Counterpoiſe of Silver on the other, you will be mightily miſtaken if you imagine, that becauſe they are to Day equal, they ſhall always remain ſo. The Weight of the Spunge varying with every Change of Moiſture in the Air, the Silver in the oppoſite Scale will ſometimes riſe and ſometimes fall. This is juſt the State of *Silver* and *Gold*, in regard of their mutual Value. Their Proportion, or Uſe, may, nay conſtantly does vary, and with it their Price. For being eſtimated one in Reference to the other, they are as it were put in oppoſite Scales, and as the one riſes the other falls, and ſo on the contrary.

Farthings made of a baſer Metal, may on this Account too deſerve your Conſideration. For whatſoever Coin you make current, above the intrinſick Value, will always be Damage to the Publick, whoever get by it. But of this I ſhall not at preſent enter into a more particular Enquiry; only this I will confidently affirm, *That it is the Intereſt of every Country, that all the current Money of it ſhould be of one and the ſame Metal; That the ſeveral Species ſhould be all of the ſame Alloy, and none of a baſer Mixture: And that the Standard once thus ſetled, ſhould be inviolably and immutably kept to Perpetuity.* For whenever that is alter'd, upon what Pretence ſoever, the Publick will loſe by it.

Since then it will neither bring us in more Money, Bullion, or Trade; nor keep that we have here, nor hinder our weighty Money, of what Denomination ſoever, from being melted, to what purpoſe ſhould the Kingdom be at the Charge of coining all our Money anew? For I do not ſuppoſe any body can propoſe, that we ſhould have two ſorts of Money at the ſame time, one heavier, and the other lighter, as it comes from the Mint; that is very abſurd to imagine. So that if all your old Money muſt be coin'd over again, it will indeed be ſome Advantage, and that a very conſiderable one, to the Officers of the Mint. For they being allow'd 3 *s.* 6 *d.* it ſhould be ſixteen Pence Halfpenny for the Coinage of every Pound Troy, which is very near five and an half *per Cent.* If our Money be ſix Milli-

ons, and muſt be coin'd all over again, it will coſt the Nation to the Mint three hundred thirty thouſand Pounds. One hundred thirty thouſand Pounds if the clip'd Money muſt ſcape, becauſe it is already as light as your new Standard; do you not own that this Deſign of new Coinage is juſt of the Nature of Clipping?

This Buſineſs of Money and Coinage is by ſome Men, and amongſt them ſome very ingenius Perſons, thought a great Myſtery, and very hard to be underſtood. Not that truly in itſelf it is ſo, but becauſe intereſted People, that treat of it, wrap up the Secret they make Advantage of in a myſtical, obſcure, and unintelligible ways of Talking; which Men, from a pre-conceiv'd Opinion of the Difficulty of the Subject, taking for Senſe, in a Matter not eaſie to be penetrated, but by the Men of Art, let paſs for current without Examination. Whereas, would they look into thoſe Diſcourſes, enquire what Meaning their Words have, they would find for the moſt part, either their Poſitions to be falſe, their Deductions to be wrong, or (which often happens) their Words to have no diſtinct Meaning at all. Where none of theſe be, there their plain, true, honeſt Senſe, would prove very eaſie and intelligible, if expreſs'd in ordinary and direct Language.

That this is ſo, I ſhall ſhew, by examining a printed Sheet on this Subject, intituled, *Remarks on a Paper given in to the Lords*, &c.

Rem. *'Tis certain, That what Place ſoever will give moſt for Silver by Weight, it will thither be carried and ſold: And if of the Money which now paſſes in* England, *there can be* 5 s. 5 d. *the Ounce given for Standard Silver at the Mint, when but* 5 s. 4 d. *of the very ſame Money can be given elſewhere for it, it will certainly be brought to the Mint; and when coin'd, cannot be ſold (having one Penny over-value ſet upon it by the Ounce) for the ſame that other Plate may be bought for, ſo will be left unmelted; at leaſt, 'twill be the Intereſt of any Exporters, to buy Plate to ſend out, before Money; whereas now 'tis his Intereſt to buy Money to ſend out before Plate.*

Anſw. The Author would do well to make it intelligible, how, *of the Money that now paſſes in* England, *at the Mint can be given* 5 s. 5 d. *the Ounce for Standard Silver, when but* 5 s. 4 d. *of the ſame Money can be given elſewhere for it.* Next, *How it has one Penny over-value ſet upon it by the Ounce,* ſo that *when coin'd it cannot be ſold.* This, to an ordinary Reader, looks very myſterious; and, I fear, is ſo, as either ſignifying nothing at all, or nothing that will hold. For,

1. I ask who is it at the Mint, that *can give* 5 s. 5 d. *per Ounce, for Standard Silver, when no body elſe can give above* 5 s. 4 d? Is it the King, or is it the Maſter-Worker, or any of the Officers? For to give 5 *s.* 5 *d.* for what will yield but 5 *s.* 4 *d.* to any body elſe, is to give one ſixty fifth Part more than it is worth. For ſo much every thing is worth, as it will yield. And I do not ſee how this can turn to account to the King, or be born by any body elſe.

2. I ask, How *a Penny over-value can be ſet upon it by the Ounce, ſo that it cannot be ſold?* This is ſo myſterious that I think it near impoſſible. For an equal Quantity of Standard Silver will always be juſt worth an equal Quantity of Standard Silver. And it is utterly impoſſible to make ſixty four Parts of Standard Silver equal to, or worth ſixty five Parts of the ſame Standard Silver; which is meant by *ſetting a Penny over-value upon it by the Ounce*, if that has any Meaning at all. Indeed, by the Workmanſhip of it, ſixty four Ounces of Standard Silver may be made not only worth ſixty five Ounces, but ſeventy or eighty. But the Coinage, which is all the Workmanſhip here, being paid for by a Tax, I do not ſee how that can be reckon'd at all: Or if it be, it muſt raiſe every 5 *s.* 4 *d.* coin'd, to above 5 *s.* 5 *d.* If I carry ſixty four Ounces of Standard Silver in Bullion to the Mint to be coin'd, ſhall I not have juſt ſixty four Ounces back again for it in Coin? And if ſo, can theſe ſixty four Ounces of coin'd Standard Silver be poſſibly made worth ſixty five Ounces of the ſame Standard Silver uncoin'd; when they coſt me no more, and I can, for barely going to the Mint, have ſixty four Ounces of Standard Silver in Bullion turn'd into Coin? Cheapneſs of Coinage in *England*, where it coſts nothing, will indeed make Money be ſooner brought to the Mint, than any where elſe; becauſe there I have the Convenience of having it made into Money for nothing. But this will no more keep it in *England* than if it were perfect Bullion. Nor will it hinder it from being melted down, becauſe it coſt no more in Coin than in Bullion: And this equally, whether your Pieces of the ſame Denomination be lighter, heavier, or juſt as they were before.

This

This being explain'd, 'twill be eaſie to ſee, whether the other things ſaid in the ſame Paragraph be true or falſe, and particularly, whether *'twill be the Intereſt of every Exporter, to buy Plate to ſend out before Money.*

Rem. *'Tis only barely aſſerted, That if Silver be raiſed at the Mint, that 'twill riſe elſewhere above it, but can never be known till it be tried.*

Anſw. The Author tells us, in the laſt Paragraph, that *Silver that is worth but* 5 s. 2 d. *per Ounce at the Mint, is worth* 5 s. 4 d. *elſewhere.* This, how true, or what Inconvenience it hath, I will not here examine. But be the Inconvenience of it what it will, this raiſing the Money he propoſes as a Remedy: And to thoſe who ſay, upon raiſing our Money, Silver will riſe too, he makes this Anſwer, that *It can never be known whether it will or no, till it be tried.* To which I reply, That it may be known as certainly without trial as it can, that two pieces of Silver that weighed equally Yeſterday, will weigh equally again to Morrow in the ſame Scales.

There is Silver (ſays our Author) *whereof an Ounce* (i. e. 480 Grains) *will change for* 5 *s.* 4 *d.* (i. e. 496 Grains) of our Standard Silver coin'd. To morrow you coin your Money lighter; ſo that then 5 *s.* 4 *d.* will have but 472 Grains of coin'd Standard Silver in it. Can it not then be known, without Trial, whether that Ounce of Silver, which to day will change for 496 Grains of Standard Silver coin'd, will change to morrow but for 472 Grains of the ſame Standard Silver coin'd? Or can any one imagine that 480 Grains of the ſame Silver, which to day are worth 496 Grains of our coin'd Silver, will to morrow be worth but 472 Grains of the ſame Silver, a little differently coin'd? He that can have a Doubt about this till it be tried, may as well demand a Trial to be made, to prove, that the ſame thing is æquiponderant, or æquivalent to it ſelf. For I think it is as clear, That 472 Grains of Silver are æquiponderant to 496 Grains of Silver, as that an Ounce of Silver, that is to day worth 496 Grains of Standard Silver, ſhould to morrow be worth but 472 Grains of the ſame Standard Silver, all Circumſtances remaining the ſame, but the different Weight of the Pieces ſtamp'd: Which is that our Author aſſerts, when he ſays, That *'tis only barely aſſerted*, &c. What has been ſaid to this, may ſerve alſo for an Anſwer to the next Paragraph. Only I deſire it may be taken notice of, that the Author ſeems to inſinuate, that Silver goes not in *England*, as in foreign Parts, by Weight: Which is a very dangerous as well as falſe Poſition; and which, if allowed, may let into our Mint what Corruption and Debaſing of our Money one pleaſes.

Rem. *That our Trade hath heretofore furniſhed us with an Overplus, brought home in Gold and Silver, is true: But that we bring home from any Place more Goods than we now export to it, I do not conceive to be ſo. And more Goods might be ſent to thoſe Parts; but by reaſon of the great Value of Silver in this part of the World, more Money is to be got by exporting Silver, than by any other thing that can be ſent; and that is the reaſon of it. And for its being melted down, and ſent out, becauſe it is ſo heavy, is not by their Paper denied.*

Anſw. *That we bring home from any place more Goods than we now export,* (the Author tells us) *he doth not conceive.*

Would he had told us a Reaſon for his Conceit. But ſince the Money of any Country is not preſently to be changed, upon any private Man's groundleſs Conceit, I ſuppoſe this Argument will not be of much Weight with many Men. I make bold to call it a groundleſs Conceit: For if the Author pleaſe to remember the great Sums of Money are carried every Year to the *Eaſt-Indies*, for which we bring home conſumable Commodities; (though I muſt own that it pays us again with Advantage) or if he will examine, how much only two Commodities, wholly conſum'd here, coſt us yearly in Money, (I mean *Canary* Wine and Currants) more than we pay for with Goods exported to the *Canaries* and *Zant*; beſides the Over-balance of Trade upon us in ſeveral other Places, he will have little reaſon to ſay, *he doth not conceive we bring home from any place more Goods than we now Export to it.*

As to what he ſays concerning the melting down and exporting our Money, becauſe it is heavy. If by *heavy*, he means, becauſe our Crown-pieces (and the reſt of our *Species* of Money in proportion) are 23 or 24 Grains heavier than he would have them coin'd: This, whoever grants it, I deny upon Grounds, which I ſuppoſe, when examined, will be found clear and evident.

Indeed when your Debts beyond Sea, to anſwer the Over-balance of foreign Importations, call for your Money, 'tis certain the heavy Money, which has the full Standard Weight, will be melted down and carried away; becauſe Foreigners value not your Stamp or Denomination, but your Silver.

He would do well to tell us what he means by *the great Value of Silver in this part of the World.* For he ſpeaks of it as a Cauſe that draws away our Money more now than formerly, or elſe it might as well have been omitted as mentioned in this place: And if he mean, by *this part of the World, England:* 'tis ſcarce Senſe to ſay, That the great Value of Silver in *England* ſhould draw Silver out of *England.* If he means the neighbouring Countries to *England,* he ſhould have ſaid it, and not doubtfully *this part of the World.* But let him, by *this part of the World,* mean what he will, I dare ſay every one will agree, That Silver is not more valu'd in this, than any other part of the World; nor in this Age, more than in our Grandfathers Days.

I am ſorry if it be true, what he tells us, That *more Money is to be got by Exportation of Silver, than by any other thing that can be ſent.* This is an Evidence, that *we bring home more Goods than we export.* For till that happens, and has brought us in Debt beyond Sea, Silver will not be exported; but the overplus of Peoples Gain, being generally laid up in Silver, it will be brought home in Silver; and ſo our People will value it as much as any other, in *this part of the World.*

The Truth of the Caſe in ſhort is this. Whenever we, by a loſing Trade, contract Debts with our Neighbours, they will put *a great Value on our Silver, and more Money will be got by tranſporting Silver than any thing can be ſent:* Which comes about thus. Suppoſe that by an Over-balance of their Trade (whether by a Sale of Pepper, Spices, and other *Eaſt-India* Commodities, it matters not) we have received great quantities of Goods, within theſe two or three Months, from *Holland,* and ſent but little thither; ſo that the Accounts balanced between the Inhabitants of *England* and the *United Provinces,* we of *England* were a Million in their Debt; What would follow from hence? This: That theſe *Dutch* Creditors, deſiring to have what is due to them, give Order to their Factors and Correſpondents here, to return it to them. For enquiring, as we do, what are the Effects of an over-balance of Trade, we muſt not ſuppoſe, they inveſt their Debts in Commodities, and return their Effects that way. A Million then being to be returned from *England* to *Holland* in Money, every one ſeeks Bills of Exchange; but *Engliſhmen* not having Debts in *Holland* to anſwer this Million, or any the leaſt part of it, Bills are not to be got. This preſently makes the Exchange very high: upon which the Bankers, *&c.* who have the Command of great quantities of Money and Bullion, ſend that away to *Holland* in Specie, and ſo take Money here to pay it again there, upon their Bills, at ſuch a rate of Exchange, as gives them five, ten, fifteen, *&c. per Cent.* profit: And thus ſometimes a 5 *s.* Piece of our mill'd Money may truly be ſaid to be worth 5 *s.* 3 *d.* 4 *d.* 6 *d.* 9 *d.* in *Holland.* And if this be *the great Value of Silver in this part of the World,* I eaſily grant it him. But this great Value is to be remedied, not by the Alteration of our Mint, but by the Regulation and Balance of our Trade. For be your Coin what it will, our Neighbours, if they over-balance us in Trade, will not only have *a great Value of our Silver,* but get it too; and there will be *more to be got by exporting Silver to them than by any other Thing can be ſent.*

Rem. *The Alteration of the Coins in* Spain *and* Portugal *are no way at all like this. For there they alter'd in Denomination near half, to deceive thoſe they paid, with paying thoſe to whom they owed one Ounce of Silver, but half an Ounce for it. But in the Alteration here deſigned, to whoever an Ounce of Silver was owing, an Ounce will be paid in this Money; it being here only deſign'd, that an Ounce of Money ſhould equal an Ounce of Silver in Value, at home, as well as abroad, which now it does not.*

Anſw. In this Paragraph the Author confeſſes the Alteration of the Coin in *Spain* and *Portugal* was a Cheat; but the *Alteration here deſign'd,* he ſays, *is not:* But the Reaſon he gives for it is admirable: viz. *Becauſe they there alter'd in Denomination near half,* and here the Denomination is alter'd but five *per Cent.* for ſo in Truth it is, whatever he deſigned. As if fifty *per Cent.* were a Cheat, but five *per Cent.* were not; becauſe perhaps leſs perceivable. For the two Things that are pretended to be done here by this new Coinage, I fear will both fail, *viz.* 1. That *to whomſoever an Ounce of Silver is owing, an Ounce of Silver ſhall be paid in this Money.*

Money. For when an Ounce of Silver is coin'd, as is propoſed, into 5 *s.* 5 *d.* (which is to make our Money five *per Cent.* lighter than it is now) I that am to receive an 100 *l. per Annum*, Fee Farm Rent; ſhall I in this new Money receive 105 *l.* or barely 100 *l.*? The firſt I think will not be ſaid. For if by Law you have made it 100 *l.* 'tis certain the Tenant will pay me no more. If you do not mean that 400 Crowns, or 2000 Shillings of your new Coin ſhall be an 100 *l.* but there muſt be five *per Cent.* in Tale, added to every 100, you are at the charge of new Coinage to no other purpoſe but to breed Confuſion. If I muſt receive 100 *l.* by Tale, of this new Money for my Fee Farm Rent, 'tis Demonſtration that I loſe five Ounces *per Cent.* of the Silver was due to me. This a little lower he confeſſes in theſe Words, *That where a Man has a Rent-SEC, that can never be more, this may ſomewhat affect it, but ſo very little, that it will ſcarce ever at all be perceived.* This *very little* is five *per Cent.* And if a Man be cheated of that, ſo he *perceives* it not, it goes for nothing. But this Loſs will not affect only ſuch Rents, as can never be more, but all Payments whatſoever, that are contracted for before this Alteration of our Money.

2. If it be true, what he affirms, *That an Ounce of Money doth equal an Ounce of Silver in value abroad, but not at home*; then this part of the Undertaking will alſo fail. For I deny that the Stamp on our Money does any more debaſe it here at home than abroad, or make the Silver in our Money not equal in Value to the ſame Weight of Silver every-where. The Author would have done well to have made it out, and not left ſo great a Paradox only to the credit of a ſingle Aſſertion.

Rem. *And for what is ſaid in this Bill to prevent Exportation, relates only to the keeping in our own Coin, and Bullion, and leaves all foreign to be exported ſtill.*

Anſw. What the Author means by *our own* and *foreign Bullion*, will need ſome Explication.

Rem. *There is now no ſuch thing as Payments made in weighty and mill'd Money.*

Anſw. I believe there are very few in Town, who do not very often receive a mill'd Crown for 5 *s.* and a mill'd half Crown for 2 *s.* 6 *d.* But he means I ſuppoſe in great and entire Sums of mill'd Money. But I ask, if all the clip'd Money were called in, whether then all the Payments would not be in weighty Money; and that not being call'd in, whether if it be lighter than your new mill'd Money, the new mill'd Money will not be melted down as much as the old? Which I think the Author there confeſſes, or elſe I underſtand him not.

Rem. *Nor will this any way interrupt Trade; for Trade will find its own courſe; the Denomination of Money in any Country no way concerning that.*

Anſw. The Denomination to a certain Weight of Money, in all Countries, concerns Trade; and the Alteration of that neceſſarily brings diſturbance to it.

Rem. *For if ſo be, it occaſions the coining more Money.*

Anſw. He talks as if it would be *the occaſion of coining more Money.* Out of what? Out of Money already coin'd, or out of Bullion? For I would be glad to know where it is.

Rem. *It may be ſome Gain to thoſe that will venture to melt down the Coin, but very ſmall Loſs (if any) to thoſe that ſhall be paid in the new: 'Tis not to be denied, but that where any Man has a Rent-SEC, that can never be more, this may ſomewhat affect it; but ſo very little, 'twill ſcarce ever at all be perceived.*

Anſw. As much as it will be Gain to melt down their Coin, ſo much Loſs will it be to thoſe who are paid in the new, *viz.* 5 *per Cent.* which, I ſuppoſe, is more than the Author would be willing to loſe, unleſs he get by it another way.

Rem. *And if the Alteration deſigned ſhould have the effect of making our native Commodities any way dearer.*

Anſw. Here our Author confeſſes, that proportionably as your Money is raiſed, the Price of other things will be raiſed too. But to make amends, he ſays,

Rem. *It does at the ſame time make the Land which produces them, of more than ſo much more in value.*

Anſw. *This more than ſo much more in Value*, is more than our Author, or any body elſe for him, will ever be able to make out.

The Price of Things will always be eſtimated by the *quantity* of Silver is given in exchange for them. And if you make your Money leſs in Weight, it muſt be made up in Tale. This is all this great Myſtery of raiſing Money, and raiſing

Land.

Land. For Example, The Mannor of *Blackacre* would yeſterday have yielded one hundred thouſand Crowns, which Crown-pieces, let us ſuppoſe *numero rotundo*, to weigh each of them an Ounce of Standard Silver. To day your new Coin comes in play, which is 5 *per Cent.* lighter. There's your Money raiſed: The Land now at Sale yields one hundred and five thouſand Crowns, which is juſt the ſame one hundred thouſand Ounces of Standard Silver. There's the Land raiſed. And is not this an admirable Invention, for which the Publick ought to be at above one hundred thouſand Pounds Charge for new Coinage, and all your Commerce put in diſorder? And then to recommend this Invention, you are told, as a great Secret, That, *Had not Money from time to time, been raiſed in its Denomination, Lands had not ſo riſen too:* Which is to ſay, Had not your Money been made lighter, fewer Pieces of it would have bought as much Land as a greater number does now.

Rem. *The Loſs of Payments there ſpoken of, will, in no ſort, be ſo great as if the Parties to whom theſe Debts are owing, were now bound to receive them in the Money now paſſes, and then to melt the ſame down; ſo at this they will have no cauſe to complain.*

Anſw. A very good Argument! The Clippers have rob'd the Publick of a good part of their Money (which Men will, ſome time or other, find in the Payments they receive) and 'tis deſired the Mint may have a liberty to be beforehand with thoſe to whom Debts are owing. They are told they will have no reaſon to *Complain* of it, who ſuffer this Loſs; becauſe it is not ſo great as the other. The damage is already done to the Publick, by Clipping. Where at laſt it will light, I cannot tell. But Men who receive clip'd Money, not being forced *to melt it down*, do not yet receive any Loſs by it. When clip'd Money will no longer change for weighty, then thoſe who have clip'd Money in their Hands, will find the Loſs of it.

Rem. *'Twill make the Cuſtoms better paid,* becauſe *there will be more Money.*

Anſw. That there will be more Money in Tale, 'tis poſſible: That there will be more Money in Weight and Worth, the Author ought to ſhew. And then, whatever becomes of the *Cuſtoms*, (which I do not hear are unpaid now) the King will loſe in the Exciſe above thirty thouſand Pounds *per Annum.* For in all Taxes where ſo many Pounds, Shillings, or Pence are determined by the Law to be paid, there the King will loſe 5 *per Cent.* The Author here, as in other places, gives a good Reaſon for it. For, *His Majeſty being to pay away this Money by Tale, as he received it, it will be to him no loſs at all.*

As if my receiving my Rents in full Tale, but in Money of undervalue five *per Cent.* were not ſo much Loſs to me, becauſe I was to pay it away again by Tale. Try it at fifty *per Cent.* The odds only is, That one being greater than the other, would make more noiſe. But our Author's great Refuge in this is, *That it will not be perceiv'd.*

Rem. *If all foreign Commodities were to be Purchaſed with this new Species of Money ſent out; we agree, That with* 100 l. *of it, there could not be ſo much Silver or other Commodities bought, as with* 100 l. *in Crown-Pieces as now coined; becauſe they would be heavier; and all Coin in any Kingdom, but where 'tis coined, only goes by Weight; and for the ſame Weight of Silver, the ſame every-where ſtill will be bought; and ſo there will, with the ſame quantity of Goods. And if thoſe Goods ſhould coſt* five per Cent. *more here in* England *than heretofore, and yield but the ſame Money (we mean by the Ounce abroad) the ſame Money brought home and coin'd, will yield the Importer* five per Cent. *more at the Mint than it heretofore could do, and ſo no damage to the Trader at all.*

Anſw. Here Truth forces from the Author a confeſſion of two Things, which demonſtrate the Vanity and Uſeleſneſs of the Project. 1. That upon this change of your Coin, foreign Goods will be rais'd. 2. Your own Goods will coſt more five *per Cent.* So that Goods of all kinds being thereupon raiſed; wherein conſiſts the raiſing of your Money, when an Ounce of Standard Silver, however minc'd, ſtamp'd, or denominated, will buy no more Commodities than it did before? This confeſſion alſo ſhews the Falſhood of that dangerous Suppoſition, That Money, *in the Kingdom where it is coin'd, goes not by Weight,* i. e. is not valued by its Weight.

Rem. *'Tis true, The Owners of Silver will find a good Market for it, and no others will be damaged; but, on the contrary, the making Plenty of Money will be an advantage to all.*

Anſw.

Anſw. I grant it true, That if your Money were really raiſed five *per Cent. the Owners of Silver* would get ſo much by it, by bringing it to the Mint to be coin'd. But ſince, as is confeſſed, Commodities will (upon this raiſing your Money) be raiſed to five *per Cent.* this Alteration will be an Advantage to no body but the Officers of the Mint, and Hoarders of Money.

Rem. *When Standard Silver was laſt raiſed at the Mint, (which it was, from* 5 s. *to* 5 s. *and* 2 d. *the Ounce, in the* 43 d. *of* Eliz.*) and, for above Forty Years after, Silver uncoin'd was not worth above* 4 s. 10 d. *the Ounce, which occaſion'd much Coining; and of Money, none in thoſe Days was exported: Whereas Silver now is worth but the very ſame* 5 s. *and* 2 d. *the Ounce ſtill at the Mint, and is worth* 5 s. 4 d. *elſewhere. So that if this Bill now with the Lords does not happen to paſs, there can never any Silver be ever more coin'd at the Mint; and all the mill'd Money will in a very little time more be deſtroyed.*

Anſw. The Reaſon of ſo much Money coin'd in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Time, and afterwards, was not the leſſening your Crown-Pieces from 480 to 462 Grains, and ſo proportionably all the reſt of your Money, (which is that the Author calls, raiſing Standard Silver from 5 *s.* to 5 *s.* 2 *d.* the Ounce) but from the over-balance of your Trade, bringing then in Plenty of Bullion, and keeping it here.

How Standard Silver (for if the Author ſpeaks of other Silver, it is a fallacy) ſhould be worth its own Weight in Standard Silver at the Mint, (*i.e.* 5 *s.* 2 *d.* the Ounce) and be worth more than its own Weight in Standard Silver, (*i. e.* 5 *s.* 4 *d.* the Ounce) in *Lombard-Street*, is a Paradox that no body, I think, will be able to comprehend, till it be better explain'd. It is time to give off Coining, if the Value of Standard Silver be leſſened by it: as really it is, if an Ounce of coin'd Standard Silver will not exchange for an Ounce of uncoin'd Standard Silver, unleſs you add 15 or 16 Grains over-plus to it: Which is what the Author would have taken upon his Word, when he ſays, *Silver is worth Five Shillings Four Pence elſewhere.*

Five Shillings Four Pence of Money coin'd at the Mint, the Author muſt allow to be at leaſt 495 Grains. An Ounce is but 480 Grains. How then an Ounce of uncoin'd Standard Silver can be worth five Shillings four Pence, (*i.e.* How 480 Grains of uncoin'd Standard Silver can be worth 495 Grains of the ſame Standard Silver, coin'd into Money) is unintelligible; unleſs the coinage of our Mint leſſens the Value of Standard Silver.

SIR,

COIN *and* Intereſt *are Two Things of ſo great Moment to the Publick, and of ſo great Concernment in Trade, that they ought, very accurately to be examin'd into, and very nicely weigh'd, upon any Propoſal of an Alteration to be made in them. I pretend not to have treated of them here as they deſerve. That muſt be the Work of an abler Hand. I have ſaid ſomething on theſe Subjects, becauſe you requir'd it. And, I hope, the Readineſs of my Obedience will excuſe, to You, the Faults I have committed, and aſſure You that I am,*

SIR,

Your moſt humble Servant,

JOHN LOCKE.

SHORT

SHORT

OBSERVATIONS

ON A

PRINTED PAPER,

Entituled,

For Encouraging the Coining Silver Money in England, *and after for keeping it here.*

THE Author ſays, *Silver yielding the propos'd* 2 d. *or* 3 d. *more by the Ounce, than it will do by being coin'd into Money, there will be none coin'd into Money; and Matter of Fact ſhews there is none.*

'Twould be hard to know what he means, when he ſays, *Silver yields* 2 d. *or* 3 d. *more by the Ounce, than it will do by being coin'd into Money:* But that he tells us in plain words at the bottom of the Leaf, that *an Ounce of Silver uncoin'd, is of* 2 d. *more value, than after it is coin'd it will be*; which I take the liberty to ſay, is ſo far from being true, that I affirm it is impoſſible to be ſo. For which I ſhall only give this ſhort Reaſon, *viz.* Becauſe the Stamp neither does nor can take away any of the intrinſick Value of the Silver, and therefore an Ounce of coined Standard Silver, muſt neceſſarily be of equal Value to an Ounce of uncoined Standard Silver. For Example; ſuppoſe a Goldſmith has a round Plate of Standard Silver juſt of the ſhape, ſize and weight of a coin'd Crown-piece, which, for brevity's ſake we will ſuppoſe to be an Ounce, this Ounce of Standard Silver is certainly of equal Value to any other Ounce of unwrought Standard Silver in his Shop; away he goes with his round piece of Silver to the Tower, and has there the Stamp ſet upon it; when he brings this numerical Piece back again to his Shop coin'd, can any one imagine that it is now 2 *d.* leſs worth than it was when he carried it out ſmooth a quarter of an hour before, or that it is not ſtill of equal Value to any other Ounce of unwrought Standard Silver in his Shop? He that can ſay 'tis 2 *d.* leſs worth than it was before it had the King's Image and Inſcription on it, may as well ſay, that 60 Grains of Silver brought from the Tower are worth but 58 Grains of Silver in *Lombard-ſtreet.*

But the Author very warily limits this ill Effect of Coinage only to *England*; why it is ſo in *England*, and not every-where, would deſerve a Reaſon.

But let us grant it to be true, as our Author affirms, that coin'd Silver in *England* is one thirtieth worſe, or of leſs Value than uncoin'd, the natural Conſequence from this, if it be true, is, that it is very unfit that the Mint ſhould be employed in *England* where it debaſes the Silver one thirtieth; for if the Stamp leſſens the Value of our Silver this Year, it will alſo do ſo the next, and ſo on to the End of the World, it always working the ſame way. Nor will the altering the Denomination, as is propos'd, at all help it.

But yet he thinks he has ſome Proof for his Propoſition, becauſe it is *Matter of Fact* that there is *no Money coin'd at the Mint.* This is the great Grievance, and is one indeed, but for a different Reaſon from what ſeems to inſpire that Paper.

The

The Matter in ſhort is this; *England* ſending more conſumable Commodities to *Spain*, than it receives from thence, the Merchants who manage that Trade, bring back the *Overplus* in Bullion, which at their Return they ſell as a Commodity. The Chapmen that give higheſt for this, are, as in all Caſes of buying and ſelling, thoſe who can make moſt Profit by it; and thoſe are the Returners of our Money by Exchange into thoſe Countries where our Debts any way contracted make a Need of it; for they getting 6, 8, 10, *&c. per Cent.* according to the Want and Demand of Money from *England* there, and according to the Riſque of the Sea, buy up this Bullion as ſoon as it comes in, to ſend it to their Correſpondents in thoſe Parts, to make good their Credit for the Bills they have drawn on them, and ſo can give more for it than the Mint-Rate, *i. e.* more than an equal Weight of mill'd Money, for an equal Weight of Standard Bullion, they being able to make more Profit of it by Returns.

Suppoſe the Balance of our Trade with *Holland* were in all other Commodities equal, but that in the laſt *Eaſt-India* Sale we bought of them of *Eaſt-India* Commodities to the Value of a Million, to be paid in a Month; within a Month a Million muſt be returned into *Holland*, this preſently raiſes the Exchange, and the Traders in Exchange ſell their Bills at high Rates; but the Balance of Trade being (as is ſuppos'd in the Caſe) equal in all other Commodities, this Million can no way be repaid to their Correſpondents on whom thoſe Bills were drawn, but by ſending them Money or Bullion to reimburſe them.

This is the true Reaſon why the Bullion brought from *Spain* is not carried to the Mint to be coin'd, but bought by Traders in foreign Exchange, and exported by them to ſupply the *Overplus* of our Expences there, which are not paid for by our Commodities. Nor will the propoſed *Raiſing of our Money*, as 'tis call'd, whether we coin our Money for the future one thirtieth, or one twentieth, or one half lighter than now it is, bring one Ounce more to the Mint than now, whilſt our Affairs in this reſpect remain in the ſame Poſture. And I challenge the Author to ſhew that it will, for ſaying is but ſaying: Bullion can never come to the Mint to be coin'd, whilſt the over-balance of Trade and foreign Expences are ſo great, that to ſatisfy them, not only the Bullion your Trade in ſome Parts now yearly brings in, but alſo ſome of your formerly coin'd Money is requiſite, and muſt be ſent out; but when a Change in that brings in and lodges Bullion here, (for now it ſeems it only paſſes through *England*) the Increaſe of Silver and Gold ſtaying in *England*, will again bring it to the Mint to be coin'd.

This makes it eaſily intelligible how it comes to paſs, that when now at the Mint they can give but 5 *s.* 2 *d. per* Ounce for Silver, they can give 5 *s.* 4 *d.* the Ounce (in *Lombard-ſtreet*, which is what our Author means when he ſays, *Silver now is worth but* 5 s. 2 d. *the Ounce at the Mint, and is worth* 5 s. 4 d. *elſewhere.*) The Reaſon whereof is plain, *viz.* Becauſe the Mint giving weighty Money for Bullion, can give ſo much and no more for Silver than it is coin'd at, which is 5 *s.* 2 *d.* the Ounce, the Publick paying all the Odds that is between the coin'd and uncoin'd Silver, which is the Manufacture of Coinage: But the Banker or Returner of Money having Uſe of Silver beyond Sea, where he can make his Profit of it by anſwering Bills of Exchange, which he ſells dear, muſt either ſend our Money in *Specie*, or melt down our Coin to tranſport, or elſe with it buy Bullion.

The ſending our Money in *Specie*, or melting it down, has ſome hazard, and therefore if he could have Bullion for 5 *s.* 2 *d. per* Ounce, or a little dearer, 'tis like he would always rather chuſe to exchange Coin for Bullion, with ſome little Loſs, rather than run the Riſque of melting it down, or Exportation.

But this would ſcarce make him pay 2 *d.* in the Crown, which is almoſt three and an half *per Cent.* if there were not ſomething more in it, than barely the Riſque of Melting or Exportation; and that is the Lightneſs of the greateſt Part of our current Coin. For Example: *N.* has given Bills for thirty thouſand Pounds *Sterling in Flanders*, and ſo has need of ten thouſand Weight of Silver to be tranſported thither; he has thirty thouſand Pounds *Sterling* by him in ready Money, whereof five thouſand Pounds is weighty mill'd Money; what ſhall hinder him then from throwing that into his Melting-Pot, and ſo reducing it to Bullion, to be tranſported? But what ſhall he do for the other twenty five thouſand Pounds, which tho' he has by him, is yet clip'd and light Money, that is at leaſt twenty

per Cent. lighter than the Standard? If he tranſports or melts down this, there is ſo much clear Loſs to him; it is therefore more Advantage to him to buy Bullion at 5 *s.* 4 *d.* the Ounce with that Money, than to tranſport or melt it down; wherein tho' the Seller of the Bullion has leſs Weight in Silver than he parts with, yet he finds his Accompt as much as if he received it in weighty Coin, whilſt a clip'd Crown-piece or Shilling paſſes as well in Payment for any Commodity here in *England* as a mill'd one. Thus our Mint is kept from coining.

But this Paper, *For encouraging the Coining, &c.* would fain have the Mill at work, tho' there be no Griſt to be had, unleſs you will grind over again what is ground already, and pay Toll for it a ſecond Time; a Propoſition fit only for the Miller himſelf to make; for the meaneſt Houſewife in the Country would laugh at it as ſoon as propos'd. However the Author pleaſes himſelf, and thinks he has a good Argument to make it paſs, *viz.* Becauſe the Toll to be paid for it will not amount to three hundred and thirty thouſand Pounds, as is ſaid in a late Treatiſe about *Raiſing the Value of Money*, p. 70. for, ſays he, that Writer is miſtaken, in ſaying that 3 *s. and* 6 *d. is allowed at the Mint for the Coinage of every Pound Troy*, whereas *there is but* ſixteen Pence half penny *there allowed for the ſame*; which ſixteen Pence half penny being above one third of 3 *s.* 6. it follows by his own Computation, that the new Coining our Money will coſt the Nation above one hundred and ten thouſand Pounds: a ſmall Sum in this our Plenty of Riches, to be laid out for the purchaſing theſe following Inconveniencies without any the leaſt Advantage.

1. A Loſs to the King of one fiftieth (if you coin your Money 2 *d. per* Crown, one twentieth, if you coin your Money 3 *d. per* Crown lighter) of all his ſtanding Revenue.

2. A like Loſs of one twentieth or one thirtieth in all Rents that are ſetled, for theſe have, during the Term, the Nature of Rent-ſeck: But five *per Cent.* Loſs in a Man's Income he thinks ſo little, *it will not be perceived.*

3. *Trouble to Merchants in their Trade.* Theſe Inconveniencies he is forc'd to allow. He might have ſaid Diſorder to all People in their Trade, tho' he ſays it will be but a *little Trouble to Merchants*, and without any real *Damage to Trade.* The Author would have done well to have made out this and a great many other Aſſertions in that Paper; but ſaying is much eaſier, if that may paſs for Proof.

Indeed he has, by a ſhort Way, anſwer'd the Book above-mention'd, in the Concluſion of his Paper, in theſe Words: *And he that ſo groſly miſtakes in ſo material Points of what he would aſſert, 'tis plain is not free from Miſtakes.* It does not appear that he who publiſhed that Book, ever thought himſelf free from Miſtakes; but he that miſtakes in two material Points, may be in the right in two others, and thoſe will ſtill need an Anſwer. But one of theſe material Points will, I think, by what is already ſaid, appear not to be a Miſtake; and for any thing the Author of the Paper hath ſaid, or can ſay, it will always be true, that an Ounce of Silver coin'd or not coin'd, is, and eternally will be of equal Value to any other Ounce of Silver. As to any other Miſtake, concerning the Rate of Coinage, 'tis like he had his Information from ſome diſintereſted Perſon, whom he thought worthy of Credit. And whether it be 3 *s.* 6 *d.* as he was told, or only ſixteen Pence half penny *per* Pound Troy, as the Paper ſays, whether the Reader will believe the one or the other, or think it worth his more exact Enquiry, this is certain, the Kingdom ought not to be at that or any other Charge where there is no Advantage, as there will be none in this propos'd Coinage, but quite the contrary.

In his Anſwer to

Object. 1. He ſays from *Edw.* III. *Silver has from time to time (as it grew in eſteem) been by Degrees raiſed in all Mints.* If an Ounce of Silver now not exchanging or paying for what one tenth of an Ounce would have purchaſed in *Edw.* III'd time, and ſo being ten times leſs worth now than it was then, be *growing in eſteem*, this Author is in the right, elſe Silver has not ſince *Edw.* III's Reign, *from time to time grown in Eſteem.* Be that as it will, he aſſigns a wrong Cauſe *of raiſing of Silver*, as he calls it in our Mint. For if *growing thus in Requeſt*, i. e. by leſſening its Value, had been the Reaſon of altering our Money, this Change of Coin, or raiſing the Denomination of Silver in ours and other Mints, ought to have been greater by much

much ſince *Henry* VII's Time, than it was between that and *Edw.* III's; becauſe the great Change of the Value of Silver has been made, by the Plenty of it pour'd into this Part of the World from the *Weſt-Indies*, not diſcovered till *Hen.* VII's Reign. So that I think I may ſay, that the Value of Silver from *Edw.* III. to *Henry* VII. changed not one tenth, but from *Henry* VII. till now it chang'd above ſeven tenths, and yet Money having been raiſed in our Mint two thirds ſince *Edw.* III's Time, the far greater Part of the Raiſing of it was before *Hen.* VII's Time, and a very ſmall Part of it ſince; ſo that the Cauſe inſinuted by our Author, 'tis evident, was not the Cauſe of leſſening our Coin ſo often, whatever was it: And 'tis poſſible there wanted not Men of Projects in thoſe Days, who for private Ends, by wrong Suggeſtions, and falſe Reaſonings, cover'd with myſterious Terms, led thoſe into Miſtakes, who had not the Time and Will nicely to examine, tho' a Crown-piece three times as big as one of ours now might, for its Size alone, deſerve to be reformed.

To *Object.* 2. He ſays, *The Raiſing the Denomination of Money in* Spain *and* Portugal, *was making it go for more when coin'd, than its true Value.*

This, I ſay, is impoſſible, and deſire the Author to prove it. It did in *Spain* and *Portugal*, juſt what it will do here and every where, it made not the Silver coin'd go for more than its Value in all Things to be bought, but juſt ſo much as the Denomination was raiſed, juſt ſo much leſs of Commodity had the Buyer in exchange for it: as it would be here, if you ſhould coin Six-pences into Shillings; if any one went to Market with this new Money, he would find that whereas he had a Buſhel of Wheat laſt Week for eight Shillings of the former Coin, he would have now but half a Buſhel for eight of the new Shillings, when the ſame Denomination had but half the Quantity of Silver. Indeed thoſe who were to receive Money upon former Contracts, would be defrauded of half their Due, receiving in their full Tale of any Denomination contracted for, but half the Silver they ſhould have; the Cheat whereof they would find, when they went to Market with their new Money. For this I have above proved, that one Ounce of Silver is, and eternally will be equal in Value to another Ounce of Silver; and all that can poſſibly put a Difference between them, is only the different Value of the Workmanſhip beſtow'd on one more than another, which in Coinage our Author tells us in this Paper is but ſixteen pence half penny *per* Pound *Troy*. I demand therefore of our Author, to ſhew that any ſort of Coinage, or, as he calls it, raiſing of Money, can raiſe the Value of coin'd Silver, or make it go for more than uncoin'd, bating the Charge of Coinage, unleſs it be to thoſe who being to receive Money upon former Contracts will by receiving the Tale agreed for, receive leſs than they ſhould of Silver, and ſo be defrauded of what they really contracted for.

What Effect ſuch a Raiſing of their Money had in one Particular, I will tell our Author. In *Portugal* they count their Money by Reys, a very ſmall, or rather imaginary Coin, juſt as if we here ſhould count all our Sums by Farthings. It pleaſed the Government, poſſibly, being told that it would raiſe the Value of their Money to raiſe in Denomenation the ſeveral *Species*, and make them go for a greater (let us ſuppoſe double the) Number of Reys than formerly. What was the Conſequence? It not only confounded the Property of the Subject, and diſturbed Affairs to no purpoſe; but Treaties of Commerce having ſetled the Rates of the Cuſtoms, at ſo many Reys on the ſeveral Commodities, the King immediately loſt in the Value half his Cuſtoms. The ſame that in Proportion will happen in the ſetled Revenue of the Crown here upon the propoſed Change.

For tho' our Author in theſe Words, *Wheras all now deſired by this Act is, to keep Silver, when coin'd, of the ſame Value it was before*, would inſinuate, that this Raiſing the Denomination, or leſſening our Coin, as is propoſed, will do no ſuch thing; yet 'tis Demonſtration, that when our Coin is leſſened 3 *d.* in 5 *s.* the King will receive five *per Cent.* leſs in Value in his Cuſtoms. Exciſe, and all his ſetled Revenue, and ſo proportionably, as the Quantity of Silver in every *Species* of our Coin ſhall be made leſs than now it is coin'd in thoſe of the ſame Denomination.

But whatever our Author means by *making Money go for more when coin'd than its true Value, or by keeping Silver when coin'd of the ſame Value it was before*; this is evident, that raiſing their Money thus by coining it with leſs Silver in it than it had before, had not the Effect in *Portugal* and *Spain*, which our Author propoſes from it here: For it has not brought one Penny more to the Mint there, nor kept

their Money or Silver from Exportation ſince, tho' Forfeiture and Death be the Penalties joined in Aid to this Trick of *Raiſing* to keep it in.

But our Author tells us in Anſwer to *Object.* 4. This *will ſcarce ever at all be perceived.* If of a 100 Guineas a Man has in his Pocket, 5 ſhould be picked out ſo as he ſhould not perceive it, the Fraud and the Loſs would not be one Jot the leſs; and tho' he perceived it not when or how it was done, yet he will find it in his Accounts, and the going ſo much back in his Eſtate at the End of the Year.

To *Object.* 3. he ſays, The *Raiſing* your Coin *(it may be) may raiſe the Price of Bullion here in* England. An Ounce of Silver will always be equal in Value to an Ounce of Silver every where, bating the Workmanſhip. I ſay it is impoſſible to be otherwiſe, and require our Author to ſhew it poſſible in *England*, or any where, or elſe hereafter to ſpare his *may be's*. To avoid Fallacies, I deſire to be underſtood, when I uſe the Word *Silver* alone, to mean nothing but Silver, and do lay aſide the Conſideration of baſer Metals that may be mixed with it: For I do not ſay that an Ounce of Standard Silver, that has almoſt one twelfth of Copper in it, is of equal Value with an Ounce of fine Silver that has no Alloy at all, but that any two Ounces of equally alloy'd Silver will always be of equal Value; the Silver being the Meaſure of Commerce, 'tis the Quantity of Silver that is in every Piece he receives, and not the Denomination of it which the Merchant looks after, and values it by.

But this Raiſing of the Denomination our Author would have paſs, becauſe 'twill be *better for the Poſſeſſors of Bullion*, as he ſays, *Anſw.* 3. But who are they who now in *England* are poſſeſs'd of ſo much Bullion? Or what private Men are there in *England* of that Conſideration, that for their Advantage all our Money ſhould be new coin'd, and of a leſs Weight, with ſo great a Charge to the Nation, and Loſs to his Majeſty's Revenue.

He farther adds, *Anſw.* 3. *It doth not thence inevitably follow, it will raiſe the Price of Bullion beyond Sea.*

It will as inevitably follow, as that nineteen Ounces of Silver will never be equal in weight or worth to twenty Ounces of Siver: So much as you leſſen your Coin, ſo much more muſt you pay in tale as will make the Quantity of Silver the Merchant expects for his Commodity, under what Denomination ſoever he receives it.

The Clothier thus buying his *Spaniſh* Wool, Oil, and Labour, at five *per Cent.* more in Denomination, ſells his woollen Manufacture proportionably dearer to the *Engliſh* Merchant, who exporting it to *Spain*, where their Money is not changed, ſells it at the uſual Market-rate, and ſo brings home the ſame Quantity of Bullion for it which he was wont, which therefore he muſt ſell to you at the ſame raiſed Value your Money is at: And what then is gain'd by all this? The Denomination is only chang'd to the Prejudice of the Publick, but as to all the great Matters of your Trade, the ſame Quantity of Silver is paid for Commodities as before, and they ſold in their ſeveral foreign Markets for the ſame Quantity of Silver. But whatever happens in the Rate of foreign Bullion, the Raiſing of the Denomination of our Money, will bring none of it to our Mint to be coin'd; that depends on the Balance of our Trade, and not on leſſening our Coin under the ſame Denomination: For whether the Pieces we call Crowns be coin'd 16, 24, or 100 Grains lighter, it will be all one as to the Value of Bullion, or the bringing more or leſs of it into *England*, or to our Mint.

What he ſays in his Anſwer to *Object.* 4. beſides what we have already taken notice of, is partly againſt his Bill, and partly miſtake.

1. He ſays, *It may be ſome (as it is now) Gain to thoſe that will venture to melt down the mill'd and heavy Money now coin'd*, That Men do venture to melt down the mill'd and heavy Money, is evident, from the ſmall Part of mill'd Money is now to be found of that great Quantity of it that has been coin'd; and a farther Evidence is this, that mill'd Money will now yield four or five more *per Cent.* than the other, which muſt be to melt down, and uſe as Bullion, and not as Money in ordinary Payments. The Reaſon whereof is, the ſhameful and horrible Debaſing (or, as our Author would have it, *Raiſing*) our unmill'd Money by Clipping.

For the Odds betwixt mill'd and unmill'd Money being now, modeſtly ſpeaking, above 20 *per Cent.* and Bullion, for Reaſons elſewhere given, being not to be had, Refiners, and ſuch as have need of Silver, find it the cheapeſt way to buy mill'd Money for clip'd, at four, five, or more *per Cent.* Loſs. I ask

I ask therefore this Gentleman, What ſhall become of all our preſent mill'd and heavy Money, upon the paſſing this Act? To which his Paper almoſt confeſſes what I will venture to anſwer for him, *viz.* That as ſoon as ſuch a Law is paſſed, the mill'd and heavy Money will all be melted down; for it being five *per Cent.* heavier, *i. e.* more worth than what is to be coin'd in the Mint, no body will carry it thither to receive five *per Cent.* leſs for it, but ſell it to ſuch as will give four or four and an half *per Cent.* more for it, and at that Rate melt it down with Advantage: For *Lombard-ſtreet* is too quick-ſighted to give ſixty Ounces of Silver for fifty ſeven Ounces of Silver, when bare throwing it into the Melting-pot will make it change for its equal Weight; ſo that by this Law five *per Cent.* Gain on all our mill'd Money, will be given to be ſhared between the Poſſeſſor and the Melter of our mill'd Money, out of the honeſt Creditor and Landlord's Pocket, who had the Guaranty of the Law, that under ſuch a Tale of Pieces of ſuch a Denomination as he let his Land for, he ſhould have to ſuch a Value, *i. e.* ſuch a Weight in Silver. Now I ask whether it be not a direct and unanſwerable Reaſon againſt this Bill, that he confeſſes that it will be *a Gain to thoſe who will melt down the mill'd and heavy Money* with ſo much LoſstothePublick, and not, as he ſays, *with very ſmall Loſs to thoſe that ſhall be paid in the new*, unleſs he calls five *per Cent. very ſmall Loſs*, for juſt ſo much is it to receive but fifty ſeven Grains or Ounces of Silver for ſixty, which is the Proportion in making your Crowns 3 *d.* lighter. This is certain, no body will pay away mill'd or weighty Money for Debts or Commodities, when it will yield him four or five *per Cent.* more; ſo that which is now left of weighty Money, being ſcatter'd up and down the Kingdom into private Hands, which cannot tell how to melt it down, will be kept up and loſt to our Trade. And as to your clip'd and light Money, will you make a new Act for Coinage, without taking any Care for that? The making a new Standard for your Money, cannot do leſs than make all Money, which is lighter than that Standard, unpaſſable; and thus the mill'd and heavy Money not coming into Payment, and the light and clip'd not being lawful Money, according to the new Standard, there muſt needs be a ſudden ſtop of Trade, and, 'tis to be fear'd, a general Confuſion of Affairs; tho' our Author ſay, *it will not any ways interrupt Trade.*

2. The latter Part of this *Section* about raiſing the Value of Land, I take the Liberty to ſay is a Miſtake; which tho' a ſufficient Reply to an Aſſertion without Proof, yet I ſhall not ſo far imitate this Author as barely to ſay things: And therefore I ſhall add this Reaſon for what I ſay, *viz.* Becauſe nothing can truly raiſe the Value, *i. e.* the Rent of Land, but the Increaſe of your Money; but becauſe *Raiſing the Value of Land* is a Phraſe which, by its uncertain Senſe, may deceive others, we may reckon up theſe ſeveral Meanings of it.

1. The Value of Land is raiſed, when its intrinſick Worth is increaſed, *i. e.* when it is fitted to bring forth a greater Quantity of any valuable Product. And thus the Value of Land is raiſed only by good Husbandry.

2. The Value of Land is raiſed, when remaining of the ſame Fertility, it comes to yield more Rent, and thus its Value is raiſed only by a greater Plenty of Money and Treaſure.

3. Or it may be raiſed in our Author's Way, which is, by Raiſing the Rent in Tale of Pieces, but not in the Quantity of Silver received for it, which, in Truth, is no raiſing of it at all, no more than it could be accounted the Raiſing of a Man's Rent, if he let his Land this Year for forty Sixpences, which laſt Year he let for twenty Shillings. Nor would it alter the Caſe, if he ſhould call thoſe forty Sixpences forty Shillings; for having but half the Silver of forty Shillings in them, they would be but of half the Value, however their Denomination were changed.

In his Anſwer to the fifth *Objection*, there is this dangerous Inſinuation, That Coin in any Country where it is coin'd *goes not by Weight*, i. e. has its Value from the Stamp and Denomination, and not the Quantity of Silver in it. Indeed in Contracts already made, if your Species be by Law coin'd a fifth Part lighter, under the ſame Denomination, the Creditor muſt take a hundred ſuch light Shillings, or twenty ſuch light Crown-pieces for 5 *l.* if the Law calls them ſo, but he loſes one fifth in the intrinſick Value of his Debt. But in Bargains to be made, and Things to be purchaſed, Money has and will always have its Value from

from the Quantity of Silver in it, and not from the Stamp and Denomination, as has been already proved, and will ſome time or other be evidenced with a witneſs in the clip'd Money. And if it were not ſo, that the Value of Money were not according to the Quantity of Silver in it, *i. e.* that it goes by Weight, I ſee no reaſon why Clipping ſhould be ſo ſeverely puniſhed.

As to Foreigners, he is forced to confeſs, That 'tis all one what our Money is, greater or leſs, who regard only the Quantity of Silver they ſell their Goods for, how then can the leſſening our Money bring more Plenty of Bullion into *England*, or to the Mint?

But he ſays, *The Owners and Importers of Silver will find a good Market at the Mint*, &c. But always a better in *Lombard-Street*, and not a Grain of it will come to the Mint, as long as by an under-balance of Trade, or other foreign Expences, we contract Debts beyond Sea, which require the remitting of greater Sums thither than are imported in Bullion. *If for above forty Years after Silver was raiſed, in the forty third Year of Queen* Elizabeth, *from* 5 s. *to* 5 s. 2 d. *the Ounce, uncoin'd Silver was not worth above* 4 s. 10 d. *per Ounce*; the Cauſe was not that raiſing of Silver in the Mint, but an over-balance of Trade, which bringing in an Increaſe of Silver yearly, for which Men having no occaſion abroad, brought it to the Mint to be coin'd, rather than let it lie dead by them in Bullion; and whenever that is the Caſe again in *England*, it will *occaſion Coining* again, and not till then. *No Money was in thoſe Days exported*, ſays he; no, nor Bullion neither ſay I; why ſhould, or how could it, when our exported Merchandize paid for all the Commodities we brought home, with an over-plus of Silver and Gold, which ſtaying here, ſet the Mint on work. But the Paſſing this Bill, will not hinder the Exportation of one Ounce either of Bullion or Money, which muſt go if you contract Debts beyond Sea; and how its having been *once melted in England*, which is another Thing propos'd in this Bill, ſhall hinder its Exportation, is hard to conceive, when even Coining has not been able to do it, as is demonſtrable, if it be examined, what vaſt Sums of mill'd Money have been coin'd in the two laſt Reigns, and how little of it is now left. Beſides, if the Exportation of Bullion ſhould be brought under any greater Difficulty than of any other Commodity, it is to be conſidered whether the Management of that Trade which is in skilful Hands, will not thereupon be ſo ordered, as to divert it from coming to *England* for the future, and cauſe it to be ſent from *Spain*, directly to thoſe Places where they know *Engliſh* Debts will make it turn to beſt account, to anſwer Bills of Exchange ſent thither.

FUR-

FURTHER

CONSIDERATIONS

CONCERNING

Raiſing the Value

OF

MONEY.

WHEREIN

Mr. LOWNDES's Arguments for it, in his late Report concerning *An Eſſay for the Amendment of the Silver Coins*, are particularly Examined.

To the Right Honourable

Sir *JOHN SOMMERS*, Kt.

Lord Keeper of the Great Seal of *England*, and one of His Majeſty's moſt Honourable Privy Council.

My LORD,

THE Papers I here preſent your Lordſhip, are in Subſtance the ſame with one which I delivered to you, in Obedience to the Commands I received by your Lordſhip, from their Excellencies the Lords Juſtices; and with another, which I writ in Anſwer to ſome Queſtions your Lordſhip was pleaſed to propoſe to me concerning our Coin. The Approbation your Lordſhip was pleaſed to give them then, has been Encouragement to me to reviſe them now, and put them in an Order; fitter to comply with their Deſires, who will needs have me print ſomething at this time on this Subject: And could any thing of this Nature be received with Indifferency in this Age; the Allowance they have had from your Lordſhip, whoſe great and clear Judgment is, with general Conſent and Applauſe, acknowledged to be the juſt Meaſure of right and wrong amongſt us, might make me hope that they might paſs in the World without any great Diſlike.

However, ſince your Lordſhip thought they might be of Uſe to clear ſome Difficulties, and rectify ſome wrong Notions that are taken up about Money, I have ventured them into the World, deſiring no Mercy to any erroneous Poſitions or wrong Reaſonings, which ſhall be found in them. I ſhall never knowingly be of any, but Truth's and my Country's Side; the former I ſhall always gladly embrace and own, whoever ſhews it me. And in theſe Papers, I am ſure, I have no other Aim, but to do what little I can for the Service of my Country. Your Lordſhip's ſo evidently preferring that to all other Conſiderations, does, in the Eyes of all Men, ſit ſo well upon you, that my Ambition will not be blamed; if I in this propoſe to my ſelf ſo great an Example, and in my little Sphere am moved by the ſame Principle.

I have a long time foreſeen the Miſchief and Ruin coming upon us by clip'd Money, if it were not timely ſtop'd: And had concern enough for the Publick, to make me print ſome Thoughts touching our Coin ſome Years ſince. The Principle I there went on, I ſee no reaſon to alter: They have, if I miſtake not, their Foundation in Nature, and will ſtand: They have their Foundation in Nature, and are clear; and will be ſo, in all the Train of their Conſequences throout this whole (as it is thought) myſterious Buſineſs of Money, to all thoſe, who will but be at the Trouble of ſtripping this Subject of hard, obſcure, and and doubtful Words, wherewith Men are often miſled, and miſlead others. And now the Diſorder is come to Extremity, and can no longer be plaid with, I wiſh it may find a ſudden and effectual Cure; not a Remedy in Sound and Appearance, which may flatter us on to Ruin in the Continuation of a growing Miſchief, that calls for preſent Help.

I wiſh too, that the Remedy may be as eaſy as poſſible; and that the Cure of this Evil be not order'd ſo as to lay a great Part of the Burthen unequally on thoſe who have had no particular Hand in it. *Weſtminſter*-Hall is ſo great a Witneſs of your Lordſhip's unbiaſſed Juſtice, and ſteddy Care to preſerve to every one their Right; that the World will not wonder you ſhould not be for ſuch a leſſening our Coin, as will without any Reaſon, deprive great Numbers of blameleſs Men of a fifth Part of their Eſtates, beyond the Relief of *Chancery*. I hope this Age will ſcape ſo great a Blemiſh. I doubt not but there are many, who, for the Service of their Country, and for the Support of the Government, would gladly part with, not only one fifth, but a much larger Portion of their Eſtates. But when it ſhall be taken from them, only to be beſtow'd on Men in their, and the common Opinion, no better deſerving of their Country than themſelves, unleſs growing exceedingly rich by the publick Neceſſities, whilſt every body elſe finds his Fortune ſtrengthned by them, be a publick Merit, that deſerves a publick and ſignal Reward, this Loſs of one fifth of their Debts and Income will ſit heavy on them, who ſhall feel it without the Alleviation of any Profit or Credit, that will thereby accrue to the Nation, by ſuch a leſſening of our Coin.

If any one ask, how I, a retired private Man, come at this time to meddle with Money and Trade, for they are inſeparable; I reply, that your Lordſhip, and the other great Men that put me upon it, are anſwerable for it: Whether what I ſay be to the Purpoſe or no, that I my ſelf am anſwerable for. This I can anſwer to all the World, that I have not ſaid any thing here, without a full Perſuaſion of its Truth; nor with any other Motive or Purpoſe than the clearing of this artificially perplexed, rather than in itſelf myſterious Subject, as far as my poor Talent reaches. That which perhaps I ſhall not be ſo well able to anſwer, to your Lordſhip and my ſelf, is the Liberty I have taken in ſuch an Addreſs as this, to profeſs that I am,

My LORD,

Your Lordſhip's moſt humble, and moſt obedient Servant,

JOHN LOCKE.

The PREFACE.

THo' Mr. Lowndes *and I differ in the Way, yet I aſſure my ſelf our End is the ſame; and that we both propoſe to our ſelves the Service of our Country. He is a Man known ſo able in the Poſt he is in, to which the Buſineſs of Money peculiarly belongs; and has ſhewed himſelf ſo learned in the Records, and Matters of the Mint; and ſo exact in Calculations and Combinations of Numbers relating to our Coin, either already in Uſe, or deſigned by him, that I think I ſhould have troubled the Publick no more on this Subject, had not he himſelf engaged me in it; and brought it to that paſs, that either I muſt be thought to renounce my own Opinion, or muſt publickly oppoſe his.*

Whilſt his Treatiſe was yet a Manuſcript, and before it was laid before thoſe great Perſons, to whom it was afterwards ſubmitted, he did me the Favour to ſhew it to me; and made me the Complement, to ask me my Opinion of it. Tho' we had ſome ſhort Diſcourſe on the Subject, yet the Multiplicity of his Buſineſs whilſt I ſtaid in Town, and my Health, which ſoon after forced me out of it, allowed us not an Occaſion to debate any one Point throughly, and bring it to an Iſſue. Before I returned to Town his Book was in the Preſs, and finiſhed before I had an Opportunity to ſee Mr. Lowndes *again. And here he laid a new Obligation on me, not only in giving me one of them, but telling me, when I received it from his Hands, that it was the firſt he had parted with to any body. I then went it over a ſecond time, and having more Leiſure to conſider it, I found there were a great many Particulars in it drawn out of ancient Records, not commonly known, wherewith he had obliged the World. Theſe, which very pleaſingly entertained me, tho' they prevail'd not on me to be of his Opinion every where, yet join'd with the great Civilities he had ſhewn me, left me in a Diſpoſition ſo little inclin'd to oppoſe any thing in it, that I ſhould rather have choſen to acknowledge my ſelf in Print, to be his Convert, if his Arguments had convinced me, than to have troubled the World with the Reaſons why I diſſent from him.*

In this Diſpoſition my Pen reſted from medling any farther with this Subject whilſt I was in Town; ſoon after my own Health, and the Death of a Friend, forc'd me into the Country; and the Buſineſs occaſion'd thereby, and my own private Affairs, took up all my Time at my firſt coming thither; and had continued on to do ſo, had not ſeveral repeated Intimations and Inſtances from London, *not without ſome Reproaches of my Backwardneſs, made me ſee, that the World concern'd me particularly in Mr.* Lowndes's *Poſtſcript, and expected ſomething from me on that Occaſion.*

Tho' poſſibly I was not wholly out of his Mind when Mr. Lowndes *writ that Invitation, yet I ſhall not make my ſelf the Complement, to think I alone am concern'd in it. The great Importance of the Matter made him deſire every one to contribute what he could to the Clearing of it, and ſetting it in a true Light. And I muſt do him this Right, to think that he prefers the publick Good to his private Opinion; and therefore is willing his Propoſals and Arguments ſhould be with Freedom examin'd to the bottom, that if there be any Miſtake in them, no body may be miſled by his Reputation and Authority, to the Prejudice of his Country. Thus I underſtand his Poſtſcript, and thus I ſhall endeavour to comply with it. I ſhall, to the beſt of my Skill, examine his Arguments with all Reſpect to him, and Fidility to Truth, as far as I can diſcover it. The Frankneſs of his Proceeding in particular with me, aſſures me he is ſo great a Lover of Truth and Right, that he will not think himſelf injur'd when that is defended; and will be glad, when it is made plain, by whoſe Hand ſoever it be.*

This is what has made me publiſh theſe Papers, without any Derogation to Mr. Lowndes, *or ſo much as a Suſpicion that he will take it amiſs. I judge of him by himſelf. For I ſhall think my ſelf obliged to any one, who ſhall ſhew me or the Publick any material Miſtake in any thing I have here ſaid, whereon any part of the Queſtion turns.* FAR-

FARTHER

CONSIDERATIONS

CONCERNING

RAISING *the* VALUE

OF

MONEY.

SILVER is the **Inſtrument** and **Meaſure** of Commerce in all the civilized and trading Parts of the World.

It is the **Inſtrument** of Commerce by its intrinſick Value.

The **intrinſick Value** of Silver conſider'd as Money, is that Eſtimate which common Conſent has placed on it, whereby it is made equivalent to all other things, and conſequently is the univerſal Barter or Exchange which Men give and receive for other things they would purchaſe or part with for a valuable Conſideration: And thus, as the Wiſe Man tells us, *Money anſwers all things.*

Silver is the **Meaſure** of Commerce by its **Quantity**, which is the Meaſure alſo of its intrinſick Value. If one Grain of Silver has an intrinſick Value in it, two Grains of Silver have double that intrinſick Value, and three Grains treble, and ſo on proportionably. This we have daily Experience of, in common buying and ſelling. For if one Ounce of Silver will buy, *i. e.* is of equal Value to one Buſhel of Wheat, two Ounces of Silver will buy two Buſhels of the ſame Wheat, *i. e.* has double the Value.

Hence it is evident, that an equal *Quantity* of Silver is always of equal Value to an equal *Quantity* of Silver.

This common Senſe, as well as the Market, teaches us. For Silver being all of the ſame Nature and Goodneſs, having all the ſame Qualities, 'tis impoſſible but it ſhould in the ſame *Quantity* have the ſame Value. For if a leſs *Quantity* of any Commodity be allowed to be equal in Value to a greater *Quantity* of the ſame ſort of Commodity, it muſt be for ſome good Quality it has which the other wants. But Silver to Silver has no ſuch Difference.

Here it will be asked, Is not ſome Silver finer than other?

I anſwer, one Maſs of mixed Metal not diſcerned by the Eye to be any thing but Silver, and therefore called Silver, may have a leſs Mixture of baſer Metal in it than another, and ſo in common Speech is ſaid to be finer Silver. So Ducatoons having a leſs Mixture of Copper in them than our *Engliſh* Coin has, are ſaid to be finer Silver. But the Truth is, the Silver that is in each is equally fine, as will appear when the baſer Metal is ſeparate from it. And 'tis of this pure or fine Silver I muſt be underſtood when I mention Silver; not regarding the Copper or Lead which may chance to be mixed with it. For Example: Take an Ounce of fine Siver, and one fourth of an Ounce of Copper, and melt them together,

one may ſay of the whole Maſs, that it is not fine Silver, but it is true there is an Ounce of fine Silver in it; and tho' this Maſs weighing one Ounce and a quarter be not of equal Value to one Ounce and a quarter of fine Silver, yet the Ounce of fine Silver in it is, when ſeparate from the Copper, of equal Value to any other Ounce of Silver.

By this Meaſure of Commerce, *viz.* The *Quantity* of Silver, Men meaſure the Value of all other things. Thus to meaſure what the Value of Lead is to Wheat, and of either of them to a certain ſort of Linnen Cloth, the *Quantity* of Silver that each is valued at or ſells for, needs only be known. For if a Yard of Cloth be ſold for half an Ounce of Silver, a Buſhel of Wheat for one Ounce, and a hundred weight of Lead for two Ounces, any one preſently ſees and ſays that a Buſhel of Wheat is double the Value of a Yard of that Cloth, and but half the Value of an hundred weight of Lead.

Some are of Opinion that this Meaſure of Commerce, like all other Meaſures, is arbitrary, and may at Pleaſure be varied, by putting more or fewer Grains of Silver in Pieces of a known Denomination, *v. g.* by making a Penny or a Shilling lighter or heavier in Silver, in a Country where theſe are known Denominations of Pieces of Silver Money. But they will be of another Mind, when they conſider that Silver is a Meaſure of a Nature quite different from all other. The Yard or Quart Men meaſure by, may reſt indifferently in the Buyers or Sellers, or a third Perſon's Hands, it matters not whoſe it is. But it is not ſo in Silver. It is the thing bargain'd for, as well as the Meaſure of the Bargain; and in Commerce paſſes from the Buyer to the Seller, as being in ſuch a **quantity** equivalent to the thing ſold: And ſo it not only meaſures the Value of the Commodity it is apply'd to, but is given in Exchange for it, as of equal Value. But this it does, (as is viſible) only by its *Quantity*, and nothing elſe. For it muſt be remembred, that Silver is the *Inſtrument* as well as *Meaſure* of Commerce, and is given in Exchange for the things traded for: And every one deſiring to get as much as he can of it for any Commodity he ſells, 'tis by the **Quantity** of Silver he gets for it in Exchange, and by nothing elſe, that he meaſures the Value of the Commodity he ſells.

The **Coining** of Silver, or making **Money** of it, is the aſcertaining of its *Quantity* by a publick Mark, the better to fit it for Commerce.

In coin'd Silver or *Money* there are theſe three Things, which are wanting in other Silver. 1. Pieces of exactly the ſame Weight and Fineneſs. 2. A Stamp ſet on thoſe Pieces by the publick Authority of that Country. 3. A known Denomination given to theſe Pieces by the ſame Authority.

The **Stamp** is a Mark, and as it were a publick Voucher, that a Piece of ſuch Denomination is of ſuch a Weight, and ſuch a Fineneſs, *i. e.* has ſo much Silver in it.

That preciſe Weight and Fineneſs, by Law appropriated to the Pieces of each Denomination, is called the **Standard**.

Fine Silver is Silver without the Mixture of any baſer Metal.

Allay is baſer Metal mixed with it.

The **Fineneſs** of any Metal appearing to be Silver, and ſo called, is the Proportion of Silver is in it, compared with what there is in it of baſer Metals.

The Fineneſs of *Standard* Silver in *England* is eleven Parts Silver, and one Part Copper, near: Or to ſpeak more exactly, the Proportion of Silver to Copper is as 111 to 9. Whatever Piece or Maſs has in it of baſer Metal, above the Proportion of 9 to 111, is worſe or coarſer than Standard. Whatever Maſs of Metal has a leſs Proportion than 9 to 111, of baſer Metal in it, is better or finer than *Standard*.

Since *Silver* is the thing ſought, and would better ſerve for the Meaſure of Commerce if it were unmixt, it will poſſibly be asked why any Mixture of baſer Metal is allowed in Money, and what Uſe there is of ſuch *Allay*, which ſerves to make the *Quantity* of *Silver* leſs known in the ſeveral Coins of different Countries.

Perhaps it would have been better for Commerce in general, and more convenient for all their Subjects, if the Princes every where, or at leaſt in this Part of the World, would at firſt have agreed on the Fineneſs of the Standard to have been juſt one twelfth Allay, in round Numbers; without thoſe minuter Fractions which are to be found in the Allay of moſt of the Coin in the ſeveral diſtinct Dominions

minions of this Part of the World. Which broken Proportion of baſer Metal to Silver, in the Standard of the ſeveral Mints ſeems to have been introduced by the Skill of Men imploy'd in Coining, to keep that Art (as all Trades are call'd) a Myſtery; rather than for any Uſe or Neceſſity there was of ſuch broken Numbers. But be that as it will, the Standard in our Mint being now ſetled by Authority, and eſtabliſhed by Cuſtom, known at home and abroad, and the Rules and Methods of Eſſaying ſuited to it; and all the wrought Plate as well as Coin of *England* being made by that Meaſure; it is of greater Concernment that it ſhould remain unvariable.

But to the Queſtion; What need is there of any Mixture of baſer Metal with Silver in Money or Plate? I anſwer, There is great Reaſon for it. For,

1. Copper mixt with Silver makes it harder, and ſo wares and waſtes leſs in Uſe than if it were fine Silver. 2. It melts eaſier. 3. Silver as it is drawn and melted from the Mine, being ſeldom perfectly fine, it would be a great Charge by refining, to ſeparate all the baſer Metals from it, and reduce it to perfectly unmixt Silver.

The Uſe of coin'd Silver or Money is, that every Man in the Country where it is current by publick Authority, may, without the Trouble of refining, eſſaying or weighing, be aſſured what **Quantity** of Silver he gives, receives, or contracts for, under ſuch and ſuch Denominations.

If this Security goes not along with the publick Stamp, Coining is Labour to no purpoſe, and puts no Difference between coin'd Money and uncoin'd Bullion. This is ſo obvious, that I think no Government, where Money is coin'd, ever overlooks it. And therefore the Laws every where, when the **Quantity** of Silver has been leſſen'd in any Piece carrying the publick Stamp, by Clipping, Waſhing, Rounding, *&c.* have taken off the Authority of the publick Stamp, and declar'd it not to be lawful Money. This is known to be ſo in *England*, and every one may not only refuſe any Money bearing the publick Stamp, if it be clip'd, or any ways rob'd of the due Weight of its Silver; but he that offers it in Payment is liable to Indictment, Fine and Impriſonment. From whence we may ſee, that the Uſe and End of the publick Stamp is only to be a Guard and Voucher of the **Quantity** of Silver which Men contract for. And the Injury done to the publick Faith, in this Point, is that which in Clipping and falſe Coining heightens the Robbery into Treaſon.

Men in their Bargains contract not for Denominations or Sounds, but for the intrinſick Value; which is the **Quantity** of Silver by publick Authority warranted to be in Pieces of ſuch Denominations. And 'tis by having a greater **Quantity** of Silver, that Men thrive and grow richer, and not by having a greater Number of Denominations; which when they come to have need of their Money will prove but empty Sounds, if they do not carry with them the real **Quantity** of Silver is expected.

The Standard once ſetled by publick Authority, the **Quantity** of Silver eſtabliſh'd under the ſeveral Denominations, (I humbly conceive) ſhould not be altered, till there were an abſolute Neceſſity ſhewn of ſuch a Change, which I think can never be.

The Reaſon why it ſhould not be changed is this; Becauſe the publick Authority is Guarantee for the Performance of all legal Contracts. But Men are abſolved from the Performance of their legal Contracts, if the **Quantity** of Silver, under ſetled and legal Denominations be altered: As is evident, If borrowing 100 *l.* or 400 Ounces of Silver to repay the ſame Quantity of Silver (for that is underſtood by the ſame Sum, and ſo the Law warrants it) or taking a Leaſe of Land for Years to come, at the like Rent of 100 *l.* they ſhall pay both the one and the other in Money coin'd under the ſame Denominations with one fifth leſs Silver in it, than at the time of the Bargain. The Landlord here and Creditor are each defrauded of twenty *per Cent.* of what they contracted for, and is their Due. And I ask, How much juſter it would be thus to diſſolve the Contracts they had made; than to make a Law, that from henceforth all Landlords and Creditors ſhould be paid their paſt Debts, and the Rents for Leaſes already made, in clip'd Money, twenty *per Cent.* lighter than it ſhould be? Both ways they loſe twenty *per Cent.* of their Due, and with equal Juſtice.

The

The Caſe would be the ſame, and legal Contracts be avoided, if the Standard ſhould be alter'd on the other ſide, and each Species of our Coin be made one fifth heavier. For then he that had borrow'd or contracted for any Sum, could not be diſcharged by paying the Quantity he agreed for, but be liable to be forced to pay twenty *per Cent.* more than he bargained for, that is, more than he ought.

On the other ſide; Whether the Creditor be forced to receive leſs, or the Debtor be forced to pay more than his Contract, the Damage and Injury is the ſame, whenever a Man is defrauded of his Due. And whether this will not be a publick Failure of Juſtice, thus arbitrarily to give one Man's Right and Poſſeſſion to another, without any Fault on the ſuffering Man's ſide, and without any the leaſt Advantage to the Publick, I ſhall leave to be conſidered.

Raiſing of Coin is but a ſpecious Word to deceive the Unwary. It only gives the uſual Denomination of a greater Quantity of Silver to a leſs, (*v. g.* calling Four Grains of Silver a Penny to Day, when five Grains of Silver made a Penny yeſterday) but adds no worth or real Value to the Silver Coin, to make amends for its want of Silver. That is impoſſible to be done. For it is only the **Quantity** of the Silver in it that is, and eternally will be, the Meaſure of its Value. And to convince any one of this I ask, whether he that is forced to receive but 320 Ounces of Silver under the Denomination of 100*l* (for 400 Ounces of Silver which he lent under the like Denomination of 100*l.*) will think theſe 320 Ounces of Silver, however denominated, worth thoſe 400 Ounces he lent? If any one can be ſuppoſed ſo filly, he need but go to the next Market or Shop to be convinced, that Men value not Money by the Denomination, but by the **Quantity** of Silver there is in it. One may as rationally hope to lengthen a Foot by dividing it into fifteen Parts, inſtead of twelve, and calling them Inches; as to increaſe the Value of the *Silver* that is in a *Shilling*, by dividing it into fifteen Parts inſtead of twelve, and calling them Pence. This is all that is done when a *Shilling* is *raiſed* from twelve to fifteen Pence.

Clipping of *Money* is raiſing it without publick Authority; the ſame Denomination remaining to the Piece, that hath now leſs *Silver* in it, that it had before.

Altering the *Standard*, by coining Pieces under the ſame Denomination with leſs *Silver* in them than they formerly had, is doing the ſame thing by publick Authority. The only Odds is, that by clipping the Loſs is not forced on any one, (for no body is obliged to receive clip'd Money;) by altering the *Standard* it is.

Altering the *Standard*, by *raiſing* the Money, will not get to the Publick or bring to the Mint to be coin'd one Ounce of *Silver:* But will defraud the King, the Church, the Univerſities and Hoſpitals, *&c.* of ſo much of their ſetled Revenue, as the Money is *raiſed*, *v. g.* Twenty *per Cent.* if the Money (as is propos'd) be raiſed one fifth. It will weaken, if not totally deſtroy the publick Faith, when all that have truſted the Publick, and aſſiſted our preſent Neceſſities, upon Acts of Parliament, in the *Million Lottery*, *Bank Act*, and other *Loans*, ſhall be defrauded of twenty *per Cent.* of what thoſe Acts of Parliament were Security for. And to conclude, this raiſing our Money will defraud all private Men of twenty *per Cent.* in all their Debts and ſetled Revenues.

Clipping by *Engliſhmen* is robbing the honeſt Man who receives clip'd Money, and transferring the Silver, *i. e.* the Value is pared off from it into the Clipper's Pocket. *Clipping* by Foreigners is robbing *England* it ſelf. And thus the *Spaniards* lately rob'd *Portugal* of a great Part of its Treaſure or Commodities (which is the ſame thing) by importing upon them clip'd Money of the *Portugal* Stamp.

Clipping, and clip'd Money, have beſides this Robbery of the Publick other great Inconveniencies: As the diſordering our Trade, raiſing foreign Exchange, and a general Diſturbance which every one feels thereby in his private Affairs.

Clipping is ſo gainful, and ſo ſecret a Robbery, that Penalties cannot reſtrain it as we ſee by Experience.

Nothing, I humbly conceive, can put a ſtop to *Clipping*, now it is grown ſo univerſal, and Men become ſo skilful in it, but making it unprofitable.

Nothing can make *Clipping* unprofitable, but making all light Money go only for its Weight. This ſtops *Clipping* in a moment, brings out all the mill'd and weighty Money, deprives us not of any Part of our clip'd Money for the Uſe of Trade, and brings it orderly, and by Degrees, and without Force, into the Mint to be recoin'd

If

If *clip'd* Money be call'd in all at once, and ſtop'd from paſſing by Weight, I fear it will ſtop Trade, put our Affairs all at a ſtand, and introduce Confuſion. Whereas, if it be permitted to paſs by its Weight, till it can by degrees be coin'd, (the Stamp ſecuring its Fineneſs as well then as now, and the Scales determining its Weight) it will ſerve for paying of great Sums as commodiouſly almoſt as weighty Money, and the weighty Money being then brought out will ſerve for the Market-Trade, and leſs Payments, and alſo to weigh the clip'd Money by.

On the other ſide; If *clip'd* Money be allowed to paſs current by Tale, till it be all recoin'd, one of theſe two Effects will apparently follow: Either that we ſhall want Money for Trade, as the *clip'd* Money decreaſes by being coin'd into weighty; (for very few, if any body, who get weighty Money into their Hands, will part with it, whilſt *clip'd* Money, not of half the Value is current) Or if they do, the Coiners and Clippers will pick it up, and new coin and clip it; whereby *clip'd* Money will be increaſed. So that, by this way, either Money will be wanting to Trade, or *clip'd* Money continued. If *clip'd* Money be ſtop'd all at once, there is immediately a Stop of Trade. If it be permitted to paſs in Tale, as if it were lawful weighty Money whilſt it is recoining, and till all be recoin'd, that way alſo there will be an end of Trade, or no end of *clip'd* Money. But if it be made to paſs for its Weight till it be all recoin'd, both theſe Evils are avoided, and the weighty Money which we want will be brought out to boot.

Money is neceſſary to the carrying on of Trade. For where Money fails, Men cannot buy, and Trade ſtops.

Credit will ſupply the Defect of it to ſome ſmall Degree for a little while. But *Credit* being nothing but the Expectation of Money within ſome limited Time, Money muſt be had or *Credit* will fail.

Money alſo is neceſſary to us, in a certain Proportion to the Plenty of it amongſt our Neighbours. For if any of our Neighbours have it in a much greater abundance than we, we are many ways obnoxious to them. 1. They can maintain a greater Force. 2. They can tempt away our People, by greater Wages, to ſerve them by Land or Sea, or in any Labour. 3. They can command the Markets, and thereby break our Trade, and make us poor. 4. They can on any Occaſion ingroſs Naval and Warlike Stores, and thereby endanger us.

In Countries where Domeſtick Mines do not ſupply it, nothing can bring in **Silver** but Tribute or Trade. Tribute is the Effect of Conqueſt: Trade, of Skill and Induſtry.

By *Commerce* Silver is brought in only by an over-balance of Trade.

An **Over balance of Trade**, is when the Quantity of Commodities which we ſend to any Country do more than pay for thoſe we bring from thence: For then the Over-plus is brought home in Bullion.

Bullion is Silver whoſe Workmanſhip has no Value. And thus foreign Coin hath no Value here for its Stamp, and our Coin is *Bullion* in foreign Dominions.

'Tis uſeleſs and labour in vain, to *coin* Silver imported into any Country where it is not to ſtay.

Silver imported cannot ſtay in any Country in which, by an Over-balance of their whole Trade, it is not made theirs, and doth not become a real Increaſe of their Wealth.

If by a general *Balance* of its *Trade*, *England* yearly ſends out Commodities to the Value of four hundred thouſand Ounces of Silver more than the Commodities we bring home from abroad coſt us; there is one hundred thouſand Pound every Year clear Gain: Which will come home in Money, be a real Increaſe of our Wealth, and will ſtay here.

On the other ſide, if upon a general *Balance* of our whole *Trade*, we yearly import Commodities from other Parts to the Value of an hundred thouſand Pound more than our Commodities exported pay for, we every Year grow an hundred thouſand Pound poorer. And if, beſides that, we ſhould alſo import a Million in Bullion from *Spain* every Year, yet it is not ours; it is no Increaſe to our Wealth, nor can it ſtay here; but muſt be exported again every Grain of it with an hundred thouſand Pound of our own Money to boot.

I have heard it propos'd as a Way to keep our Money here, that we ſhould pay our Debts contracted beyond Seas, by Bills of *Exchange*.

The Idleneſs of ſuch a Propoſition will appear, when the Nature of Exchange is a little conſider'd.

Foreign **Exchange** is the Paying of Money in one Country, to receive it in another.

The **Exchange** is **High**, when a Man pays for Bills of Exchange above the *Par*. It is **Low**, when he pays leſs than the *Par*.

The **Par** is a certain Number of Pieces of the Coin of one Country, containing in them an equal Quantity of Silver to that in another Number of Pieces of the Coin of another Country: *v. g.* ſuppoſing 36 *Skillings* of *Holland* to have juſt as much Silver in them as twenty *Engliſh* Shillings. Bills of Exchange drawn from *England* to *Holland* at the rate of 36 *Skillings Dutch* for each Pound *Sterling*, is according to the *Par*. He that pays the Money here, and receives its there, neither gets nor loſes by the Exchange; but receives juſt the ſame **Quantity** of Silver in the one Place, that he parts with in the other. But if he pays one Pound *Sterling* to receive but 30 *Skillings* in *Holland*, he pays one ſixth more than the *Par*, and ſo pays one ſixth more Silver for the Exchange, let the Sum be what it will.

The Reaſon of *High Exchange*, is the buying much Commodities in any foreign Country, beyond the Value of what that Country takes of ours. This makes *Engliſhmen* have need of great Sums there, and this raiſes the *Exchange* or Price of Bills. For what grows more into Demand, increaſes preſently in Price.

Returning Money by *Exchange* into foreign Parts, keeps not one Farthing from going out: It only prevents the more troubleſome and hazardous Way of ſending Money in Specie forwards and backwards. *Bills of Exchange* more Commodiouſly, by Scrips of Paper, even the Accounts between particular Debtors and Creditors in different Countries, as far as the Commerce between thoſe two Places is equivalent: But where the Over-balance, on either ſide, Demands Payment, there *Bills of Exchange* can do nothing; but Bullion, or Money in Specie muſt be ſent. For in a Country where we owe Money, and have no Debts owing to us, *Bills* will not find Credit; but for a ſhort time, till Money can be ſent to reimburſe thoſe that paid them; unleſs we can think Men beyond Sea will part with their Money for nothing. If the Traders of *England* owe their Correſpondents of *Holland* a hundred thouſand Pound, their Accounts with all the reſt of the World ſtanding equal, and remaining ſo, one Farthing of this hundred thouſand Pound cannot be paid by *Bills of Exchange*. For Example, I owe a thouſand Pound of it; and to pay that, buy a Bill of *N.* here, drawn on *John de Wit* of *Amſterdam*, to pay *P. van Lore* my Correſpondent there. The Money is paid accordingly, and thereby I am out of *Van Lore's* Debt; but one Farthing of the Debt of *England* to *Holland* is not thereby paid; for *N.* of whom I bought the *Bill of Exchange*, is now as much indebted to *John de Wit*, as I was before to *P. van Lore*. Particular Debtors and Creditors are only changed by *Bills of Exchange*; but the Debt owing from one Country to the other, cannot be paid without real Effects ſent thither to that Value, either in Commodities, or Money. Where the Balance of Trade barely pays for Commodities with Commodities, there Money muſt be ſent, or elſe the Debts cannot be paid.

I have ſpoke of *Silver* Coin alone, becauſe that makes the Money of Account, and Meaſure of Trade, all through the World. For all Contracts are, I think, every where made, and Accounts kept in *Silver* Coin. I am ſure they are ſo in *England*, and the neighbouring Countries.

Silver therefore, and *Silver* alone, is the Meaſure of *Commerce*. Two Metals, as *Gold* and *Silver*, cannot be the Meaſure of Commerce both together, in any Country: Becauſe the Meaſure of Commerce muſt be perpetually the ſame, invariable, and keeping the ſame Proportion of Value in all its Parts. But ſo only one Metal does, or can do to it ſelf: So *Silver* is to *Silver*, and *Gold* to *Gold*. And an Ounce of *Silver* is always of equal Value to an Ounce of *Silver*, and an Ounce of *Gold* to an Ounce of *Gold*; and two Ounces of the one, or the other, of double the Value to an Ounce of the ſame. But *Gold* and *Silver* change their Value one to another: For ſuppoſing them to be in Value as ſixteen to one now; perhaps the next Month they may be as fifteen and three quarters, or fifteen and ſeven eighths to one. And one may as well make a Meaſure, *v. g.* a Yard, whoſe Parts lengthen and ſhrink, as a Meaſure of Trade of Materials, that have not always a ſetled unvariable value to one another.

One

One Metal therefore alone can be the Money of Account and Contract, and the Meaſure of Commerce in any Country. The fitteſt for this Uſe, of all other, is *Silver*, for many Reaſons, which need not here be mention'd. It is enough that the World has agreed in it, and made it their *common Money*; and, as the *Indians* rightly call it, *Meaſure*. All other Metals, *Gold*, as well as Lead, are but Commodities.

Commodities are Moveables, valuable by Money, the common Meaſure.

Gold, tho' not the Money of the World, and the Meaſure of Commerce, nor fit to be ſo, yet may, and ought to be coined, to aſcertain its Weight and Fineneſs; and ſuch Coin may ſafely have a Price as well as a Stamp ſet upon it by publick Authority; ſo the Value ſet be under the Market-price. For then ſuch Pieces coin'd, will be a Commodity as paſſable as Silver Money, very little varying in their Price: As Guineas which were coin'd at the Value of 20 *s.* but paſſed uſually for between 21 or 22 Shillings, according to the current Rate; but not having ſo high a Value put upon them by the Law, no body could be forced to take them to their Loſs at 21 *s.* 6 *d.* if the Price of Gold ſhould happen at any Time to be cheaper.

From what has been ſaid, I think it appears:

1. That *Silver* is that which Mankind have agreed on to take, and give in Exchange for all other Commodities, as an Equivalent.

2. That 'tis by the **quantity** of Silver they give or take, or contract for, that they eſtimate the Value of other things, and ſatisfy for them; and thus by its **Quantity** Silver becomes the Meaſure of Commerce.

3. Hence it neceſſarily follows, that a greater **Quantity** of Silver has a greater Value; a leſs **Quantity** of Silver has a leſs Value; and an equal **Quantity** an equal Value.

4. That Money differs from uncoin'd Silver only in this, that the **Quantity** of Silver in each Piece of Money, is aſcertain'd by the Stamp it bears; which is ſet there to be a publick Voucher of its Weight and Fineneſs.

5. That Gold is *Treaſure* as well as Silver, becauſe it decays not in keeping, and never ſinks much in its Value.

6. That *Gold* is fit to be coin'd as well as Silver, to aſcertain its *quantity* to thoſe who have a mind to traffick in it; but not fit to be joyn'd with Silver, as a Meaſure of Commerce.

7. That *Jewels* too are Treaſure, becauſe they keep without Decay; and have conſtantly a great Value, in proportion to their Bulk: But cannot be uſed for Money, becauſe their Value is not meaſur'd by their Quantity; nor can they, as Gold and Silver, be divided, and keep their Value.

8. The other *Metals* are not *Treaſure*, becauſe they decay in keeping, and becauſe of their Plenty; which makes their Value little in a great Bulk; and ſo unfit for Money, Commerce, and Carriage.

9. That the only Way to bring *Treaſure* into *England*, is the well ordering our Trade.

10. That the only Way to bring *Silver and Gold* to the *Mint*, for the increaſe of our Stock of Money and Treaſure, which ſhall ſtay here, is an over-balance of our whole Trade. All other Ways to increaſe our Money and Riches, are but Projects that will fail us.

Theſe things premiſed, I ſhall now proceed to ſhew wherein I differ from Mr. *Lowndes*, and upon what Grounds I do ſo.

Mr. *Lowndes* propoſes, that our Money ſhould be raiſed (as it is called) one fifth: that is, That all our preſent Denominations of Money, as *Penny*, *Shilling*, *Half-Crown*, *Crown*, &c. ſhould each have, one fifth leſs Silver in it, or be anſwered with Coin of one fifth leſs Value. How he propoſes to have it done, I ſhall conſider hereafter. I ſhall at preſent only examine the Reaſons he gives for it.

His firſt Reaſon, *p.* 68. he gives us in theſe Words, *The Value of the Silver in the Coin ought to be raiſed to the foot of ſix Shillings three Pence in every Crown; becauſe the Price of Standard Silver in Bullion is riſen to ſix Shillings five Pence an Ounce.*

This Reaſon ſeems to me to labour under ſeveral great Miſtakes, as,

1. That Standard Silver can riſe in reſpect of it ſelf.

2. That Standard Bullion is now, or ever was worth, or ſold to the Traders in it for 6 *s.* 5 *d.* the Ounce of lawful Money of *England*. For if that Matter of Fact holds not to be ſo, that an Ounce of *Sterling* Bullion is worth 6 *s.* 5 *d.* of our

mill'd weighty Money, this Reaſon ceaſes: And our weighty Crown-pieces ought not to be raiſed to *6 s.* 3 *d.* becauſe our light clip'd Money will not purchaſe an Ounce of Standard Bullion, under the Rate of *6 s.* 5 *d.* of that light Money. And let me add here, nor for that Rate neither. If therefore the Author means here, that an Ounce of Standard Silver is riſen to *6 s.* 5 *d.* of our clip'd Money, I grant it him, and higher too. But then that has nothing to do with the raiſing our lawful Coin, which remains unclip'd; unleſs he will ſay too, that Standard Bullion is ſo riſen, as to be worth, and actually to ſell for *6 s.* 5 *d.* the Ounce of our weighty mill'd Money. This I not only deny, but farther add, that it is impoſſible to be ſo. For *6 s.* 5 *d.* of mill'd Money, weighs an Ounce and a Quarter near. Can it therefore be poſſible, that one Ounce of any Commodity, ſhould be worth an Ounce and a Quarter of the ſelf ſame Commodity, and of exactly the ſame Goodneſs? For ſo is *Standard Silver* to *Standard Silver*. Indeed one has a Mark upon it, which the other has not: But it is a Mark that makes it rather more, than leſs valuable: Or if the Mark, by hindring its Exportation, makes it leſs valuable for that Purpoſe, the Melting-pot can eaſily take it off.

The Complaint made of melting down our weighty Money, anſwers this Reaſon evidently. For can it be ſuppos'd, that a Goldſmith will give one Ounce and a Quarter of coin'd Silver, for one Ounce of Bullion; when by putting it into his Melting-pot, he can for leſs than a Penny Charge make it Bullion? (For 'tis always to be remembred, what I think is made clear, that the Value of Silver, conſidered as it is Money, and the Meaſure of Commerce, is nothing but its *Quantity*.) And thus a mill'd Shilling, which has double the Weight of Silver in it to a *current Shilling*, whereof half the Silver is clip'd away, has double the Value. And to ſhew that this is ſo, I will undertake, that any Merchant, who has Bullion to ſell, ſhall ſell it for a great deal leſs Number of Shillings in Tale, to any one, who will contract to pay him in mill'd Money, than if he be paid in the current clip'd Money.

Thoſe who ſay Bullion is **riſen**, I deſire to tell me; What they mean by *Riſen?* Any Commodity, I think, is properly ſaid to be **riſen**, when the ſame *Quantity* will exchange for a greater *Quantity* of another thing; but more particularly of that thing which is the Meaſure of Commerce in the Country. And thus Corn is ſaid to be *Riſen* amongſt the *Engliſh* in *Virginia*, when a Buſhel of it will ſell, or exchange for more Pounds of Tobacco; amongſt the *Indians*, when it will ſell for more Yards of *Wampompeak*, which is their Money and amongſt the *Engliſh* here, when it will exchange for a greater Quantity of Silver, than it would before. *Riſing* and *Falling* of Commodities is always between ſeveral Commodities of diſtinct Worths. But no body can ſay, that Tobacco (of the ſame Goodneſs) is riſen in reſpect of it ſelf. One Pound of the ſame Goodneſs will never exchange for a Pound and a Quarter of the ſame Goodneſs. And ſo it is in Silver: And an Ounce of Silver will always be of equal Value to an Ounce of Silver; nor can it ever riſe or fall in reſpect of it ſelf: An Ounce of *Standard Silver* can never be worth an Ounce and a Quarter of *Standard Silver*; nor one Ounce of uncoin'd Silver, exchange for an Ounce and a Quarter of coin'd Silver: The Stamp cannot ſo much debaſe its Value. Indeed the Stamp hindring its free Exportation, may make the Goldſmith (who profits by the Return of Money) give one hundred and twentieth, or one ſixtieth or perhaps ſometimes one thirtieth more (that is *5 s.* 2 *d.* $\frac{1}{2}$ *5 s.* 3 *d.* or *5 s.* 4 *d.* the Ounce of coin'd Silver for uncoin'd, when there is need of ſending Silver beyond Seas; as there always is when the Balance of Trade will not ſupply our Ways, and pay our Debts there. But much beyond this, the Goldſmith will never give for Bullion; ſince he can make it out of coin'd Money at a cheaper Rate.

'Tis ſaid *Bullion* is riſen to *6 s.* 5 *d.* the Ounce, *i. e.* that an Ounce of uncoin'd *Silver* will exchange for an Ounce and a Quarter of coin'd Silver. If any one can believe this, I will put this ſhort Caſe to him. He has of Bullion or *Standard* uncoin'd Silver, two round Plates, each of an exact Size and Weight of a *Crown* Piece: He has beſides, of the ſame Bullion, a round Plate of the Weight and *Size* of a *Shilling*, and another yet leſs, of the exact Weight and Size of a *Threepence*. The two great Plates being of equal Weight and Fineneſs, I ſuppoſe he will allow to be of equal Value, and that the two leſs, join'd to either of them

make

make it one fifth more worth than the other is by it ſelf, they having all three together one fifth more Silver in them. Let us ſuppoſe then, one of the greater, and the two leſs Plates to have received the next Moment, (by Miracle, or by the Mill, it matters not how) the Mark or Stamp of our *Crown*, our *Shilling*, and our *Threepence*: Can any body ſay, that now they have got the Stamp of our Mint upon them, they are ſo fallen in Value, or the other unſtamp'd Piece ſo *Riſen*, that that unſtamp'd Piece which a Moment before was worth only one of the other Pieces, is now worth them all three? Which is to ſay, that an Ounce of uncoin'd Silver is worth an Ounce and a Quarter of coin'd. This is what Men would perſuade us, when they ſay, that Bullion is raiſed to *6 s. 5 d.* [of lawful Money] the Ounce, which I ſay is utterly impoſſible. Let us conſider this a little farther in another Inſtance. The preſent mill'd *Crown-Piece*, ſay they, will not exchange for an Ounce of Bullion, without the Addition of a *Shilling* and a *Three-pence* of weighty Coin added to it. Coin but that *Crown-Piece* into *6 s. 3 d.* and then they ſay it will buy an Ounce of Bullion, or elſe they give up their Reaſon and Meaſure of raiſing the Money. Do that which is allow'd to be equivalent to coining of a preſent mill'd *Crown-Piece* into *6 s. 3 d. viz.* call it 75 Pence, and then alſo it muſt by this Rule of *Raiſing* buy an Ounce of Bullion. If this be ſo, the ſelf-ſame mill'd *Crown-Piece* will and will not exchange for an Ounce of Bullion. Call it 60 Pence, and it will not: The very next Moment call it 75 Pence, and it will. I am afraid no body can think Change of Denomination has ſuch Power.

Mr. *Lowndes* ſupports **this his** firſt Reaſon with theſe Words, *p. 68. This Reaſon which I humbly conceive will appear irrefragable, is grounded upon a Truth ſo apparent, that it may well be compared to an Axiom, even in Mathematical Reaſoning; to wit, that* **Whenſoever the intrinſick Value of Silver in the Coin hath been, or ſhall be, leſs than the Price of Silver in Bullion, the Coin hath and will be melted down.**

This I think, tho' it be allowed Mr. *Lowndes* for as *apparent a Truth*, and as certain a *Maxim* as he could wiſh, yet ſerves not at all to his purpoſe of leſſening the Coin. For when the Coin, is as it ſhould be, according to the Standard (let the Standard be what it will) weighty and unclip'd, it is impoſſible that the Value of coin'd Silver ſhould be leſs than the Value or Price of uncoin'd; becauſe, as I have ſhown, the Value and Quantity of *Silver* are the ſame: And where the *Quantities* are equal, the *Values* are equal; excepting only the *Odds* that may be between *Bullion* that may be freely exported, and coin'd Silver that may not; the Odds whereof ſcarce ever amounts to above *2 d. per Ounce*, and rarely to above a *Penny* or an *Half-penny*. And this Odds (whatever it be) will equally belong to his raiſed mill'd Money, which cannot be exported, as it will to our preſent mill'd Money, which cannot be exported, as I ſhall have Occaſion to ſhew more particularly hereafter. All this Diſorder, and a thouſand others, comes from light and unlawful Money being current. For then it is no wonder that Bullion ſhould be kept up to the Value of your clip'd Money; that is, that Bullion ſhould not be ſold by the Ounce for leſs than *6 s. 5 d.* when that *6 s. 5 d.* clip'd Money paid for it, does not weigh above an Ounce. This Inſtance therefore of the preſent Price of Bullion, proves nothing but that the **Quantity** of Silver in Money governs the Value of it, and not the Denomination; as appears when clip'd Money is brought to buy Bullion. This is a fair Trial: Silver is ſet againſt Silver, and by that is ſeen whether clip'd Money be of the ſame Value with weighty of the ſame Denomination, or whether it be not the Quantity of Silver in it that regulates its Value.

I cannot but wonder that Mr. *Lowndes*, a Man ſo well ſkill'd in the Law, eſpecially of the *Mint*, the *Exchequer*, and of our *Money*, ſhould all along in this Argument ſpeak of clip'd Money, as if it were the lawful Money of *England*; and ſhould propoſe by that (which is in Effect by the Clippers Sheers) to regulate a new ſort of Coin to be introduced into *England*. And if he will ſtand to that Meaſure, and leſſen the new Coin to the Rate of Bullion ſold in Exchange for preſent current clip'd Money, to prevent its being melted down; he muſt make it yet much lighter than he propoſes, ſo that raiſing it, or to give it its due Name, that leſſening of it one fifth will not ſerve the Turn: For I will be bold to ſay, that Bullion now in *England* is no where to be bought by Ounce the for

6 s. 5 d.

6 s. 5 d. of our preſent current clip'd Money. So that if his Rule be true, and nothing can ſave the weighty Coin from melting down, but reducing it to the Weight that clip'd Money is brought to, he muſt leſſen the Money in his new Coin much more than one fifth; for an Ounce of Standard Bullion will always be worth an Ounce of clip'd Money, whether that in Tale amount to *6 s 5 d. 6 s. 6 d.* 10 *s.* or any other Number of Shillings or Pence of the nick-named clip'd Money. For a Piece of Silver that was coin'd for a Shilling, but has half the Silver clip'd off, in the Law, and in the Propriety of Speech, is no more a Shilling than a Piece of Wood, which was once a ſealed Yard, is ſtill a Yard when one half of it is broke off.

Let us conſider this Maxim a little farther; which out of the Language of the Mint in plain *Engliſh*, I think, amounts to thus much, *viz.* That *when an Ounce of Standard Bullion coſts a greater Number of Pence in Tale, than an Ounce of that Bullion can be coin'd into by the Standard of the Mint, the Coin will be melted down.* I grant it, if Bullion ſhould riſe to 15 Pence the Ounce above 5 *s.* 2 *d.* as is now pretended; which is to ſay, that an Ounce of Bullion cannot be bought for leſs than an Ounce and a Quarter of the like Silver coin'd. But that, as I have ſhew'd, is impoſſible to be: And every one would be convinced of the contrary, if we had none now but lawful Money current. But 'tis no Wonder if the Price and Value of things be confounded and uncertain, when the Meaſure it ſelf is loſt. For we have now no lawful Silver Money current amongſt us; and therefore cannot talk nor judge right, by our preſent uncertain clip'd Money, of the Value and Price of things, in reference to our lawful regular Coin, adjuſted and kept to the unvarying Standard of the Mint. The Price of Silver in Bullion above the Value of Silver in Coin, when clipping has not defac'd our current Caſh (for then the Odds is very rarely above a Penny or two Pence the Ounce) is ſo far from being a Cauſe of melting down our Coin, that this Price is given above the Value of the Silver in our Coin, is given only to preſerve our Coin from being melted down: For no body buys Bullion at above 5 *s.* 2 *d.* the Ounce, (which is juſt the Value) for any other Reaſon, but to avoid the Crime and Hazard of melting down our Coin.

I think it will be agreed on all Hands, that no body will melt down our Money, but for Profit. Now Profit can be made by melting down our Money, but only in two Caſes.

Firſt, When the current Pieces of the ſame Denomination are unequal, and of different Weights ſome heavier, ſome lighter: For then the Traders in Money cull out the heavier, and melt them down with Profit. This is the ordinary Fault of coining by the Hammer, wherein it uſually ſufficed, That a Bar of Silver was cut into as many Half Crowns, or Shillings, as anſwer'd its whole Weight; without being very exact in making each particular Piece of its due Weight, whereby ſome Pieces came to be heavier, and ſome lighter, than by the Standard they ſhould. And then the heavier Pieces were cull'd out, and there was Profit to be made (as one eaſily perceives) in melting them down. But this Cauſe of melting down our Money is eaſily prevented, by the exacter way of Coining by the Mill, in which each ſingle Piece is brought to its juſt Weight. This Equality of Pieces of the ſame Denomination, is to be found in our Money, more than ever, ſince Clipping has been in Faſhion: And therefore 'tis no Wonder, that in this irregular State of our Money, one Complaint is, that the heavy Money is melted down. But this alſo, the making clip'd Money go at preſent for its Weight, (which is a ſudden reducing it to the Standard) and then, by Degrees, recoining it into mill'd Money (which is the ultimate and more compleat reducing it to the Standard) perfectly cures.

The other Caſe wherein our Money comes to be melted down, is a loſing Trade; or, which is the ſame thing in other Words, an over-great Conſumption of foreign Commodities. Whenever the over-balance of foreign Trade makes it difficult for our Merchants to get Bills of Exchange, the Exchange preſently riſes, and the Returns of Money raiſe them in Proportion to the Want of Money *Engliſhmen* have in any Parts beyond Seas. They who thus furniſh them with Bills, not being able to ſatisfie their Correſpondents on whom thoſe Bills are drawn, with the Product of our Commodities there, muſt ſend Silver from hence to reimburſe them, and repay the Money they have drawn out of their Hands.

Hands. Whilſt Bullion may be had for a ſmall Piece more than the Weight of our current Caſh, theſe Exchangers generally chuſe rather to buy Bullion, than run the Riſque of melting down our Coin, which is criminal by the Law. And thus the Matter for the moſt part went, whilſt mill'd and clipt Money paſſed promiſcuouſly in Payment: For ſo long a clipt Half-crown was as good here as a mill'd one, ſince one paſſed, and could be had as freely as the other. But as ſoon as there began to be a Diſtinction between clipt and unclipt Money, and weighty Money could no longer be had for the light, Bullion (as was natural) aroſe; and it would fall again to morrow to the Price it was at before, if there were none but weighty Money to pay for it. In ſhort, whenever the whole of our foreign Trade and Conſumption exceeds our Exportation of Commodities, our Money muſt go to pay our Debts ſo contracted, whether melted or not melted down. If the Law makes the Exportation of our Coin penal, it will be melted down; if it leaves the Exportation of our Coin free, as in *Holland*, it will be carried out in Specie. One way or other go it muſt, as we ſee in *Spain*; but whether melted down or not melted down it matters little: Our Coin and Treaſure will be both ways equally diminiſhed, and can be reſtor'd only by an Overbalance of our whole Exportation, to our whole Importation of conſumable Commodities. Laws made againſt Exportation of Money or Bullion will be all in vain. Reſtraint, or Liberty in that Matter, makes no Country rich or poor: As we ſee in *Holland*, which had plenty of Money under the free Liberty of its Exportation; and *Spain*, in great want of Money under the ſevereſt Penalties againſt carrying of it out. But the coining, or not coining our Money, on the ſame Foot it was before, or in bigger or leſs Peices, and under whatſoever Denominations you pleaſe, contributes nothing to, or againſt its melting down or Exportation, ſo our Money be all kept, each Species in its full Weight of Silver, according to the Standard: For if ſome be heavier, and ſome lighter, allow'd to be current, ſo under the ſame Denomination the heavier will be melted down, where the Temptation of Profit is conſiderable, which in well regulated Coin kept to the Standard, cannot be. But this melting down carries not away one Grain of our Treaſure out of *England*. The coming and going of that depends wholly upon the Balance of our Trade; and therefore it is a wrong Concluſion which we find, *p.* 71. *That continuing either old or new Coins on the preſent foot, will be nothing elſe but furniſhing a Species to melt down at an extravagant Profit, and will encourage a violent Exportation of our Silver for ſake of the Gain only, till we ſhall have little or none left.* For Example: Let us ſuppoſe all our light Money new coin'd, upon the Foot that this Gentlemen would have it, and all our old mill'd Crowns going for 75 Pence as he propoſes, and the reſt of the old mill'd Money proportionably; I deſire it to be ſhewed how this would hinder the Exportation of one Ounce of Silver, whilſt our Affairs are in the preſent Poſture. Again, on the other ſide, ſuppoſing all our Money were now mill'd Coin upon the preſent Foot, and our Balance of Trade changing, our Exportation of Commodities, were a Million more than our Importation, and like to continue ſo yearly; whereof one half was to *Holland*, and the other to *Flanders*, there being an equal Balance between *England* and all other Parts of the World we trade to; I ask, what poſſible Gain could any *Engliſhman* make, by melting down and carrying out our Money to *Holland* and *Flanders*, when a Million was to come thence hither, and *Engliſhmen* had more there already than they knew how to uſe there, and could not get home without paying dear there for Bills of Exchange? If that were the Caſe of our Trade, the Exchange would preſently fall here, and riſe there beyond the *Par* of their Money to ours, *i. e.* an *Engliſh* Merchant muſt give in *Holland* more Silver for the Bills he bought there, than he ſhould receive upon thoſe Bills here, if the two Sums were weigh'd one againſt the other; or run the Riſque of bringing it home in Specie. And what then could any *Engliſhman* get by exporting of our Money or Silver thither?

Theſe are the only two Caſes, wherein our Coin can be melted down with Profit; and I challenge any one living to ſhew me any other. The one of them is removed only by a regular juſt Coin kept equal to the Standard; be that what it will, it matters not, as to the Point of melting down of the Money. The other is to be moved only by the Balance of our Trade kept from running us behind-hand, and contracting Debts in foreign Countries by an Over-conſumption of their Commodities.

To

To thoſe who ſay that the Exportation of our Money, whether melted down, or not melted down, depends wholly upon our Conſumption of foreign Commodities, and not at all upon the Sizes of the ſeveral Species of our Money, which will be equally exported, or not exported, whether coin'd upon the old, or the propoſed new Foot: Mr. *Lowndes* replies,

1. That *the Neceſſity of foreign Expence* and Exportation *to anſwer the Balance of Trade, may be diminiſhed, but cannot in any Senſe be augmented by raiſing the Value of our Money.*

I beg his Pardon if I cannot aſſent to this. Becauſe the Neceſſity of our Exportation of Money depending wholly upon the Debts which we contract in foreign Parts, beyond what our Commodities exported can pay; the Coining our Money in bigger or leſs Pieces under the ſame or different Denominations, or on the preſent or propoſed Foot, in itſelf neither increaſing thoſe Debts, nor the Expences that make them, can neither augment nor diminiſh the Exportation of our Money.

2. He replies, *p.* 72. That Melters of the Coin *will have leſs Profit by fourteen Pence Half-penny in the Crown*, when the Money is coined upon the new Foot.

To this I take Liberty to ſay, that there will not be a Farthing more Profit in melting down the Money, if it were all new mill'd Money upon the preſent Foot, than if it were all new coin'd, as is propoſed one fifth lighter. For whence ſhould the Profit ariſe more in the one, than the other? But Mr. *Lowndes* goes upon this Suppoſition; That Standard Bullion is now worth Six Shillings and five Pence an Ounce, of mill'd Money, and would continue to ſell for Six Shillings five Pence the Ounce, if our Money were all weighty mill'd Money: Both which I take to be Miſtakes, and think I have proved them to be ſo.

3. He ſays, *'Tis hoped that the Exchange to* Holland *may be kept at a ſtand, or at leaſt from falling much lower.* I hope ſo too. But how that concerns this Argument, or the Coining of the Money upon a new Foot, I do not ſee.

4. He ſays, *p.* 73. *There is a great Difference with Regard to the Service and Diſſervice of the Publick, between carrying out Bullion or Coin, for neceſſary Uſes, or for prohibited Commodities.* The Gain to the Exporters, which is that which makes them melt it down and export it, is the ſame in both Caſes. And the Neceſſity of exporting it is the ſame. For 'tis to pay Debts, which there is an equal Neceſſity of paying, when once contracted, tho' for uſeleſs things. They are the Goldſmiths and Dealers in Silver that uſually export what Silver is ſent beyond Sea, to pay the Debts they have contracted by their Bills of Exchange. But thoſe Dealers in Exchange ſeldom know, or conſider, how they to whom they give their Bills, have or will employ the Money they receive upon thoſe Bills. Prohibited Commodities, 'tis true, ſhould be kept out, and uſeleſs ones impoveriſh us by being brought in. But that is the Fault of our Importation: And there the Miſchief ſhould be cured, by Laws, and our way of Living. For the Exportation of our Treaſure is not the Cauſe of their Importation, but the Conſequence. Vanity and Luxury ſpends them: That gives them Vent here: That Vent cauſes their Importation: And when our Merchants have brought them, if our Commodities will not be enough, our Money muſt go to pay for them. But what this Paragraph has in it againſt continuing our Coin upon the preſent Foot, or for making our Coin lighter, I confeſs here again, I do not ſee.

'Tis true what Mr. *Lowndes* obſerves here, the Importation of Gold, and the going of Guineas at 30*s.* has been a great Prejudice and Loſs to the Kingdom. But that has been wholly owing to our clip'd Money, and not at all to our Money being coin'd at five Shillings two Pence the Ounce; nor is the Coining our Money lighter, the Cure of it. The only Remedy for that Miſchief, as well as a great many others, is the putting an End to the paſſing of clip'd Money by Tale, as if it were lawful Coin.

5. His fifth Head, *p.* 74. is to anſwer thoſe, who hold, that by the leſſening our Money one fifth, all People who are to receive Money upon Contracts already made, will be defrauded of twenty *per Cent.* of their Due: And thus all Men will loſe one fifth of their ſetled Revenues, and all Men that have lent Money one fifth of their Principal and Uſe. To remove this Objection, Mr. *Lowndes* ſays, that Silver in *England* is grown ſcarce, and conſequently dearer, and ſo is of higher Price. Let us grant for the preſent, it is of higher Price (which how he makes out I ſhall examine by and by.) This, if it were ſo, ought not to annul

nul any Man's Bargain, nor make him receive leſs in Quantity than he lent. He was to receive again the ſame Sum, and the publick Authority was Guarantee that the ſame Sum ſhould have the ſame Quantity of Silver under the ſame Denomination. And the Reaſon is plain, why in Juſtice he ought to have the ſame Quantity of Silver again, notwithſtanding any pretended Riſe of its Value. For if Silver had grown more plentiful, and by Conſequence (by our Author's Rule) cheaper, his Debtor would not have been compelled by the publick Authority to have paid him, in Conſideration of its Cheapneſs, a greater Quantity of Silver than they contracted for. *Cacao-Nuts* were the Money of a Part of *America*, when we firſt came thither. Suppoſe then you had lent me laſt Year 300, or fifteen ſcore *Cacao-Nuts*, to be repaid this Year, Wou'd you be ſatisfied and think your ſelf paid your Due, if I ſhou'd tell you, *Cacao-Nuts* were ſcarce this Year, and that four ſcore were of as much Value this Year as an hundred the laſt; and that therefore you were well and fully paid if I reſtored to you only 240 for the 300 I borrow'd? Would you not think your ſelf defrauded of two thirds of your Right by a ſuch Payment? Nor would it make any amends for this to Juſtice, or Reparation to you, that the Publick had (after your Contract, which was made for *fifteen Score*) alter'd the Denomination of *Score*, and appli'd it to ſixteen inſtead of twenty. Examine it, and you will find this juſt the Caſe, and the Loſs proportionable in them both: That is, a real Loſs of twenty *per Cent.* As to Mr. *Lowndes*'s Proofs, that Silver is now one fifth more Value than it was, and therefore a Man has Right done him, if he receive one fifth leſs than his Contract, I fear none of them will reach Mr. *Lowndes*'s Point. He ſaith, *p.* 77. *By daily Experience nineteen penny Weight, and three Tenths of a penny Weight of Sterling Silver, which is juſt the Weight of a Crown-piece, will purchaſe more coin'd Money than five unclip'd Shillings.* I wiſh he had told us where this *daily Experience* he ſpeaks of is to be found: For I dare ſay no body hath ſeen a Sum of *unclip'd Shillings* paid for Bullion any where this twelve Months, to go no further back.

In the next Place, I wiſh he had told us how much *more* than five lawful mill'd Shillings, Bullion of the Weight of a Crown-piece will purchaſe. If he had ſaid it would purchaſe ſix Shillings and three Pence weighty Money, he had proved the Matter in Queſtion. And whoever has the Weight of a Crown in Silver paid him in Mr. *Lowndes*'s new Coin, inſtead of ſix Shillings and three Pence of our preſent Money, has no Injury done him, if it will certainly purchaſe him ſix Shillings and three Pence all unclip'd of our preſent Money. But every one at firſt ſight perceives this to be impoſſible, as I have already proved it. And I have in this the Concurrence of Mr. *Lowndes*'s new Scheme, to prove it to be ſo. For, *p.* 62. he propoſes that his *Silver Unite* having the Weight and Fineneſs of a preſent unclip'd Crown-piece, ſhould go for 75 Pence; and that the preſent Shilling ſhould go for 15 Pence; by which Eſtabliſhment there will be 75 Pence in his *Unite*, and 93 Pence three Farthings in ſix Shillings three Pence, weighty Money of the preſent Coin; which is an undeniable Confeſſion, that it is as impoſſible for his *Silver Unite*, (having no more Silver in it than a preſent unclip'd Crown) to be worth, and ſo to purchaſe ſix unclip'd Shillings and three Pence, of our preſent Money, as it is for 75 Pence to be worth 93 of the ſame Pence, or 75 to be equal to 93.

If he means by *more*, that his *Sterling Silver* of the Weight of a Crown-piece will purchaſe a Penny, or two Pence more than five unclip'd Shillings, which is the moſt, and which is but accidental too; What is this Riſe of its Value to 15 Pence? And what amends will one ſixtieth (a little more or leſs) Riſe in Value, make for one fifth diminiſhed in Weight, and loſt in Quantity? which is all one as to ſay, that a Penny, or thereabouts, ſhall make amends for fifteen Pence taken away.

Another way to recommend his new Coin, to thoſe who ſhall receive it inſtead of the preſent weightier Coin, he tells them, *p.* 77. it will pay as much Debt, and purchaſe as much Commodities as our preſent Money, which is one fifth heavier: What he ſays of Debts is true. But yet I would have it well conſidered by our *Engliſh* Gentlemen, that tho' Creditors will loſe one fifth of their Principal and Uſe, and Landlords will loſe one fifth of their Income, yet the Debtors and Tenants will not get it. It will be asked, Who then will get it? Thoſe, I ſay, and thoſe only, who have great Sums of weighty Money (whereof one ſees not a

Piece

piece now in Payments) hoarded up by them, will get by it. To thoſe by the propoſed change of our Money will be an increaſe of one fifth added to their Riches, paid out of the Pockets of the reſt of the Nation. For what theſe Men received for four Shillings, they will pay again for five. This weighty Money hoarded up, Mr. *Lowndes*, *p.* 105. computes at one Million and ſix hundred thouſand Pounds. So that by raiſing our Money one fifth, there will three hundred and twenty thouſand Pound be given to thoſe who have hoarded up our weighty Money; which hoarding up of Money is thought by many to have no other Merit in it than the prejudicing our Trade and publick Affairs, and increaſing our Neceſſities, by keeping ſo great a part of our Money from coming Abroad, at a time when there was ſo great need of it. If the Sum of unclip'd Money in the Nation, be as ſome ſuppoſe, much greater; then there will by this contrivance of the raiſing our Coin, be given to theſe rich Hoarders, much above the aforeſaid Sum of three hundred and twenty thouſand Pounds of our preſent Money. No body elſe, but theſe Hoarders, can get a Farthing by this propoſed change of our Coin; unleſs Men in Debt have Plate by them, which they will Coin to pay their Debts. Thoſe too, I muſt confeſs, will get one fifth by all the Plate of their Own, which they ſhall coin and pay Debts with, valuing their Plate at Bullion: But if they ſhall conſider the Faſhion of their Plate, what that coſt when they bought it, and the Faſhion that new Plate will coſt them, if they intend ever to have Plate again, they will find this one fifth ſeeming preſent Profit in coining their Plate to pay their Debts, amount to little or nothing at all. No body then but the Hoarders will get by this twenty *per Cent.* And I challenge any one to ſhew how any body elſe (but that little in the caſe of Plate coin'd to pay Debts) ſhall get a Farthing by it. It ſeems to promiſe faireſt to the Debtors; but to them too it will amount to nothing. For he that takes up Money to pay his Debts, will receive this new Money, and pay it again at the ſame rate he received it, juſt as he does now our preſent Coin, without any Profit at all. And though Commodities (as is natural) ſhall be raiſed in proportion to the leſſening of the Money, no body will get by that, any more than they do now, when all things are grown dearer. Only he that is bound up by Contract to receive any Sum under ſuch a Denomination of Pounds, Shillings and Pence, will find his Loſs ſenſibly when he goes to buy Commodities, and make new Bargains. The Markets and the Shops will ſoon convince him, that his Money, which is one fifth lighter, is alſo one fifth worſe; when he muſt pay twenty *per Cent.* more for all the Commodities he buys with the Money of the new Foot, than if he bought it with the preſent Coin.

This Mr. *Lowndes* himſelf will not deny, when he calls to mind what he himſelf, ſpeaking of the Inconveniences we ſuffer by our clip'd Money, ſays, *p.* 115. *Perſons before they conclude in any Bargains, are neceſſitated firſt to ſettle the Price or Value of the very Money they are to receive for their Goods; and if it be in clip'd or bad Money, they ſet the Price of their Goods accordingly: Which I think has been one great Cauſe of raiſing the Price, not only of Merchandize, but even of Edibles, and other Neceſſaries for the Suſtenance of the common People, to their great Grievance.* That every one who receives Money after the raiſing our Money, on Contracts made before the change, muſt loſe twenty *per Cent.* in all he ſhall buy, is Demonſtration, by Mr. *Lowndes*'s own Scheme. Mr. *Lowndes* propoſes that there ſhould be Shillings coin'd upon the new Foot one fifth lighter than our preſent Shillings, which ſhould go for twelve Pence a piece; and that the unclip'd Shillings of the preſent Coin ſhould go for fifteen Pence a piece, and the Crown for ſeventy-five Pence. A Man who has a Debt of an hundred Pounds owing him, upon Bond or Leaſe, receives it in theſe new Shillings, inſtead of lawful Money of the preſent Standard: He goes to Market with twenty Shillings in one Pocket of this new Money, which are valued at 240 Pence; and in the other Pocket with four mill'd Crown-pieces, (or twenty mill'd Shillings of the preſent Coin) which are valued at three hundred Pence, which is one fifth more: 'Tis Demonſtration then that he loſes one fifth, or twenty *per Cent.* in all that he buys, by the Receipt of this new Money, for the preſent Coin, which was his Due; unleſs thoſe he deals with will take four for five Pence, or four Shillings for five Shillings. He buys, for Example, a Quart of Oil for fifteen Pence: If he pay for it with the old Money in one Pocket, one Shilling will do it; if with the new Money in the other, he muſt add three Pence to it, or a quarter of another Shilling; and ſo of all the reſt that he pays for,

with

with either the old Money which he ſhould have received his Debts in, or with the New, which he was forced to recieve for it. Thus far it's Demonſtration he loſes twenty *per Cent.* by receiving his Debt in a new Money thus raiſed, when he uſes it to buy any thing. But to make him amends, Mr. *Lowndes* tells him, Silver is now dearer; and all things conſequently will be bought cheaper twenty *per Cent.* And yet at the ſame time he tells them in the Paſſage above cited out of *p.* 115. that all other things are grown dearer. I am ſure there is no Demonſtration that they will be ſold twenty *per Cent.* cheaper. And if I may credit Houſe-keepers and ſubſtantial Tradeſmen, all ſorts of Proviſions and Commodities are lately riſen exceſſively; and notwithſtanding the Scarcity of Silver, begin to come up to the true Value of our clip'd Money, every one ſelling their Commodities ſo as to make themſelves amends in the Number of light Pieces what they want in Weight. A Creditor ought to think the new light Money equivalent to the preſent heavier, becauſe it will buy as much Commodities. But what if it ſhould fail, as 'tis ten to one but it will, what Security has he for it? He is told ſo, and he muſt be ſatisfied. The Salt, Wine, Oil, Silk, Naval-Stores, and all foreign Commodities, will none of them be ſold us by Foreigners for a leſs Quantity of Silver than before, becauſe we have given the Name of more Pence to it, is I think Demonſtration. All our Names (if they are any more to us) are to them but bare Sounds; and our Coin, as theirs to us, but meer Bullion, valued only by its Weight. And a *Swede* will no more ſell you his Hemp and Pitch, or a *Spaniard* his Oil, for leſs Silver; becauſe you tell him Silver is ſcarcer now in *England*, and therefore riſen in Value one fifth, than a Tradeſman of *London* will ſell his Commodity cheaper to the *Iſle of Man*, becauſe they are grown poorer, and Money is ſcarce there.

All foreign Commodities muſt be ſhut out of the Number of thoſe that will fall, to comply with our raiſing our Money. Corn alſo, 'tis evident, does not riſe or fall by the Differences of more or leſs Plenty of Money, but by the Plenty and Scarcity that God gives. For our Money, in Appearance, remaining the ſame, the Price of Corn is double one Year to what it was the precedent; and therefore we muſt certainly make account that ſince the Money is one fifth lighter, it will buy one fifth leſs Corn *Communibus annis.* And this being the great Expence of the Poor, that takes up almoſt all their Earnings; if Corn be *Communibus annis* ſold for one fifth more Money in Tale, than before the Change of our Money, they too muſt have one fifth more in Tale of the new Money for their Wages, than they have now; and the Day-Labourer muſt have, not only twelve, but fifteen Pence of the new Money a Day, which is the preſent Shilling, that he has now, or elſe he cannot live. So that all foreign Commodities, with Corn and Labour keeping up their Value to the Quantity of Silver, they ſell for now, and not complying in the Fall of their real Price with the nominal Raiſing of our Money; there is not much left wherein Landlords and Creditors are to expect the Recompence of twenty *per Cent.* Abatement of Price in Commodities to make up their Loſs in the Lightneſs of our Money they are paid their Rents and Debts in. 'Twould be eaſie to ſhew the ſame thing concerning our other native Commodities, and make it clear, that we have no Reaſon to expect they ſhould abate of their preſent Price, any more than Corn and Labour. But this is enough, and any one, who has a mind to it, may trace the reſt at his Leiſure.

And thus I fear the Hopes of cheaper Penny-worths, which might beguile ſome Men into a Belief, that Landlords and Creditors would receive no leſs by the propoſed new Money, is quite vaniſhed. But if the Promiſe of better Penny-worths and a Fall of all Commodities twenty *per Cent.* ſhould hold true, this would not at all relieve Creditors and Landlords, and ſet them on equal Terms with their Neighbours: Becauſe the cheap Penny-worths will not be for them alone; but every body elſe, as well as they, will ſhare in that Advantage; ſo that their Silver being diminiſh'd one fifth in their Rents and Debts, which are paid them, they would ſtill be twenty *per Cent.* greater Loſers than their unhoarding Neighbours, and forty *per Cent.* greater Loſers than the Hoarders of Money; who will certainly get twenty *per Cent.* in the Money, whatever happens in the Price of Things; and twenty *per Cent.* more in the Cheapneſs of Commodities, if that promiſed Recompence be made good to Creditors and Landlords. For the Hoarders of Money (if the Price of things falls) will buy as cheap as they. So that whatever is ſaid of

the Cheapneſs of Commodities, 'tis Demonſtration, (whether that proves true or no) that Creditors, and Landlords, and all thoſe who are to receive Money upon Bargains made before the propoſed Change of our Coin, will unavoidably loſe twenty *per Cent.*

One thing Mr *Lowndes* ſays in this Paragraph very remarkable, which I think decides the Queſtion. His Words, *p.* 78. are theſe, *That if the Value of the Silver in the Coins (by an extrinſick Denomination) be raiſed above the Value or Market Price of the ſame Silver* **reduced to Bullion**, *the Subject would be proportionably injured and defrauded as they were formerly in the Caſe of baſe Moneys coin'd by publick Authority.* It remains therefore only to ſhew, that the Market Price of Standard Bullion is not one fifth above our Coin that is to be raiſed, and then we have Mr. *Lowndes* of our ſide too againſt its Raiſing. I think it is abundantly proved already, that Standard Bullion neither is, nor can be worth one fifth more than our Lawful weighty Money: And if it be not, by Mr. *Lowndes*'s Confeſſion, there is no need of raiſing our preſent legal mill'd Money to that Degree; and 'tis only our clip'd Money that wants Amendment: And when that is recoin'd and reduced all to mill'd and lawful Money, that then too will have no need of raiſing. This I ſhall now prove out of Mr. *Lowndes*'s own Words here.

Mr. *Lowndes* in the forecited Words compares *the Value of Silver in our Coin*, to the *Value of the ſame Silver* **reduced to Bullion**; which he ſuppoſing to be as four to five, makes that the Meaſure of the Raiſing our Money. If this be the Difference of Value between Silver in Bullion, and Silver in Coin; and it be true, that four Ounces of Standard Bullion be worth five Ounces of the ſame Silver coin'd? Or, which is the ſame Thing, that Bullion will ſell by the Ounce for ſix Shillings and five Pence unclip'd Money; I will take the Boldneſs to adviſe His Majeſty to buy, or to borrow any where ſo much Bullion, or rather than be without it, melt down ſo much Plate, as is equal in Weight to twelve hundred Pounds *Sterling* of our preſent mill'd Money. This let him ſell for mill'd Money. And according to our Author's Rule, it will yield fifteen hundred Pounds. Let that fifteen Hundred Pounds be reduc'd into Bullion, and ſold again, and it will produce eighteen Hundred and ſixty Pounds: Which eighteen hundred and ſixty Pounds of weighty Money being reduc'd to Bullion, will ſtill produce one fifth more in Weight of Silver, being ſold for weighty Money. And thus His Majeſty may get at leaſt three hundred and twenty thouſand Pounds by ſelling of Bullion for weighty Money, and melting that down into Bullion, as faſt as he receives it; till he has brought into his Hands the Million and ſix hundred thouſand Pounds, which Mr. *Lowndes* computes there is of weighty Money left in *England.*

I doubt not but every one who reads it, will think this a very ridiculous Propoſition. But he muſt think it ridiculous for no other Reaſon, but becauſe he ſees 'tis impoſſible, that Bullion ſhould ſell for one fifth above its Weight of the ſame Silver coin'd, that is, that an Ounce of Standard Silver ſhould ſell for ſix Shillings five Pence of our preſent weighty Money. For if it will, 'tis no ridiculous thing that the King ſhould melt down, and make that Profit of his Money.

If our Author's Rule, (*p.* 78. where he ſays, *That the only juſt and reaſonable Foot upon which the Coins ſhould be current, is the very Price of the Silver thereof, in caſe it be molten in the ſame Place where Coins are made current*) be to be obſerved; our Money is to be raiſed but an Half-penny, or at moſt a Penny in five Shillings: for that was the ordinary Odds in the Price between Bullion and coin'd Silver, before Clipping had deprived us, in Commerce, of all our mill'd and weighty Money. And Silver in Standard Bullion would not be in Value one Jot above the ſame *Silver* in Coin, if clip'd Money were not current by Tale, and coin'd *Silver* (as Mr. *Lowndes* propoſes, *p.* 73.) as well as Bullion, had the Liberty of Exportation. For when we have no clip'd Money, but all our current Coin is Weight, according to the Standard, all the Odds of Value that Silver in Bullion has to Silver in Coin, is only owing to the Prohibition of its Exportation in Money; and never riſes, nor can riſe, above what the Goldſmith ſhall eſtimate the Riſque and Trouble of melting it down; which is ſo little, that the Importers of *Silver* could never raiſe it to above a Penny an Ounce, but at ſuch times as the *Eaſt-India* Company, or ſome foreign Sale, calling for a great Quantity of Silver at a time, made the Goldſmiths ſcramble for it; and ſo the Importers of Bullion raiſe its Price upon them, according to the preſent need of great Quantities of *Silver*, which

which every Goldſmith (eager to ingroſs to himſelf as much as he could) was content to pay high for, rather than go without: His preſent Gains from thoſe whom he furniſh'd, and whom otherwiſe he could not furniſh, making him amends.

The natural Value then between Silver in Bullion, and in Coin, is (I ſay) every where equal; bating the Charge of Coinage, which gives the Advantage to the ſide of the Coin. The ordinary Odds here in *England*, between Silver in Bullion, and the ſame in our Coin, is by Reaſon that the Stamp hinders its free Exportation about a Penny in the Crown. The accidental Difference, by reaſon of ſudden Occaſions, is ſometimes (but rarely) two Pence in five Shillings, or ſomewhat more in great Urgencies. And ſince the ordinary Rate of things is to be taken as the Meaſure of their Price, and Mr. *Lowndes* tells us, *p.* 78. That *if the Value of the Silver in the Coins ſhould be raiſed above the Value, or Market Price, of the ſame Silver reduced to Bullion, the Subject would be proportionably injured and defrauded*; I leave him to make the Inference, what will be the Conſequence in *England*, if our Coin be raiſed here one fifth, or twenty *per Cent.*

Mr. *Lowndes* ſays farther, *p.* 80. That *Silver has a Price.* I anſwer; Silver to Silver can have no other Price, but Quantity for Quantity. If there be any other Difference in Value, it is or can be nothing but one of theſe two: Firſt, Either the Value of the Labour imploy'd about one Parcel of Silver more than another, makes a Difference in their Price; and thus faſhion'd Plate ſells for more than its Weight of the ſame Silver; and in Countries where the Owners pay for the Coinage, Silver in Coin is more worth than its Weight in Bullion; but here, where the Publick pays the Coinage, they are of very near equal Value, when there is no need of Exportation: For then there is no more Odds than the Trouble of carrying the Bullion to the Mint, and fetching again, is worth; or the Charge of Refining ſo much of it, as will bring it to Standard, if it be worſe than Standard.

Or Secondly, Some Privilege belonging to one Parcel of Silver which is denied to another, *viz.* Here in *England* a Liberty of Exportation allowed to Silver in Bullion, denied to Silver ſtamp'd. This, when there is need of Exportation of Silver, gives ſome ſmall Advantage of Value to uncoin'd Silver here, above coin'd; but that is ordinarily very inconſiderable; and can never reach to one fifth, nor half one fifth, as has been already ſhewn. And this I think will anſwer all that is ſaid about the Price of Silver in that Place.

'Tis true what Mr. *Lowndes* ſays in the next Words, *p.* 81. *That five Shillings coin'd upon the Foot propoſed, will actually contain more real and intrinſick Value of Silver by a great Deal, than is in the current Money now commonly applied to the Payment of the ſaid Rents, Revenues and Debts.* But will he hence conclude, becauſe there is now loſt in thoſe Rents, Revenues and Debts, *a great deal* more than twenty *per Cent.* under the preſent Irregularity of our Coin, and the Robbery in clip'd Money, without any the leaſt Neglect or Miſcarriage in the Owner that intitled him to that Loſs, that therefore it is juſt that the Loſs of twenty *per Cent.* be eſtabliſh'd on him by Law for the future, in the reforming of our Coin?

Mr. *Lowndes*'s ſecond Reaſon for leſſening of our Coin we have, *p.* 82. in theſe Words, *The Value of the Silver in the Coin ought to be raiſed, to encourage the bringing of Bullion to the Mint to be coin'd.* This Raiſing of Money is in Effect, as has been ſeen, nothing but giving a Denomination of more Pence to the ſame Quantity of Silver, *viz.* That the ſame Quantity of Silver ſhall hereafter be called ſeventy-five Pence, which is now called ſixty Pence. For that is all is done: As is manifeſt, when a Crown-piece which now goes but for ſixty Pence, ſhall be made to go for ſeventy five Pence; for 'tis plain, it contains nothing of Silver or Worth in it, more than it did before. Let us ſuppoſe, that all our Silver Coin now in *England* were Sixpences, Shillings, Half-crowns and Crowns, all mill'd Money full Weight according to the preſent Standard; and that it ſhould be ordered, that for the future, the Crown-piece inſtead of going for ſixty Pence, ſhould go for ſeventy five Pence, and ſo proportionably of all the other Pieces, I ask then, how ſuch a Change of Denomination ſhall bring Bullion to the Mint to be coin'd, and from whence? I ſuppoſe this Change of Names, or aſcribing to it more imaginary Parts of any Denomination, has no Charms in it to bring Bullion to the Mint to be coin'd: For whether you call the Piece coin'd twelve Pence, or fifteen Pence, or ſixty or ſeventy five, a *Crown* or a *Scepter*, it will buy no more Silk, Salt or Bread than it would before. That therefore can-

it would before. That therefore cannot tempt People to bring it to the Mint. And if it will pay more Debt, that is perfect defrauding, and ought not to be permitted. Next, I ask, from whence ſhall this Raiſing fetch it? For Bullion cannot be brought hither to ſtay here, whilſt the Balance of our Trade requires all the Bullion we bring in, to be exported again, and more Silver out of our former Stock with it, to anſwer our Exigencies beyond Seas. And whilſt it is ſo, the Goldſmiths and Returners of Money will give more for Bullion to export, than the Mint can give for it to coin; and ſo none of that will come to the Mint.

But ſays our Author, *p.* 83. *An Half-penny an Ounce Profit, which will be in the propoſed Coin, above the preſent Price of Sterling Bullion, will be an Encouragement to thoſe who have Engliſh Plate, to bring it in to be coin'd.* I doubt whether there will be any ſuch Profit; for I imagine that Standard Bullion cannot now be bought *per* Ounce for ſix Shillings and five Pence of our clip'd running Caſh, which is the Meaſure whereby Mr. *Lowndes* determines of the Price of Sterling Silver. But taking this Half-penny an Ounce Profit for granted, it will not bring to the Mint any Plate, whoſe Faſhion is valued by the Owner at above an Half-penny *per* Ounce; and how much then it is like to bring to the Mint, is eaſie to gueſs.

The true and only good Reaſon that brings Bullion to the Mint to be coin'd, is the ſame that brings it to *England* to ſtay there, *viz.* The Gain we make by an Over-balance of Trade. When our Merchants carry Commodities abroad, to a greater Value than thoſe they bring home, the Over-plus comes to them in foreign Coin or Bullion, which will ſtay here, when we gain by the Balance of our whole Trade. For then we can have no Debts beyond Sea to be paid with it: In this thriving Poſture of our Trade, thoſe to whoſe Share this Bullion falls, not having any Uſe of it whilſt it is in Bullion, chooſe to carry it to the Mint to have it coin'd there, whereby it is of more Uſe to them for all the Buſineſs of Silver in Trade, or purchaſing Land; the Mint having aſcertained the Weight and Fineneſs of it: So that on any Occaſion, every one is ready to take it at its known Value, without any Scruple; a Convenience that is wanting in Bullion. But when our Trade runs on the other ſide, and our exported Commodities will not pay for thoſe foreign ones we conſume, our Treaſure muſt go; and then it is in vain to beſtow the Labour of Coining on Bullion that muſt be exported again. To what purpoſe is it to make it paſs through our Mint, when it will away? The leſs Pains and Charge it coſts us, the better.

His third Reaſon *p.* 83. is, that this Raiſing our Coin by making it **more in Tale** *will make it more commenſurate to the general Need thereof*, and thereby hinder the Increaſe of *hazardous Paper-credit*, and the Inconveniency of *Bartering*.

Juſt as the Boy cut his Leather into five Quarters (as he called them) to cover his Ball, when cut into four Quarters it fell ſhort: But after all his Pains, as much of his Ball lay bare as before, If the Quantity of coin'd Silver employ'd in *England* falls ſhort, the arbitrary Denomination of a greater Number of Pence given to it, or which is all one, to the ſeveral coin'd Pieces of it, will not make it commenſurate to the Size of our Trade, or the Greatneſs of our Occaſions. This is as certain, as that if the Quantity of a Board which is to ſtop a Leak of a Ship fifteen Inches ſquare, be but twelve Inches ſquare, it will not be made to do it, by being meaſured by a Foot that is divided into fifteen Inches inſtead of twelve, and ſo having a larger Tale or Number of Inches in Denomination given to it.

This indeed would be a convincing Reaſon, if Sounds would give Weight to Silver, and the Noiſe of a greater Number of Pence (leſs in Quantity proportionably as they are more in Number) were a *large Supply of Money*, which our Author, *p.* 84. ſays our Occaſions require, and which he by *an Increaſe of the Tale* of Pence hopes to provide. But that Miſtake is very viſible, and ſhall be farther ſhewn in the Buſineſs of Bartering.

The Neceſſity of Truſt and Bartering is one of the many Inconveniencies ſpringing from the Want of Money. This Inconvenience, the multiplying arbitrary Denominations, will no more ſupply, nor any ways make our Scarcity of Coin commenſurate to the need there is of it, than if the Cloth which was provided for cloathing the Army, falling ſhort, one ſhould hope to make it commenſurate to that need there is of it, by meaſuring it by a Yard one fifth ſhorter than the Standard, or changing the Standard of the Yard, and ſo getting the full Denomination of Yards, neceſſary according to the preſent Meaſure. For this is

all

all will be done by raiſing our Coin, as is propoſed. All it amonts to, is no more but this, *viz.* That each Piece, and conſequently our whole Stock of Money ſhould be meaſured and denominated by a Penny, one fifth leſs than the Standard.

Where there is not coin'd Silver in Proportion to the Value of the Commodities that daily change Owners in Trade, there is a Neceſſity of Truſt, or Bartering, *i. e.* changing Commodities for Commodities, without the Intervention of Money. For Example, let us ſuppoſe in *Bermudas* but an hundred Pounds in ready Money, but that there is every Day there a Transferring of Commodities from one Owner to another, to the Value of double as much. When the Money is all got into Hands that have already bought all that they have need of for that Day, whoever has need of any thing elſe that Day, muſt either go on tick, or barter for it, *i. e.* give the Commodities he can beſt ſpare for the Commodities he wants, *v. g.* Sugar for Bread, *&c.* Now 'tis evident here, that changing the Denomination of the Coin they already have in *Bermudas*, or coining it over again undeor new Denominations, will not contribute in the leaſt towards the removing this Neceſſity of Truſt or Bartering. For the whole Silver they have in Coin, being but four hundred Ounces; and the Exchange of the Commodities made in a diſtance of time, wherein this Money is paid, not above once, being to the Value of eight hundred thouſand Ounces of Silver; 'tis plain that one half of the Commodities that ſhift Hands, muſt of Neceſſity be taken upon Credit, or exchanged by Barter; thoſe who want them, having not Money to pay for them. Nor can any Alteration of the Coin, or Denomination of theſe four hundred Ounces of Silver, help this; becauſe the Value of the Silver, in reſpect of other Commodities, will not thereby be at all increaſed; and the Commodities changed, being (as in the Caſe) double in Value to the four hundred Ounces of coin'd Silver to be laid out in them; nothing can ſupply this Want but a double Quantity, *i. e.* eight hundred Ounces of coin'd Silver; how denominated it matters not, ſo there be a fit Proportion of ſmall Pieces to ſupply ſmall Payments.

Suppoſe the Commodities paſſing every Day in *England*, in Markets and Fairs, between Strangers, or ſuch as truſt not one another, were to the Value of a Million of Ounces of Silver; and there was but half a Million of Ounces of coin'd Silver in the Hands of thoſe who wanted thoſe Commodities; 'tis Demonſtration they muſt truck for them, or go without them. If then the coin'd Silver of *England* be not ſufficient to anſwer the Value of Commodities moving in Trade amongſt us, Credit or Barter muſt do it. Where the Credit and Money fail, Barter alone muſt do it: Which being introduced by the Want of a greater Plenty of coin'd Silver, nothing but a greater Plenty of coin'd Silver can remove it. The Increaſe of Denomination does, or can do nothing in the Caſe: For 'tis Silver by its Quantity, and not Denomination, that is the Price of things, and Meaſure of Commerce; and 'tis the Weight of Silver in it, and not the Name of the Piece that Men eſtimate Commodities by, and exchange them for.

If this be not ſo, when the Neceſſity of our Affairs abroad, or ill Husbandry at home, has carried away half our Treaſure, and a Moiety of our Money is gone out of *England*; 'tis but to iſſue a Proclamation, That a Penny ſhall go for Twopence, Sixpence for a Shilling, Half a Crown for a Crown, *&c.* and immediately without any more ado we are as rich as before. And when half the Remainder is gone, 'tis but doing the ſame thing again, and raiſing the Denomination anew, and we are where we were, and ſo on: Where by ſuppoſing the Denomination raiſed $\frac{11}{12}$, every Man will be as rich with an Ounce of Silver in his Purſe as he was before when he had ſixteen Ounces there; and in as great Plenty of Money, able to carry on his Trade, without bartering; his Silver, by this ſhort Way of raiſing, being chang'd into the Value of Gold: For when Silver will buy ſixteen times as much Wine, Oil and Bread, *&c.* to Day, as it would Yeſterday, (all other things remaining the ſame but the Denomination) it hath the real Worth of Gold.

This, I gueſs, every body ſees cannot be ſo. And yet this muſt be ſo, if it be true, that raiſing the Denomination one fifth can ſupply the Want, or one Jot raiſe the Value of Silver in reſpect of other Commodities, *i. e.* make a leſs Quantity of it to Day, buy a greater Quantity of Corn, Oil and Cloth, and all other Commodities, than it would Yeſterday, and thereby remove the Neceſſity of Bartering.

tering. For if Raiſing the Denomination can thus raiſe the Value of Coin in Exchange for other Commodities one fifth, by the ſame Reaſon it can raiſe it two fifths, and afterwards three fifths, and again, if need be, four fifths, and as much farther as you pleaſe. So that by this admirable Contrivance of raiſing our Coin, we ſhall be as rich, and as well able to ſupport the Charge of the Governmrnt, and carry on our Trade without Bartering, or any other Inconvenience, for want of Money, with ſixty thouſand Ounces of coin'd Silver in *England*, as if we had ſix or ſixty Millions. If this be not ſo, I deſire any one to ſhew me, why the ſame Way of raiſing the Denomination, which can raiſe the Value of Money in reſpect of other Commodities, one fifth, cannot when you pleaſe raiſe it another fifth, and ſo on? I beg to be told where it muſt ſtop, and why at ſuch a Degree, without being able to go farther.

It muſt be taken notice of, that the Raiſing I ſpeak of here, is the raiſing of the Value of our Coin in reſpect of other Commodities (as I call it all along) in Contradiſtinction to raiſing the Denomination. The confounding of theſe in Diſcourſes concerning Money, is one great Cauſe, I ſuſpect, that this Matter is ſo little underſtood, and ſo often talk'd of with ſo little Information of the Hearers.

A Penny is a Denomination no more belonging to eight than to eighty, or to one ſingle Grain of Silver: And ſo it is not neceſſary that there ſhould be ſixty ſuch Pence, no more nor leſs, in an Ounce of Silver, *i. e.* twelve in a Piece call'd a Shilling, and ſixty in a Piece call'd a Crown; ſuch like Diviſions being only extrinſical Denominations, are every where perfectly arbitrary. For here in *England* there might as well have been twelve Shillings in a Penny, as twelve Pence in a Shilling, *i. e.* the Denomination of the leſs Piece might have been a Shilling, and of the bigger a Penny. Again, the Shilling might have been coined ten times as big as the Penny, and the Crown ten times as big as the Shilling; whereby the Shilling would have but ten Pence in it, and the Crown an hundred. But this, however order'd, alters not one Jot the Value of the Ounce of Silver in reſpect of other things, any more than it does its Weight. This Raiſing being but given of Names at pleaſure to *aliquot* Parts of any Piece, *viz.* that now the ſixtieth Part of an Ounce of Silver ſhall be call'd a Penny, and to Morrow that the ſeventy fifth Part of an Ounce of Silver ſhall be call'd a Penny, may be done with what Increaſe you pleaſe. And thus it may be order'd by a Proclamation, That a Shilling ſhall go for twenty four Pence, an Halfcrown for ſixty inſtead of thirty Pence, and ſo of the reſt. But that an Halfcrown ſhould be worth, or contain, ſixty ſuch Pence as the Pence were before this Change of Denomination was made, that no Power on Earth can do. Nor can any Power (but that which can make the Plenty or Scarcity of Commodities) raiſe the Value of our Money thus double, in reſpect of other Commodities, and make that the ſame Piece, or Quantity of Silver, under a double Denomination, ſhall purchaſe double the Quantity of Pepper, Wine or Lead, an Inſtant after ſuch Proclamation, to what it would do an Inſtant before. If this could be, we might, as every one ſees, raiſe Silver to the Value of Gold, and make our ſelves as rich we pleaſed. But 'tis but going to Market with an Ounce of Silver of one hundred and twenty Pence, to be convinc'd that it will purchaſe no more than an Ounce of Silver of ſixty Pence. And the Ringing of the Piece will as ſoon purchaſe more Commodities as its Change of Denomination, and the multipli'd Name of Pence, when it is called ſix ſcore inſtead of ſixty.

'Tis propos'd, that the twelve Pence ſhould be raiſed to fifteen Pence, and the Crown to ſeventy five Pence, and ſo proportionably of the reſt: But yet that the Pound Sterling ſhould not be raiſed. If there be any Advantage in raiſing, why ſhould not that be raiſed too? And as the Crown-piece is raiſed from ſixty to ſeventy five Pence, why ſhould not the Pound Sterling be raiſed in the ſame Proportion, from two hundred and forty Pence, to three hundred Pence?

Farther, If this raiſing our Coin can ſo ſtretch our Money, and enlarge our pared Remainder of it, as *to make it more commenſurate to the general Need thereof, for carrying on the common Traffick and Commerce of the Nation, and to anſwer Occaſions requiring a larger Supply of Money*, as Mr. *Lowndes* tells us in his third Reaſon, *p.* 83. Why are we ſo nigardly to our ſelves in this time of Occaſion, as to ſtop at one fifth? Why do we not raiſe it one full Moiety, and thereby double our Money? If Mr. *Lowndes*'s Rule, *p.* 78. *That if the Value of the Silver in the Coin, ſhould*

ſhould be raiſed above the Market-price of the ſame Silver reduc'd to Bullion; the **Subject** *would be proportionably injur'd and* **defrauded**, muſt keep us from theſe Advantages, and the publick Care of Juſtice ſtop the Raiſing of the Money at one fifth, becauſe if our Money be raiſed beyond the Market-price of Bullion, it will be ſo much *defrauded of the Subject*: I then ſay it muſt not be raiſed one fifth, nor half one fifth, that is, it muſt not be raiſed *fifteen Pence* in the Crown; no nor *five Pence*. For I deny that the Market-price of Standard Bullion ever was, or ever can be *five Shillings ſeven Pence*, of lawful weighty Money, the Ounce: So that if our preſent mill'd Money be raiſed one fifth, the Subjects will, by Mr. *Lowndes*'s Rule, be *defrauded* ſixteen *per Cent.* nay, above eighteen *per Cent.* For the Market-price of Standard Bullion being ordinarily under five Shillings four Pence the Ounce, when ſold for weighty Money (which is but one thirtieth) whatever our preſent mill'd Money is rais'd above one thirtieth, it is by Mr. *Lowndes*'s Rule ſo much *defrauding the Subject*. For the *Market-price* of any thing, and ſo of Bullion, is to be taken from its ordinary Rate all the Year round; and not from the extraordinary Riſe of two or three Market-days in a Year. And that the *Market-price* of *Standard Silver* was not found, nor pretended to be above *five Shillings and four Pence* the Ounce, before Clipping had left none but light running Caſh to pay for Bullion, or any thing elſe, is evident from a Paper then publiſh'd, which I took the Liberty to examine in my *Conſiderations of the Conſequences of Raiſing the Value of Money*, &c. printed 1692. The Author of that Paper, 'tis manifeſt, was not ignorant of the Price of Silver, nor had a Deſign to leſſen its Rate, ſet down the higheſt Price it then bore.

If then Mr. *Lowndes*'s Rule of Juſtice, and Care of the Subject, be to regulate the Riſe of our mill'd Money, it muſt be raiſed above one thirtieth Part. If the Advantages he promiſes, of making our Money, by raiſing it one fifth, *more commenſurate to the general Need thereof*, be to be laid hold on, 'tis reaſonable to raiſe it higher, *to make it yet more commenſurate to the general Need there is of it.* Which ever of the two Mr. *Lowndes* will prefer, either Reaſon of State, or Rule of Juſtice, one fifth muſt not be his Meaſure of raiſing our preſent mill'd Money. If the Advantage of making our Money more proportionate to our Trade, and other Neceſſities, be to govern its propoſed *Raiſing*, every one will cry out to Mr. *Lowndes*, If your Way will do what you ſay, the *Raiſing* it one half will be much better than one fifth, and therefore pray let an Half-crown be raiſed to a Crown, and a Sixpence to a Shilling. If Equity, and the Conſideration of the Subjects Property ought to govern in the Caſe, you muſt not raiſe our mill'd Crown to above five Shillings and four Pence.

If it here be ſaid to me, that I do then allow that our Money may be raiſed one thirtieth, *i. e.* that the Crown-piece ſhould be raiſed to five Shillings and two Pence, and ſo proportionably of the other Species of our Coin; I anſwer, he that infers ſo, makes his Inference a little too quick.

But let us for once allow the ordinary Price of *Standard Silver* to be five Shillings four Pence the Ounce, to be paid for in weighty Coin (for that muſt always be remembred, when we talk of the Rate of Bullion) and that the Rate of Bullion is the juſt Meaſure of raiſing our Money. This I ſay is no Reaſon for the Raiſing our mill'd Crown now to five Shillings four Pence, and recoining all our clip'd Money upon that Foot; unleſs we intend, as ſoon as that is done, to new raiſe, and coin it again. For whilſt our Trade and Affairs abroad require the Exportation of *Silver*, and the Exportation of our coin'd *Silver* is prohibited, and made penal by our Law, Standard Bullion will always be ſold here for a little more than its Weight of coin'd Silver. So that if we ſhall endeavour to equal our coin'd Silver to Standard Bullion, by raſing it, whilſt there is a Neceſſity of the Exportation of Silver, we ſhall do no otherwiſe than a Child, who runs to overtake and get up to the Top of his Shadow, which ſtill advances at the ſame Rate that he does. The Privilege that Bullion has, to be exported freely, will give it a little Advance in Price above our Coin, let the Denomination of that be raiſed or fallen as you pleaſe, whilſt there is need of its Exportation, and the Exportation of our Coin is prohibited by Law. But this Advance will be but little, and will always keep within the Bounds which the Riſque and Trouble of melting down our Coin ſhall ſet to it in the Eſtimate of the Exporter. He that will rather venture to throw an hundred Pound into his

Melting-

Melting-pot, when no body ſees him, and reduce it to Bullion, than give an hundred and five Pounds for the ſame Weight of the like Bullion, will never give five Shillings and five Pence of mill'd Money for an Ounce of Standard Bullion; nor buy at that Price, what he can have near five *per Cent.* cheaper, without any Riſque, if he will not accuſe himſelf. And I think it may be concluded, that very few, who have Furnances, and other Conveniencies ready for melting Silver, will give one *per Cent.* for Standard Bullion, which is under five Shillings and three Pence *per* Ounce, who can only for the Trouble of melting it, reduce our Coin to as good Bullion.

The Odds of the Price in Bullion to Coin on this Account (which is the only one, where the Coin is kept to the Standard) can never be a Reaſon for raiſing our Coin to preſerve it from melting down: Becauſe this Price above its Weight is given for Bullion, only to avoid melting down our Coin; and ſo this Difference of Price between Standard Bullion and our Coin, can be no Cauſe of its melting down.

Theſe three Reaſons which I have examin'd, contain the great Advantages, which our Author ſuppoſes the propos'd raiſing of our Coin will produce. And therefore I have dwelt longer upon them. His remaining ſix Reaſons being of leſs moment, and offering moſt of them, but ſome circumſtantial Conveniencies, as to the Computation of our Money, *&c.* I ſhall more briefly paſs over. Only before I proceed to them, I ſhall here ſet down the different Value of our Money, collected from our Author's Hiſtory of the ſeveral Changes of our Coin, ſince *Edward* the Firſt's Reign, quite down to this preſent time. A curious Hiſtory indeed, for which I think my ſelf and the World indebted to Mr. *Lowndes*'s great Learning in this ſort of Knowledge, and his great Exactneſs in relating the Particulars.

I ſhall remark only the Quantity of Silver was in a Shilling in each of thoſe Changes; that ſo the Reader may at firſt Sight, without farther Trouble, compare the Leſſening, or Increaſe of the Quantity of Silver upon every Change. For in Propriety of Speech, the adding to the *Quantity* of Silver in our Coin, is the true Raiſing of its Value; and the diminiſhing the *Quantity* of Silver in it, is the ſinking of its Value; however they come to be tranſpos'd, and uſed in the quite contrary Senſe.

If my Calculations, from the Weight and Fineneſs I find ſet down in Mr. *Lowndes*'s Extract out of the Indentures of the Mint, have not miſled me, the Quantity of Silver to a Grain, which was in a Shilling in every Change of our Money, is ſet down in the following Table.

One Shilling contain'd of fine Silver,

			Grains.
28	*Edw.*	1	264
18	*Edw.*	3	236
27	*Edw.*	3	213
9	*Hen.*	5	176
1	*Hen.*	6	142
4	*Hen.*	6	176
49	*Hen.*	6	142
1	*Hen.*	8	118
34	*Hen.*	8	100
36	*Hen.*	8	60
37	*Hen.*	8	40
3	*Edw.*	6	40
5	*Edw.*	6	20
6	*Edw.*	6	88
2	*Eliz.*		89
43	*Eliz.*		86

And ſo it has remained from the 43d Year of Queen *Elizabeth* to this Day.

Mr. *Lowndes*'s 69

Mr. *Lowndes* having given us the Fineneſs of the Standard Silver in every Reign, and the Number of Pieces a Pound *Troy* was coin'd into, cloſes this Hiſtory with Words

Words to this Purpoſe, *p.* 56. *By this Deduction it doth evidently appear, that it hath been a Policy conſtantly practiſed in the Mints of* England, *to raiſe the Value of the Coin in its extrinſick Denomination from time to time, as any Exigence or Occaſion required, and more eſpecially to encourage the bringing of Bullion into the Realm to be coin'd.* This indeed is roundly to conclude for his Hypotheſis. But I could wiſh, that from the Hiſtories of thoſe Times, wherein the ſeveral Changes were made, he had ſhew'd us the Exigencies and Occaſions that produced the raiſing of the Coin, and what Effects it had.

If I miſtake not, *Henry* the VIIIth's ſeveral Raiſings of our Coin, brought little Increaſe of Silver into *England*. As the ſeveral Species of our Coin leſſen'd in their reſpective Quantities of Silver; ſo the Treaſure of the Realm decreaſed too: And he that found the Kingdom rich, did not, as I remember, by all his raiſing our Coin, leave it ſo.

Another thing, (that from this Hiſtory) makes me ſuſpect that the Raiſing the Denomination was never found effectively to draw Silver into *England*, is the lowering the Denomination, or adding more Silver to the ſeveral Species of our Coin, as in *Hen.* VI's Time, the Shilling was increaſed from one hundred forty two Grains of Silver, to one hundred ſeventy ſix. And in the ſixth of *Edw.* VI. in whoſe Time raiſing the Denomination ſeems to have been tried to the utmoſt, when a Shilling was brought to twenty Grains of Silver. And the great Alteration that was then quickly made on the other Hand, from twenty to eighty Grains at one Leap, ſeems to ſhew that this Leſſening the Silver in our Coin, had proved highly prejudicial: For this is a greater Change in ſinking of the Denomination in Proportion, than ever was made at once in *Raiſing* it; a *Shilling* being made four times weightier in Silver the ſixth, than it was in the fifth Year of *Edw.* VI's Reign.

Kingdoms are ſeldom found weary of the Riches they have, or averſe to the Increaſe of their Treaſure. If therefore the Raiſing the Denomination did in reality bring Silver into the Realm, it cannot be thought that they would at any time ſink the Denomination, which by the Rule of Contraries ſhould be at leaſt ſuſpected to drive, or keep it out.

Since therefore we are not from Matter of Fact informed, what were the true Motives that cauſed thoſe ſeveral Changes in the Coin; may we not with Reaſon ſuſpect that they were owing to that Policy of the Mint, ſet down by our Author, *p.* 83. in theſe Words, That the *propoſed Advance is agreeable to the Policy that in paſt Ages hath been practiſed, not only in our Mint, but in the Mints of all Politick Governments; namely, to Raiſe the Value of Silver in the Coin,* **to promote the Work of the Mint?** As I remember, ſuitable to this *Policy of the Mint*, there was, ſome two Years ſince, a Complaint of a worthy Gentleman, not ignorant of it, that the Mill in the Mint ſtood ſtill; and therefore there was a Propoſal offer'd for bringing Griſt to the Mill.

The Buſineſs of Money, as in all times, even in this our quick-ſighted Age, hath been thought a Myſtery: Thoſe employ'd in the Mint muſt, by their Places, be ſuppoſed to penetrate deepeſt into it. 'Tis no impoſſible thing then to imagine, that it was not hard, in the Ignorance of paſt Ages, when Money was little, and Skill in the Turns of Trade leſs, for thoſe verſed in the Buſineſs and Policy of the Mint, to perſuade a Prince, eſpecially if Money were ſcarce, that the Fault was in the Standard of the Mint, and that the Way to increaſe the Plenty of Money, was to *raiſe* (a well-ſounding Word) the Value of the Coin. This could not but be willingly enough hearkned to; when, beſides the Hopes of drawing an Increaſe of Silver into the Realm, it brought preſent Gain by the Part which the King got of the Money, which was hereupon all coined anew, and the Mint Officers loſt nothing, *ſince it promoted the Work of the Mint.*

This Opinion Mr. *Lowndes* himſelf gives ſufficient ground for in his Book, particularly *p.* 29. where we read theſe Words, *Altho' the former Delaſements of the Coins by publick Authority, eſpecially thoſe in the Reign of King* Henry VIII. *and King* Edward VI. *might be projected for the Profit of the Crown, and the Projectors might meaſure that Profit by the exceſſive Quantities of Allay that were mixed with the Silver and the Gold* (and let me add, or by the Quantity of Silver leſſened in each Species, which is the ſame thing.) *And tho' this was enterprized by a Prince, who could ſtretch his Prerogative very far upon his People; and was done in Times when the Nation had very little Commerce, inland or foreign, to be injured and prejudiced thereby; yet Experience*

perience preſently ſhewed, that the Projectors were miſtaken, and that it was abſolutely neceſſary to have the baſe Money reformed. This at leaſt they were not miſtaken in, that they brought Work to the Mint, and a Part of the Money coin'd to the Crown for *Seigniorage*: in both which there was Profit. Mr. *Lowndes* tells us, *p.* 44. *That* Henry VIII. *had to the Value of fifty Shillings for every Pound Weight of Gold coin'd.* I have met with it ſomewhere, that formerly the King might take what he pleaſed for Coinage. I know not too but the flattering Name of raiſing Money might prevail then as it does now; and impoſe ſo far on them, as to make them think, the *Raiſing*, i. e. diminiſhing the Silver in their Coin, would bring it into the Realm, or ſtay it here when they found it going out. For if we may gueſs at the other, by *Henry* VIII's *Raiſing*, it was probably when, by Reaſon of Expence in foreign Wars, or ill managed Trade, they found Money begin to grow ſcarce.

The having the Species of our Coin one fifth bigger, or one fifth leſs than they are at preſent, would be neither good nor harm to *England*, if they had always been ſo. Our Standard has continued in Weight and Fineneſs juſt as it is now, for very near this hundred Years laſt paſt: And thoſe who think the Denomination and Size of our Money have any Influence on the State of our Wealth, have no Reaſon to change the preſent Standard of our Coin; ſince under that we have had a greater Increaſe, and longer Continuance of Plenty of Money, than perhaps any other Country can ſhew; I ſee no Reaſon to think, that a little bigger or leſs Size of the Pieces coin'd, is of any Moment one way or t'other. The Species of Money in any Country, of whatſoever Sizes, fit for Coining, if their Proportions to one another be ſuited to Arithmetick and Calculations, in whole Numbers, and the Ways of Accounts in that Country; if they are adapted to ſmall Payments, and carefully kept to their juſt Weight and Fineneſs, can have no Harm in them. The Harm comes by the Change, which unreaſonably and unjuſtly gives away and transfers Mens Properties, diſorders Trade, puzzles Accounts, and needs a new Arithmetick to caſt up Reckonings, and keep Accounts in; beſides a thouſand other Inconveniencies; not to mention the Charge of recoining the Money. For this may be depended on, that if our Money be raiſed as is propoſed, it will inforce the Recoining of all our Money, both old and new, (except the new Shillings) to avoid the terrible Difficulty and Confuſion there will be in keeping Accounts in Pounds, Shillings, and Pence, (as they muſt be) when the Species of our Money are ſo ordered, as not to anſwer thoſe Denominations in round Numbers.

This Conſideration leads me to Mr. *Lowndes's fifth* and *ſixth* Reaſons, *p.* 85. wherein he recommends the raiſing our Money in the Proportion propoſed, for its Convenience, to our accounting by *Pounds*, *Shillings*, and *Pence*. And for obviating *Perplexity among the common People*, he propoſes the preſent weighty *Crown* to go at ſix Shillings three Pence; and the new *Scepter* or *Unite* to be coin'd of the ſame Weight, to go at the ſame Rate; and *Half-Crowns*, *Half-Scepters*, or *Half-Unites*, of the Weight of the preſent *Half-Crown*, to go for *two Shillings ſeven Pence Half-Penny*: By no Number of which Pieces can there be made an even *Pound Sterling*, or any Number of even *Shillings* under a *Pound*; but they always fall into Fractions of *Pounds* and *Shillings*, as may be ſeen by this following Table.

		l.	*s.*	*d.*
1	*Half-Crown, Half-Scepter, or Half-Unite Piece*		3	$1\frac{1}{2}$
1	*Crown, Scepter, or Unite Piece*		6	3
3	*Half-Crown Pieces*		9	$4\frac{1}{2}$
2	*Crown Pieces*		12	6
5	*Half-Crown Pieces*		15	$7\frac{1}{2}$
3	*Crown Pieces*		18	9
7	*Half-Crown Pieces*	1	1	$10\frac{1}{2}$
4	*Crown Pieces*	1	5	

The preſent *Shilling*, and new *Teſtoon*, going for fifteen Pence, no Number of them make any Number of even *Shillings*, but *five Shillings*, *ten Shillings*, *fifteen Shillings*, and *twenty Shillings*; but in all the reſt, they always fall into Fractions.

The like may be ſaid of the preſent *Six-pences*, and future half *Teſtoons* going for *ſeven Pence Half-penny*; the *Quarter Teſtoons*, which are to go for *three Pence*

three

three Farthings; and the *Groſs* and *Groats*, which are to go for *five Pence*; the half *Groſs* or *Groat*, which is to go for *two Pence Halfpenny*; and the *Prime*, which is to go for a *Penny Farthing*: Out of any Tale of each of which Species there can no juſt Number of Shillings be made, as I think, but *five Shillings*, *ten Shillings*, *fifteen Shillings*, and *twenty Shillings*; but they always fall into Fractions. The new intended *Shilling* alone ſeems to be ſuited to our accounting in *Pounds*, *Shillings* and *Pence*. The great Pieces, as *Scepters*, and *Half-ſcepters*, which are made to ſerve for the Payment of greater Sums, and are for Diſpatch in Tale, will not in Tale fall into even *Pounds*. And I fear it will puzzle a better Arithmetician, than moſt Countrymen are, to tell, without Pen and Ink, how many of the leſſer Pieces (except the Shillings) however combined, will make juſt ſixteen or ſeventeen Shillings. And I imagine there is not one Country-man of three, but may have it for his Pains, if he can tell an hundred Pounds made up of a promiſcous Mixture of the Species of this new raiſed Money (excluding the Shillings) in a Day's-time. And that which will help to confound him, and every body elſe, will be the *Old Crowns*, *Half-crowns*, *Shillings*, and *Sixpences* current for new Numbers of *Pence*. So that I take it for granted, that if our Coin be raiſed, as is propoſed, not only all our clip'd, but all our weighty and mill'd Money muſt of Neceſſity be recoin'd too; if you would not have Trade diſturbed, and People more diſeaſed with new Money, which they cannot tell, nor keep Accounts in, than with light and clip'd Money, which they are cheated with. And what a Charge the new coining of all our Money will be to the Nation, I have computed in another Place. * That I think is of ſome Conſideration in our preſent Circumſtances, though the Confuſion that this new raiſed Money, I fear, is like to introduce; and the Want of Money, and Stop of Trade, when the clip'd is called in, and the weighty is to be recoin'd; be of much greater.

* Vid. ſhort Obſervations on a Paper entiuled, *For incouraging Coining*, &c. *p.* 8.

His *Fourth*, *Eighth*, and *Ninth* Reaſons, *p.* 84. and 86. are taken from the ſaving our preſent mill'd Money from being cut and recoin'd. The End I confeſs to be good: 'Tis very reaſonable, that ſo much excellent Coin, as good as ever was in the World, ſhould not be deſtroyed. But there is, I think, a ſurer and eaſier Way to preſerve it, than what Mr. *Lowndes* propoſes. 'Tis paſt doubt, it will be in no Danger of Recoining, if Money be kept upon the preſent Foot: But if it be raiſed, as Mr. *Lowndes* propoſes, all the preſent mill'd Money will be in Danger, and the Difficulty of counting it upon the new propoſed Foot will inforce it to be recoin'd into new Pieces of Crowns, Half-crowns, Shillings, and Sixpences, that may paſs for the ſame Number of Pence the preſent do, *viz.* 60, 30, 12, and 6. as I have above ſhewn. He ſays in his *Fourth* Reaſon, that *if Pieces having the ſame Bigneſs, ſhould have different Values, it might be difficult for the common People (eſpecially thoſe not skill'd in Arithmetick) to compute how many of one kind will be equal to the Sum of another.* Such Difficulties and Confuſion, in counting Money, I agree with him, ought carefully to be avoided. And therefore, *ſince if Pieces having the ſame Bigneſs* and Stamp, which the People are acquainted with, ſhall have new Values different from thoſe which People are accuſtomed to; and theſe new Values ſhall in Numbers of Pence not anſwer our Way of accounting by *Pounds*, and *Shillings*; *it will be difficult for the common People (eſpecially thoſe not skill'd in Arimetick) to compute how many of any one kind will make any Sum they are to pay or receive*; eſpecially when the Numbers of any one kind of Pieces will be brought into ſo few even Sums of *Pounds*, and *Shillings*. And thus Mr *Lowndes*'s Argument here turns upon himſelf, and is againſt raiſing our Coin, to the Value propoſed by him, from the *Confeſſion* it will produce.

His 8th Reaſon, *p.* 86. we have in theſe Words, *It is difficult to conceive how any Deſign of amending the clip'd Money, can be compaſſed without raiſing the Value of the Silver remaining in them, becauſe of the great Deficiency of the Silver clip'd away (which upon recoining) muſt neceſſarily be defraid and born one way or other.*

'Tis no *Difficulty to conceive*, that clip'd Money, being not lawful Money, ſhould be prohibited to paſs for more than its Weight. Next, it is *no Difficulty to conceive*, that clip'd Money, paſſing for no more than its Weight, and ſo being in the State of Standard Bullion, which cannot be exported, ſhould be brought to the Mint, and there exchanged for weighty Money. By this Way, *it is no Difficulty to conceive how the Amending the clip'd Money may be compaſſed, becauſe this Way the Deficiency of the Silver clip'd away, will certainly be defraid and born one way or other.*

And thus I have gone over all Mr. *Lowndes*'s Reaſons for *raiſing* our Coin; Wherein, tho' I ſeem to differ from him, yet I flatter my ſelf, it is not altogether ſo much as at firſt ſight may appear; ſince by what I find in another Part of his Book, I have reaſon to judge he is a great deal of my Mind. For he has *five* very good Arguments for *continuing the preſent Standard of Fineneſs*, each of which is as ſtrong for continuing alſo *the preſent Standard of Weight*. i. e. continuing a Penny of the ſame Weight of *Standard Silver*, which at preſent it has. He that has a mind to be ſatitisfied of this, may read Mr. *Lowndes*'s firſt five Reaſons for continuing the *preſent Standard of Fineneſs*, which he will find in his 29, 30, 31, 32 Pages of his *Report*. And when Mr. *Lowndes* himſelf has again conſidered what there is of Weight in them, and how far it reaches, he will at leaſt not think it ſtrange if they appear to me and others, good Arguments againſt putting leſs Silver into our Coin of the ſame Denominations, let that Diminution be made what way it will.

What Mr. *Lowndes* ſays about Gold Coins, *p.* 88, *&c.* appears to me highly rational, and I perfectly agree with him; excepting only that I do not think Gold is in regard of Silver riſen one Third in *England*; which I think may be thus made out. A Guinea weighing five Penny-weight of and nine Grains, or one hundred and twenty nine Grains; and a Pound Sterling weighing one thouſand eight hundred and ſixty Grains; a Guinea at twenty Shillings is as one hundred and twenty nine to one thouſand eight hundred and ſixty; that is, as one to fourteen and an half.

A Guinea at two and twenty Shillings, is as one hundred and twenty nine, to two thouſand forty two, *i. e.* as one to ſixteen.

A Guinea at thirty Shillings, is as one hundred twenty nine to two thouſand ſeven hundred eighty four, *i. e.* as one to twenty one and an half, near.

He therefore that receives twenty Shillings mill'd Money for a Guinea, receives one thouſand eight hundred and ſixty Grains *Standard Silver*, for one hundred twenty nine Grains of *Standard Gold*, i. e. fourteen and an half for one.

He who receives two and twenty Sillings mill'd Money for a Guinea, has two thouſand forty two Grains Standard Silver, for one hundred twenty nine Grains Standard Gold, *i. e.* ſixteen for one.

He who receives thirty Shillings mill'd Money for a Guinea, has two thouſand ſeven hundred eighty four Grains Standard Silver, for one hundred twenty nine Grains of Gold, *i. e.* twenty one and an half for one.

But the current Caſh being (upon Trials made about *Midſummer* laſt) computed by Mr. *Lowndes*, p. 108. to want half its Standard Weight, and not being mended ſince, it is evident he who receives thirty Shillings of our preſent clip'd Money, for a Guinea, has but one thouſand three hundred ninety two Grains of Standard Silver, for one hundred twenty nine Grains of Gold, *i. e.* has but ten and three Quarters of Silver for one of Gold.

I have left out the utmoſt Preciſions of Fractions in theſe Computations, as not neceſſary in the preſent Caſe, theſe whole Numbers ſhewing well enough the Difference of the Value of Guineas at thoſe ſeveral Rates.

If it be true what I here aſſert, *viz.* That he who receives thirty Shillings in our current clip'd Money for a Guinea, receives not eleven Grains of Silver for one of Gold; whereas the Value of Gold to Silver in all our Neighbouring Countries is about fifteen to one, which is about a third Part more; it will probably be demanded, how comes it to paſs that Foreigners, or others, import Gold; when they do not receive as much Silver for it here, as they may have in all other Countries? The Reaſon whereof is viſibly this, that they exchange it not here for Silver, but for our Commodities: And our Bargains for Commodities as well as all other Contracts being made in Pounds, Shillings, and Pence, our clip'd Money retains amongſt the People (who know not how to count but by current Money) a Part of its legal Value, whilſt it paſſes for the Satisfaction of legal Contracts, as if it were lawful Money. As long as the King receives it for his Taxes, and the Landlord for his Rent, 'tis no wonder the Farmer and Tenant ſhould receive it for his Commodities. And this perhaps would do well enough, if our Money and Trade were to circulate only amongſt our ſelves, and we had no Commerce with the reſt of the World, and needed it not. But here lies the Loſs, when Foreigners ſhall bring over Gold hither, and with that pay for our Commodities at the Rate of thirty Shillings the Guinea, when the ſame Quantity of Gold that is

in

in a Guinea is not beyond Sea worth more Silver than is in twenty, or one and twenty and ſix Pence of our mill'd and lawful Money: By which Way of paying for our Commodities *England* loſes near one third of the Value of all the Commodities it thus ſells. And 'tis all one as if Foreigners paid for them in Money coin'd and clip'd beyond Sea, wherein was one third leſs Silver than there ought to be. And thus we loſe near one third in all our Exportation, whilſt foreign Gold imported is received in Payment for thirty Shillings a Guinea. To make this appear, we need but trace this Way of Commerce a little, and there can be no Doubt of the Loſs we ſuffer by it.

Let us ſuppoſe, for Example, a Bale of Holland Linnen, worth there one hundred and eighty Ounces of our *Standard Silver*; and a Bale of Serge here, worth alſo the ſame Weight of one hundred and eighty Ounces of the ſame *Standard Silver:* 'Tis evident, theſe two Bales are exactly of the ſame Value. Mr. *Lowndes* tells us, *p.* 88. *That at this Time the Gold that is in a Guinea (if it were carried to* Spain, Italy, Barbary, *and ſome other Places,) would not purchaſe ſo much Silver there, as is equal to the Standard of twenty of our Shillings*, i. e. would be in Value there to Silver ſcarce as one to fourteen and an half: And I think, I may ſay, that Gold in *Holland* is, or lately was, as one to fifteen, or not much above. Taking then Standard Gold in *Holland* to be in Proportion to *Standard Silver*, as one to about fifteen, or a little more; twelve Ounces of our Standard Gold, or as much Gold as is in forty four *Guineas* and an half, muſt be given for that Bale of Holland Linnen, if any one will pay for it there in Gold: But if he buys that Bale of Serge here for one hundred and eighty Ounces of Silver, which is forty eight Pounds *Sterling*, if he pays for it in Gold at thirty Shillings the Guinea, two and thirty Guineas will pay for it. So that in all the Goods that we ſell beyond Seas for Gold imported, and coin'd into Guineas, unleſs the Owners raiſe them one third above what they would ſell them for in mill'd Money, we loſe twelve in forty four and an half, which is very near one third.

This Loſs is wholly owing to the permitting clip'd Money in Payment. And this Loſs we muſt unavoidably ſuffer whilſt clip'd Money is current amongſt us. And this robbing of *England* of near one third of the Value of the Commodities we ſell it out, will continue whilſt People had rather receive Guineas at thirty Shillings, than Silver Coin (no other being to be had) that is not worth half what they take it for. And yet this clip'd Money, as bad as it is, and however unwilling People are to be charged with it, will always have Credit enough to paſs, whilſt the Goldſmiths and Bankers receive it; and they will always receive it; whilſt they can paſs it over again to the King with Advantage, and can have Hopes to prevail, that at laſt when it can be born no longer, but muſt be call'd in, no Part of the Loſs of light Money, which ſhall be found in their Hands ſhall fall upon them, tho' they have for many Years dealt in it, and by Reaſon of its being clip'd have had all the running Caſh of the Kingdom in their Hands, and made Profit of it. I ſay, clip'd Money, however bad it be, will always paſs whilſt the King's Receivers, the Bankers of any kind, and at laſt the Exchequer takes it. For who will not receive clip'd Money, rather than have none for his neceſſary Occaſions, whilſt he ſees the great Receipt of the Exchequer admits it, and the Bank and Goldſmiths will take it of him, and give him Credit for it, ſo that he needs keep no more of it by him than he pleaſes. In this State, whilſt the Exchequer receives clip'd Money, I do not ſee how it can be ſtop'd from paſſing. A clip'd Half-crown that goes at the Exchequer, will not be refuſed by any one who has Hopes by his own or others Hands to convey it thither, and who, unleſs he take it, cannot Trade, or ſhall not be paid. Whilſt therefore the Exchequer is open to clip'd Money, it will paſs, and whilſt clip'd Money paſſes, Clippers will certainly be at Work; and what a Gap this leaves to Foreigners, if they will make uſe of it to pour in clip'd Money upon us (as its Neighbours did into *Portugal*) as long as we have either Goods or weighty Money left to be carried away at fifty *per Cent.* or greater Profit, its eaſie to ſee.

I will ſuppoſe the King receives clip'd Money in the Exchequer, and at half or three Quarters Loſs coins it into mill'd Money. For if he receives all, how much ſoever clip'd, I ſuppoſe the Clippers Sheers are not ſo ſqueamiſh as not to pare away above half. 'Twill be a wonderful Conſciencioufneſs in them, no where, that I know to be parallell'd, if they will content themſelves with leſs

Profit

Profit than they can make, and will leave ſeven Penny Worth of Silver in an Half-crown, if ſix Penny Worth and the Stamp be enough to make it paſs for Half a Crown. When His Majeſty hath coin'd this into mill'd Money of Standard Weight, and paid it out again to the Bankers, Goldſmiths or others, what ſhall then become of it? Either they will lay it up to get rid of their clip'd Money, for no body will part with heavy Money, whilſt he has any light; nor will any heavy Money come abroad whilſt there is light left; for whoever has clip'd Money by him, will ſell good Bargains, or borrow at any Rate of thoſe who are willing to part with any weighty, to keep that by him, rather than the clip'd Money he has in his Hands. So that as far as this reaches, no mill'd Money, how much ſoever be coin'd will appear abroad, or if it does, will it long ſcape the Coiners and Clippers Hands, who will be at work preſently upon it to furniſh the Exchequer with more clip'd Money at fifty, ſixty, ſeventy, or I know not what Advantage? Tho' this be enough to cut off the Hopes of mill'd Money appearing in Payments whilſt any clip'd is current; yet to this we may add, that Gold imported at an Over-value will ſweep it away as faſt as it is coin'd, whilſt clip'd Money keeps up the Rate of Guineas above their former Value. This will be the Circulation of our Money, whilſt clip'd is permitted any way to be current. And if ſtore enough of clip'd Money from at home or abroad, can be but provided (as 'tis more than probable it may now the Trade is ſo univerſal, and has been ſo long practiſed with great Advantage, and no great Danger, as appears by the few have ſuffer'd in regard of the great Number 'tis evident are engaged in the Trade, and the Vent of it here in *England* is ſo known and ſure) I do not ſee how in a little while we ſhall have any Money or Goods at all left in *England*, if Clipping be not immediately ſtop'd. And how Clipping can be ſtop'd, but by an immediate poſitive Prohibition, whereby all clip'd Money ſhall be forbid to paſs in any Payment whatſoever, or to paſs for more than its Weight, I would be glad to learn. Clipping is the great Leak, which for ſome time paſt has contributed more to ſink us, than all the Force of our Enemies could do. 'Tis like a Breach in the Sea-bank, which widens every Moment till it be ſtop'd. And my timerous Temper muſt be pardon'd, if I am frighted with the Thoughts of clip'd Money being current one Moment longer, at any other Value but of warranted Standard Bullion. And therefore there can be nothing more true and reaſonable, nor that deſerves better to be conſider'd, than what Mr. *Lowndes* ſays in his Corollary, *p.* 90.

Whoever deſires to know the different Ways of coining Money by the *Hammer* and by the *Mill*, may inform himſelf in the exact Account Mr. *Lowndes* has given of both, under his ſecond general Head: Where he may alſo ſee the probableſt Gueſs that has been made of the Quantity of our clip'd Money, and the Silver deficient in it; and an Account of what *Silver* Money was coin'd in the Reigns of Q. *Elizabeth*, K. *James* Iſt. and *Charles* Iſt. more exact than is to be had any where elſe. There is only one thing which I ſhall mention, ſince Mr. *Lowndes* does it here again under this Head, *p.* 100. and that is, melting down our Coin; concerning which I ſhall venture humbly to propoſe theſe following Queſtions.

1. Whether Bullion be any thing but Silver, whoſe Workmanſhip has no Value?

2. Whether that Workmanſhip, which can be had for nothing, has, or can have any Value?

3. Whether, whilſt the Money in our Mint is coin'd for the Owners, without any coſt to them, our Coin can ever have any Value above any Standard Bullion?

4. Whether, whilſt our Coin is not of Value above Standard Bullion, Goldſmiths and others, who have need of *Standard Silver*, will not take what is by the free Labour of the Mint ready eſſaid and adjuſted to their Uſe, and melt that down, than be at the Trouble of melting, mixing and eſſaying of Silver for the Uſes they have?

5. Whether the only Cure for this Wanton, tho' criminal melting down our Coin, be not, that the Owners ſhould pay one Moiety of the Sixteen-pence halfpenny, which is paid *per* Pound *Troy* for Coinage of Silver, which the King now pays all?

6. Whether by this Means *Standard Silver* in Coin will not be more worth than *Standard Silver* in Bullion, and ſo be preſerved from this wanton melting down, as ſoon as an Over-balance of our Trade ſhall bring us Silver to ſtay here?

For

for till then it is in vain to think of preſerving our Coin from melting down, and therefore to no Purpoſe till then to change that Law.

7. Whether any Laws, or any Penalties can keep our Coin from being carried out, when Debts contracted beyond Sea call for it?

8. Whether it be any Odds to *England*, whether it be carried out, melted down into Bullion, or in Specie?

9. Whether, whilſt the Exigencies of our Occaſions and Trade call for it abroad it will not always be melted down for the Conveniency of Exportation, ſo long as the Laws prohibits its Exportation in Specie?

10. Whether Standard Silver in Coin and in Bullion, will not immediately be of the ſame Value as ſoon as the Prohibition of carrying out Money in Specie is taken off?

11. Whether an Ounce of Silver the more would be carried out in a Year, if that Prohibition were taken off?

12. Whether Silver in our Coin will not always, during the Prohibition of its Exportation, be a little leſs worth than Silver in Bullion, whilſt the Conſumption of foreign Commodities beyond what ours pay for, makes the Exportation of Silver neceſſary? And ſo, during ſuch a State, *Raiſe* your Money as much and as you will, *Silver in the Coin will never fetch as much as the Silver in Bullion*, as Mr. *Lowndes* expreſſes it, *p.* 110.

As to the Inconveniencies and Damages we ſuſtain by clip'd Money paſſing by Tale, as if it were lawful, nothing can be more true, more judicious, nor more weighty, than what Mr. *Lowndes* ſays under his third General-Head; wherein I perfectly agree with him, excepting only where he builds any thing upon the propoſed Raiſing our Coin one fifth. And to what he ſays, *p.* 114. concerning our being *deprived of the Uſe of our heavy Money, by Mens hoarding it, in Proſpect that the Silver contained in thoſe weighty Pieces will turn more to their Profit, than lending it at Intereſt, Purchaſing or Trading therewith*, I crave leave to add, That thoſe *Hoarders* of Money, a great many of them, drive no leſs, but rather a greater Trade, by hoarding the weighty Money, than if they let it go abroad. For, by that Means all the current Caſh being light, clip'd, and hazardous Money, 'tis all tumbled into their Hands, which gives Credit to their Bills, and furniſhes them to trade for as much as they pleaſe, whilſt every body elſe ſcarce trades at all, (but juſt as Neceſſity forces) and is ready to ſtand ſtill.

Where he ſays, *p.* 114. *'Tis not likely the weighty Monies will ſoon appear abroad without raiſing their Value, and recoining the clip'd Monies*: I ſhould agree with him, if it ran thus: Without recoining the clip'd, and in the mean time making it go for its Weight. For that will, I humbly conceive, bring out the heavy Money with raiſing its Value, as effectually and ſooner; for it will do it immediately: His will take up ſome time. And I fear, if clip'd Money be not ſtopt all at once, and preſently from paſſing any way in Tale, the Damage it will bring will be irreparable.

Mr. Lowndes's *Fourth General Head is, to propoſe the Means that muſt be obſerved, and the proper Methods to be uſed in, and for the Re-eſtabliſhment of the Silver Coins.*

The firſt is, *That the Work ſhould be finiſhed in as little time as may be; not only to obviate a farther Damage by Clipping in the Interim, but alſo that the needful Advantages of the new Money may be the ſooner obtained for the Service of the Nation.*

Theſe, I agree with him, are very good and neceſſary Ends; but they are both to be attain'd, I conceive, much ſooner by making clip'd Money go for its Weight, than by the Method Mr. *Lowndes* propoſes. For this immediately puts an End to *Clipping*, and *obviates all farther Damage thereby*. Next, it immediately brings out all the hoarded weighty Money, and ſo that *Advantage* will be ſooner obtain'd for the Service of the Nation, than it can any other way beſides. Next, it preſerves the Uſe of clip'd Money *for the Service of the Nation in the* **Interim**, till it can be recoin'd all at the *Tower*.

His Second Propoſition is, *That the Loſs, or the greateſt Part of it, ought to born by the Publick, and not by Particulars, who being very numerous will be prejudiced againſt a Reformation for the publick Benefit, if it be to be effected at the Coſt of particular Men.*

A Tax given to make good the Defect of *Silver* in clip'd Money, will be paid by *Particulars*; and ſo the Loſs will be born by *particular Men*: And whether theſe Particulars be not more numerous, or at leaſt a great Number of innocent Men

of

of them more ſenſibly burden'd that way, than if it takes its Chance in the Hands of thoſe Men, who have profited by the having it in their Hand, will be worth conſidering. And I wiſh it were well weigh'd, which of the two Ways the greater Number of Men would be moſt dangerouſly prejudic'd againſt this *Reformation*. But as Mr. *Lowndes* orders the Matter, every body will, I fear, be *prejudic'd againſt this Reformation*, when (as he divides it, *p.* 133, 134.) the Owners will bear near one half of the Loſs in the Price of his clip'd Money, and every body elſe his Part of the Remainder, in a Tax levied on them for it. I wiſh a Remedy could be found without any body's Loſs. Moſt of thoſe Ways I have heard propoſed to make Reparation to every *particular Man*, for the clip'd Money ſhall be found in his Hands, do ſo delay the Remedy, if not entail Clipping upon us, that I fear ſuch a Care of *Particulars* endangers the whole. And if that ſuffer, it will go but ill with *Particulars*. I am not for hindring thoſe who have clip'd Money, from any Recompence which can be provided and made them. The Queſtion here, is not whether the honeſt Countryman ſhall bear the Loſs of his clip'd Money without any more ado, or pay a Tax to recompence himſelf. That which I humbly conceive the Nation is moſt concerned in, is, that Clipping ſhould be finally ſtop'd, and that the Money which remains ſhould go according to its true Value, for the carrying on of Commerce, and the preſent Supply of Peoples Exigencies, till that Part of it which is defac'd, can by the Mint be brought to its legal and due Form. And therefore I think it will be the rational Deſire of all *Particulars*, that the ſhorteſt and ſureſt Way, not interfering with Law or Equity, ſhould be taken to put an effectual End to an Evil, which every Moment it continues works powerfully toward a general Ruin.

His fourth Propoſition is, *That no room muſt be left for Jealouſie*; I acknowledge to be a good one, if there can be a Way found to attain it.

I cannot but wonder to find theſe Words, *p.* 124. *That no Perſon whatſoever ſhall hereafter be oblig'd to accept in legal Payments any Money whatſoever, that is already clip'd or may hereafter be clip'd or diminiſh'd; and that no Perſon ſhall tender or receive any ſuch Money in Payment, under ſome ſmall Penalty to be made eaſily recoverable*, &c.

As if any Man now were obliged to receive clip'd Money in legal Payment, and there were not already a Law with ſevere Penalties againſt thoſe who tendered clip'd Money in Payment?

'Tis a Doubt to me, whether the Warden, Maſter-Worker, &c. of the Mint at the Tower, could find fit and skilful Perſons enough to ſet nine other Mints at Work in other Parts of *England* in a Quarter of a Year, as Mr. *Lowndes* propoſes, *p.* 127. Beſides, Mr. *Lowndes* tells us, *p.* 96. that the *Engines which put the Letters upon the Edges of the larger Silver Pieces, and mark the Edges of the reſt with a Graining, are* **wrought ſecretly**. And indeed this is ſo great a Guard againſt counterfeiting as well as clipping our Money, that it deſerves well to be kept a Secret, as it has been hitherto. But how that can be, if Money be to be coin'd in nine other Mints, ſet up in ſeveral Parts, is hard to conceive. And laſtly, perhaps ſome may apprehend it may be of ill Conſequence to have ſo many Men inſtructed and employ'd in the Art of Coining, only for a ſhort Job, and then turn'd looſe again to ſhift for themſelves by their own Skill and Induſtry, as they can.

The Proviſion made in his fourth Rule, *p.* 136. to prevent the Gain *of ſubtile Dealers* by *culling out the heavieſt of the clip'd Pieces*, tho' it be the Product of great Sagacity and Foreſight, exactly calculated, and as well contrived as in that Caſe it can be; yet I fear is too ſubtile for the Apprehenſion and Practice of Countrymen, who many of them, with their little Quickneſs in ſuch Matters, have alſo but ſmall Sums of Money by them, and ſo neither having Arithmetick, nor Choice of clip'd Money to adjuſt it to the Weight there required, will be hardly made to underſtand it. But I think the Clippers have, or will take Care that there will not be any great need of it.

To conclude, I confeſs my ſelf not to ſee the leaſt Reaſon why our preſent mill'd Money ſhould be at all altered in Fineneſs, Weight, or Value. I look upon it to be the beſt and ſafeſt from counterfeiting, adulterating, or any Ways being fraudulently diminiſhed, of any that ever was coin'd. It is adjuſted to our legal Payments, Reckonings and Accounts, to which our Money muſt be reduced: The raiſing its Denomination will neither add to its Worth, nor make the Stock

we

we have, more proportionate to our Occaſions, nor bring one Grain of Silver the more into *England*, or one Farthing Advantage to the Publick: It will only ſerve to defraud the King, and a great Number of his Subjects, and perplex all; and put the Kingdom to a needleſs Charge of Recoining all, both mill'd as well as clip'd Money.

If I might take upon me to offer any thing new, I would humbly propoſe, that ſince Market and retail Trade requires leſs Diviſions than *Sixpences*, a ſufficient Quantity of *Four-penny*, *Four penny half penny*, and *Five penny Pieces* ſhould be coined. Theſe in Change will anſwer all the Fractions between *Sixpence* and a *Farthing*, and thereby ſupply the Want of ſmall Monies, whereof I believe no body ever ſaw enough common to anſwer the Neceſſity of ſmall Payments; whether, either becauſe there was never a ſufficient Quantity of ſuch Pieces coin'd, or whether becauſe of their Smallneſs they are apter to be loſt out of any Hands, or becauſe they oftner falling into Childrens Hands, they loſe them, or lay them up; ſo it is, there is always a viſible Want of them, to ſupply which, without the Inconveniencies attending very ſmall Coin, the propoſed Pieces, I humbly conceive, will ſerve.

If it be thought fit for this End to have *Four pence*, *Four pence half penny*, *and Five penny Pieces*, coined, it will, I ſuppoſe, be convenient that they ſhould be diſtinguiſhed from *Sixpences*, and from one another, by a deep and very large plain Difference in the Stamp on both ſides, to prevent Miſtakes, and Loſs of Time in telling Money. The *Four pence half penny*, has already the Harp for a known Diſtinction, which may be fit to be continued: The *Five pence* may have the Feathers, and the *Four pence* this Mark IV. of four on the Reverſe, and on the other ſide they may each have the King's Head with a Crown on it, to ſhew on that ſide too, that the Piece ſo coined is one of thoſe under a Six pence; and with that they may each on that ſide alſo have ſome Marks of Diſtinction one from another, as the *Five pence* this Mark of V. the *Four pence half penny* a little Harp, and the *Four pence* nothing.

Theſe, or any other better Diſtinctions, which his Majeſty ſhall order, will in Tale readily diſcover them, if by chance any of them fall into larger Payments, for which they are not deſigned.

And thus I have, with as much Brevity and Clearneſs as I could, complied with what Mr. *Lowndes* profeſſes to be the *End* of Printing his *Report* in theſe Words, *viz. That any Perſons who have conſidered an Affair of this Nature, may (if they pleaſe) communicate their Thoughts for rendring the Deſign here aimed at, more perfect, or more agreeable to the publick Service.* It muſt be confeſſed that my Conſiderations have led me to Thoughts in ſome Parts of this Affair, quite oppoſite to Mr. *Lowndes's*: But how far this has been from any Deſire to oppoſe him, or to have a Diſpute with a Man, no otherwiſe known to me but by his Civilities, and whom I have a very great Eſteem for, will appear by what I printed about *Raiſing the Value of Money*, above three Years ſince. All that I have ſaid here in anſwer to him, being nothing but the applying the Principles, I then went on, particularly now to Mr. *Lowndes's* Arguments, as they came in my way; that ſo thereby others might judge what will, or will not be the Conſequences of ſuch a Change of our Coin, as he propoſes, the only Way, I think, of *rendring his Deſign more agreeable to the publick Services.*

One Shilling contained of fine Silver.

		Gr.
28	*Edw.* 1	264
18	*Edw.* 3	236
27	*Edw.* 3	213
9	*Hen.* 5	176
1	*Hen.* 6	142
4	*Hen.* 6	176
49	*Hen.* 6	142
1	*Hen.* 8	118
34	*Hen.* 8	100
36	*Hen.* 8	60
37	*Hen.* 8	40

The Fineneſs increaſed, but the Weight leſſen'd.

3	*Ed.* 6	40
5	*Ed.* 6	20
6	*Ed.* 6	88
2	*Eliz.*—	89
43	*Eliz.*—	86

i. e. 7$\frac{1}{3}$ *Gr. in a Penny.*

Wm. IIId.

1 l. Troy of Sterling Silver is coin'd in 62 *Shillings: the remedy over or under is* 2,$\frac{1}{2}$ *pwt. or* 6 *d.* $\frac{1}{4}$ *which is the* 124 *part ſere v. pl.* 8 *Aug.* 99.

Species.	*Weight.* oz.	pwt.	gr.		*Fineneſs.* Oz.	Pwt.	*Value.* Sh.	Pence.
Mexico Real	—	17	12	Juſt St^{d}.	—	—	4	4$\frac{2}{3}$
Duckatoon of Flanders	1	—	22	better	—	4$\frac{1}{2}$	5	4
Sevil Real	—	17	12		—	1	4	4$\frac{1}{3}$
Holland Dollar	—	18	5	worſe	—	10	4	4
Lyon Dollar	—	17	18$\frac{1}{2}$		2	3	3	4$\frac{2}{3}$
Rix Dollar of the Empire	—	18	15		—	7$\frac{1}{2}$	4	5$\frac{3}{4}$
Old Cardecu	—	6	3$\frac{1}{2}$		—	1	1	6$\frac{2}{3}$
French Lewis	—	17	11		—	$\frac{1}{2}$	4	4$\frac{1}{3}$
Double milrez of Portugal	—	14	4		—	1$\frac{1}{2}$	3	6$\frac{1}{4}$
Single milrez of Portugal	—	7	2		—	1	1	9
St. Mark of Venice	—	10	4		—	1$\frac{1}{2}$	2	6
Double Dutch Styver	—	1	—		4	6	—	1$\frac{1}{4}$
Croſs Dollar	—	18	—		—	12	4	2$\frac{1}{2}$
Zeeland Dollar	—	13	—		2	—	2	3
Old Philip Dollar	1	2	—		1	—	5	—
Ferdinando Dollar 1623	—	18	6		—	12$\frac{1}{2}$	4	3
Prince of Orange Dollar 1624	—	18	6		—	10$\frac{1}{2}$	4	3$\frac{1}{2}$
Leopoldus Dollar 1624	—	18	2		—	9$\frac{1}{2}$	4	3$\frac{1}{2}$
Rodolphus Dollar 1607	—	18	7		—	10	4	4
Maximilian Dollar 1616	—	18	2		—	4$\frac{1}{2}$	4	4$\frac{2}{3}$
Daniſh Dollar 1620	—	13	—		—	13	2	11$\frac{1}{2}$
Portugal Teſtoon	—	5	—		—	1	1	2$\frac{3}{4}$
The quarter of a new French Lewis	—	4	9		—	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	1

A Pound Weight of *Troy* of Standard Gold is cut into Guineas 44$\frac{1}{2}$. One Guinea weighs Gr. 129$\frac{3}{11}$, *i. e.* 5 p. w. 9 Gr. $\frac{3}{11}$.

TWO

Two
TREATISES
OF
GOVERNMENT.

In the Former,

The false PRINCIPLES and FOUNDATION of

Sir *Robert Filmer*, and his FOLLOWERS,

Are DETECTED and OVERTHROWN.

The Latter, is an

ESSAY

Concerning the

True ORIGINAL, EXTENT, and END of

CIVIL-GOVERNMENT.

TWO
TREATISES
OF
GOVERNMENT.

In the Former,

The False Principles and Foundation of

Sir Robert Filmer, and his Followers,

Are Detected and Overthrown.

The Latter is an

ESSAY

Concerning the

True Original, Extent, and End of

CIVIL-GOVERNMENT.

The PREFACE.

READER,

THOU haſt here the Beginning and End of a Diſcourſe concerning Government; what Fate has otherwiſe diſpoſed of the Papers that ſhould have filled up the Middle, and were more than all the reſt, 'tis not worth while to tell thee. Theſe, which remain I hope are ſufficient to eſtabliſh the Throne of our great Reſtorer, Our preſent King William; to make good his Title, in the Conſent of the People, which being the only one of all lawful Governments, he has more fully and clearly, than any Prince in Chriſtendom; and to juſtify to the World the People of England, whoſe Love of their juſt and natural Rights, with their Reſolution to preſerve them, ſaved the Nation when it was on the very Brink of Slavery and Ruin. If theſe Papers have that Evidence, I flatter my ſelf, is to be found in them, there will be no great miſs of thoſe which are loſt, and my Reader may be ſatisfied without them. For I imagine, I ſhall have neither the Time, nor Inclination to repeat my Pains, and fill up the wanting Part of my Anſwer, by tracing Sir Robert again, thro' all the Windings and Obſcurities, which are to be met with in the ſeveral Branches of his wonderful Syſtem. The King, and Body of the Nation, have ſince ſo throughly confuted his Hypotheſis, that, I ſuppoſe, no body hereafter will have either the Confidence to appear againſt our common Safety, and be again an Advocate for Slavery; or the Weakneſs to be deceived with Contradictions dreſſed up in a popular Stile, and well turned Periods. For if any one will be at the Pains, himſelf, in thoſe Parts, which are here untouched, to ſtrip Sir Robert's Diſcourſes of the Flouriſh of doubtful Expreſſions, and endeavour to reduce his Words to direct, poſitive, intelligible Propoſitions, and then compare them one with another, he will quickly be ſatisfied, there was never ſo much glib Nonſence put together in well ſounding Engliſh. If he think it not worth while to examine his Works all through, let him make an Experiment in that Part, where he treats of Uſurpation; and let him try, whether he can, with all his Skill, make Sir Robert intelligible, and conſiſtent with himſelf, or common Senſe. I ſhould not ſpeak ſo plainly of a Gentleman, long ſince paſt anſwering, had not the Pulpit, of late Years, publickly owned his Doctrine, and made it the current Divinity of the Times. 'Tis neceſſary thoſe Men, who taking on them to be Teachers, have ſo dangerouſly miſled others, ſhould be openly ſhewed of what Authority this their Patriarch is, whom they have ſo blindly followed, that ſo they either retract, what upon ſo ill Grounds they have vented, and cannot be maintain'd; or elſe juſtify thoſe Principles which they preach'd up for Goſpel, tho' they had no better an Author than an Engliſh Courtier. For I ſhould not have writ againſt Sir Robert, or taken the Pains to ſhew his Miſtakes, Inconſiſtencies, and want of (what he ſo much boaſts of, and pretends wholly to build on) Scripture-proofs, were there not Men amongſt us, who, by crying up his Books, and eſpouſing his Doctrine, ſave me from the Reproach of writing againſt a dead Adverſary. They have been ſo zealous in this Point, that, if I have done him any wrong, I cannot hope they ſhould ſpare me. I wiſh, where they have done the Truth, and the Publick wrong, to redreſs it: And allow its juſt Weight to this Reflection, that there cannot be done a greater Miſchief to Prince and People, than the propagating wrong Notions concerning Government, that ſo at laſt all Times might not have Reaſon to complain of the Drum Eccleſiaſtick. If any one, concerned really for Truth, undertake the Confutation of my Hypotheſis, I promiſe him either to recant my Miſtake, upon fair Conviction; or to anſwer his Difficulties. But he muſt remember two Things.

Firſt, That cavilling here and there, at ſome Expreſſion, or little Incident of my Diſcourſe, is an Anſwer to my Book.

Secondly, That I ſhall not take Railing for Arguments, nor think either of theſe worth my Notice, Though I ſhall always look on my ſelf as bound to give Satisfaction to any one, who ſhall appear to be conſciencioufly ſcrupulous in the Point, and ſhall ſhew any juſt Grounds for his Scruples.

I have nothing more, but to advertiſe the Reader, that

A ſtands for our Author.

O for his Obſervations on *Hobbs*, *Milton*, &c.

And that a bare Quotation of Pages always means Pages of his *Patriarcha*. *Edit.* 1680.

OF

GOVERNMENT.

BOOK I.

CHAP. I.

§. 1. SLAVERY is so vile and miserable an Estate of Man, and so directly opposite to the generous Temper and Courage of our Nation; that 'tis hardly to be conceived, that an *Englishman*, much less a *Gentleman*, should plead for't. And truly I should have taken Sir *Robert Filmer's Patriarcha*, as any other Treatise, which would persuade all Men, that they are Slaves, and ought to be so, for such another Exercise of Wit, as was his, who writ the Encomium of *Nero*; rather than for a serious Discourse meant in earnest, had not the Gravity of the Title and Epistle, the Picture in the Front of the Book, and the Applause that followed it, required me to believe, that the Author and Publisher were both in earnest. I therefore took it into my Hands with all the Expectation, and read it thro' with all the Attention due to a Treatise that made such a Noise at its coming abroad, and cannot but confess my self mightily surprised, that in a Book, which was to provide Chains for all Mankind, I should find nothing but a Rope of Sand, useful perhaps to such, whose Skill and Business it is to raise a Dust, and would blind the People, the better to mislead them; but in Truth not of any Force to draw those into Bondage, who have their Eyes open, and so much Sense about them, as to consider, that Chains are but an ill wearing, how much Care soever hath been taken to file and polish them.

§. 2. If any one think I take too much Liberty in speaking so freely of a Man, who is the great Champion o fAbsolute Power, and the Idol of those who worship it; I beseech him to take this small Allowance for once, to one, who, even after the Reading of Sir *Robert*'s Book, cannot but think himself, as the Laws allow him, a Freeman: And I know no Fault it is to do so, unless any one better skill'd in the Fate of it, than I, should have it revealed to him, that this Treatise, which has lain dormant so long, was, when it appeared in the World, to carry, by Strength of its Arguments, all Liberty out of it; and that from thenceforth our Author's short Model was to be the Pattern in the Mount, and the perfect Standard of Politicks for the future. His System lies in a little compass, 'tis no more but this,

That all Government is absolute Monarchy.

And the Ground he builds on, is this,

That no Man is born free.

§. 3. In this last Age a Generation of Men has sprung up amongst us, that would flatter Princes with an Opinion, that they have a Divine Right to absolute Power, let the Laws by which they are constituted, and are to govern, and the Conditions under which they enter upon their Authority, be what they will, and their Engagements to observe them never so well ratified by solemn Oaths

and

miſes. To make way for this Doctrine, they have denied Mankind a Right to natural Freedom; whereby they have not only, as much as in them lies, expoſed all Subjects to the utmoſt Miſery of Tyranny and Oppreſſion, but have alſo unſettled the Titles, and ſhaken the Thrones of Princes: (For they too, by theſe Mens Syſtem, except only one, are all born Slaves, and by Divine Right, are Subjects to *Adam*'s right Heir;) as if they had deſign'd to make War upon all Government, and ſubvert the very Foundations of Human Society, to ſerve their preſent Turn.

4. However we muſt believe them upon their own bare Words, when they tell us, We are all born Slaves, and muſt continue ſo, there is no Remedy for it; Life and Thraldom we enter'd into together, and can never be quit of the one, till we part with the other. Scripture or Reaſon, I am ſure, do not any where ſay ſo, notwithſtanding the noiſe of Divine Right, as if Divine Authority hath ſubjected us to the unlimited Will of another. An admirable State of Mankind, and that which they have not had Wit enough to find out till this latter Age. For however Sir *Robert Filmer* ſeems to condemn the Novelty of the contrary Opinion, *Patr. p.* 3. yet I believe it will be hard for him to find any other Age or Country of the World, but this, which has aſſerted Monarchy to be *Jure Divino*. And he confeſſes, *Patr. p.* 4. That *Heyward, Blackwood, Barclay, and others, that have bravely vindicated the Right of Kings in moſt Points*, never thought of this, *but with one Conſent admitted the Natural Liberty and Equality of Mankind*

5. By whom this Doctrine came at firſt to be broach'd, and brought in faſhion amongſt us, and what ſad Effects it gave riſe to, I leave to *Hiſtorians* to relate, or to the Memory of thoſe who were Contemporaries with *Sibthorp* and *Manwaring* to recollect. My Buſineſs at preſent is only to conſider what Sir *R. F.* who is allowed to have carried this Argument fartheſt, and is ſuppoſed to have brought it to Perfection, has ſaid in it; for from him every one, who would be as faſhionable as *French* was at Court, has learned, and runs away with this ſhort Syſtem of Politicks, *viz. Men are not born free, and therefore could never have the Liberty to chuſe either Governours, or Forms of Government.* Princes have their Power abſolute, and by Divine Right; for Slaves could never have a Right to compact or conſent. *Adam* was a abſolute Monarch, and ſo are all Princes ever ſince.

CHAP. II.

Of Paternal and Regal Power.

6. SIR *R. F*'s. great Poſition is, that *Men are not naturally Free* This is the Foundation on which his abſolute Monarchy ſtands, and from which it erects it ſelf to an hight, that its Power is above every Power, *Caput inter nubila*, ſo high above all earthly and human Things, that Thought can ſcarce reach it; that Promiſes and Oaths, which tie the infinite Deity, cannot confine it. But if this Fouudation fails all his Fabric falls with it, Goverments muſt be left again to the old way of being made by Contrivance, and the Conſent of Men (Ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις) making uſe of their Reaſon to unite together into Society. To prove this grand Poſition of his, he tells us, *p.* 12. *Men are born in Subjection to their Parents*, and therefore cannot be free. And this Authority of Parents, he calls *Royal Authority*, p. 12, 14. *Fatherly Authority, Right of Fatherhood, p.* 12, 20. One would have thought he would, in the beginning of ſuch a Work as this, on which was to depend the Authority of Princes, and the Obedience of Subjects, have told us expreſly, what that fatherly Authority is, have defin'd it, though not limited it, becauſe in ſome other Treatiſes of his he tells us, 'tis unlimited, and * unlimitable; he ſhould at leaſt have given us ſuch an Account of it, that we might have had an entire Notion of this *Fatherhood*, or *Fatherly Authority*, whenever it came in our way in his Writings: This I expected to have found in the firſt Chapter of his *Patriarcha*. But inſtead thereof, having, 1. *En paſ-*

* *In Grants and Gifts that have their Original from God or Nature, as the Power of the Father hath, no inferior Power of Man can limit, nor make any Law of Preſcription againſt them.* O. 158. *The Scripture teaches, that Supreme Power was originally the Father, without any Limitation,* O. 245.

ſant,

ſaint, Made his Obeiſance to the *Arcana Imperii*, p. 5. 2. Made his Compliment to the *Rights and Liberties of this, or any other Nation*, p. 6. which he is going preſently to null and deſtroy; And, 3. Made his Leg to thoſe learned Men, who did not ſee ſo far into the Matter as himſelf, *p.* 7. He comes to fall on *Bellarmine*, p. 8. and, by a Victory over him, eſtabliſhes his *Fatherly Authority* beyond any Queſtion. *Bellarmine* being routed by his own Confeſſion, *p.* 11. the Day is clear got, and there is no more need of any Forces: For having done that, I obſerve not that he ſtates the Quſtion, or rallies up any Arguments to make good his Opinion, but rather tells us the Story, as he thinks fit, of this ſtrange kind of domineering Phantom, called the *Fatherhood*, which whoever could catch, preſently got Empire, and unlimited abſolute Power. He aſſures us how this *Fatherhood* began in *Adam*, continued its Courſe, and kept the World in order all the time of the *Patriarchs* till the Flood, got out of the Ark with *Noah* and his Sons, made and ſupported all the Kings of the Earth till the Captivity of the *Iſraelites* in *Egypt*, and then the poor *Fatherhood* was under Hatches, till *God by giving the* Iſraelites *Kings, re-eſtabliſhed the ancient and prime Right of the lineal Succeſſion in Paternal Government*. This is his Buſineſs from *p.* 12, to 19. And then obviating an Objection, and clearing a Difficulty or two with one half Reaſon, *p.* 23. *to confirm the Natural Right of Regal Power*, he ends the firſt Chapter: I hope 'tis no Injury to call an half Quotation an half Reaſon; for God ſays, *Honour thy Father and Mother*; but our Author contents himſelf with half, leaves out *thy Mother* quite, as little ſerviceable to his Purpoſe. But of that more in another Place.

7. I do not think our Author ſo little skill'd in the Way of writing Diſcourſes of this Nature, nor ſo careleſs of the Point in Hand, that he by Overſight commits the Fault, that he himſelf, in his *Anarchy of a mix'd Monarchy*, p. 239. objects to Mr. *Hunton* in theſe Words: *Where firſt I charge the A. that he hath not given us any Definition, or Deſcription of Monarchy in general; for by the Rules of Method, he ſhould have firſt defin'd.* And by the like Rule of Method Sir *Robert* ſhould have told us, what his *Fatherhood* or *Fatherly Authority* is, before he had told us, in whom it was to be found, and talked ſo much of it. But perhaps Sir *Robert* found, that this *Fatherly Authority*, this Power of Fathers, and of Kings, for he makes them both the ſame, *p.* 24. would make a very odd and frightful Figure, and very diſagreeing, with what either Children imagine of their Parents, or Subjects of their Kings, if he ſhould have given us the whole Draught together in that gigantic Form, he had painted it in his own Phancy; and therefore, like a wary Phyſician, when he would have his Patient ſwallow ſome harſh or *corroſive Liquor*, he mingles it with a large Quantity of that which may dilute it; that the ſcatter'd Parts may go down with leſs Feeling, and cauſe leſs Averſion.

8. Let us then endeavour to find what Account he gives us of this *Fatherly Authority*, as it lies ſcatter'd in the ſeveral Parts of his Writings. And firſt, as it was veſted in *Adam*, he ſays, *Not only* Adam, *but the ſucceeding Patriarchs, had by Right of Fatherhood Royal Authority over their Children*, p. 12. *This Lordſhip which* Adam *by Command had over the whole World, and by Right deſcending from him the Patriarchs did enjoy, was as large and ample as the abſolute Dominion of any Monarch, which hath been ſince the Creation*, p. 13. *Dominion of Life and Death, making War, and concluding Peace*, p. 13. Adam *and the Patriarchs had abſolute Power of Life and Death*, p. 35. *Kings, in the Right of Parents, ſucceed to the Exerciſe of ſupreme Juriſdiction*, p. 19. *As Kingly Power is by the Law of God, ſo it hath no inferior Law to limit it*, Adam *was Lord of all*, p. 40. *The Father of a Family governs by no other Law, than by his own Will*, p. 78. *The Superiority of Princes is above Laws*, p. 79. *The unlimited Juriſdiction of Kings is ſo amply deſcrib'd by* Samuel, p. 80. *Kings are above the Laws*, p. 93. And to this Purpoſe ſee a great deal more which our A. delivers in *Bodin's* Words: *It is certain, that all Laws, Privileges, and Grants of Princes, have no Force, but during their Life; if they be not ratified by the expreſs Conſent, or by Sufferance of the Prince following, eſpecially Privileges*, O. p. 279. *The Reaſon why Laws have been alſo made by Kings, was this; When Kings were either buſied with Wars, or diſtracted with publick Cares, ſo that every private Man could not have Acceſs to their Perſons, to learn their Wills and Pleaſure, then were Laws of Neceſſity invented, that ſo every particular Subject might find his principal Pleaſure decipher'd unto him in the Tables of his Law*, p. 92. *In a Monarchy, the King muſt by Neceſſity be above the Laws*, p. 160. *A perfect Kingdom is that, wherein the King rules all Things according to his own*

Will,

Will, p. 100. *Neither Common nor Statute Laws are, or can be, any Diminution of that general Power, which Kings have over their People by Right of Fatherhood*, p. 115. Adam *was the Father, King, and Lord over his Family; a Son, a Subject, and a Servant or Slave, were one and the ſame thing at firſt. The Father had Power to diſpoſe or ſell his Children or Servants; whence we find, that the firſt reckoning up of Goods in Scripture, the Man-Servant and the Maid-Servant, are numbred among the Poſſeſſions and Subſtance of the Owner, as other Goods were*, O. Pref. *God alſo hath given to the Father a Right or Liberty, to alien his Power over his Children to any other; whence we find the Sale and Gift of Children to have much been in uſe in the Beginning of the World, when Men had their Servants for a Poſſeſſion and an Inheritance, as well as other Goods; whereupon we find the Power of Caſtrating and making Eunuchs much in uſe in old times*, O. p. 155. *Law is nothing elſe but the Will of him that hath the Power of the Supream Father*, O. p. 223. *It was God's Ordinance that the Supremacy ſhould be unlimited in* Adam, *and as large as all the Acts of his Will; and as in him ſo in all others that have Supream Power*, O. p. 245.

9. I have been fain to trouble my Reader with theſe ſeveral Quotations in our A.'s own Words, that in them might be ſeen his own Deſcription of his *Fatherly Authority*, as it lies ſcatter'd up and down in his Writings, which he ſuppoſes was firſt veſted in *Adam*, and by Right belongs to all Princes ever ſince. This *Fatherly Authority* then, or *Right of Fatherhood*, in our A.'s Senſe, is a Divine unalterable Right of Sovereignty, whereby a Father or a Prince hath an abſolute, arbitrary, unlimited, and unlimitable Power, over the Lives, Liberties, and Eſtates of his Children and Subjects; ſo that he may take or alienate their Eſtates, ſell, caſtrate, or uſe their Perſons as he pleaſes, they being all his Slaves, and he Lord or Proprietor of every thing, and his unbounded Will their Law.

10. Our A. having placed ſuch a mighty Power in *Adam*, and upon that Suppoſition, founded all Government, and all Power of Princes, it is reaſonable to expect, that he ſhould have proved this with Arguments clear and evident, ſuitable to the Weightineſs of the Cauſe. That ſince Men had nothing elſe left them, they might in Slavery have ſuch undeniable Proofs of its Neceſſity, that their Conſciences might be convinced, and oblige them to ſubmit peaceably to that abſolute Dominion, which their Governors had a Right to exerciſe over them. Without this, what Good could our A. do, or pretend to do, by erecting ſuch an unlimited Power, but flatter the natural Vanity and Ambition of Men, too apt of itſelf to grow and encreaſe with the Poſſeſſion of any Power? And by perſuading thoſe, who, by the Conſent of their Fellow-Men, are advanced to great, but limited, Degrees of it, that by that Part which is given them, they have a Right to all, that was not ſo; and therefore may do what they pleaſe, becauſe they have Authority to do more than others, and ſo tempt them to do, what is neither for their own, nor the Good of thoſe under their Care; whereby great Miſchiefs cannot but follow.

11. The Sovereignty of *Adam*, being that on which, as a ſure Baſis, our A. builds his mighty abſolute Monarchy, I expected, that, in his *Patriarcha*, this his main Suppoſition would have been proved, and eſtabliſhed with all that Evidence of Arguments, that ſuch a fundamental Tenet required; and that this, on which the great Streſs of the Buſineſs depends, would have been made out with Reaſons ſufficient to juſtify the Confidence with which it was aſſumed. But in all that Treatiſe, I could find very little tending that way: The thing is there ſo taken for granted, without Proof, that I could ſcarce believe my ſelf, when upon attentive reading that Treatiſe, I found there ſo mighey a Structure rais'd, upon the bare Suppoſition of this Foundation. For it is ſcarce credible, that in a Diſcourſe, where he pretends to confute the *Erroneous Principle* of Man's *Natural Freedom*, he ſhould do it by a bare Suppoſition of *Adam*'s *Authority*, without offering any Proof for that Authority. Indeed he confidently ſays, that *Adam* had *Royal Authority*, p. 12, and 13. *Abſolute Lordſhip and Dominion of Life and Death*, p. 13. *An Univerſal Monarchy*, p. 33. *Abſolute Power of Life and Death*, p. 35. He is very frequent in ſuch Aſſertions, but, what is ſtrange, in all his whole *Patriarcha* I find not one Pretence of a Reaſon to eſtabliſh this his great Foundation of Government; not any thing that looks like an Argument, but theſe

Words: *To confirm this Natural Right of Regal Power, we find in the Decalogue, that the Law which enjoins Obedience to Kings, is delivered in the Terms, Honour thy Father, as if all Power were originally in the Father.* And why may I not add as well, That in the *Decalogue*, the Law that enjoins Obedience to Queens, is delivered in the Terms of *Honour thy Mother*, as if all Power were originally in the Mother? The Argument, as Sir *Robert* puts it, will hold as well for one as t'other: But of this, more in its due Place.

12. All that I take notice of here, is, that this is all our A. says in this firſt, or any of the following Chapters, to prove the *Abſolute Power of* Adam, which is his great Principle: And yet, as if he had there ſettled it upon ſure Demonſtration, he begins his ſecond Chapter with theſe Words, *By conferring theſe Proofs and Reaſons, drawn from the Authority of the Scripture.* Where thoſe *Proofs* and *Reaſons* for *Adam*'s Sovereignty are, bating that of *Honour thy Father*, above-mentioned I confeſs, I cannot find; unleſs what he ſays, *p.* 11. *In theſe Words we have an evident Confeſſion.* viz. *of* Bellarmine, *that Creation made Man Prince of his Poſterity*, muſt be taken for Proofs and Reaſons drawn from Scripture, or for any ſort of Proof at all: tho' from thence by a new way of Inference, in the Words immediately following, he concludes, *the Royal Authority of* Adam, ſufficiently ſettled in him.

13. If he has in that Chapter, or any where in the whole Treatiſe, given any other Proofs of *Adam*'s *Royal Authority*, other than by often repeating it, which, among ſome Men, goes for Argument, I deſire any body for him to ſhew me the Place and Page, that I may be convinced of my Miſtake, and acknowledge my Overſight. If no ſuch Arguments are to be found, I beſeech thoſe Men, who have ſo much cried up this Book, to conſider, whether they do not give the World cauſe to ſuſpect, that it's not the Force of Reaſon and Argument, that makes them for Abſolute Monarchy, but ſome other By-Intereſt, and therefore are reſolved to applaud any Author, that writes in Favour of this Doctrine, whether he ſupport it with Reaſon or no. But I hope they do not expect, that rational and indifferent Men ſhould be brought over to their Opinion, becauſe this their great Dr. of it, in a Diſcourſe made on purpoſe, to ſet up the *Abſolute Monarchical Power of* Adam, in Oppoſition to the *Natural Freedom* of Mankind, has ſaid ſo little to prove it, from whence it is rather naturally to be concluded, that there is little to be ſaid.

14. But, that I might omit no Care to inform myſelf in our A.'s full Senſe, I conſulted his *Obſervations on Ariſtotle, Hobs*, &c. To ſee whether in Diſputing with others he made uſe of any Arguments, for this his darling Tenet of *Adam's Sovereignty*; ſince in his Treatiſe of the *Natural Power of Kings*, he hath been ſo ſparing of them. In his Obſervations on Mr. *Hob*'s *Leviathan*, I think he has put, in ſhort, all thoſe Arguments for it together, which in his Writings I find him any where to make uſe of; his Words are theſe, *If God created only* Adam, *and of a Piece of him made the Woman, and if by Generation from them Two, as Parts of them all Mankind be propagated: If alſo God gave to* Adam *not only the Dominion over the Woman and the Children that ſhould iſſue from them, but alſo over the whole Earth to ſubdue it, and over all the Creatures on it, ſo that as long as* Adam *lived, no Man could claim or enjoy any thing but by Donation, Aſſignation or Permiſſion from him, I wonder*, &c. *O.* 165. Here we have the Sum of all his Arguments, for *Adam*'s *Sovereignty*, and againſt *Natural Freedom*, which I find up and down in his other Treatiſes: And they are theſe following; *God's Creation of* Adam, the *Dominion* he gave him *over Eve:* And the *Dominon* he had as *Father over his Children*, all which I ſhall particularly conſider.

CHAP. III.

Of Adam's *Title to Sovereignty by Creation.*

15 SIR *Robert* in his Preface to his Obſervations on *Ariſtotle*'s Politics, tells us, *A Natural Freedom of Mankind cannot be ſuppoſed without the Denial of the Creation of* Adam: But how *Adam*'s being created, which was nothing but his receiving a Being immediately from Omnipotency and the Hand of God, gave *Adam* a

Sovereignty

Sovereignty over any thing, I cannot ſee, nor conſequently underſtand, how a *Suppoſition of Natural Freedom is a Denial of* Adam's *Creation*, and would be glad any body elſe (ſince our A. did not vouchſafe us the Favour) would make it out for him. For I find no Difficulty to ſuppoſe the *Freedom of Mankind*, tho' I have always believed the *Creation of* Adam. He was Created, or began to exiſt, by God's immediate Power, without the Intervention of Parents, or the Pre-exiſtence of any of the ſame Species to beget him, when it pleaſed God he ſhould; and ſo did the Lyon, the King of Beaſts, before him, by the ſame Creating Power of God: And if bare Exiſtence by that Power, and in that way, will give Dominion, without any more ado, our A. by this Argument, will make the Lyon have as good a Title to it, as he, and certainly the Antienter. No! for *Adam* had his Title *by the Appointment of God*, ſays our A. in another Place. Then bare *Creation* gave him not Dominion, and one might have *ſuppoſed Mankind Free* without *the Denying the Creation of* Adam, ſince 'twas God's *Appointment* made him Monarch.

16. But let us ſee, how he puts his *Creation* and this *Appointment* together. *By the Appointment of God*, ſays Sir *Robert*, *as ſoon as* Adam *was created, he was Monarch of the World, tho' he had no Subjects; for tho' there could not be actual Government till there were Subjects, yet by the Right of Nature it was due to* Adam *to be Governor of his Poſterity, tho' not in Act, yet at leaſt in Habit,* Adam *was a King from his Creation.* I wiſh he had told us here, what he meant *by God's Appointment.* For whatſoever Providence orders, or the Law of Nature directs, or poſitive Revelation declares, may be ſaid to be *by God's Appointment:* But I ſuppoſe it cannot be meant here in the firſt Senſe, *i. e.* by Providence; becauſe that would be to ſay no more, but that *as ſoon as* Adam *was Created* he was *de facto* Monarch, becauſe *by Right of Nature it was due to* Adam, *to be Governor of his Poſterity.* But he could not *de facto* be by Providence conſtituted the Governor of the World, at a Time, when there was actually no Government, no Subjects to be governed, which our A. here confeſſes. *Monarch of the World* is alſo differently uſed by our Author, for ſometimes he means by it a Proprietor of all the World excluſive of the reſt of Mankind, and thus he does in the ſame Page of his Preface before cited, *Adam*, ſays he, *being commanded to Multiply and People the Earth and to ſubdue it, and having Dominion given him over all Creatures, was thereby the Monarch of the whole World, none of his Poſterity had any Right to poſſeſs any thing but by his Grant or Permiſſion, or by Succeſſion from him.* 2. Let us underſtand then by *Monarch* Proprietor *of the World*, and by *Appointment* God's actual Donation, and revealed poſitive Grant made to *Adam*, 1 Gen. 28. as we ſee Sir *Robert* himſelf does in this parallel Place, and then his Argument will ſtand thus, *by the poſitive Grant of God: As ſoon as* Adam *was created, he was Proprietor of the World, becauſe by the Right of Nature it was due to* Adam *to be Governor of his Poſterity.* In which way of arguing there are two manifeſt Falſhoods. *Firſt*, It is falſe, that God made that Grant to *Adam*, as ſoon as he was Created, ſince tho' it ſtands in the Text immediately after his Creation, yet it is plain it could not be ſpoken to *Adam*, till after *Eve* was made and brought to him, and how then could he be *Monarch by Appointment as ſoon as created*, eſpecially ſince he calls, if I miſtake not, that which God ſays to *Eve*, 3 Gen. 16. *The original Grant of Government*, which not being till after the Fall, when *Adam* was ſomewhat, at leaſt in time and very much, diſtant in Condition from his *Creation*, I cannot ſee, how our A. can ſay in this Senſe, that *by God's Appointment, as ſoon as* Adam *was created he was Monarch of the World. Secondly*, were it true that God's actual Donation *appointed* Adam *Monarch of the World as ſoon as he was created*, yet the Reaſon here given for it would not prove it, but it would always be a falſe Inference, that God, by a poſitive Donation *appointed* Adam *Monarch of the World, becauſe by Right of Nature it was due to* Adam *to be Governor of his Poſterity:* For having given him the Right of Government by Nature, there was no need of a poſitive Donation; at leaſt it will never be a Proof of ſuch a Donation.

17. On the other ſide the Matter will not be much mended, if we underſtand *by God's Appointment* the Law of Nature, (tho' it be a pretty harſh Expreſſion for it in this Place) and *by Monarch of the World*, Sovereign Ruler of Mankind: For then the Sentence under Conſideration muſt run thus: *By the Law of Nature, as ſoon as* Adam *was created he was Governor of Mankind, for by Right of Nature it was due*

due to Adam *to be Governor of his Poſterity*, which amounts to this, He was *Governor by Right of Nature*, becauſe he was *Governor by Right of Nature*: But ſuppoſing we ſhould grant, that a Man is *by Nature Governor* of his Children, *Adam* could not hereby *be Monarch as ſoon as Created*: For this Right of Nature being founded in his being their Father, how *Adam* could have a *Natural Right* to be *Governor*, before he was a Father, when by being a Father only he had that *Right*, is, methinks, hard to conceive, unleſs he would have him to be a Father before he was a Father, and to have a Title before he had it.

18. To this foreſeen Objection, our A. anſwers very Logically, *He was Governor in Habit, and not in Act*: A very pretty way of being a Governor without Government, a Father without Children, and a King without Subjects. And thus Sir *Robert* was an Author before he writ his Book, not *in Act* 'tis true, but in *Habit*, for when he had once Publiſh'd it, it was due to him *by the Right of Nature*, to be an Author, as much as it was *to* Adam *to be Governor of his Children*, when he had begot them: And if to be ſuch a *Monarch of the World*, an abſolute Monarch *in Habit, but not in Act*, will ſerve the turn, I ſhould not much envy it to any of Sir *Robert*'s Friends, that he thought fit graciouſly to beſtow it upon, tho' even this of *Act* and *Habit*, if it ſignified any thing but our A.'s Skill in Diſtinctions, be not to his Purpoſe in this Place. For the Queſtion is not here about *Adam*'s actual Exerciſe of Government, but actually having a Title be Governor: Government, ſays our A. was *due to* Adam *by the Right of Nature*: What is this Right of Nature? A Right Fathers have over their Children by begetting them; *Generatione jus acquiritur parentibus in liberos*, ſays our A. out of *Grotius*, O. 223. The Right then follows the Begetting as ariſing from it, ſo that according to this way of Reaſoning or Diſtinguiſhing of our A. *Adam*, as ſoon as he was created, had a Title *only in Habit, and not in Act*, which in plain *Engliſh* is, He had actually no Title at all.

19. To ſpeak leſs Learnedly, and more Intelligibly, one may ſay of *Adam*, he was in a Poſſibility of being *Governor*, ſince it was poſſible he might beget Children, and thereby accquire that Right of Nature, be it what it will, to govern them, that accrues from thence: But what Connection has this with *Adam*'s *Creation*, to make him ſay, that *as ſoon as he was Created, he was Monarch of the World?* For it may be as well ſaid of *Noah*, that as ſoon as he was born, he was Monarch of the World, ſince he was in Poſſibility (which in our A.'s Senſe is enough to make a Monarch, *a Monarch in Habit,*) to out-live all Mankind, but his own Poſterity. What ſuch neceſſary Connection there is betwixt *Adam*'s *Creation*, and his *Right to Government*; ſo that a *Natural Freedom of Mankind cannot be ſuppoſed without the Denial of the Creation of* Adam, I confeſs for my part I do not ſee; nor how thoſe Words, *by the Appointment*, &c. *O.* 254. however explained, can be put together, to make any tolerable Senſe, at leaſt to eſtabliſh this Poſition, with which they end, *viz.* Adam *was a King from his Creation*; a King, ſays our A. *not in Act, but in Habit*, i. e. actually no King at all.

20. I fear I have tired my Reader's Patience, by dwelling longer on this Paſſage, than the Weightineſs of any Argument in it, ſeems to require: But I have unavoidably been engaged in it by our A.'s way of Writing, who, hudling ſeveral Suppoſitions together, and that in doubtful and general Terms, makes ſuch a Medly and Confuſſion, that it is impoſſible to ſhew his Miſtakes, without examining the ſeveral Senſes, wherein his Words may be taken, and without ſeeing how, in any of theſe various Meanings, they will conſiſt together, and have any Truth in them: For in this preſent Paſſage before us, how can any one argue againſt this Poſition of his, that Adam *was a King from his Creation*, unleſs one examine, whether the Words, *from his Creation*, be to be taken, as they may, for the time of the Commencement of his Government, as the foregoing Words import, *as ſoon as he was created he was Monarch*; or, for the Cauſe of it, as he ſays, *p.* 11. *Creation made Man Prince of his Poſterity*: How farther can one judge of the truth of his being thus King, till one has examined, whether King be to be taken, as the Words in the Beginning of this Paſſage would perſuade, on Suppoſition of his *private Dominion*, which was by God's poſitive Grant, *Monarch of the World by Appointment*; or *King* on Suppoſition of his *Fatherly Power* over his Off-ſpring, which was by Nature, *due by the Right of Nature*, whether, I ſay, King be to be taken in both, or one only of theſe two Senſes, or in neither of them, but only this, that Creation

made

made him Prince, in a way different from both the other? For tho' this Aſſertion, that Adam *was King from his Creation*, be true in no Senſe, yet it ſtands here as an evident Concluſion drawn from the preceding Words, tho' in truth it be but a bare Aſſertion join'd to other Aſſertions of the ſame kind, which confidently put together in Words of undetermined and dubious Meaning, look like a ſort of arguing, when there is indeed neither Proof nor Connection: A Way very famailiar with our A. of which having given the Reader a Taſte here, I ſhall, as much as the Argument will permit me, avoid touching on hereafter; and ſhould not have done it here, were it not to let the World ſee, how Incoherences, in Matter, and Suppoſitions without Proofs put handſomely together in good Words and a plauſible Stile, are apt to paſs for ſtrong Reaſon and good Senſe, till they come to be look'd into with Attention.

CHAP. IV.

Of Adam's *Title to Sovereignty by Donation*, Gen. 1. 28.

21. HAVING at laſt got thro' the foregoing Paſſage, where we have been ſo long detain'd, not by the Force of Arguments and Oppoſition, but the Intricacy of the Words, and the Doubtfulneſs of the Meaning; Let us go on to his next Argument, for *Adam*'s Sovereignty. Our A. tells us in the Words of Mr. *Selden*, that Adam *by Donation from God*, Gen. 1. 28. *was made the general Lord of all Things, not without ſuch a private Dominion to himſelf, as without his Grant did exclude his Children. This Determination of Mr.* Selden, ſays our A. *is conſonant to the Hiſtory of the* Bible, *and natural Reaſon*, O. 210. And his Pref. to his Obſ. on *Ariſt.* he ſays thus, *The firſt Government in the World was Monarchical in the Father of all Fleſh*, Adam *being commanded to multiply and people the Earth, and to ſubdue it, and having Dominion given him over all Creatures, was thereby the Monarch of the whole World, none of his Poſterity had any Right to poſſeſs any thing, but by his Grant or Permiſſion, or by Succeſſion from him: The Earth, ſaith the* Pſalmiſt, *hath he given to the Children of Men, which ſhew the Title comes from Fatherhood.*

22. Before I examine this Argument, and the Text on which it is founded, it is neceſſary to deſire the Reader to obſerve, that our A. according to his uſual Method, begins in one Senſe, and concludes in another; he begins here with *Adam*'s Propriety, or *private Dominion, by Donation*; and his Concluſion is, *which ſhew the Title comes from Fatherhood.*

23. But let us ſee the Argument. The Words of the Text are theſe; *And God bleſſed them, and God ſaid unto them, be Fruitful and Multiply and Repleniſh the Earth and ſubdue it, and have Dominion over the Fiſh of the Sea, and over the Fowl of the Air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the Earth*, 1 Gen. 28. from whence our A. concludes, *that* Adam, *having here Dominion given him over all Creatures, was thereby the Monarch of the whole World:* Whereby muſt be meant, that either this Grant of God gave *Adam* Property, or as our A. calls it, *private Dominion* over the Earth, and all inferior or irrational Creatures, and ſo conſequently that he was thereby *Monarch*; or 2°, that it gave him Rule and Dominion over all Earthly Creatures whatſoever, and thereby over his Children, and ſo he was *Monarch*; for, as Mr. *Selden* has properly worded it, Adam *was made General Lord of all things*, one may very clearly underſtand him, that he means nothing to be granted to *Adam* here but Property, and therefore he ſays not one Word of *Adam's Monarchy*. But our A. ſays, Adam *was hereby Monarch of the World*, which properly ſpeaking, ſignifies Sovereign Ruler of all the Men in the World; and ſo *Adam*, by this Grant, muſt be conſtituted ſuch a Ruler. If our A. means otherwiſe, he might, with much Clearneſs have ſaid, that *Adam was hereby Proprietor of the whole World.* But he begs your Pardon in that Point, clear diſtinct Speaking not ſerving every where to his Purpoſe, you muſt not expect it in him, as in Mr. *Selden*, or other ſuch Writers.

24. In Oppoſition therefore to our A.'s Doctrine, that Adam *was Monarch of the whole World*, founded on this Place, I ſhall ſhew.

1. That

1. That by this Grant, 1 *Gen.* 28. God gave no immediate Power to *Adam* over Men, over his Children, over thoſe of his own Species; and ſo he was not made Ruler, or *Monarch* by this Charter.

2. That by this Grant God gave him not *Private Dominion* over the inferior Creatures, but Right in common with all Mankind, ſo neither was he *Monarch*, upon the account of the Property here given him.

25. 1. That this Donation, 1 *Gen.* 28. gave *Adam* no Power over Men, will appear, if we conſider the Words of it. For ſince all poſitive Grants convey no more, than the expreſs Words, they are made in, will carry, let us ſee which of them here will comprehend Mankind, or *Adam*'s Poſterity; and thoſe, I imagin, if any, muſt be theſe, *every living thing that moveth*, the Words in *Hebrew* are, חיה הרמשת *i. e. Beſtiam Reptantem*, of which Words the Scripture it ſelf is the beſt Interpreter: God having created the Fiſhes and Fowls the 5*th* Day, the Beginning of the 6*th*, he creates the Irrational Inhabitants of the dry Land, which, *v.* 24. are deſcribed in theſe Words, *Let the Earth bring forth the living Creature after his kind; Cattle and creeping things, and Beaſts of the Earth, after his kind, and*, v. 2. *and God made the Beaſts of the Earth after his kind, and Cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth on the Earth after his kind:* Here in the Creation of the brute Inhabitants of the Earth, he firſt ſpeaks of them all under one General Name, of *Living Creatures*, and then afterwards divides them into three Ranks, 1. *Cattle*, or ſuch Creatures as were or might be tame, and ſo be the private Poſſeſſion of particular Men: 2. חיה which *ver* 24. and 25. in our Bible, is tranſlated Beaſts, and by the *Septuagint* θηρία, *Wild Beaſts*, and is the ſame Word, that here in our Text, *ver* 28. where we have this great Charter to *Adam*, is tranſlated *Living thing*, and is alſo the ſame Word uſed, *Gen.* 9. 2. where this Grant is renew'd to *Noah*, and there likewiſe tranſlated *Beaſt*. 3. The third Rank were the creeping Animals, which *ver.* 24 and 25. are compriſed under the Word, הרמשת, the ſame that is uſed here *ver.* 28. and is tranſlated *moving*, but in the former Verſes *Creeping*, and by the *Septuagint* in all theſe Places, ἑρπετὰ, or Reptils; from whence it appears, that the Words which we tranſlate here in God's Donation, *ver.* 28. *Living Creatures moving* are the ſame, which in the Hiſtory of the Creation, *ver.* 24, 25. ſignify two, Ranks of terreſtrial Creatures, *viz. Wild Beaſts* and *Reptils*, and are ſo underſtood by the *Septuagint*.

26. When God had made the Irrational Animals of the World, divided into three Kinds, from the Places of their Habitation, *viz. Fiſhes of the Sea, Fowls of the Air*, and living Creatures of the Earth, and theſe again into *Cattle, Wild Beaſts*, and *Reptils*, he conſiders of making Man, and the Dominion he ſhould have over the Terreſtrial World, *ver.* 26. and then he reckons up the Inhabitants of theſe three Kingdoms: But in the terreſtrial, leaves out the ſecond Rank חיה, or wild Beaſts: But here, *ver.* 28. where he actually exerciſes this Deſign, and gives him this Dominion, the Text mentions *the Fiſhes of the Sea, and Fowls of the Air*, and the *Terreſtrial Creatures* in the Words that ſignify the *Wild Beaſts* and *Reptils*, tho' tranſlated *Living thing that moveth*, leaving out Cattle. In both which Places, tho' the Word that ſignifies *Wild Beaſts* be omitted in one, and that which ſignifies *Cattle* in the other, yet, ſince God certainly executed in one Place, what he declares he deſigned in the other, we cannot but underſtand the ſame in both Places, and have here only an Account, how the terreſtrial irrational Animals, which were already created and reckon'd up at their Creation, in three diſtinct Ranks *of Cattle, Wild Beaſts*, and *Reptils*, were here, *ver.* 28. actually put under the Dominion of Man, as they were deſigned *ver.* 26. nor do theſe Words contain in them the leaſt Appearance of any thing, that can be wreſted, to ſignify God's giving to one Man Dominion over another, to *Adam* over his Poſterity.

27. And this further appears from *Gen.* 9. 2. where God renewing this Charter to *Noah* and his Sons, he gives them Dominion over the *Fowls of the Air, and the Fiſhes of the Sea, and the Terreſtrial Creatures*, expreſſed by חיה and הרמש wild Beaſts and Reptils, the ſame Words that in the Text before us, 1 *Gen.* 28. are tranſlated *every moving thing, that moveth on the Earth*, which by no means can comprehend Man, the Grant being made to *Noah* and his Sons, all the Men then living, and not to one Part of Men over another: Which is yet more evident from the very next Words, *ver.* 3. where God gives every רמש, *every moving thing*,

thing, the very Words uſed, *Ch.* 1. 28. to them for Food. By all which it is plain, that God's Donation to *Adam*, Ch. 1. 28. and his Deſignation, *v.* 26. and his Grant again to *Noah* and his Sons, refer to and contain in them neither more nor leſs, than the Works of the Creation of the 5th Day, and the Beginning of the 6th, as they are ſet down from the 20th, to 26th, *ver.* incluſively of the 1ſt *Ch.* and ſo comprehend all the Species of irrational Animals of the *Terraqueous Globe*, tho' all the Words whereby they are expreſſed in the Hiſtory of their Creation, are no where uſed in any of the following Grants, but ſome of them omitted in one, and ſome in another. From whence I think it is paſt all Doubt, that Man cannot be comprehended in this Grant, nor any Dominion over thoſe of his own Species be convey'd to *Adam*. All the Terreſtrial irrational Creatures are enumerated at their Creation, *ver.* 25. under the Names *Beaſts of the Earth, Cattle and creeping things*; but Man being not then Created, was not contain'd under any of thoſe Names; and therefore, whether we underſtand the *Hebrew* Words right or no, they cannot be ſuppoſed to comprehend Man, in the very ſame Hiſtory, and the very next Verſes following, eſpecially ſince that *Hebrew* Word רמש which if any in this Donation to *Adam*, Ch. 1. 28. muſt comprehend Man, is ſo plainly uſed in Contradiſtinction to him, as *Gen.* 6. 20. 7. 14. 21. 23. *Gen.* 8. 17, 19. And if God made all Mankind Slaves to *Adam* and his Heirs, by giving *Adam* Dominion over *every living thing that moveth on the Earth*, Ch. 1. 28. as our A. would have it, methinks Sir *Robert* ſhould have carried his Monarchical Power one Step higher, and ſatisfied the World, that Princes might eat their Subjects too, ſince God gave as full Power to *Noah* and his Heirs, *Ch.* 9. 2. to eat *every living thing that moveth*, as he did to *Adam* to have Dominion over them, the *Hebrew* Words in both Places being the ſame.

28. *David*, who might be ſuppoſed to underſtand the Donation of God in this Text, and the right of Kings too, as well as our A. in his Comment on this Place, as the Learned and judicious *Ainſworth* calls it, in the 8th *Pſalm*, finds here no ſuch Charter of Monarchical Power, his Words are, *Thou haſt made him*, i. e. Man the Son of Man, *a little lower than the Angels, thou mad'ſt him to have Dominion over the Works of thy Hands, thou haſt put all things under his Feet, all Sheep and Oxen and the Beaſts of the Field, and the Fowls of the Air, and Fiſh of the Sea, and whatſoever paſſeth thro' the Paths of the Sea.* In which Words, if any one can find out, that there is meant any Monarchical Power of one Man over another, but only the Dominion of the whole Species of Mankind, over the inferior Species of Creatures, he may, for ought I know, deſerve to be one of Sir *Rob.'s Monarchs in habit*, for the Rareneſs of the Diſcovery. And by this time, I hope it is evident, that he that gave *Dominion over every Living thing that moveth on the Earth*, gave *Adam* no Monarchical Power over thoſe of his own Species, which will yet appear more fully in the next thing I am to ſhew.

29. 2. Whatever God gave by the Words of this Grant, 1 *Gen.* 28. it was not to *Adam* in particular, excluſive of all other Men: Whatever *Dominion* he had thereby, it was not a *private Dominion*, but a Dominion in common with the reſt of Mankind. That this Donation was not made in particular to *Adam*, appears evidently from the Words of the Text, it being made to more than one, for it was ſpoken in the Plural Number, God bleſſed *them*, and ſaid unto *them*, Have Dominion. God ſays unto *Adam* and *Eve*, have Dominion; *thereby*, ſays our A. *Adam was Monarch of the World:* But the Grant being to them, *i. e.* ſpoke to *Eve* alſo, as many Interpreters think with Reaſon, that theſe Words were not ſpoken till *Adam* had his Wife, muſt not ſhe thereby be Lady, as well as he Lord of the World? If it be ſaid, that *Eve* was ſubjected to *Adam*, it ſeems ſhe was not ſo ſubjected to him, as to hinder her Dominion over the Creatures, or *Property* in them; for ſhall we ſay that God ever made a joint Grant to two, and one only was to have the Benefit of it?

30. But perhaps 'twill be ſaid, *Eve* was not made till afterward, grant it ſo, what Advantage will our A. get by it? The Text will be only the more directly againſt him, and ſhew that God, in his Donation, gave the World to Mankind in common, and not to *Adam* in particular. The Word *Them* in the Text muſt include the Species of Man, for 'tis certain *Them* can by no means ſignify *Adam* alone. In the 26th Verſe, where God declares his Intention to give this Dominion, it is plain he meant, that he would make a Species of Creatures, that

ſhould

ſhould have Dominion over the other Species of this Terreſtrial Globe: The Words are, *And God ſaid, Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeneſs, and let them have Dominion over the Fiſh*, &c. *They* then were to have Dominion. Who? even thoſe who were to have the *Image* of God, the Individuals of that Species of *Man*, that he was going to make, for that *Them* ſhould ſignify *Adam* ſingly, excluſive of the reſt, that ſhould be in the World with him, is againſt both Scripture and all Reaſon: And it cannot poſſibly be made Senſe, if *Man* in the former Part of the *Verſe* do not ſignify the ſame with *Them* in the latter, only *Man* there, as is uſual, is taken for the Species, and *them* the Individuals of that Species; and we have a Reaſon in the very Text. God makes him *in his own Image after his own Likeneſs*, makes him an intellectual Creature, and ſo capable of *Dominion:* For wherein ſoever elſe the *Image of God* conſiſted, the intellectual Nature was certainly a Part of it, and belong'd to the whole Species, and enabled them to have *Dominion* over the inferior Creatures; and therefore *David* ſaith in the 8th *Pſalm* above cited, *Thou haſt made him little lower than the Angels, thou haſt made him to have Dominion.* 'Tis not of *Adam* King *David* ſpeaks here, for *Verſe* 4. 'tis plain, 'tis of *Man, and the Son of Man*, of the Species of Mankind.

31. And that this Grant ſpoken to *Adam* was made to him, and the whole Species of Man, is clear from our A.'s own Proof out of the *Pſalmiſt. The Earth*, ſaith the Pſalmiſt, *hath he given to the Children of Men; which ſhews the Title comes from Fatherhood.* Theſe are Sir *Robert*'s Words in the Preface before cited, and a ſtrange Inference it is he makes; *God hath given the Earth to the Children of Men*, ergo *the Title comes from Fatherhood.* 'Tis pity the Propriety of the *Hebrew* Tongue had not uſed *Fathers of Men*, inſtead of *Children of Men*, to expreſs Mankind; then indeed our A. might have had the Countenance of the Sound of the Words, to have placed the *Title* in the *Fatherhood.* But to conclude, that the *Fatherhood* had the Right to the Earth, becauſe God gave it *to the Children of Men*, is a Way of arguing contrary to our A.: And a Man muſt have a great Mind to go contrary to the Sound as well as Senſe of the Words, before he could light on it. But the Senſe is yet harder, and more remote from our A.'s Purpoſe: For as it ſtands in his Preface, it is to prove *Adam*'s being Monarch, and his Reaſoning is thus, *God gave the Earth to the Children of Men*, ergo *Adam was Monarch of the World.* I defy any Man to make a more pleaſant Concluſion than this, which cannot be excuſed from the moſt obvious Abſurdity, till it can be ſhewn, that *by Children of Men*, he who had no Father, *Adam* alone is ſignified; but whatever our A. does, the Scripture ſpeaks not Nonſenſe.

32. To maintain this *Property and private Dominion of* Adam, our A. labours in the following Page to deſtroy the Community granted to *Noah* and his Sons, in that parallel Place, 9 *Gen.* 1, 2, 3. and he endeavours to do it two Ways.

1. Sir *Rob.* would perſuade us againſt the expreſs Words of the Scripture, that what was here granted to *Noah*, was not granted to his Sons in common with him. His Words are; *As for the general Community between* Noah *and his Sons, which Mr.* Selden *will have to be granted to them*, 9 Gen. 2. *the Text doth not warrant it.* What *Warrant* our A. would have, when the plain expreſs Words of Scripture, not capable of another Meaning, will not ſatisfy him, who pretends to build wholly on Scripture, is not eaſy to imagine. The Text ſays, *God bleſſed* Noah *and his Sons, and ſaid unto them*, i. e. as our A. would have it, *unto him: For*, ſaith he, *altho' the Sons are there mentioned with* Noah *in the Bleſſing, yet it may beſt be underſtood, with a Subordination or Benediction in Succeſſion*, O. 211. That indeed is *beſt*, for our A. to be underſtood, which beſt ſerves to his Purpoſe, but that truly *may beſt be underſtood* by any body elſe, which beſt agrees with the plain Conſtruction of the Words, and ariſes from the obvious Meaning of the Place; and then with *Subordination* and *in Succeſſion*, will not *be beſt underſtood*, in a Grant of God, where he himſelf put them not, nor mentions any ſuch Limitation. But yet, our A. has Reaſons, why it *may beſt be underſtood ſo. The Bleſſing*, ſays he in the following Words, *might truly be fulfilled, if the Sons either under or after their Father, enjoy'd a private Dominion*, O. 211. which is to ſay, that a Grant, whoſe expreſs Words give a joint Title in preſent (for the Text ſays, into your Hands they are delivered) *may beſt be underſtood with a Subordination* or in *Succeſſion:* Becauſe 'tis poſſible, that *in Subordination*, or in *Succeſſion* it may be enjoy'd. Which is all one as to ſay, that a Grant of any thing in preſent Poſſeſſion, *may beſt be underſtood* of Reverſion:

Reverſion: Becauſe 'tis poſſible one may live to enjoy it in Reverſion. If the Grant be indeed to a Father and to his Sons after him, who is ſo kind as to let his Children enjoy it preſently in common with him, one may truly ſay, as to the Event, one will be as good as the other; but it can never be true, that what the expreſs word grant in poſſeſſion, and in common, *may beſt be underſtood*, to be in Reverſion. The Sum of all his reaſoning amounts to this: God did not give to the Sons of *Noah* the World in common with their Father, becauſe 'twas poſſible they might enjoy it under, or after him. A very good ſort of Argument, againſt an expreſs Text of Scripture: But God muſt not be believed, though he ſpeaks it himſelf, when he ſays, does any thing, which will not conſiſt with Sir *Robert*'s Hypotheſis.

33. For 'tis plain, however he would exclude them, That part of this *Benediction*, as he would have it *in Succeſſion*, muſt needs be meant to the Sons, and not to *Noah* himſelf at all, *Be Fruitful, and Multiply, and Repleniſh the Earth*, ſays God, in this Bleſſing. This part of the Benediction, as appears by the Sequel, concerned not *Noah* himſelf at all; for we read not of any Children he had after the Flood, and in the following Chapter, where his Poſterity is reckon'd up, there is no mention of any, and ſo this *Benediction in Succeſſion*, was not to take place till 350 Years after, and to ſave our A.'s imaginary *Monarchy*, the Peopling of the World muſt be deferr'd 350 Years; for this part of the Benediction cannot be underſtood with *Subordination*, unleſs our A. will ſay, that they muſt ask leave of their Father *Noah* to lie with their Wives. But in this one Point our A. is conſtant to himſelf in all his Diſcourſes, he takes great care there ſhould be Monarchs in the World, but very little that there ſhould be People; and indeed his way of Government is not the way to People the World. For how much Abſolute Monarchy helps to fulfil this great and primary Bleſſing of God Almighty, *Be Fruitful, and Multiply, and repleniſh the Earth*, which contains in it the improvement too of Arts and Sciences, and the Conveniences of Life, may be ſeen in thoſe large and rich Countries, which are happy under the *Turkiſh* Government, where are now to be found $\frac{1}{2}$, nay in many, if not moſt parts of them $\frac{1}{10}$, perhaps I might ſay not $\frac{1}{100}$ of the People, that were formerly, as will eaſily appear to any one, who will compare the Accounts we have of it at this time, with Antient Hiſtory. But this by the by.

34. The other Parts of this *Benediction* or *Grant*, are ſo expreſſed, that they muſt needs be underſtood to belong equally to them all; as much to *Noah*'s Sons as to *Noah* himſelf, and not to his Sons *with a Subordination* or *in Succeſſion*. *The Fear of you, and the dread of you*, ſays God, *ſhall be upon every Beaſt*, &c. Will any Body but our A. ſay, that the Creatures feared and ſtood in awe of *Noah* only, and not of his Sons without his leave, or till after his Death? And the following Words, *into your hands they are delivered*, are they to be underſtood as our A. ſays, if your Father pleaſe, or they ſhall be deliver'd into your hands hereafter. If this be to argue from Scripture, I know not what may not be proved by it, and I can ſcarce ſee how much this differs from that *Fiction and Phanſie*; or how much a ſurer Foundation it will prove, than the opinions of *Philoſophers and Poets*, which our A. ſo much condemns in his Preface.

35. But our A. goes on to prove, that *it may beſt be underſtood with a Subordination or a Benediction in Succeſſion, for*, ſays he, *it is not probable that the private Dominion which God gave to* Adam, *and by his Donation, Aſſignation or Ceſſion to his Children, was Abrogated, and a Community of all things inſtituted between* Noah *and his Sons.* — Noah *was left the ſole Heir of the World, why ſhould it be thought that God would diſinherit him of his Birth-right, and make him of all Men in the World the only Tenant in common with his Children*, O. 211.

36. The Prejudices of our own ill-grounded Opinions, however by us called *probable*, cannot authorize us to underſtand Scripture contrary to the direct and plain Meaning of the Words. I grant, 'tis not probable, that *Adam*'s *private Dominion* was here *Abrogated*: Becauſe it is more than improbable, (for it will never be proved) that ever *Adam* had any ſuch *private Dominion*: And ſince parallel Places of Scripture are moſt probable to make us know, how they *may be beſt underſtood*, there needs but the comparing this Bleſſing here to *Noah* and his Sons after the Flood, with that to *Adam* after the Creation, 1 *Gen.* 28. to aſſure any one that God gave *Adam* no ſuch *private Dominion*. 'Tis *probable*, I confeſs, that *Noah* ſhould

have the ſame Title, the ſame Property and Dominion after the Flood, that *Adam* had before it: But ſince *private Dominion* cannot conſiſt with the Bleſſing and Grant God gave to him and his Sons in Common, 'tis a ſufficient Reaſon to conclude, that *Adam* had none, eſpecially ſince in the Donation made to him, there is no Words that expreſs it, or do in the leaſt favour it; and then let my Reader judge whether *it may beſt be underſtood*; when in the one Place there is not one Word for it, not to ſay what has been above proved, that that Text in ſelf proves the contrary; and in the other, the Words and Senſe are directly againſt it.

37. But our A. ſays, Noah *was the ſole Heir of the World, why ſhould it be thought that God would diſinherit him of his Birth-right: Heir*, indeed, in *England*, ſignifies the Eldeſt Son, who is by the Law of *England* to have all his Father's Land, but where God ever appointed any ſuch *Heir of the World*, our A. would have done well to have ſhewed us; and how *God diſinherited him of his Birth-right*, or what Harm was done him if God gave his Sons a Right to make uſe of a Part of the Earth for the Support of themſelves and Families, when the Whole was not only more than *Noah* himſelf, but infinitely more than they all could make uſe of, and the Poſſeſſions of one could not at all prejudice, or, as to any Uſe, ſtreighten that of the other.

38. Our A. probably foreſeeing he might not be very ſucceſsful in perſuading People out of their Senſes, and ſay what he could, Men would be apt to believe the plain Words of Scripture, and think, as they ſaw, that the Grant was ſpoken to *Noah* and his Sons jointly. He endeavours to inſinuate, as if this Grant to *Noah*, conveyed no Property, no Dominion; becauſe, *Subduing the Earth and Dominion over the Creatures are therein omitted, nor the Earth once named.* And therefore, ſays he, *there is a conſiderable Difference between theſe two Texts, the firſt Bleſſing gave* Adam *a Dominion over the Earth and all Creatures, the latter allows* Noah *Liberty to uſe the living Creatures, for Food, here is no Alteration or Diminiſhing of his Title, to a Property of all Things, but an Enlargement only of his Commons*, O. 211. So that in our A.'s Senſe, all that was ſaid here to *Noah* and his Sons, gave them no Dominion, no Property, but only *Enlarged* the *Commons*; their *Commons*, I ſhould ſay ſince, God ſays, *to you are they given*, tho' our A. ſays *his*, for as for *Noah*'s Sons, they it ſeems by Sir *Robert*'s Appointment, during their Father's Life-time, were to keep faſting Days.

39. Any one but our A. would be mightily ſuſpected, to be blinded with Prejudice, that in all this Bleſſing to *Noah* and his Sons, could ſee nothing but *only* an Enlargement of Commons. For as to *Dominion* which our A. thinks omitted, *the Fear of you, and the Dread of you*, ſays God, *ſhall be upon every Beaſt*, which I ſuppoſe, expreſſes the *Dominion*, or Superiority was deſigned Man over the living Creatures, as fully as may be, for in that Fear and Dread, ſeems chiefly to conſiſt what was given to *Adam*, over the inferior Animals; who as abſolute a Monarch as he was, could not make bold with a Lark or Rabbit to ſatisfy his Hunger, and had the Herbs but in common with the Beaſts, as is plain from 1 *Gen.* 2. 9. and 30. In the next Place, 'tis manifeſt that in this Bleſſing to *Noah* and his Sons; Property is not only given in clear Words, but in a larger Extent than it was to *Adam*. *Into your Hands they are given*, ſays God, to *Noah* and his Sons; which Words, if they give not Property, nay, Property in Poſſeſſion, 'twill be hard to find Words, that can; ſince there is not a Way to expreſs a Man's being poſſeſſed of any thing more natural, nor more certain, than to ſay, *it is delivered into his Hands.* And, *ver.* 3. to ſhew, that they had then given them the utmoſt Property Man is capable of, which is to have a Right to deſtroy any thing by uſing it; *Every moving thing that liveth*, ſaith God, *ſhall be Meat for you*, which was not allowed to *Adam* in his Charter. This our A. calls, *a Liberty of uſing them for Food, and only an Enlargement of Commons, but no Alteration of Property*, O. 211. What other Property Man can have in the Creatures, but the *Liberty of uſing them*, is hard to be underſtood: So that if the firſt Bleſſing, as our A. ſays, gave Adam *Dominion over the Creatures*, and the Bleſſing to *Noah* and his Sons, gave them *ſuch a Liberty to uſe them*, as *Adam* had not; it muſt needs give them ſomething that *Adam* with his Sovereignty wanted, ſomething that one would be apt to take for a greater Property; for certainly he has no abſolute Dominion over even the brutal Part of the Creatures, and the Property he has in them is very narrow and ſcanty, who cannot

not make that uſe of them, which is permitted to another. Should any one, who is abſolute Lord of a Country, have bidden our A. *ſubdue the Earth*, and given him Dominion over the Creatures in it, but not have permitted him to have taken a Kid or a Lamb out of the Flock, to ſatisfy his Hunger, I gueſs, he would ſcarce have thought himſelf Lord or Proprietor of that Land, or the Cattle on it; but would have found the difference between *having Dominion*, which a Shepherd may have, and having full Property as an Owner. So that, had it been his own *Caſe*, Sir *Rob.* I believe, would have thought here was an *Alteration*, nay, an enlarging of *Property*; and that *Noah* and his Children had by this Grant, not only Property given them, but ſuch a Property given them in the Creatures, as *Adam* had not: For however, in reſpect of one another, Men may be allowed to have Propriety in their diſtinct Portions of the Creatnres; yet in reſpect of God the Maker of Heaven and Earth, who is ſole Lord and Proprietor of the whole World: Man's Propriety in the Creatures is nothing but that *Liberty to uſe them*, which God has permitted, and ſo Man's Property may be altered and enlarged, as we ſee it was here, after the Flood, when other Uſes of them are allowed, which before were not. From all which I ſuppoſe, it is clear, that neither *Adam* nor *Noah*, had any *Private Dominion*, any Property in the Creatures, excluſive of his Poſterity, as they ſhould ſucceſſively grow up into need of them, and come to be able to make uſe of them.

40. Thus we have examined our A.'s Argument for *Adam*'s *Monarchy*, founded on the Bleſſing pronounced, 1 *Gen.* 28. Wherein I think 'tis impoſſible for any ſober Reader, to find any other but the ſetting of Mankind above the other kinds of Creatures, in this habitable Earth of ours. 'Tis nothing but the giving to Man, the whole Species of Man, as the chief Inhabitant, who is the Image of his Maker, the Dominion over the other Creatures. This lies ſo obvious in the plain Words, that any one but our A. would have thought it neceſſary to have ſhewn, how theſe Words that ſeem'd to ſay the quite contrary, gave *Adam Monarchical abſolute Power* over other Men, or the *Sole Property* in all the Creatures; and methinks in a buſineſs of this Moment, and that whereon he builds all that follows, he ſhould have done ſomething more than barely cite Words, which apparently make againſt him; for I confeſs, I cannot ſee any thing in them, tending to *Adam*'s *Monarchy*, or *Private Dominion*, but quite the contrary. And I the leſs deplore the dulneſs of my Apprehenſion herein, ſince I find the Apoſtle ſeems to have as little notion of any ſuch *Private Dominion of Adam* as I, when he ſays, God *gives us all things richly to enjoy*, which he could not do, if it were all given away already, to Monarch *Adam*, and the Monarchs his Heirs and Succeſſors. To conclude, this Text is ſo far from proving *Adam* ſole Proprietor, that on the contrary, it is a Confirmation of the Original Community of all things amongſt the Sons of Men, which appearing from this Donation of God, as well as other Places of Scripture, the Sovereignty of *Adam*, built upon his *Private Dominion*, muſt fall, not having any Foundation to ſupport it.

41. But yet if after all, any one will needs have it ſo, that by this Donation of God, *Adam* was made ſole Proprietor of the whole Earth, what will this be to his Sovereignty? and how will it appear, that *Propriety* in Land gives a Man Power over the Life of another? or how will the Poſſeſſion, even of the whole Earth, give any one a Sovereign Arbitrary Authority over the Perſons of Men? The moſt ſpecious Thing to be ſaid, is, that he that is Proprietor of the whole World, may deny all the reſt of Mankind Food, and ſo at his Pleaſure ſtarve them, if they will not acknowledge his Sovereignty, and obey his Will. If this were true, it would be a good Argument to prove, that there was never any ſuch *Property*, that God never gave any ſuch *Private Dominion*; ſince it is more reaſonable to think, that God who bid Mankind increaſe and multiply, ſhould rather himſelf give them all a Right, to make uſe of the Food and Raiment, and other Conveniences of Life, the Materials whereof he had ſo plentifully provided for them, than to make them depend upon the Will of a Man for their Subſiſtence, who ſhould have Power to deſtroy them all when he pleaſed, and who being no better than other Men, was in Succeſſion likelier by Want, and the dependance of a ſcanty Fortune, to tie them to hard Service, than by liberal Allowance of the Conveniences of Life, promote the great Deſign of God, *Increaſe* and *Multiply*: He that doubts this, let him look into the Abſolute Monarchies of the

World, and ſee what becomes of the Conveniences of Life, and the Multitudes of People.

42. But we know God hath not left one Man ſo to the Mercy of another, that he may ſtarve him if he pleaſe: God the Lord and Father of all has given no one of his Children ſuch a Property in his peculiar Portion of the Things of this World, but that he has given his needy Brother a Right in the Surpluſſage of his Goods, ſo that it cannot juſtly be denied him, when his preſſing Wants call for it. And therefore no Man could ever have a juſt Power over the Life of another by Right of Property in Land or Poſſeſſions, ſince 'twould always be a Sin in any Man of Eſtate, to let his Brother periſh for want of affording him Relief out of his Plenty. As *Juſtice* gives every Man a Title to the Product of his honeſt Induſtry, and the fair Acquiſitions of his Anceſtors deſcended to him; ſo *Charity* gives every Man a Title to ſo much out of another's Plenty, as will keep him from extreme Want, where he has no Means to ſubſiſt otherwiſe: and a Man can no more juſtly make uſe of another's Neceſſity, to force him to become his Vaſſal, by with-holding that Relief, God requires him to afford to the Wants of his Brother, than he that has more ſtrength can ſeize upon a weaker, maſter him to his Obedience, and with a Dagger at his Throat offer him Death or Slavery.

43. Should any one make ſo perverſe an uſe of God's Bleſſings poured on him with a liberal Hand; ſhould any one be Cruel and Uncharitable to that extremity, yet all this would not prove that Propriety in Land, even in this Caſe, gave any Authority over the Perſons of Men, but only that Compact might; ſince the Authority of the Rich Proprietor, and the Subjection of the needy Beggar began not from the poſſeſſion of the Lord, but the Conſent of the poor Man, who prefer'd being his Subject to ſtarving. And the Man he thus ſubmits to, can pretend to no more Power over him, than he has conſented to, upon Compact. Upon this ground a Man's having his Stores filled in a time of Scarcity, having Money in his Pocket, being in a Veſſel at Sea, being able to Swim, *&c.* may as well be the Foundation of Rule and Dominion, as being Poſſeſſor of all the Land in the World; any of theſe being ſufficient to enable me to ſave a Man's Life, who would periſh if ſuch Aſſiſtance were denied him; and any thing by this Rule, that may be an occaſion of working upon another's Neceſſity, to ſave his Life, or any thing dear to him, at the rate of his Freedom, may be made a Foundation of Sovereignty, as well as Property. From all which it is clear, that tho' God ſhould have given *Adam Private Dominion*, yet that *Private Dominion* could give him no *Sovereignty*; But we have already ſufficiently proved, that God gave him no *Private Dominion*.

CHAP. V.

Of Adam's *Title to Sovereignty by the Subjection of* Eve.

44. THE next Place of Scripture we find our A. builds his Monarchy of *Adam* on, is 3 *Gen.* 26. *And thy deſire ſhall be to thy Husband, and he ſhall rule over thee. Here we have* (ſays he) *the Original Grant of Government*, from whence he concludes, in the following Part of the Page, *O.* 244. *That the Supreme Power is ſettled in the Fatherhood, and limited in one kind of Government, that is to Monarchy:* For let his Premiſes be what they will, this is always the Concluſion; let *Rule* in any Text, be but once named, and preſently *Abſolute Monarchy* is by Divine Right eſtabliſh'd. If any one will but carefully read our A.'s own Reaſoning from theſe Words, *O.* 244. and conſider among other things, *the Line and Poſterity of* Adam, as he there brings them in, he will find ſome difficulty, to make Senſe of what he ſays; but we will allow this at preſent, to his peculiar way of Writing, and conſider the Force of the Text in hand. The Words are the Curſe of God upon the Woman, for having been the firſt and forwardeſt in the Diſobedience; and if we will conſider the Occaſion of what God ſays here to our firſt Parents, that he was denouncing Judgment, and declaring his Wrath againſt them both, for their Diſobedience, we cannot ſuppoſe that this was the time, wherein God was granting *Adam* Prerogatives and Privileges, inveſting him with

with Dignity and Authority, Elevating him to Dominion and Monarchy: For though as a helper in the Temptation, *Eve* was laid below him, and ſo he had accidentally a Superiority over her, for her greater Puniſhment; yet he too had his ſhare in the Fall as well as the Sin, and was laid lower, as may be ſeen in the following Verſes; and 'twould be hard to imagine, that God, in the ſame Breath, ſhould make him Univerſal *Monarch* over all Mankind, and a Day-Labourer for his Life; turn him out of *Paradiſe to till the ground*, *ver.* 23. and at the ſame time, advance him to a Throne, and all the Privileges and Eaſe of Abſolute Power.

45. This was not a Time, when *Adam* could expect any Favours, any Grant of Privileges, from his offended Maker. If this be *the Original Grant of Government*, as our A. tells us, and *Adam* was now made Monarch, whatever Sir *Robert* would have him, 'tis plain, God made him but a very poor Monarch, ſuch an one, as our A. himſelf would have counted it no great Privilege to be. God ſets him to work for his Living, and ſeems rather to give him a Spade into his hand, to ſubdue the Earth, than a Scepter to rule over its Inhabitants. *In the Sweat of thy Face thou ſhalt eat thy Bread*, ſays God to him, *ver.* 19. This was unavoidable, may it perhaps be anſwered, becauſe he was yet without Subjects, and had no body to work for him, but afterwards living as he did above 900 Years, he might have People enough, whom he might Command, to work for him; no, ſays God, not only whilſt thou art without other help, ſave thy Wife, but as long as thou liveſt, ſhalt thou live by thy Labour. *In the Sweat of thy Face, ſhalt thou eat thy Bread, till thou return unto the Ground, for out of it waſt thou taken, for duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return*, *v.* 19. It will perhaps be anſwered again, in Favour of our A. that theſe Words are not ſpoken perſonally to *Adam*, but in him, as their Repreſentative to all Mankind, this being a Curſe upon Mankind, becauſe of the Fall.

46. God I believe, ſpeaks differently from Men, becauſe he ſpeaks with more Truth, more Certainty: But when he vouchſafes to ſpeak to Men, I do not think, he ſpeaks differently from them, in croſſing the Rules of Language in uſe amongſt them: This would not be to condeſcend to their Capacities, when he humbles himſelf to ſpeak to them, but to loſe his Deſign in ſpeaking, what thus ſpoken, they could not underſtand. And yet thus muſt we think of God, if the Interpretations of Scripture, neceſſary to maintain our A.'s Doctrine, muſt be received for good. For by the ordinary Rules of Language, it will be very hard to underſtand what God ſays; If what he ſpeaks here, in the ſingular Number to *Adam*, muſt be underſtood to be ſpoken to all Mankind, and what he ſays in the Plural Number, 1 *Gen.* 26. and 28. muſt be underſtood of *Adam* alone, excluſive of all others, and what he ſays to *Noah* and his Sons jointly, muſt be underſtood to be meant to *Noah* alone, *Gen.* 9.

47. Farther it is to be noted, that theſe Words here of 3 *Gen.* 16. which our A. calls *the Original Grant of Government*, were not ſpoken to *Adam*, neither indeed was there any Grant in them made to *Adam*, but a Puniſhment laid upon *Eve*: And if we will take them as they were directed in particular to her, or in her, as their Repreſentative, to all other Women, they will at moſt concern the Female Sex only, and import no more, but that Subjection they ſhould ordinarily be in to their Husbands: But there is here no more Law to oblige a Woman to ſuch a Subjection, if the Circumſtances either of her Condition, or Contract with her Husband ſhould exempt her from it, than there is, that ſhe ſhould bring forth her Children in Sorrow and Pain, if there could be found a Remedy for it, which is alſo a part of the ſame Curſe upon her: For the whole Verſe runs thus, *Unto the Woman he ſaid, I will greatly multiply thy Sorrow and thy Conception; in ſorrow thou ſhalt bring forth Children, and thy Deſire ſhall be to thy Husband, and he ſhall rule over Thee.* 'Twould, I think, have been a hard matter for any body, but our A. to have found out a Grant of *Monarchical Government to Adam* in theſe Words, which were neither ſpoke to, nor of him: neither will any one, I ſuppoſe by theſe Words, think the weaker Sex, as by a Law, ſo ſubjected to the Curſe contained in them, that 'tis their Duty not to endeavour to avoid it. And will any one ſay, that *Eve*, or any other Woman, ſinn'd, if ſhe were brought to Bed without thoſe multiplied Pains God threatens her here with? Or that either of our Queens, *Mary* or *Elizabeth*, had they married any of their Subjects, had been by this Text put into a Political Subjection to him? or that he thereby ſhould have had

had *Monarchical Rule* over her? God, in this Text, gives not, that I ſee, any Authority to *Adam* over *Eve*, or to Men over their Wives, but only foretels what ſhould be the Woman's Lot, how by his Providence he would order it ſo, that ſhe ſhould be ſubject to her Husband, as we ſee that generally the Laws of Mankind and Cuſtoms of Nations have ordered it ſo; and there is, I grant, a Foundation in Nature for it.

48. Thus when God ſays of *Jacob* and *Eſau*, *That the Elder ſhould ſerve the Younger*, 25 *Gen.* 23. no body ſuppoſes that God hereby made *Jacob Eſau*'s Sovereign, but foretold what ſhould *de facto* come to paſs.

But if theſe Words here ſpoke to *Eve* muſt needs be underſtood as a Law to bind her and all other Women to Subjection, it can be no other Subjection, than what every Wife owes her Husband; and then, if this be the *Original Grant of Government*, and the *Foundation of Monarchical Power*, there will be as many Monarchs as there are Husbands: If therefore theſe Words give any Power to *Adam*, it can be only a Conjugal Power, not Political; the Power that every Husband hath to order the Things of private Concernment in his Family, as Proprietor of the Goods and Land there, and to have his Will take place before that of his Wife in all things of their common Concernment: But not a Political Power of Life and Death over her, much leſs over any body elſe.

49. This I am ſure: If our A. will have this Text to be a *Grant*, *the Original Grant of Government*, Political Government, he ought to have proved it by ſome better Arguments than by barely ſaying, That *thy Deſire ſhall be unto thy Husband* was a Law, whereby *Eve*, and *all that ſhould come of her*, were ſubjected to the Abſolute Monarchical Power of *Adam* and his Heirs. *Thy Deſire ſhall be to thy Husband*, is too doubtful an Expreſſion, of whoſe ſignification Interpreters are not agreed, to build ſo confidently on, and in a matter of ſuch Moment, and ſo great and general Concernment: But our A. according to his way of Writing, having once named the Text, concludes preſently, without any more ado, that the Meaning is, as he would have it. Let the Words *Rule* and *Subject* be but found in the Text or Margent, and it immediately ſignifies the Duty of a Subject to his Prince; the Relation is changed, and though God ſays *Husband*, Sir *Robert* will have it *King*; *Adam* has preſently *Abſolute Monarchical Power* over *Eve*, and not only over *Eve*, but *all that ſhould come of her*, though the Scripture ſays not a word of it, nor our A. a word to prove it. But *Adam* muſt for all that be an Abſolute Monarch, and ſo down to the end of the Chapter. And here I leave my Reader to conſider, whether my bare ſaying, without offering any Reaſons to evince it, that this Text gave not *Adam* that *Abſolute Monarchical Power*, our A. ſuppoſes, but not as ſufficient to deſtroy that Power, as his bare Aſſertion is to Eſtabliſh it, ſince the Text mentions neither *Prince* nor *People*, ſpeaks nothing of *Abſolute* or *Monarchical Power*, but the Subjection of *Eve* to *Adam*, a Wife to her Husband. And he that would trace our A. ſo all through, would make a ſhort and ſufficient Anſwer to the greateſt Part of the Grounds he proceeds on, and abundantly confute them by barely denying; It being a ſufficient Anſwer to Aſſertions without Proof, to deny them without giving a Reaſon. And therefore ſhould I have ſaid nothing, but barely deny'd, that by this Text *the Supreme Power was ſettled and founded by God himſelf, in the Fatherhood, Limited to Monarchy, and that to* Adam*'s Perſon and Heirs*, all which our A. notably concludes from theſe Words, as may be ſeen in the ſame Page, *O.* 244. it had been a ſufficient Anſwer; ſhould I have deſired any ſober Man only to have read the Text, and conſidered to whom, and on what occaſion it was ſpoken, he would, no doubt, have wondered how our A. found out *Monarchical Abſolute Power* in it, had he not had an exceeding good Faculty to find it himſelf, where he could not ſhew it others. And thus we have examined the two Places of Scripture, all that I remember our A. brings to prove *Adam*'s *Sovereignty*, that *Supremacy*, which he ſays, *it was God's Ordinance ſhould be unlimited in* Adam, *and as large as all the Acts of his Will*, O. 254. viz. 1 *Gen.* 28. and 3 *Gen.* 16. one whereof ſignifies only the Subjection of the Inferior Ranks of Creatures to Mankind, and the other the Subjection that is due from a Wife to her Husband, both far enough from that which Subjects owe the Governors of Political Societies.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Adam's *Title to Sovereignty by Fatherhood.*

50. THERE is one thing more, and then I think I have given you all that our A. brings for Proof of *Adam*'s Sovereignty, and that is a Suppoſition of a natural Right of Dominion over his Children, by being their Father: And this Title of *Fatherhood* he is ſo pleaſed with, that you will find it brought in almoſt in every Page; particularly he ſays, *Not only* Adam, *but the ſucceeding Patriarchs had by Right of Fatherhood Royal Authority over their Children*, p. 12. And in the ſame Page, *This Subjection of Children being the Fountain of all Regal Authority*, &c. This being as one would think by his ſo frequent mentioning it, the main Baſis of all his Frame, we may well expect clear and evident Reaſon for it, ſince he lays it down as a Poſition neceſſary to his Purpoſe, That *every Man that is born is ſo far from being Free, that by his very Birth he becomes a Subject of him that begets him*, O. 156. So that *Adam* being the only Man Created, and all ever ſince being Begotten, no body has been Free. If we ask how *Adam* comes by this Power over his Children, he tells us here 'tis by Begetting them: And ſo again, *O.* 223. *This Natural Dominion of* Adam, ſays he, *may be proved out of* Grotius *himſelf, who teacheth, That generatione jus acquiritur parentibus in liberos.* And indeed the Act of Begetting being that which makes a Man a Father, his Right of a Father over his Children can naturally ariſe from nothing elſe.

51. *Grotius* tells us not here how far this *jus in liberos*, this Power of Parents over their Children extends; but our A. always very clear in the Point, aſſures us, 'tis *Supreme Power*, and like that of Abſolute Monarchs over their Slaves, Abſolute Power of Life and Death. He that ſhould demand of him, how, or for what Reaſon it is, that Begetting a Child gives the Father ſuch an Abſolute Power over him, will find him anſwer nothing: We are to take his Word for this, as well as ſeveral other things, and by that the Laws of Nature, and the Conſtitutions of Government, muſt ſtand or fall: Had he been an Abſolute Monarch, this way of Talking might have ſuited well enough; *pro ratione voluntas* might have been of force in his Mouth; but in the way of Proof or Argument is very unbecoming, and will little advantage his Plea for Abſolute Monarchy. Sir *Robert has too much leſſen'd a Subject's Authority to leave himſelf the hopes of Eſtabliſhing any thing by his bare Saying it*; one Slave's Opinion without Proof, is not of weight enough to diſpoſe of the Liberty and Fortunes of all Mankind. If all Men are not, as I think they are, naturally equal, I'm ſure all Slaves are; and then I may without Preſumption oppoſe my ſingle Opinion to his; and be confident that my Saying, *That Begetting of Children makes them not Slaves to their Fathers, as certainly* ſets all Mankind Free, as his affirming the contrary makes them all Slaves. But that this Poſition, which is the Foundation of all their Doctrine, who would have Monarchy to be *Jure Divino*, may have all fair play, let us hear what Reaſons others gave for it, ſince our A. offers none.

52. The Argument, I have heard others make uſe of, to prove that Fathers, by Begetting them, come by an Abſolute Power over their Children, is this; That *Fathers have a Power over the Lives of their Children, becauſe they give them Life and Being*, which is the only Proof it is capable of: Since there can be no Reaſon, why naturally one Man ſhould have any Claim or Pretence of Right over that in another, which was never his, which he beſtowed not, but was received from the Bounty of another. 1. I anſwer, That every one who gives another any Thing, has not always thereby a Right to take it away again. But, 2. They who ſay the *Father* gives Life to his Children, are ſo dazled with the Thoughts of Monarchy, that they do not, as they ought, remember God, who is *the Author and Giver of Life: 'Tis in him alone we live, move, and have our Being.* How can he be thought to give Life to another, that knows not wherein his own Life conſiſts? Philoſophers are at a Loſs about it after their moſt diligent Enquiries; and Anatomiſts, after their whole Lives and Studies ſpent in Diſſections, and diligent examining the Bodies of Men, confeſs their Ignorance in the Structure and Uſe of many Parts of Man's Body, and in that Operation wherein Life conſiſts in the

the whole. And doth the rude Plow-Man, or the more ignorant Voluptuary frame and faſhion ſuch an admirable Engine as this is, and then put Life and Senſe into it? Can any Man ſay, he formed the Parts that are neceſſary to the Life of his Child? Or can he ſuppoſe himſelf to give the Life, and yet not know what Subject is fit to receive it, nor what Actions or Organs are neceſſary for its Reception or Preſervation?

53. To give Life to that which has yet no Being, is to frame and make a living Creature, faſhion the Parts, and mould and ſuit them to their Uſes, and having proportion'd and fitted them together, to put into them a living Soul. He that could do this, might indeed have ſome Pretence to deſtroy his own Workmanſhip. But is there any one ſo bold, that dares thus far arrogate to himſelf the Incomprehenſible Works of the Almighty? Who alone did at firſt, and continues ſtill to make a living Soul, he alone can breathe in the Breath of Life. If any one thinks himſelf an Artiſt at this, let him number up the Parts of his Child's Body, which he hath made, tell me their Uſes and Operations, and when the living and rational Soul began to inhabit this curious Structure, when Senſe began, and how this Engine which he has framed, Thinks and Reaſons: If he made it, let him, when it is out of order mend it, at leaſt tell wherein the Defects lie. *Shall he that made the Eye not ſee?* Says the Pſalmiſt, *Pſalm* 94. 9. See theſe Mens Vanities? The Structure of that one Part is ſufficient to convince us of an All-wiſe Contriver, and he has ſo viſible a Claim to us as his Workmanſhip, that one of the ordinary Appellations of God in Scripture is, *God our Maker*, and *the Lord our Maker*. And therefore though our A. for the magnifying of his *Fatherhood*, be pleaſed to ſay, *O.* 159. *That even the Power which God himſelf exerciſeth over Mankind is by Right of Fatherhood*, yet this Fatherhood is ſuch an one as utterly excludes all Pretence of Title in Earthly Parents; for he is *King*, becauſe he is indeed Maker of us all, which no Parents can pretend to be of their Children.

54. But had Men Skill and Power to make their Children, 'tis not ſo ſlight a Piece a Workmanſhip, that it can be imagined, they could make them without deſigning it. What Father of a Thouſand, when he begets a Child, thinks farther than to ſatisfy his preſent Appetite. God in his infinite Wiſdom has put ſtrong Deſires of Copulation into the Conſtitution of Men, thereby to continue the Race of Mankind, which he doth moſt commonly without the Intention, and often againſt the Conſent and Will of the Begetter. And indeed thoſe who deſire and deſign Children, are but the Occaſions of their Being, and when they deſign and wiſh to beget them, do little more towards their making, than *Ducalion* and his Wife in the Fable did towards the making of Mankind, by throw-Pebbles over their Heads.

55. But grant that the Parents made their Children, gave them Life and Being, and that hence there followed an Abſolute Power. This would give the *Father* but a joint Dominion with the Mother over them. For no body can deny but that the Woman had an equal Share, if not the greater, as nouriſhing the Child a long Time in her own Body out of her own Subſtance: There it is faſhion'd, and from her it receives the Materials and Principles of its Conſtitution: And it is ſo hard to imagine the rational Soul ſhould preſently inhabit the yet unformed Embrio, as ſoon as the Father has done his Part in the Act of Generation, that if it muſt be ſuppoſed to derive any thing from the Parents, it muſt certainly owe moſt to the Mother. But be that as it will, the Mother cannot be denied an equal Share in begetting of the Child, and ſo the abſolute Authority of the *Father* will not ariſe from hence. Our A. indeed is of another Mind; for he ſays, *For we know that God at the Creation gave the Sovereignty to the Man over the Woman, as being the nobler and principal Agent in Generation*, O. 172. I remember not this in my Bible, and when the Place is brought where God at the *Creation* gave the Sovereignty to Man over the Woman, and that for this Reaſon, becauſe *he is the nobler and principal Agent in Generation*, it will be time enough to conſider, and anſwer it. But this is no new thing for our A. to tell us his own Fancies for certain and divine Truths, though there be often a great deal of Difference between his and divine Revelations; for God in the Scripture ſays, *his Father and his Mother that begot him.*

56. They

56. They who allege the Practice of Mankind, for *expoſing or ſelling* their Children, as a Proof of their Power over them, are with Sir *Robert* happy Arguers; and cannot but recommend their Opinion, by founding it on the moſt ſhameful Action, and moſt unnatural Murder, human Nature is capable of. The Dens of Lions and Nurſeries of Wolves know no ſuch Cruelty as this: Theſe Savage Inhabitants of the Deſert obey God and Nature in being tender and careful of their Off-ſpring: They will Hunt, Watch, Fight and almoſt Starve for the Preſervation of their Young; never part with them; never forſake them, till they are able to ſhift for themſelves. And is it the Privilege of Man alone to act more contrary to Nature than the Wild and moſt Untamed Part of the Creation? Doth God forbid us under the ſevereſt Penalty, that of Death, to take away the Life of any Man, a Stranger, and upon Provocation? And does he permit us to deſtroy thoſe, he has given us the Charge and Care of; and by the Dictates of Nature and Reaſon, as well as his Reveal'd Command, requires us to preſerve. He has in all the Parts of the Creation taken a peculiar Care to propagate and continue the ſeveral Species of Creatures, and makes the Individuals act ſo ſtrongly to this End, that they ſometimes neglect their own private Good for it; and ſeem to forget that general Rule, which Nature teaches all things of Self-Preſervation; and the Preſervation of their Young, as the ſtrongeſt Principle in them, over-rules the Conſtitution of their particular Natures. Thus we ſee when their Young ſtand in need of it, the timerous become Valiant, the fierce and ſavage Kind, and the ravenous Tender and Liberal.

57. But if the Example of what hath been done, be the Rule of what ought to be, Hiſtory would have furniſh'd our A. with Inſtances of this *Abſolute Fatherly Power* in its Height and Perfection, and he might have ſhew'd us in *Peru*, People that begot Children purpoſe to Fatten and eat them. The Story is ſo remarkable, that I cannot but ſet it down in the A.'s Words. 'In ſome Provinces, *ſays* 'he, they were ſo liquoriſh after Man's Fleſh, that they would not have the Pa'tience to ſtay till the the Breath was out of the Body, but would ſuck the Blood 'as it ran from the Wounds of the dying Man; they had publick Shambles of 'Man's Fleſh, and their Madneſs herein was to that Degree, that they ſpared 'not their own Children which they had begot on Strangers, taken in War: 'For they made their Captives their Miſtreſſes and choicely nouriſhed the Chil'dren they had by them, till about thirteen Years Old they Butcher'd and Eat 'them; and they ſerved the Mothers after the ſame Faſhion, when they grew 'paſt Child-bearing, and ceaſed to bring them any more Roaſters, *Gracilaſſo de la Vega hiſt. des Yncas de Peru*, L. 1. c. 12.

58. Thus far can the buſy Mind of Man carry him to a Brutality below the level of Beaſts, when he quits his Reaſon, which places him almoſt equal to Angels. Nor can it be otherwiſe in a Creature, whoſe Thoughts are more than the Sands, and wider than the Ocean, where Fancy and Paſſion muſt needs run him into ſtrange Courſes, if Reaſon, which is his only Star and Compaſs, be not that he ſteers by. The Imagination is always reſtleſs and ſuggeſts variety of Thoughts, and the Will, Reaſon being laid aſide, is ready for every extravagant Project; and in this State, he that goes fartheſt out of the Way, is thought fitteſt to lead, and is ſure of moſt Followers: And when Faſhion has once eſtabliſhed what Folly or Craft began, Cuſtom makes it ſacred, and 'twill be thought Impudence or Madneſs, to contradict or queſtion it. He that will impartially ſurvey the Nations of the World, will find ſo much of their Religions, Governments and Manners, brought in and continued amongſt them by theſe Means, that he will have but little Reverence for the Practices which are in Uſe and Credit amongſt Men; and will have Reaſon to think, that the Woods and Foreſts, where the irrational untaught Inhabitants keep right by following Nature, are fitter to give us Rules, than Cities and Places, where thoſe that call themſelves civil and rational, go out of their Way, by the Authority of Example. If Precedents are ſufficient to eſtabliſh a Rule, in this Caſe our A. might have found in Holy Writ Children ſacrificed by their Parents, and this amongſt the People of God themſelves: The *Pſalmiſt* tells us, *Pſal.* CVI. 38. *They ſhed innocent Blood, even the Blood of their Sons and of their Daughters, whom they ſacrificed unto the Idols of Canaan.* But God judg'd not of this by our A.'s Rule, nor allow'd of the Authority of Practice againſt his righteous Law, but as it follows there, *The Land was*

polluted with Blood, therefore was the Wrath of the Lord kindled againſt his People inſomuch that he abhorr'd his own Inheritance. The killing of their Children tho' it were faſhionable, was charged on them as *innocent Blood*, and ſo had in the account of God the Guilt of Murder, as the offering them to Idols had the Guilt of Idolatry.

59. Be it then as Sir *Rob.* ſays, that *anciently*, it was uſual for Men *to ſell and caſtrate their Children*, O. 155. Let it be, that they expoſed them; add to it, if you pleaſe, for this is ſtill greater Power, that they begat them for their Table, to fat and eat them: If this proves a Right to do ſo, we may, by the ſame Argument, juſtify Adultery, Inceſt and Sodomy, for there are Examples of theſe too, both ancient and modern: Sins, which I ſuppoſe, have their principal Aggravation from this, that they croſs the main Intention of Nature, which willeth the Increaſe of Mankind, and the Continuation of the Species in the higheſt Perfection, and the Diſtinction of Families, with the Security of the Marriage-Bed, as neceſſary thereunto.

60. In Confirmation of this natural Authority of the Father, our A. brings a lame Proof from the poſitive Command of God in Scripture: His Words are, *to confirm the natural Right of Regal Power, we find in the Decalogue, that the Law which enjoins Obedience to Kings, is delivered in the Terms, Honour thy Father*, p. 23. *whereas many confeſs, that Government only in the Abſtract, is the Ordinance of God, they are not able to prove any ſuch Ordinance in the Scripture, but only in the Fatherly Power, and therefore we find the Commandment, that enjoins Obedience to Superiors, given in the Terms, Honour thy Father; ſo that not only the Power and Right of Government, but the Form of the Power Governing, and the Perſon having the Power, are all the Ordinances of God. The firſt Father had not only ſimply Power, but Power Monarchical, as he was Father immediately from God*, O. 254. To the ſame Purpoſe, the ſame Law is cited by our A. in ſeveral other Places, and juſt after the ſame Faſhion, that is, *and Mother*, as Apochryphal Words, are always left out; a great Argument of our A.'s Ingenuity, and the Goodneſs of his Cauſe, which required in its Defender Zeal to a Degree of Warmth, able to warp the ſacred Rule of the Word of God, to make it comply with his preſent Occaſion; a Way of proceeding not unuſual to thoſe, who embrace not Truths, becauſe Reaſon and Revelation offer them; but eſpouſe Tenets and Parties, for Ends different from Truth, and then reſolve at any rate to defend them; and ſo do with the Words and Senſe of Authors, they would fit to their Purpoſe, juſt as *Procruſtes* did with his Gueſts, lop or ſtretch them, as may beſt fit them to the Size of their Notions: And they always prove like thoſe, ſo ſerved, Deformed, Lame, and Uſeleſs.

61. For had our A. ſet down this Command without Garbling, as God gave it, and joined *Mother* to Father, every Reader would have ſeen, that it had made directly againſt him; and that it was ſo far from Eſtabliſhing the *Monarchical Power of the Father*, that it ſet up the *Mother* equal with him, and injoin'd nothing but what was due in common, to both Father and Mother: For that is the conſtant Tenor of the Scripture, *Honour thy Father and Mother*, Exod. 20. *He that ſmiteth his Father or Mother, ſhall ſurely be put to Death*, 20. 15. *He that curſeth his Father or Mother, ſhall ſurely be put to Death*, Ver. 17. Repeated *Liv.* 20. 9. and by our Saviour, *Matth.* 15. 4. *Ye ſhall fear every Man his Mother and his Father*, Lev. 19. 3. *If a Man have a rebellious Son, which will not obey the Voice of his Father, or the Voice of his Mother; then ſhall his Father and his Mother lay hold on him, and ſay, this our Son is ſtubborn and rebellious, he will not Obey our Voice*, Deut. 21. 18, 19, 20, 21. *Curſed be he that ſetteth light by his Father or his Mother*, 28. 16. *My Son, hear the Inſtruction of thy Father, and forſake not the Law of thy Mother*, are the Words of *Solomon* a King, who was not ignorant of what belonged to him as a Father or a King, and yet he joins *Father* and *Mother* together, in all the Inſtructions he gives Children quite thro' his Book of *Proverbs*. *Woe unto him, that ſaith unto his Father, what begetteſt thou, or to the Woman, what haſt thou brought forth*, Iſa. 11. ver. 10. *In thee have they ſet light by Father or Mother*, Ezek. 28. 2. *And it ſhall come to paſs, that when any ſhall yet propheſy, then his Father and his Mother that begat him, ſhall ſay unto him, thou ſhalt not live, and his Father and Mother that begat him, ſhall thruſt him thro' when he propheſieth*, Zech. 13. 3. Here not the Father only, but the Father and Mother jointly, had Power in this Caſe of Life and Death. Thus ran the Law of the *Old Teſtament*, and in the *New* they are likewiſe

likewiſe join'd, in the Obedience of their Children, *Eph.* 6. 1. The Rule is, *Children obey your Parents*, and I do not remember, that I any where read, *Children obey your Father* and no more: The Scripture joins *Mother* too in that Homage, which is due from Children; and had there been any Text, where the Honour or Obedience of Children had been directed to the *Father* alone, 'tis not likely that our A. who pretends to build all upon Scripture, would have omitted it: Nay the Scripture makes the Authority of *Father and Mother*, in reſpect of thoſe they have begot, ſo equal, that in ſome Places it neglects, even the Priority of Order, which is thought due to the Father, and the *Mother* is put firſt, as *Lev.* 19. 3. From which ſo conſtantly joining Father and Mother together, as is found quite thro' the Scripture, we may conclude that the Honour they have a Title to from their Children, is one common Right belonging ſo equally to them both, that neither can claim it wholly, neither can be excluded.

62. One would wonder then how our A. infers from the 5th Commandment, that all *Power was originally in the Father.* How he finds *Monarchical Power of Government, ſettled and fixed by the Commandment, Honour thy Father and thy Mother.* If all the Honour due by the Commandment, be it what it will, be the only Right of the *Father*, becauſe he, as our A. ſays, *has the Sovereignty over the Woman, as being the nobler and principler Agent in Generation*, why did God afterwards all along join the *Mother* with him, to ſhare in his Honour? Can the Father, by this Sovereignty of his, diſcharge the Child from paying this Honour to his *Mother?* The Scripture gave no ſuch Licenſe to the *Jews*, and yet there were often Breaches wide enough betwixt Husband and Wife, even to Divorce and Separation: And, I think, no body will ſay a Child may with-hold Honour from his Mother, or, as the Scripture terms it, *ſet light by her*, tho' his Father ſhould command him to do ſo; no more than the Mother could diſpence with him for neglecting to *Honour* his Father: Whereby 'tis plain, that this Command of God, gives the Father no Sovereignty, no Supremacy.

63. I agree with our A. that the Title to this *Honour* is veſted in the Parents by Nature and is a Right which accrues to them, by their having begotten their Children, and God by many poſitive Declarations has confirm'd it to them: I alſo allow our A.'s Rule *that in Grants and Gifts, that have their Original from God and Nature, as the Power of the Father*, (let me add *and Mother*, for whom God hath joined together, let no Man put aſunder) *no inferior Power of Men can limit, nor make any Law of Preſcription againſt them*, O. 158. ſo that the Mother having by this Law of God, a Right to Honour from her Children, which is not ſubject to the Will of her Husband, we ſee this *Abſolute Monarchical Power of the Father*, can neither be founded on it, nor conſiſt with it: And he has a Power very far from *Monarchical*, very far from that Abſoluteneſs our A. contends for, when another has over his Subjects the ſame Power he hath, and by the ſame Title: And therefore he cannot forbear ſaying himſelf, that *he cannot ſee how any Man's Children can be free from Subjection to their Parents*, p. 12. which in common Speech, I think, ſignifies *Mother* as well as *Father*, or if *Parents* here ſignifies only *Father*, 'tis the firſt time I ever yet knew it to do ſo, and by ſuch an Uſe of Words, one may ſay any thing.

64. By our A.'s Doctrine, the Father having abſolute Juriſdiction over his Children, has alſo the ſame over their Iſſue; and the Conſequence is good, were it true, that the Father had ſuch a Power: And yet I ask our A. whether the Grandfather, by his Sovereignty, could diſcharge the Grandchild from paying to his Father the Honour due to him by the 5th Commandment. If the Grandfather hath by *Right of Fatherhood*, ſole Sovereign Power in him, and that Obedience which is due to the Supreme Magiſtrate, be commanded in theſe Words, *Honour thy Father*, 'tis certain the Grandfather might diſpence with the Grandſon's honouring his Father, which ſince 'tis evident in common Senſe, he cannot, it follows from hence that, *Honour thy Father and Mother*, cannot mean an abſolute Subjection to a Sovereign Power, but ſomething elſe. The Right therefore which Parents have by Nature, and which is confirm'd to them by the 5th Commandment, cannot be that political Dominion, which our A. would derive from it: For that being in every civil Society ſupreme ſomewhere, can diſcharge any Subject from any Political Obedience to any one of his fellow Subjects. But what Law of the Magiſtrate, can give a Child Liberty, not to *Honour his Father and Mo-*

ther: 'Tis an Eternal Law, annex'd purely to the Relation of Parents and Children, and ſo contains nothing of the Magiſtrates Power in it, nor is ſubjected to it.

65. Our A. ſays, *God hath given to a Father, a Right or Liberty to alien his Power over his Children to any other*, O. 155. I doubt whether he can *Alien* wholly the Right of *Honour* that is due from them: But be that as it will, this I am ſure, he cannot *Alien*, and retain the ſame Power. If therefore the Magiſtrates Sovereignty be as our A. would have it, *nothing but the Authority of a ſupreme Father*, p. 23. 'tis unavoidable, that if the Magiſtrate hath all this Paternal Right, as he muſt have if *Fatherhood* be the Fountain of all Authority; then the Subjects, tho' Fathers, can have no Power over their Children, no Right to Honour from them: For it cannot be all in another's Hands, and a Part remain with the Parents. So that according to our A.'s own Doctrine, *Honour thy Father and Mother* cannot poſſibly be underſtood of political Subjection and Obedience; ſince the Laws both in the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, that commanded Children to *Honour and Obey their Parents*, were given to ſuch, whoſe Fathers were under civil Government, and fellow Subjects with them in political Societies; and to have bid them *Honour and Obey their Parents* in our A.'s Senſe, had been to bid them be Subjects to thoſe who had no Title to it; the Right to Obedience from Subjects, being all veſted in another; and inſtead of teaching Obedience, this had been to foment Sedition, by ſetting up Powers that were not. If therefore this Command, *Honour thy Father and Mother*, concern political Dominion, it directly overthrows our A.'s Monarchy; ſince it being to be paid by every Child to his Father, even in Society, every Father muſt neceſſarily have political Dominion, and there will be as many Sovereigns as there are Fathers: Beſides that the Mother too hath her Title, which deſtroys the Sovereignty of one ſupreme Monarch. But if *Honour thy Father and Mother* mean ſomething diſtinct from political Power, as neceſſarily it muſt, it is beſides our A.'s Buſineſs, and ſerves nothing to his Purpoſe.

66. *The Law that enjoins Obedience to Kings is delivered*, ſays our A. *in the Terms, Honour thy Father, as if all the Power were originally in the Father*, O. 254.: And that Law is alſo delivered, ſay I, in the Terms, *Honour thy Mother*, as if all Power were originally in the Mother. I appeal whether the Argument be not as good on one ſide as the other, *Father and Mother* being joined all along in the *Old* and *New Teſtament* where-ever Honour or Obedience is enjoin'd Children. Again our A. tells us, O. 254. *that this Command, Honour thy Father gives the Right to govern, and makes the Form of Government Monarchical.* To which I anſwer, that if by *Honour thy Father* be meant Obedience to the political Power of the Magiſtrate, it concerns not any Duty we owe to our natural Fathers, who are Subjects; becauſe they, by our A.'s Doctrine, are diveſted of all that Power, it being placed wholly in the Prince, and ſo being equally Subjects and Salves with their Children, can have no Right by that Title, to any ſuch *Honour or Obedience*, as contains in it political Subjection: If *Honour thy Father and Mother* ſignifies the Duty we owe our natural Parents, as by our Saviour's Interpretation, *Matth.* 15. 4. and all the other mentioned Places, 'tis plain it does, then it cannot concern political Obedience, but a Duty that is owing to Perſons, who have no Title to Sovereignty, nor any political Authority as Magiſtrates over Subjects. For the Perſon of a private Father, and a Title to Obedience, due to the ſupreme Magiſtrate, are things inconſiſtent; and therefore this Command, which muſt neceſſarily comprehend the Perſons of our natural Fathers, muſt mean a Duty we owe them diſtinct from our Obedience to the Magiſtrate, and from which the moſt abſolute Power of Princes cannot abſolve us. What this Duty is, we ſhall in its due Place examine.

67. And thus we have at laſt got through all, that in our A. looks like an Argument for that *abſolute unlimited Sovereignty* deſcribed, *Sect.* 8. which he ſuppoſes in *Adam*; ſo that Mankind ever ſince have been all born *Slaves*, without any Title to Freedom. But if *Creation*, which gave nothing but a Being, made not Adam *Prince of his Poſterity*: If *Adam*, Gen. 1. 28. was not conſtituted Lord of Mankind, nor had a *private Dominion* given him excluſive of his Children, but only a Right and Power over the Earth, and inferior Creatures in common with the Children of Men: If alſo *Gen.* 3. 16. God gave not any political Power

to

to *Adam* over his Wife and Children, but only ſubjected *Eve* to *Adam*, as a Puniſhment, or foretold the Subjection of the weaker Sex, in the ordering the common Concernments of their Families, but gave not thereby to *Adam*, as to the Husband, Power of Life and Death, which neceſſarily belongs to the Magiſtrate: If Fathers by begetting their Children acquire no ſuch Power over them: And if the Command, *Honour thy Father and Mother*, give it not, but only enjoins a Duty owing to Parents equally, whether Subjects or not, and to the *Mother* as well as the *Father*: If all this be ſo, as I think, by what has been ſaid, is very evident, then Man has a *natural Freedom*, notwithſtanding all our A. confidently ſays to the contrary; ſince all that ſhare in the ſame common Nature, Faculties and Powers, are in Nature equal, and ought to partake in the ſame common Rights and Privileges, till the manifeſt Appointment of God, who is *Lord over all bleſſed for ever*, can be produced to ſhew any particular Perſon's Supremacy; or a Man's own Conſent ſubjects him to a Superior. This is ſo plain, that our A. confeſſes, that Sir *John Hayward*, *Blackwood* and *Barclay*, *the great Vindicators of the Right of Kings*, could not deny it, *but admit with one Conſent the natural Liberty and Equality of Mankind*, for a Truth unqueſtionable. And our A. hath been ſo far from producing any thing, that may make good his great Poſition, *That* Adam *was abſolute Monarch*, and ſo *Men are not naturally free*, that even his own Proofs make againſt him; ſo that to uſe his own Way of arguing, *This firſt erroneous Principle failing, the whole Fabric of this vaſt Engine of* Abſolute Power *and* Tyranny, *drops down of it ſelf*, and there needs no more to be ſaid in Anſwer to all that he builds upon ſo falſe and frail a Foundation.

68. But to ſave others the Pains, were there any need, he is not ſparing himſelf to ſhew, by his own Contradictions, the Weakneſs of his own Doctrine. *Adam*'s abſolute and ſole Dominion is that, which he is every where full of, and all along builds on, and yet he tells us, *p.* 12. *That as* Adam *was Lord of his Children, ſo his Children under him had a Command and Power over their own Children.* The unlimited and undivided Sovereignty of *Adam*'s *Fatherhood*, by our A.'s Computation, ſtood but a little while, only during the firſt Generation, but as ſoon as he had Grandchildren, Sir *Rob.* could give but a very ill Account of it. Adam, *as Father of his Children*, ſaith he, *hath an abſolute, unlimited Royal Power over them, and by Virtue thereof over thoſe that they begot, and ſo to all Generations*; and yet *his Children*, viz. *Cain* and *Seth*, have a paternal Power over their Children at the ſame time; ſo that they are at the ſame time *abſolute Lords*, and yet *Vaſſals and Slaves*; *Adam* has all the Authority, as *Grandfather of the People*, and they have a Part of it as Fathers of a Part of them: He is abſolute over them and their Poſterity, by having begotten them, and yet they are abſolute over their Children by the ſame Title. *No*, ſays our A. *Adam*'s *Children under him, had Power over their own Children, but ſtill with Subordination to the firſt Parent.* A good Diſtinction that ſounds well, and 'tis pity it ſignifies nothing, nor can be reconciled with our A.'s Words. I readily grant, that ſuppoſing *Adam*'s *abſolute Power* over his Poſterity, any of his Children might have from him a delegated, and ſo a *Subordinate* Power over a Part, or all the reſt: But that cannot be the Power our A. ſpeaks of here, it is not a Power by Grant and Commiſſion, but the natural paternal Power he ſuppoſes a Father to have over his Children. For 1. he ſays, *As* Adam *was Lord of his Children, ſo his Children under him had a Power over their own Children*: They were then Lords over their own Children after the ſame Manner, and by the ſame Title, that *Adam* was, *i. e.* by Right of Generation, by Right of *Fatherhood*. 2. 'Tis plain he means the natural Power of Fathers, becauſe he limits it to be only *over their own Children*; a delegated Power has no ſuch Limitation, as only over their own Children, it might be over others, as well as their own Children. 3. If it were a delegated Power, it muſt appear in Scripture; but their is no Ground in Scripture to affirm, that *Adam*'s Children had any other Power over theirs, than what they naturally had as Fathers.

69. But that he means here Paternal Power, and no other, is paſt doubt, from the Inference he makes in theſe Words immediately following, *I ſee not then how the Children of* Adam, *or of any Man elſe can be free from Subjection to their Parents.* Whereby it appears that the *Power* on one ſide, and the *Subjection* on the other, our A. here ſpeaks of, is that *natural Power* and *Subjection* between Parents and Children. For that which every Man's Children owed, could be no other; and

that

that our A. always affirms to be abſolute and unlimited. This natural *Power* of Parents over their Children, *Adam* had over his Poſterity, ſays our A. and this *Power* of Parents over their Children, his Children had over theirs in his Life-time, ſays our A. alſo: ſo that *Adam*, by a natural Right of Father, had an abſolute unlimited Power over all his Poſterity, and at the ſame time his Children had by the ſame Right abſolute unlimited Power over theirs. Here then are two abſolute unlimited Powers exiſting together, which I would have any body reconcile one to another, or to common Senſe. For the *Salvo* he has put in of *Subordination*, makes it more abſurd: To have one *Abſolute, Unlimited*, nay *Unlimitable Power* in Subordination to another, is ſo manifeſt a Contradition, that nothing can be more. Adam *is abſolute Prince with the Unlimited Authority of Fatherhood over all his Poſterity*; all his Poſterity are then abſolutely his Subjects, and, as our A. ſays, his Slaves, Children and Grandchildren are equally in this State of Subjection and Slavery; and yet, ſays our A. *the Children of* Adam *have Paternal*, i. e. *Abſolute unlimited Power over their own Children:* Which in plain *Engliſh* is, they are Slaves and abſolute Princes at the ſame time, and in the ſame Government: and one Part of the Subjects have an abſolute unlimited Power over the other by the natural Right of Parentage.

70. If any one will ſuppoſe in Favour of our A. that he here meant, that Parents, who are in Subjection themſelves to the abſolute Authority of their Father, have yet ſome Power over their Children; I confeſs he is ſomething nearer the Truth: But he will not at all hereby help our A.: For he no where ſpeaking of the Paternal Power, but as an abſolute unlimited Authority, cannot be ſuppos'd to underſtand any thing elſe here, unleſs he himſelf had limited it, and ſhewed how far it reach'd. And that he means here Paternal Authority in that large Extent, is plain from the immediate following Words; *This Subjection of Children being*, ſays he, *the Foundation of all Regal Authority*, p. 12. *The Subjection* then that in the former Line, he ſays, *every Man is in to his Parents*, and conſequently what *Adam*'s Grandchildren were in to their Parents, was that which was the Fountain of all *Regal Authority*, i. e. according to our A. *abſolute unlimitable Authority*. And thus *Adam*'s Children had *Regal Authority* over their Children, whilſt they themſelves were Subjects to their Father, and Fellow-Subjects with their Children. But let him mean as he pleaſes, 'tis plain he allows *Adam*'s *Children to have Paternal Power*, p. 12. as alſo all other Fathers to have *Paternal Power over their Children*, O. 156. From whence one of theſe two things will neceſſarily follow, that either *Adam*'s Children, even in his Life-time, had, and ſo all other Fathers have, as he phraſes it, *p.* 12. *By Right of Fatherhood Royal Authority over their Children*, or elſe, that *Adam, by Right of Fatherhood, had not Royal Authority*. For it cannot be but that *Paternal Power* does, or does not give *Royal Authority* to them that have it: If it does not, then *Adam* could not be Sovereign by this Title, nor any body elſe, and then there is an End of all our A.'s Politicks at once: If it does give *Royal Authority*, then every one that has *Paternal Power* has *Royal Authority*, and then by our A.'s Patriarchal Government, there will be as many Kings as there are Fathers.

71. And thus what a Monarchy he hath ſet up, let him and his Diſciples conſider. Princes certainly will have great Reaſon to thank him for theſe new Politicks, which ſet up as many abſolute Kings in every Country as there are Fathers of Children. And yet who can blame our A. for it, it lying unavoidably in the Way of our diſcourſing upon our A.'s Principles? For having placed an *abſolute Power* in *Fathers by Right of Begetting*, he could not eaſily reſolve how much of this Power belong'd to a Son over the Children he had begotten; and ſo it fell out to be a very hard matter to give all the Power as he does, to *Adam*, and yet allow a Part in his Life-time to his Children, when they were Parents, and which he knew not well how to deny them. This makes him ſo doubtful in his Expreſſions, and ſo uncertain where to place this abſolute natural Power, which he calls *Fatherhood*; ſometimes *Adam* alone has it all, as *p.* 13. O. 244, 245. & *Pref.*

Sometimes *Parents* have it, which Word ſcarce ſignifies the Father alone, *p.* 12, 19.

Sometimes *Children* during their Fathers Life-time, as *p.* 12.

Sometimes *Fathers* of *Families*, as *p.* 78, and 79.

Some-

Sometimes *Fathers* indefinitely, O. 155.
Sometimes *the Heir to* Adam, O. 253.
Sometimes *the Poſterity of* Adam, 244, 246.
Sometimes *prime Fathers, all Sons or Grandchildren of* Noah, O. 244.
Sometimes *the eldeſt Parents*, p. 12.
Sometimes *all Kings*, p. 19.
Sometimes all that have Supreme Power, O. 245.
Sometimes *Heirs to thoſe firſt Progenitors, who were at the firſt natural Parents of the whole People*, p. 19.
Sometimes an Elective King, *p.* 23.
Sometimes thoſe, whether a few or a Multitude, that Govern the *Commonwealth*, p. 23.
Sometimes he that can catch it, an *Uſurper*, p. 23. O. 155.

72. Thus this *New Nothing*, that is to carry with it all Power, Authority, and Government; *This Fatherhood*, which is to deſign the Perſon, and Eſtabliſh the Throne of Monarchs, whom the People are to obey, may, according to Sir *Robert*, come into any Hands, any how, and ſo by his Politicks give to Democracy Royal Authority, and make an Uſurper a Lawful Prince. And if it will do all theſe fine Feats, much good do our Author and all his Followers with their omnipotent *Fatherhood*, which can ſerve for nothing but to unſettle and deſtroy all the lawful Governments in the World, and to Eſtabliſh in their Room Diſorder, Tyranny, and Uſurpation.

CHAP. VII.

Of Fatherhood and Property conſidered together as Fountains of Sovereignty.

73. IN the forgoing Chapters we have ſeen what *Adam*'s Monarchy was, in our A.'s Opinion, and upon what Titles he founded it. The Foundations which he lays the chief Streſs on, as thoſe from which he thinks he may beſt derive Monarchical Power to future Princes, are two, *viz. Fatherhood and Property*, and therefore the *Way* he propoſes to *remove the Abſurdities and Inconveniencies of the Doctrine of natural Freedom*, is, *to maintain the natural and private Dominion of* Adam, O. 222. Conformable hereunto, he tells us, the *Grounds and Principles of Government neceſſarily depend upon the Original of Property*, O. 108. *The Subjection of Children to their Parents is the Fountain of all Regal Authority*, p. 12. *And all Power on Earth is either derived or uſurped from the Fatherly Power, there being no other Original to be found of any Power whatſoever*, O. 158. I will not ſtand here to examine how it can be ſaid without a Contradiction, that the *firſt Grounds and Principles of Government neceſſarily depend upon the Original of Property*, and yet, *that there is no other Original of any Power whatſoever, but that of the Father*: It being hard to underſtand how there can be *no other Original* but *Fatherhood*, and yet that the *Grounds and Principles of Government depend upon the Original of Property*; *Property and Fatherhood* being as far different as Lord of a Mannor and Father of Children. Nor do I ſee how they will either of them agree with what our A. ſays, O. 244. of God's Sentence againſt *Eve*, Gen. 3. 16. *That it is the Original Grant of Government*: ſo that if that were the *Original*, Government had not its *Original* by our A.'s own Confeſſion, either from *Property* or *Fatherhood*: and this Text which he brings as a Proof of *Adam*'s Power over *Eve*, neceſſarily contradicts what he ſays of the *Fatherhood*, that it is the *Sole Fountain of all Power*. For if *Adam* had any ſuch Regal Power over *Eve*, as our A. contends for, it muſt be by ſome other Title than that of Begetting.

74. But I leave him to reconcile theſe Contradictions, as well as many others, which may plentifully be found in him, by any one who will but read him with a little Attention, and ſhall come now to conſider, how theſe two Originals of Government, *Adam*'s *natural and private Dominion*, will conſiſt, and ſerve to make out and eſtabliſh the Titles of ſucceeding Monarchs, who, as our A. obliges them,

muſt

muſt all derive their Power from theſe *Fountains*. Let us then ſuppoſe *Adam* made *by God's Donation* Lord and ſole Proprietor of the whole Earth, in as large and ample a manner as Sir *Robert* could wiſh; let us ſuppoſe him alſo *by Right of Fatherhood* abſolute Ruler over his Children with an unlimited Supremacy, I ask then upon *Adam*'s Death what becomes of both his *natural* and *private Dominion*; and I doubt not 'twill be anſwered, that they deſcended to his next Heir, as our A. tells us in ſeveral Places. But this way, 'tis plain, cannot poſſibly convey both his *natural* and *private Dominion* to the ſame Perſon. For ſhould we allow, that all the Property, all the Eſtate of the Father ought to deſcend to the Eldeſt Son, (which will need ſome Proof to eſtabliſh it) and ſo he has by that Title all the *private Dominion* of the Father, yet the Father's *natural Dominion*, the Paternal Power cannot deſcend unto him by Inheritance. For it being a Right that accrues to a Man only by begetting, no Man can have this natural Dominion over any one, he does not *beget*; unleſs it can be ſuppos'd, that a Man can have a Right to any thing, without doing that upon which that Right is ſolely founded: For if a Father by *begetting*, and no other Title has *natural Dominion* over his Children, he that does not beget them, cannot have this *natural Dominion* over them; and therefore be it true or falſe, that our A. ſays, O. 156. That *every Man that is born, by his very Birth becomes a Subject to him that begets him*, this neceſſarily follows, *viz.* That a Man by his Birth cannot become a Subject to his Brother, who did not beget him; unleſs it can be ſuppos'd that a Man by the very ſame Title can come to be under the *natural and abſolute Dominion* of two different Men at once; or it be Senſe to ſay, that a Man by Birth is under the *natural Dominion* of his Father, only becauſe he begat him, and a Man by Birth alſo is under the *natural Dominion* of his Eldeſt Brother, tho' he did not beget him.

75. If then the *private Dominion of* Adam, *i. e.* his Property in the Creatures, deſcended at his Death all intirely to his Eldeſt Son, his Heir: (for if it did not, there is preſently an end of all Sir *Robert*'s Monarchy) and his *natural Dominion*; the Dominion a Father has over his Children by begetting them, belong'd immediately upon *Adam*'s Deceaſe equally to all his Sons who had Children, by the ſame Title their Father had it, the Sovereignty founded upon *Property*, and the Sovereignty founded upon *Fatherhood*, come to be divided; ſince *Cain* as Heir had that of *Property* alone, *Seth* and the other Sons that of *Fatherhood* equally with him. This is the beſt can be made of our A.'s Doctrine, and of the two Titles of Sovereignty he ſets up in *Adam*, one of them will either ſignify nothing, or if they both muſt ſtand, they can ſerve only to confound the Rights of Princes, and diſorder Government in his Poſterity. For by building upon two Titles to Dominion, which cannot deſcend together, and which he allows may be ſeparated, (for he yields that *Adam*'s *Children had their diſtinct Territories by Right of private Dominion*, O. 210. p. 40.) he makes it perpetually a Doubt upon his Principles where the Sovereignty is, or to whom we owe our Obedience, ſince *Fatherhood* and *Property* are diſtinct Titles, and began preſently upon *Adam*'s Death to be in diſtinct Perſons. And which then was to give way to the other?

76. Let us take the Account of it, as he himſelf gives it us. He tells us out of *Grotius*, That *Adam*'s *Children by Donation, Aſſignation, or ſome kind of Ceſſion before he was dead, had their diſtinct Territories by Right of private Dominion*; Abel *had his Flocks and Paſtures for them*; Cain *had his Fields for Corn, and the Land of* Nod *where he built him a City*, O. 210. Here 'tis obvious to demand, which of theſe two after *Adam*'s Death was Sovereign? *Cain*, ſays our A. *p.* 19. By what Title? *As Heir; for Heirs to Progenitors, who were natural Parents of their People, are not only Lords of their own Children, but alſo of their Brethren*, ſays our A. *p.* 19. What was *Cain* Heir to? Not the entire Poſſeſſions, not all that which *Adam* had *private Dominion* in, for our A. allows that *Abel* by a Title derived from his Father, *had his diſtinct Territory for Paſture by Right of private Dominion*. What then *Abel* had by *private Dominion*, was exempt from *Cain*'s Dominion. For he could not have *private Dominion* over that, which was under the *private Dominion* of another; and therefore his Sovereignty over his Brother is gone with this *private Dominion*, and ſo there are preſently two Sovereigns, and his imaginary Title of *Fatherhood* is out of Doors, and *Cain* is no Prince over his Brother. Or elſe if *Cain* retain his Sovereignty over *Abel*, notwithſtanding his *private Dominion*, it will follow, that the *firſt Grounds and Principles of Government* have nothing to do with *Property*, what-

whatever our A. ſays to the contrary. 'Tis true, *Abel* did not out-live his Father *Adam*, but that makes nothing to the Argument, which will hold good againſt Sir *Robert* in *Abel*'s Iſſue, or in *Seth*, or any of the Poſterity of *Adam*, not deſcended from *Cain*.

77. The ſame Inconvenience he runs into about *the three Sons of Noah*, who, as he ſays, *p.* 13. *had the whole World divided amongſt them by their Father.* I ask then in which of the Three ſhall we find *the Eſtabliſhment of Regal Power* after *Noah*'s Death? If in all Three, as our A. there ſeems to ſay; then it will follow, that Regal Power is founded in Property of Land, and follows *private Dominion*, and not in *paternal Power* or *natural Dominion*, and ſo there is an end of paternal Power as the Fountain of regal Authority, and the ſo much magnified *Fatherhood* quite vaniſhes. If the regal Power deſcended to *Shem* as Eldeſt, and Heir to his Father, then *Noah*'s *Diviſion of the World by Lot to his Sons, or his Ten Years ſailing about the Mediterranean to appoint each Son his part*, which our A. tells of, *p.* 15. was Labour loſt, his Diviſion of the World to them, was to ill, or to no Purpoſe. For his Grant to *Cham* and *Japhet* was little worth, if *Shem*, notwithſtanding this Grant, as ſoon as *Noah* was dead, was to be Lord over them. Or, if this Grant of *private Dominion* to them, over their aſſigned Territories, were good, here were ſet up two diſtinct Sorts of Power, not ſubordinate one to the other, with all thoſe Inconveniences which he muſters up againſt the *Power of the People*, O. 158. which I ſhall ſet down in his own Words, only changing *Property* for *People*. *All Power on Earth is either derived or uſurped from the Fatherly Power, there being no other Original to be found of any Power whatſoever: For if there ſhould be granted two Sorts of Power, without any Subordination of one to the other, they would be in perpetual Strife which ſhould be Supreme, for two Supremes cannot agree: If the Fatherly Power be Supreme, then the Power grounded on private Dominion muſt be ſubordinate, and depend on it; and if the Power* grounded on Property *be Supreme, then the Fatherly Power muſt ſubmit to it, and cannot be exerciſed without the Licenſe of the Proprietors, which muſt quite deſtroy the Frame and Courſe of Nature.* This is his own arguing againſt two diſtinct Independent Powers, which I have ſet down in his own Words, only putting Power riſing from Property, for *Power of the People*; and when he has anſwered what he himſelf has urged here againſt two diſtinct Powers, we ſhall be better able to ſee how, with any tolerable Senſe, he can derive all Regal Authority *from the natural and private Dominion of* Adam from *Fatherhood* and *Property* together, which are diſtinct Titles, that do not always meet in the ſame Perſon; and 'tis plain, by his own Confeſſion, preſently ſeparated as ſoon both as *Adam*'s and *Noah*'s Death made way for Succeſſion: Though our A. frequently in his Writings jumbles them together, and omits not to make uſe of either, where he thinks it will ſound beſt to his Purpoſe. But the Abſurdities of this will more fully appear in the next Chapter, where we ſhall examine the Ways of Conveyance of the Sovereignty of *Adam*, to Princes that were to Reign after him.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Conveyance of Adam's *ſovereign Monarchical* Power.

78. SIR *Robert*, having not been very happy in any Proof he brings for the Sovereignty of *Adam*, is not much more fortunate in conveying it to future Princes, who, if his Politicks be true, muſt all derive their Titles from that firſt Monarch. The Ways he has aſſigned, as they lie ſcatter'd up and down in his Writings, I will ſet down in his own Words: In his Preface he tells us, That *Adam being Monarch of the whole World, none of his Poſterity had any Right to poſſeſs any thing, but by his Grant or Permiſſion, or by Succeſſion from him.* Here he makes two Ways of Conveyance of any thing *Adam* ſtood poſſeſſed of, and thoſe are *Grants* or *Succeſſion*. Again he ſays, *All Kings either are, or are to be reputed the next Heirs to thoſe firſt Progenitors, who were at firſt the natural Parents of the whole People*, p. 19. *There cannot be any Multitude of Men whatſoever, but that in it, conſider'd by it ſelf, there is one Man amongſt them, that in Nature hath a Right to be the King of all the reſt, as being the next Heir to* Adam, O. 253. Here in theſe Places *Inheritance* is the only

only Way he allows of conveying Monarchical Power to Princes. In other Places he tells us, O. 155. *All Power on Earth is either derived or uſurped from the Fatherly Power*, O. 158. *All Kings that now are, or ever were either Fathers of their People, or Heirs of ſuch Fathers, or Uſurpers of the Right of ſuch Fathers*, O. 253. And here he makes *Inheritance* or *Uſurpation* the only Ways whereby Kings come by this Original *Power*: But yet he tells us, *This Fatherly Empire, as it was of it ſelf Hereditary, ſo it was alienable by Patent, and ſeizable by an Uſurper*, O. 190. So then here Inheritance, Grant or Uſurpation will convey it. And laſt of all, which is moſt admirable, he tells us, *p.* 100. *It ſkills not which way Kings come by their Power, whether by Election, Donation, Succeſſion, or by any other Means, for it is ſtill the Manner of the Government by ſupreme Power, that makes them properly Kings, and not the Means of obtaining their Crowns.* Which I think is a full Anſwer to all his whole *Hypotheſis* and Diſcourſe about *Adam*'s Royal Authority, as the Fountain from which all Princes were to derive theirs: And he might have ſpared the Trouble of ſpeaking ſo much as he does up and down of Heirs and Inheritance, if to make any one *properly a King*, needs no more but *Governing by ſupreme Power, and it matters not by what Means he came by it.*

79. By this notable Way, our A. may make *Oliver* as *properly King*, as any one elſe he could think of: And had he had the Happineſs to live under *Maſſanello*'s Government, he could not by this his own Rule have forborn to have done Homage to him, with *O King live for ever*, ſince the Manner of his Government by ſupreme Power, made him properly King, who was but the Day before properly a Fiſherman. And if *Don Quixot* had taught his Squire to govern with ſupreme Authority, our A. no doubt, could have made a moſt loyal Subject in *Sancho Pancha*'s *Iſland*; and he muſt needs have deſerved ſome Preferment in ſuch Governments, ſince I think he is the firſt Politician, who, pretending to ſettle Government upon its true Baſis, and to eſtabliſh the Thrones of lawful Princes, ever told the World, That he was *properly a King, whoſe Manner of Government was by ſupreme Power, by what Means ſoever he obtained it*; which in plain *Engliſh* is to ſay, that Regal and Supreme Power is properly and truly his, who can by any Means ſeize upon it; and if this be, to be *properly a King*, I wonder how he came to think of, or where he will find, an *Uſurper*.

80. This is ſo ſtrange a Doctrine, that the Surpriſe of it hath made me paſs by, without their due Reflection, the Contradictions he runs into, by making ſometimes *Inheritance* alone, ſometimes only *Grant* or *Inheritance*, ſometimes only *Inheritance* or *Uſurpation*, ſometimes all theſe three, and at laſt *Election* or *any other Means*, added to them, the Ways whereby *Adam*'s Royal *Authority*, that is, his Right to ſupreme Rule, could be convey'd down to future Kings and Governors, ſo as to give them a Title to the Obedience and Subjection of the People. But theſe Contradictions lie ſo open, that the very Reading of our A.'s own Words, will diſcover them to any ordinary Underſtanding; and though what I have quoted out of him (with abundance more of the ſame Strain and Coherence, which might be found in him) might well excuſe me from any farther trouble in this Argument, yet having propoſed to my ſelf, to examine the main Parts of his Doctrine, I ſhall a little more particularly conſider how *Inheritance, Grant, Uſurpation* or *Election*, can any way make out Government in the World upon his Principles; or derive to any one a Right of Empire, from this Regal Authority of *Adam*, had it been never ſo well proved, that he had been abſolute Monarch, and Lord of the whole World.

CHAP. IX.

Of Monarchy, by Inheritance from Adam.

81. THough it be never ſo plain, that there ought to be Government in the World, nay ſhould all Men be of our A.'s Mind that divine Appointment had ordained it to be *Monarchical*, yet ſince Men cannot obey any thing, that cannot command; and Ideas of Government in the Fancy, though never ſo perfect, though never ſo right, cannot give Laws, nor preſcribe Rules to the Actions

ons of Men; it would be of no behoof for the ſettling of Order, and Eſtabliſhment of Government in its Exerciſe and Uſe amongſt Men, unleſs there were a Way alſo taught how to know the Perſon, to whom it belonged to have this Power, and exerciſe this Dominion over others. 'Tis in vain then to talk of Subjection and Obedience without telling us whom we are to obey. For were I never ſo fully perſwaded that there ought to be Magiſtracy and Rule in the World; yet I am never the leſs at Liberty ſtill, till it appears, who is the Perſon, that hath Right to my Obedience; ſince if there be no Marks to know him by, and diſtinguiſh him, that hath Right to Rule from other Men, it may be my ſelf, as well as any other. And therefore though Submiſſion to Government be every one's Duty, yet ſince that ſignifies nothing but ſubmitting to the Direction and Laws of ſuch Men, as have Authority to command, 'tis not enough to make a Man a Subject, to convince him that there is *Regal Power* in the World; but there muſt be ways of deſigning, and knowing the Perſon to whom this *Regal Power* of Right belongs: And a Man can never be oblig'd; in Conſcience to ſubmit to any Power, unleſs he can be ſatisfied who is the Perſon, who has a Right to exerciſe that Power over him. If this were not ſo, there would be no diſtinction between Pirates and Lawful Princes; he that has Force is without any more ado to be obey'd, and Crowns and Scepters would become the Inheritance only of Violence and Rapine. Men too might as often and as innocently change their Governors, as they do their Phyſicians, if the Perſon cannot be known, who has a Right to direct me, and whoſe Preſcriptions I am bound to follow. To ſettle therefore Mens Conſciences, under an Obligation to Obedience, 'tis neceſſary, that they know not only, that there is a Power ſomewhere in the World, but the Perſon who by Right is veſted with this Power over them.

82. How ſucceſsful our A. has been in his Attempts, to ſet up a *Monarchical Abſolute Power* in *Adam*, the Reader may judge by what has been already ſaid; but were that *Abſolute Monarchy* as clear as our A. would deſire it, as I preſume it is the contrary, yet it could be of no uſe to the Government of Mankind now in the World, unleſs he alſo make out theſe two things.

Firſt, That this *Power of Adam* was not to end with him, but was upon his Deceaſe conveyed intire to ſome other Perſon, and ſo on to Poſterity.

Secondly, That the Princes and Rulers now on Earth, are poſſeſſed of this *Power of Adam*, by a right way of Conveyance derived to them.

83. If the firſt of theſe fail, the *Power of Adam*, were it never ſo great, never ſo certain, will ſignify nothing to the preſent Government and Societies in the World, but we muſt ſeek out ſome other original of Power for the Government of Polities than this of *Adam*, or elſe there will be none at all in the World. If the latter fail, it will deſtroy the Authority of the preſent Governors, and abſolve the People from Subjection to them, ſince they having no better a Claim than others to that Power, which is alone the Fountain of all Authority, can have no Title to rule over them.

84. Our A. having fanſied an abſolute Sovereignty in *Adam*, mentions ſeveral Ways of its Conveyance to Princes, that were to be his Succeſſors; but that which he chiefly inſiſts on, is that of Inheritance, which occurs ſo often in his ſeveral Diſcourſes, and I having in the foregoing Chapter quoted ſeveral of theſe Paſſages, I ſhall not need here again to repeat them. This Sovereignty he erects, as has been ſaid, upon a double Foundation, *viz.* that of *Property*, and that of *Fatherhood*. One was the Right he was ſuppoſed to have in all Creatures, a Right to poſſeſs the Earth with the Beaſts, and other inferior Ranks of things in it, for his private Uſe, excluſive of all other Men. The other was the Right he was ſuppoſed to have, to Rule and Govern Men, all the reſt of Mankind.

85. In both theſe Rights, there being ſuppoſed an excluſion of all other Men, it muſt be upon ſome Reaſon peculiar to *Adam*, that they muſt both be founded.

That of his *Property* our A. ſuppoſes to ariſe from God's immediate *Donation*, *Gen.* 1. 28. and that of *Fatherhood* from the Act of *Begetting*: Now in all Inheritance, if the Heir ſucceed not to the Reaſon, upon which his Father's Right was founded, he cannot ſucceed to the Right which followeth from it. For Example, *Adam* had a Right of Property in the Creatures upon the *Donation* and *Grant* of God Almighty, who was Lord and Proprietor of them all; let this be ſo as our A. tells us, yet upon his Death his Heir can have no Title to them, no ſuch

Right of Property in them, unleſs the ſame Reaſon, *viz.* God's *Donation* veſted a Right in the *Heir* too. For if *Adam* could have had no Property in, nor uſe of the Creatures without this poſitive *Donation* from God, and this *Donation*, were only perſonally to *Adam*, his *Heir* could have no Right by it, but upon his Death it muſt revert to God the Lord and Owner again; for poſitive Grants give no Title farther, than the expreſs Words convey it, and by which only it is held. And thus, if, as our A. himſelf contends, that *Donation, Gen.* 1. 28. were made only to *Adam* perſonally, his Heir could not ſucceed to his Property in the Creatures; and if it were a Donation to any but *Adam*, let it be ſhewn, that it was to his Heir in our A.'s Senſe, *i.e.* to one of his Children excluſive of all the reſt.

86. But not to follow our A. too far out of the Way, the plain of the Caſe is this. God having made Man, and planted in him, as in all other Animals, a ſtrong Deſire of Self-Preſervation; and furniſhed the World with things fit for Food and Raiment, and other Neceſſaries of Life, ſubſervient to his Deſign, that Man ſhould live and abide for ſome time upon the Face of the Earth, and not that ſo curious and wonderful a Piece of Workmanſhip, by its own Negligence or want of Neceſſaries, ſhould periſh again, preſently after a few Moments continuance; God, I ſay, having made Man and the World thus, ſpoke to him, (that is) directed him by his Senſes and Reaſon, as he did the inferior Animals by their Senſe, and Inſtinct, which he had placed in them to that purpoſe, to the Uſe of thoſe things, which were ſerviceable for his Subſiſtence, and given him as the Means of his *Preſervation*. And therefore I doubt not, but before theſe Words were pronounced, 1 *Gen.* 28, 29. (if they muſt be underſtood literally to have been ſpoken) and without any ſuch Verbal *Donation*, Man had a Right to an Uſe of the Creatures, by the Will and Grant of God. For the Deſire, ſtrong Deſire of preſerving his Life and Being having been planted in him, as a Principle of Action by God himſelf, Reaſon, *which was the Voice of God in him*, could not but teach him and aſſure him, that purſuing that natural Inclination, he had to preſerve his Being, he followed the Will of his Maker, and therefore had a Right to make uſe of thoſe Creatures, which by his Reaſon or Senſes he could diſcover would be ſerviceable thereunto. And thus Man's *Property* in the Creatures, was founded upon the Right he had, to make uſe of thoſe things, that were neceſſary or uſeful to his Being.

87. This being the Reaſon and Foundation of *Adam*'s *Property* gave the ſame Title, on the ſame Ground, to all his Children, not only after his Death, but in his Life-time: So that here was no Privilege of his *Heir* above his other Children, which could exclude them from an equal Right to the Uſe of the inferior Creatures, for the comfortable Preſervation of their Beings, which is all the *Property* Man hath in them; and ſo *Adam*'s Sovereignty built on *Property*, or as our A. calls it, *Private Dominion* comes to nothing. Every Man had a Right to the Creatures, by the ſame Title *Adam* had, *viz.* by the Right every one had to take care of, and provide for their Subſiſtence: And thus Men had a Right in common, *Adam*'s Children in common with him. But if any one had began, and made himſelf a Property in any particular thing, (which how he, or any one elſe, could do, ſhall be ſhewn in another Place) that Thing, that Poſſeſſion, if he diſpos'd not otherwiſe of it by his poſitive Grant, deſcended naturally to his Children, and they had a Right to ſucceed to it, and poſſeſs it.

88. It might reaſonably be asked here, how come Children by this Right of Poſſeſſing, before any other, the Properties of their Parents upon their Deceaſe. For it being perſonally the Parents, when they die, without actually transferring their Right to another, why does it not return again to the common Stock of Mankind? 'Twill perhaps be anſwered, that common Conſent hath diſpoſed of it to their Children. Common Practice, we ſee indeed does ſo diſpoſe of it, but we cannot ſay, that it is the common Conſent of Mankind; for that hath never been asked, nor actually given; and if common tacit Conſent hath eſtabliſh'd it, it would make but a poſitive, and not a natural Right of Children to inherit the Goods of their Parents: But where the Practice is univerſal, 'tis reaſonable to think the Cauſe is natural. The Ground then, I think to be this. The firſt and ſtrongeſt Deſire God planted in Men, and wrought into the very Principles of their Nature, being that of Self-Preſervation, that is the Foundation of a Right to the Creatures for the particular Support, and Uſe of each individual Perſon him-

himſelf. But next to this, God planted in Men a ſtrong Deſire alſo of propagating their Kind, and continuing themſelves in their Poſterity; and this gives Children a Title, to ſhare in the *Property* of their Parents, and a Right to inherit their Poſſeſſions. Men are not Proprietors of what they have meerly for themſelves, their Children have a Title to part of it, and have their Kind of Right join'd with their Parents, in the Poſſeſſion, which comes to be wholly theirs, when Death, having put an End to their Parents Uſe of it, hath taken them from their Poſſeſſions; and this we call Inheritance: Men being by a like Obligation bound to preſerve what they have begotten, as to preſerve themſelves, their Iſſue come to have a Right in the Goods they are poſſeſſed of. That Children have ſuch a Right, is plain from the Laws of God; and that Men are convinced, that Children have ſuch a Right, is evident from the Law of the Land, both which Laws require Parents to provide for their Children.

89. For Children being by the Courſe of Nature born weak, and unable to provide for themſelves, they have by the Appointment of God himſelf, who hath thus ordered the Courſe of Nature, a Right to be nouriſh'd and maintain'd by their Parents; nay a Right not only to a bare Subſiſtence, but to the Conveniences and Comforts of Life, as far as the Conditions of their Parents can afford it. Hence it comes, that when their Parents leave the World, and ſo the Care due to their Children ceaſes, the Effects of it are to extend as far as poſſibly they can, and the Proviſions, they have made in their Life-time, are underſtood to be intended, as Nature requires they ſhould, for their Children, whom after themſelves, they are bound to provide for, though the dying Parents, by expreſs Words, declare nothing about them, Nature appoints the Deſcent of their Property to their Children, who thus come to have a Title, and natural Right of Inheritance to their Fathers Goods, which the reſt of Mankind cannot pretend to.

90. Were it not for this Right of being Nouriſhed and Maintained by their Parents, which God and Nature has given to Children, and obliged Parents to, as a Duty, it would be reaſonable, that the Father ſhould inherit the Eſtate of his Son, and be prefer'd in the Inheritance before his Grand-Child. For to the Grand-Father, there is due a long Score of Care and Expences laid out upon the Breeding and Education of his Son, which one would think in Juſtice ought to be paid. But that having been done in Obedience to the ſame Law, whereby the received Nouriſhment and Education from his own Parents; this Score of Education, received from a Man's Father, is paid by taking Care, and providing for his own Children, is paid, I ſay, as much as is requir'd of Payment by Alteration of Property, unleſs preſent Neceſſity of the Parents require a Return of Goods for their neceſſary Support and Subſiſtence. For we are not now ſpeaking of that Reverence, Acknowledgment, Reſpect and Honour, that is always due from Children to their Parents; but of Poſſeſſions and Commodities of Life valuable by Money. But though it be incumbent on Parents to bring up and provide for their Children, yet this Debt to their Children does not quite cancel the Score due to their Parents; but only is made by Nature preferable to it. For the Debt a Man owes his Father takes Place, and gives the Father a Right to inherit the Son's Goods, where for want of Iſſue, the Right of Children doth not exclude that Title. And therefore a Man having a Right to be maintain'd by his Children, where he needs it; and to enjoy alſo the Comforts of Life from them, when the neceſſary Proviſion due to them, and their Children will afford it; if his Son die without Iſſue, the Father has a Right in Nature to poſſeſs his Goods, and inherit his Eſtate (whatever the Municipal Laws of ſome Countries, may abſurdly direct otherwiſe,) and ſo again his Children and their Iſſue from him; or for want of ſuch, his Father and his Iſſue. But where no ſuch are to be found, *i. e.* no Kindred, there we ſee the Poſſeſſions of a Private Man revert to the Community, and ſo in Politic Societies come into the Hands of the publick Magiſtrate: but in the State of Nature become again perfectly Common, no body having a Right to inherit them: nor can any one have a Property in them, otherwiſe than in other things common by Nature, of which I ſhall ſpeak in its due Place.

91. I have been the larger, in ſhewing upon what ground Children have a Right to ſucceed to the Poſſeſſion of their Fathers Properties, not only becauſe by it, it will appear, that if *Adam* had a Property (a Titular inſignificant uſeleſs Property; for it could be no better, for he was bound to Nouriſh and Maintain

his

his Children and Poſterity out of it) in the whole Earth and its Product, yet all his Children coming to have by the Law of Nature, and Right of Inheritance a joint Title, and Right of Property in it after his Death, it could convey no Right of Sovereignty to any one of his Poſterity over the reſt: Since every one having a Right of Inheritance to his Portion, they might enjoy their Inheritance, or any Part of it in Common, or ſhare it, or ſome Parts of it by Diviſion, as it beſt liked them. But no one could pretend to the whole Inheritance, or any Sovereignty ſuppoſed to accompany it; ſince a Right of Inheritance gave every one of the reſt, as well as any one, a Title to ſhare in the Goods of his Father. Not only upon this Account, I ſay, have I been ſo particular in examining the Reaſon of Childrens inheriting the Property of their Fathers, but alſo becauſe it will give us farther Light in the Inheritance of *Rule* and *Power*, which in Countries where their particular Municipal Laws give the whole Poſſeſſion of Land entirely to the Firſt Born, and Deſcent of Power has gone ſo to Men by this Cuſtom, ſome have been apt to be deceived into an Opinion, that there was a Natural or Divine Right of Primogeniture, to both *Eſtate* and *Power*; and that the Inheritance of both *Rule* over Men and *Property* in Things, ſprang from the ſame Original, and were to deſcend by the ſame Rules.

92. Property, whoſe Original is from the Right a Man has to uſe any of the inferior Creatures, for the Subſiſtence and Comfort of his Life, is for the Beneſit and ſole Advantage of the Proprietor, ſo that he may even deſtroy the Thing, that he has Property in by his uſe of it, where need requires: But Government being for the Preſervation of every Man's Right and Property, by preſerving him from the Violence or Injury of others, is for the good of the Governed. For the Magiſtrates Sword being for a *Terror to Evil Doers*, and by that Terror to inforce Men to obſerve the poſitive Laws of the Society, made conformable to the Laws of Nature, for the publick Good, *i. e.* the Good of every particular Member of that Society, as far as by common Rule, it can be provided for; the Sword is not given the Magiſtrate for his own Good alone.

93. Children therefore, as has been ſhew'd, by the dependance they have on their Parents for Subſiſtence, have a Right of Inheritance to their Fathers Property, as that which belongs to them for their proper Good and Behoof, and therefore are fitly termed Goods, wherein the Firſt Born has not a ſole or peculiar Right by any Law of God and Nature, the younger Children having an equal Title with him founded on that Right they all have to Maintenance, Support and Comfort from their Parents, and on nothing elſe. But Government being for the Benefit of the Governed, and not the ſole Advantage of the Governors (but only for theirs with the reſt, as they make a Part of that Politick Body, each of whoſe Parts and Members are taken care of, and directed in its peculiar Functions for the Good of the whole, by the Laws of the Society) cannot be inherited by the ſame Title, that Children have to the Goods of their Father. The Right a Son has to be maintained and provided with the Neceſſaries and Conveniences of Life out of his Father's Stock, gives him a Right to ſucceed to his Father's *Property* for his own Good; but this can give him no Right to ſucceed alſo to the *Rule*, which his Father had over other Men. All that a Child has Right to claim from his Father is Nouriſhment and Education, and the things Nature furniſhes for the Support of Life: But he has no Right to demand *Rule* or *Dominion* from him: He can ſubſiſt and receive from him the Portion of good Things, and Advantages of Education naturally due to him, without *Empire and Dominion*. That (if his Father hath any) was veſted in him, for the Good and Behoof of others: and therefore the Son cannot claim or inherit it by a Title, which is founded wholly on his own private Good and Advantage.

94. We muſt know how the firſt Ruler, from whom any one Claims, came by his Authority, upon what Ground any one has *Empire*, what his Title is to it, before we can know who has a Right to ſucceed him in it, and inherit it from him: If the Agreement and Conſent of Men firſt gave a Scepter into any one's Hand, or put a Crown on his Head, that alſo muſt direct its Deſcent and Conveyance. For the ſame Authority, that made the firſt a lawful *Ruler*, muſt make the ſecond too, and ſo give Right of Succeſſion: In this Caſe Inheritance or Primogeniture, can in its ſelf have no Right, no Pretence to it, any farther than that Conſent, which Eſtabliſhed the Form of the Government, hath ſo ſettled

the

the Succeſſion. And thus we ſee the Succeſſion of Crowns, in ſeveral Countries places it on different Heads, and he comes by Right of Succeſſion, to be a Prince in one Place, who would be a Subject in another.

95. If God by his poſitive Grant and revealed Declaration, firſt gave *Rule* and *Dominion* to any Man, he that will claim by that Title, muſt have the ſame poſitive Grant of God for his Succeſſion. For if that has not directed the Courſe of its Deſcent and Conveyance down to others, no body can ſucceed to this Title of the firſt Ruler. Children have no Right of Inheritance to this; and Primogeniture can lay no Claim to it, unleſs God, the Author of this Conſtitution, hath ſo ordained it. Thus we ſee the Pretenſions of *Saul*'s Family, who received his Crown from the immediate Appointment of God, ended with his Reign; and *David* by the ſame Title that *Saul* Reigned, *viz.* God's Appointment, ſucceeded in his Throne, to the excluſion of *Jonathan*, and all Pretenſions of Paternal Inheritance: And if *Solomon* had a Right to ſucceed his Father, it muſt be by ſome other Title, than that of Primogeniture. A *Cadet*, or Siſter's Son, muſt have the Preference in Succeſſion, if he has the ſame Title the firſt lawful Prince had: and in Dominion that has its Foundation only in the poſitive Appointment of God himſelf, *Benjamin* the Youngeſt, muſt have the Inheritance of the Crown, if God ſo direct, as well as one of that Tribe had the firſt Poſſeſſion.

96. *If Paternal Right* the Act of *Begetting*, give a Man *Rule* and *Dominion*, Inheritance or Primogeniture can give no Title. For he that cannot ſucceed to his Father's Title, which was *Begetting*, cannot ſucceed to that Power over his Brethren, which his Father had by Paternal Right over them. But of this I ſhall have occaſion to ſay more in another place. This is plain in the mean Time, that any Government, whether ſuppoſed to be at firſt founded in *Paternal Right*, *Conſent of the People*, or the *poſitive Appointment of God himſelf*, which can ſuperſede either of the other, and ſo begin a new Government upon a new Foundation, I ſay, any Government began upon either of theſe, can by Right of Succeſſion come to thoſe only, who have the Title of him, they ſucceed to Power founded on *Contract*, can deſcend only to him, who has Right by that Contract: Power founded on *Begetting*, he only can have that *Begets*: and Power founded on the poſitive *Grant* or Donation of God, he only can have by Right of Succeſſion, to whom that Grant directs it.

97. From what I have ſaid, I think this is clear, that a Right to the Uſe of the Creatures, being founded Originally in the Right a Man has to ſubſiſt and enjoy the Conveniences of Life; and the natural Right Children have to inherit the Goods of their Parents, being founded in the Right they have to the ſame Subſiſtence and Commodities of Life, out of the Stock of their Parents, who are therefore taught by Natural Love and Tenderneſs to provide for them, as a part of themſelves: and all this being only for the Good of the Proprietor, or Heir; it can be no Reaſon for Childrens Inheriting of *Rule* and *Dominion*, which has another Original, and a different End. Nor can Primogeniture have any Pretence to a Right of ſolely Inheriting either *Property* or *Power*, as we ſhall, in its due Place, ſee more fully. 'Tis enough to have ſhew'd here, that *Adam*'s *Property*, or *Private Dominion*, could not convey any Sovereignty or Rule to his Heir, who not having a Right to inherit all his Father's Poſſeſſions, could not thereby come to have any Sovereignty over his Brethren: and therefore if any Sovereignty on account of his *Property*, had been veſted in *Adam*, which in Truth there was not; yet it would have died with him.

98. As *Adam*'s Sovereignty, if by vertue of being Proprietor of the whole World, he had any Authority over Men, could not have been inherited by any of his Children over the reſt, becauſe they had the ſame Title to divide the Inheritance, and every one had a Right to a Portion of his Father's Poſſeſſions: So neither could *Adam*'s Sovereignty by Right of *Fatherhood*, if any ſuch he had, deſcend to any one of his Children. For it being in our A.'s Account, a Right acquired by *Begetting* to Rule over thoſe he had Begotten, it was not a Power poſſible to be Inherited, becauſe the Right being in conſequent to, and built on, an Act perfectly Perſonal, made that Power ſo too, and impoſſible to be Inherited. For Paternal Power, being a Natural Right riſing only from the Relation of Father and Son, is as impoſſible to be inherited as the Relation itſelf, and a Man may pretend as well to inherit the Conjugal Power the Husband, whoſe Heir he

is, had over his Wife, as he can to inherit the Paternal Power of a Father over his Children. For the Power of the Husband being founded on Contract, and the Power of the Father on *Begetting*, he may as well inherit the Power obtained by the Conjugal Contract, which was only Perſonal, as he may the Power obtained by Begetting, which could reach no farther than the Perſon of the Begetter, unleſs Begetting can be a Title to Power in him, that does not Beget.

99. Which makes it a reaſonable Queſtion to ask, whether *Adam*, dying before *Eve*, his Heir, (ſuppoſe *Cain* or *Seth*) ſhould have by Right of Inheriting *Adam*'s *Fatherhood*, Sovereign Power over *Eve* his Mother. For *Adam*'s *Fatherhood* being nothing but a Right he had to govern his Children, becauſe he begot them; he that inherits *Adam*'s *Fatherhood*, inherits nothing, even in our A.'s Senſe, but the Right *Adam* had to govern his Children, becauſe he begot them: So that the Monarchy of the Heir would not have taken in *Eve*, or if it did, it being nothing but the *Fatherhood of Adam* deſcended by Inheritance, the Heir muſt have Right to govern *Eve*, becauſe *Adam* begot her; for *Fatherhood* is nothing elſe.

100. Perhaps it will be ſaid with our A. that a Man can alien his Power over his Child; and what may be transfer'd by Compact, may be poſſeſſed by Inheritance. I Anſwer, A Father cannot Alien the Power he has over his Child, he may perhaps to ſome degrees forfeit it, but cannot transfer it; and if any other Man acquire it, 'tis not by the Father's Grant, but by ſome Act of his own. For Example, a Father, unnaturally careleſs of his Child, ſells or gives him to another Man; and he again expoſes him; a third Man finding him, breeds up, cheriſhes and provides for him as his own: I think in this Caſe, no body will doubt, but that the greateſt Part of filial Duty and Subjection was here owing, and to be paid to this Foſter-Father; and if any thing could be demanded from the Child, by either of the other, it could be only due to his Natural Father: who perhaps might have forfeited his Right to much of that Duty comprehended in the Command, *Honour your Parents*, but could transfer none of it to another. He that purchaſed, and neglected the Child got by his Purchaſe and Grant of the Father, no Title to Duty or Honour from the Child, but only he acquired it, who by his own Authority, performing the Office and Care of a Father, to the forlorn and periſhing Infant, made himſelf by Paternal Care, a Title to proportionable Degrees of Paternal Power. This will be more eaſily admitted upon Conſideration of the Nature of Paternal Power, for which I refer my Reader to the Second Book.

101. To return to the Argument in Hand: This is evident, That Paternal Power ariſing only from *Begetting*, for in that our A. places it alone, can neither be *transferr'd*, nor *inherited*: And he that does not beget, can no more have Paternal Power, which ariſes from thence, than he can have a Right to any thing, who performs not the Condition, to which only it is annexed. If one ſhould ask, by what Law has a Father Power over his Children? It will be anſwered, no doubt, by the Law of Nature, which gives ſuch a Power over them, to him that begets them. If one ſhould ask likewiſe, by what Law does our A.'s Heir come by a Right to Inherit? I think it would be anſwer'd, by the Law of Nature too. For I find not that our A. brings one Word of Scripture to prove the Right of ſuch an Heir he ſpeaks of. Why then the Law of Nature gives Father's Paternal Power over their Children, becauſe they did *beget* them; and the ſame Law of Nature gives the ſame Paternal Power to the Heir over his Brethren, who did not *beget* them: whence it follows, that either the Father has not his Paternal Power by Begetting, or elſe that the Heir has it not at all: For 'tis hard to underſtand how the Law of Nature, which is the Law of Reaſon, can give the Paternal Power to the Father over his Children, for the only Reaſon of *Begetting*; and to the Firſt-born over his Brethren without this only Reaſon, *i.e.* for no Reaſon at all: and if the Eldeſt, by the Law of Nature, can inherit this Paternal Power, without the only Reaſon, that gives a Title to it, ſo may the Youngeſt, as well as he, and a Stranger as well as either; for where there is no Reaſon for any one, as there is not, but for him that Begets, all have an equal Title. I am ſure our A. offers no Reaſon, and when any body does, we ſhall ſee whether it will hold or no.

102. In the mean time 'tis as good Senſe to ſay, that by the Law of Nature a Man has Right to Inherit the Property of another, becauſe he is of Kin to him,

and

and is known to be of his Blood, and therefore by the ſame Law of Nature, an utter Stranger to his Blood, has Right to inherit his Eſtate: As to ſay that by the Law of Nature, he that begets them, has Paternal Power over his Children, and therefore by the Law of Nature the Heir, that begets them not, has this Paternal Power over them; or ſuppoſing the Law of the Land gave Abſolute Power over their Children; to ſuch only who nurſed them, and fed their Children themſelves, could any body pretend, that this Law gave any one, who did no ſuch Thing, Abſolute Power over thoſe, who were not his Children.

103. When therefore it can be ſhew'd, that Conjugal Power can belong to him, that is not an Husband; it will alſo I believe be proved, that our A.'s Paternal Power acquired by Begetting, may be inherited by a Son; and that a Brother, as Heir to his Father's Power, may have a Paternal Power over his Brethren, and by the ſame Rule Conjugal Power too: but till then, I think we may reſt ſatisfied, that the Paternal Power of *Adam*, this Sovereign Authority of *Fatherhood*, were there any ſuch, could not deſcend to, nor be inherited by his next Heir. *Fatherly Power* I eaſily grant our A. if it will do him any good, can never be loſt, becauſe it will be as long in the World as there are Fathers: But none of them will have *Adam*'s Eternal Power, or derive theirs from him, but every one will have his own, by the ſame Title *Adam* had his, *viz.* by *Begetting*, but not by Inheritance; or Succeſſion, no more than Husbands have their Conjugal Power by Inheritance from *Adam*. And thus we ſee as *Adam* had no ſuch *Property*, no ſuch *Paternal Power*, as gave him *Sovereign* Juriſdiction over Mankind; ſo likewiſe his Sovereignty built upon either of theſe Titles, if he had any ſuch, could not have deſcended to his Heir, but muſt have ended with him: *Adam* therefore, as has been proved, being neither Monarch, nor his imaginary Monarchy hereditable, the Power which is now in the World, is not that which was *Adam*'s, ſince all that *Adam* could have upon our A.'s Grounds, either of *Property* or *Fatherhood*, neceſſarily died with him, and could not be convey'd to Poſterity by Inheritance. In the next Place we will conſider, whether *Adam* had any ſuch Heir, to inherit his Power, as our A. talks of.

CHAP. X.

Of the Heir to Adam's *Monarchical Power.*

104. OUR A. tells us, O. 253. *That it is a Truth undeniable, that there cannot be any Multitude of Men whatſoever, either great or ſmall, tho' gathered together from the ſeveral Corners and remoteſt Regions of the World, but that in the ſame Multitude conſidered by it ſelf, there is one Man amongſt them, that in Nature hath a Right to be King of all the reſt, as being the next Heir to* Adam, *and all the other Subjects to him, every Man by Nature is a King or a Subject.* And again, *p.* 20. *If* Adam *himſelf were ſtill living, and now ready to die, it is certain that there is one Man, and but one in the World who is next Heir.* Let this *Multitude of Men* be, if our A. pleaſes, all the Princes upon the Earth, there will then be our by A.'s Rule, *one amongſt them, that in Nature hath a Right to be King of all the reſt, as being the Right Heir to* Adam; an excellent Way to eſtabliſh the Thrones of Princes, and ſettle the Obedience of their Subjects, by ſetting up an Hundred, or perhaps a Thouſand Titles (if there be ſo many Princes in the World) againſt any King now Reigning, each as good, upon our A.'s Grounds, as his who wears the Crown. If this Right of *Heir* carry any Weight with it, if it be the *Ordinance of God*, as our A. ſeems to tell us, O. 244. muſt not all be ſubject to it, from the higheſt to the loweſt? Can thoſe who were the Name of Princes, without having the Right of being *Heirs to* Adam, demand Obedience from their Subjects by this Title, and not be bound to pay it by the ſame Law? either Governments in the World are not to be claim'd, and held by this Title of *Adam*'s Heir, and then the ſtarting of it is to no purpoſe, the being or not being *Adam*'s Heir ſignifies nothing as to the Title of Dominion: Or if it really be, as our A. ſays, the true Title to Government and Sovereignty, the firſt thing to be done, is to find out this

true Heir of *Adam*, ſeat him in his Throne, and then all the Kings and Princes of the World ought to come and reſign up their *Crowns* and *Scepters* to him, as things that belong no more to them, than to any of their Subjects.

105. For either this Right in Nature, of *Adam*'s Heir, to be King over all the race of Men, (for all together they make one *Multitude*) is a Right not neceſſary to the making of a lawful King, and ſo there may be lawful Kings without it, and then Kings Titles and Power depend not on it: or elſe all the Kings in the World but one are not lawful Kings, and ſo have no Right to Obedience: Either this Title of Heir to *Adam* is that whereby Kings hold their Crowns, and have a Right to Subjection from their Subjects, and then one only can have it, and the reſt being Subjects can require no Obedience from other Men, who are but their Fellow Subjects; or elſe it is not the Title whereby Kings Rule, and have a Right to Obedience from their Subjects, and then Kings are Kings without it, and this Dream of the Natural Sovereignty of *Adam*'s Heir is of no Uſe to Obedience and Government. For if Kings have a Right to Dominion, and the Obedience of their Subjects, who are not, nor can poſſibly be Heirs to *Adam*, what Uſe is there of ſuch a Title, when we are oblig'd to Obey without it? If Kings who are not Heirs to *Adam*, have no Right to Sovereignty, we are all free, 'till our A. or any body for him, will ſhew us *Adam*'s Right Heir. If there be but one Heir of *Adam*, there can be but one lawful King in the World, and no body in Conſcience can be oblig'd to Obedience 'till it be reſolved who that is; for it may be any one, who is not known to be of a younger Houſe, and all others have equal Titles. If there be more than one Heir of *Adam*, every one is his Heir, and ſo every one has Regal Power. For if two Sons can be Heirs together, then all the Sons are equally Heirs, and ſo all are Heirs, being all Sons, or Sons of *Adam*. Betwixt theſe two the Right of Heir cannot ſtand; for by it either but one only Man, or all Men are Kings. Take which you pleaſe, it diſſolves the Bonds of Government and Obedience; ſince if all Men are Heirs, they can owe Obedience to no body; if only one, no body can be obliged to pay Obedience to him, 'till he be known, and his Title made out.

CHAP. XI.

Who HEIR?

106. THE great Queſtion which in all Ages has diſturb'd Mankind, and brought on them the greateſt part of thoſe Miſchiefs, which have ruin'd Cities, depopulated Countries, and diſorder'd the Peace of the World, has been not whether there be Power in the World, nor whence it came, but who ſhould have it. The ſetling of this Point being of no ſmaller Moment than the Security of Princes, and the Peace and Welfare of their Eſtates and Kingdoms, a Reformer of Politicks, one would think, ſhould lay this ſure, and be very clear in it, for if this remain diſputable, all the reſt will be to very little Purpoſe; and the skill uſed in dreſſing up Power with all the Splendor and Temptation Abſolutneſs can add to it, without ſhewing who has a Right to have it, will ſerve only to give a greater Edge to Man's Natural Ambition, which of its ſelf is but too keen. What can this do but ſet Men on the more eagerly to Scramble, and ſo lay a ſure and laſting Foundation of endleſs Contention and Diſorder, inſtead of that Peace and Tranquility, which is the Buſineſs of Government, and the End of Human Society?

197. This Deſignation of the Perſon our A. is more than ordinary obliged to take Care of, becauſe he, affirming that *the Aſſignment of civil Power is by divine Inſtitution*, hath made the Conveyance as well as the Power it ſelf Sacred: ſo that no Conſideration, no Act or Art of Man can divert it from that Perſon, to whom, by this divine Right it is Aſſigned; no Neceſſity or Contrivance can ſubſtitute another Perſon in his Room. For if the *Aſſignment of civil Power be by divine Inſtitution*; and *Adam*'s Heir be he, to whom it is thus aſſigned, as in the fore-

foregoing Chapter our A. tells us, it would be as much Sacrilege for any one to be King, who was not *Adam*'s Heir, as it would have been amongſt the *Jews*, for any one to have been *Prieſt*, who had not been of *Aaron*'s Poſterity: For *not only* the Prieſthood *in general being by divine Inſtitution, but the Aſſignment of it* to the ſole Line and Poſterity of *Aaron*, made it impoſſible to be enjoy'd or exerciſed by any one, but thoſe Perſons, who are of the Off-ſpring of *Aaron*: whoſe Succeſſion therefore was carefully obſerved, and by that the Perſons who had a Right to the Prieſthood certainly known.

108. Let us ſee then what Care our A. has taken, to make us know who is this *Heir*, who *by divine Inſtitution, has a Right to be King over all Men.* The firſt Account of him we meet with is *p.* 12. in theſe Words: *This Subjection of Children, being the Fountain of all Regal Authority, by the Ordination of God himſelf; it follows, that civil Power not only in general, is by divine Inſtitution, but even the Aſſignment of it ſpecifically to the eldeſt Parents.* Matters of ſuch Conſequence as this is, ſhould be in plain Words, as little liable, as might be, to Doubt or Equivocation; and, I think, if Language be capable of expreſſing any thing diſtinctly and clearly, that of Kindred, and the ſeveral Degrees of nearneſs of Blood, is one. It were therefore to be wiſh'd, that our A. had uſed a little more intelligible Expreſſions here, that we might have better known, who it is, to whom the *Aſſignment of civil Power* is made by *divine Inſtitution*; or at leaſt would have told us what he meant by *eldeſt Parents*. For I believe if Land had been aſſigned or granted to him, and the *eldeſt Parents* of his Family, he would have thought it had needed an Interpreter; and 'twould ſcarce have been known to whom next it belonged.

109. In Propriety of Speech, (and certainly Propriety of Speech is neceſſary in a Diſcourſe of this Nature) *eldeſt Parents* ſignifies either the eldeſt Men and Women that have had Children, or thoſe who have longeſt had Iſſue; and then our A.'s Aſſertion will be, That thoſe Fathers and Mothers, who have been longeſt in the World, or longeſt fruitful, have by *divine Inſtitution* a Right to *civil Power*. If there be any Abſurdity in this, our A. muſt anſwer for it: And if his Meaning be different from my Explication, he is to be blam'd, that he would not ſpeak it plainly. This I am ſure, *Parents* cannot ſignify Heirs Male, nor *eldeſt Parents* an infant Child: who yet may ſometime be the true Heir, if there can be but one. And we are hereby ſtill as much at a Loſs, who *civil Power* belongs to, notwithſtanding this *Aſſignment by divine Inſtitution*, as if there had been no ſuch *Aſſignment* at all, or our A. had ſaid nothing of it. This of *eldeſt Parents* leaving us more in the dark, who by *divine Inſtitution* has a Right to *civil Power*, than thoſe who never heard any thing at all of *Heir*, or Deſcent, of which our A. is ſo full. And tho' the chief Matter of his Writings be to teach Obedience to thoſe, who have a Right to it, which he tells us is conveyed by Deſcent, yet who thoſe are, to whom this Right by Deſcent belongs, he leaves, like the Philoſophers Stone in Politicks, out of the Reach of any one to diſcover from his Writings.

110. This Obſcurity cannot be imputed to want of Language in ſo great a Maſter of Style as Sir *Robert* is, when he is reſolved with himſelf, what he would ſay: And therefore, I fear, finding how hard it would be to ſettle Rules of Deſcent by divine Inſtitution, and how little it would be to his Purpoſe, or conduce to the clearing and eſtabliſhing the Titles of Princes, if ſuch Rules of Deſcent were ſettled, he choſe rather to content himſelf with doubtful and general Terms, which might make no ill Sound in Mens Ears, who were willing to be pleas'd with them, rather than offer any clear Rules of Deſcent of this *Fatherhood* of *Adam*, by which Mens Conſciences might be ſatisfied to whom it deſcended, and know the Perſons who had a Right to Regal Power, and with it to their Obedience.

111. How elſe it is poſſible, that laying ſo much Streſs, as he does, upon *Deſcent*, and *Adam*'s *Heir*, *next Heir*, *true Heir*, he ſhould never tell us what *Heir* means, nor the Way to know who the *next* or *true Heir* is. This, I do not remember, he does any where expreſly handle; but, where it comes in his Way, very warily and doubtfully touches; tho' it be ſo neceſſary, that without it all Diſcourſes of Government and Obedience upon his Principles would be to no Purpoſe, and *Fatherly Power*, never ſo well made out, will be of no uſe to any body. Hence he tells us, O. 244. *That not only the Conſtitution of Power in general, but the Limitation of it to one kind*, (i. e.) *Monarchy and the Determination of it to the individual*

vidual Perſon and Line of Adam, *are all three Ordinances of God, neither* Eve *nor her Children could either limit* Adam's *Power, or joyn others with him; and what was given unto* Adam *was given in his Perſon to his Poſterity.* Here again our A. informs us, that the *Divine Ordinance* hath limited the Deſcent of *Adam*'s Monarchical Power. To whom? *To* Adam's *Line and Poſterity*, ſays our A. A notable *Limitation*, a *Limitation* to all Mankind. For if our A. can find any one amongſt Mankind, that is not of the *Line* and *Poſterity* of *Adam*, he may perhaps tell him, who this next Heir of *Adam*'s is: But for us, I deſpair how this *Limitation* of *Adam*'s Empire to his *Line* and *Poſterity* will help us to find out *one Heir*. This *Limitation* indeed of our A. will ſave thoſe the Labour, who would look for him amongſt the Race of Brutes, if any ſuch there were: But will very little contribute to the Diſcovery of *one next Heir* amongſt Men, tho' it make a ſhort and eaſy Determination of the Queſtion about the Deſcent of *Adam*'s Regal Power, by telling us, that the *Line* and *Poſterity* of *Adam* is to have it, that is in plain *Engliſh*, any one may have it, ſince there is no Perſon living, that hath not the Title of being of the *Line* and *Poſterity* of *Adam*; and while it keeps there, it keeps within our A.'s Limitation by God's Ordinance. Indeed, *p.* 19. he tells us, that *ſuch Heirs are not only Lords of their own Children, but of their Brethren*, whereby, and by the Words following, which we ſhall conſider anon, he ſeems to inſinuate, that the eldeſt Son is *Heir*; but he no where, that I know, ſays in direct Words, but by the Inſtances of *Cain* and *Jacob*, that there follow, we may allow this to be ſo far his Opinion concerning Heirs, that where there are divers Children, the eldeſt Son has the Right to be *Heir*. That Primogeniture cannot give any Title to Paternal Power, we have already ſhew'd. That a Father may have a Natural Right to ſome Kind of Power over his Children, is eaſily granted, but that an elder Brother has ſo over his Brethren remains to be proved: God or Nature has not any where, that I know, placed by ſuch Juriſdiction in the Firſt-born; nor can Reaſon find any ſuch natural Superiority amongſt Brethren. The Law of *Moſes* gave a double Portion of the Goods and Poſſeſſions to the Eldeſt, but we find not any where, that naturally, or by *God*'s *Inſtitution*, Superiority or Dominion belong'd to him, and the Inſtances there brought by our A. are but ſlender Proofs of a Right to Civil Power and Dominion in the Firſt-born, and do rather ſhew the contrary.

112. His Words are in the fore-cited Place: *And therefore we find God told* Cain *of his Brother* Abel; *his Deſire ſhall be Subject unto thee, and thou ſhalt Rule over him.* To which I anſwer,

1. Theſe Words of God to *Cain*, are by many Interpreters with great Reaſon, underſtood in a quite different Senſe than what our A. uſes them in.

2. Whatever was meant by them, it could not be, that *Cain* as Elder, had a Natural Dominion over *Abel*; for the Words are conditional: *If thou doſt well*, and ſo perſonal to *Cain*, and whatever was ſignified by them, did depend on his Carriage and not follow his Birth-right: And therefore could by no means be an Eſtabliſhment of Dominion in the Firſt-born in general. For before this *Abel* had his *diſtinct Territories by Right of private Dominion*, as our A. himſelf confeſſes, O. 210. which he could not have had to the Prejudice of the Heir's Title, *If by Divine Inſtitution, Cain* as Heir were to inherit all his Father's Dominion.

3. If this were intended by God as the Charter of Primogeniture, and the Grant of Dominion to Elder Brothers in general as ſuch, by Right of Inheritance, we might expect it ſhould have included all his Brethren. For we may well ſuppoſe, *Adam*, from whom the World was to be Peopled, had by this Time, that theſe were grown up to be Men, more Sons than theſe two: Whereas *Abel* himſelf is not ſo much as named; and the Words in the Original can ſcarce with any good Conſtruction, be applied to him.

4. It is too much to build a Doctrine of ſo mighty Conſequence upon ſo doubtful and obſcure a Place of Scripture, which may be well, nay better, underſtood in a quite different Senſe, and ſo can be but an ill Proof, being as doubtful as the thing to be proved by it; eſpecially when there is nothing elſe in Scripture or Reaſon to be found, that favours or ſupports it.

113. It follows, *p.* 19. *Accordingly when* Jacob *bought his Brother's Birth-right*, Iſaac *bleſſed him thus; be Lord over thy Brethren, and let the Sons of thy Mother bow before thee.* Another Inſtance, I take it, brought by our A. to evince Dominion

due

due to Birth-right, and an admirable one it is. For it muſt be no ordinary Way of Reaſoning in a Man, that is pleading for the natural Power of Kings, and againſt all Compact, to bring for Proof of it, an Example, where his own Account of it founds all the Right upon Compact, and ſettles Empire in the Younger Brother, unleſs buying and ſelling be no Compact; for he tells us, *when* Jacob *bought his Brother's Birth-right.* But paſſing by that, let us conſider the Hiſtory it ſelf, with what Uſe our A. makes of it, and we ſhall find theſe following Miſtakes about it.

1. That our A. reports this, as if *Iſaac* had given *Jacob* this Bleſſing, immediately upon his purchaſing the *Birth-right*; for he ſays, *when* Jacob *bought*, Iſaac *bleſſed* him, which is plainly otherwiſe in the Scripture. For it appears, there was a Diſtance of time between, and if we will take the Story in the Order it lies, it muſt be no ſmall Diſtance; all *Iſaac*'s ſojourning in *Gerar*, and Tranſactions with *Abimelech*, Gen. 26. coming between, *Rebecca* being then beautiful and conſequently young, but *Iſaac* when he bleſſed *Jacob*, was old and decrepid: And *Eſau* alſo complains of *Jacob*, Gen. 27. 36. that *two times* he had ſupplanted him, *he took away my Birth-right*, ſays he, *and behold now he hath taken away my Bleſſing*; Words, that I think ſignify Diſtance of Time and Difference of Action.

2. Another Miſtake of our A.'s is, that he ſuppoſes *Iſaac* gave *Jacob the Bleſſing*, and bid him be *Lord over his Brethren*, becauſe he had the *Birth-right*; for our A. brings this Example to prove, that he that has the *Birth-right*, has thereby a Right to *be Lord over his Brethren.* But it is alſo manifeſt by the Text, that *Iſaac* had no Conſideration of *Jacob*'s having bought the Birth-right; for when he bleſſed him, he conſidered him not as *Jacob*, but took him for *Eſau.* Nor did *Eſau* underſtand any ſuch Connection between *Birth-right* and the *Bleſſing*, for he ſays, *he hath ſupplanted me theſe two times, he took away my Birth-right, and behold now he hath taken away my Bleſſing: Whereas had the Bleſſing*, which was to be *Lord over his Brethren*, belong'd to the *Birth-right*, *Eſau* could not have complain'd of this ſecond, as a Cheat, *Jacob* having got nothing but what *Eſau* had ſold him, when he ſold him his *Birth-right*; ſo that it is plain, Dominion, if theſe Words ſignifie it, was not underſtood to belong to the *Birth-right.*

114. And that in thoſe Days of the Patriarchs, Dominion was not underſtood to be the Right of the Heir, but only a greater Portion of Goods, is plain from *Gen.* 21. 10. for *Sarah* taking *Iſaac* to be Heir, ſays, *caſt out the Bondwoman and her Son, for the Son of this Bondwoman ſhall not be Heir with my Son:* whereby could be meant nothing, but that he ſhould not have a Pretence to an equal Share of his Father's Eſtate after his Death, but ſhould have his Portion preſently and be gone. Accordingly we read, *Gen.* 25. 5, 6. *That* Abraham *gave all that he had unto Iſaac, but unto the Sons of the Concubines which* Abraham *had*, Abraham *gave Gifts and ſent them away from* Iſaac *his Son, while he yet lived.* That is, *Abraham* having given Portions to all his other Sons, and ſent them away, that which he had reſerved, being the greateſt part of his Subſtance, *Iſaac* as Heir poſſeſſed after his Death, but by being Heir, he had no Right to be *Lord over his Brethren*; for if he had, why ſhould *Sarah* endeavour to rob him of one of his *Subjects*, or leſſen the Number of his *Slaves*, by deſiring to have *Iſhmael* ſent away.

115. Thus as under the Law, the Privilege of *Birth-right* was nothing but a double Portion, ſo we ſee that before *Moſes* in the Patriarchs Time, from whence our A. pretends to take his Model, there was no Knowledge, no Thought, that Birth-right gave Rule or Empire, Paternal or Kingly Authority, to any one over his Bretheren. If this be not plain enough in the Story of *Iſaac* and *Iſhmael*, he that will look into 1 *Chron.* 5. 12. may there read theſe Words, Reuben *was the firſt Born, but foraſmuch as he defiled his Father's Bed, his Birth-right was given unto the Sons of* Joſeph, *the Son of* Iſrael, *and the Genealogy is not to be reckoned after the Birth-right; for* Judah *prevailed above his Bretheren, and of him came the chief Ruler, but the Birth-right was* Joſeph's; what this Birth-right was, *Jacob* bleſſing *Joſeph*, *Gen.* 48. 22. telleth us in theſe Words, *Moreover I have given thee one Portion above thy Brethren, which I took out of the Hand of the Amorite, with my Sword and with my Bow.* Whereby it is not only plain, that the Birth-right was nothing but a double Portion, but the Text in *Chron.* is expreſs againſt our A.'s Doctrine, and ſhews that Dominion was no part of the Birth-right. For it tells us, that *Joſeph* had the Birth-right, but *Judah* the Dominion. One would think our A. were very fond

of

of the very Name of *Birth-right*, when he brings this Inſtance of *Jacob* and *Eſau*, to prove that Dominion belongs to the Heir over his Brethren.

116. 1. Becauſe it will be but an ill Example to prove, that Dominion by God's Ordination belong'd to the Eldeſt Son, becauſe *Jacob* the Youngeſt here had it, let him come by it how he would. For if it prove any thing, it can only prove againſt our A. that the *Aſſignment of Dominion to the Eldeſt, is not by Divine Inſtitution*, which would then be unalterable. For if by the Law of God, or Nature, abſolute Power and Empire belongs to the eldeſt Son and his Heirs, ſo that they are ſupream Monarchs, and all the reſt of their Brethren Slaves, our A. gives us Reaſon to doubt, whether the eldeſt Son has a Power to part with it, to the Prejudice of his Poſterity, ſince he tells us, O. 158. That *in Grants and Gifts that have their Original from God or Nature, or inferior Power of Man can limit, or make any Law of Preſcription againſt them.*

117. 2. Becauſe this Place, *Gen.* 27. 29. brought by our A. concerns not at all the Dominion of one Brother over the other, nor the Subjection of *Eſau* to *Jacob*. For 'tis plain in the Hiſtory, that *Eſau* was never ſubject to *Jacob*, but lived apart in Mount *Seir*, where he founded a diſtinct People and Government, and was himſelf Prince over them, as much as *Jacob* was in his own Family. This Text if conſider'd, can never be underſtood of *Eſau* himſelf, or the perſonal Dominion of *Jacob* over him: For the Words *Brethren* and *Sons of thy Mother*, could not be uſed literally by *Iſaac* who knew *Jacob* had only one Brother; and theſe Words are ſo far from being true in a literal Senſe, or eſtabliſhing any Dominion in *Jacob* over *Eſau*, that in the Story we find the quite contrary, for *Gen.* 32. *Jacob* ſeveral times calls *Eſau* Lord, and himſelf his Servant; and *Gen.* 33. *he bowed himſelf ſeven times to the Ground to* Eſau. Whether *Eſau* then were a Subject and Vaſſal (nay as our A. tells us, all Subjects are Slaves) to *Jacob*, and *Jacob* his Sovereign Prince by Birth-right, I leave the Reader to judge; and to believe if he can, that theſe Words of *Iſaac*, *be Lord over thy Brethren, and let thy Mother's Sons bow down to thee*, confirm'd *Jacob* in a Sovereignty over *Eſau*, upon the Account of the *Birth-right* he had got from him.

118. He that reads the Story of *Jacob* and *Eſau*, will find there was never any Juriſdiction or Authority, that either of them had over the other after their Father's Death; they lived with the Friendſhip and Equality of Brethren, neither *Lord*, neither *Slave* to his Brother; but independent of each other, were both Heads of their diſtinct Families, where they received no Laws from one another, but lived ſeparately, and were the Roots out of which ſprang two diſtinct People under two diſtinct Governments. This Bleſſing then of *Iſaac*, whereon our A. would build the Dominion of the elder Brother ſignifies no more, but what *Rebecca* had been told from God, *Gen.* 25. 23. *Two Nations are in thy Womb, and two manner of People, ſhall be ſeparated from thy Bowels, and the one People ſhall be ſtronger than the other People, and the Elder ſhall ſerve the Younger*; and ſo *Jacob* bleſſed *Judah*, Gen. 49. and gave him the *Scepter* and *Dominion*, from whence our A. might have argued as well, that Juriſdiction and Dominion, belongs to the third Son over his Brethren, as well as from this Bleſſing of *Iſaac*, that it belonged to *Jacob*: Both theſe Places contain only Predictions of what ſhould long after happen to their Poſterities, and not any Declaration of the Right of Inheritance to Dominion in either. And thus we have our A.'s two great and only Arguments to prove, that *Heirs are Lords over their Brethren.*

1. Becauſe God tells *Cain*, Gen. 4. That however Sin might ſet upon him, he ought or might be Maſter of it: For the moſt learned Interpreters underſtood the Words of Sin, and not of *Abel*, and give ſo ſtrong Reaſons for it, that nothing can convincingly be infer'd, from ſo doubtful a Text, to our A.'s Purpoſe.

2. Becauſe in this of *Gen.* 27. *Iſaac* foretels that the *Iſraelits*, the Poſterity of *Jacob*, ſhould have Dominion over the *Edomites*, the Poſterity of *Eſau*; therefore ſays our A. *Heirs are Lords of their Brethren:* I leave any one to judge of the Concluſion.

119. And now we ſee how our A. has provided for the Deſcending, and Conveyance down of *Adam*'s monarchical Power, or paternal Dominion to Poſterity, by the Inheritance of his *Heir*, ſucceeding to all his Father's Authority, and becoming upon his Death as much Lord as his Father was, *not only over his own Children, but over his Brethren*, and all deſcended from his Father, and ſo *in infinitum*

tum. But yet who this Heir is, he does not once tell us; and all the Light we have from him in this ſo fundamental a Point, is only, that in his Inſtance of *Jacob*, by uſing the Word *Birth-right*, as that which paſſed from *Eſau* to *Jacob*, he leaves us to gueſs, that by Heir, he means the eldeſt Son; tho' I do not remember he any where mentions expreſly the Title of the Firſt-born, but all along keeps himſelf under the Shelter of the indefinite Term *Heir*. But taking it to be his Meaning, that the eldeſt Son is Heir, (for if the Eldeſt be not, there will be no Pretence why the Sons ſhould not be all *Heirs* alike) and ſo by Right of Primogeniture has Dominion over his Brethren; this is but one Step towards the Settlement of Succeſſion, and the Difficulties remain ſtill as much as ever, till he can ſhew us who is meant by Right Heir, in all thoſe Caſes which may happen where the preſent Poſſeſſor hath no Son. This he ſilently paſſes over, and perhaps wiſely too: For what can be wiſer, after one has affirm'd, That *the Perſon having that Power, as well as the Power and Form of Government, is the Ordinance of God, and by divine Inſtitution*, vid. O. 254. p. 12. than to be careful, not to ſtart any Queſtion concerning the Perſon, the Reſolution whereof will certainly lead him into a Confeſſion, that God and Nature hath determined nothing about him. And if our A. cannot ſhew who by Right of Nature, or a clear poſitive Law of God, has the next Right to inherit the Dominion of this natural Monarch he has been at ſuch Pains about, when he died without a Son, he might have ſpared his Pains in all the reſt, it being more neceſſary for the ſetling Mens Conſciences, and determining their Subjection and Allegiance, to ſhew them who by original Right, ſuperior and antecedent to the Will, or any Act of Men, hath a Title to this *paternal Juriſdiction*, than it is to ſhew that by Nature there was ſuch a *Juriſdiction*; it being to no Purpoſe for me to know there is ſuch a *paternal Power*, which I ought, and am diſpoſed to obey, unleſs where there are many Pretenders, I alſo know the Perſon, that is rightfully inveſted and endow'd with it.

120. For the main Matter in Queſtion being concerning the Duty of my Obedience, and the Obligation of Conſcience, I am under, to pay it to him, that is of Right my Lord and Ruler, I muſt know the Perſon, that this Right of paternal Power reſides in, and ſo impowers him to claim Obedience from me. For let it be true what he ſays, *p.* 12. That *Civil Power not only in general is by divine Inſtitution, but even the Aſſignment of it ſpecially to the Eldeſt Parents*; and O. 254. *That not only the Power or Right of Government, but the Form of the Power of Governing, and the Perſon having that Power, are all the Ordinance of God*; yet unleſs he ſhew us in all Caſes who is this Perſon, *Ordain'd* by God; who is this *Eldeſt Parent*, all his abſtract Notions of Monarchical Power will ſignify juſt nothing, when they are to be reduced to Practice, and Men are conſcientiouſly to pay their Obedience. For *paternal Juriſdiction* being not the thing to be obeyed, becauſe it cannot command, but is only that which gives one Man a Right, which another hath not, and if it come by Inheritance, another Man cannot have, to command and be obey'd; it is ridiculous to ſay, I pay Obedience to the *paternal Power*, when I obey him, to whom paternal Power gives no Right to my Obedience: For he can have no divine Right to my Obedience, who cannot ſhew his divine Right to the Power of ruling over me, as well as that by Divine Right, there is ſuch a Power in the World.

121. And hence not being able to make out any Prince's Title to Government, as Heir to *Adam*, which therefore is of no Uſe, and had been better let alone, he is fain to reſolve all into preſent Poſſeſſion, and makes civil Obedience as due to an *Uſurper*, as to a lawful King; and thereby the *Uſurper*'s Title as good. His Words are, O. 253. And they deſerve to be remembred: *If an Uſurper diſpoſſeſs the true Heir, the Subjects Obedience to the Fatherly Power muſt go along and wait upon God's Providence.* But I ſhall leave his Title of Uſurpers to be examin'd in its due Place, and deſire my ſober Reader to conſider what Thanks Princes owe ſuch Politicks as this, which can ſuppoſe *paternal Power*, (i. e.) a Right to Government in the Hands of a *Cade*, or a *Cromwel*, and ſo all Obedience being due to paternal Power, the Obedience of Subjects will be due to them, by the ſame Right, and upon as good Grounds, as it is to lawful Princes; and yet this as dangerous a Doctrine as it is, muſt neceſſarily follow from making all political Power to be nothing elſe, but *Adam*'s paternal Power by Right and divine *Inſtitution*, deſcending from him without being able to ſhew to whom it deſcended, or who is Heir to it.

122. To

122. To ſettle Government in the World, and to lay Obligations to Obedience on any Man's Conſcience, it is as neceſſary (ſuppoſing with our A. that all Power be nothing but the being poſſeſſed of *Adam's Fatherhood*) to ſatisfy him, who has a Right to this *Power*, this *Fatherhood*, when the Poſſeſſor dies without Sons to ſucceed immediately to it, as it was to tell him, that upon the Death of the Father, the Eldeſt Son had a Right to it: For it is ſtill to be remember'd, that the great Queſtion is, (and that which our A. would be thought to contend for, if he did not ſometimes forget it) what Perſons have a Right to be obeyed, and not whether there be a Power in the World, which is to be called *paternal*, without knowing in whom it reſides: For ſo it be a Power, *i. e.* Right to govern, it matters not, whether it be termed *Paternal* or *Regal*, *Natural* or *Acquired*: whether you call it *ſupreme Fatherhood*, or *ſupreme Brotherhood*, will be all one, provided we know who has it.

123. I go on then to ask whether in the inheriting of this *paternal Power*, this *ſupreme Fatherhood*, the Grandſon by a Daughter, hath a Right before a Nephew by a Brother? Whether the Grandſon by the Eldeſt Son, being an Infant, before the younger Son a Man and able? Whether the Daughter before the Uncle? any other Man, deſcended by a Male Line? Whether a Grandſon by a younger Daughter, before a Grand-daughter by an elder Daughter? Whether the elder Son by a Concubine, before a younger Son by a Wife? From whence alſo will ariſe many Queſtions of Legitimation, and what in Nature is the Difference betwixt a Wife and a Concubine? For as to the municipal or poſitive Laws of Men, they can ſignify nothing here. It may farther be asked, Whether the eldeſt Son being a Fool, ſhall inherit this *paternal Power*, before the younger a wiſe Man? And what Degree of Folly it muſt be, that ſhall exclude him? And who ſhall be Jude of it? Whether the Son of a Fool excluded for his Folly, before the Son of his wife Brother who Reign'd? Who has the *paternal Power* whilſt the Widow-Queen is with Child by the deceaſed King, and no body knows whether it will be a Son or a Daughter? Which ſhall be Heir of the two Male-Twins, who by the Diſſection of the Mother, were laid open to the World? Whether a Siſter by the Half-blood, before a Brother's Daughter by the whole Blood?

124. Theſe, and many more ſuch Doubts, might be propoſed about the Titles of Succeſſion, and the Right of Inheritance; and that not as idle Speculations, but ſuch as in Hiſtory we ſhall find, have concerned the Inheritance of Crowns and Kingdoms; and if ours want them, we need not go farther for famous Examples of it, than the other Kingdom in this very Iſland, which having been fully related by the ingenious and learned Author of *Patriarcha non Monarcha*, I need ſay no more of. Till our A. hath reſolved all the Doubts, that may ariſe about the next Heir, and ſhewed that they are plainly determin'd by the Law of Nature, or the revealed Law of God, all his Suppoſitions of a *Monarchical*, *Abſolute*, *Supreme*, *paternal Power* in *Adam*, and the Deſcent of that Power to his Heirs, would not be of the leaſt Uſe to eſtabliſh the Authority, or make out the Title of any one Prince now on Earth; but would rather unſettle and bring all into Queſtion: For let our A. tell us as long as he pleaſes, and let all Men believe it too, that *Adam* had a *Paternal* and thereby a *Monarchical Power*; that this (the only *Power* in the World) *deſcended to his Heirs*; and that there is no other Power in the World but this: Let this be all as clear Demonſtration, as it is manifeſt Error, yet if it be not paſt Doubt, to whom this *paternal Power deſcends*, and whoſe now it is, no body can be under any Obligation of *Obedience*, unleſs any one will ſay, that I am bound to pay *Obedience* to *paternal Power* in a Man, who has no more *paternal Power* than I my ſelf; which is all one as to ſay, I obey a Man, becauſe he has a Right to govern; and if I be asked, how I know he has a Right to govern, I ſhould anſwer, It cannot be known, that he has any at all. For that cannot be the Reaſon of my Obedience, which I know not to be ſo: much leſs can that be a Reaſon of my Obedience, which no body at all can know to be ſo.

125. And therefore all this ado about *Adam's Fatherhood*, the Greatneſs of its Power, and the Neceſſity of its Suppoſal, helps nothing to eſtabliſh the Power of thoſe that govern, or to determine the *Obedience* of Subjects who are to obey, if they cannot tell whom they are to obey, or it cannot be known who are to govern, and who to obey. In the State the World now is irrecoverably ignorant, who is *Adam's* Heir. This *Fatherhood*, this *Monarchical Power of* Adam deſcending

to

to his Heirs, would be of no more uſe to the Government of Mankind, than it would be to the quieting of Mens Conſcientes, or ſecuring their Healths, if our A. had aſſured them, that *Adam* had a *Power* to forgive Sins, or cure Diſeaſes, which by divine Inſtitution deſcended to his *Heir*, whilſt this *Heir* is impoſſible to be known. And ſhould he not do as rationally, who upon the Aſſurance of our A. went and confeſſed his Sins, and expected a good Abſolution; or took Phyſick with Expectation of Health from any one who had taken on himſelf the Name of Prieſt or Phyſician, or thruſt himſelf into thoſe Employments, ſaying, I acquieſce in the abſolving Power deſcending from *Adam*, or I ſhall be cured by the medicinal Power deſcending from *Adam*; as he who ſays, I ſubmit to and obey the *paternal Power* deſending from *Adam*, when 'tis confeſſed all theſe Powers deſcend only to his ſingle Heir, and that Heir is unknown.

126. 'Tis true, the Civil Lawyers have pretended to determine ſome of theſe Caſes concerning the Succeſſion of Princes; but by our A.'s Principles, they have medled in a Matter that belongs not to them: For if all political Power be derived only from *Adam*, and be to deſcend only to his ſucceſſive Heirs, by the *Ordinance of God* and *divine Inſtitution*, this is a Right anticedent and paramount to all Government; and therefore the poſitive Laws of Men, cannot determine that, which is it ſelf the Foundation of all Law and Government, and is to receive its Rule only from the Law of God and Nature. And that being ſilent in the Caſe, I am apt to think there is no ſuch Right to be convey'd this Way: I am ſure it would be to no Purpoſe if there were, and Men would be more at a Loſs concerning Government and Obedience to Governors, than if there were no ſuch Right; ſince by poſitive Laws and Compact, which *divine Inſtitution* (if there be any) ſhuts out, all theſe endleſs inextricable Doubts, can be ſafely provided againſt; but it can never be underſtood, how a divine natural Right, and that of ſuch Moment as is all Order and Peace in the World, ſhould be convey'd down to Poſterity, without any plain natural or divine Rule concerning it. And there would be an End of all civil Government, if the *Aſſignment* of civil Power were by *divine Inſtitution* to the Heir, and yet by that *divine Inſtitution* the Perſon of the Heir could not be known. This *paternal regal Power*, being by divine Right only his, it leaves no room for human Prudence, or conſent to place it any where elſe; for if only one Man hath a divine Right to the Obedience of Mankind, no body can claim that Obedience, but he that can ſhew that Right; nor can Mens Conſciences by any other Pretence be obliged to it. And thus this Doctrine cuts up all Government by the Roots.

127. Thus we ſee how our A. laying it for a ſure Foundation, that the very *Perſon* that is to Rule, is the *Ordinance* of God, and by *divine Inſtitution*, tells us at large, only that this Perſon is the *Heir*, but who this Heir is, he leaves us to gueſs; and ſo this *divine Inſtitution* which aſſigns it to a Perſon, whom we have no Rule to know, is juſt as good as an Aſſignment to no body at all. But whatever our A. does, *divine Inſtitution* makes no ſuch ridiculous Aſſignments: Nor can God be ſuppoſed to make it a ſacred Law, that one certain Perſon ſhould have a Right to ſomething, and yet not give Rules to mark out, and know that Perſon by, or give an *Heir* a divine Right to Power, and yet not point out who this *Heir* is. 'Tis rather to be thought, that an *Heir* had no ſuch Right by *divine Inſtitution*, than that God ſhould give ſuch a Right to the *Heir*, but yet leave it doubtful, and undeterminable who ſuch Heir is.

128. If God had given the Land of *Canaan* to *Abraham*, and in general Terms to ſome body after him, without naming his Seed, whereby it might be known, who that ſome body was, it would have been as good and uſeful an Aſſignment, to determine the Right to the Land of *Canaan*, as it would be the determining the Right of Crowns, to give Empire to *Adam* and his ſucceſſive Heirs after him, without telling who his Heir is: For the Word *Heir*, without a Rule to know who it is, ſignifies no more than ſome body, I know not whom. God making it a *divine Inſtitution*, that Men ſhould not marry thoſe who were *near of Kin*, thinks it not enough to ſay, *none of you ſhall approach to any that is near of Kin to him, to uncover their Nakedneſs*: But moreover gives Rules to know who are thoſe *near of Kin*, forbidden by *divine Inſtitution*, or elſe that Law would have been of no uſe; it being to no Purpoſe to lay Reſtraint, or give Privileges, to Men, in ſuch general Terms, as the particular Perſon concern'd cannot be known by. But

God not having any where ſaid, the next Heir ſhall inherit all his Father's Eſtate or Dominion, we are not to wonder, that he hath no where appointed, who that Heir ſhould be; for never having intended any ſuch thing, never deſigned any Heir in that Senſe, we cannot expect he ſhould any where nominate, or appoint any Perſon to it, as we might, had it been otherwiſe. And therefore in Scripture, though the Word *Heir* occur, yet there is no ſuch thing, as Heir in our A.'s Senſe, one that was by Right of Nature to inherit all that his Father had, excluſive of his Brethren. Hence *Sarah* ſuppoſes, that if *Iſhmael* ſtaid in the Houſe, to ſhare in *Abraham*'s Eſtate after his Death, this Son of a Bond-woman might be Heir with *Iſaac*; and therefore, ſays ſhe, *caſt out this Bond-woman and her Son, for the Son of this Bond-woman ſhall not be Heir with my Son*; but this cannot excuſe our A. who telling us there is in every Number of Men, one who is Right and next *Heir* to *Adam*, ought to have told us what the Laws of Deſcent are. But he having been ſo ſparing to inſtruct us by Rules, how to know who *is Heir*, let us ſee in the next place, what his Hiſtory out of Scripture, on which he pretends wholly to build his Government, gives us in this neceſſary and fundamental Point.

129. Our A. to make good the Title of his Book, *p.* 13. begins his Hiſtory of the Deſcent of *Adam*'s regal Power, *p.* 13. in theſe Words, *This Lordſhip which* Adam *by Command had over the whole World, and by Right deſcending from him, the Patriarchs did enjoy was a large*, &c. How does he prove that the Patriarchs by Deſcent did enjoy it? for *Dominion of Life and Death*, ſays he, *we find* Judah *the Father pronounced Sentence of Death againſt* Thamar *his Daughter-in-Law for playing the Harlot, p.* 13. How does this prove that *Judah* had abſolute and ſovereign Authority? *He pronounced Sentence of Death.* The pronouncing of Sentence of Death, is not a certain Mark of Sovereignty, but uſually the Office of inferior Magiſtrates. The Power of making Laws of Life and Death, is indeed a Mark of Sovereignty, but pronouncing the Sentence according to thoſe Laws may be done by others, and therefore this will but ill prove that he had ſovereign Authority: As if one ſhould ſay, *Judge Jefferies*, pronounced Sentence of Death in the late Times, therefore *Judge Jefferies*, had ſovereign Authority. But it will be ſaid, *Judah* did it not by Commiſſion from another, and therefore did it in his own Right. Who knows whether he had any Right at all, heat of Paſſion might carry him to do that, which he had no Authority to do. Judah *had Dominion of Life and Death*, how does that appear? He exerciſed it, he *pronounced Sentence of Death againſt* Thamar, our A. thinks it is very good Proof, that becauſe he did it, therefore he had a Right to do it: He lay with her alſo: By the ſame way of Proof, he had a Right to do that too. If the Conſequence be good from doing to a Right of doing. *Abſalon* too may be reckon'd amongſt our A.'s Sovereigns, for he pronounced ſuch a Sentence of Death againſt his Brother *Amnon*, and much upon a like Occaſſion, and had it executed too; if that be ſufficient to prove a Dominion of Life and Death.

But allowing this all to be clear Demonſtration of ſovereign Power, who was it, that had this *Lordſhip by Right deſcending to him from* Adam, *as large and ample as the abſoluteſt Dominion of any Monarch? Judah*, ſays our A. *Judah* a younger Son of *Jacob*, his Father and elder Brethren living; ſo that if our A.'s own Proof be to be taken, a younger Brother may, in the Life of his Father and elder Brothers, *by Right of Deſcent, enjoy* Adam's *Monarchical Power*; and if one ſo qualify'd may be Monarch by Deſcent, why may not every Man? If *Judah*, his Father and elder Brother living, were one of *Adam*'s Heirs, I know not who can be excluded from this Inheritance; all Men by Inheritance may be Monarchs as well as *Judah*.

130. *Touching War, we ſee that* Abraham *commanded an Army of* 318 *Soldiers of his own Family, and* Eſau *met his Brother* Jacob *with* 400 *Men at Arms; for Matter of Peace;* Abraham *made a League with* Abimelech, &c. *p.* 13. Is it not poſſible for a Man to have 318 Men in his Family, without being Heir to *Adam?* A Planter in the *Weſt Indies* has more, and might, if he pleaſed (who doubts) muſter them up and lead them out againſt the *Indians*, to ſeek Reparation upon any Injury received from them, and all this without the *abſolute Dominion of a Monarch, deſcending to him from* Adam. Would it not be an admirable Argument to prove, that all Power by God's Inſtitution deſcended from *Adam* by Inheritance, and that the

very

very Perſon and Power of this Planter were the *Ordinance of God*, becauſe he had Power in his Family over Servants, born in his Houſe, and bought with his Money? For this was juſt *Abraham*'s Caſe; Thoſe who were Rich in the *Patriarch*'s Days, as in the *Weſt Indies* now, bought *Men* and *Maid Servants*, and by their Increaſe, as well as purchaſing of new, came to have large and numerous Families, which though they made uſe of in War or Peace, can it be thought the Power they had over them was an Inheritance deſcended from *Adam*, when 'twas the Purchaſe of their Money? A Man's riding in an Expedition againſt an Enemy, his Horſe bought in a Fair would be as good a Proof that the Owner *enjoy'd the Lordſhip of* Adam *by Command had over the whole World, by Right deſcending to him*, as *Abraham*'s leading out the Servants of his Family is, that the *Patriarchs* enjoy'd this Lordſhip by Deſcent from *Adam*: ſince the Title to the Power, the Maſter had in both Caſes, whether over Slaves or Horſes, was only from his Purchaſe; and the getting a Dominion over any thing by Bargain, and Money is a new way of proving one had it by Deſcent and Inheritance.

131. *But making War and Peace are Marks of Sovereignty.* Let it be ſo in politick Societies, may not therefore a Man in the *Weſt Indies*, who hath with him Sons of his own, Friends, or Companions, Soldiers under Pay or Slaves bought with Money, or perhaps a Band made up of all theſe, make War and Peace, if there ſhould be occaſion, and *ratify the Articles too with an Oath*, without being a Sovereign, an abſolute King over thoſe who went with him. He that ſays he cannot, muſt then allow many Maſters of Ships, many private Planters to be abſolute Monarchs, for as much as this they have done. War and Peace cannot be made for politick Societies, but by the ſupreme Power of ſuch Societies; becauſe War and Peace, giving a different Motion to the Force of ſuch a Politick Body, none can make War or Peace, but that which has the direction of the force of the whole Body, and that in politick Societies is the only ſupreme Power. In voluntary Societies for the time, he that has ſuch a Power by conſent, may make War and Peace, and ſo may a ſingle Man for himſelf, the State of War not conſiſting in the Number of *Partiſans*, but the Enmity of the Parties, where they have no Superior to appeal to.

132. The actual making of War or Peace is no proof of any other Power, but only of diſpoſing thoſe to exerciſe or ceaſe Acts of Enmity for whom he makes it, and this Power in many Caſes any one may have without any politick Supremacy: And therefore the making of War or Peace will not prove that every one that does ſo is a politick Ruler, much leſs a King; for then Common-wealths muſt be Kings too, for they do as certainly make War and Peace as Monarchical Government.

133. But granting this a *Mark of Sovereignty* in *Abraham*, is it a Proof of the Deſcent to him, of *Adam*'s *Sovereignty* over the whole World? If it be, it will ſurely be as good a proof of the *deſcent of* Adam's *Lordſhip* to others too. And then Common-wealths, as well as *Abraham* will be *Heirs of Adam*, for they make *War and Peace*, as well as he. If you ſay, that the *Lordſhip of Adam* doth not by Right deſcend to Common-wealths, though they make War and Peace, the ſame ſay I of *Abraham*, and then there is an end of your Argument; if you ſtand to your Argument, and ſay thoſe that do make War and Peace, as Common-wealths do without doubt, do *inherit* Adam's *Lordſhip*, there is an end of your Monarchy, unleſs you will ſay, that Common-wealths *by deſcent enjoying* Adam's *Lordſhip* are Monarchies, and that indeed would be a new way of making all the Governments in the World Monarchical.

134. To give our A. the Honour of this new Invention, for I confeſs it is not I have firſt found it out by tracing his Principles, and ſo charged it on him, 'tis fit my Readers know that (as abſurd as it may ſeem) he teaches it himſelf, *p.* 23. where he ingenuouſly ſays, *In all Kingdoms and Common-wealths in the World, whether the Prince be the ſupreme Father of the People, or but the true Heir to ſuch a Father, or come to the Crown by Uſurpation or Election, or whether ſome few or a Multitude govern the Common-wealth; yet ſtill the Authority that is in any one, or in many, or in all theſe is, the only Right, and natural Authority of a ſupreme Father*, which Right of *Fatherhood* he often tells us, is *Regal and Royal Authority*; as particularly, *p.* 12. the Page immediately preceding this Inſtance of *Abraham*. This Regal Authority, he ſays, thoſe that govern Common-wealths have; and if it be true, that Regal

and Royal Authority be in thoſe that govern Common-wealths, it is as true that Common-wealths are govern'd by Kings; for if Regal Authority be in him that governs; he that governs muſt needs be a King, and ſo all Common-wealths are nothing but downright Monarchies, and then what need any more ado about the Matter? The Governments of the World are as they ſhould be, there is nothing but Monarchy in it. This without doubt, was the ſureſt Way our A. could have found, to turn all other Governments, but Monarchical, out of the World.

135. But all this ſcarce proves *Abraham*, to have been King as Heir to *Adam*. If by Inheritance he had been King, *Lot*, who was of the ſame Family muſt needs have been his Subject, by that Title, before the Servants in his Family; but we ſee they liv'd as Friends and Equals, and when their Herdſmen could not agree, there was no Pretence of Juriſdiction or Superiority between them, but they parted by Conſent, *Gen.* 13. hence he is called both by *Abraham*, and by the Text *Abraham's Brother*, the Name of Friendſhip and Equality, and not of Juriſdiction and Authority, though he were really but his Nephew. And if our A. knows that *Abraham* was *Adam*'s Heir, and a King, 'twas more, it ſeems, than *Abraham* himſelf knew, or his Servant whom he ſent a wooing for his Son; for when he ſets out the Advantages of the Match, 24 *Gen.* 35. thereby to prevail with the young Woman and her Friends. He ſays, *I am* Abraham's *Servant, and the Lord hath bleſſed my Maſter greatly, and he is become great, and he hath given him Flocks and Herds, and Silver and Gold, and Men-Servants and Maid-Servants, and Camels and Aſſes, and Sarah my Maſter's Wife, bare a Son to my Maſter when ſhe was old, and unto him hath he given all he hath.* Can one think that a diſcreet Servant, that was thus particular to ſet out his Maſter's Greatneſs, would have omitted the Crown *Iſaac* was to have, if he had known of any ſuch? Can it be imagin'd he ſhould have neglected to have told them on ſuch an Occaſion as this, that *Abraham* was a King, a Name well known at that time, for he had nine of them his Neighbours, if he or his Maſter had thought any ſuch thing, the likelieſt Matter of all the reſt, to make his Errand ſucceſsful?

136. But this Diſcovery, it ſeems, was reſerved for our A. to make 2 or 3000 Years after, and let him enjoy the Credit of it, only he ſhould have taken care that ſome of *Adam*'s Land ſhould have deſcended to this his *Heir*, as well as all *Adam*'s Lordſhip. For though this Lordſhip which *Abraham*, (if we may believe our A.) as well as the other Patriarchs, *by Right deſcending to him did enjoy, was as large and ample as the abſoluteſt Dominion of any Monarch which hath been ſince the Creation*; yet his Eſtate, his Territories, his Dominions were very narrow and ſcanty, for he had not the Poſſeſſion of a Foot of Land, till he bought a Field and a Cave of the Sons of *Heth* to bury *Sarah* in.

137. The Inſtance of *Eſau* joyn'd with this of *Abraham*, to prove that the *Lordſhip which* Adam *had over the whole World, by Right deſcending from him, the Patriarchs did enjoy*, is yet more pleaſant than the former. Eſau *met his Brother* Jacob *with* 400 *Men at Arms*; he therefore was a King by Right of Heir to *Adam*. 400 arm'd Men then however got together are enough to prove him, that leads them, to be a King and *Adam*'s Heir. There have been Tories in *Ireland*, (whatever there are in other Countries) who would have thank'd our A. for ſo honourable an Opinion of them, eſpecially if there had been no body near with a better Title of 500 armed Men, to queſtion their Royal Authority of 400. 'Tis a ſhame for Men to trifle ſo, to ſay no worſe of it, in ſo ſerious an Argument. Here *Eſau* is brought as a Proof that *Adam*'s Lordſhip, *Adam's abſolute Dominion, as large as that of any Monarch deſcended by Right to the Patriarchs*, and in this very *Chap. p.19. Jacob* is brought as an Inſtance of one, that by *Birth-right was Lord over his Brethren.* So we have here two Brothers abſolute Monarchs by the ſame Title, and at the ſame time Heirs to *Adam*; the eldeſt Heir to *Adam*, becauſe he met his Brother with 400 Men; and the youngeſt Heir to *Adam* by *Birth-right*: Eſau *enjoy'd the Lordſhip which* Adam *had over the whole World by Right deſcending to him, in as large and ample manner, as the abſoluteſt Dominion of any Monarch*, and at the ſame time, *Jacob Lord over him, by the Right Heirs have to be Lords over their Brethren, Riſum teneatis?* I never, I confeſs, met with any Man of Parts ſo dextrous as Sir *Rob.* at this way of arguing: But 'twas his Misfortune to light upon an *Hypotheſis*, that could not be accommodated to the nature of Things, and human Affairs; his Principles could not be made to agree with that Conſtitution and Order, which God had

ſettled

ſettled in the World, and therefore muſt needs often claſh with common Senſe and Experience.

138. In the next Section, he tells us, *This Patriarchal Power continued not only till the Flood, but after it, as the Name Patriarchs doth in part prove.* The Word Patriarch doth more than *in part prove*, that *Patriarchal Power* continued in the World as long as there were Patriarchs, for 'tis neceſſary that Patriarchal Power ſhould be whilſt there are Patriarchs; as 'tis neceſſary there ſhould be paternal or conjugal Power, whilſt there are Fathers or Husbands; but this is but playing with Names. That which he would fallaciouſly inſinuate, is the Thing in queſtion to be proved, *viz.* That the *Lordſhip which* Adam *had over the World*, the ſuppoſed abſolute univerſal Dominion of *Adam* by *Right deſcending from him, the Patriarchs did enjoy.* If he affirms ſuch an abſolute Monarchy continued to the Flood, in the World, I would be glad to know what Records he has it from; for I confeſs I cannot find a Word of it in my Bible: If by *Patriarchal Power*, he means any thing elſe, it is nothing to the Matter in hand. And how the Name *Patriarch* in ſome part proves, that thoſe, who are called by that Name, had abſolute monarchical Power, I confeſs, I do not ſee, and therefore I think needs no Anſwer till the Argument from it be made out a little clearer.

139. *The three Sons of* Noah *had the World*, ſays our A. *divided amongſt them by their Father, for of them was the whole World overſpread*, p. 14. The World might be overſpread by the Offspring of *Noah*'s Sons, though he never divided the World amongſt them; for the Earth might be repleniſhed without being divided: So that all our A.'s Argument here, proves no ſuch Diviſion. However I allow it to him, and then ask, the World being divided amongſt them, which of the three was *Adam*'s Heir? If *Adam's Lordſhip, Adam's Monarchy*, by Right deſcended only to the Eldeſt, then the other two could be but his *Subjects*, his *Slaves*; if by Right it deſcended to all the three Brothers, by the ſame Right, it will deſcend to all Mankind, and then it will be impoſſible what he ſays, *p.* 19. that *Heirs are Lords of their Brethren*, ſhould be true, but all Brothers, and conſequently all Men will be equal and independent, all Heirs to *Adam*'s Monarchy, and conſequently all Monarchs too, one as much as another. But 'twill be ſaid *Noah* their Father divided the World amongſt them, ſo that our A. will allow more to *Noah*, than he will to God Almighty, for O. 211. he thought it hard, that God himſelf ſhould give the World to *Noah* and his Sons, to the prejudice of *Noah*'s Birth-right, his Words are, *Noah was left ſole Heir to the World, why ſhould it be thought that God would diſinherit him of his Birth-right, and make him of all Men in the World, the only Tenant in common with his Children?* and yet here he thinks it fit that *Noah* ſhould diſinherit *Shem* of his *Birth-right*, and divide the World betwixt him and his Brethren, ſo that his *Birth-right*, when our A. pleaſes, muſt, and when he pleaſes muſt not, be ſacred and inviolable.

140. If *Noah* did divide the World between his Sons, and his Aſſignment of Dominions to them were good, there is an end of divine Inſtitution; all our A.'s Diſcourſe of *Adam*'s Heir, with whatſoever he builds on it, is quite out of doors; and the natural Power of Kings fall to the ground; and then *the form of the Power Governing, and the Perſon having that Power, will not be* (as he ſays they are, O. 254. *the Ordinance of God*, but they will be *Ordinances of Man.* For if the Right of the Heir be the Ordinance of God, a divine Right, no Man, Father or not Father, can alter it: If it be not a divine Right, it is only human, depending on the Will of Man: And ſo where human Inſtitution gives it not, the firſt-born has no Right at all above his Brethren; and Men may put Government into what hands, and under what form they pleaſe.

141. He goes on, *Moſt of the civileſt Nations of the Earth, labour to fetch their Original from ſome of the Sons, or Nephews of* Noah, *p.* 14. How many do moſt of the civileſt Nations amount to? and who are they? I fear the *Chineſes*, a very great and civil People, as well as ſeveral other People of the *Eaſt*, *Weſt*, *North* and *South*, trouble not themſelves much about this Matter. All that believe the Bible, which I believe are our A.'*s moſt of the civileſt Nations*, muſt neceſſarily derive themſelves from *Noah*, but for the reſt of the World, they think little of his Sons or Nephews. But if the Heralds and Antiquaries of all Nations, for 'tis theſe Men generally that labour to find out the Originals of Nations, or all the Nations themſelves *ſhould labour to fetch their Original from ſome of the Sons or Nephews*

phews of Noah, what would this be to prove, that the *Lordſhip which* Adam *had over the whole World, by Right deſcended to the Patriarchs?* Whoever, Nations, or Races of Men, *labour to fetch their Original from,* may be concluded to be thought by them, Men of Renown, famous to Poſterity, from the greatneſs of their Virtues and Actions; but beyond theſe they look not, nor conſider who they were Heirs to, but look on them as ſuch as raiſed themſelves by their own Virtue to a degree, that would give a Luſtre to thoſe, who in future Ages could pretend to derive themſelves from them. But if it were *Ogyges, Hercules, Brama, Tamberlain, Pharamond*; nay, if *Jupiter* and *Saturn* were the Names, from whence divers Races of Men, both ancient and modern, have labour'd to derive their Original; will that prove, that thoſe Men *enjoyed the Lordſhip of* Adam, *by Right deſcending to them?* If not, this is but a Flouriſh of our A.'s to miſlead his Reader, that in it ſelf ſignifies nothing.

142. To as much Purpoſe, is, what he tells us, *p.* 15. concerning this Diviſion of the World, *That ſome ſay it was by* Lot, *and others that* Noah *ſailed round the* Mediterranean *in Ten Years, and divided the World into* Aſia, Africk *and* Europe, Portions for his three Sons. *America* then it ſeems, was left to be his that could catch it. Why our A. takes ſuch Pains to prove the Diviſion of the World by *Noah* to his Sons, and will not leave out an Imagination, though no better than a Dream, that he can find any where to favour it, is hard to gueſs, ſince ſuch a *Diviſion*, if it prove any thing, muſt neceſſarily take away the Title of *Adam*'s Heir; unleſs three Brothers can altogether be Heirs of *Adam*; and therefore the following Words, *Howſoever the manner of this Diviſion be uncertain, yet it is moſt certain the Diviſion it ſelf was by Families from* Noah *and his Children, over which the Parents were Heads and Princes*, p. 15. If allow'd him to be true, and of any force to prove, that all the Power in the World is nothing but the Lordſhip *of* Adam's *deſcending by Right*, they will only prove, that the Fathers of the Children are all Heirs to this Lordſhip of *Adam*. For if in thoſe Days *Cham* and *Japhet*, and other Parents, beſides the eldeſt Son, were Heads and Princes over their Families, and had a right to divide the Earth by Families, what hinders younger Brothers, being Fathers of Families, from having the ſame Right? If *Cham* and *Japhet* were Princes by Right deſcending to them, notwithſtanding any Title of Heir in their eldeſt Brother, younger Brothers by the ſame Right deſcending to them are Princes now, and ſo all our A.'s natural Power of Kings will reach no farther than their own Children, and no Kingdom by this natural Right can be bigger than a Family. For either this *Lordſhip of* Adam *over the whole World*, by Right deſcends only to the eldeſt Son, and then there can be but one Heir, as our A. ſays, *p.* 19. Or elſe, it by Right deſcends to all the Sons equally, and then every Father of a Family will have it, as well as the three Sons of *Noah*: Take which you will, it deſtroys the preſent Governments and Kingdoms, that are now in the World, ſince whoever has this *natural Power of a King*, by Right deſcending to him, muſt have it either, as our A. tells us, *Cain* had it, and be Lord over his Brethren, and ſo be alone King of the whole World; or elſe, as he tells us here, *Shem, Cham* and *Japhet* had it, three Brothers, and ſo be only Prince of his own Family, and all Families independent one of another; all the World muſt be only one Empire by the Right of the next Heir, or elſe every Family be a diſtinct Government of it ſelf, by the *Lordſhip of* Adam's *deſcending to Parents of Families.* And to this only tends all the Proofs he here gives us of the deſcent of *Adam*'s Lordſhip: For continuing his Story of this Deſcent: he ſays,

143. *In the diſperſion of* Babel, *we muſt certainly find the Eſtabliſhment of Royal Power, throughout the Kingdoms of the World*, p. 14. If you muſt find it, pray do, and you will help us to a new piece of Hiſtory: But you muſt ſhew it us before we ſhall be bound to believe, that regal Power was eſtabliſhed in the World upon your Principles. For, that regal Power was eſtabliſhed *in the Kingdoms of the World*, I think no body will diſpute; but that there ſhould be Kingdoms in the World, whoſe ſeveral Kings enjoy'd their Crowns, *by right deſcending to them from* Adam, that we think not only *Apocrypha*, but alſo utterly impoſſible. If our A. has no better Foundation for his Monarchy than a Suppoſition of what was done at the diſperſion of *Babel*, the Monarchy he erects thereon, whoſe top is to reach to Heaven to unite Mankind, will ſerve only to divide and ſcatter them, as that Tower did; and inſtead of eſtabliſhing Civil Government and Order in the World, will produce nothing but Confuſion.

144. For

144. For he tells us, the *Nations* they were divided into, *were distinct Families, which had Fathers for Rulers over them; whereby it appears, that even in the Confusion, God was careful to preserve the fatherly Authority, by distributing the Diversity of Languages according to the Diversity of Families, p.* 14. It would have been a hard Matter for any one but our A. to have found out so plainly in the Text, he here brings, that all the Nations in that Dispersion were govern'd by *Fathers*, and that *God was careful to preserve the fatherly Authority.* The Words of the Text are, *These are the Sons of* Shem *after their Families, after their Tongues in their Lands, after their Nations*; and the same thing is said of *Cham* and *Japhet*, after an Enumeration of their Posterities; in all which there is not one Word said of their Governors, or Forms of Government; of *Fathers*, or *fatherly Authority.* But our A. who is very quick-sighted to spy out *Fatherhood*, where no body else could see any the least Glimpses of it, tells us positively their *Rulers were Fathers, and God was careful to preserve the fatherly Authority*; and why? Because those of the same Family spoke the same Language, and so of Necessity in the Division kept together. Just as if one should argue thus; *Hanibal* in his Army, consisting of divers Nations, kept those of the same Language together, therefore Fathers were Captains of each Band, and *Hanibal* was careful of the *fatherly Authority:* Or in Peopling of *Carolina*, the *English*, *French*, *Scotch*, and *Welch* that are there, plant themselves together, and by them the Country is divided *in their Lands after their Tongues, after their Families, after their Nations*; therefore Care was taken of the *fatherly Authority.* Or because in many Parts of *America*, every little Tribe was a distinct People, with a different Language, one should infer, that therefore *God was careful to preserve the fatherly Authority*, or that therefore their Rulers *enjoy'd* Adam's *Lordship by Right descending to them*, though we know not who were their Governors, nor what their Form of Government, but only that they were divided into little independent Societies, speaking different Languages.

145. The Scripture says not a Word of their Rulers or Forms of Government, but only gives an Account, how Mankind came to be divided in distinct Languages and Nations; and therefore 'tis not to argue from the Authority of Scripture, to tell us positively, *Fathers* were their *Rulers*, when the Scripture says no such Thing; but to set up Fancies of ones own Brain, when we confidently aver Matter of Fact, where Records are utterly silent. Upon a like Ground, *i. e.* none at all, he says, *That they were not confused Multitudes without Heads and Governors, and at Liberty to chuse what Governors or Governments they pleased.*

146. For I demand, when Mankind were all yet of one Language, all Congregated in the Plain of *Shinar*, were they then all under one Monarch, *who enjoy'd the Lordship of* Adam *by Right descending to him?* If they were not, there was then no Thoughts, 'tis plain, of *Adam's Heir*, no Right to Government known then upon that Title; no Care taken by God or Man, of *Adam's fatherly Authority.* If when Mankind were but one People, dwelt altogether, and were of one Language, and were upon building a City together; and when 'twas plain, they could not but know the right *Heir*, for *Shem* lived till *Isaac's* Time, a long while after the Division at *Babel*; if then, I say, they were not under the Monarchical Government of *Adam's* Fatherhood, by Right descending to the Heir, 'tis plain there was no regard had to the *Fatherhood*, no Monarchy acknowledg'd due to *Adam's Heir*, no Empire of *Shem's* in *Asia*, and consequently no such Division of the World by *Noah*, as our A. has talked of. As far as we can conclude any thing from Scripture in this Matter, it seems from this Place, that if they had any Government, it was rather a Commonwealth than an absolute Monarchy: For the Scripture tells us, *Gen.* 11. *They said*, 'Twas not a Prince commanded the building of this City and Tower, 'twas not by the Command of one *Monarch*, but by the Consultation of many, a Free People; *Let us build us a City*; They built it for themselves as Free Men, not as Slaves for their Lord and Master: *That we be not scattered abroad*: having a City once Built, and fixed Habitations to settle our Abodes and Families. This was the Consultation and Design of a People, that were at Liberty to part asunder, but desired to keep in one Body, and could not have been either necessary or likely in Men tied together under the Government of one Monarch, who if they had been, as our A. tells us, all *Slaves* under the absolute Dominion of a Monarch, needed not have taken such Care to hinder themselves from wandering out of the Reach of his Dominion. I demand whether this

this be not plainer in Scripture than any thing of *Adam*'s *Heir or fatherly Authority*?

147. But if being as God ſays, *Gen.* 11.6. one People, they had one Ruler, one King by natural Right, Abſolute and Supreme over them, *what care had God to preſerve the paternal Authority of the ſupreme Fatherhood*, if on a ſudden he ſuffers 72 (for ſo many our A. talks of) *diſtinct Nations*, to be erected out of it under diſtinct Governors, and at once to withdraw themſelves from the Obedience of their Sovereign. This is to intitle God's Care how and to what we pleaſe. Can it be Senſe to ſay, that God was careful to preſerve the *fatherly Authority* in thoſe who had it not? For if theſe were Subjects under a Supreme Prince, what Authority had they? Was it an Inſtance of God's Care to preſerve the *fatherly Authority* when he took away the true *Supreme Fatherhood* of the natural Monarch. Can it be Reaſon to ſay, That God, for the Preſervation of *fatherly Authority*, lets ſeveral new Governments with their Governors ſtart up, who could not all have *fatherly Authority*. And is it not as much Reaſon to ſay, That God is careful to deſtroy *fatherly Authority* when he ſuffers one who is in Poſſeſſion of it, to have his Government torn in pieces, and ſhared by ſeveral of his Subjects? Would it not be an Argument juſt like this for Monarchical Government to ſay, when any Monarchy was ſhatter'd to pieces, and divided amongſt revalted Subjects, that God was careful to preſerve Monarchical Power, by rending a ſettled Empire into a multitude of little Governments? If any one will ſay, that what happens in Providence to be preſerv'd, God is careful to preſerve as a thing therefore to be eſteemed by Men as neceſſary or uſeful, 'tis a peculiar Propriety of Speech, which every one will not think fit to imitate: But this I am ſure is impoſſible to be either proper, or true ſpeaking, that *Shem*, for Example (for he was then alive,) ſhould have *fatherly Authority*, or Sovereignty by Right of Fatherhood over that one People at *Babel*, and that the next Moment *Shem* yet living, 72 others, ſhould have *fatherly Authority*, or Sovereignty by Right of Fatherhood over the ſame People, divided into ſo many diſtinct Governments: Either theſe 72 Fathers actually were Rulers, juſt before the Confuſion, and then they were not one People, but that God himſelf ſays they were; or elſe they were a Common-wealth, and then where was Monarchy? or elſe theſe 72 Fathers had *fatherly Authority* but knew it not. Strange! that *fatherly Authority* ſhould be the only Original of Government amongſt Men, and yet all Mankind not know it; and ſtranger yet, that the Confuſion of Tongues ſhould reveal it to them all on a ſudden, that in an Inſtant theſe 72 ſhould know that they had *fatherly Power*, and all others know that they were to obey it in them, and every one know that particular *fatherly Authority* to which he was a Subject. He that can think this arguing from Scripture, may from thence make out what Model of an *Eutopia* will beſt ſuit with his Fancy or Intereſt; and this *Fatherhood* thus diſpoſed of, will juſtify both a Prince who claims an univerſal Monarchy, and his Subjects, who being Fathers of Families, ſhall quit all Subjecton to him, and *Canton* his Empire into leſs Governments for themſelves; for it will always remain a Doubt in which of theſe the fatherly Authority reſided, till our A. reſolves us, whether *Shem* who was then alive, or theſe 72 new Princes, beginning ſo many new Empires in his Dominions, and over his Subjects, had right to Govern, ſince our A. tells us, that both one, and t'other had *fatherly*, which is ſupreme Authority, and are brought in by him as Inſtances of thoſe, who did *enjoy the Lordſhips of* Adam *by Right deſcending to them, which was as large and ample as the abſoluteſt Dominion of any Monarch.* This at leaſt is unavoidable, that if *God was careful to preſerve the fatherly Authority, in the 72 new erected Nations*, it neceſſarily follows, that he was as careful to deſtroy all Pretences of *Adam*'s Heir; ſince he took Care, and therefore did preſerve the *fatherly Authority* in ſo many, at leaſt 71, that could not poſſibly be *Adam*'s Heirs, when the right Heir (if God had ever ordain'd any ſuch Inheritance) could not but be known, *Shem* then living, and they being all one People.

148. *Nimrod* is his next Inſtance of enjoying this Patriarchal Power, *p.* 16. but I know not for what Reaſon our A. ſeems a little unkind to him, and ſays, that he *againſt Right enlarged his Empire, by ſeizing violently on the Rights of other Lords of Families.* Theſe *Lords of Families* here were called *Fathers of Families*, in his Account of the Diſperſion of *Babel*; but it matters not how they were called, ſo we know who they are, for this fatherly Authority muſt be in them, either as Heirs

to

to *Adam*, and ſo there could not be 72, nor above one at once, or elſe as natural Parents over their Children, and ſo every Father will have *paternal Authority* over his Children by the ſame Right, and in as large Extent as thoſe 72 had, and ſo be Independent Princes over their own Off-ſpring. Taking his *Lords of Families*, in this later Senſe (as 'tis hard to give thoſe Words any other Senſe in this Place) he gives us a very pretty Account of the Original of Monarchy, in theſe following Words, *p.* 16. *And in this Senſe he may be ſaid to be the Author and Founder of Monarchy*, viz. As againſt Right ſeizing violently on the Rights of Fathers over their Children; which paternal Authority, if it be in them, by Right of Nature; (for elſe how could thoſe 72 come by it) no body can take from them without their own Conſents; and then I deſire our A. and his Friends to conſider, how far this will concern other Princes, and whether it will not, according to his Concluſion of that Paragraph, reſolve all regal Power of thoſe, whoſe Dominions extend beyond their Families, either into Tyranny and Uſurpation, or Election and Conſent of Fathers of Families, which will differ very little from Conſent of the People.

149. All his Inſtances, in the next *Section*, *p.* 17. of 12 Dukes of *Edom*, the 9 Kings in a little Corner of *Aſia* in *Abraham*'s Days, the 31 Kings in *Canaan* deſtroyed by *Joſhua*, and the Care he takes to prove that theſe were all ſovereign Princes, and that every Town in thoſe Days had a King, are ſo many direct Proofs againſt him, that it was not the *Lordſhip of* Adam *by Right deſcending* to them that made Kings. For if they had held their Royalties by that Title, either there muſt have been but one Sovereign over them all, or elſe every Father of a Family had been as good a Prince, and had as good a Claim to Royalty as theſe. For if all the Sons of *Eſau*, had each of them, the Younger as well as the Eldeſt, the Right of *Fatherhood*, and ſo were ſovereign Princes after their Father's Death, the ſame Right had their Sons after them, and ſo on to all Poſterity, which will limit all the natural Power of Fatherhood, only to be over the Iſſue of their own Bodies, and their Deſcendants, which Power of Fatherhood dies with the Head of each Family, and makes way for the like Power of Fatherhood to take Place, in each of his Sons over their reſpective Poſterities; whereby the Power of Fatherhood will be preſerv'd indeed, and is intelligible, but will not be at all to our A.'s Purpoſe. None of the Inſtances he brings are Proofs of any Power they had, as Heirs of *Adam*'s paternal Authority by the Title of his Fatherhood deſcending to them; no nor of any Power they had by Virtue of their own: For *Adam*'s *Fatherhood* being over all Mankind, it could deſcend but to one at once, and from him to his Right Heir only, and ſo there could by that Title be but one King in the World at a Time: And by Right of Fatherhood, not deſcending from *Adam*, it muſt be only as they themſelves were Fathers, and ſo could be over none but their own Poſterity. So that if thoſe 12 Dukes of *Edom*, if *Abraham* and the 9 Kings his Neighbours; if *Jacob* and *Eſau* and the 31 Kings in *Canaan*, the 72 Kings mutilated by *Adonibeſeck*, the 32 Kings that came to *Benhadad*, the 70 Kings of *Greece* making War at *Troy*, whereas our A. contends, all of them ſovereign Princes; 'tis evident that Kings derive their Power from ſome other Original *than Fatherhood*, ſince ſome of theſe had Power over more than their own Poſterity, and 'tis Demonſtration, they could not be all Heirs to *Adam*: For I challenge any Man to make any Pretence to Power by Right of *Fatherhood*, either intelligible or poſſible in any one, otherwiſe, than either as *Adam*'s Heir, or as Progenitor over his own Deſcendants, naturally ſprung from him. And if our A. could ſhew that any one of theſe Princes, of which he gives us here ſo large a Catalogue, had his Authority by either of theſe Titles, I think I might yield him the Cauſe: though 'tis manifeſt they are all impertinent and directly contrary to what he brings them to prove, *viz.* That the *Lordſhip which* Adam *had over the World by Right, deſcended to the Patriarchs.*

150. Having told us, *p.* 16. That *the Patriarchal Government continued in* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob, *until the* Egyptian *Bondage*, *p.* 17. He tells us, *By manifeſt Footſteps we may trace this Paternal Government unto the* Iſraelites *coming into* Egypt, *where the Exerciſe of the ſupreme patriarchal Government was intermitted, becauſe they were in Subjection to a ſtronger Prince.* What theſe Footſteps are of paternal Government, in our A.'s Senſe, *i. e.* of abſolute monarchical Power deſcending from *Adam*, and exerciſed by Right of *Fatherhood* we have ſeen, that is for 2290

Years no Footſteps at all: Since in all that time he cannot produce any one Example of any Perſon who claim'd or exerciſed regal Authority by Right of *Fatherhood*; or ſhew any one who being a King was *Adam*'s Heir: All that his Proofs amount to, is only this, that there were Fathers, Patriarchs and Kings in that Age of the World; but that the Fathers and Patriarchs had any abſolute arbitrary Power, or by what Titles thoſe Kings had theirs, and of what Extent it was, the Scripture is wholly ſilent; 'tis manifeſt by Right of *Fatherhood* they nither did, nor could claim any Title to Dominion and Empire.

151. To ſay, *That the Exerciſe of ſupreme patriarchal Government was intermitted, becauſe they were in Subjection to a ſtronger Prince*, proves nothing but what I before ſuſpected, viz. That *patriarchal Juriſdiction or Government* is a fallacious Expreſſion, and does not in our A. ſignifie (what he would yet inſinuate by it) *paternal* and *regal Power*, ſuch an abſolute Sovereignty as he ſuppoſes was in *Adam*.

152. For how can he ſay that *patriarchal Juriſdiction was intermitted in Egypt*, where there was a King, under whoſe regal Government the *Iſraelites* were, if *patriarchal* were *abſolute monarchical Juriſdiction?* And if it were not, but ſomething elſe, why does he make ſuch ado about a Power not in Queſtion, and nothing to the Purpoſe? The Exerciſe of *patriarchal* Juriſdiction, if *patriarchal* be *regal*, was not intermitted whilſt the *Iſraelites* were in *Egypt*. 'Tis true, the Exerciſe of *regal Power* was not then in the Hands of any of the promiſed Seed of *Abraham*, nor before neither, that I know; but what is that to the Intermiſſion of *regal Authority, as deſcending from* Adam, unleſs our A. will have it, that this choſen Line of *Abraham*, had the Right of Inheritance to *Adam*'s Lordſhip; and then to what Purpoſes are his Inſtances of the 72 Rulers, in whom the fatherly Authority was preſerv'd in the Confuſion at *Babel*? Why does he bring the 12 Princes Sons of *Iſmael*; and the Dukes of *Edom*, and join them with *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, as Examples of the Exerciſe of true *patriarchal Government*, if the Exerciſe of *patriarchal Juriſdiction* were intermitted in the World, whenever the Heirs of *Jacob* had not ſupreme Power? I fear *ſupreme patriarchal Juriſdiction* was not only *intermitted*, but from the time of the *Egyptian* Bondage quite loſt in the World, ſince 'twill be hard to find from that Time downwards, any one who exerciſed it as an Inheritance deſcending to him from the Patriarchs *Abraham*, *Iſaac* and *Jacob*. I imagined monarchical Government, would have ſerved his turn in the Hands of *Pharaoh* or any Body. But one cannot eaſily diſcover in all Pleaces, what his Diſcourſe tends to, as particularly in this Place, it is not obvious to gueſs what he drives at, when he ſays, *the Exerciſe of ſupreme patriarchal Juriſdiction* in *Egypt*, or how this ſerves to make out the Deſcent of *Adam*'s Lordſhip to the Patriarchs, or any Body elſe.

153. For I thought he had been giving us out of Scripture, Proofs and Examples of monarchical Government, founded on paternal Authority, deſcending from *Adam*; and not a Hiſtory of the *Jews*: amongſt whom yet we find no Kings, till many Years after they were a People: And when Kings were their Rulers, there is not the leaſt mention or room for a Pretence that they were Heirs to *Adam*, or Kings by paternal Authority. I expected, talking ſo much as he does of Scripture, that he would have produced thence a Series of Monarchs, whoſe Titles were clear to *Adam*'s *Fatherhood*, and who, as Heirs to him, own'd and exerciſed paternal Juriſdiction over their Subjects, and that this was the true patirarchical Government; whereas he neither proves, that the Patriarchs were Kings; nor that either Kings or Patriarchs were Heirs to *Adam*, or ſo much as pretended to it: And one may as well prove, that the Patriarchs were all abſolute Monarchs; that the Power both of Patriarchs and Kings was only Paternal; and that this Power deſcended to them from *Adam*; I ſay all theſe Propoſitions may be as well prov'd by a confuſed Account of a multitude of little Kings in the *Weſt-Indies*, out of *Ferdinando Soto*, or any of our late Hiſtories of the *Northern America*, or by our A.'s 70 Kings of *Greece*, out of *Homer*, as by any thing he brings out of Scripture, in that multitude of Kings he has reckon'd up.

154. And methinks he ſhould have let *Homer* and his Wars of *Troy* alone, ſince his great Zeal to Truth or Monarchy carried him to ſuch a pitch of Tranſport againſt *Philoſophers* and *Poets*, that he tells us in his Preface, that there *are too many in theſe Days, who pleaſe themſelves in running after the Opinion of Philoſophers and Poets, to find out ſuch an Original of Government, as might promiſe them ſome Title to Liberty,*

Liberty, to the great Scandal of Chriſtianity, and bringing in of Atheiſm. And yet theſe Heathens, Philoſopher *Ariſtotle*, and Poet *Homer*, are not rejected by our zealous Chriſtian Politician, whenever they offer any thing that ſeems to ſerve his Turn; whether *to the great Scandal of* Chriſtianity, *and bringing in of* Atheiſm, let him look. This I cannot but obſerve, in Authors who 'tis viſible write not for Truth; how ready Zeal for Intereſt and Party is to entitle *Chriſtianity* to their Deſigns, and to charge *Atheiſm* on thoſe who will not without examining ſubmit to their Doctrines, and blindly ſwallow their Nonſenſe.

But to return to his Scripture Hiſtory, our A. farther tells us, p. 18. that *after the return of the* Iſraelites *out of* Bondage, *God out of a ſpecial Care of them, choſe* Moſes *and* Joſhua *ſucceſſively to govern as Princes in the place and ſtead of the ſupreme Fathers.* If it be true, that they *returned out of Bondage*, it muſt be into a State of Freedom, and muſt imply, that both before and after this *Bondage*, they were free, unleſs our A. will ſay, that changing of Maſters, is returning *out of Bondage*; or that a Slave *returns out of Bondage*, when he is removed from one Gally to another. If then they *return'd out of Bondage*, 'tis plain that in thoſe Days, whatever our A. in his Preface ſays to the contrary, there was difference betwen a *Son*, a *Subject*, and a *Slave*; and that neither the *Patriarchs* before, nor their Rulers after this *Egyptian Bondage*, *number'd their Sons or Subjects amongſt their Poſſeſſions*, and diſpoſed of them with as abſolute a Dominion, as they did *their other Goods*.

155. This is evident in *Jacob*, to whom *Reuben* offer'd his two Sons as Pledges, and *Judah* was at laſt Surety for *Benjamin*'s ſafe Return out of *Egypt*: Which all had been vain, ſuperfluous, and but a ſort of Mockery, if *Jacob* had had the ſame Power over every one of his Family, as he had over his Ox or his Aſs, as an *Owner* over his *Subſtance*; and the Offers that *Reuben* or *Judah* made, had been ſuch a Security for returning of *Benjamin*, as if a Man ſhould take two Lambs out of his Lord's Flock, and offer one as Security, that he will ſafely reſtore the other.

156. When they were out of this *Bondage*, what then? *God out of a ſpecial Care of them, the Iſraelites.* 'Tis well that once in his Book, he will allow God to have any Care of the People, for in other Places he ſpeaks of Mankind, as if God had no Care of any Part of them, but only of their Monarchs, and that the reſt of the People, the Societies of Men, were made as ſo many Herds of Cattle, onfor the Service, Uſe, and Pleaſure of their Princes.

157. *Choſe* Moſes *and* Joſhua *ſucceſſively to govern as Princes:* a ſhrewd Argument our A. has found out to prove God's Care of the fatherly Authority, and *Adam*'s Heirs, that here as an Expreſſion of his Care of his own People, he chuſes thoſe for Princes over them, that had not the leaſt Pretence to either. The Perſons choſen were, *Moſes* of the Tribe of *Levi*, and *Joſhua* of the Tribe of *Ephraim*, neither of which had any Title of *Fatherhood*. But, ſays our A. they were in the place and ſtead of the ſupreme Fathers. If God had any where, as plainly declared, his Choice of ſuch *Fathers* to be Rulers, as he did of *Moſes* and *Joſhua*, we might believe *Moſes* and *Joſhua* were in *their places* and *ſtead:* But that being the Queſtion in debate, till that be better prov'd, *Moſes* being choſen by God to be a Ruler of his People, will no more prove that Government belong'd to *Adam*'s *Heir*, or to the *Fatherhood*, than God's chuſing *Aaron* of the Tribe of *Levi* to be Prieſt, will prove that the Prieſthood belong'd to *Adam*'s Heir or the *Prime Fathers:* Since God could chuſe *Aaron* to be Prieſt, and *Moſes* Ruler in *Iſrael*, though neither of thoſe Offices, were ſettled on *Adam*'s *Heir*, or the *Fatherhood*.

158. Our A. goes on, *and after them likewiſe for a time he raiſed up Judges, to defend his People in time of Peril*, p. 18. This proves fatherly Authority to be the Original of Government, and that it deſcended from *Adam* to his Heirs, juſt as well, as what went before: Only here our A. ſeems to confeſs, that theſe Judges, who were all the Governors they then had, were only Men of Valour, whom they made their Generals to defend them in time of Peril; and cannot God raiſe up ſuch Men, unleſs Fatherhood have a Title to Government?

But ſays our A. *when God gave the* Iſraelites *Kings, he re-eſtabliſhed the ancient and prime Right of lineal Succeſſion to paternal Government*, p. 18.

160. How did God *re-eſtabliſh* it? By a Law, a poſitive Command? We find no ſuch thing. Our A. means then, that when God gave them a King, in giving them a King, he *re-eſtabliſhed the Right*, &c. To re-eſtabliſh *de facto* the Right of lineal Succeſſion to paternal Government, is to put a Man in Poſſeſſion of that Government, which his Fathers did enjoy, and he by lineal Succeſſion had a Right to. For, firſt, if it were another Government, than what his Anceſtors had, it was not ſucceeding to an *ancient Right*, but beginning a new one. For a Prince ſhould give a Man, beſides his ancient Patrimony, which for ſome Ages his Family had been diſſeiz'd of, an additional Eſtate, never before in the Poſſeſſion of his Anceſtors, he could not be ſaid to *re-eſtabliſh the Right of lineal Succeſſion*, to any more, than what had been formerly enjoy'd by his Anceſtors. If therefore the Power the Kings of *Iſrael* had, were any thing more, than *Iſaac* or *Jacob* had, it was not the *re-eſtabliſhing* in them the Right of Succeſſion to a Power, but giving them a new Power, however you pleaſe to call it *Paternal* or not: and whether *Iſaac* and *Jacob* had the ſame Power, that the Kings of *Iſrael* had, I deſire any one, by what has been above ſaid, to conſider, and I do not think they will find, that either *Abraham Iſaac*, or *Jacob*, had any regal Power at all.

161. Next, there can be no *re-eſtabliſhment of the prime and ancient Right of lineal Succeſſion* to any thing, unleſs he, that is put in Poſſeſſion of it, has the Right to ſucceed, and be the true and next Heir to him he ſucceeds to. Can that be a re-eſtabliſhment, which begins in a new Family? Or that the *re-eſtabliſhment of an ancient Right of lineal Succeſſion*, when a Crown is given to one, who has no Right of Succeſſion to it, and who, if the lineal Succeſſion had gone, on had been out of all poſſibility of Pretence to it? *Saul* the firſt King, God gave the *Iſraelites*, was of the Tribe of *Benjamin*; was the *ancient and prime Right of lineal Succeſſion re-eſtabliſhed* in him? The next was *David* the youngeſt Son of *Jeſſe*, of the Poſterity of *Judah*, *Jacob*'s *third Son*. Was the *ancient and prime Right of lineal Succeſſion to paternal Government re-eſtabliſh'd* in him? Or in *Solomon* his younger Son and Succeſſor in the Throne? Or in *Jeroboam* over the ten Tribes? Or in *Athaliah*, a Woman who reigned ſix Years, an utter Stanger to the Royal Blood? *If the ancient and prime Right of lineal Succeſſion to paternal Government*, were *re-eſtabliſh'd* in any of theſe or their Poſterity, *the ancient and prime Right of lineal Succeſſion to paternal Government*, belongs to younger Brothers as well as elder, and may be re-eſtabliſh'd in any Man living; for whatever younger Brothers, by *ancient and prime Right of lineal Succeſſion*, may have as well as the elder, that every Man living may have a Right to, by lineal Succeſſion, and Sir *Robert* as well as any other. And ſo what a brave Right of lineal Succeſſion, to his *paternal* or *regal Government*, our A. has *re-eſtabliſh'd*, for the ſecuring the Rights and Inheritance of Crowns, where every one may have it, let the World conſider.

162. But ſays our A. however, *p.* 19. *Whenſoever God made choice of any ſpecial Perſon to be King, he intended that the Iſſue alſo ſhould have Benefit thereof, as being comprehended ſufficiently in the Perſon of the Father, although the Father was only named in the Grant.* This yet will not help out Succeſſion; for if, as our A. ſays, the Benefit of the Grant be intended to the *Iſſue* of the Grantee, this will not direct the Succeſſion; ſince if God give any thing to a Man and his *Iſſue* in general, the Claim cannot be to any one of that *Iſſue* in particular, every one that is of his Race will have an equal Right. If it be ſaid, our A, meant *Heir*, I believe our A. was as willing as any body to have uſed that Word, if it would have ſerved his Turn, but *Solomon* who ſucceeded *David* in his Throne, being no more his Heir than *Jeroboam*, who ſucceeded him in the Government of the ten Tribes, was his Iſſue, our A. had Reaſon to avoid ſaying, That God intended it to the *Heirs*, when that would not hold in a Succeſſion, which our A. could not except againſt, and ſo he has left his Succeſſion as undetermin'd, as if he had ſaid nothing about it. For if the regal Power be given by God to a Man and his *Iſſue*, as the Land of *Canaan* was to *Abraham* and his Seed, muſt they not all have a Title to it, all ſhare in it? And one may as well ſay, that by God's Grant to *Abraham* and his Seed, the Land of *Canaan* was to belong only to one of his Seed excluſive of all others, as by God's Grant of Dominion to a Man and *his Iſſue*, this Dominion was to belong in peculiar to one of his *Iſſue* excluſive of all others.

163. But

163. But how will our A. prove that whenſoever God made choice of any ſpecial Perſon to be a King, he intended that *the* (I ſuppoſe he means his) *Iſſue alſo ſhould have Beneſit thereof:* Has he ſo ſoon forgot *Moſes* and *Joſhua* whom in this very *Section*, he ſays, *God out of a ſpecial care choſe to govern as Princes*, and the Judges that God raiſed up? Had not theſe Princes, having the Authority of the *ſupreme Fatherhood*, the ſame Power that the Kings had, and being ſpecially choſen by God himſelf, ſhould not their *Iſſue* have the Benefit of that Choice, as well as *David*'s or *Solomon*'s? If theſe had the paternal Authority put into their Hands immediately by God, why had not their *Iſſue* the Benefit of this Grant in a Succeſſion to this Power? Or if they had it as *Adam*'s Heirs, why did not their Heirs enjoy it after them by Right deſcending to them? For they could not be Heirs to one another. Was the Power the ſame, and from the ſame Original in *Moſes*, *Joſhua* and the *Judges* as it was in *David* and the *Kings*, and was it inheritable in one and not in the other? If it was *paternal Authority*: then God's own People where govern'd by thoſe that had not *paternal Authority*, and thoſe Governors did well enough without it: If it were *paternal Authority*, and God choſe the Perſons that were to exerciſe it, our A.'s Rule fails, that *whenſoever God makes choice of any Perſon to be ſupreme Ruler* (for I ſuppoſe the name King has no Spell in it, 'tis not the Title, but the Power makes the Difference) *he intends that the Iſſue alſo ſhould have the Benefit of it*, ſince from their coming out of *Egypt*, to *David*'s Time 400 Years, the *Iſſue* was never *ſo ſufficiently comprehended in the Perſon of the Father*, as that any Son after the Death of his Father, ſucceeded to the Government amongſt all thoſe Judges that judged *Iſrael*. If to avoid this, it be ſaid, God always choſe the Perſon of the Succeſſor, and ſo transferring the *fatherly Authority* to him, excluded his Iſſue from ſucceeding to it, that is manifeſtly not ſo in the Story of *Jeptha*, where he articled with the People, and they made him Judge over them, as is plain, *Jud.* 11.

164. 'Tis in vain then to ſay, that *whenſoever God chuſes any ſpecial Perſon* to have the Exerciſe of *paternal Authority* (for if that be not to be King, I deſire to know the difference between a King and one having the Exerciſe of *paternal Authority*,) *he intends the Iſſue alſo ſhould have the Benefit of it*, ſince we find the Authority, the Judges had, ended with them, and deſcended not to their *Iſſue*, and if the Judges had not *paternal Authority*, I fear it will trouble our A. or any of the Friends to his Principles, to tell who had then the *paternal Authority*, that is, the Government and ſupreme Power amongſt the *Iſralites*; and I ſuſpect they muſt confeſs that the choſen People of God continued a People ſeveral hundreds of Years, without any Knowledge or Thought of this *paternal Authority*, or any appearance of monarchical Government at all.

165. To be ſatisfied of this, he needs but read the Story of the *Levite*, and the War thereupon with the *Benjamites*, in the three laſt *Chap.* of *Jud.* and when he finds, that the *Levite* appeals to the People for Juſtice; that it was the Tribes and the Congregation, that debated, reſolv'd, and directed all that was done on that Occaſion; he muſt conclude, either that *God* was not *careful to preſerve the fatherly Authority* amongſt his own choſen People; or elſe that the *fatherly Authority* may be preſerved, where there is no monarchical Government; if the latter, then it will follow that though *fatherly Authority* be never ſo well prov'd, yet it will not infer a Neceſſity of monarchical Government; if the former, it will ſeem very ſtrange and improbable, that God ſhould ordain *fatherly Authority* to be ſo ſacred amongſt the Sons of Men, that there could be no Power, or Government without it, and yet that amongſt his own People, even whilſt he is providing a Government for them, and therein preſcribes Rules to the ſeveral States and Relations of Men, this great and Fudamental one, this moſt material and neceſſary of all the reſt, ſhould be concealed, and lie neglected for 400 Years after.

166. Before I leave this, I muſt ask how our A. knows that *whenſoever God makes choice of any ſpecial Perſon to be King, he intends that the Iſſue ſhould have the Benefit thereof?* Does God by the Law of Nature or Revelation ſay ſo? By the ſame Law alſo he muſt ſay, which of his *Iſſue* muſt enjoy the Crown in Succeſſion, and ſo point out the Heir, or elſe leave his *Iſſue* to divide and ſcramble for the Government: Both alike abſurd, and ſuch as will deſtroy the Benefit of ſuch Grant to the *Iſſue*. When any ſuch Declaration of God's Intention is produced, it will be our Duty to believe God intends it ſo, but till that be done, our A. muſt ſhew

us

some better Warrant, before we shall be obliged to receive him as the Authentick Revealer of God's Intentions.

167. *The Issue*, says our A. *is comprehended sufficiently in the Person of the Father, although the Father only was named in the Grant*: And yet God, when he gave the Land of *Canaan* to *Abraham*, Gen. 13. 15. thought fit to put *his Seed* into the Grant too: So the Priesthood was given to *Aaron and his Seed*; and the Crown God gave not only to *David*, but *his Seed* also: And however our A. assures us that *God intends, that the Issue should have the Benefit of it, when he chuses any Person to be King*, yet we see that the Kingdom, which he gave to *Saul*, without mentioning his Seed after him, never came to any of his *Issue*: and why, when God chose a Person to be King, he should intend, that his *Issue* should have the Benefit of it, more than when he chose one to be Judge in *Israel*, I would fain know a Reason; or why does a Grant of *Fatherly Authority* to a King more comprehend the *Issue*, than when a like Grant is made to a Judge? Is *Paternal Authority* by Right to descend to the *Issue*, of one and not of the other? There will need some reason to be shewn of this Difference, more than the Name, when the Thing given is the same *Fatherly Authority*, and the manner of giving it, God's choice of the Person, the same too; for I suppose our A. when he says, *God raised up Judges*, will by no means allow, they were chosen by the People.

168. But since our A. has so confidently assured us of the care of God to preserve the *Fatherhood*, and pretends to build all he says, upon the Authority of the Scripture, we may well expect that the People whose Law, Constitution and History is chiefly contained in the Scripture, should furnish him with the clearest Instances of God's care of preserving of the Fatherly Authority in that People who 'tis agreed he had a most peculiar Care of. Let us see then what State this *Paternal Authority* or Government was in amongst the *Jews*, from their beginning to be a People. It was omitted by our A.'s Confession, from their coming into *Egypt*, till their return out of that Bondage, above 200 Years: From thence till God gave the *Israelites* a King about 400 Years more, our A. gives but a very slender account of it, nor indeed all that time are there the least Footsteps of Paternal or Regal Government amongst them. But then, says our A. *God re-established the ancient and prime Right of Lineal Succession to Paternal Government.*

169. What a *Lineal Succession to Paternal Government* was then Established, we have already seen. I only now consider how long this lasted, and that was to their Captivity about 500 Years: From thence to their Destruction by the *Romans*, above 650 Years after, the *ancient and prime Right of Lineal Succession to Paternal Government* was again lost, and they continued a People in the promised Land without it. So that of 1750 Years, they that were God's peculiar People, they had Hereditary Kingly Government amongst them, not one third of the Time, and of that Time there is not the least Footstep of one Moment of *Paternal Government, nor the Re-establishment of the ancient and prime Right of Lineal Succession to it*, whether we suppose it to be derived, as from its Fountain, from *David*, *Saul*, *Abraham*, or, which upon our A.'s Principles is the only true, from *Adam*.

*****

OF CIVIL-GOVERNMENT.

BOOK II.

CHAP. I.

IT having been ſhewn in the foregoing Diſcourſe.

1. That *Adam* had not either by natural Right of Fatherhood, or by poſitive Donation form God, any ſuch Authority over his Children, or Dominion over the World as is pretended.

2. That if he had, his Heirs yet had no Right to it.

3. That if his Heirs had, there being no Law of Nature nor poſitive Law of God that determines, which is the right Heir in all Caſes that may ariſe, the Right of Succeſſion, and conſequently of bearing Rule, could not have been certainly determined.

4. That if even that had been determined, yet the Knowledge of which is the eldeſt Line of *Adam*'s Poſterity, being ſo long ſince utterly loſt, that in the Races of Mankind and Families of the World, there remains not to one above another, the leaſt Pretence to be the eldeſt Houſe, and to have Right of Inheritance.

All theſe Premiſes having, as I think, been clearly made out, it is impoſſible that the Rulers now on Earth, ſhould make any Benefit, or derive any the leaſt Shadow of Authority from that, which is held to be the Foundation of all Power, *Adam*'s *private Dominion and paternal Juriſdiction*; ſo that, he that will not give juſt occaſion, to think, that all Government in the World is the Product only of Force and Violence, and that Men live together by no other Rules but that of Beaſts, where the ſtrongeſt carries it; and ſo lay a Foundation for perpetual Diſorder and Miſchief, Tumult, Sedition and Rebellion, (Things that the Followers of that Hypotheſis ſo loudly cry out againſt) muſt of neceſſity find out another Riſe of Government, another Original of political Power, and another Way of deſigning and knowing the Perſons that have it, than what Sir *Robert F.* hath taught us.

2. To this Purpoſe, I think it may not be amiſs, to ſet down what I take to be political Power. That the Power of a *Magiſtrate* over a Subject, may be diſtinguiſh'd from that of a *Father* over his Children, a *Maſter* over his Servant, a *Huſband* over his Wife, and a *Lord* over his Slave. All which diſtinct Powers happening ſometime together in the ſame Man, if he be conſidered under theſe different Relations, it may help us to diſtinguiſh theſe Powers one from another, and ſhew the Difference betwixt a Ruler of a Common-wealth, a Father of a Family, and a Captain of a Galley.

3. *Political Power*, then I take to be a *Right* of making Laws with Penalties of Death, and conſequently all leſs Penalties, for the regulating and preſerving of Property, and of employing the Force of the Community, in the Execution of ſuch Laws, and in the Defence of the Common-wealth from foreign Injury, and all this only for the publick Good.

CHAP. II.

Of the State of Nature.

4. TO underſtand political Power right, and derive it from its Original, we muſt conſider, what State all Men are naturally in, and that is, a *State* of *perfect Freedom* to order their Actions, and diſpoſe of their Poſſeſſions, and Perſons as they think fit, within the Bounds of the Law of Nature, without asking Leave, or depending upon the Will of any other Man.

A *State* alſo *of Equality*, wherein all the Power and Juriſdiction is Reciprocal, no one having more than another; there being nothing more evident, than that Creatures of the ſame Species and Rank, promiſcuouſly born to all the ſame advantages of Nature, and the uſe of the ſame Faculties, ſhould alſo be equal one amongſt another without Subordination or Subjection, unleſs the Lord and Maſter of them all, ſhould by any manifeſt Declaration of his Will ſet one above another, and confer on him, by an evident and clear Appointment, and undoubted Right to Dominion and Sovereignty.

5. This *Equality* of Men by Nature, the judicious *Hooker* looks upon as ſo evident in it ſelf and beyond all queſtion, that he makes it the Foundation of that Obligation to mutual Love amongſt Men, on which he builds the Duties they owe one another, and from whence he derives the great Maxims *of Juſtice* and *Charity*. His words are:

The like natural Inducement, hath brought Men to know that it is no leſs their Duty, to Love others than themſelves, for ſeeing thoſe Things which are equal, muſt needs all have one Meaſure; if I cannot but wiſh to receive Good, even as much at every Man's Hands, as any Man can wiſh unto his own Soul, and how ſhould I look to have any part of my Deſire herein ſatisfied, unleſs my ſelf be careful to ſatisfy the like Deſire, which is undoubtedly in other Men, being of one and the ſame Nature; to have any thing offered them repugnant to this Deſire, muſt needs in all reſpects grieve them as much as me, ſo that if I do harm, I muſt look to ſuffer, there being no Reaſon that others ſhould ſhew greater meaſures of Love to me, than they have by me, ſhewed unto them; my Deſire therefore to be lov'd of my Equals in Nature, as much as poſſible may be, impoſeth upon me a natural Duty of bearing to them-ward, fully the like Affection; from which relation of Equality between our ſelves and them that are as our ſelves, what ſeveral Rules and Canons, natural Reaſon hath drawn, for Direction of Life, no Man is ignorant. Eccl. Pol. Li. 1.

6. But though this be *a State of Liberty* yet *it is not a State of Licence*; though Man in that State have an uncontroulable Liberty, to diſpoſe of his Perſon or Poſſeſſions, yet he has not Liberty to deſtroy himſelf, or ſo much as any Creature in his Poſſeſſion, but were ſome nobler Uſe, than its bare Preſervation calls for it. The *State of Nature* has a Law of Nature to govern it, which obliges every one: And Reaſon' which is that Law, teaches all Mankind, who will but conſult it, that being all *equal and independent*, no one ought to harm another in his Life, Health, Liberty, or Poſſeſſions. For Men being all the Workmanſhip of one Omnipotent, and infinitely wiſe Maker: All the Servants of one Sovereign Maſter, ſent into the World by his Order, and about his Buſineſs, they are his Property, whoſe Workmanſhip they are, made to laſt during his, not one anothers Pleaſure: And being furniſhed with like Faculties, ſharing all in one Community of Nature, there cannot be ſuppoſed any ſuch *Subordination* among us, that may authorize us to deſtroy one another, as if we were made for one another's Uſes, as the inferior Ranks of Creatures are for ours. Every one, as he is *bound to preſerve himſelf*, and not to quit his Station wilfully, ſo by the like reaſon, when his own Preſervation comes not in Competition, ought he, as much as he can, *to preſerve the reſt of Mankind*, and may not, unleſs it be to do Juſtice on an Offender, take away, or impair the Life, or what tends to the Preſervation of the Life, the Liberty, Health, Limb, or Goods of another.

7. And that all Men may be reſtrained from invading others Rights, and from doing hurt to one another, and the Law of Nature be obſerved, which willeth the Peace and *Preſervation of all Mankind*, the *Execution* of the Law of Nature is in that State, put into every Man's Hand, whereby every one has a Right to puniſh the Tranſgreſſors of that Law to ſuch a Degree, as may hinder its Violation.

tion. For the *Law of Nature* would, as all other Laws, that concern Men in this World, be in vain, if there were no Body that in the State of Nature, had a *Power to execute* that Law, and thereby preſerve the Innocent and reſtrain Offenders. And if any one in the State of Nature may puniſh another, for any Evil he has done, every one may do ſo. For in that *State of perfect Equality*, where naturally there is no Superiority or Juriſdiction of one, over another, what any may do in Proſecution of that Law, every one muſt needs have a Right to do.

8. And thus in the State of Nature, *one Man comes by a Power over another*; but yet no abſolute or arbitrary Power, to uſe a Criminal, when he has got him in his Hands, according to the paſſionate Heats, or boundleſs Extravagancy of his own Will; but only to retribute to him, ſo far, as calm Reaſon and Conſcience dictate what is proportionate to his Tranſgreſſion, which is ſo much as may ſerve for *Reparation and Reſtraint*. For theſe two are the only Reaſons, why one Man may lawfully do harm to another, which is that we call *Puniſhment*. In tranſgreſſing the Law of Nature, the Offender declares himſelf to live by another Rule, than that of common Reaſon and Equity, which is that Meaſure God has ſet to the Actions of Men, for their mutual Security; and ſo he becomes dangerous to Mankind, the Tie, which is to ſecure them from Injury and Violence, being ſlighted and broken by him. Which being a Treſpaſs againſt the whole Species, and the Peace and Safety of it, provided for by the Law of Nature, every Man upon this Score, by the Right he hath to preſerve Mankind in general, may reſtrain, or where it is neceſſary, deſtroy Things noxious to them, and ſo may bring ſuch Evil on any one, who hath tranſgreſſed that Law, as may make him repent the doing of it, and thereby deter him, and, by his Example others, from doing the like Miſchief. And in this Caſe, and upon this Ground, *every Man hath a Right to puniſh the Offender, and be Executioner of the Law of Nature.*

9. I doubt not but this will ſeem a very ſtrange Doctrine to ſome Men: But before they condemn it, I deſire them to reſolve me, by what Right any Prince or State can put to death, or *puniſh an Alien*, for any Crime he commits in their Country? 'Tis certain their Laws by virtue of any Sanction, they receive from the promulgated Will of the Legiſlative, reach not a Stranger: They ſpeak not to him, nor, if they did, is he bound to hearken to them. The legiſlative Authority, by which they are in Force over the Subjects of that Common-wealth, hath no Power over him. Thoſe who have the ſupream Power of making Laws in *England*, *France* or *Holland*, are to an *Indian*, but like the reſt of the World, Men without Authority: And therefore, if by the Law of Nature, every Man hath not a Power to puniſh Offences againſt it, as he ſoberly judges the Caſe to require, I ſee not how the Magiſtrates of any Community, can *puniſh an Alien* of another Country; ſince in reference to him, they can have no more Power, than what every Man naturally may have over another.

10. Beſides the Crimes which conſiſts in violating the Law, and varying from the right Rule of Reaſon, whereby a Man ſo far becomes degenerate, and declares himſelf to quit the Principles of human Nature, and to be a noxious Creature, there is commonly *Injury* done, ſome Perſon or other, ſome other Man receives Damage by his Tranſgreſſion, in which caſe he who hath received any Damage, has beſides the right of Puniſhment common to him with other Men, a particular Right to ſeek *Reparation* from him that has done it. And any other Perſon who finds it juſt, may alſo join with him that is injur'd, and aſſiſt him in recovering from the Offender, ſo much as may make Satisfaction for the harm he has ſuffered.

11. From theſe *two diſtinct Rights*, the one of *puniſhing* the Crime *for Reſtraint*, and preventing the like Offence, which Right of puniſhing is in every Body; the other of taking *Reparation*, which belongs only to the injured Party, comes it to paſs, that the Magiſtrate, who by being Magiſtrate, hath the common Right of puniſhing put into his Hands, can often, where the Publick Good demands not the Execution of the Law, *remit* the Puniſhment of criminal Offences by his own Authority, but yet cannot *remit* the Satisfaction due to any private Man, for the Damage he has received. That, he who has ſuffered the Damage has a Right to demand in his own Name, and he alone can remit: The damnified Perſon has this Power of appropriating to himſelf, the Goods or Service of the Offender, *by Right of Self-Preſervation*, as every Man has a Power to puniſh the Crime, to prevent its being committed again, *by the Right he has of preſerving all Mankind*,

and doing all reaſonable Things, he can, in order to that end: And thus it is, that every Man in the State of Nature, has a Power to kill a Murderer, both *to deter* others from doing the like Injury, which no Reparation can compenſate, by the Example of the Puniſhment that attends it from every Body, and alſo to ſecure Men from the attempts of a Criminal, who having renounced Reaſon, the common Rule and Meaſure, God hath given to Mankind, hath by the unjuſt Violence and Slaughter he hath committed upon one, declared War againſt all Mankind, and therefore may be deſtroyed as a *Lyon* or a *Tyger*, one of thoſe wild ſavage Beaſts, with whom Men can have no Society nor Security: And upon this is grounded that great Law of Nature, *whoſo ſheddeth Man's Blood, by Man ſhall his Blood be ſhed.* And *Cain* was ſo fully convinced, that every one had a Right to deſtroy ſuch a Criminal, that after the Murder of his Brother, he cries out, *Every one that findeth me, ſhall ſlay me*; ſo plain was it writ in the Hearts of all Mankind.

12. By the ſame Reaſon, may a Man in the State of Nature *puniſh the leſſer Breaches* of that Law. It will perhaps be demanded with Death? I anſwer, each Tranſgreſſion may be *puniſhed* to that *degree*, and with ſo much *Severity*, as will ſuffice to make it an ill Bargain to the Offender, give him cauſe to repent, and terrify others from doing the like. Every Offence that can be committed in the State of Nature, may in the State of Nature be alſo puniſhed equally, and as far forth as it may, in a Common-wealth. For though it would be beſides my preſent Purpoſe, to enter here into the Particulars of the Law of Nature, or its *Meaſures of Puniſhment*; yet, it is certain there is ſuch a Law, and that too, as intelligible and plain to a rational Creature, and a Studier of that Law, as the poſitive Laws of Common-wealths; nay poſſibly plainer; as much as Reaſon is eaſier to be underſtood, than the Fancies and intricate Contrivances of Men, following contrary and hidden Intereſts put into Words; for ſo truly are a great part of the *municiple Laws* of Countries, which are only ſo far right, as they are founded on the Law of Nature, by which they are to be regulated and interpreted.

13. To this ſtrange Doctrine, *viz.* That *in the State of Nature, every one has the Executive Power* of the Law of Nature, I doubt not but it will be objected, that it is unreaſonable for Men to be Judges in their own Caſes, that Self-love will make Men partial to themſelves and their Friends: And on the other ſide, that ill Nature, Paſſion and Revenge will carry them too far in puniſhing others; and hence nothing but Confuſion and Diſorder will follow, and that therefore God hath certainly appointed Government to reſtrain the Partiality and Violence of Men. I eaſily grant, that *Civil-Government* is the proper Remedy for the Inconveniencies of the State of Nature, which muſt certainly be great, where Men may be Judges in their own Caſe, ſince 'tis eaſie to be imagined, that he who was ſo unjuſt as to do his Brother an Injury, will ſcarce be ſo juſt as to condemn himſelf for it: But I ſhall deſire thoſe who make this Objection, to remember, that *abſolute Monarchs* are but Men, and if Government is to be the Remedy of thoſe Evils, which neceſſarily follow from Mens being Judges in their own Caſes, and the State of Nature is therefore not to be endured, I deſire to know what kind of Government that is, and how much better it is than the State of Nature, where one Man commanding a Multitude, has the Liberty to be judge in his own Caſe, and may do to all his Subjects whatever he pleaſes, without the leaſt queſtion or controle of thoſe who execute his Pleaſure? And in whatſoever he doth, whether led by Reaſon, Miſtake or Paſſion, muſt be ſubmitted to? Which Men in the State of Nature are not bound to do one to another: And if he that judges, judges amiſs in his own, or any other Caſe, he is anſwerable for it to the reſt of Mankind.

14. 'Tis often asked as a mighty Objection, *where are*, or ever were, there any *Men in ſuch a State of Nature?* To which it may ſuffice as an Anſwer at preſent: That ſince all Princes and Rulers of *Independent* Governments all through the World, are in a State of Nature, 'tis plain the World never was, nor ever will be, without Numbers of Men in that State. I have named all Governors of *Independent Communities*, whether they are, or are not, in League with others. For 'tis not every Compact that puts an end to the State of Nature between Men, but only this one of agreeing together mutually to enter into one Community, and make one Body Politick; other Promiſes, and Compacts, Men may make one

with

with another, and yet ſtill be in the State of Nature. The Promiſes and Bargains for Truck, *&c.* between the two Men in the deſert Iſland, mentioned by *Garcilaſſo de la Vega*, in his Hiſtory of *Peru*; or between a *Swiſs* and an *Indian*, in the Woods of *America*, are binding to them, though they are perfectly in a State of Nature, in reference to one another. For Truth and keeping of Faith belongs to Men, as Men, and not as Members of Society.

15. To thoſe that ſay, There were never any Men in the State of Nature: I will not only oppoſe the Authority of the judicious *Hooker*, *Eccl. Pol. Lib.* 1. *Sect.* 10. where he ſays, *The Laws which have been hitherto mentioned*, i. e. the Laws of Nature, *do bind Men abſolutely, even as they are Men, although they have never any ſettled Fellowſhip, and never any ſolemn Agreement amongſt themſelves what to do or not to do, but for as much as we are not by our ſelves ſufficient to furniſh our ſelves with competent ſtore of Things, needful for ſuch a Life as our Nature doth deſire, a Life fit for the Dignity of Man; therefore to ſupply thoſe Defects and Imperfections which are in us, as living ſingle and ſolely by our ſelves, we are naturally induced to ſeek Communion and Fellowſhip with others, this was the cauſe of Mens uniting themſelves, at firſt in politick Societies.* But I moreover affirm, That all Men are naturally in that State, and remain ſo, till by their own Conſents they make themſelves Members of ſome politick Society; and I doubt not in the Sequel of this Diſcourſe, to make it very clear.

CHAP. III.

Of the State of War.

16. THE *State of War* is a State of *Enmity* and *Deſtruction*: And therefore declaring by Word or Action, not a paſſionate and haſty, but a ſedate ſettled Deſign, upon another Man's Life, *puts him in a State of War* with him againſt whom he has declared ſuch an Intention, and ſo has expoſed his Life to the others Power to be taken away by him, or any one that joins with him in his Defence, and eſpouſes his Quarrel; it being reaſonable and juſt I ſhould have a Right to deſtroy that, which threatens me with Deſtruction. For *by the fundamental Law of Nature, Man being to be preſerved*, as much as poſſible, when all cannot be preſerved, the Safety of the Innocent is to be preferred: And one may deſtroy a Man who makes War upon him, or has diſcovered an Enmity to his Being, for the ſame Reaſon, that he may kill a *Woolf* or a *Lion*; becauſe ſuch Men are not under the Ties of the Common-Law of Reaſon, have no other Rule, but that of Force and Violence, and ſo may be treated as Beaſts of Prey, thoſe dangerous and noxious Creatures, that will be ſure to deſtroy him, whenever he falls into their Power.

17. And hence it is, that he who attempts to get another Man into his Abſolute Power, does thereby *put himſelf into a State of War* with him; it being to be underſtood as a Declaration of a Deſign upon his Life. For I have reaſon to conclude, that he who would get me into his Power without my Conſent, would uſe me as he pleaſed, when he had got me there, and deſtroy me too, when he had a fancy to it; for no Body can deſire to *have me in his abſolute Power*, unleſs it be to compel me by Force to that, which is againſt the Right of my Freedom, *i. e.* make me a Slave. To be free from ſuch Force is the only Security of my Preſervation; and Reaſon bids me look on him, as an Enemy to my Preſervation, who would take away that *Freedom*, which is the Fence to it; ſo that he who makes an *attempt to enſlave* me, thereby puts himſelf into a State of War with me. He that in the State of Nature, *would take away the Freedom*, that belongs to any one in that State, muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed to have a deſign to take away every thing elſe, that *Freedom* being the Foundation of all the reſt: As he that in the State of Society, would take away the *Freedom* belonging to thoſe of that Society or Common-wealth, muſt be ſuppoſed to deſign to take away from them every thing elſe, and ſo be looked on as *in a State of War*.

18. This makes it lawful for a Man to *kill a Thief*, who has not in the leaſt hurt him, nor declared any Deſign upon his Life, any farther, than by the Uſe of Force, ſo to get him in his Power, as to take away his Money, or what he pleaſes

from him; becauſe uſing Force, where he has no Right, to get me into his Power, let his Pretence be what it will, I have no reaſon to ſuppoſe, that he, who would *take away my Liberty* would not, when he had me in his Power, take away every thing elſe. And therefore it is lawful for me to treat him, as one who has *put himſelf into a State of War* with me, *i. e.* kill him if I can; for to that Hazard does he juſtly expoſe himſelf, whoever introduces a State of War, and is Aggreſſor in it.

19. And here we have the plain *Difference between the State of Nature, and the State of War*, which however ſome Men have confounded, are as far diſtant, as a State of Peace, good Will, mutual Aſſiſtance and Preſervation; and a State of Enmity, Malice, Violence and mutual Deſtruction are one from another. Men living together according to Reaſon, without a common ſuperior on Earth, with Authority to judge between them, is *properly the State of Nature*. But Force, or a declared deſign of Force upon the Perſon of another, where there is no common Superior on Earth to appeal to for Relief, *is the State of War*: and 'tis the want of ſuch an Appeal gives a Man the Right of War even againſt an *Aggreſſor*, tho' he be in Society and a fellow Subject. Thus a *Thief*, whom I cannot harm, but by Appeal to the Law, for having ſtolen all that I am worth, I may kill, when he ſets on to rob me but of my Horſe or Coat; becauſe the Law, which was made for my Preſervation where it cannot interpoſe to ſecure my Life from preſent Force, which if loſt, is capable of no Reparation, permits me my own Defence, and the Right of War, a Liberty to kill the Aggreſſor, becauſe the Aggreſſor allows not Time to appeal to our common Judge, nor the Deciſion of the Law, for Remedy in a Caſe, where the Miſchief may be irreparable. *Want of a common Judge with Authority, puts all Men in a State of Nature: Force without Right, upon a Man's Perſon, makes a State of War*, both where is, and is not, a common Judge.

20. But when the actual Force is over, the *State of War ceaſes* between thoſe that are in Society, and are equally on both Sides ſubjected to the fair Determination of the Law; becauſe then there lies open the Remedy of Appeal for the paſt Injury, and to prevent future Harm; but where no ſuch Appeal is, as in the State of Nature, for want of poſitive Laws, and Judges with Authority to appeal to, *the State of War once begun, continues*, with a Right to the innocent Party to deſtroy the other whenever he can, until the Aggreſſor offers Peace, and deſires Reconciliation on ſuch Terms, as may repair any Wrongs he has already done, and ſecure the Innocent for the future; nay where an Appeal to the Law, and conſtituted Judges lies open, but the Remedy is deny'd by a manifeſt perverting of Juſtice, and a barefac'd wreſting of the Laws to protect or indemnify the Violence or Injuries of ſome Men, or Party of Men, *there* it *is* hard to imagine any thing but *a State of War*. For where-ever Violence is uſed, and Injury done, though by Hands appointed to adminiſter Juſtice, it is ſtill Violence and Injury, however colour'd with the Name, Pretences, or Forms of Law, the End whereof being to protect and redreſs the Innocent, by an unbiaſſed Application of it, to all who are under it; where-ever that is not *bona fide* done, *War is made* upon the Sufferers, who having no Appeal on Earth to right them, they are left to the only Remedy in ſuch Caſes, an Appeal to Heaven.

21. To avoid this *State of War* (wherein there is no Appeal but to Heaven, and wherein every the leaſt Difference is apt to end, where there is no Authority to decide between the Contenders) is one great *Reaſon of Mens putting themſelves into Society*, and quitting the State of Nature. For where there is an Authority, a Power on Earth, from which Relief can be had by *Appeal*, there the continuance of the *State of War* is excluded, and the Controverſy is decided by that Power. Had there been any ſuch Court, any ſuperior Juriſdiction on Earth, to determine the Right between *Jephtha* and the *Ammonites*, they had never come to a *State of War*, but we ſee he was forced to appeal to Heaven. *The Lord the Judge* (ſays he) *be Judge this Day between the Children of* Iſrael, *and the Children of* Ammon, *Jud.* 11. 27. and then proſecuting, and relying on his *Appeal*, he leads out his Army to Battle: And therefore in ſuch Controverſies, where the Queſtion is put, *who ſhall be Judge?* It cannot be meant, who ſhall decide the Controverſy; every one knows what *Jephtha* here tells us, that *the Lord the Judge*, ſhall judge. Where there is no Judge on Earth, the Appeal lies to God in Heaven. That Queſtion

then

then cannot mean, who ſhall judge? Whether another hath put himſelf in a *State of War* with me, and whether I may as *Jephtha* did, *appeal to Heaven* in it? Of that I my ſelf can only be Judge in my own Conſcience, as I will anſwer it at the great Day, to the ſupreme Judge of all Men.

CHAP. IV.

Of SLAVERY.

22. THE *Natural Liberty* of Man is to be free from any ſuperior Power on Earth, and not to be under the Will or Legiſlative Authority of Man, but to have only the Law of Nature for his Rule. The *Liberty of Man*, in Society, is to be under no other Legiſlative Power, but that eſtabliſhed, by Conſent, in the Common-wealth; nor under the dominion of any Will, or Reſtraint of any Law, but what that Legiſlative ſhall enact, according to the Truſt put in it. Freedom then is not what Sir *R. F.* tells us, *O. A.* 55. *A Liberty for every one to do what he liſts, to live as he pleaſes, and not to be tied by any Laws*: But *Freedom of Men under Government*, is, to have a ſtanding Rule to live by, common to every one of that Society, and made by the legiſlative Power erected in it; a Liberty to follow my own Will in all Things, where that Rule preſcribes not; and not to be ſubject to the inconſtant, uncertain, unknown, arbitrary Will of another Man: As *Freedom of Nature* is to be under no other Reſtraint but the Law of Nature.

23. This *Freedom* from abſolute, arbitrary Power, is ſo neceſſary to, and cloſely joined with a Man's Preſervation, that he cannot part with it, but by what forfeits his Preſervation and Life together. For a Man, not having the Power of his own Life, *cannot*, by Compact, or his own Conſent, *enſlave himſelf* to any one, nor put himſelf under the abſolute, arbitrary Power of another, to take away his Life, when he pleaſes. No body can give more Power than he has himſelf; and he that cannot take away his own Life, cannot give another Power over it. Indeed having by his Fault, forfeited his own Life, by ſome Act that deſerves Death; he, to whom he has forfeited it, may (when he has him in his Power) delay to take it. For, whenever he finds the Hardſhip of his Slavery outweigh the Value of his Life, 'tis in his Power, by reſiſting the Will of his Maſter, to draw on himſelf the Death he deſires.

24. This is the perfect Condition of *Slavery*, which is nothing elſe, but *the State of War continued, between a lawful Conqueror, and a Captive.* For, if once *Compact* enter between them, and make an Agreement for a limited Power on the one Side, and Obedience on the other, the *State of War and Slavery* ceaſes, as long as the Compact endures. For, as has been ſaid, no Man can, by Agreement, paſs over to another that which he hath not in himſelf, a Power over his own Life.

I confeſs, we find among the *Jews*, as well as other Nations, that Men did ſell themſelves; but, 'tis plain, this was only to *Drudgery, not to Slavery.* For, it is evident, the Perſon ſold was not under an abſolute, arbitrary, deſpotical Power. For the Maſter could not have Power to kill him, at any time, whom at a certain time, he was obliged to let go free out of his Service; and the Maſter of ſuch a Servant was ſo far from having an arbitrary Power over his Life, that he could not at Pleaſure, ſo much as maim him, but the loſs of an Eye, or Tooth, ſet him free, *Exod.* XXI.

CHAP. V.

Of PROPERTY.

25. WHether we conſider natural *Reaſon*, which tells us, that Men, being once born, have a Right to their Preſervation, and conſequently to Meat and Drink, and ſuch other Things, as Nature affords for their Subſiſtence; or *Revelation*, which gives us an account of thoſe Grants God made of the World

World to *Adam*, and to *Noah*, and his Sons, 'tis very clear, that God, as K. *David* ſays, *Pſal.* cxv. 16. *has given the Earth to the Children of Men*; given it to Mankind in common. But this being ſuppoſed, it ſeems to ſome a very great Difficulty, how any one ſhould ever come to have a *Property* in any thing: I will not content my ſelf to anſwer, That if it be difficult to make out *Property*, upon a Suppoſition, that God gave the World to *Adam*, and his Poſterity in common; it is impoſſible that any Man, but one univerſal Monarch ſhould have any Property upon a Suppoſition, that God gave the World to *Adam* and his Heirs in Succeſſion, excluſive of all the reſt of his Poſterity. But I ſhall endeavour to ſhew, how Men might come to have a *Property* in ſeveral Parts of that which God gave to Mankind in common, and that without any expreſs Compact of all the Commoners.

26. God, who hath given the World to Men in common, hath alſo given them Reaſon to make uſe of it to the beſt Advantage of Life, and Convenience. The Earth, and all that is therein, is given to Men for the Support and Comfort of their Being. And though all the Fruits it naturally produces, and Beaſts it feeds, belong to Mankind in common, as they are produced by the ſpontaneous Hand of Nature; and no Body has originally a private Dominion, excluſive of the reſt of Mankind, in any of them, as they are thus in their natural State: yet being given for the Uſe of Men, there muſt of Neceſſity be *a Means to appropriate* them ſome way or other, before they can be of any Uſe, or at all beneficial to any particular Man. The Fruit, or Veniſon, which nouriſhes the wild *Indian*, who knows no Incloſure, and is ſtill a Tenant in common, muſt be his, and ſo his, *i. e.* a part of him, that another can no longer have any right to it, before it can do any Good for the Support of his Life.

27. Though the Earth, and all inferior Creatures be common to all Men, yet every Man has a *Property* in his own *Perſon*: This no Body has any Right to but himſelf. The *Labour* of his Body, and the *Work* of his Hands, we may ſay, are properly his. Whatſoever then he removes out of the State that Nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his *Labour* with, and joined to it ſomething that is his own, and thereby makes it his *Property*. It being by him removed from the common State Nature hath placed it in, it hath by this *Labour* ſomething annexed to it, that excludes the common Right of other Men. For this *Labour* being the unqueſtionable Property of the Labourer, no Man but he can have a Right to what that is once joined to, at leaſt where there is enough, and as good left in common for others.

28. He that is nouriſhed by the Acorns he pickt up under an Oak, or the Apples he gathered from the Trees in the Wood, has certainly appropriated them to himſelf. No Body can deny but the Nouriſhment is his. I ask then, When did they begin to be his? When he digeſted? Or when he eat? Or when he boiled? Or when he brought them home? Or when he pickt them up? And 'tis plain, if the firſt gathering made them not his, nothing elſe could. That *Labour* put a Diſtinction between them and common: That added ſomething to them more than Nature, the common Mother of all, had done, and ſo they became his private Right. And will any one ſay, he had no Right to thoſe Acorns or Apples, he thus appropriated, becauſe he had not the Conſent of all Mankind to make thhm his? Was it a Robbery thus to aſſume to himſelf what belonged to all in common? If ſuch a Conſent as that was neceſſary, Man had ſtarved, notwithſtanding the Plenty God had given him. We ſee in *Commons*, which remain ſo by Compact, that 'tis the taking any part of what is common, and removing it out of the State Nature leaves it in, which *begins the Property*; without which the Common is of no Uſe. And the taking of this or that Part, does not depend on the expreſs Conſent of all the Commoners. Thus the Graſs my Horſe has bit: the Turfs my Servant has cut: and the Ore I have digg'd in any Place, where I have a Right to them in common with others, become my *Property*, without the Aſſignation or Conſent of any Body. The *Labour* that was mine, removing them out of that common State they were in, hath *fixed* my *Property* in them.

29. By making an explicit Conſent of every Commoner, neceſſary to any ones appropriating to himſelf any part of what is given in common, Children or Servants could not cut the Meat, which their Father or Maſter had provided for them in common, without aſſigning to every one his peculiar Part.

Tho'

Tho' the Water runinng in the Fountain be every ones, yet who can doubt, but that in the Pitcher is his only who drew it out? His *Labour* hath taken it out of the Hands of Nature, where it was common, and belong'd equally to all her Children, and *hath* thereby *appropriated* it to himſelf.

30. Thus this Law of Reaſon makes the Deer that *Indian*'s who hath killed it; 'tis allowed to be his Goods, who hath beſtowed his Labour upon it, tho' before it was the common Right of every one. And amongſt thoſe who are counted the civiliz'd Part of Mankind, who have made and multiplied poſitive Laws to determine *Property*, this original Law of Nature, for the *Beginning of Property*, in what was before common, ſtill takes Place; and by vertue thereof, what Fiſh any one catches in the Ocean, that great and ſtill remaining Common of Mankind; or what Ambergreiſe any one takes up here, is *by* the *Labour* that removes it out of that common State Nature left it in, *made* his *Property*, who takes that Pains about it. And even amongſt us, the Hare that any one is hunting, is thought his who purſues her during the Chaſe. For being a Beaſt that is ſtill looked upon as common, and no Man's private Poſſeſſion; whoever has employ'd ſo much *Labour* about any of that kind, as to find and purſue her, has thereby removed her from the State of Nature, wherein ſhe was common, and hath *begun a Property*.

31. It will perhaps be objected to this, That if gathering the Acorns, or other Fruits of the Earth, *&c.* makes a Right to them, then any one may *ingroſs* as much as he will. To which I anſwer, Not ſo. The ſame Law of Nature, that does by this means give us Property, does alſo *bound* that *Property* too. *God has given us all Things richly*, 2 Tim. vi. 12. is the Voice of Reaſon confirmed by Inſpiration. But how far has he given it us? *To enjoy*. As much as any one can make uſe of to any Advantage of Life before it ſpoils; ſo much he may by his Labour fix a Property in: Whatever is beyond this, is more than his Share, and belongs to others. Nothing was made by God for Man to ſpoil or deſtroy. And thus conſidering the Plenty of natural Proviſions there was a long time in the World, and the few Spenders; and to how ſmall a Part of that Proviſion the Induſtry of one Man could extend it ſelf, and ingroſs it to the Prejudice of others; eſpecially keeping within the *Bounds*, ſet by Reaſon, *of* what might ſerve for his *Uſe*; there could be then little room for Quarrels or Contentions about Property ſo eſtabliſh'd.

32. But the *chief Matter of Property* being now not the Fruits of the Earth, and the Beaſts that ſubſiſt on it, but *the Earth it ſelf*; as that which takes in and carries with it all the reſt: I think it is plain, that *Property* in that too is acquir'd as the former. *As much Land* as a Man tills, plants, improves, cultivates, and can uſe the Product of, ſo much is his *Property*. He by his Labour does, as it were, incloſe it from the Common. Nor will it invalidate his Right to ſay, every Body elſe has an equal Title to it; and therefore he cannot appropriate, he cannot incloſe, without the Conſent of all his Fellow Commoners, all Mankind. God, when he gave the World in common to all Mankind, commanded Man alſo to Labour, and the Penury of his Condition required it of him. God and his Reaſon commanded him to ſubdue the Earth, *i. e.* improve it for the Benefit of Life, and therein lay out ſomething upon it that was his own, his Labour. He that in Obedience to this Command of God, ſubdued, tilled and ſowed any part of it, thereby annexed to it ſomething that was his *Property*, which another had no Title to, nor could without Injury take from him.

33. Nor was this *Appropriation* of any Parcel of *Land*, by improving it, any Prejudice to any other Man, ſince there was ſtill enough, and as good left; and more than the yet unprovided could uſe. So that in effect, there was never the leſs left for others becauſe of his Incloſure for himſelf. For he that leaves as much as another can make uſe of, does as good as take nothing at all. No Body could think himſelf injur'd by the drinking of another Man, though he took a good Draught, who had a whole River of the ſame Water left him to quench his Thirſt: And the Caſe of Land and Water, where there is enough of both, is perfectly the ſame.

34. God gave the World to Men in common; but ſince he gave it for their Benefit, and the greateſt Conveniencies of Life they were capable to draw from it, it cannot be ſuppoſed he meant it ſhould always remain common and uncultivated.

vated. He gave it to the uſe of the Induſtrious and Rational, (and *Labour* was to be *his Title* to it;) not to the Fancy or Covetouſneſs of the Quarrelſom and Contentious. He that has as good left for his Improvement, as was already taken up, needed not complain, ought not to meddle with what was already improved by another's Labour: If he did, 'tis plain he deſired the Benefit of another's Pains, which he had no Right to, and not the Ground which God had given him in common with others to labour on, and whereof there was as good left, as that already poſſeſſed, and more than he knew what to do with, or his Induſtry could reach to.

35. 'Tis true, in *Land* that is *common* in *England*, or any other Country, where there is Plenty of People under Government, who have Money and Commerce, no one can incloſe or appropriate any Part, without the conſent of all his Fellow-Commoners: Becauſe this is left common by Compact, *i. e.* by the Law of the Land, which is not to be violated. And tho' it be common, in reſpect of ſome Men, it is not ſo to all Mankind; but is the joint Property of this Country, or this Pariſh. Beſides, the Remainder, after ſuch Incloſure, would not be as good to the reſt of the Commoners, as the whole was, when they could all make uſe of the whole; whereas in the Beginning and firſt peopling of the great Common of the Word, it was quite otherwiſe. The Law Man was under, was rather for appropriating. God commanded, and his Wants forced him to *labour*. That was his *Property*, which could not be taken from him where-ever he had fixed it. And hence ſubduing or cultivating the Earth, and having Dominion, we ſee are joined together. The one gave Title to the other. So that God, by commanding to ſubdue, gave Authority ſo far to *appropriate*: And the Condition of human Life, which requires Labour and Materials to work on, neceſſarily introduce private Poſſeſſions.

36. Nature has well ſet the *Meaſure of Property* by the Extent of Mens *Labour and the Conveniencies of Life*: No Man's Labour could ſubdue, or appropriate all; nor could his Enjoyment conſume more than a ſmall Part; ſo that it was impoſſible for any Man, this way, to intrench upon the Right of another, or acquire to himſelf a Property, to the Prejudice of his Neighbour, who would ſtill have room for as good, and as large a Poſſeſſion (after the other had taken out his) as before it was appropriated. *Meaſure* did confine every Man's *Poſſeſſion*, to a very moderate Proportion, and ſuch, as he might appropriate to himſelf, without Injury to any Body, in the firſt Ages of the World, when Men were more in danger to be loſt, by wandring from their Company, in the then vaſt wilderneſs of the Earth, than to be ſtraitned for want of room to plant in. And the ſame *Meaſure* may be allowed ſtill without Prejudice to any Body, as full as the World ſeems. For ſuppoſing a Man, or Family, in the State they were at firſt peopling of the World by the Children of *Adam*, or *Noah*; let him plant in ſome In-land, vacant Places of *America*, we ſhall find that the *Poſſeſſions* he could make himſelf, upon the *Meaſures* we have given, would not be very large, nor, even to this Day, prejudice the reſt of Mankind, or give them reaſon to complain, or think themſelves injured by this Man's Incroachment, tho' the Race of Men have now ſpread themſelves to all the Corners of the World, and do infinitely exceed the ſmall Number was at the Beginning. Nay, the Extent of *Ground* is of ſo little Value, *without Labour*, that I have heard it affirmed, that in *Spain* it ſelf, a Man may be permitted to plough, ſow, or reap, without being diſturbed upon Land he has no other Title to, but only his making uſe of it. But, on the contrary, the Inhabitants think themſelves beholden to him, who, by his Induſtry on neglected, and conſequently waſte Land, has increaſed the Stock of Corn, which they wanted. But be this as it will, which I lay no Streſs on; this I dare boldly affirm, that the ſame *Rule of Propriety*, (*viz.*) that every Man ſhould have as much as he could make uſe of, would hold ſtill in the World, without ſtraitning any Body; ſince there is Land enough in the World to ſuffice double the Inhabitants, had not the *Invention of Money*, and the tacit Agreement of Men, to put a Value on it, introduced (by conſent) larger Poſſeſſions, and a Right to them; which, how it has done, I ſhall by and by ſhew more at large.

37. This is certain, That in the Beginning, before the Deſire of having more than Man needed, had altered the intrinſick Value of Things, which depends only on their Uſefulneſs to the Life of Man: or had *agreed, that a little piece of yellow Metal*

Metal, which would keep without waſting or decay, ſhould be worth a great Piece of Fleſh, or a whole Heap of Corn, though Men had a right to appropriate, by their Labour, each one to himſelf, as much of the Things of Nature, as he could uſe; yet this could not be much, nor to the Prejudice of others, where the ſame Plenty was ſtill left, to thoſe who would uſe the ſame Induſtry. To which let me add, that he who appropriates Land to himſelf by his Labour, does not leſſen but increaſe the common Stock of Mankind. For the Proviſions ſerving to the ſupport of human Life; produced by one Acre of incloſed and cultivated Land are (to ſpeak much within Compaſs) ten times more than thoſe which are yielded by an Acre of Land of an equal Richneſs lying waſte in Common. And therefore he that incloſes Land, and has a greater Plenty of the Conveniencies of Life from ten Acres, than he could have from an hundred left to Nature, may truly be ſaid to give ninety Acres to Mankind. For his Labour now ſupplies him with Proviſions out of ten Acres, which were but the Product of an hundred lying in Common. I have here rated the improv'd Land very low in making its Product but as ten to one, when it is much nearer an hundred to one. For I ask whether in the wild Woods and uncultivated Waſte of *America* left to Nature without any Improvement, Tillage, or Husbandry, a thouſand Acres yield the needy and wretched Inhabitants as many Conveniencies of Life, as ten Acres of equal fertile Land do in *Devonſhire*, where they are well cultivated?

Before the Appropriation of Land, he who gather'd as much of the wild Fruit, killed, caught, or tamed, as many of the Beaſts, as he could; he that ſo employ'd his Pains about any of the ſpontaneous Products of Nature, as any way to alter them, from the State which Nature put them in, *by* placing any of his *Labour* on them, did thereby *acquire a Propriety in them*: But if they periſhed, in his Poſſeſſion, without their due Uſe; if the Fruits rotted, or the Veniſon putrified, before he could ſpend it, he offended againſt the common Law of Nature, and was liable to be puniſhed; he invaded his Neighbour's Share, for he had *no Right, farther than his Uſe* called for any of them, and they might ſerve to afford him Conveniencies of Life.

38. The ſame *Meaſures* govern'd the *Poſſeſſions of Land* too: Whatſoever he tilled and reaped, laid up and made uſe of before it ſpoiled, that was his peculiar Right; whatſoever he encloſed, and could feed, and make uſe of, the Cattle and Product was alſo his. But if either the Graſs of his Incloſure rotted on the Ground, or the Fruit of his planting periſh'd without gathering, and laying up, this Part of the Earth, notwithſtanding his Incloſure, was ſtill to be look'd on as Waſte, and might be the Poſſeſſion of any other. Thus, at the Beginning, *Cain* might take as much Ground as he could Till, and make it his own Land, and yet leave enough for *Abel*'s Sheep to feed on; a few Acres would ſerve for both their Poſſeſſions. But as Families increaſed, and Induſtry inlarged their Stocks, their *Poſſeſſions inlarged* with the Need of them; but yet it was commonly *without any fixed Property to the Ground* they made uſe of, till they incorporated, ſettled themſelves together, and built Cities, and then by Conſent, they came in Time, to ſet out the *Bounds of their diſtinct Territories*, and agree on Limits between them and their Neighbours; and by Laws within themſelves; ſettled the *Properties* of thoſe of the ſame Society. For we ſee, that in that Part of the World which was firſt inhabited, and therefore like to be the beſt peopled, even as low down as *Abraham*'s Time, they wandred with their Flocks, and their Herds, which was their Subſtance, freely up and down; and this *Abraham* did, in a Country where he was a Stranger. Whence it is plain, that at leaſt, a great Part of the *Land lay in Common*; that the Inhabitants valued it not, nor claim'd Property in any more than they made uſe of. But when there was not room enough in the ſame Place, for their Herds to feed together, they by Conſent, as *Abraham* and *Lot* did, *Gen.* xiii 5. ſeparated and enlarged their Paſture, where it beſt liked them. And for the ſame Reaſon *Eſau* went from his Father, and his Brother, and planted in *Mount Seir*, *Gen.* xxxvi. 6.

39. And thus, without ſuppoſing any private Dominion, and Property in *Adam*, over all the World, excluſive of all other Men, which can no way be prov'd, nor any ones Property be made out from it; but ſuppoſing the *World* given as it was to the Children of Men *in Common*, we ſee how *Labour* could make Men diſtinct

Titles to ſeveral Parcels of it, for their private Uſes; wherein there could be no doubt of Right, no room for Quarrel.

40. Nor is it ſo ſtrange, as perhaps before Conſiderat on it may appear, that the *Property of Labour* ſhould be able to over-balance the Community of Land. For 'tis *Labour* indeed that *puts the difference of Value* on every thing; and let any one conſider what the difference is between an Acre of Land planted with Tobacco or Sugar, ſown with wheat or Barly; and an Acre of the ſame Land lying in Common, without any Husbandry upon it, and he will find, that the Improvement of *Labour makes* the far greater part of the Value. I think it will be but a very modeſt Computation to ſay, that of the *Products* of the Earth uſeful to the Life of Man 9/10 are the *effects of Labour*: Nay, if we will rightly eſtimate Things as they come to our Uſe, and caſt up the ſeveral Expences about them, what in them is purely owing to *Nature*, and what to *Labour*, we ſhall find, that in moſt of them 99/100 are wholly to be put on the account of *Labour*.

41. There cannot be a clearer Demonſtration of any thing, than ſeveral Nations of the *Americans* are of this, who are rich in Land and poor in all the Comforts of Life, whom Nature having furniſhed as liberally as any other People, with the Materials of Plenty, *i. e.* a fruitful Soil, apt to produce in abundance, what might ſerve for Food, Raiment, and Delight; yet for *want of improving it by Labour*, have not one hundredth part of the Conveniencies we enjoy: And a King of a large and fruitful Territory there feeds, lodges, and is clad worſe than a Day-Labourer in *England*.

42. To make this a little clearer, let us but trace ſome of the ordinary Proviſions of Life, through their ſeveal Progreſſes, before they come to our Uſe, and ſee how much they receive of their *value from human Induſtry*. Bread, Wine and Cloath, are Things of daily Uſe, and great Plenty, yet notwithſtanding, Acorns, Water and Leaves, or Skins, muſt be our Bread, Drink, and Cloathing, did not *Labour* furniſh us with theſe more uſeful Commodities. For whatever *Bread* is more worth than Acorns, Wine than Water, and *Cloath* or *Silk*, than Leaves, Skins or Moſs, that is wholly *owing to Labour* and *Induſtery*. The one of theſe being the Food and Raiment which unaſſiſted Nature furniſhes us with; the other Proviſions which our Induſtry and Pains prepare for us, which how much they exceed the other in Value, when any one hath computed, he will then ſee, how much *Labour makes the far greateſt part of the value* of Things we enjoy in this World: And the Ground that produces the Materials, is ſcarce to be reckon'd in, as any, or at moſt but a very ſmall part of it; ſo little, that even amongſt us, Land that is left wholly to Nature, that hath no Improvement of Paſturage, Tillage, or Planting, is called, as indeed it is, *Waſte*; and we ſhall find the Benefit of it amount to little more than nothing.

This ſhews how much numbers of Men are to be preferred to largeneſs of Dominions; and that the Increaſe of Lands, and the right employing of them is the great Art of Government: And that Prince, who ſhall be ſo wiſe and godlike, as by eſtabliſhed Laws of Liberty to ſecure Protection and Enconregment to the honeſt Induſtry of Mankind, againſt the Oppreſſion of Power and Narrowneſs of Party, will quickly be too hard for his Neighbours; But this by the by: To return to the Argument in Hand.

43. An Acre of Land, that bears here twenty Buſhels of Wheat, and another in *America* which, with the ſame Husbandry, would do the like, are, without doubt, of the ſame natural intrinſick Value: But yet the Benefit Mankind receives from the one in a Year, is worth 5 *l.* and from the other poſſibly not worth a penny, if all the Profit an *Indian* received from it were to be valued, and ſold hear; at leaſt, I may truly ſay, not 1/100. 'Tis *Labour* then, which *puts the greateſt part of Value upon Land*, without which it would ſcarcely be worth any thing: 'Tis to that we owe the greateſt part of all its uſeful Products; for all that the Straw, Bran, Bread, of that Acre of Wheat, is more worth than the Product of an Acre of as good Land, which lies waſte, is all the effect of Labour. For 'tis not barely the Ploughman's Pains, the Reaper's and Threſher's Toil, and the Baker's Sweat, is to be counted into the *Bread* we eat; the Labour of thoſe who broke the Oxen, who digg'd and wrought the Iron and Stones, who felled and fram'd the Timber employ'd about the Plough, Mill, Oven, or any other Utenſils, which are a vaſt Number, requiſite to this Corn, from its being Seed to be ſown, to its being made

made Bread, muſt all be *charged on* the Account of *Labour*, and received as an Effect of that: Nature and the Earth furniſh'd only the almoſt worthleſs Materials, as in themſelves. 'Twould be a ſtrange *Catalogue of Things, that Induſtry provided and made uſe of, about every Loaf of Bread*, before it came to our Uſe, if we could trace them; Iron, Wood, Leather, Bark, Timber, Stone, Bricks, Coals, Lime, Cloath, Dying Drugs, Pitch, Tar, Maſts, Ropes, and all the Materials made uſe of in the Ship, that brought any of the Commodities made uſe of by any of the Workmen, to any part of the Work, all which, 'twould be almoſt impoſſible, at leaſt to long, too reckon up.

44. From all which it is Evident, that tho' the Things of Nature are given in Common, yet Man by being Maſter of himſelf, and *Proprietor of his own Perſon, and the Actions or Labour of it, had ſtill in himſelf the great Foundation of Property*; and that, which made up the great Part of what he apply'd to the Support or Comfort of his Being, when Invention and Arts had improv'd the Conveniencies of Life; was perfectly his own, and did not belong in Common to others.

45. Thus *Labour*, in the Beginning *gave a Right of Property*, where-ever any one was pleaſed to employ it, upon what was Common, which remained a long while, the far greater Part, and is yet more than Mankind makes uſe of. Men, at firſt, for the moſt Part, contented themſelves with what un-aſſiſted Nature offered to their Neceſſities: And though afterwards, in ſome Parts of the World, (where the Increaſe of People and Stock, with the *Uſe of Money*, had made Land ſcarce, and ſo of ſome Value) the ſeveral *Communities* ſettled the Bounds of their diſtinct Territories; and by Laws within themſelves, regulated the Properties of the private Men of their Society; and ſo, *by Compact* and Agreement, *ſettled the Property* which Labour and Induſtry began; and the Leagues that have been made between ſeveral States and Kingdoms, either expreſly or tacitly diſowning all Claim and Right to the Land in the others Poſſeſſion, have, by common Conſent, given up their Pretences to their natural common Right, which originally they had to thoſe Countries, and ſo have, by *poſitive Agreement, ſettled a Property* amongſt themſelves, in diſtinct Parts and Parcels of the Earth; yet there are ſtill *great Tracts of Ground* to be found, which, (the Inhabitants thereof not having joyn'd with the reſt of Mankind, in the Conſent of the Uſe of their common Money) *lie waſte*, and are more, than the People, who dwell on it, do, or can make uſe of, and ſo ſtill lie in Common. Though this can ſcarce happen amongſt that Part of Mankind, that have conſented to the Uſe of Money.

46. The greateſt part of *Things really uſeful* to the Life of Man, and ſuch as the Neceſſity of Subſiſting made the firſt Commoners of the World look after, as it doth the *Americans* now, *are* generally Things of *ſhort Duration*; ſuch as if they are not conſumed by Uſe, will decay and periſh of themſelves: Gold, Silver, and Diamonds, are Things, that Fancy or Agreement hath put the Value on, more than real Uſe, and the neceſſary Support of Life. Now of thoſe good Things which Nature hath provided in (Common, every one had a Right as hath been ſaid) to as much as he could uſe, and *Property* in all he could effect with his Labour; all that his Induſtry could extend to, to alter from the State Nature had put it in, was his. He that *gathered* a hundred Buſhels of Acorns or Apples, had thereby a *Property* in them, they were his Goods as ſoon as gathered. He was only to look, that he uſed them before they ſpoiled, elſe he took more than his Share, and robb'd others. And indeed it was a fooliſh thing, as well as diſhoneſt, to hoard up more, than he could make uſe of. If he gave away a Part to any body elſe, ſo that it periſhed not uſeleſly in his Poſſeſſion, theſe he alſo made uſe of. And if he alſo bartred away Plumbs, that would have rotted in a Week, for Nuts that would laſt good for his eating a whole Year, he did no Injury; he waſted not the common Stock; deſtroy'd no Part of the Portion of Goods that belonged to others, ſo long as nothing periſh'd uſeleſly in his Hands. Again, If he would give his Nuts for a piece of Metal, pleaſed with its Colour; or exchange his Sheep for Shells, or Wooll for a ſparkling Peble or a Diamond, and keep thoſe by him all his Life, he invaded not the Right of others, he might heap up as much of theſe durable Things as he pleaſed; the *exceeding of the Bounds of* his *juſt Property* not lying in the Largneſs of his Poſſeſſion, but the periſhing of any thing uſeleſly in it.

47. And thus *came in the use of Money*, some lasting thing that Men might keep without spoiling, and that by mutual Consent Men would take in exchange for the truly useful, but perishable Supports of Life.

48. And as different degrees of Industry were apt to give Men Possessions in different Proportions, so this *Invention of Money* gave them the Opportunity to continue and enlarge them. For supposing an Island, seperate from all possible Commerce with the rest of the World, wherein there were but an hundred Families, but there were Sheep, Horses and Cows, with other useful Animals, wholsome Fruits, and Land enough for Corn for an hundred thousand times as many, but nothing in the Island, either because of its Commonness, or Perishableness, fit to supply the Place of *Money*: What Reason could any one have there to enlarge his Possessions beyond the Use of his Family, and a plentiful Supply to its *Consumption*, either in what their own Industry produced, or they could barter for like perishable, useful Commodities, with others? Where there is not something, both lasting and scarce, and so valuable, to be hoarded up, there Men will be apt to enlarge their *Possessions of Land*, were it never so rich, never so free for them to take. For I ask, what would a Man value Ten thousand, or an Hundred thousand Acres of excellent *Land*, ready cultivated, and well stocked too with Cattle in the middle of the In-land Parts of *America*, where he had no Hopes of Commerce with other parts of the World, to draw *Money* to him by the sale of the Product? It would not be worth the enclosing, and we should see him give up again to the wild Common of Nature, whatever was more than would supply the Conveniencies of Life to be had there for him and his Family.

49. Thus in the Beginning all the World was *America*, and more so than that is now; for no such thing as *Money*, was any where known. Find out something that hath the *Use and Value of Money* amongst his Neighbours, you shall see the same Man will begin presently to *enlarge* his Possessions.

50. But since Gold and Silver, being little useful to the Life of Man in proportion to Food, Raiment, and Carriage, has its *Value* only from the Consent of Men, whereof *Labour* yet *makes*, in great part, *the Measure*, it is plain, that Men have agreed to a disproportionate and unequal *Possession of the Earth*, they having by a tacit and voluntary Consent, found out a Way how a Man may fairly possess more Land, than he himself can use the Product of, by receiving in Exchange for the overplus Gold and Silver, which may be hoarded up without Injury to any one; these Metals not spoiling or decaying in the Hands of the Possessor. This Partage of Things in an Inequality of private Possessions, Men have made practicable out of the Bounds of Society, and without Compact only by putting a Value on Gold and Silver, and tacitly agreeing in the Use of Money. For in Governments, the Laws regulate the Right of Property, and the Possession of Land is determin'd by positive Constitutions.

51. And thus, I think, it is very easy to conceive without any Difficulty, *how Labour could at first begin a Title of Property* in the common Things of Nature, and how the spending it upon our Uses bound it. So that there could then be no Reason of quarreling about Title, nor any Doubt about the largeness of Possession it gave. Right and Conveniency went together; for as a Man had a Right to all he could imploy his Labour upon, so he had no temptation to Labour for more than he could make Use of. This left no Room for Controversy about the Title, nor for Incroachment on the Right of others; what Portion a Man carv'd to himself, was easily seen; and it was useless as well as dishonest to carve himself too much, or take more than he needed.

CHAP. III.

Of Paternal Power.

52. IT may perhaps be censured as an impertinent Criticism in a Discourse of this Nature to find fault with Words and Names, that have obtain'd in the World: And yet possibly it may not be amiss to offer new ones, when the old are apt to lead Men into Mistakes as this of *Paternal Power* probably has done, which

which ſeems ſo to place the Power of Parents over their Children wholly in the *Father*, as if the *Mother* had no Share in it, whereas, if we conſult Reaſon or Revelation, we ſhall find, ſhe hath an equal Title. This may give one Reaſon to ask, whether this might not be more properly called *Parental Power*? For whatever Obligation Nature and the Right of Generation lays on Children, it muſt certainly bind them equal to both the concurrent Cauſes of it. And accordingly we ſee the poſitive Law of God every where joins them together, without Diſtinction, when it commands the Obedience of Children, *Honour thy Father and thy Mother*, Exod. 20. 12. *Whoſoever curſeth his Father or his Mother*, Lev. 20. 9. *Ye ſhall fear every Man his Mother and his Father*, Lev. 19. 3. *Children obey your Parents*, &c. Eph. 9. 1. is the Stile of the Old and New Teſtament.

53. Had but this one thing been well conſider'd, without looking any deeper into the Matter, it might perhaps have kept Men from running into thoſe groſs Miſtakes, they have made, about this Power of Parents; which however it might without any great Harſhneſs, bear the Name of abſolute Dominion, and regal Authority, when under the Title of *paternal Power*, it ſeem'd appropriated to the Father, would yet have ſounded but odly, and in the very Name ſhewn the Abſurdity, if this ſuppoſed abſolute Power over Children had been called *Parental*; and thereby have diſcover'd, that it belong'd to the Mother too; for it will but very ill ſerve the Turn of thoſe Men, who contend ſo much for the abſolute Power and Authority of the *Fatherhood*, as they call it, that the Mother ſhould have any Share in it. And it would have but ill ſupported the *Monarchy* they contend for, when by the very Name it appear'd, that that fundamental Authority, from whence they would derive their Government of a ſingle Perſon only, was not placed in one, but two Perſons jointly. But to let this of Names paſs.

54. Though I have ſaid above, *Chap.* 2. *That all Men by Nature are equal*, I cannot be ſuppoſed to underſtand all ſorts of *Equality*: *Age* or *Virtue* may give Men a juſt Precedency: *Excellency of Parts* and *Merit* may place others above the common Level: *Birth* may ſubject ſome, and *Alliance* or *Benefits* others to pay an Obſervance to thoſe to whom Nature, Gratitude, or other Reſpects may have made it due; and yet all this conſiſts with the *Equality*, which all Men are in, in reſpect of Juriſdiction or Dominion, one over another; which was the *Equality* I there ſpoke of, as proper to the Buſineſs in Hand, being that *equal Right*, that every Man hath, *to his natural Freedom*, without being ſubjected to the Will or Authority of any other Man.

55. *Children*, I confeſs, are not born in this full State of *Equality*, though they are born to it. Their Parents have a ſort of Rule and Juriſdiction over them, when they come into the World, and for ſome time after, but 'tis but a temporary one. The Bonds of this Subjection are like the ſwadling Clothes they are wrapt up in, and ſupported by in the Weakneſs of their Infancy: Age and Reaſon as they grow up, looſen them, 'till at length they drop quite off, and leave a Man at his own free Diſpoſal.

56. *Adam* was created a perfect Man, his Body and Mind in full Poſſeſſion of their Strength and Reaſon, and ſo was capable, from the firſt Inſtant of his Being, to provide for his own Support and Preſervation, and govern his Actions according to the Dictates of the Law of Reaſon which God had implanted in him. From him the World is peopled with his Deſcendants, who are all born Infants, weak and helpleſs, without Knowledge or Underſtanding: But to ſupply the Defects of this imperfect State, till the Improvement of Growth and Age had removed them, *Adam* and *Eve*, and after them all *Parents* were, by the Law of Nature, *under an Obligation to preſerve, nouriſh, and educate the Children*, they had begotten; not as their own Workmanſhip, but the Workmanſhip of their own Maker, the Almighty, to whom they were to be accountable for them.

57. The Law, that was to govern *Adam*, was the ſame, that was to govern all his Poſterity, the *Law of Reaſon*. But his Off-ſpring having another way of entrance into the World, different from him, by a natural Birth, that produced them ignorant and without the Uſe of *Reaſon*, they were not preſently *under that Law*; for no body can be under a Law, which is not promulgated to him; and this Law being promulgated or made known by *Reaſon* only, he that is not come to the Uſe of his *Reaſon*, cannot be ſaid to be *under this Law*; and *Adam*'s Children, being not preſently as ſoon as born *under this Law of Reaſon*, were not preſently

ſently *free*. For *Law*, in its true Notion, *is* not ſo much the Limitation as *the Direction of a free and intelligent Agent* to his proper Intereſt, and preſcribes no farther than is for the general Good of thoſe under that Law: Could they be happier without it, the *Law*, as an uſeleſs Thing, would of it ſelf vaniſh; and that ill deſerves the Name of Confinement which hedges us in only from Bogs and Precipices. So that, however it may be miſtaken, *the End of Law is*, not to aboliſh or reſtrain, but to *preſerve and enlarge Freedom*. For in all the States of created Beings capable of Laws, *where there is no Law, there is no Freedom*. For *Liberty* is to be free from Reſtraint and Violence from others; which cannot be, where there is no Law: But Freedom is not, as we are told, *A Liberty for every Man to do what he liſts*: (For who could be free, when every other Man's Humour might domineer over him?) But a *Liberty* to diſpoſe, and order as he liſts, his Perſon, Actions, Poſſeſſions, and his whole Property, within the Allowance of thoſe Laws, under which he is, and therein not to be ſubject to the arbitrary Will of another, but freely follow his own.

58. The *Power*, then, *that Parents have* over their Children, ariſes from that Duty which is incumbent on them, to take Care of their Off-ſpring, during the imperfect State of Childhood. To inform the Mind, and govern the Actions of their yet ignorant Nonage, till Reaſon ſhall take its Place, and eaſe them of that Trouble, is what the Children want, and the Parents are bound to. For God having given Man an Underſtandign to direct his Actions, has allowed him a Freedom of Will, and Liberty of Acting, as properly belonging thereunto, within the Bounds of that Law he is under. But whilſt he is in an Eſtate, wherein he has not *Underſtanding* of his own to direct his *Will*, he is not to have any *Will* of his own to follow: He that *underſtands* for him, muſt *will* for him too; he muſt preſcribe to his Will, and regulate his Actions; but when he comes to the Eſtate that made his *Father a Freeman*, the *Son is a Freeman* too.

59. This holds in all the Laws a Man is under, whether Natural or Civil. Is a Man under the Law of Nature? *What made him free* of that Law? What gave him a free diſpoſing of his Property, according to his own Will, within the Compaſs of that Law? I anſwer; a State of Maturity wherein he might be ſuppoſed capable to know that Law, that ſo he might keep his Actions within the Bounds of it. When he has acquired that State, he is preſum'd to know how far that Law is to be his Guide, and how far he may make uſe of his *Freedom*, and ſo comes to have it; till then, ſome body elſe muſt guide him, who is preſum'd to know, how far the Law allows a Liberty. If ſuch a State of Reaſon, ſuch an Age of Diſcretion *made him Free*, the ſame ſhall *make* his Son *Free* too. Is a Man under the Law of *England? What made him Free of* that Law? That is, to have the Liberty to diſpoſe of his Actions and Poſſeſſions according to his own Will, within the Permiſſion of that Law? A Capacity of knowing that Law. Which is ſuppoſed by that Law, at the Age of one and twenty Years, and in ſome Caſes ſooner. If this *made* the Father *Free*, it ſhall make the Son *Free* too. Till then we ſee the Law allows the Son to have no Will, but he is to be guided by the Will of his Father or Guardian, who is to underſtand for him. And if the Father die, and fail to ſubſtitute a Deputy in his Truſt; if he hath not provided a Tutor, to govern his Son, during his Minority, during his want of Underſtanding, the Law takes care to do it, ſome other muſt govern him, and be a Will to him, till he hath *attained to a State of Freedom*, and his Underſtanding be fit to take the Government of his Will. But after that, the Father and Son are equally *Free* as much as Tutor and Pupil after Nonage; equally Subjects of the ſame Law together, without any Dominion left in the Father over the Life, Liberty, or Eſtate of his Son, whether they be only in the State and under the Law of Nature, or under the poſitive Laws of an eſtabliſh'd Government.

60. But if, through Defects that may happen out of the ordinary Courſe of Nature, any one comes not to ſuch a Degree of Reaſon, wherein he might be ſuppoſed capable of knowing the Law, and ſo living within the Rules of it, he is *never capable of being a Freeman*, he is never let looſe to the diſpoſure of his own Will (becauſe he knows no Bounds to it, has not Underſtanding, its proper Guide) but is continued under the Tuition and Government of others, all the Time his own Underſtanding is uncapable of that Charge. And ſo *Lunaticks* and *Ideots* are never ſet free from the Government of their Parents; *Children who are not as yet*

come

come unto those Years whereat they may have; and Innocents which are excluded by a natural defect from ever having; Thirdly, *Madmen, which for the present cannot possibly have the use of right Reason to guide themselves, have for their Guide, the Reason that guideth other Men which are Tutors over them, to seek and procure their Good for them,* says Hooker, *Eccl. Pol. lib.* 1. *sect.* 7. All which seems no more than that Duty, which God and Nature has laid on Man, as well as other Creatures, to preserve their Off-spring, till they can be able to shift for themselves, and will scarce amount to an Instance or Proof of *Parents* Regal Authority.

61. Thus we are *born free*, as we are born rational; not that we have actually the Exercise of either: Age that brings one, brings with it the other too. And thus we see how *natural Freedom and Subjection to Parents* may consist together, and are both founded on the same Principle. A *Child is Free* by his Father's Title, by his Father's Understanding, which is to govern him, till he hath it of his own. The *Freedom of a Man at Years of Discretion*, and the *Subjection* of a Child *to* his *Parents*, whilst yet short of that Age, are so consistent, and so distinguishable, that the most blinded Contenders for Monarchy, *by Right of Fatherhood*, cannot miss this *Difference*; the most obstinate cannot but allow their Consistency. For were their Doctrine all true, were the right Heir of *Adam* now known, and by that Title settled a Monarch in his Throne, invested with all the absolute unlimited Power Sir *R. F.* talks of; if he should die as soon as his Heir were born, must not the *Child*, notwithstanding he were never so free, never so much Sovereign, be in Subjection to his Mother and Nurse, to Tutors and Governors, till Age and Education brought him Reason and Ability to govern himself, and others? The Necessities of his Life, the Health of his Body, and the Information of his Mind would require him to be directed by the Will of others and not his own; and yet will any one think, that this Restraint and Subjecton were inconsistent with, or spoil'd him of that Liberty or Sovereignty he had a Right to, or gave away his Empire to those who had the Government of his Nonage? This Government over him only prepared him the better and sooner for it. If any body should ask me, when my Son is *of Age to be Free*? I shall answer, Just when his Monarch is of Age to govern. *But at what Time*, says the judicious *Hooker*, Eccl. Pol. l. 1. Sect. 6. *a Man may be said to have attain'd so far forth the use of Reason, as sufficeth to make him capable of those Laws whereby he is then bound to guide his Actions; this is a great deal more easy for Sense to discern, than for any one by Skill and Learning to determine*

62. Common-wealths themselves take notice of, and allow, that there is a *Time when Men* are to *begin to act like Free Men*, and therefore till that Time require not Oaths of Fealty, or Allegiance, or other publick owning of, or Submission to the Government of their Countries.

63. The *Freedom* then of Man, and Liberty of acting according to his own Will, is *grounded on* his having *Reason*, which is able to instruct him in that Law he is to govern himself by, and make him know how far he is left to the Freedom of his own Will. To turn him loose to an unrestrain'd Liberty, before he has Reason to guide him, is not the allowing him the privilege of his Nature to be Free; but to thrust him out amongst Brutes, and abandon him to a State as wretched, and as much beneath that of a Man, as theirs. This is that which puts the *Authority* into the *Parents* Hands to govern the *Minority* of their Children. God hath made it their Business to employ this Care on their Off-spring, and hath placed in them suitable Inclinations of Tenderness, and Concern to temper this Power, to apply it, as his Wisdom design'd it, to the Childrens good, as long as they should need to be under it.

64. But what Reason can hence advance this Care of the *Parents* due to their Off-spring into an *absolute arbitrary Dominion* of the Father, whose Power reaches no farther, than by such a Discipline, as he finds most effectual, to give such Strength and Health to their Bodies, such Vigour and Rectitude to their Minds, as may best fit his Children to be most useful to themselves and others; and, if it be necessary to this Condition, to make them work, when they are able, for their own Subsistance. But in this Power the *Mother* too has her Share with the *Father*.

65. Nay this *Power* so little belongs to the *Father* by any peculiar Right of Nature, but only as he is Guardian of his Children, that when he quits his Care of them, he looses his Power over them, which goes along with their Nourishment

and

and Education, to which it is inſeparably annexed; and it belongs as much to the *Foſter-Father* of an expoſed Child, as the natural Father of another. So little Power does the bare *act of begetting* give a Man over his Iſſue; if all his Care ends there, and this be all the Title he hath to the Name and Authority of a Father. And what will become of this *paternal Power* in that Part of the World, where one Woman hath more than one Husband at a Time? Or in thoſe Parts of *America*, where, when the Husband and Wife part, which happens frequently, the Children are all left to the Mother, follow her, and are wholly under her Care and Proviſion? If the Father die whilſt the Children are young, do they not naturally every where owe the ſame Obedience to their *Mother*, during their Minority, as to their Father were he alive? And will any one ſay, that the Mother hath a legiſlative Power over her Children? That ſhe can make ſtanding Rules, which ſhall be of perpetual Obligation, by which they ought to regulate all the Concerns of their Property, and bound their Liberty all the Courſe of their Lives? Or can ſhe inforce the Obſervation of them with Capital Puniſhment? For this is the proper *Power of the Magiſtrate*, of which the Father hath not ſo much as the Shadow. His Command over his Children is but Temporary, and reaches not their Life or Property: It is but a help to the Weakneſs and Imperfection of their Nonage, a Diſcipline neceſſary to their Education: And though a *Father* may diſpoſe of his own Poſſeſſions as he pleaſes, when his Children are out of Danger of periſhing for Want, yet his Power extends not to the Lives or Goods, which either their own Induſtry, or another's Bounty has made theirs; nor to their Liberty neither, when they are once arrived to the Infranchiſement of the Years of Diſcretion. The *Father's Empire* then ceaſes, and he can from thence forwards no more diſpoſe of the Liberty of his Son, than that of any other Man: And it muſt be far from an abſolute or perpetual Juriſdiction, from which a Man may withdraw himſelf, having Licence from divine Authority to *leave Father and Mother and cleave to his Wife.*

66. But though there be a Time when a *Child* comes to be as *free* from Subjection to the Will and Command of this Father, as the Father himſelf is free from Subjection to the Will of any body elſe, and they are each under no other Reſtraint, but that which is common to them both, whether it be the Law of Nature, or municipal Law of their Country: Yet this Freedom exempts not a Son from that *Honour* which he ought, by the Law of God and Nature, *to* pay his *Parents*. God having made the Parents Inſtruments in his great Deſign of continuing the Race of Mankind, and the Occaſions of Life to their Children; as he hath laid on them an Obligation to nouriſh, preſerve, and bring up their Offſpring; ſo he has laid on the Children a perpetual Obligation of *honouring their Parents*, which containing in it an inward Eſteem and Reverence to be ſhewn by all outward Expreſſions, ties up the Child from any thing, that my ever injure or affront, diſturb, or endanger the Happineſs or Life of thoſe from whom he received his; and engages him in all Actions of Defence, Relief, Aſſiſtance and Comfort of thoſe, by whoſe Means he entered into Being, and has been made capable of any Enjoyments of Life. From this Obligation no State, no Freedom can abſolve Children. But this is very far from giving Parents a Power of Command over their Children, or an Authority to make Laws and diſpoſe as they pleaſe, of their Lives or Liberties. 'Tis one thing to owe Honour and Reſpect, Gratitude and Aſſiſtance; another to require an abſolute Obedience and Submiſſion. The *Honour due to Parents*, a Monarch in his Throne owes his Mother, and yet this leſſens not his Authority, nor ſubjects him to her Government.

67. The Subjection of a Minor places in the Father a temporary Government, which terminates with the Minority of the Child: and the *Honour due from a Child*, places in the Parents a perpetual Right to Reſpect, Reverence, Support, and Compliance too, more or leſs, as the Father's Care, Coſt, and Kindneſs, in his Education, has been more or leſs. This ends not with Minority, but holds in all Parts and Conditions of a Man's Life. The want of diſtinguiſhing theſe two Powers, *viz.* That which the Father hath in the Right of *Tuition*, during Minority; and the Right of *Honour* all his Life, may perhaps have cauſed a great part of the Miſtakes about this Matter. For to ſpeak properly of them, the firſt of theſe is rather the Privilege of Children, and Duty of Parents, than any Prerogative of Paternal Power. The Nouriſhment and Education of their Children, is

a Charge

a Charge ſo incumbent on Parents for their Children's Good, that nothing can abſolve them from taking Care of it. And tho' the *Power of commanding and chaſtiſing* them go along with it, yet God hath woven into the Principles of human Nature ſuch a Tenderneſs for their Off-ſpring, that there is little fear that Parents ſhould uſe their Power with too much Rigour? the Exceſs is ſeldom on the ſevere ſide, the ſtrong byaſs of Nature drawing the other way. And therefore God Almighty when he would expreſs his gentle Dealing with the *Iſraelites*, he tells them, that tho' he chaſten'd them, *he chaſten'd them as a Man chaſtens his Son*, Deut. viii. 5. *i. e.* with Tenderneſs and Affection, and kept them under no ſeverer Diſcipline, than what was abſolutely beſt for them, and had been leſs Kindneſs to have ſlacken'd. This is that Power to which *Children* are commanded *Obedience*, that the Pains and Care of their Parents may not be increaſed, or ill rewarded.

68. On the other ſide, *Honour* and *Support* all that which Gratitude requires to return for the Benefits received by and from them, is the indiſpenſible Duty of the Child, and the proper Privilege of the Parents. This is intended for the Parents Advantage, as the other is for the Child's; though Education, the Parents Duty, ſeems to have moſt Power, becauſe the Ignorance and Infirmities of Childhood ſtand in need of Reſtraint and Correction; which is a viſible Exerciſe of Rule, and a kind of Dominion. And that Duty which is comprehended in the Word *Honour*, requires leſs Obedience, though the Obligation be ſtronger on grown, than younger Children. For who can think the Command, *Children obey your Parents*, requires in a Man, that has Children of his own, the ſame Submiſſion to his Father, as it does in his yet young Children to him; and that by this Precept he were bound to obey all his Father's Commands, if, out of a Conceit of Authority, he ſhould have the Indiſcretion to treat him ſtill as a Boy?

69. The firſt part then of *Paternal Power*, or rather Duty, which is *Education*, belongs ſo to the Father, that it terminates at a certain Seaſon; when the Buſineſs of Education is over it ceaſes of it ſelf, and is alſo alienable before. For a Man may put the Tuition of his Son in other Hands; and he that has made his Son an *Apprentice* to another, has diſcharged him, during that Time, of a great part of his Obedience both to himſelf and to his Mother. But all the *Duty of Honour*, the other Part, remains never the leſs entire to them; nothing can cancel that: It is ſo inſeparable from them both, that the Father's Authority cannot diſpoſſeſs the Mother of this Right, nor can any Man diſcharge his Son from *honouring* her that bore him. But both theſe are very far from a Power to make Laws, and inforcing them with Penalties, that may reach Eſtate, Liberty, Limbs and Life. The Power of Commanding ends with Nonage; and tho' after that, *Honour* and Reſpect, Support and Defence, and whatſoever Gratitude can oblige a Man to, for the higheſt Benefits he is naturally capable of, be always due from a Son to his Parents; yet all this puts no Scepter into the Father's Hand, no ſovereign Power of Commanding. He has no Dominion over his Son's Property, or Actions; nor any Right, that his Will ſhould preſcribe to his Sons in all things; however it may become his Son in many things, not very inconvenient to him and his Family, to pay a Deference to it.

70. A Man may owe *Honour* and Reſpect to an ancient, or wiſe Man; Defence to his Child or Friend; Relief and Support to the Diſtreſſed; and Gratitude to a Benefactor, to ſuch a degree, that all he has, all he can do, cannot ſufficiently pay it: But all theſe give no Authority, no Right to any one, of making Laws over him from whom they are owing. And, 'tis plain, all this is due not only to the bare Title of Father; not only becauſe, as has been ſaid, it is owing to the Mother too; but becauſe theſe Obligations to Parents, and the Degrees of what is requir'd of Children, may be varied by the differeut Care and Kindneſs, Trouble and Expence, which is often employed upon one Child more than another.

71. This ſhews the Reaſon how it comes to paſs, that *Parents in Societies*, where they themſelves are Subjects, retain a *Power over their Children*, and have as much Right to their Subjection, as thoſe who are in the State of Nature. Which could not poſſibly be, if all Political Power were only Paternal, and that in truth they were one and the ſame thing: For then, all Paternal Power being in

the Prince, the Subject could naturally have none of it. But these two *Powers*, *Political* and *Paternal*, are so perfectly distinct and separate; are built upon so different Foundations, and given to so different Ends, that every Subject that is a Father, has as much a Paternal Power over his Children, as the Prince has over his: And every Prince, that has Parents, owes them as much filial Duty and Obedience, as the meanest of his Subjects do to theirs; and can therefore contain not any part or degree of that kind of Dominion, which a Prince or Magistrate has over his Subject.

72. Though the Obligation on the Parents to *bring up* their Children, and the Obligation on Children to *honour* their Parents, contain all the Power on the one Hand, and Submission on the other, which are proper to this Relation, yet there is *another Power* ordinarily *in the Father*, whereby he has a Tie on the Obedience of his Children; which though it be common to him with other Men, yet the Occasions of shewing it, almost constantly happening to Fathers in their private Families, and the Instances of it elsewhere being rare, and less taken notice of, it passes in the World for a part of *Paternal Jurisdiction*. And this is the Power Men generally have to *bestow their Estates* on those who please them best. The Possession of the Father being the Expectation and Inheritance of the Children, ordinarily in certain Proportions, according to the Law and Custom of each Country; yet it is commonly in the Father's Power to bestow it with a more sparing or liberal Hand, according as the Behaviour of this or that Child hath comported with his Will and Humour.

73. This is no small Tie on the Obedience of Children: And there being always annexed to the Enjoyment of Land, a Submission to the Government of the Country, of which that Land is a part; it has been commonly suppos'd, That a *Father* could *oblige his Posterity to that Government*, of which he himself was a Subject, and that his Compact held them; whereas, it being only a necessary Condition annexed to the Land, and the Inheritance of an Estate which is under that Government, reaches only those who will take it on that Condition, and so is no natural Tie or Engagement, but a voluntary Submission. For *every Man's Children* being by Nature as *free* as himself, or any of his Ancestors ever were, may, whilst they are in that Freedom, chuse what Society they will join themselves to, what Common-wealth they will put themselves under. But if they will enjoy the *Inheritance* of their Ancestors, they must take it on the same Terms their Ancestors had it, and submit to all the Conditions annex'd to such a Possession. By this Power indeed Fathers oblige their Children to Obedience to themselves, even when they are past Minority, and most commonly too subject them to this or that Political Power. But neither of these by any peculiar Right of *Fatherhood*, but by the Reward they have in their Hands to inforce and recompence such a Compliance; and is no more Power than what a *Frenchman* has over an *Englishman*, who by the Hopes of an Estate he will leave him, will certainly have a strong Tie on his Obedience: And if when it is left him, he will enjoy it, he must certainly take it upon the Conditions annex'd to the *Possession of Land* in that Country where it lies, whether in *France* or *England*.

74. To conclude then, though the *Father's Power* of commanding extends no farther than the Minority of his Children, and to a degree only fit for the Discipline and Government of that Age; and though that *Honour* and *Respect*, and all that which the *Latins* called *Piety*, which they indispensibly owe to their Parents all their Life-time, and in all Estates, with all that Support and Defence is due to them, gives the Father no Power of Governing, *i. e.* making Laws and enacting Penalties on his Children; though by all this he has no Dominion over the Property or Actions of his Son: Yet 'tis obvious to conceive how easy it was, in the first Ages of the World, and in Places still, where the thinness of People gives Families leave to separate into unpossessed Quarters, and they have room to remove or plant themselves in yet vacant Habitations; for the *Father of the Family* to become the Prince of † it; he had been a Ruler from the beginning of the Infancy

† *It is no improbable Opinion therefore which the* Arch-Philosopher *was of, That the chief Person in every Household was always, as it were, a King: So when Numbers of Households joyn'd themselves in Civil Societies together, Kings were the first kind of Governours amongst them, which is also,* as

fancy of his Children: and ſince without ſome Government it would be hard for them to live together, it was likelieſt it ſhould, by the expreſs or tacit Conſent of the Children when they were grown up, be in the Father, where it ſeemed without any Change barely to continue; when indeed nothing more was required to it, than the permitting the *Father* to exerciſe alone in his Family, that executive Power of the Law of Nature, which every free Man naturally hath, and by that Permiſſion reſigning up to him a Monarchical Power whilſt they remained in it. But that this was not by any *Paternal Right*, but only by the Conſent of his Children, is evident from hence, That no body doubts, but if a Stranger, whom Chance or Buſineſs had brought to his Family, had there kill'd any of his Children, or committed any other Fact, he might condemn and put him to Death, or otherwiſe have puniſh'd him, as well as any of his Children; which it was impoſſible he ſhould do by virtue of any paternal Authority over one who was not his Child, but by virtue of that executive Power of the Law of Nature, which, as a Man, he had a Right to: And he alone could puniſh him in his Family, where the Reſpect of his Children had laid by the Exerciſe of ſuch a Power, to give way to the Dignity and Authority they were willing ſhould remain in him, above the reſt of his Family.

75. Thus 'twas eaſy, and almoſt natural for Children by a tacit, and ſcarce avoidable Conſent, to make way for the *Father's Authority and Government*. They had been accuſtomed in their Childhood to follow his Direction, and to refer their little Differences to him; and when they were Men, who fitter to rule them? Their little Properties, and leſs Covetouſneſs, ſeldom afforded greater Controverſies; and when they ſhould ariſe, where could they have a fitter Umpire than he, by whoſe Care they had every one been ſuſtain'd and brought up, and who had a Tenderneſs for them all? 'Tis no wonder that they made no Diſtinction betwixt Minority and full Age: nor looked after one and twenty, or any other Age that might make them the free Diſpoſers of themſelves and Fortunes, when they could have no Deſire to be out of their Pupilage: The Government they had been under, during it, continued ſtill to be more their Protection than Reſtraint; and they could no where find a greater Security to their Peace, Liberties, and Fortunes, than in the *Rule of a Father*.

76. Thus the natural *Fathers of Families*, by an inſenſible Change, became the *politick Monarchs* of them too: And as they chanced to live long, and leave able and worthy Heirs, for ſeveral Succeſſions, or otherwiſe; ſo they laid the Foundations of Hereditary, or Elective Kingdoms, under ſeveral Conſtitutions and Manners, according as Chance, Contrivance, or Occaſions happen'd to mould them. But if Princes have their Titles in their Fathers Right, and it be a ſufficient Proof of the natural *Right of Fathers* to political Authority, becauſe they commonly were thoſe in whoſe Hands we find, *de facto*, the Exerciſe of Government: I ſay, if this Argument be good, it will as ſtrongly prove, that all Princes, nay Princes only, ought to be Prieſts, ſince 'tis as certain, that in the Beginning, *The Father of the Family was Prieſt, as that he was Ruler in his own Houſhold.*

---

as it ſeemeth, the Reaſon why the Name of Fathers continued ſtill in them, who, of Fathers, were made Rulers; as alſo the ancient Cuſtom of Governours to do as Melchizedec, *and being Kings, to exerciſe the Office of Prieſts, which Fathers did, at the firſt grew perhaps by the ſame Occaſion. Howbeit, this is not the only kind of Regiment that has been received in the World. The Inconveniencies of one kind have cauſed ſundry others to be deviſed; ſo that in a Word, all publick Regiments of what kind ſoever, ſeemeth evidently to have riſen from the deliberate Advice, Conſultation and Compoſition between Men, judging it convenient or behoveful; there being no Impoſſibility in Nature conſidered by itſelf, but that Man might have lived without any publick Regiment.* Hooker's Eccl. P. L. 1. Sect. 10.

CHAP. VII.

Of Political or Civil Society.

77. GOD having made Man ſuch a Creature, that, in his own Judgment, it was not good for him to be alone, put him under ſtrong Obligations of Neceſſity, Convenience, and Inclination to drive him into *Society*, as well as fitted him with Underſtanding and Language to continue and enjoy it. The *firſt Society* was between Man and Wife, which gave beginning to that between Parents and Children; to which, in time, that between Maſter and Servant came to be added: And though all theſe might, and commonly did meet together, and make up but one Family, wherein the Maſter or Miſtreſs of it had ſome ſort of Rule proper to a Family; each of theſe, or all together, came ſhort of *Political Society*, as we ſhall ſee, if we conſider the different Ends, Ties, and Bounds of each of theſe.

78. *Conjugal Society* is made by a voluntary Compact between Man and Woman; and tho' it conſiſt chiefly in ſuch a Communion and Right in one anothers Bodies, as is neceſſary to its chief End, Procreation; yet it draws with it mutual Support and Aſſiſtance, and a Communion of Intereſts too, as neceſſary not only to unite their Care and Affection, but alſo neceſſary to their common Off-ſpring, who have a Right to be nouriſhed, and maintained by them, till they are able to provide for themſelves.

79. For the End of *Conjunction, between Male and Female*, being not barely Procreation, but the Continuation of the Species; this Conjunction betwixt Male and Female ought to laſt, even after Procreation, ſo long as is neceſſary to the Nouriſhment and Support of the young Ones, who are to be ſuſtained by thoſe that got them, till they be able to ſhift and provide for themſelves. This Rule, which the infinite wiſe Maker hath ſet to the Works of his Hands, we find the inferior Creatures ſteadily obey. In thoſe viviparous Animals which feed on Graſs, the *Conjunction between Male and Female* laſts no longer than the very Act of Copulation; becauſe the Teat of the Dam being ſufficient to nouriſh the Young, till it be able to feed on Graſs, the Male only begets, but concerns not himſelf for the Female or Young, to whoſe Suſtenance he can contribute nothing. But in Beaſts of Prey the *Conjunction* laſts longer: becauſe the Dam not being able well to ſubſiſt her ſelf, and nouriſh her numerous Off-ſpring by her own Prey alone, a more laborious, as well as more dangerous way of living, than by feeding on Graſs, the Aſſiſtance of the Male is neceſſary to the Maintenance of their common Family, which cannot ſubſiſt till they are able to prey for themſelves, but by the joint Care of Male and Female. The ſame is to be obſerved in all Birds (except ſome domeſtick Ones, where Plenty of Food excuſes the Cock from feeding, and taking care of the young Brood) whoſe young needing Food in the Neſt, the Cock and Hen continue Mates, till the young are able to uſe their Wing, and provide for themſelves.

80. And herein I think lies the chief, if not the only Reaſon, *why the Male and Female in Mankind are tied to a longer Conjunction* than other Creatures, *viz.* Becauſe the Female is capable of conceiving, and *de facto* is commonly with Child again, and brings forth too a new Birth, long before the former is out of Dependency for Support on his Parents help, and able to ſhift for himſelf, and has all the Aſſiſtance is due to him from his Parents; whereby the Father, who is bound to take care for thoſe he hath begot, is under an Obligation to continue in conjugal Society with the ſame Woman longer than other Creatures, whoſe young being able to ſubſiſt of themſelves, before the time of Procreation returns again, the conjugal Bond diſſolves of it ſelf, and they are at Liberty, till *Hymen* at his uſual Anniverſary Seaſon ſummons them again to chuſe new Mates. Wherein one cannot but admire the Wiſdom of the great Creator, who having given to Man Foreſight, and an Ability to lay up for the future, as well as to ſupply the preſent Neceſſity, hath made it neceſſary, that *Society of Man and Wife ſhould be more laſting*, than of Male and Female amongſt other Creatures; that ſo their Induſtry might be encouraged, and their Intereſt better united, to make Proviſion and lay

up

up Goods for their common Iſſue, which uncertain Mixture, or eaſy and frequent Solutions of conjugal Society would mightily diſturb.

81. But though theſe are Ties upon *Mankind*, which make the *Conjugal Bonds* more firm and laſting in Man, than the other Species of Animals; yet it would give one reaſon to enquire, why this *Compact*, where Procreation and Education are ſecured, and Inheritance taken care for, may not be made determinable, either by Conſent, or at a certain Time, or upon certain Conditions, as well as any other voluntary Compacts, there being no Neceſſity in the Nature of the thing, nor to the Ends of it, that it ſhould always be for Life; I mean, to ſuch as are under no Reſtraint of any poſitive Law, which ordains all ſuch Contracts to be perpetual.

82. But the Husband and Wife, though they have but one common Concern, yet having different Underſtandings, will unavoidably ſometimes have different Wills too; it therefore being neceſſary that the laſt Determination, *i. e.* the Rule, ſhould be placed ſomewhere; it naturally falls to the Man's Share, as the abler and the ſtronger. But this reaching but to the things of their common Intereſt and Property, leaves the Wife in the full and free Poſſeſſion of what by Contract is her peculiar Right, and gives the Husband no more Power over her Life than ſhe has over his. The *Power of the Husband* being ſo far from that of an abſolute Monarch, that the *Wife* has in many Caſes a Liberty to ſeparate from him; where natural Right or their Contract allows it, whether that Contract be made by themſelves in the State of Nature, or by the Cuſtom or Laws of the Country they live in; and the Children upon ſuch Separation fall to the Father or Mother's Lot, as ſuch Contract does determine.

83. For all the Ends of *Marriage* being to be obtained under politick Government, as well as in the State of Nature, the Civil Magiſtrate doth not abridge the Right or Power of either naturally neceſſary to thoſe Ends, *viz.* Procreation and mutual Support and Aſſiſtance whilſt they are together; but only decides any Controverſy that may ariſe between Man and Wife about them. If it were otherwiſe, and that abſolute *Sovereignty* and Power of Life and Death naturally belong'd to the Husband, and were *neceſſary to the Society between Man and Wife*, there could be no Matrimony in any of thoſe Countries where the Husband is allow'd no ſuch abſolute Authority. But the Ends of Matrimony requiring no ſuch Power in the Husband, the Condition of *Conjugal Society* put it not in him, it being not at all neceſſary to that State. *Conjugal Society* could ſubſiſt and attain it Ends without it; nay, Community of Goods, and the Power over them, mutual Aſſiſtance and Maintenance, and other things belonging to *Conjugal Society*, might be varied and regulated by that Contract which unites Man and Wife in that Society, as far as may conſiſt with Procreation and the bringing up of Children till they could ſhift for themſelves; nothing being neceſſary to any Society, that is not neceſſary to the Ends for which it is made.

84. The *Society betwixt Parents and Children*, and the diſtinct Rights and Powers belonging reſpectively to them, I have treated of ſo largely in the foregoing Chapter, that I ſhall not here need to ſay any thing of it. And I think it is plain, that it is far different from a politick Society.

85. *Maſter* and *Servant* are Names as old as Hiſtory, but given to thoſe of far different Condition; for a Freeman makes himſelf a Servant to another, by ſelling him for a certain time, the Service he undertakes to do, in exchange for Wages he is to receive: And though this commonly puts him into the Family of his Maſter, and under the ordinary Diſcipline thereof; yet it gives the Maſter but a temporary Power over him, and no greater, than what is contained in the *Contract* between 'em. But there is another ſort of Servants, which by a peculiar Name we call *Slaves*, who being Captives taken in a juſt War, are by the Right of Nature ſubjected to the abſolute Dominion and arbitrary Power of their Maſters. Theſe Men having, as I ſay, forfeited their Lives, and with it their Liberties, and loſt their Eſtates; and being in the *State of Slavery*, not capable of any Property, cannot in that State be conſidered as any part of *Civil Society*; the chief End whereof is the Preſervation of Property.

86. Let us therefore conſider a *Maſter of a Family* with all theſe ſubordinate Relations of *Wife*, *Children*, *Servants*, and *Slaves*, united under the Domeſtick Rule of a Family; which, what Reſemblance ſoever it may have in its Order, Offices, and Number too, with a little Common-wealth, yet is very far from it, both

in

in its Conſtitution, Power and End: Or if it muſt be thought a Monarchy, and the *Paterfamilias* the abſolute Monarch in it, abſolute Monarchy will have but a very ſhattered and ſhort Power, when 'tis plain, by what has been ſaid before, That the *Maſter of the Family* has a very diſtinct and differently limited *Power*, both as to Time and Extent, over thoſe ſeveral Perſons that are in it; for except Slave (and the Family is as much a Family, and his Power as *Paterfamilias* as great, whether there be any Slaves in the Family or no) he has no Legiſlative Power of Life and Death over any of them, and none too but what a *Miſtreſs of a Family* may have as well as he. And he certainly can have no abſolute Power over the whole *Family*, who has but a very limited one over every Individual in it. But how a *Family*, or any other Society of Men differ from that, which is properly *Political Society*, we ſhall beſt ſee, by conſidering wherein *Political Society* itſelf conſiſts.

87. Man being born, as has been proved, with a Title to perfect Freedom, and an uncontrouled Enjoyment of all the Rights and Privileges of the Law of Nature, equally with any other Man or Number of Men in the World, hath by Nature a Power, not only to preſerve his Property, that is, his Life, Liberty and Eſtate, againſt the Injuries and Attempts of other Men; but to judge of and puniſh the Breaches of that Law in others, as he is perſuaded the Offence deſerves, even with Death itſelf, in Crimes where the Heinouſneſs of the Fact, in his Opinion, requires it. But becauſe no *Political Society* can be, nor ſubſiſt without having in itſelf the Power to preſerve the Property, and in order thereunto, puniſh the Offences of all thoſe of that Society; there, and there only is *Political Society*, where every one of the Members hath quitted this natural Power, reſign'd it up into the Hands of the Community in all Caſes that exclude him not from appealing for Protection to the Law eſtabliſhed by it. And thus all private Judgment of every particular Member being excluded, the Community comes to be Umpire, by ſettled ſtanding Rules, indifferent, and the ſame to all Parties; and by Men having Authority from the Community, for the execution of thoſe Rules, decides all the Differences that may happen between any Members of that Society concerning any Matter of Right; and puniſhes thoſe Offences which any Member hath committed againſt the Society, with ſuch Penalties as the Law has eſtabliſhed; whereby it is eaſy to diſcern, who are, and who are not, in *Political Society* together. Thoſe who are united into one Body, and have a common eſtabliſh'd Law and Judicature to appeal to, with Authority to decide Controverſies between them, and puniſh Offenders, are in *Civil Society* one with another: But thoſe who have no ſuch common Appeal, I mean on Earth, are ſtill in the State of Nature, each being, where there is no other, Judge for himſelf, and Executioner; which is, as I have before ſhew'd it, the perfect *State of Nature*.

88. And thus the Common-wealth comes by a Power to ſet down what Puniſhment ſhall belong to the ſeveral Tranſgreſſions which they think worthy of it, committed amongſt the Members of that Society, (which is the *Power of making Laws*) as well as it has the Power to puniſh any Injury done unto any of its Members, by any one that is not of it, (which is the *Power of War and Peace*;) and all this for the Preſervation of the Property of all the Members of that Society, as far as is poſſible. But tho' every Man who has enter'd into Civil Society, and is become a Member of any Common-wealth has thereby quitted his Power to puniſh Offences, againſt the Law of *Nature*, in Proſecution of his own private Judgment, yet with the Judgment of Offences, which he has given up to the Legiſlative in all Caſes, where he can appeal to the Magiſtrate, he has given a Right to the Common-wealth to employ his Force, for the Execution of the Judgments of the Common-wealth, whenever he ſhall be called to it; which indeed are his own Judgments, they being made by himſelf, or his Repreſentative. And herein we have the Original of the *legiſlative* and *executive Power* of Civil Society, which is to judge by ſtanding Laws, how far Offences are to be puniſhed, when committed within the Common-wealth; and alſo to determine, by occaſional Judgments founded on the preſent Circumſtances of the Fact, how far Injuries from without are to be vindicated; and in both theſe to employ all the Force of all the Members, when there ſhall be need.

89. Where-ever therefore any number of Men are ſo united into one Society, as to quit every one his executive Power of the Law of Nature, and to reſign it to the

the Publick, there and there only is a *Political, or Civil Society*. And this is done, where-ever any number of Men, in the State of Nature, enter into Society to make one People, one Body Politick, under one ſupreme Government; or elſe when any one joins himſelf to, and incorporates with any Government already made. For hereby he authorizes the Society, or which is all one, the Legiſlative thereof, to make Laws for him, as the publick Good of the Society ſhall require; to the Execution whereof, his own Aſſiſtance (as to his own Decrees) is due. And this *puts Men* out of a State of *Nature into* that of a *Common-wealth*, by ſetting up a Judge on Earth, with Authority to determine all the Controverſies, and redreſs the Injuries, that may happen to any Member of the Commonwealth; which Judge is the Legiſlative, or Magiſtrates appointed by it. And where-ever there are any number of Men, however aſſociated, that have no ſuch deciſive Power to appeal to, there they are ſtill in *the State of Nature*.

90. Hence it is evident, that *abſolute Monarchy*, which by ſome Men is counted the only Government in the World, is indeed *inconſiſtent with Civil Society*, and ſo can be no Form of Civil-Government at all. For the *End of Civil Society*, being to avoid, and remedy thoſe Inconveniencies of the State of Nature, which neceſſarily follow from every Man's being Judge in his own Caſe, by ſetting up a known Authority, to which every one of that Society may appeal upon any Injury received, or Controverſy that may ariſe, and which every one of the † Society ought to obey; where-ever any Perſons are, who have not ſuch an Authority to appeal to, for the Deciſion of any Difference between them, there thoſe Perſons are ſtill *in the State of Nature*. And ſo is every *abſolute Prince*, in reſpect of thoſe who are under his *Dominion*.

91. For he being ſuppos'd to have all, both legiſlative and executive Power in himſelf alone, there is no Judge to be found, no Appeal lies open to any one, who may fairly, and indifferently, and with Authority decide, and from whoſe Deciſion Relief and Redreſs may be expected of any Injury or Inconveniency, that may be ſuffered from the Prince, or by his Order: So that ſuch a Man, however intitled, *Czar*, or *Grand Seignor*, or how you pleaſe, is as much *in the State of Nature*, with all under his Dominion, as he is with the reſt of Mankind. For where-ever any two Men are, who have no ſtanding Rule, and common Judge to appeal to on Earth, for the Determination of Controverſies of Right betwixt them, there they are ſtill *in the State of* * *Nature*, and under all the Inconveniencies of it, with only this woeful Difference to the Subject, or rather Slave of an abſolute Prince: That whereas, in the ordinary State of Nature, he has a Liberty to judge of his Right, and according to the beſt of his Power, to maintain it; now whenever his Property is invaded by the Will and Order of his Monarch, he has not only no Appeal, as thoſe in the Society ought to have, but as if he were degraded from the common ſtate of Rational Creatures, is denied a Liberty to judge of, or to defend his Right: and ſo is expoſed to all the Miſery and Inconveniencies, that a Man can fear from one, who being in the unreſtrained ſtate of Nature, is yet corrupted with Flattery, and armed with Power.

92. For he that thinks *abſolute Power purifies Mens Bloods*, and corrects the Baſeneſs of human Nature, need read but the Hiſtory of this, or any other Age to be convinced of the contrary. He that would have been inſolent and injurious in

---

† *The publick Power of all Society is above every Soul contained in the ſame Society; and the principal Uſe of that Power is, to give Laws unto all that are under it, which Laws in ſuch Caſes we muſt obey, unleſs there be reaſon ſhew'd which may neceſſarily inforce, that the Law of Reaſon, or of God, doth injoyn the contrary.* Hook. Eccl. Pol. L. 1. Sect. 16.

* *To take away all ſuch mutual Grievances, Injuries and Wrongs*, i. e. ſuch as attend Men in the State of Nature. *There was no way but only by growing into Compoſition and Agreement amongſt themſelves, by ordaining ſome kind of Government publick, and by yielding themſelves ſubject thereunto, that unto whom they granted Authority to rule and govern, by them the Peace, Tranquillity and happy Eſtate of the reſt might be procured. Men always knew that where Force and Injury was offered, they might be Defenders of themſelves; they knew that however Men may ſeek their Commodity; yet if this were done with Injury unto others, it was not to be ſuffered, but by all Men, and all good Means to be withſtood. Finally, they knew that no Man might in reaſon take upon him to determine his own Right, and according to his own Determination proceed in Maintenance thereof, in as much as every Man is towards himſelf, and them whom he greatly affects, partial; and therefore that Strifes and Troubles would be endleſs, except they gave their common Conſent all to be ordered by ſome, whom they ſhall agree upon, without which Conſent there would be no reaſon that one Man ſhould take upon him to be Lord or Judge over another.* Hooker's Eccl. Pol. L. 1. Sect. 10.

the

the Woods of *America*, would not probably be much better in a Throne; where perhaps Learning and Religion ſhall be found out to juſtify all, that he ſhall do to his Subjects, and the Sword preſently ſilence all thoſe that dare queſtion it. For what the *Protection of abſolute Monarchy* is, what kind of Fathers of their Countries it makes Princes to be, and to what a degree of Happineſs and Security it carries Civil Society, where this ſort of Government is grown to Perfection, he that will look into the late Relation of *Ceylon*, may eaſily ſee.

93. *In abſolute Monarchies* indeed, as well as other Governments of the World, the Subjects have an Appeal to the Law, and Judges to decide any Controverſies, and reſtrain any Violence that may happen betwixt the Subjects themſelves, one amongſt another. This every one thinks neceſſary, and believes he deſerves to be thought a declared Enemy to Society and Mankind, who ſhould go about to take it away. But whether this be from a true Love of Mankind and Society, and ſuch a Charity as we owe all one to another, there is Reaſon to doubt. For this is no more, than that every Man, who loves his own Power, Profit, or Greatneſs, may and naturally muſt do, keep thoſe Animals from hurting, or deſtroying one another, who labour and drudge only for his Pleaſure and Advantage; and ſo are taken care of, not out of any Love the Maſter has for them, but Love of himſelf, and the Profit they bring him. For if it be asked, what Security, *what Fence* is there, in ſuch a State, *againſt the Violence and Oppreſſion of this abſolute Ruler?* The very Queſtion can ſcarce be born. They are ready to tell you, that it deſerves Death only to ask after Safety. Betwixt Subject and Subject, they will grant, there muſt be Meaſures, Laws and Judges, for their mutual Peace and Security: But as for the *Ruler*, he ought to be *abſolute*, and is above all ſuch Circumſtances; becauſe he has Power to do more Hurt and Wrong, 'tis right when he does it. To ask how you may be guarded from Harm, or Injury, on that ſide where the ſtrongeſt Hand is to do it, is preſently the Voice of Faction and Rebellion. As if when Men quitting the State of Nature entered into Society, they agreed that all of them but one ſhould be under the Reſtraint of Laws, but that he ſhould ſtill retain all the Liberty of the State of Nature, increaſed with Power, and made licentious by Impunity. This is to think, that Men are ſo fooliſh, that they take care to avoid what Miſchiefs may be done them by *Pole-Cats*, or *Foxes*; but are content, nay think it Safety, to be devoured by *Lions*.

94. But whatever Flatterers may talk to amuze Peoples Underſtandings, it hinders not Men from feeling; and when they perceive, that any Man in what Station ſoever, is out of the Bounds of the Civil Society which they are of, and that they have no Appeal on Earth againſt any Harm, they may receive from him, they are apt to think themſelves in the State of Nature, in reſpect of him, whom they find to be ſo; and to take care as ſoon as they can, to have that *Safety and Security in Civil Society*, for which it was firſt inſtituted, and for which only they entered into it. And therefore, though perhaps at firſt, (as ſhall be ſhewed more at large hereafter in the following Part of this Diſcourſe) ſome one good and excellent Man having got a Prehemency amongſt the reſt, had this Difference paid to his Goodneſs and Vertue, as to a kind of natural Authority, that the chief Rule, with Arbitration of their Differences, by a tacit Conſent devolved into his Hands, without any other Caution, but the Aſſurance they had of his Uprightneſs and Wiſdom; yet when time, giving Authority, and (as ſome Men would perſuade us,) Sacredneſs to Cuſtoms, which the negligent, and unforeſeeing Innocence of the firſt Ages began, had brought in Succeſſors of another Stamp, the People finding their Properties not ſecure under the Government, as then it was, (whereas Government has no other End but the Preſervation of * Property) could never be ſafe nor at reſt, *nor think themſelves in Civil Society*, till the Legiſlature was placed in collective Bodies of Men, call them Senate, Parliament, or what you pleaſe. By which Means every ſingle Perſon became ſubject, equally with other the Mea-

* *At the firſt, when ſome certain kind of Regiment was once appointed, it may be that nothing was then farther thought upon for the Manner of Governing, but all permitted unto their Wiſdom and Diſcretion, which were to Rule, till by Experience they found this for all Parts very inconvenient, ſo as the Thing which they had deviſed for a Remedy, did indeed but increaſe the Sore, which it ſhould have cured. They ſaw, that to live by one Mans Will, became the cauſe of all Mens Miſery. This conſtrained them to come unto Laws, wherein all Men might ſee their Duty beforehand, and know the Penalties of tranſgreſſing them.* Hooker's Eccl. Pol. L. 1. Sect. 10.

neſt

neſt Men, to thoſe Laws, which he himſelf, as Part of the Legiſlative, had eſtabliſh'd; nor could any one, by his own Authority avoid the Force of the Law, when once made; nor by any Pretence of Superiority plead Exemption, thereby to Licenſe his own, or the Miſcarriages of any of his Dependents. * *No Man in civil Society can be exempted from the Laws of it.* For if any Man may do, what he thinks fit, and there be no Appeal on Earth, for Redreſs or Security againſt any Harm he ſhall do: I ask, whether he be not perfectly ſtill in the State of Nature? and ſo can be *no Part or Member of that civil Society*; unleſs any one will ſay, the State of Nature and Civil Society are one and the ſame Thing, which I have never yet found any one ſo great a Patron of Anarchy as to affirm.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Beginning of Political Societies.

95. MEN being, as has been ſaid, by Nature, all free, equal, and independent, no one can be put out of this Eſtate, and ſubjected to the political Power of another, without his own Conſent. The only Way whereby any one deveſts himſelf of his natural Liberty, and puts on the *Bonds of civil Society*, is by agreeing with other Men to join and unite into a Community, for their comfortable, ſafe, and peaceable living one amongſt another, in a ſecure Enjoyment of their Properties, and a greater Security againſt any, that are not of it. This any Number of Men may do, becauſe it injures not the Freedom of the reſt; they are left as they were in the Liberty of the State of Nature. When any Number of Men have ſo *conſented to make one Community or Government*, they are thereby preſently incorporated, and make *one body Politick*, wherein the *Majority* have a Right to act and conclude the reſt.

96. For when any Number of Men have, by the Conſent of every Individual, made a *Community*, they have thereby made that *Community* one Body, with a Power to act as one Body, which is only by the Will and Determination of the *Majority*. For that which acts any Community, being only the Conſent of the Individuals of it, and it being neceſſary to that which is one Body to move one Way; it is neceſſary the Body ſhould move that Way whither the greater Force carries it, which is the *Conſent of the Majority*: Or elſe it is impoſſible it ſhould act or continue one Body, *one Community*, which the Conſent of every Individual that united into it, agreed that it ſhould; and ſo every one is bound by that Conſent to be concluded by the *Majority*. And therefore we ſee, that in Aſſemblies, empower'd to act by poſitive Laws, where no Number is ſet by that poſitive Law which empowers them, the *Act of the Majority* paſſes for the Act of the whole, and of Courſe determines, as having by the Law of Nature and Reaſon, the Power of the whole.

97. And thus every Man, by conſenting with others to make one Body Politick under one Government, puts himſelf under an Obligation, to every one of that Society, to ſubmit to the Determination of the *Majority*, and to be concluded by it; or elſe this *original Compact*, whereby he with others incorporates into *one Society*, would ſignify nothing, and be no Compact, if he be left free, and under no other Ties, than he was in before in the State of Nature. For what Appearance would there be of any Compact? What new Engagement, if he were no farther ty'd by any Decrees of the Society, than he himſelf thought fit, and did actually conſent to? This would be ſtill as great a Liberty, as he himſelf had before his Compact, or any one elſe in the State of Nature hath, who may ſubmit himſelf, and Conſent to any Acts of it, if he thinks fit.

98. For if *the Conſent of the Majority* ſhall not, in Reaſon, be receiv'd, as *the Act of the Whole*, and conclude every Individual; nothing but the Conſent of every In-

* *Civil Law being the Act of the whole body Politick, doth therefore over-rule each ſeveral Part of the ſame Body.* Hooker, ibid.

dividual can make any Thing to be the Act of the Whole: But such a Consent is next impossible ever to be had, if we consider the Infirmities of Health, and Avocations of Business, which in a Number, though much less than that of a Common-wealth, will necessarily keep many away from the publick Assembly. To which if we add the variety of Opinions, and contrariety of Interest, which unavoidably happen in all Collections of Men, the coming into Society upon such Terms would be only like *Cato*'s coming into the Theatre, only to go out again. Such a Constitution, as this, would make the mighty *Leviathan* of a shorter Duration, than the feeblest Creatures; and not let it outlast the Day it was born in: Which cannot be suppos'd, till we can think, that rational Creatures should desire and constitute Societies only to be dissolved. For where the *Majority* cannot conclude the rest, there they cannot act as one Body, and consequently will be immediately dissolv'd again.

99. Whosoever therefore out of a State of Nature unite into a *Community*, must be understood to give up all the Power, necessary to the Ends for which they unite into Society, to the *Majority* of the Community, unless they expressly agreed in any Number greater than the *Majority*. And this is done by barely agreeing to *unite into one political Society*, which is *all the Compact* that is, or needs be, between the Individuals, that enter into, or make up a *Common-wealth*. And thus that, which begins and actually *constitutes any political Society*, is nothing but the Consent of any Number of Freemen capable of a Majority to unite and incorporate into such a Society. And this is that, and that only, which did, or could give Beginning to any *lawful Government* in the World.

100. To this I find two Objections made.

First, *That there are no Instances to be found in Story, of a Company of Men Independent, and equal one amongst another, that meet together, and in this Way began and set up a Government.*

Secondly, *'Tis impossible of Right, that Men should do so, because all Men being born under Government, they are to submit to that, and are not at Liberty to begin a new one.*

101. To the first there is this to answer, That it is not at all to be wonder'd, that *History* gives us but a very little Account of *Men, that lived together in the State of Nature.* The Inconveniencies of that Condition, and the love, and want of Society no sooner brought any Number of them together, but they presently united, and incorporated, if they design'd to continue together. And if we may not suppose *Men* ever to have been *in the State of Nature*, because we hear not much of them in such a State, we may as well suppose the Armies of *Salmanasser*, or *Xerxes* were never Children, because we hear little of them, till they were Men, and embodied in Armies. Government is every where antecedent to Records, and Letters seldom come in amongst a People, till a long continuation of Civil Society has, by other more necessary Arts, provided for their Safety, Ease, and Plenty. And then they begin to look after the History of their Founders, and search into their *Original*, when they have out-liv'd the Memory of it. For 'tis with *Common-wealths* as with particular Persons, they are commonly *ignorant of their own Birth and Infancies*: And if they know any thing of their *Original*, they are beholden for it, to the accidental Records, that others have kept of it. And those that we have, of the Beginning of any Polities in the World, excepting that of the *Jews*, where God himself immediately interpos'd, and which favours not at all paternal Dominion, are all either plain Instances of such a Beginning, as I have mention'd, or at least have manifest Footsteps of it.

102. He must shew a strange Inclination to deny evident Matter of Fact, when it agrees not with his Hypothesis, who will not allow, that the *Beginning* of *Rome* and *Venice* were by the uniting together of several Men free and independent one of another, amongst whom there was no natural Superiority or Subjection. And if *Josephus Acosta*'s Word may be taken, he tells us, that in many Parts of *America* there was no Government all. *There are great and apparent Conjectures*, says he, *that these Men*, speaking of those of *Peru*, *for a long Time had neither Kings nor Common-wealths, but liv'd in Troops, as they do this Day in* Floriday, *the* Cheriquanas, *those of* Brasil, *and many other Nations, which have no certain Kings, but as Occasion is offer'd in Peace or War, they chuse their Captains as they please*, l. 1. c. 25. If it be said, that every Man there was born subject to his Father, or the Head of his Family. That the Subjection due from a Child to a Father, took not away his Freedom of uniting

ting into what political Society he thought fit, has been already proved. But be that as it will, these Men, 'tis evident, were actually *Free*; and whatever Superiority some Politicians now would place in any of them, they themselves claimed it not; but by Consent were all *equal*, till by the same Consent they set Rulers over themselves. So that their *Politick Societies* all *began* from a voluntary Union, and the mutual Agreement of Men freely acting in the Choice of their Governors, and Forms of Government.

103. And I hope those who went away from *Sparta* with *Palantus*, mention'd by *Justin*, l. 3. c. 4. will be allow'd to have been *Freemen, Independent* one of another, and to have set up a Government over themselves, by their own Consent. Thus I have given several Examples out of History, of *People Free and in the State of Nature*, that being met together incorporated and *began a Common-wealth*. And if the want of such Instances be an Argument to prove that *Government* were not, nor could not be so *begun*, I suppose the Contenders to paternal Empire were better let it alone, than urge it against natural Liberty. For if they can give so many Instances, out of History, of *Governments begun* upon paternal Right, I think (though at best an Argument from what has been, to what should of Right be, has no great Force) one might, without any great Danger, yield them the Cause. But if I might advise them in the Case, they would do well not to search too much into the *Original of Governments*, as they have begun *de facto*, lest they should find at the Foundation of most of them, something very little favourable to the Design they promote, and such a Power as they contend for.

104. But to conclude, Reason being plain on our Side, that Men are naturally Free, and the Examples of History shewing, that the *Governments* of the World, that were begun in Peace, had their Beginning laid on that Foundation, and were *made by the Consent of the People*; there can be little room for Doubt, either where the Right is, or what has been the Opinion, or Practice of Mankind, about the *first erecting of Governments*.

105. I will not deny, that if we look back as far as History will direct us, towards the *Original of Common-wealths*, we shall generally find them under the Government and Administration of one Man. And I am also apt to believe, that where a Family was numerous enough to subsist by itself, and continued entire together, without mixing with others, as it often happens, where there is much Land, and few People, the Government commonly began in the Father. For the Father having, by the Law of Nature, the same Power with every Man else to punish, as he thought fit, any Offences against that Law, might thereby punish his transgressing Children, even when they were Men, and out of their Pupilage; and they were very likely to submit to his Punishment, and all join with him against the Offender, in their turns, giving him thereby Power to execute his Sentence against any Transgression, and so in effect make him the Law-Maker, and Governor over all, that remain'd in Conjunction with his Family. He was fittest to be trusted; paternal Affection secur'd their Property, and Interest under his Care; and the Custom of obeying him, in their Childhood, made it easier to submit to him, rather than to any other. If therefore they must have one to rule them, as Government is hardly to be avoided amongst Men that live together; who so likely to be the Man, as he that was their common Father; unless Negligence, Cruelty, or any other Defect of Mind or Body, made him unfit for it? But when either the Father died, and left his next Heir, for want of Age, Wisdom, Courage, or any other Qualities, less fit for Rule; or where several Families met, and consented to continue together; there 'tis not to be doubted, but they used their natural Freedom, to set up him, whom they judg'd the ablest, and most likely, to rule well over them. Conformable hereunto we find the People of *America*, who (living out of the Reach of the conquering Swords, and spreading Domination of the two great Empires of *Peru* and *Mexico*) enjoy'd their own natural Freedom, though, *cæteris paribus*, they commonly prefer the Heir of their deceased King; yet if they find him weak, or uncapable, they pass him by, and set up the stoutest and bravest Man for their Ruler.

106. Thus, though looking back as far as Records give us any Account of Peopling the World, and the History of Nations, we commonly find the *Government* to be in one Hand; yet it destroys not that which I affirm, *viz.* That the *Beginning of politick Society* depends upon the Consent of the Individuals, to join into,

dividual can make any Thing to be the Act of the Whole: But such a Consent is next impossible ever to be had, if we consider the Infirmities of Health, and Avocations of Business, which in a Number, though much less than that of a Common-wealth, will necessarily keep many away from the publick Assembly. To which if we add the variety of Opinions, and contrariety of Interest, which unavoidably happen in all Collections of Men, the coming into Society upon such Terms would be only like *Cato*'s coming into the Theatre, only to go out again. Such a Constitution, as this, would make the mighty *Leviathan* of a shorter Duration, than the feeblest Creatures; and not let it outlast the Day it was born in: Which cannot be suppos'd, till we can think, that rational Creatures should desire and constitute Societies only to be dissolved. For where the *Majority* cannot conclude the rest, there they cannot act as one Body, and consequently will be immediately dissolv'd again.

99. Whosoever therefore out of a State of Nature unite into a *Community*, must be understood to give up all the Power, necessary to the Ends for which they unite into Society, to the *Majority* of the Community, unless they expresly agreed in any Number greater than the *Majority*. And this is done by barely agreeing to *unite into one political Society*, which is *all the Compact* that is, or needs be, between the Individuals, that enter into, or make up a *Common-wealth*. And thus that, which begins and actually *constitutes any political Society*, is nothing but the Consent of any Number of Freemen capable of a Majority to unite and incorporate into such a Society. And this is that, and that only, which did, or could give Beginning to any *lawful Government* in the World.

100. To this I find two Objections made.

First, *That there are no Instances to be found in Story, of a Company of Men Independent, and equal one amongst another, that meet together, and in this Way began and set up a Government.*

Secondly, *'Tis impossible of Right, that Men should do so, because all Men being born under Government, they are to submit to that, and are not at Liberty to begin a new one.*

101. To the first there is this to answer, That it is not at all to be wonder'd, that *History* gives us but a very little Account of *Men, that lived together in the State of Nature.* The Inconveniencies of that Condition, and the love, and want of Society no sooner brought any Number of them together, but they presently united, and incorporated, if they design'd to continue together. And if we may not suppose *Men* ever to have been *in the State of Nature*, because we hear not much of them in such a State, we may as well suppose the Armies of *Salmanasser*, or *Xerxes* were never Children, because we hear little of them, till they were Men, and embodied in Armies. Government is every where antecedent to Records, and Letters seldom come in amongst a People, till a long continuation of Civil Society has, by other more necessary Arts, provided for their Safety, Ease, and Plenty. And then they begin to look after the History of their Founders, and search into their *Original*, when they have out-liv'd the Memory of it. For 'tis with *Common-wealths* as with particular Persons, they are commonly *ignorant of their own Birth and Infancies*: And if they know any thing of their *Original*, they are beholden for it, to the accidental Records, that others have kept of it. And those that we have, of the Beginning of any Polities in the World, excepting that of the *Jews*, where God himself immediately interpos'd, and which favours not at all paternal Dominion, are all either plain Instances of such a Beginning, as I have mention'd, or at least have manifest Footsteps of it.

102. He must shew a strange Inclination to deny evident Matter of Fact, when it agrees not with his Hypothesis, who will not allow, that the *Beginning* of *Rome* and *Venice* were by the uniting together of several Men free and independent one of another, amongst whom there was no natural Superiority or Subjection. And if *Josephus Acosta*'s Word may be taken, he tells us, that in many Parts of *America* there was no Government all. *There are great and apparent Conjectures*, says he, *that these Men*, speaking of those of *Peru*, *for a long Time had neither Kings nor Common-wealths, but liv'd in Troops, as they do this Day in* Floriday, *the* Cheriquanas, *those of* Brasil, *and many other Nations, which have no certain Kings, but as Occasion is offer'd in Peace or War, they chuse their Captains as they please*, l. 1. c. 25. If it be said, that every Man there was born subject to his Father, or the Head of his Family. That the Subjection due from a Child to a Father, took not away his Freedom of uniting

ting into what political Society he thought fit, has been already proved. But be that as it will, these Men, 'tis evident, were actually *Free*; and whatever Superiority some Politicians now would place in any of them, they themselves claimed it not; but by Consent were all *equal*, till by the same Consent they set Rulers over themselves. So that their *Politick Societies* all *began* from a voluntary Union, and the mutual Agreement of Men freely acting in the Choice of their Governors, and Forms of Government.

103. And I hope those who went away from *Sparta* with *Palantus*, mention'd by *Justin*, l. 3. c. 4. will be allow'd to have been *Freemen*, *Independent* one of another, and to have set up a Government over themselves, by their own Consent. Thus I have given several Examples out of History, of *People Free and in the State of Nature*, that being met together incorporated and *began a Common-wealth*. And if the want of such Instances be an Argument to prove that *Government* were not, nor could not be so *begun*, I suppose the Contenders to paternal Empire were better let it alone, than urge it against natural Liberty. For if they can give so many Instances, out of History, of *Governments begun* upon paternal Right, I think (though at best an Argument from what has been, to what should of Right be, has no great Force) one might, without any great Danger, yield them the Cause. But if I might advise them in the Case, they would do well not to search too much into the *Original of Governments*, as they have begun *de facto*, lest they should find at the Foundation of most of them, something very little favourable to the Design they promote, and such a Power as they contend for.

104. But to conclude, Reason being plain on our Side, that Men are naturally Free, and the Examples of History shewing, that the *Governments* of the World, that were begun in Peace, had their Beginning laid on that Foundation, and were *made by the Consent of the People*; there can be little room for Doubt, either where the Right is, or what has been the Opinion, or Practice of Mankind, about the *first erecting of Governments*.

105. I will not deny, that if we look back as far as History will direct us, towards the *Original of Common-wealths*, we shall generally find them under the Government and Administration of one Man. And I am also apt to believe, that where a Family was numerous enough to subsist by itself, and continued entire together, without mixing with others, as it often happens, where there is much Land, and few People, the Government commonly began in the Father. For the Father having, by the Law of Nature, the same Power with every Man else to punish, as he thought fit, any Offences against that Law, might thereby punish his transgressing Children, even when they were Men, and out of their Pupilage; and they were very likely to submit to his Punishment, and all join with him against the Offender, in their turns, giving him thereby Power to execute his Sentence against any Transgression, and so in effect make him the Law-Maker, and Governor over all, that remain'd in Conjunction with his Family. He was fittest to be trusted; paternal Affection secur'd their Property, and Interest under his Care; and the Custom of obeying him, in their Childhood, made it easier to submit to him, rather than to any other. If therefore they must have one to rule them, as Government is hardly to be avoided amongst Men that live together; who so likely to be the Man, as he that was their common Father; unless Negligence, Cruelty, or any other Defect of Mind or Body, made him unfit for it? But when either the Father died, and left his next Heir, for want of Age, Wisdom, Courage, or any other Qualities, less fit for Rule; or where several Families met, and consented to continue together; there 'tis not to be doubted, but they used their natural Freedom, to set up him, whom they judg'd the ablest, and most likely, to rule well over them. Conformable hereunto we find the People of *America*, who (living out of the Reach of the conquering Swords, and spreading Domination of the two great Empires of *Peru* and *Mexico*) enjoy'd their own natural Freedom, though, *cæteris paribus*, they commonly prefer the Heir of their deceased King; yet if they find him weak, or uncapable, they pass him by, and set up the stoutest and bravest Man for their Ruler.

106. Thus, though looking back as far as Records give us any Account of Peopling the World, and the History of Nations, we commonly find the *Government* to be in one Hand; yet it destroys not that which I affirm, *viz.* That the *Beginning of politick Society* depends upon the Consent of the Individuals, to join into,

and make one Society; who when they are thus incorporated, might ſet up what Form of Government they thought fit. But this having given occaſion to Men to miſtake, and think, that by Nature Government was monarchical, and belong'd to the Father, it may not be amiſs here to conſider, why People in the Beginning generally pitch'd upon this Form, which though pherhaps the Father's Prehemineney might in the firſt Inſtitution of ſome Common-wealths, give a Riſe to, and place in the Beginning, the Power in one Hand; yet it is plain that the Reaſon, that continued the Form of *Government in a ſingle Perſon*, was not any Regard, or Reſpect to paternal Authority; ſince all petty *Monarchies*, that is, almoſt all Monarchies, near their Original, have been commonly, at leaſt upon occaſion, *Elective*.

107. Firſt then, in the Beginning of Things, the Father's Government of the Childhood of thoſe ſprung from him, having accuſtomed them to the *Rule of one Man*, and taught them that where it was exerciſed with Care and Skill, with Affection and Love to thoſe under it, it was ſufficient to procure and preſerve to Men all the political Happineſs they ſought for in Society. It was no wonder that they ſhould pitch upon, and naturally run into that Form of Government, which from their Infancy they had been all accuſtomed to; and which, by Experience, they had found both eaſie and ſafe. To which, if we add, that *Monarchy* being ſimple and moſt obvious to Men, whom neither Experience had Inſtructed in Forms of Government, nor the Ambition or Inſolence of Empire had taught to beware of the Encroachments of Prerogative, or the Inconveniencies of abſolute Power, which Monarchy in Succeſſion was apt to lay claim to, and bring upon them; it was not at all ſtrange, that they ſhould not much trouble themſelves, to think of Methods of reſtraing any Exorbitances of thoſe to whom they had given the Authority over them and of balancing the Power of Government, by placing ſeveral Parts of it in different Hands. They had neither felt the Oppreſſion of tyrannical Dominion, nor did the faſhion of the Age, nor their Poſſeſſions, or way of living, (which afforded little Matter for Covetouſneſs or Ambition) give them any Reaſon to apprehend or provide againſt it; and therefore 'tis no wonder they put themſelves into ſuch a *Frame of Government*, as was not only, as I ſaid, moſt obvious and ſimple, but alſo beſt ſuited to their preſent State and Condition; which ſtood more in need of Defence againſt foreign Invaſions and Injuries, than of Multipliſity of Laws. The Equality of a ſimple poor way of living, confining their Deſires within the narrow Bounds of each Man's ſmall Property, made few Controverſies, and ſo no need of any Laws to deſide them or Variety of Officers to ſuperintend the Proceſs, or look after the Execution of Juſtice, where there were but few Treſpaſſes, and few Offenders. Since then thoſe, who liked one another ſo well as to join into Society, cannot but be ſuppoſed to have ſome Acquaintance and Friendſhip together, and ſome Truſt one in another; they could not but have greater Apprehenſions of others, than of one of another: And therefore their firſt Care and Thought cannot but be ſuppoſed to be, how to ſecure themſelves againſt foreign Force. 'Twas natural for them to put themſelves under a *Frame of Government*, which might beſt ſerve to that End; and chuſe the wiſeſt and braveſt Man to conduct them in their Wars, and lead them out againſt their Enemies, and in this chiefly be their *Ruler*.

108. Thus we ſee, that the *Kings* of the *Indians* in *America*, which is ſtill a Pattern of the firſt Ages in *Aſia* and *Europe*, whilſt the Inhabitants were too few for the Country, and want of People and Money gave Men no Temptation to enlarge their Poſſeſſions of Land, or conteſt for wider Extent of Ground, are little more than *Generals of their Armies*; and though they command abſolutely in War, yet at home and in time of Peace they exerciſe very little Dominion, and have but a very moderate Sovereignty, the Reſolutions of Peace and War being ordinarily either in the People, or in a Council. Though the War itſelf, which admits not of of Plurality of Governors, naturally devolves the Command into the *King's ſole Authority*.

109. And thus in *Iſrael* it ſelf, the *chief Buſineſs of their Judges and firſt King* ſeems to have been *to be Captains of War*, and Leaders of their Armies; which, (beſides what is ſignified by *going out and in before the People*, which was, to march forth to War, and home again in the Heads of their Forces) appears plainly in the Story of *Jephtha*. The *Ammonites* making War upon *Iſrael*, the *Gileadites* in

Fear

Fear ſend to *Jephtha*, a Baſtard of their Family whom they had caſt off, and article with him, if he will aſſiſt them againſt the *Ammonites*, to make him their Ruler; which they do in theſe Words, *And the People made him Head and Captain over them*, Judg. xi. 11. which was, as it ſeems, all one as to be *Judge*. *And he judged Iſrael*, Judg. xii. 7. that is, was their *Captain-General ſix Years*. So when *Jotham* upbraids the *Shechemites* with the Obligation they had to *Gideon*, who had been their *Judge* and Ruler, he tells them, *he fought for you, and adventured his Life for, and deliver'd you out of the Hands of* Midian, *Judg.* ix. 17. Nothing mention'd of him, but what he did as a *General*: and indeed that is all is found in his Hiſtory, or in any of the reſt of the Judges. And *Abimelech* particularly is called *King*, tho' at moſt he was but their *General*. And when, being weary of the ill Conduct of *Samuel*'s Sons, the Children of *Iſrael* deſired a *King, like all the Nations to judge them, and to go out before them, and to fight their Battles*, 1 Sam. viii. 20. God granting their Deſire, ſays to *Samuel*, *I will ſend thee a Man, and thou ſhalt anoint him to be Captain over my People* Iſrael, *that he may ſave my People out of the Hands of the* Philiſtines, c. ix. v. 16. As if the only *Buſineſs of a King* had been to lead out their Armies, and fight in their Defence; and accordingly at his Inauguration pouring a Viol of Oil upon him, declares to *Saul*, that *the Lord had anointed him to be Captain over his Inheritance*, c. x. v. 1. And therefore thoſe, who after *Saul*'s being ſolemnly choſen and ſaluted *King* by the *Tribes* at *Miſpah*, were unwilling to have him their King, make no other Objection but this, *How ſhall this Man ſave us?* v. 27. as if they ſhould have ſaid, This Man is unfit to be our *King*, not having Skill and Conduct enough in War, to be able to defend us. And when God reſolved to transfer the Government to *David*, it is in theſe Words, *But now thy Kingdom ſhall not continue: The Lord hath ſought him a Man after his own Heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be Captain over his People*, c. xiii. v. 14. As if the whole *kingly Authority* were nothing elſe but to be their *General*: And therefore the *Tribes* who had ſtuck to *Saul*'s Family, and oppoſed *David*'s Reign, when they came to *Hebron* with Terms of Submiſſion to him, they tell him, amongſt other Arguments they had to ſubmit to him as to their King, That he was in effect their *King* in *Saul*'s Time, and therefore they had no Reaſon but to receive him as their *King* now. *Alſo* (ſay they) *in Time paſt, when* Saul *was King over us, thou waſt he that ledeſt out and broughteſt in* Iſrael, *and the Lord ſaid unto thee, thou ſhalt feed my People* Iſrael, *and thou ſhalt be a Captain over* Iſrael.

110. Thus, whether *a Family* by Degrees *grew up into a Common-wealth*, and the fatherly Authority being continued on to the elder Son, every one in his Turn growing up under it, tacitly ſubmitted to it, and the Eaſineſs and Equality of it not offending any one, every one acquieſced, till Time ſeem'd to have confirm'd it, and ſettled a Right of Succeſſion by Preſcription; or whether ſeveral Families, or the Deſcendants of ſeveral Families, whom Chance, Neighbourhood, or Buſineſs brought together, uniting into a Society, the need of a General, whoſe Conduct might defend them againſt their Enemies in War, and the great Confidence the Innocency and Sincerity of that poor but vertuous Age, (ſuch as are almoſt all thoſe which begin Governments, that ever come to laſt in the World) gave Men one of another, made the firſt Beginners of Common-wealths generally put the Rule into one Man's Hand, without any other expreſs Limitation or Reſtraint, but what the Nature of the Thing, and the End of Government required: Which ever of thoſe it was that at firſt put the Rule into the Hand of a ſingle Perſon, certain it is, no body was intruſted with it but for the publick Good and Safety, and to thoſe Ends in the Infancies of Common-wealths commonly uſed it. And unleſs thoſe who had it had done ſo, young Societies could not have ſubſiſted; without ſuch nurſing Fathers tender and careful of the publick Weal, all Governments would have ſunk under the Weakneſs and Infirmities of their Infancy, and the Prince and People had ſoon periſhed together.

111. But though the *Golden Age* (before vain Ambition, and *amor ſceleratus habendi*, evil Concupiſcence had corrupted Mens Minds into a Miſtake of true Power and Honour) had more Vertue, and conſequently better Governors, as well as leſs vicious Subjects; and there was then *no ſtretching Prerogative* on the one Side, to oppreſs the People; *nor* conſequently on the other, any *Diſpute about Privilege*, to leſſen or reſtrain the Power of the Magiſtrate, and ſo no Conteſt betwixt Rulers and People about Governors or Government: Yet, when Ambi-

tion

tion and Luxury in future Ages * would retain and increaſe the Power, without doing the Buſineſs for which it was given; and aided by Flattery, taught Princes to have diſtinct and ſeparate Intereſt from their People, Men found it neceſſary to examine more carefully the *Original* and Rights *of Government*; and to find out Ways to *reſtrain the Exorbitances*, and *prevent the Abuſes* of that Power which they having intruſted in another's Hands only for their own Good, they found was made uſe of to hurt them.

122. Thus we may ſee how probable it is, that People that were naturally free, and by their own Conſent either ſubmitted to the Government of their Father, or united together out of different Families, to make a Government, ſhould generally put the *Rule into one Man's Hands*, and chuſe to be under the Conduct of a *ſingle Perſon*, without ſo much as by expreſs Conditions limiting or regulating his Power, which they thought ſafe enough in his Honeſty and Prudence. Though they never dream'd of Monarchy being *Jure Divino*, which we never heard of among Mankind, till it was revealed to us in the Divinity of this laſt Age; nor ever allow'd paternal Power to have a Right to Dominion, or to be the Foundation of all Government. And thus much may ſuffice to ſhew, that as far as we have any Light from Hiſtory, we have Reaſon to conclude, that all peaceful Beginnings of *Government* have been *laid in the Conſent of the People*. I ſay, *peaceful*, becauſe I ſhall have Occaſion in another Place to ſpeak of Conqueſt, which ſome eſteem a Way of beginning of Governments.

The other Objection I find urg'd againſt the beginning of Polities, in the Way I have mention'd, is this, viz.

113. *That all Men being born under Government, ſome or other, it is impoſſible any of them ſhould ever be free, and at Liberty to unite together, and begin a new one, or ever be able to erect a lawful Government.*

If this Argument be good; I ask, how came ſo many lawful Monarchies into the World? For if any body, upon this Suppoſition, can ſhew me any one Man, in any Age of the World, free to begin a lawful Monarchy; I will be bound to ſhew him ten other *free Men* at Liberty, at the ſame time to unite and begin a new Government under a regal, or any other Form. It being Demonſtration, that if any one, *born under the Dominion* of another, may be ſo *free* as to have a Right to command others in a new and diſtinct Empire; every one that is *born under the Dominion* of an other may be ſo free too, and may become a Ruler, or Subject, of a diſtinct ſeparate Government. And ſo by this their own Principle, either all Men, however *born*, are *free*, or elſe there is but one lawful Prince, one lawful Government in the World. And then they have nothing to do but barely to ſhew us, which that is. Which, when they have done, I doubt not but all Mankind will eaſily agree to pay Obedience to him.

114. Though it be a ſufficient Anſwer to their Objection to ſhew, that it involves them in the ſame Difficulties that it doth thoſe, thy uſe it againſt; yet I ſhall endeavour to diſcover the Weakneſs of this Argument a little farther.

All Men, ſay they, *are born under Government, and therefore they cannot be at Liberty to begin a new one. Every one is born a Subject to his Father, or his Prince, and is therefore under the perpetual Tie of Subjection and Allegiance.* 'Tis plain Mankind never own'd nor conſidered any ſuch natural *Subjection that they were born in*, to one or to the other that tied them, without their own Conſents, to a Subjection to them and their Heirs.

115. For there are no Examples ſo frequent in Hiſtory, both ſacred and profane, as thoſe of Men withdrawing themſelves, and their Obedience, from the Juriſdiction they were born under, and the Family or Community they were bred up in, and *ſetting up new Governments* in other Places; from whence ſprang all that number of petty Common-wealths in the Beginning of Ages, and which always

* *At firſt, when ſome certain kind of Regiment was once approved, it may be, nothing was then further thought upon for the manner of governing, but all permitted unto the Wiſdom and Diſcretion which were to Rule, till by Experience they found this for all Parts very inconvenient, ſo as the thing which they had deviſed for a Remedy, did indeed but increaſe the Sore which it ſhould have cured. They ſaw, that to live by one Man's Will, became the Cauſe of all Mens Miſery. This conſtrained them to come unto Laws wherein all Men might ſee their Duty beforehand, and know the Penalties of tranſgreſſing them.* Hooker's Eccl. Pol. L. 1. Sect. 10.

multiply'd,

multiplied, as long as there was room enough, till the Stronger, or more Fortunate, ſwallowed the Weaker; and thoſe great ones again breaking to pieces, diſſolved into leſſer Dominions. All which are ſo many Teſtimonies againſt paternal Sovereignty, and plainly prove, That it was not the natural Right of the *Father* deſcending to his Heirs, that made Governments in the Beginning, ſince it was impoſſible, upon that Ground, there ſhould have been ſo many little Kingdoms; all muſt have been but only one univerſal Monarchy, if Men had not been at *Liberty to ſeparate* themſelves from their Families, and the Government, be it what it will, that was ſet up in it, and go and make diſtinct Common-wealths and other Governments, as they thought fit.

116. This has been the Practice of the World from its firſt Beginning to this Day; nor is it now any more Hindrance to the Freedom of Mankind, that they are *born under conſtituted and ancient Polities*, that have eſtabliſhed Laws and ſet Forms of Government, that if they were born in the Woods, amongſt the unconfined Inhabitants, that run looſe in them. For thoſe, who would perſuade us that *by being born under any Government, we are naturally Subjects to it*, and have no more any Title or Pretence to the Freedom of the State of Nature, have no other Reaſon (bating that of paternal Power, which we have already anſwer'd) to produce for it, but only, becauſe our Fathers or Progenitors paſſed away their natural Liberty, and thereby bound up themſelves and their Poſterity to a perpetual Subjection to the Government, which they themſelves ſubmitted to. 'Tis true that whatever Engagements or Promiſes any one has made for himſelf, he is under the Obligation of them, but *cannot* by any *Compact* whatſoever, *bind his Children or Poſterity*. For his Son, when a Man, being altogether as free as the Father, any *Act of the Father can no more give away the Liberty of the Son*, than it can of any body elſe: He may indeed annex ſuch Conditions to the Land, he enjoyed as a Subject of any Common-wealth, as may oblige his Son to be of that Community, if he will enjoy thoſe Poſſeſſions which were his Father's; becauſe that Eſtate being his Father's Property, he may diſpoſe or ſettle it, as he pleaſes.

117. And this has generally given the Occaſion to miſtake in this Matter; becauſe Common-wealths not permitting any Part of their Dominions to be diſmembred, nor to be enjoyed by any but thoſe of their Community, the Son cannot ordinarily enjoy the Poſſeſſion of his Father, but under the ſame Terms his Father did: by becoming a Member of the Society; whereby he puts himſelf preſently under the Government, he finds there eſtabliſhed, as much as any other Subject of that Common-wealth. And thus *the Conſent of Freemen, born under Government*, which only *makes them Members of it*, being given ſeparately in their Turns, as each comes to be of Age, and not in a Multitude together; People take no Notice of it, and thinking it not done at all, or not neceſſary, conclude they are naturally Subjects as they are Men.

118. But, 'tis plain, *Governments* themſelves underſtand it otherwiſe; they claim *no Power over the Son, becauſe of that they had over the Father*; nor look on Children as being their Subjects, by their Father being ſo. If a Subject of *England* have a Child, by an *Engliſh* Woman in *France*, whoſe Subject is he? Not the King of *England*'s; for he muſt have Leave to be admitted to the Pivileges of it. Nor the King of *France*'s: For how then has his Father a Liberty to bring him away, and breed him as he pleaſes? And whoever was judged as a *Traitor* or *Deſerter*, if he left or warr'd againſt a Country, for being barely born in it of Parents that were Alians there? 'Tis plain then, by the Practice of Governments themſelves, as well as by the Law of right Reaſon, that *a Child is born a Subject of no Country or Government*. He is under his Father's Tuition and Authority, till he comes to Age of Diſcretion; and then he is a Freeman, at Liberty what Government he will put himſelf under; what Body politick he will unite himſelf to. For if an *Engliſhman*'s Son, born in *France*, be at Liberty and may do ſo, 'tis evident there is no Tie upon him by his Father's being a Subject of this Kingdom; nor is he bound up, by any Compact of his Anceſtors. And why then hath not his Son, by the ſame Reaſon, the ſame Liberty, though he be born any where elſe? Since the Power that a Father hath naturally over his Children, is the ſame where ever they be born; and the Ties of natural Obligations, are not bounded by the poſitive Limits of Kingdoms and Common-wealths.

119. *Every Man* being, as has been ſhewed, *naturally free*, and nothing being able to put him into Subjection to any earthly Power, but only his own *Conſent*, it is to be conſider'd, what ſhall be underſtood to be a *ſufficient Declaration* of a Man's *Conſent, to make him ſubject* to the Law of any Government. There is a common Diſtinction of an expreſs and a tacit Conſent, which will concern our preſent Caſe. No Body doubts but an expreſs *Conſent*, of any Man, entring into any Society, makes him a perfect Member of that Society, a Subject of that Government. The Difficulty is, what ought to be look'd upon as a *tacit Conſent*, and how far it binds, *i. e.* how far any one ſhall be looked on to have conſented, and thereby ſubmitted to any Government, where he has made no Expreſſions of it at all. And to this I ſay, that every Man, that hath any Poſſeſſions, or Enjoyment, of any Part of the Dominion of any Government, doth thereby give his *tacit Conſent*, and is as far forth obliged to Obedience to the Laws of that Government, during ſuch Enjoyment, as any one under it; whether this his Poſſeſſion be of Land, to him and his Heirs for ever, or a Lodging only for a Week; or whether it be barely travelling freely on the Highway; and in effect, it reaches as far as the very Being of any one within the Teritorries of that Government.

120. To underſtand this the better, it is fit to conſider, that every Man, when he, at firſt, incorporates himſelf into any Common-wealth, he, by his uniting himſelf thereunto, annexed alſo, and ſubmits to the Community thoſe Poſſeſſions, which he has, or ſhall acquire, that do not already belong to any other Government. For it would be a direct Contradiction, for any one, to enter into Society with others for the ſecuring and regulating of Property: And yet to ſuppoſe his Land, whoſe Property is to be regulated by the Laws of the Society, ſhould be exempt from the Juriſdiction of that Government, to which he himſelf, the Proprietor of the Land is a Subject, by the ſame Act therefore, whereby any one unites his Perſon, which was before free, to any Common-wealth; by the ſame he unites his Poſſeſſions, which was before free, to it alſo; and they become, both of them, Perſon and Poſſeſſion, ſubject to the Government and Dominion of that Common-wealth, as long as it hath a Being. Whoever therefore, from thenceforth, by Inheritance, Purchaſe, Permiſſion, or otherways, *enjoys any Part of the Land*, ſo annexed to, and under the Government *of that Common-wealth, muſt take it with the Condition* it is under; that is, *of ſubmitting to the Government of the Common-wealth*, under whoſe Juriſdiction it is, as far forth as any Subject of it.

121. But ſince the Government has a direct Juriſdiction only over the Land, and reaches the Poſſeſſor of it, (before he has actually incorporated himſelf in the Society) only as he dwells upon, and enjoys that: The Obligation any one is under, by Virtue of ſuch Enjoyment, to *ſubmit to the Government, begins and ends with the Enjoyment*; ſo that whenever the Owner, who has given nothing but ſuch a *tacit Conſent* to the Government, will, by Donation, Sale, or otherwiſe, quit the ſaid Poſſeſſion, he is at Liberty to go and incorporate himſelf into any other Common-wealth; or to agree with others to begin a new one, *in vacuis locis*, in any part of the World, they can find free and unpoſſeſſed: Whereas he that has once, by actual Agreement, and any *expreſs* Declaration, given his *Conſent* to be of any Common-weal, is perptually and indiſpenſably obliged to be, and remain unalterably a Subject to it, and can never be again in the Liberty of the State of Nature; unleſs, by any Calamity, the Government he was under, comes to be diſſolv'd; or elſe by ſome publick Acts cuts him off from being any longer a Member of it.

122. But ſubmitting to the Laws of any Country, living quietly, and enjoying Privileges and Protection under them, *makes not a Man a Member of that Society*: This is only a local Protection and Homage due to, and from all thoſe, who, not being in the State of War, come within the Territories belonging to any Government, to all Parts whereof the Force of its Law extends. But this no more *makes a Man a Member of that Society*, a perpetual Subject of that Common-wealth, than it would make a Man a Subject to another, in whoſe Family he found it convenient to abide for ſome time; though, whilſt he continu'd in it, he were oblig'd to comply with the Laws, and ſubmit to the Government, he found there. And thus we ſee, that *Foreigners*, by living all their Lives under another Government, and enjoying the Privileges and Protection of it, though they are bound, even in Conſcience, to ſubmit to its Adminiſtration, as far forth as any Deniſon; yet do

not

not thereby come to be *Subjects or Members of that Common-wealth.* Nothing can make any Man ſo, but his actually entering into it by poſitive Engagement, and expreſs Promiſe and Compact. This is that, which I think, concerning the Beginning of political Societies, and that *Conſent which makes any one a Member* of any Common-wealth.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Ends of Political Society and Government.

123. IF Man in the State of Nature be ſo free, as has been ſaid; if he be abſolute Lord of his own Perſon and Poſſeſſions, equal to the greateſt and ſubject to no Body, why will he part with his Freedom? Why will he give up this Empire, and ſubject himſelf to the Dominion and Controul of any other Power? To which, 'tis obvious to anſwer, that though in the State of Nature he hath ſuch a Right, yet the Enjoyment of it is very uncertain, and conſtantly expoſed to the Invaſions of others. For all being Kings as much as he, every Man his equal, and the greater Part no ſtrict Obſervers of Equity and Juſtice, the Enjoyment of the Property he has in this State, is very unſafe, very unſecure. This makes him willing to quit this Condition, which however free, is full of Fears and continual Dangers: and 'tis not without Reaſon, that he ſeeks out, and is willing to join in Society with others, who are already united, or have a mind to unite, for the mutual *Preſervation* of their Lives, Liberties and Eſtates, which I call by the general Name, *Property.*

124. The great and *chief End* therefore, of Mens uniting into Common-wealths, and putting themſelves under Government, *is the Preſervation of their Property.* To which in the State of Nature there are many Things wanting.

Firſt, There wants an *eſtabliſh'd*, ſettled, known *Law*, received and allow'd by common Conſent to be the Standard of Right and Wrong, and the common Meaſure to decide all Controverſies between them. For though the Law of Nature be plain and intelligible to all rational Creatures; yet Men being biaſſed by their Intereſt, as well as Ignorant for want of Study of it, are not apt to allow of it as a Law binding to them in the Application of it to their particular Caſes.

125. *Secondly*, In the State of Nature there wants *a known and indifferent Judge*, with Authority to determine all Differences according to the eſtabliſh'd Law. For every one, in that State, being both Judge and Executioner of the Law of Nature, Men being partial to themſelves, Paſſion and Revenge is very apt to carry them too far, and with too much Heat, in their own Caſes; as well as Negligence, and Unconcernedneſs, to make them too Remiſs in other Mens.

126. *Thirdly*, In the State of Nature there often wants *Power* to back and ſupport the Sentence when Right, and to *give* it due *Execution.* They who by any Injuſtice offend, will ſeldom fail, where they are able, by Force to make good their Injuſtice; ſuch Reſiſtance many times makes the Puniſhment dangerous, and frequently deſtructive, to thoſe who attempt it.

127. Thus Mankind, notwithſtanding all the Privileges of the ſtate of Nature, being but in an ill Condition, while they remain in it, are quickly driven into Society. Hence it comes to paſs, that we ſeldom find any Number of Men live any time together in this State. The Inconveniencies that they are therein expoſed to, by the irregular, and uncertain Exerciſe of the Power every Man has of puniſhing the Tranſgreſſions of others, make them take Sanctuary under the eſtabliſh'd Laws of Government, and therein ſeek *the Preſervation of their Property.* 'Tis this makes them ſo willingly give up every one his ſingle Power of puniſhing, to be exerciſed by ſuch alone, as ſhall be appointed to it, amongſt them; and by ſuch Rules as the Community, or thoſe authorized by them to that Purpoſe, ſhall agree on. And in this we have the original *Right and Riſe of both the legiſlative and executive Power*, as well as of the Governments, and Societies themſelves.

128. For in the State of Nature, to omit the Liberty he has of innocent Delights, a Man has two Powers.

The firſt is to do whatſoever he thinks fit for the Preſervation of himſelf, and others within the Permiſſion of the *Law of Nature*, by which Law, common to them all, he and all the reſt of *Mankind are of one Community*, make up one Society, diſtinct from all other Creatures. And were it not for the Corruption and Viſiouſneſs of degenerate Men, there would be no need of any other; no Neceſſity that Men ſhould ſeparate from this great and natural Community, and by poſitive Agreements combine into ſmaller and divided Aſſociations.

The other Power a Man has in the State of Nature, is the *Power to puniſh the Crimes* committed againſt that Law. Both theſe he gives up, when he joins in a private, if I may ſo call it, or particular political Society, and incorporates into any Common-wealth, ſeparate from the reſt of Mankind.

129. The firſt *Power, viz. of doing whatſoever he thought fit for the Preſervation of himſelf*, and the reſt of Mankind, *he gives up* to be regulated by Laws made by the Society, ſo far forth as the Preſervation of himſelf, and the reſt of that Society ſhall require; which Laws of the Society in many Things confine the Liberty he had by the Law of Nature.

130. *Secondly*, The *Power of puniſhing he wholly gives up*, and engages his natural Force, (which he might before employ in the Execution of the Law of Nature, by his own ſingle Authority, as he thought fit) to aſſiſt the executive Power of the Society, as the Law thereof ſhall require. For being now in a new State, wherein he is to enjoy many Conveniencies, from the Labour, Aſſiſtance, and Society of others in the ſame Community, as well as Protection from its whole Strength; he is to Part alſo with as much as his natural Liberty, in providing for himſelf, as the Good, Proſperity, and Safety of the Society ſhall require; which is not only neceſſary, but juſt; ſince the other Members of the Society do the like.

131. But though Men when they enter into Society, give up the Equality, Liberty, and executive Power they had in the State of Nature, into the Hands of the Society, to be ſo far diſpoſed of by the Legiſlative, as the good of the Society ſhall require; yet it being only with an Intention in every one the better to preſerve himſelf his Liberty and Property; (For no rational Creature can be ſuppoſed to change his Condition with an Intention to be worſe) the Power of the Society, or *Legiſlative* conſtituted by them, can *never be ſuppos'd to extend farther than the common Good*; but is obliged to ſecure every ones Property, by providing againſt thoſe three Defects above-mention'd, that made the State of Nature ſo unſafe and uneaſie. And ſo whoever has the Legiſlative or ſupreme Power of any Common-wealth, is bound to govern by eſtabliſh'd *ſtanding Laws*, promulgated and known to the People, and not by extemporary Decrees; by *indifferent* and upright *Judges*, who are to decide Controverſies by thoſe Laws: and to employ the Force of the Community at Home, *only in the Execution of ſuch Laws*, or Abroad to prevent or redreſs foreign Injuries, and ſecure the Community from Inroads and Invaſion. And all this to be directed to no other *End*, but the *Peace*, *Safety*, and *publick Good* of the People.

CHAP. X.

Of the Forms of a Common-wealth.

132. THE Majority having, as has been ſhew'd, upon Mens firſt uniting into Society, the whole Power of the Community, naturally in them, may employ all that Power in making Laws for the Community from time to time, and executing thoſe Laws by Officers of their own appointing; and then the *Form* of the Government is a perfect *Democracy*: Or elſe may put the Power of making Laws into the Hands of a few ſelect Men, and their Heirs or Succeſſors; and then it is an *Oligarchy*: Or elſe into the Hands of one Man, and then it is a *Monarchy*: If to him and his Heirs, it is an *Hereditary Monarchy*: If to him only for Life, but upon his Death the Power only of nominating a Succeſſor to return to them; an *Elective Monarchy*. And ſo accordingly of theſe, the Community may make compounded and mixt Forms of Government, as they think good. And if the Legiſlative Power be at firſt given by the Majority to one or more Perſons only for

for their Lives, or any limited Time, and then the ſupreme Power to revert to them again; when it is ſo reverted, the Community may diſpoſe of it again anew into what Hands they pleaſe, and ſo conſtitute a new Form of Government. For the *Form of Government depending upon the placing the* ſupreme Power, which is *the Legiſlative*, it being impoſſible to conceive that an inferior Power ſhould preſcribe to a ſuperior, or any but the Supreme make Laws, according as the Power of making Laws is placed, ſuch is the *Form of the Common-wealth.*

133. By *Common-wealth*, I muſt be underſtood all along to mean, not a Democracy, or any Form of Government, but *any independant Community* which the *Latines* ſignified by the Word *Civitas*, to which the Word which beſt anſwers in our Language, is *Common-wealth*, and moſt properly expreſſes ſuch a Society of Men, which Community or City in *Engliſh* does not, for there may be ſubordinate Communities in a Government; and City amongſt us has a quite different Notion from Common-wealth: And therefore to avoid Ambiguity, I crave Leave to uſe the Word *Common-wealth* in that Senſe, in which I find it uſed by King *James* the firſt, and I take it to be its genuine Signification; which if any Body diſlike, I conſent with him to change it for a better.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Extent of the Legiſlative Power.

134. THE great End of Mens entring into Society, being the Enjoyment of their Properties in Peace and Safety, and the great Inſtrument and Means of that being the Laws eſtabliſh'd in that Society; the *firſt and fundamental poſitive Law* of all Common-wealths, *is the eſtabliſhing of the Legiſlative* Power; as the *firſt and fundamental natural Law*, which is to govern even the Legiſlative it ſelf, *is the Preſervation of the Society*, and (as far as will conſiſt with the publick Good) of every Perſon in it. This *Legiſlative* is not only *the ſupreme Power* of the Common-wealth, but ſacred and unalterable in the Hands where the Community have once placed it; nor can any Edict of any body elſe, in what Form ſoever conceiv'd, or by what Power ſoever back'd, have the Force and Obligation of a *Law*, which has not its *Sanction from* that *Legiſlative*, which the Publick has choſen and appointed. For without this the Law could not have that, which is abſolutely neceſſary to its being a *Law*, * *the Conſent of the Society*, over whom no Body can have a Power to make Laws, but by their own Conſent, and by Authority received from them; and therefore all the *Obedience*, which by the moſt ſolemn Ties any one can be obliged *to* pay, ultimately terminates in this *ſupreme Power*, and is directed by thoſe Laws which it enacts: Nor can any Oaths to any foreign Power whatſoever, or any domeſtick ſubordinate Power, diſcharge any Member of the Sotiety from his *Obedience to the Legiſlative*, acting purſuant to their Truſt; nor oblige him to any Obedience contrary to the Laws ſo enacted, or farther than they do allow; it being rediculous to imagine one can be tied ultimately to *obey* any *Power* in the Society, which is not the *Supreme*.

135. Though the *Legiſlative*, whether placed in one or more, whether it be always in being, or only by intervals, tho' it be the *ſupreme* Power in every Common-wealth; yet,

Firſt, It is *not*, nor can poſſibly be abſolutely *Arbitrary* over the Lives and Fortunes of the People. For it being but the joint Power of every Member of the

* *The lawful Power of making Laws to Command whole Politick Societies of Men, belonging ſo properly unto the ſame intire Societies, that for any Prince or Potentate of what Kind ſoever upon Earth, to exerciſe the ſame of himſelf, and not by expreſs Commiſſion immediately and perſonally received from God, or elſe by authority derived at the firſt from their Conſent, upon whoſe Perſons they impoſe Laws, it is no better than mere* Tyranny. *Laws they are not therefore which publick Approbation hath not made ſo.* Hooker's Eccl. Pol. L. 1. Sect. 10. *Of this Point therefore, we are to Note, that ſith Men naturally have no full and perfect Power to command whole Politick multitudes of Men, therefore utterly without our Conſent, we could in ſuch ſort be at no Man's Commandment living. And to be commanded we do conſent when that Society, whereof we be a Part, hath at any time before conſented, without revoking the ſame after by the like univerſal Agreement.*

Laws therefore human, of what Kind ſoever, are available by Conſent. Ibid.

Society given up to that Perſon, or Aſſembly, which is Legiſlator; it can be no more than thoſe Perſons had in a State of Nature before they entered into Society, and gave up to the Community. For no Body can transfer to another more Power, than he has in himſelf; and no Body has an abſolute arbitrary Power over himſelf, or over any other, to deſtroy his own Life, or take away the Life or Property of another. A Man, as has been prov'd, cannot ſubject himſelf to the arbitrary Power of another; and having in the State of Nature no arbitrary Power over the Life, Liberty, or Poſſeſſion of another, but only ſo much as the Law of Nature gave him for the Preſervation of himſelf, and the reſt of Mankind; this is all he doth, or can give up to the Common-Wealth, and by it to the *Legiſlative Power*, ſo that the Legiſlative can have no more than this. Their Power in the utmoſt Bounds of it, is *limited to the publick good* of the Society. It is a Power, that hath no other End but Preſervation, and therefore can never * have a Right to deſtroy, enſlave, or deſignedly to impoveriſh the Subjects. The Obligations of the Law of Nature, ceaſe not in Society, but only in many Caſes are drawn cloſer, and have by human Laws known Penalties annexed to them, to inforce their Obſervation. Thus the Law of Nature ſtands as an eternal Rule to all Men, *Legiſlators* as well as others. The *Rules* that they make for other Mens Actions, muſt, as well as their own, and other Mens Actions, be conformable to the Law of Nature, *i.e.* to the Will of God, of which that is a Declaration, and the *fundamental Law of Nature being the Preſervation of Mankind*, no human Sanction can be good, or valid againſt it.

136. *Secondly*, † The *Legiſlative*, or ſupreme Authority, cannot aſſume to its ſelf a Power to Rule by extemporary arbitrary Decrees, but *is bound to diſpenſe Juſtice*, and decide the Rights of the Subject *by promulgated ſtanding Laws, and known authoriz'd Judges*. For the Law of Nature being unwritten, and ſo no where to be found but in the Minds of Men, they who through Paſſion or Intereſt ſhall miſcite, or miſapply it, cannot ſo eaſily be convinced of their Miſtake, where there is no eſtabliſh'd Judge: And ſo it ſerves not, as it ought to determine the Rights, and fence the Properties of thoſe that live under it, eſpecially where every one is Judge, Interpreter, and Executioner of it too, and that in his own Caſe: And he that has Right on his Side, having ordinarily but his own ſingle Strength, hath not Force enough to defend himſelf from Injuries, or to puniſh Delinquents. To avoid theſe Inconveniencies, which diſorder Mens Properties in the State of Nature, Men unite into Societies, that they may have the united Strength of the whole Society to ſecure and defend their Properties, and may have *ſtanding Rules* to bound it, by which every one may know, what is his. To this End it is that Men give up all their natural Power to the Society, which they enter into, and the Community put the Legiſlative Power into ſuch Hands as they think fit, with this Truſt, that they ſhall be govern'd by *declar'd Laws*, or elſe their Peace, Quiet, and Property will ſtill be at the ſame Uncertainty, as it was in the State of Nature.

137. Abſolute arbitrary Power, or governing without *ſettled ſtanding Laws*, can neither of them conſiſt with the Ends of Society and Government, which Men would not quit the Freedom of the State of Nature for, and tie themſelves up under, were it not to preſerve their Lives, Liberties and Fortunes; and by

---

* *Two Foundations there are which bear up publick Societies, the one a natural Inclination, whereby all Men deſire ſociable Life and Fellowſhip; the other an Order, expreſly or ſecretly agreed upon, touching the Manner of their Union in living together; the latter is that which we call the Law of a Common-weal, the very Soul of a politick Body, the Parts whereof are by Law animated, held together, and ſet on work in ſuch Actions as the common Good requireth. Laws Politick, ordain'd for external Order and Regiment amongſt Men, are never framed as they ſhould be, unleſs preſuming the Will of Man to be inwardly Obſtinate, Rebellious, and Averſe from all Obedience to the ſacred Laws of his Nature: In a Word, unleſs preſuming Man to be in regard of his depraved Mind, little better than a wild Beaſt, they do accordingly provide notwithſtanding ſo to frame his outward Actions, that they be no Hindrance unto the common Good, for which Societies are inſtituted. Unleſs they do this they are not perfect.* Hooker's Eccl. Pol. L. 1. Sect. 10.

† *Human Laws are Meaſures in reſpect of Men whoſe Actions they muſt direct, howbeit ſuch Meaſures they are as have alſo their higher Rules to be meaſured by, which Rules are two, the Law of God, and the Law of Nature; ſo that Laws Human muſt be made according to the general Laws of Nature, and without Contradiction to any poſitive Law of Scripture, otherwiſe they are ill made.* Ibid. L. 3. Sect. 9.

To conſtrain Men to any Thing inconvenient doth ſeem unreaſonable. Ibid. L. 1. Sect. 10.

ſtated

ſtated Rules of Right and Property to ſecure their Peace and Quiet. It cannot be ſuppoſed that they ſhould intend, had they a Power ſo to do, to give to any one, or more, an *abſolute arbitrary Power* over their Perſons and Eſtates, and put a Force into the Magiſtrates Hand to execute his unlimited Will arbitrarily upon them. This were to put themſelves into a worſe Condition than the State of Nature, wherein they had a Liberty to defend their Right againſt the Injuries of others, and were upon equal Terms of Force to maintain it, whether invaded by a ſingle Man, or many in Combination. Whereas by ſuppoſing they have given up themſelves to the *abſolute arbitrary Power* and Will of a Legiſlator, they have diſarmed themſelves, and armed him, to make Prey of them when he pleaſes. He being in a much worſe Condition, who is expoſed to the arbitrary Power of one Man who has the Command of 100000, than he that is expos'd to the Arbitrary Power of 100000 ſingle Men; no body being ſecure, that his Will, who hath ſuch a Command, is better, than that of other Men, tho' his Force be 100000 times ſtronger. And therefore whatever Form the Common-wealth is under, the ruling Power ought to govern by *declared* and *received Laws*, and not by extemporary Dictates and undetermin'd Reſolutions. For then Mankind will be in a far worſe Condition, than in the State of Nature, if they ſhall have armed one, or a few Men with the joint Power of a Multitude, to force them to obey at Pleaſure the exorbitant and unlimited Decrees of their ſudden Thoughts, or unreſtrain'd, and till that Moment unknown Wills, without having any Meaſures ſet down which may guide and juſtify their Actions. For all the Power the Government has, being only for the good of the Society, as it ought not to be *Arbitrary* and at Pleaſure, ſo it ought to be exerciſed by *eſtabliſhed and promulgated Laws*; that both the People may know their Duty, and be ſafe and ſecure within the Limits of the Law; and the Rulers too kept within their due Bounds, and not be tempted, by the Power they have in their Hands, to employ it to ſuch Purpoſes, and by ſuch Meaſures, as they would not have known, and own not willingly.

138. *Thirdly*, The *ſupreme Power cannot take* from any Man any Part of his *Property* without his own Conſent. For the Preſervation of Property being the End of Government, and that for which Men enter into Society, it neceſſarily ſuppoſes and requires, that the People ſhould *have Property*, without which they muſt be ſuppoſed to loſe that, by entering into Society, which was the End for which they entred into it, too groſs an Abſurdity for any Man to own. *Men* therefore *in Society having Property*, they have ſuch a Right to the Goods, which by the Law of the Community are theirs, that no body hath a Right to take their Subſtance or any Part of it from them, without their own Conſent; without this they have no *Property* at all. For I have truely no *Property* in that, which another can by Right take from me, when he pleaſes, againſt my Conſent. Hence it is a Miſtake to think, that the *ſupreme or legiſlative Power* of any Common-wealth, can do what it will, and diſpoſe of the Eſtates of the Subjects *arbitrarily*, or take any Part of them at Pleaſure. This is not much to be fear'd in Governments, where the *Legiſlative* conſiſts wholly or in part, in Aſſemblies which are variable, whoſe Members upon the Diſſolution of the Aſſembly, are Subjects under the Common Laws of their Country, equally with the reſt. But in Governments, where the *Legiſlative* is in one laſting Aſſembly always in being, or in one Man, as in abſolute Monarchies, there is Danger ſtill, that they will think themſelves to have a diſtinct Intereſt, from the reſt of the Community; and ſo will be apt to increaſe their own Riches and Power, by taking what they think fit from the People. For a Man's *Property* is not at all ſecure, tho' there be good and equitable Laws to ſet the Bounds of it, between him and his Fellow-Subjects, if he who Commands thoſe Subjects, have Power to take from any private Man, what Part he pleaſes of his *Property*, and uſe and diſpoſe of it as he thinks good.

139. But *Government*, into whatſoever Hands it is put, being, as I have before ſhew'd, intruſted with this Condition, and *for this End*, that Men might have and ſecure their *Properties*, the Prince, or Senate, however it may have Power to make Laws, for the regulating of *Property*, between the Subjects one amongſt another, yet can never have a Power to take to themſelves the whole, or any Part of the Subjects *Property*, without their own Conſent. For this would be in effect to leave them no *Property* at all. And to let us ſee, that even *abſolute Power*, where

where it is neceſſary, is not *Arbitrary* by being abſolute, but is ſtill limited by that Reaſon, and confin'd to thoſe Ends, which requir'd it in ſome Caſes to be abſolute, we need look no farther than the common Practice of Martial Diſcipline. For the Preſervation of the Army, and in it the whole Common-wealth, requires an *abſolute Obedience* to the Command of every ſuperior Officer, and it is juſtly Death to diſobey or diſpute the moſt dangerous or unreaſonable of them; but yet we ſee, that neither the Serjeant, that could Command a Soldier to march up to the Mouth of a Cannon, or ſtand in a Breach, where he is almoſt ſure to periſh, can Command that Soldier to give him one Penny of his Money; nor the *General*, that can condemn him to Death for deſerting his Poſt, or for not obeying the moſt deſperate Orders, can yet with all his *abſolute Power* of Life and Death, diſpoſe of one Farthing of that Soldier's Eſtate, or ſeize one Jot of his Goods; whom yet he can command any Thing, and hang for the leaſt Diſobedience. Becauſe ſuch a blind Obedience is neceſſary to that End, for which the Commander has his Power, *viz.* the Preſervation of the reſt; but the diſpoſing of his Goods has nothing to do with it.

140. 'Tis true, Governments cannot be ſupported without great Charge, and 'tis fit every one who enjoys a Share of the Protection, ſhould pay out of his Eſtate his Proportion for the Maintenance of it. But ſtill it muſt be with his own Conſent, *i. e.* the Conſent of the Majority, giving it either by themſelves, or their Repreſentatives choſen by them. For if any one ſhall claim a *Power to lay* and levy *Taxes* on the People, by his own Authority, and without ſuch Conſent of the People, he thereby invades the *fundamental Law of Property*, and ſubverts the End of Government. For what Property have I in that, which another may by Right take, when he pleaſes to himſelf?

141. *Fourthly*, The *Legiſlative cannot tranſfer the Power of making Laws* to any other Hands. For it being but a delegative Power from the People, they who have it, cannot paſs it over to others. The People alone can appoint the Form of the Common-wealth, which is by conſtituting the Legiſlative, and appointing in whoſe Hands that ſhall be. And when the People have ſaid, we will ſubmit to Rules, and be govern'd by *Laws* made by ſuch Men, and in ſuch Forms, no Body elſe can ſay other Men ſhall make *Laws* for them; nor can the People be bound by any *Laws*, but ſuch as are enacted by thoſe whom they have choſen, and authorized to make *Laws* for them. The Power of the *Legiſlative* being derived from the People by a poſitive voluntary Grant and Inſtitution, can be no other, than what that poſitive Grant convey'd, which being only to make *Laws*, and not to make *Legiſlators*, the *Legiſlative* can have no Power to transfer their Authority of making Laws, and place it in other Hands.

142. Theſe are the *Bounds* which we truſt, that is put in them by the Society, and the Law of God and Nature, have *ſet to the Legiſlative* Power of every Common-wealth, in all Forms of Government.

Firſt, They are to govern by *promulgated eſtabliſh'd Laws*, not to be varied in particular Caſes, but to have one Rule for Rich and Poor, for the Favourite at Court, and the Country Man at Plough.

Secondly, Theſe *Laws* alſo ought to be deſigned *for* no other End ultimately, but *the good of the People.*

Thirdly, They muſt *not raiſe Taxes* on the *Property of the People, without the Conſent of the People*, given by themſelves or their Deputies. And this properly concerns only ſuch Governments where the *Legiſlative* is always in being, or at leaſt where the People have not reſerv'd any Part of the Legiſlative to Deputies, to be from Time to Time choſen by themſelves.

Fourthly, The *Legiſlative* neither muſt *nor can tranſfer the Power of making Laws* to any body elſe, or place it any where, but where the People have.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Of the Legiſlative, Executive, and Federative Power of the Common-wealth.

143. THE *Legiſlative* Power is that, which has a Right *to direct how the Force of the Common-wealth* ſhall be employ'd for preſerving the Community and the Members of it. But becauſe thoſe Laws which are conſtantly to be Executed, and whoſe Force is always to continue, may be made in a little time; therefore there is no need, that the *Legiſlative* ſhould be always in Being, not having always Buſineſs to do. And becauſe it may be too great a Temptation to human Frailty, apt to graſp at Power, for the ſame Perſons, who have the Power of making Laws, to have alſo in their Hands the Power to execute them, whereby they exempt themſelves from Obedience to the Laws they make, and ſuit the Law, both in its making, and execution, to their own private Advantage, and thereby come to have a diſtinct Intereſt from the reſt of the Community, contrary to the End of Socicty and Government: Therefore in well order'd Common-wealths, where the Good of the whole is ſo conſidered, as it ought, the *Legiſlative* Power is put into the Hands of divers Perſons, who duly aſſembled, have by themſelves, or jointly with others, a Power to make Laws, which when they have done, being ſeparated again, they are themſelves ſubject to the Laws, they have made; which is a new, and near Tie upon them, to take Care, that they make them for the publick Good.

144. But becauſe the Laws, that are at once, and in a ſhort time made, have a conſtant and laſting Force, and need a *perpetual Execution*, or an Attendance thereunto: Therefore 'tis neceſſary there ſhould be a *Power always in Being*, which ſhould ſee to the *Execution* of the Laws that are made, and remain in Force. And thus the *Legiſlative* and *Executive Power* come often to be ſeparated.

145. There is another *Power* in every Common-wealth, which one may call *natural*, becauſe it is that which anſwers to the Power every Man naturally had before he entered into Society. For though in a Common-wealth the Members of it are diſtinct Perſons ſtill in reference to one another, and as ſuch are governed by the Laws of the Society; yet in reference to the reſt of Mankind, they make one Body, which is, as every Member of it before was, ſtill in the State of Nature with the reſt of Mankind. Hence it is, that the Controverſies that happen between any Man of the Society with thoſe that are out of it, are managed by the Publick; and an Injury done to a Member of their Body, engages the whole in the Reparation of it. So that under this Conſideration, the whole Community is one Body in the State of Nature, in reſpect of all other States or Perſons out of its Community.

146. This therefore contains the Power of War and Peace, Leagues and Alliances, and all the Tranſactions, with all Perſons and Communities without the Common-wealth, and may be called *Federative*, if any one pleaſes. So the Thing be underſtood, I am indifferent as to the Name.

147. Theſe two Powers, *Executive* and *Federative*, though they be really diſtinct in themſelves, yet one comprehending the *Execution* of the Municipal Laws of the Society *within* its ſelf, upon all that are Parts of it; the other the Mannagement of the *Security and Intereſt of the Publick without*, with all thoſe that it may receive Benefit or Damage from, yet they are always almoſt united. And tho' this *Federative Power* in the well or ill Mannagement of it be of great Moment to the Common-wealth, yet it is much leſs capable to be directed by antecedent, ſtanding, poſitive Laws, than the *Executive*; and ſo muſt neceſſarily be left to the Prudence and Wiſdom of thoſe, whoſe Hands it is in, to be managed for the publick Good. For the *Laws* that concern Subjects one amongſt another, being to direct their Actions, may well enough *precede* them. But what is to be done, in reference to *Foreigners*, depending much upon their Actions, and the Variation of Deſigns and Intereſts, muſt be *left* in great part *to the Prudence* of thoſe, who have this Power committed to them, to be managed by the beſt of their Skill, for the Advantage of the Common-wealth.

148. Though,

148. Though, as I ſaid, the *executive* and *federative Power* of every Community be really diſtinct in themſelves, yet they are hardly to be ſeparated, and placed at the ſame time, in the Hands of diſtinct Perſons. For both of them requiring the Force of the Society for their Exerciſe, it is almoſt impracticable to Place the Force of the Common-wealth in diſtinct, and not ſubordinate Hands; or that the *executive* and *federative Power* ſhould be *placed* in Perſons, that might act ſeparately, whereby the Force of the Publick would be under different Commands, which would be apt ſometime or other to cauſe Diſorder and Ruin.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Subordination of the Powers of the Common-wealth.

149. THough in a conſtituted Common-wealth, ſtanding upon its own Baſis, and acting according to its own Nature, that is, acting for the Preſervation of the Community, there can be but *one ſupreme Power*, which is *the Legiſlative*, to which all the reſt are and muſt be Subordinate, yet the Legiſlative being only a fiduciary Power to act for certain Ends, there remains ſtill *in the People a ſupreme Power to remove or alter the Legiſlative*, when they find the *Legiſlative* act contrary to the Truſt repoſed in them. For all *Power given with Truſt* for the attaining an *End*, being limited, by that End, whenever that *End* is manifeſtly neglected, or oppoſed, the *Truſt* muſt neceſſarily be *forfeitrd*, and the Power devolve into the Hands of thoſe that gave it, who may place it a-new where they ſhall think beſt for their Safety and Security. And thus the *Community* perpetually *retains a ſupreme Power* of ſaving themſelves from the Attempts and Deſigns of any body, even of their Legiſlators, when ever they ſhall be ſo fooliſh, or ſo wicked, as to lay and carry on Deſigns againſt the Liberties and Properties of the Subject. For no Man or Society of Men, having a Power to deliver up their *Preſervation*, or conſequently the Means of it, to the abſolute Will and arbitrary Dominion of another; whenever any one ſhall go about to bring them into ſuch a ſlaviſh Condition, they will always have a Right to preſerve, what they have not a Power to part with; and to rid themſelves of thoſe, who invade this fundamental, ſacred, and unalterable Law of *Self-preſervation*, for which they enter'd into Society. And thus the *Community* may be ſaid in this Reſpect to be *always the ſupreme Power*, but not as conſidered under any Form of Government, becauſe this Power of the People can never take place till the Government be diſſolved.

150. In all Caſes, whilſt the Government ſubſiſts, the *Legiſlative is the ſupreme Power*. For what can give Laws to another, muſt needs be ſuperior to him; and ſince the Legiſlative is no otherwiſe Legiſlative of the Society, but by the Right it has to make Laws for all the Parts, and for every Member of the Society, preſcribing Rules to their Actions, and giving Power of Execution, where they are tranſgreſſed, the *Legiſlative* muſt needs be the *Supreme*, and all other Powers in any Members or Parts of the Society, derived from and ſubordinate to it.

151. In ſome Common-wealths where the *Legiſlative* is not always in Being, and the *Executive* is veſted in a ſingle Perſon, who has alſo a Share in the Legiſlative; there that ſingle Perſon in a very tolerable Senſe may alſo be call'd *Supreme*, not that he has in himſelf all the ſupreme Power, which is that of Law-making: But becauſe he has in him the *ſupreme Execution*, from whom all inferior Magiſtrates derive all their ſeveral ſubordinate Powers, or at leaſt the greateſt part of them; having alſo no Legiſlative ſuperior to him, there being no Law to be made without his Conſent, which cannot be expected ſhould ever ſubject him to the other part of the Legiſlative, *he* is properly enough in this Senſe *Supreme*. But yet it is to be obſerved, that though *Oaths of Allegiance* and Fealty are taken to him, 'tis not to him as ſupreme Legiſlator, but as *ſupreme Executor* of the Law, made by a joint Power of him with others; *Allegiance* being nothing but *Obedience according to Law*, which when he violates, he has no Right to Obedience, nor can claim it otherwiſe than as the publick Perſon veſted with the Power of the Law,

and

and ſo is to be conſider'd as the Image, Phantom, or Repreſentative of the Common-wealth, acted by the Will of the Society, declared in its Laws; and thus he has no Will, no Power, but that of the Law. But when he quits this Repreſentation, this publick Will, and acts by his own private Will, he degrades himſelf, and is but a ſingle private Perſon without Power, and without Will, that has any Right to *Obedience*; the Members owing no *Obedience* but to the publick Will of the Society.

152. The *executive Power* placed any where but in a Perſon, that has alſo a Share in the Legiſlative, is viſibly ſubordinate and accountable to it, and may be at pleaſure changed and diſplaced; ſo that it is not the *ſupreme executive Power*, that is exempt from *Subordination*, but the *ſupreme executive Power* veſted in one, who having a Share in the Legiſlative, has no diſtinct ſuperior Legiſlative to be ſubordinate and accountable to, farther than he himſelf ſhall join and conſent; ſo that he is no more ſubordinate than he himſelf ſhall think fit, which one may certainly conclude will be but very little. Of other *miniſterial and ſubordinate Powers* in a Common-wealth we need not ſpeak, they being ſo multiply'd with infinite Variety, in the different Cuſtoms and Conſtitutions of diſtinct Common-wealths, that it is impoſſible to give a particular account of them all. Only thus much, which is neceſſary to our preſent Purpoſe, we may take Notice of concerning them, that the have no manner of Authority any of them, beyond what is by poſitive Grant and Commiſſion, delegated to them, and are all of them accountable to ſome other Power in the Common-wealth.

153. It is not neceſſary, no nor ſo much as convenient, that the *Legiſlative* ſhould be *always in Being*. But abſolutely neceſſary that the executive Power ſhould, becauſe there is not always need of new Laws to be made, but always need of Execution of the Laws that are made. When the *Legiſlative* hath put the *Execution* of the Laws, they make, into other Hands, they have a Power ſtill to reſume it out of thoſe Hands, when they find Cauſe, and to puniſh for any Mall-adminiſtration againſt the Laws. The ſame holds alſo in regard of the *Federative Power*, that and the *Executive* being both *miniſterial* and *ſubordinate to the Legiſlative*, which has been ſhew'd in a conſtituted Common-wealth, is the Supreme. The *Legiſlative* alſo in this Caſe being ſuppos'd to conſiſt of ſeveral Perſons; (for if it be a ſingle Perſon, it cannot but be always in Being, and ſo will as Supreme, naturally have the ſupreme executive Power, together with the legiſlative) may *aſſemble and exerciſe their Legiſlature*, at the Times, that either their original Conſtitution, or their own Adjournment appoints, or when they pleaſe; if neither of theſe have appointed any Time, or there be no other Way preſcrib'd to convoke them. For the ſupreme Power being placed in them by the People, 'tis always in them, and they may exerciſe it when they pleaſe, unleſs by their original Conſtitution they are limited to certain Seaſons, or by an Act of their ſupreme Power, they have adjourned to a certain Time; and when that Time comes, they have a Right to *aſſemble* and act again.

154. If the *Legiſlative*, or any Part of it be made up of *Repreſentatives* choſen for that Time by the People, which afterwards return into the ordinary State of Subjects, and have no Share in the Legiſlature but upon a new Choice, this Power of chuſing muſt alſo be exerciſed by the People, either at certain appointed Seaſons, or elſe when they are ſummon'd to it; and in this latter Caſe, the Power of convoking the Legiſlative, is ordinarily placed in the Executive, and has one of theſe two Limitations in reſpect of Time: That either the original Conſtitution requires their *aſſembling* and *acting* at certain Intervals, and then the executive Power does nothing but miniſterially iſſue Directions for their electing and aſſembling, according to due Forms: Or elſe it is left to his Prudence to call them by new Elections, when the Occaſions or Exigencies of the Publick require the Amendment of old, or making of new Laws, or the Redreſs or Prevention of any Inconveniencies, that lie on, or threaten the People.

155. It may be demanded here, What if the executive Power being poſſeſſed of the Force of the Common-wealth, ſhall make uſe of that Force to hinder the *meeting* and *acting of the Legiſlative*, when the original Conſtitution, or the publick Exigencies require it? I ſay uſing Force upon the People without Authority, and contrary to the Truſt put in him, that does ſo, is a State of War with the People, who have a Right to *reinſtate* their *Legiſlative in the Exerciſe of* their Power. For having

having erected a Legiſlative, with an Intent they ſhould exerciſe the Power of making Laws, either at certain ſet Times, or when there is need of it, when they are hinder'd by any Force from, what is ſo neceſſary to the Society, and wherein the Safety and Preſervation of the People conſiſts, the People have a Right to remove it by Force. In all States and Conditions the true Remedy of *Force* without Authority, is to oppoſe *Force* to it. The uſe of *Force* without Authority, always puts him that uſes it into a *State of War*, as the Aggreſſor, and renders him liable to be treated accordingly.

156. The *Power of aſſembling and diſmiſſing the Legiſlative*, placed in the Executive, gives not the Executive a Superiority over it, but is fiduciary Truſt placed in him, for the Safety of the People, in a Caſe where the Uncertainty, and Variableneſs of human Affairs could not bear a ſteady fixed Rule. For it not being poſſible, that the firſt Framers of the Government ſhould, by any Foreſight, be ſo much Maſters of future Events, as to be able to perfix ſo juſt Periods of Return and Duration to the *Aſſemblies of the Legiſlative*, in all times to come, that might exactly anſwer all the Exigencies of the Common-wealth; the beſt Remedy could be found for the Defect, was to truſt this to the Prudence of one who was always to be preſent, and whoſe Buſineſs it was to watch over the publick Good. Conſtant *frequent Meetings of the Legiſlative*, and long Continuations of their Aſſemblies, without neceſſary Occaſion, could not but be burthenſome to the People, and muſt neceſſarily in Time produce more dangerous Inconveniencies, and yet the quick Turn of Affairs might be ſometimes ſuch as to need their preſent Help: Any Delay of their *conveining* might endanger the Publick; and ſometimes too their Buſineſs might be ſo great, that the limited Time of their ſitting might be too ſhort for their Work, and rob the Publick of the Benefit which could be had only from their mature Deliberation. What then could be done in this Caſe to prevent the Community from being expoſed ſome time or other to eminent Hazard, on one ſide or the other, by fixed Intervals and Periods, ſet to the *meeting and acting of the Legiſlative*, but to entruſt it to the Prudence of ſome, who being preſent, and acquainted with the State of publick Affairs, might make Uſe of this Prerogative for the publick Good? And where elſe could this be ſo well placed as in his Hands, who was intruſted with the Execution of the Laws for the ſame End? Thus ſuppoſing the Regulation of Times for the *aſſembling and ſitting of the Legiſlative*, not ſettled by the original Conſtitution, it naturally fell into the Hands of the Executive, not as an arbitrary Power depending on his good Pleaſure, but with this Truſt always to have it exerciſed only for the publick Weal, as the Occurances of Times and Change of Affairs might require. Whether *ſettled Periods of their Conveining*, or *a Liberty* left to the Prince for *convoking the Legiſlative*, or perhaps a Mixture of both, hath the leaſt Inconvenience attending it, 'tis not my Buſineſs here to enquire, but only to ſhew, that though the Executive Power may have the Prerogative of *convoking* and *diſſolving* ſuch *Conventions of the Legiſlative*, yet it is not thereby ſuperior to it.

157. Things of this World are in ſo conſtant a Flux, that nothing remains long in the ſame State. Thus People, Riches, Trade, Power, change their Stations, Flouriſhing mighty Cities come to Ruin, and prove in Time neglected deſolate Corners, whilſt other unfrequented Places grow into populous Countries, fill'd with Wealth and Inhabitants. But Things not always changing equally, and private Intereſt often keeping up Cuſtoms and Privileges, when the Reaſons of them are ceaſed, it often comes to paſs, that in Governments, where part of the Legiſlative conſiſts of *Repreſentatives* choſen by the People, that in Tract of Time this *Repreſentation* becomes very *unequal* and diſproportionate to the Reaſons it was firſt eſtabliſh'd upon. To what groſs Abſurdities the following of Cuſtom, when Reaſon has left it, may lead, we may be ſatisfied, when we ſee the bare Name of a Town, of which there remains not ſo much as the Ruins, where ſcarce ſo much Houſing as a Sheepcoat, or more Inhabitants than a Shepherd is to be found, ſends *as many Repreſentatives* to the grand Aſſembly of Law-makers, as a whole County numerous in People, and powerful in Riches. This Strangers ſtand amazed at, and every one muſt confeſs needs a Remedy. Though moſt think it hard to find one, becauſe the Conſtitution of the Legiſlative being the original and ſupreme Act of the Society, antecedent to all poſitive Laws in it, and depending wholly on the People, no inferior Power

can

can alter it. And therefore the *People*, when the *Legiſlative* is once conſtituted, *having* in ſuch a Government as we have been ſpeaking of, *no Power* to act as long as the Government ſtands: this Inconvenience is thought incapable of a Remedy.

158. *Salus Populi Suprema Lex*, is certainly ſo juſt and fundamental a Rule, that he, who ſincerely follows it, cannot dangerouſly err. If therefore the Executive, who has the Power of convoking the Legiſlative, obſerving rather the true Proportion, than faſhion of *Repreſentation*, regulates, not by old Cuſtom, but true Reaſon, the *Number of Members*, in all Places, that have a Right to be diſtinctly repreſented, which no part of the People however incorporated can pretend to, but in Proportion to the Aſſiſtance which it affords to the Publick, it cannot be judg'd to have ſet up a new Legiſlative, but to have reſtored the old and true one, and to have rectified the Diſorders, which Succeſſion of Time had inſenſibly, as well as inevitably introduced. For it being the Intereſt, as well as Intention of the People, to have a fair and *equal Repreſentative*; whoever brings it neareſt to that, is an undoubted Friend to, and Eſtabliſher of the Government, and cannot miſs the Conſent and Approbation of the Community. *Prerogative* being nothing but a Power in the Hands of the Prince, to provide for the publick Good, in ſuch Caſes, which depending upon unforeſeen and uncertain Occurrences, certain and unalterable Laws could not ſafely direct; whatſoever ſhall be done manifeſtly for the good of the People, and the eſtabliſhing the Government upon its true Foundations, is, and always will be juſt *Prerogative*. The Power of erecting new Corporations, and therewith *new Repreſentatives*, carries with it a Suppoſition, that in Time the *Meaſures of Repreſentation* might vary, and thoſe Places have a juſt Right to repreſented which before had none; and by the ſame Reaſon, thoſe ceaſe to have a Right, and be too inconſiderable for ſuch a Privilege, which before had it. 'Tis not a Change from the preſent State, which perhaps Corruption or Decay has introduced, that makes an Inroad upon the Government, but the Tendency of it to injure or oppreſs the People, and to ſet up one Part, or Party with a Diſtinction from, and an unequal Subjection of the reſt. Whatſoever cannot but be acknowledg'd to be of Advantage to the Society, and People in general, upon juſt and laſting Meaſures, will always, when done, juſtify itſelf; and whenever the People ſhall chuſe their *Repreſentatives upon* juſt and undeniably *equal Meaſures*, ſuitable to the orginal Frame of the Government, it cannot be doubted to be the Will and Act of the Society, whoever permitted or cauſed them ſo to do.

CHAP. XIV.

Of PREROGATIVE.

159. WHERE the legiſlative and executive Power are in diſtinct Hands, (as they are in all moderated Monarchies, and well-framed Governments) there the Good of the Society requires, that ſeveral Things ſhould be left to the Diſcretion of him, that has the executive Power. For the Legiſlators not being able to foreſee and provide by Laws, for all that may be uſeful to the Community, the Executor of the Laws having the Power in his Hands, has by the common Law of Nature a Right to make uſe of it for the good of the Society, in many Caſes, where the municipal Law has given no Direction, till the Legiſlative can conveniently be aſſembled to provide for it. Many Things there are, which the Law can by no Means provide for, and thoſe muſt neceſſarily be left to the Diſcretion of him that has the executive Power in his Hands, to be ordered by him as the publick Good and Advantage ſhall require: Nay, 'tis fit that the Laws themſelves ſhould in ſome Caſes give way to the executive Power, or rather to this fundamental Law of Nature and Government, *viz.* That as much as may be, *all* the Members of the Society are to be preſerved. For ſince many Accidents may happen, wherein a ſtrict and rigid Obſervation of the Laws may do Harm; (as not to pull down an innocent Man's Houſe to ſtop the Fire, when the next to it a burning) and a Man may come ſometimes within the

reach of the Law, which makes no Diſtinction of Perſons, by an Action that may deſerve Reward and Pardon; 'tis fit the Ruler ſhould have a Power, in many Caſes, to mitigate the Severity of the Law, and Pardon ſome Offenders: For the *End of Government* being *the Preſervation of all*, as much as may be, even the Guilty are to be ſpared, where it can prove no Prejudice to the Innocent.

160. This Power to act according to Diſcretion, for the Publick Good, without the Preſcription of the Law, and ſometimes even againſt it, *is* that which is called *Prerogative*. For ſince in ſome Governments the Law-making Power is not always in Being, and is uſually too numerous, and ſo too ſlow, for the Diſpatch requiſite to Execution: And becauſe alſo it is impoſſible to foreſee, and ſo by Laws to provide for all Accidents and Neceſſities that may concern the Publick; or to make ſuch Laws as will do no harm, if they are executed with an inflexible Rigour, on all Occaſions, and upon all Perſons that may come in their Way, therefore there is a Latitude left to the executive Power, to do many things of Choice which the Laws do not preſcribe.

161. This Power, whilſt employ'd for the Benefit of the Community, and ſuitably to the Truſt and Ends of the Government, *is undoubted Prerogative*, and never is queſtion'd. For the People are very ſeldom or never ſcrupulous or nice in the Point; they are far from examining *Prerogative*, whilſt it is in any tolerable Degree employ'd for the Uſe it was meant, that is, for the Good of the People, and not manifeſtly againſt it. But if there comes to be a *Queſtion* between the executive Power and the People, about a thing claim'd as a *Prerogative*; the Tendency of the Exerciſe of ſuch *Prerogative* to the Good or Hurt of the People will eaſily decide that Queſtion.

162. It is eaſy to conceive, that in the Infancy of Governments, when Common-wealths differed little from Families in Number of People, they differ'd from them too but little in Number of Laws; And the Governors, being as the Fathers of them, watching over them for their Good, the Government was almoſt all *Prerogative*. A few eſtabliſh'd Laws ſerv'd the Turn, and the Diſcretion and Care of the Ruler ſupply'd the reſt. But when Miſtake or Flattery prevail'd with weak Princes to make Uſe of this Power for private Ends of their own, and not for the publick Good, the People were fain, by expreſs Laws, to get Prerogative determin'd in thoſe Points wherein they found Diſadvantage from it: And thus declared *Limitations of Prerogative* whereby the People found neceſſary in Caſes which they and their Anceſtors had left, in the utmoſt Latitude, to the Wiſdom of thoſe Princes, who made no other but a right Uſe of it, that is, for the Good of the People.

163. And therefore they have a very wrong Notion of Government, who ſay, that the People have *incroach'd upon the Prerogative*, when they have got any part of it to be defined by poſitive Laws. For in ſo doing they have not pulled from the Prince any thing that of Right belong'd to him, but only declar'd that that Power which they indefinitely left in his or his Anceſtors Hands, to be exerciſed for their Good, was not a thing which they intended him when he uſed it otherwiſe. For the End of Government being the good of the Community, whatſoever Alterations are made in it, tending to that End, cannot be an *Incroachment* upon any body, ſince no body in Government can have a Right tending to any other End. And thoſe only are *Incroachments*, which prejudice or hinder the publick Good. Thoſe who ſay otherwiſe, ſpeak as if the Prince had a diſtinct and ſeparate Intereſt from the Good of the Community, and was not made for it, the Root and Sourſe from which ſpring almoſt all thoſe Evils and Diſorders which happen in kingly Governments. And indeed if that be ſo, the People under his Government are not a Society of rationl Creatures, entered into a Community for their mutual Good; they are not ſuch as have ſet Rulers over themſelves, to guard and promote that Good; but are to be look'd on as an Herd of inferior Creatures under the Dominion of a Maſter, who keeps them and works them for his own Pleaſure or Profit. If Men were ſo void of Reaſon, and brutiſh, as to enter into Society on ſuch Terms, *Prerogative* might indeed be, what ſome Men would have it, an arbitrary Power to do things hurtful to the People.

164. But ſince a rational Creature cannot be ſuppoſed, when Free, to put himſelf into Subjection to another, for his own Harm: (Though where he finds a

good

good and wiſe Ruler, he may not perhaps think it either neceſſary or uſeful, to ſet preciſe Bounds to his Power in all things) *Prerogative* can be nothing but the Peoples permitting their Rulers to do ſeveral things of their own free Choice, where the Law was ſilent, and ſometimes too againſt the direct Letter of the Law, for the publick Good; and their acquieſcing in it when ſo done. For as a good Prince, who is mindful of the Truſt put into his Hands, and careful of the Good of his People, cannot have too much *Prerogative*, that is, Power to do good: So a weak and ill Prince, who would claim that Power which his Predeceſſors exerciſed without the Direction of the Law, as a *Prerogative* belonging to him by Right of his Office, which he may exerciſe at his Pleaſure, to make or promote an Intereſt diſtinct from that of the Publick, gives the People an Occaſion to claim their Right, and limit that Power, which, whilſt it was exerciſed for their Good, they were content ſhould be tacitly allowed.

165. And therefore he that will look into the *Hiſtory of England*, will find, that *Prerogative* was always *largeſt* in the Hands of our wiſeſt and beſt Princes; becauſe the People obſerving the whole Tendency of their Actions to be the publick Good, conteſted not what was done without Law to that End; or if any human Frailty or Miſtake (for Princes are but Men made as others) appear'd in ſome ſmall Declinations from that End; yet 'twas viſible, the Main of their Conduct tended to nothing but the Care of the Publick. The People therefore finding Reaſon to be ſatisfied with theſe Princes, whenever they acted without or contrary to the Letter of the Law, acquieſced in what they did, and, without the leaſt Complaint, let them enlarge their *Prerogative* as they pleaſed, judging rightly, that they did nothing herein to the prejudice of their Laws, ſince they acted conformable to the Foundation and End of all Laws, the publick Good.

166. Such God-like Princes indeed had ſome Title to arbitrary Power, by that Argument, that would prove abſolute Monarchy the beſt Government, as that which God himſelf governs the Univerſe by; becauſe ſuch Kings partake of his Wiſdom and Goodneſs. Upon this is founded that Saying, That the Reigns of good Princes have always been moſt dangerous to the Liberties of their People. For when their Succeſſors, managing the Government with different Thoughts, would draw the Actions of thoſe good Rulers into precedent, and make them the Standard of their *Prerogative*, as if what had been done only for the good of the People, was a Right in them to do, for the Harm of the People, if they ſo pleaſed; it has often occaſion'd Conteſt, and ſometimes publick Diſorders, before the People could recover their original Right, and get that to be declared not to be *Prerogative*, which truely was never ſo: Since 'tis impoſſible that any body in the Society ſhould ever have a Right to do the People Harm; though it be very poſſible, and reaſonable, that the People ſhould not go about to ſet any Bounds to the *Prerogative* of thoſe Kings or Rulers, who themſelves tranſgreſſed not the Bounds of the publick Good. For *Prerogative is nothing but the Power of doing publick Good without a Rule.*

167. The Power of *calling Parliaments* in *England*, as to preciſe Time, Place, and Duration, is certainly a *Prerogative* of the King, but ſtill with this Truſt, that it ſhall be made uſe of for the good of the Nation, as the Exegencies of the Times, and Variety of Occaſions ſhall require. For it being impoſſible to foreſee which ſhould always be the fitteſt Place for them to aſſemble in, and what the beſt Seaſon; the Choice of theſe was left with the executive Power, as might be moſt ſubſervient to the publick Good, and beſt ſuit the Ends of Parliaments.

168. The old Queſtion will be ask'd in this Matter of *Prerogative*. But *who ſhall be Judge* when this Power is made a right uſe of? I anſwer: Between an executive Power in Being, with ſuch a *Prerogative*, and a Legiſlative that depends upon his Will for their conveining, there can be no *Judge on Earth*: As there can be none between the Legiſlative and the People, ſhould either the Executive or the Legiſlative, when they have got the Power in their Hands, deſign, or go about to enſlave or deſtroy them. The People have no other Remedy in this, as in all other Caſes where they have no Judge on Earth, but to *appeal to Heaven*. For the Rulers in ſuch Attempts, exerciſing a Power the People never put into their Hands, (who can never be ſuppoſed to conſent that any body ſhould rule over them for their Harm) do that which they have not a Right to do. And where the Body of the People, or any ſingle Man is deprived of their Right, or is under

the

the Exerciſe of a Power without Right and have no Appeal on Earth, then they have a Liberty to appeal to Heaven, whenever they judge the Cauſe of ſufficient Moment. And therefore tho' the *People cannot be Judge*, ſo as to have by the Conſtitution of that Society any ſuperior Power, to determine and give effective Sentence in the Caſe; yet they have, by a Law antecedent and paramount to all poſitive Laws of Men, reſerv'd that ultimate Determination to themſelves which belongs to all Mankind, where there lies no Appeal on Earth, *viz.* to judge, whether they have juſt Cauſe to make their Appeal to Heaven. And this Judgment they cannot part with, it being out of Man's Power ſo to ſubmit himſelf to another, as to give him a Liberty to deſtroy him; God and Nature never allowing a Man ſo to abandon himſelf, as to neglect his own Preſervation: And ſince he cannot take away his own Life, neither can he give another Power to take it. Nor let any one think, this lays a perpetual Foundation for Diſorder; for this operates not, till the Inconveniency is ſo great that the Majority feel it, and are weary of it, and find a Neceſſity to have it amended. But this the Executive Power, or wiſe Princes never need come in the Danger of: And 'tis the Thing of all others, they have moſt need to avoid, as of all others the moſt perilous.

CHAP. XV.

Of Paternal, Political, and Deſpotical Power, conſider'd together.

169. THough I have had Occaſion to ſpeak of theſe ſeparately before, yet the great Miſtakes of late about Government, having, as I ſuppoſe, ariſen from confounding theſe diſtinct Powers one with another, it may not, perhaps, be amiſs to conſider them here together.

170. *Firſt* then, *paternal* or *parental Power* is nothing but that which Parents have over their Children, to govern them for the Childrens Good, till they come to the Uſe of Reaſon, or a State of Knowledge, wherein they may be ſuppoſed capable to underſtand that Rule, whether it be the Law of Nature, or the municipal Law of their Country, they are to govern themſelves by: Capable, I ſay, to know it, as well as ſeveral others, who live as Freemen under that Law. The Affection and Tenderneſs which God hath planted in the Breaſts of Parents towards their Children, makes it evident, that this is not intended to be a ſevere arbitrary Government, but only for the Help, Inſtruction, and Preſervation of their Offspring. But happen it as it will, there is, as I have proved, no reaſon why it ſhould be thought to extend to Life and Death, at any time over their Children, more than over any body elſe; neither can there be any Pretence why this *parental Power* ſhould keep the Child when grown to a Man, in ſubjection to the Will of his Parents, any farther than the having received Life and Education from his Parents, obliges him to Reſpect, Honour, Gratitude, Aſſiſtance, and Support all his Life to both Father and Mother. And thus, 'tis true, the *Paternal* is a natural *Government*, but not at all extending itſelf to the Ends and Juriſdictions of that, which is Political. The *Power of the Father doth not reach* at all to the *Property* of the Child, which is only in his own diſpoſing.

171. *Secondly*, *Political Power* is that Power, which every Man having in the State of Nature, has given up into the Hands of the Society, and therein to the Governors, whom the Society hath ſet over itſelf, with this expreſs or tacit Truſt, That it ſhall be employed for their Good, and the Preſervation of their Property: Now this *Power*, which every Man has *in the State of Nature*, and which he parts with to the Society, in all ſuch Caſes, where the Society can ſecure him, is to uſe ſuch Means, for the Preſerving of his own Property, as he thinks good, and Nature allows him; and to puniſh the Breach of the Law of Nature in others ſo, as (according to the beſt of his Reaſon) may moſt conduce to the Preſervation of himſelf, and the reſt of Mankind. So that the *End and Meaſure of this Power*, when in every Man's Hands in the State of Nature, being the Preſervation of all of his Society, that is, all Mankind in general, it can have no other *End or Meaſure*, when in the Hands of the Magiſtrates but to preſerve the Members of that

that Society in their Lives, Liberties, and Poſſeſſions; and ſo cannot be an abſolute, arbitrary Power over their Lives and Fortunes, which are as much as poſſible to be preſerv'd; but a *Power to make Laws*, and annex ſuch *Penalties* to them, as may tend to the Preſervation of the whole, by cutting off thoſe Parts, and thoſe only, which are ſo corrupt, that they threaten the Sound and Healthy, without which no Severity is lawful. And this *Power has its Original only from Compact* and Agreement, and the mutual Conſent of thoſe who make up the Community.

172. *Thirdly*, *Deſpotical Power* is an abſolute, arbitrary Power one Man has over another, to take away his Life, whenever he pleaſes. This is a Power, which neither Nature gives, for it has made no ſuch Diſtinction between one Man and another; nor Compact can convey, for Man not having ſuch an Arbitrary Power over his own Life, cannot give another Man ſuch a Power over it; but it is the *effect only of Forfeiture*, which the Aggreſſor makes of his own Life, when he puts himſelf into the State of War with another. For having quitted Reaſon, which God hath given to be the Rule betwixt Man and Man, and the common Bond whereby Humankind is united into one Fellowſhip and Society; and having renounced the Way of Peace which that teaches, and made uſe of the Force of War, to compaſs his unjuſt Ends upon another; where he has no Right, and ſo revolting from his own Kind to that of Beaſts, by making Force, which is theirs, to be his Rule of Right, he renders himſelf liable to be deſtroy'd by the injur'd Perſon, and the reſt of Mankind, that will join with him in the execution of Juſtice, as any other wild Beaſt, or noxious Brute with whom Mankind can have neither Society nor Security. And thus *Captives*, taken in a juſt and lawful War, and ſuch only, are *ſubject to a deſpotical Power*, which as it ariſes not from Compact, ſo neither is it capable of any, but is the State of War continued. For what Compact can be made with a Man, that is not Maſter of his own Life? What Condition can he perform? And if he be once allowed to be Maſter of his own Life, the *deſpotical, arbitrary Power* of his Maſter ceaſes. He that is Maſter of himſelf, and his own Life, has a Right to the Means of preſerving it; ſo that *as ſoon as Compact enters, Slavery ceaſes*, and he ſo far quits his abſolute Power, and puts an End to the State of War, who enters into Conditions with his Captive.

173. *Nature gives* the firſt of theſe, *viz. paternal Power to Parents* for the Benefit of their Children during their Minority, to ſupply their want of Ability, and underſtanding how to manage their Property. (By *Property* I muſt be underſtood here, as in other Places, to mean that Property which Men have in their Perſons as well as Goods) *Voluntary Agreements gives the* ſecond, *viz. Political Power to Governors* for the Benefit of their Subjects, to ſecure them in the Poſſeſſion and Uſe of their Properties. And *Forfeiture gives* the third *deſpotical Power to Lords* for their own Benefit, over thoſe who are ſtripp'd of all Property.

174. He, that ſhall conſider the diſtinct Riſe and Extent, and different Ends of theſe ſeveral Powers, will plainly ſee, that *paternal Power* comes as far ſhort of that of the *Magiſtrate*, as *deſpotical* exceeds it; and that *abſolute Dominion*, however placed, is ſo far from being one kind of civil Society, that it is as inconſiſtent with it, as Slavery is with Property. *Paternal Power* is only where Minority makes the Child incapable to manage his Property; *Political* where Men have Property in their own Diſpoſal; and *deſpotical* over ſuch as have no Property at all.

CHAP. XVI.

Of CONQUEST.

175. THough Governments can originally have no other Riſe than that before-mention'd, nor *Polities* be *founded on* any thing but the *Conſent of the People*; yet ſuch has been the Diſorders Ambition has filled the World with, that in the Noiſe of War, which makes ſo great a Part of the Hiſtory of Mankind, *this Conſent* is little taken Notice of: And therefore many have miſtaken the Force of Arms, for the Conſent of the People; and reckon Conqueſt as one of the Originals

Originals of Government. But *Conqueſt* is as far from ſetting up any Government, as demoliſhing an Houſe is from building a new one in the Place. Indeed it often makes way for a new Frame of a Common-wealth, by deſtroying the former; but, without Conſent of the People, can never erect a new one.

176. That the *Aggreſſor*, who puts himſelf into the State of War, with another, and unjuſtly invades another Man's Right, *can* by ſuch an unjuſt War, *never* come to *have a Right over the Conquered*, will be eaſily agreed by all Men, who will not think, that Robbers and Pyrates have a Right of Empire over whomſoever they have Force enough to maſter, or that Men are bound by Promiſes, which unlawful Force extorts from them. Should a Robber break into my Houſe, and with a Dagger at my Throat, make me ſeal Deeds to convey my Eſtate to him, would this give him any Title? Juſt ſuch a Title by his Sword, has an *unjuſt Conqueror*, who forces me into Submiſſion. The Injury and the Crime is equal, whether committed by the Wearer of a Crown, or ſome petty Villain. The Title of the Offender, and the Number of his Followers make no Difference in the Offence, unleſs it be to aggravate it. The only Difference is, great Robbers puniſh little ones, to keep them in their Obedience, but the great ones are rewarded with Laurels and Triumphs, becauſe they are too big for the weak Hands of Juſtice in this World, and have the Power in their own Poſſeſſion, which ſhould puniſh Offenders. What is my Remedy againſt a Robber, that ſo broke into my Houſe? *Appeal* to the Law for Juſtice. But perhaps Juſtice is deny'd, or I am crippled and cannot ſtir, robb'd and have not the Means to do it. If God has taken away all Means of ſeeking Remedy, there is nothing left but Patience. But my Son, when able, may ſeek the Relief of the Law, which I am denied: He or his Son may renew his *Appeal*, till he recover his Right. But the Conquered, or their Children have no Court, no Arbitrator on Earth to appeal to. Then they may *Appeal*, as *Jephtha* did to *Heaven*, and repeat their *Appeal*, till they recovered the native Right of their Anceſtors, which was, to have ſuch a Legiſlative over them, as the Majority ſhould approve, and freely acquiſce in. If it be objected, this would cauſe endleſs Trouble; I anſwer, no more than Juſtice does, where ſhe lies open to all that appeal to her. He that troubles his Neighbour without a Cauſe, is puniſh'd for it by the Juſtice of the Court he appeals to. And he that *appeals to Heaven*, muſt be ſure he has Right on his ſide: and a Right too that is worth the Trouble and Coſt of his Appeal, as he will anſwer at a Tribunal, that cannot be deceived, and will be ſure to retribute to every one according to the Miſchiefs he hath created to his Fellow-Subjects, that is, any part of Mankind. From whence 'tis plain that he that *Conquers in an unjuſt War can thereby have no Title to the Subjection and Obedience of the Conquered.*

177. But ſuppoſing Victory favours the right Side, let us conſider a *Conqueror in a lawful War*, and ſee what Power he gets, and over whom.

Firſt, 'Tis plain he *gets no Power by his Conqueſt over thoſe that conquered with him.* They that fought on his Side cannot ſuffer by the Conqueſt, but muſt at leaſt be as much Freemen as they were before. And moſt commonly they ſerve upon Terms, and on Condition to ſhare with their Leader, and enjoy a Part of the Spoil, and other Advantages that attend the conquering Sword: Or at leaſt have a Part of the ſubdued Country beſtowed upon them. And *the conquering People are not I hope to be Slaves by Conqueſt*, and wear their Laurels only to ſhew they are Sacrifices to their Leader's Triumph. They that found abſolute Monarchy upon the Title of the Sword make their Heroes, who are the Founders of ſuch Monarchies, arrant *Draw-can-Sirs*, and forget they had any Officers and Soldiers that fought on their Side in the Battles they won, or aſſiſted them in the ſubduing, or ſhared in poſſeſſing the Countries they maſter'd. We are told by ſome, that the *Engliſh* Monarchy is founded in the *Norman* Conqueſt, and that our Princes have thereby a Title to abſolute Dominion: Which if it were true, (as by Hiſtory it appears otherwiſe) and that *William* had a Right to make War on this Iſland; yet his Dominion by Conqueſt could reach no farther than to the *Saxons* and *Britains*, that were then Inhabitants of this Country. The *Normans* that came with him, and helped to conquer, and all deſcended from them, are Freemen and no Subjects by Conqueſt; let that give what Dominion it will. And if I or any Body elſe ſhall claim Freedom, as derived from them, it will be very hard to prove the contrary: And 'tis plain, the Law that has made no Diſtinction between

tween the one and the other, intends not there ſhould be any Difference in their Freedom or Privileges.

178. But ſuppoſing, which ſeldom happens, that the Conquerors and Conquered never incorporate into one People, under the ſame Laws and Freedom. Let us ſee next *what Power a lawful Conqueror has over the Subdued*: And that I ſay is purely deſpotical. He has an abſolute Power over the Lives of thoſe, who by an unjuſt War have forfeited them; but not over the Lives or Fortunes of thoſe, who engaged not in the War, nor over the Poſſeſſions even of thoſe, who were actually engaged in it.

179. *Secondly*, I ſay then the *Conqueror* gets no Power but only over thoſe, who have actually aſſiſted, concurr'd, or conſented to that unjuſt Force, that is uſed againſt him. For the People having given to their Governors no Power to do an unjuſt thing, ſuch as is to make an unjuſt War, (for they never had ſuch a Power in themſelves:) They ought not to be charged, as guilty of the Violence and Unjuſtice, that is committed in an unjuſt War, any farther, than they actually abet it; no more, than they are to be thought guilty of any Violence or Oppreſſion their Governors ſhould uſe upon the People themſelves, or any part of their Fellow-Subjects, they have impowered them no more to one, than to the other. Conquerors, 'tis true, ſeldom trouble themſelves to make the Diſtinction, but they willingly permit the Confuſion of War to ſweep all together; but yet this alters not the Right: For the Conqueror's Power over the Lives of the Conquered, being only becauſe they have uſed Force to do, or maintain an Injuſtice, he can have that Power only over thoſe, who have concurred in that Force, all the reſt are innocent; and he has no more Title over the People of that Country, who have done him no Injury, and ſo have made no Forfeiture of their Lives, than he has over any other, who without any Injuries or Provocations, have lived upon fair Terms with him.

180. *Thirdly*, The *Power a Conqueror gets* over thoſe he overcomes *in a juſt War, is perfectly deſpotical*; he has an abſolute Power over the Lives of thoſe, who by putting themſelves in a ſtate of War, have forfeited them; but he has not thereby a Right and Title to their Poſſeſſions. This I doubt not, but at firſt Sight will ſeem a ſtrange Doctrine, it being ſo quite contrary to the Practice of the World; there being nothing more familiar in ſpeaking of the Dominion of Countries, than to ſay ſuch an one conquer'd it. As if Conqueſt, without any more ado, convey'd a Right of Poſſeſſion. But when we conſider, that the Practice of the ſtrong and powerful, how univerſal ſoever it may be, is ſeldom the Rule of Right, however it be one part of the Subjection of the Conquered, not to argue againſt the Conditions, cut out to them by the conquering Sword.

181. Tho' in all War there be uſually a Complication of Force and Damage, and the Aggreſſor ſeldom fails to harm the Eſtate, when he uſes Force againſt the Perſons of thoſe he makes War upon; yet 'tis the Uſe of Force only that puts a Man into the ſtate of War. For whether by Force he begins the Injury, or elſe having quietly, and by Fraud, done the Injury, he refuſes to make Reparation, and by Force maintains it, (which is the ſame thing, as at firſt to have done it by Force) 'tis the unjuſt Uſe of Force, that makes the War. For he that breaks open my Houſe, and violently turns me out of Doors; or having peaceably got in, by Force keeps me out, does in effect the ſame thing; ſuppoſing we are in ſuch a ſtate, that we have no common Judge on Earth, whom I may appeal to, and to whom we are both obliged to ſubmit: For of ſuch I am now ſpeaking: 'Tis the *unjuſt Uſe of Force then*, that *puts a Man into the ſtate of War* with another, and thereby he, that is guilty of it, makes a Forfeiture of his Life. For quitting Reaſon, which is the Rule given between Man and Man, and uſing Force, the Way of Beaſts, he becomes liable to be deſtroyed by him he uſes Force againſt, as any ſavage ravenous Beaſt, that is dangerous to his Being.

182. But becauſe the Miſcarriages of the Father are no Faults of the Children, and they may be rational and peaceable, notwithſtanding the Brutiſhneſs and Injuſtice of the Father; the Father, by his Miſcarriages and Violence, can forfeit but his own Life, but involves not his Children in his Guilt or Deſtruction. His Goods, which Nature that willeth the Preſervation of all Mankind as much as is poſſible, hath made to belong to the Children to keep them from periſhing, do ſtill continue to belong to his Children. For ſuppoſing them not to have joyn'd in

in the War, either through Infancy, Abſence, or Choice, they have nothing to forfeit them: *nor has the Conqueror any Right* to take them away, by the bare Title of having ſubdued him, that by Force attempted his Deſtruction; though perhaps he may have ſome Right to them, to repair the Damages, he has ſuſtained by the War, and the Defence of his own Right; which how far it reaches to the Poſſeſſions of the Conquered, we ſhall ſee by and by. So that he that *by Conqueſt has a Right over a Man's Perſon* to deſtroy him if he pleaſes, has not thereby a Right over *his Eſtate* to Poſſeſs and enjoy it. For it is the brutal Force the Aggreſſor has uſed, that gives his Adverſary a Right to take away his Life, and deſtroy him if he pleaſes, as a noxious Creature, but 'tis Damage ſuſtain'd that alone gives him Title to another Man's Goods: For though I may kill a Thief that ſets on me in the Highway, yet I may not (which ſeems leſs) take away his Money, and let him go; this would be Robbery on my ſide. His Force, and the ſtate of War he put himſelf in, made him forfeit his Life, but gave me no Title to his Goods. The *Right* then of *Conqueſt extends only to the Lives* of thoſe who join'd in the War, *not to their Eſtates*, but only in order to make Reparation for the Damages received, and the Charges of the War, and that too with Reſervation of the Right of the innocent Wife and Children.

183. Let the *Conqueror* have as much Juſtice on his Side, as could be ſuppoſed, he *has* no *Right* to ſeize more than the vanquiſhed could forfeit; his Life is at the Victor's Mercy, and his Service, and Goods he may appropriate, to make himſelf Reparation; but he cannot take the Goods of his Wife and Children; they too had a Title to the Goods he enjoy'd, and their Shares in the Eſtate he poſſeſſed. For Example, I in the State of Nature (and all Common-wealths are in the State of Nature one with another) have injured another Man, and refuſing to give Satisfaction, it comes to a State of War, wherein my defending by Force, what I had gotten unjuſtly, makes me the Aggreſſor. I am conquered: My Life, 'tis true, as forfeit, is at Mercy, but not my Wives and Childrens. They made not the War, nor aſſiſted in it. I could not forfeit their Lives, they were not mine to forfeit. My Wife had a Share in my Eſtate, that neither could I forfeit. And my Children alſo, being born of me, had a Right to be maintained out of my Labour or Subſtance. Here then is the Caſe; The Conqueror has a Title to Reparation for Damages received, and the Children have a Title to their Father's Eſtate for their Subſiſtence. For as to the Wife's Share, whether her own Labour, or Compact gave her a Title to it, 'tis plain, her Husband could not forfeit what was hers. What muſt be done in the Caſe? I anſwer; The fundamental Law of Nature being, that all, as much as may be, ſhould be preſerv'd, it follows, that if there be not enough fully to *ſatisfy* both, *viz.* for the *Conqueror's Loſſes*, and Childrens Maintenance, he that hath, and to ſpare, muſt remit ſomething of his full Satisfaction, and give way to the preſſing and preferable Title of thoſe, who are in danger to periſh without it.

184. But ſuppoſing the *Charge* and *Damages of the War* are to be made up to the Conqueror, to the utmoſt Farthing; and that the Children of the Vanquiſhed, ſpoiled of all their Father's Goods, are to be left to ſtarve and periſh; yet the ſatisfying of what ſhall, on this Score, be due to the Conqueror, will ſcarce give him a *Title to any Country he ſhall conquer*. For the Damages of War can ſcarce amount to the Value of any conſiderable Tract of Land, in any part of the World, where all the Land is poſſeſſed, and none lies Waſte. And if I have not taken away the Conqueror's Land, which, being vanquiſhed, it is impoſſible I ſhould; ſcarce any other Spoil I have done him, can amount to the Value of mine, ſuppoſing it equally cultivated, and of an Extent any way coming near, what I had over-run of his. The Deſtruction of a Years Product or two, (for it ſeldom reaches four or five) is the utmoſt Spoil, that uſually can be done. For as to Money, and ſuch Riches, and Treaſure taken away, theſe are none of Natures Goods, they have but a fantaſtical imaginary Value: Nature has put no ſuch upon them: They are of no more account by her Standard, than the Wampompeke of the *Americans* to an *European* Prince, or the Silver Money of *Europe* would have been formerly to an *American*. And five Years Product is not worth the perpetual Inheritance of Land, where all is poſſeſſed, and none remains waſte, to be taken up by him, that is diſſeiz'd: Which will be eaſily granted, if one do but take away the imaginary Value of Money, the Diſproportion being more, than between five

and

and five hundred. Though, at the ſame time, half a Years Product is more worth, than the Inheritance, where there being more Land, than the Inhabitants poſſeſs, and make uſe of, any one has Liberty to make uſe of the Waſte: But there Conquerors take little Care to poſſeſs themſelves of the *Lands of the Vanquiſhed*. No Damage therefore, that Men in the State of Nature (as all Princes and Governments are in reference to one another) ſuffer from one another, can give a Conqueror Power to diſpoſſeſs the Poſterity of the Vanquiſhed, and turn them out of that Inheritance, which ought to be the Poſſeſſion of them and their Deſcendants to all Generations. The Conqueror indeed will be apt to think himſelf Maſter: And 'tis the very Condition of the Subdued not to be able to diſpute their Right. But if that be all, it gives no other Title than what bare Force gives to the Stronger over the Weaker: And, by this Reaſon, he that is ſtrongeſt will have a Right to whatever he pleaſes to ſeize on.

185. Over thoſe then that joined with him in the War, and over thoſe of the ſubdued Country that oppoſed him not, and the Poſterity even of thoſe that did, the Conqueror, even in a juſt War, hath, by his Conqueſt no *Right of Dominion*: They are free from any Subjection to him, and if their former Government be diſſolved, they are at Liberty to begin and erect another to themſelves.

186. The Conqueror, 'tis true, uſually, by the Force he has over them, compels them, with a Sword at their Breaſts, to ſtoop to his Conditions, and ſubmit to ſuch a Government as he pleaſes to afford them; but the Enquiry is, What Right he has to do ſo? If it be ſaid, they ſubmit by their own Conſent, then this allows their own *Conſent* to be *neceſſary to give the Conqueror a Title to rule* over them. It remains only to be conſidered, whether *Promiſes extorted by Force*, without Right, can be thought Conſent, and *how far they bind*. To which I ſhall ſay, they *bind not at all*; becauſe whatſoever another gets from me by Force, I ſtill retain the Right of, and he is obliged preſently to reſtore. He that forces my Horſe from me, ought preſently to reſtore him, and I have ſtill a Right to retake him. By the ſame Reaſon, he that *forced a Promiſe* from me, ought preſently to reſtore it, *i. e.* quit me of the Obligation of it; or I may reſume it my ſelf, *i. e.* chuſe whether I will perform it. For the Law of Nature laying an Obligation on me only by the Rule ſhe preſcribes, cannot oblige me by the Violation of her Rules: Such is the extorting any thing from me by Force. Nor does it at all alter the Caſe to ſay, *I gave my Promiſe*, no more than it excuſes the Force, and paſſes the Right, when I put my Hand in my Pocket, and deliver my Purſe my ſelf to a Thief, who demands it with a Piſtol at my Breaſt.

187. From all which it follows, that the *Government of a Conqueror*, impoſed by Force on the Subdued, againſt whom he had no Right of War, or who joined not in the War againſt him, where he had Right, *has no Obligation* upon them.

188. But let us ſuppoſe, that all the Men of that Community being all Members of the ſame Body politick, may be taken to have join'd in that unjuſt War wherein they are ſubdued, and ſo their Lives are at the Mercy of the Conqueror.

189. I ſay, this concerns not their Children who are in their Minority. For ſince a Father hath not, in himſelf, a Power over the Life and Liberty of his Child, no Act of his can poſſibly forfeit it. So that the Children, whatever may have happened to the Fathers, are Freemen, and the abſolute Power of the *Conqueror* reaches no farther than the Perſons of the Men that were ſubdued by him, and dies with them; and ſhould he govern them as Slaves, ſubjected to his abſolute arbitrary Power, he *has* no *ſuch Right of Dominion over their Children*. He can have no Power over them but by their own Conſent, whatever he may drive them to ſay or do; and he has no lawful Authority, whilſt Force, and not Choice, compels them to Submiſſion.

190. Every Man is born with a double Right: *Firſt*, A *Right of Freedom to his Perſon*, which no other Man has a Power over, but the free Diſpoſal of it lies in himſelf. *Secondly*, A *Right* before any other Man, *to inherit* with his Brethren his *Father's Goods*.

191. By the firſt of theſe, a Man is *naturally free* from Subjection to any Government, tho' he be born in a Place under its Juriſdiction. But if he diſclaim the lawful Government of the Country he was born in, he muſt alſo quit the Right that belong'd to him by the Laws of it, and the Poſſeſſions there deſcending to him from his Anceſtors, if it were a Government made by their Conſent.

192. By the ſecond, the *Inhabitants* of any Country, who are deſcended, and derive a Title to their Eſtates from thoſe who are ſubdued, and had a Government forced upon them againſt their free Conſents, *retain a Right to the Poſſeſſion of their Anceſtors*, though they conſent not freely to the Government, whoſe hard Conditions were by Force impoſed on the Poſſeſſors of that Country. For the firſt *Conqueror never having had a Title to the Land* of that Country, the People who are the Deſcendants of, or claim under thoſe who were forced to ſubmit to the Yoke of a Government by Conſtraint, have always a Right to ſhake it off, and and free themſelves from the Uſurpation or Tyranny which the Sword hath brought in upon them, till their Rulers put them under ſuch a Frame of Government as they willingly and of choice conſent to. Who doubts but the *Grecian* Chriſtians, Deſcendants of the ancient Poſſeſſors of that Country, may juſtly caſt off the *Turkiſh* Yoke which they have ſo long groaned under, whenever they have an Opportunity to do it? For no Government can have a Right to Obedience from a People who have not freely conſented to it; which they can never be ſuppoſed to do, till either they are put in a full ſtate of Liberty, to chuſe their Government and Governors, or at leaſt till they have ſuch ſtanding Laws, to which they have by themſelves or their Repreſentatives given their free Conſent, and alſo till they are allow'd their due Property, which is ſo to be Proprietors of what they have, that no body can take away any Part of it without their own Conſent, without which, Men under any Government are not in the ſtate of Freemen, but are direct Slaves under the Force of War.

193. But granting that the *Conqueror* in a juſt War has a Right to the Eſtates, as well as Power over the Perſons, of the Conquered; which, 'tis plain, he *hath* not: Nothing of *abſolute Power* will follow from hence, in the Continuance of the Government: Becauſe the Deſcendants of theſe being all Freemen, if he grants them Eſtates and Poſſeſſions to inhabit his Country, (without which it would be worth nothing) whatſoever he grants them, they have, ſo far as it is granted, *Property* in. The Nature whereof is, that *without a Man's own Conſent* it *cannot be taken from him.*

194. Their *Perſons* are *free* by a native Right, and their *Properties*, be they more or leſs, are *their own, and at their own diſpoſe*, and not at his; or elſe it is no *Property*. Suppoſing the Conqueror gives to one Man a thouſand Acres, to him and his Heirs for ever, to another he lets a thouſand Acres for his Life, under the Rent of 50*l.* or 500*l. per Ann.* Has not the one of theſe a Right to his thouſand Acres for ever, and the other, during his Life, paying the ſaid Rent? And hath not the Tenant for Life a *Property* in all that he gets over and above his Rent, by his Labour and Induſtry, during the ſaid Term, ſuppoſing it be double the Rent? Can any one ſay, the King, or Conqueror, after his Grant, may by his Power of Conqueror take away all, or part of the Land from the Heirs of one, or from the other during his Life, he paying the Rent? Or can he take away from either, the Goods or Money they have got upon the ſaid Land, at his Pleaſure? If he can, then all free and voluntary *Contracts* ceaſe, and are void in the World; there needs nothing to diſſolve them at any time, but Power enough: And all the *Grants* and *Promiſes* of *Men in Power*, are but Mockery and Colluſion. For can there be any thing more ridiculous than to ſay, I give yond yours ua this for ever; and that in the ſureſt and moſt ſolemn Way of Conveyance can be deviſed: And yet it is to be underſtood, that I have a Right, if I pleaſe, to take it away from you again to Morrow?

195. I will not diſpute now, whether Princes are exempt from the Laws of their Country; but this I am ſure, they owe Subjection to the Laws of God and Nature. No Body, no Power, can exempt them from the Obligations of that eternal Law. Thoſe are ſo great, and ſo ſtrong, in the Caſe of *Promiſes*, that Omnipotency itſelf can be tied by them. *Grants*, *Promiſes*, and *Oaths*, are *Bonds* that *hold the Almighty*: Whatever ſome Flatterers ſay to Princes of the World, who all together, with all their People joined to them, are, in Compariſon of the Great God, but as a Drop of the Bucket, or a Duſt on the Balance, inconſiderable nothing!

196. The ſhort of the *Caſe in Conqueſt* is this, The Conqueror, if he have a juſt Cauſe, has a deſpotical Right over the Perſons of all, that actually aided, and concurred in the War againſt him, and a Right to make up his Damage and Coſt

out of their Labour and Eſtates, ſo he injure not the Right of any other. Over the reſt of the People, if there were any that conſented not to the War, and over the Children of the Captives themſelves, or the Poſſeſſions of either, he has no Power; and ſo can have, *by vertue of Conqueſt, no lawful Title* himſelf *to Dominion* over them, or derive it to his Poſterity; but is an Aggreſſor, if he attempts upon their Properties, and thereby puts himſelf in a State of War againſt them, and has no better a Right of Principality, he, nor any of his Succeſſors, than *Hingar*, or *Hubba*, the *Danes* had here in *England*; or *Spartacus*, had he conquered *Italy*, would have had; which is to have their Yoke caſt off, as ſoon as God ſhall give thoſe under their Subjection Courage and Opportunity to do it. Thus, notwithſtanding whatever Title the Kings of *Aſſyria* had over *Judah*, by the Sword, God aſſiſted *Hezekiah* to throw off the Dominion of that conquering Empire. *And the Lord was with Hezekiah, and he proſpered; wherefore he went forth, and he rebelled againſt the King of Aſſyria, and ſerved him not*, 2 Kings xviii. 7. Whence it is plain, that ſhaking off a Power, which Force, and not Right hath ſet over any one, though it hath the Name of *Rebellion*, yet is no Offence before God, but is that which he allows and countenances, though even Promiſes and Covenants, when obtain'd by Force, have intervened. For 'tis very probable, to any one that reads the Story of *Ahaz* and *Hezekiah* attentively, that the *Aſſyrians* ſubdued *Ahaz*, and depoſed him, and made *Hezekiah* King in his Father's Life-time; and that *Hezekiah* by Agreement had done him Homage, and paid him Tribute all this time.

CHAP. XVII.

Of USURPATION.

197. AS Conqueſt may be called a foreign Uſurpation, ſo Uſurpation is a kind of domeſtick Conqueſt, with this Difference, that an Uſurper can never have Right on his ſide, it being no *Uſurpation*, but where one is got into the *Poſſeſſion of what another has a Right to.* This, ſo far as it is *Uſurpation*, is a Change only of Perſons, but not of the Forms and Rules of the Government: For if the Uſurper extend his Power beyond what of right belonged to the lawful Princes, or Governors of the Common-wealth, 'tis *Tyranny* added to *Uſurpation.*

198. In all lawful Governments, the Deſignation of the Perſons, who are to bear Rule, is as natural and neceſſary a part as the Form of the Government itſelf, and is that which had its Eſtabliſhment originally from the People; the Anarchy being much alike, to have no Form of Government at all; or to agree, that it ſhould be Monarchical, but to appoint no Way to deſign the Perſon that ſhall have the Power, and be the Monarch. Hence all Common-wealths, with the Form of Government eſtabliſhed, have Rules alſo of appointing thoſe, who are to have any Share in the publick Authority, and ſettled Methods of conveying the Right to them. For the Anarchy is much alike to have no Form of Government at all; or to agree that it ſhall be Monarchical, but to appoint no way to know or deſign the Perſon that ſhall have the Power, and be the Monarch. Whoever gets into the Exerciſe of any part of the Power, by other ways than what the Laws of the Community have preſcribed, hath no Right to be obeyed, though the Form of the Common-wealth be ſtill preſerved; ſince he is not the Perſon the Laws have appointed, and conſequently not the Perſon the People have conſented to. Nor can ſuch an *Uſurper*, or any deriving from him, ever have a Title, till the People are both at liberty to conſent, and have actually conſented to allow, and confirm in him the Power he hath till then uſurped.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of TYRANNY.

199. AS Uſurpation is the Exerciſe of Power, which another hath a Right to; ſo *Tyranny is the Exerciſe of Power beyond Right*, which no Body can have a Right to. And this is making uſe of the Power any one has in his Hands, not for the good of thoſe who are under it, but for his own private ſeparate Advantage. When the Governor, however intitled, makes not the Law, but his Will the Rule; and his Commands and Actions are not directed to the Preſervation of the Properties of his People, but the Satisfaction of his own Ambition, Revenge, Covetouſneſs, or any other irregular Paſſion.

200. If one can doubt this to be Truth, or Reaſon, becauſe it comes from the obſcure Hand of a Subject, I hope the Authority of a King will make it paſs with him. King *James* the Firſt, in his Speech to the Parliament 1603, tells them thus, *I will ever prefer the Weal of the Publick, and of the whole Common-wealth, in making of good Laws and Conſtitutions, to any particular and private Ends of mine. Thinking ever the Wealth and Weal of the Common-wealth to be my greateſt Weal and worldly Felicity; a Point wherein a lawful King doth directly differ from a Tyrant. For I do acknowledge, that the ſpecial and greateſt Point of Difference that is between a righteful King, and an uſurping Tyrant, is this, That whereas the proud and ambitious Tyrant doth think, his Kingdom and People are only ordained for Satisfaction of his Deſires and unreaſonable Appetites; the righteous and juſt King doth by the contrary acknowledge himſelf to be ordained for the procuring of the Wealth and Property of his People.* And again, in his Speech to the Parliament 1609, he hath theſe Words, *The King binds himſelf by a double Oath, to the Obſervation of the fundamental Laws of his Kingdom. Tacitly, as by being a King, and ſo bound to protect as well the People, as the Laws of his Kingdom, and expreſly by his Oath at his Coronation; ſo as every juſt King, in a ſettled Kingdom, is bound to obſerve that Paction made to his People, by his Laws in framing his Government agreeable thereunto, according to that Paction which God made with* Noah *after the Deluge. Hereafter, Seed-time and Harveſt, and Cold and Heat, and Summer and Winter, and Day and Night, ſhall not ceaſe while the Earth remaineth. And therefore a King governing in a ſettled Kingdom, leaves to be a King, and degenerates into a Tyrant, as ſoon as he leaves off to rule according to his Laws.* And a little after, *Therefore all Kings that are not Tyrants, or perjured, will be glad to bound themſelves within the Limits of their Laws. And they that perſwade them the contrary, are Vipers, and Peſts both againſt them and the Common-wealth.* Thus that learned King, who well underſtood the Notions of Things, makes the Difference betwixt a *King* and a *Tyrant* to conſiſt only in this, That one makes the Laws the Bounds of his Power, and the Good of the Publick, the End of his Government; the other makes all give way to his own Will and Appetite.

201. 'Tis a Miſtake to think this Fault is proper only to Monarchies; other Forms of Government are liable to it, as well as that. For where-ever the Power, that is put in any Hands for the Government of the People, and the Preſervation of their Properties is applied to other Ends, and made uſe of to impoveriſh, haraſs, or ſubdue them to the arbitrary irregular Commands of thoſe that have it: There it preſently becomes *Tyranny*, whether thoſe that thus uſe it are one or many. Thus we read of the Thirty Tyrants at *Athens*, as well as one at *Syracuſe*; and the intolerable Dominion of the *Decemviri* at *Rome* was nothing better.

202. *Wherever Law ends, Tyranny begins*, if the Law be tranſgreſſed to another's harm. And whoſoever in Authority exceeds the Power given him by the Law, and makes uſe of the Force, he has under his Command, to compaſs that upon the Subject, which the Law allows not, ceaſes in that to be a Magiſtrate, and acting without Authority, may be oppoſed, as any other Man, who by Force invades the Right of another. This is acknowledged in ſubordinate Magiſtrates. He that hath Authority to ſeize my Perſon in the Street, may be oppoſed as a Thief and a Robber, if he endeavours to break into my Houſe to execute a Writ, notwith-

notwithſtanding that I know, he has ſuch a Warrant, and ſuch a Legal Authority, as will impower him to arreſt me abroad. And why this ſhould not hold in the higheſt, as well as in the moſt inferior Magiſtrate, I would gladly be informed. It is reaſonable, that the eldeſt Brother, becauſe he has the greateſt part of his Father's Eſtate, ſhould thereby have a Right to take away any of his younger Brother's Portions? Or that a rich Man, who poſſeſſed a whole Country, ſhould from thence have a Right to ſeize, when he pleaſed, the Cottage and Garden of his poor Neighbour? The being rightfully poſſeſſed of great Power and Riches exceedingly beyond the greateſt part of the Sons of *Adam*, is ſo far from being an Excuſe, much leſs a Reaſon, for Rapine and Oppreſſion, which the endamaging one another without Authority is, that it is a great Aggravation of it. For the exceeding the Bounds of Authority, is no more a Right in a great, than a petty Officer; no more juſtifiable in a King than a Conſtable: But is ſo much the worſe in him, in that he has more Truſt put in him, has already a much greater Share than the reſt of his Brethren, and is ſuppoſed, from the Advantages of his Education, Employment, and Counſellors, to be more knowing in the Meaſures of Right and Wrong.

203. May the *Commands* then *of a Prince be oppoſed?* May he be reſiſted as often as any one ſhall find himſelf aggrieved, and but imagine he has not a Right done him? This will unhinge and overturn all Polities, and inſtead of Government and Order, leave nothing but Anarchy and Confuſion.

204. To this I anſwer: That *Force* is to be *oppoſed* to nothing, but to unjuſt and unlawful *Force*; whoever makes any Oppoſition in any other Caſe, draws on himſelf a juſt Condemnation both from God and Man; and ſo no ſuch Danger or Confuſion will follow, as is often ſuggeſted. For,

205. *Firſt*, As in ſome Countries, the Perſon of the Prince by Law is ſacred; and ſo whatever he commands or does, his Perſon is ſtill free from all Queſtion or Violence, not liable to Force, or any judicial Cenſure or Condemnation. But yet Oppoſition may be made to the illegal Acts of any inferior Officer, or other commiſſioned by him, unleſs he will by actually putting himſelf into a State of War with his People, diſſolve the Government, and leave them to that Defence, which belongs to every one in the ſtate of Nature. For of ſuch things who can tell what the End will be? And a Neighbour Kingdom has ſhewed the World an odd Example. In all other Caſes the *Sacredneſs* of the *Perſon exempts him from all Inconveniencies*, whereby he is ſecure, whilſt the Government ſtands, from all Violence and Harm whatſoever; than which there cannot be a wiſer Conſtitution. For the Harm he can do in his own Perſon not being likely to happen often, nor to extend it ſelf far; nor being able by his ſingle Strength to ſubvert the Laws, nor oppreſs the Body of the People, ſhould any Prince have ſo much Weakneſs, and ill Nature as to be willing to do it, the Inconveniency of ſome particular Miſchiefs, that may happen ſometimes, when a heady Prince comes to the Throne, are well recompenſed, by the Peace of the Publick, and Security of the Government, in the Perſon of the Chief Magiſtrate, thus ſet out of the reach of Danger: It being ſafer for the Body, that ſome few private Men ſhould be ſometimes in danger to ſuffer, than that the Head of the Republick ſhould be eaſily, and upon ſlight Occaſions expoſed.

206. *Secondly*, But this Privilege belonging only to the King's Perſon, hinders not, but they may be queſtioned, oppoſed, and reſiſted, who uſe unjuſt Force, though they pretend a Commiſſion from him, which the Law authorizes not. As is plain in the Caſe of him, that has the King's Writ to arreſt a Man, which is a full Commiſſion from the King; and yet he that has it cannot break open a Man's Houſe to do it, nor execute this Command of the King upon certain Days, nor in certain Places, though this Commiſſion have no ſuch Exception in it, but they are the Limitations of the Law, which if any one tranſgreſs, the King's Commiſſion excuſes him not. For the King's Authority being given him only by the Law, he cannot impower any one to act againſt the Law, or juſtify him, by his Commiſſion in ſo doing. The *Commiſſion*, or *Command of any Magiſtrate, where he has no Authority*, being as *void* and inſignificant, as that of any private Man. The difference between the one and the other, being that the Magiſtrate has ſome Authority ſo far, and to ſuch Ends, and the private Man has none at all. For 'tis not the *Commiſſion*, but the *Authority*, that gives the Right of acting; and *againſt*

the

the Laws there can be no Authority. But, notwithſtanding ſuch Reſiſtance, the King's Perſon and Authority are ſtill both ſecured, and ſo *no Danger to Gover-nor or Government.*

207. *Thirdly*, Suppoſing a Government wherein the Perſon of the Chief Magiſtrate is not thus Sacred; yet this *Doctrine* of the Lawfulneſs of *Reſiſting* all unlawful Exerciſes of his Power, *will not* upon every ſlight Occaſion indanger him, or *embroil the Government.* For where the injured Party may be relieved, and his Damages repaired by Appeal to the Law, there can be no Pretence for Force, which is only to be uſed where a Man is intercepted from appealing to the Law. For nothing is to be accounted Hoſtile Force, but where it leaves not the Remedy of ſuch an Appeal. And 'tis ſuch *Force* alone, that *puts* him that uſes it *into a ſtate of War*, and makes it lawful to reſiſt him. A Man with a Sword in his Hand, demands my Purſe in the High-way, when perhaps I have not 12 *d.* in my Pocket; this Man I may lawfully kill. To another I deliver 100 *l.* to hold only whilſt I alight, which he refuſes to reſtore me, when I am got up again, but draws his Sword to defend the Poſſeſſion of it by Force, if I endeavour to retake it. The Miſchief this Man does me, is a hundred, or poſſibly a thouſand times more, than the other perhaps intended me, (whom I killed before he really did me any) and yet I might lawfully kill the one, and cannot ſo much as hurt the other lawfully. The Reaſon whereof is plain; becauſe the one uſing *Force*, which threatned my Life, I could not have *Time to appeal* to the Law to ſecure it: And when it was gone, 'twas too late to appeal. The Law could not reſtore Life to my dead Carcaſs: The Loſs was irreparable; which to prevent, the Law of Nature gave me a Right to *deſtroy* him, who had put himſelf into a ſtate of War with me, and threatened my Deſtruction. But in the other Caſe, my Life not being in danger, I may have the *Benefit of appealing* to the Law, and have Reparation for my 100 *l.* that way.

208. *Fourthly*, But if the unlawful Acts done by the Magiſtrate, be maintained (by the Power he has got) and the Remedy which is due by Law, be by the ſame Power obſtructed; yet the *Right of Reſiſting*, even in ſuch manifeſt Acts of Tyranny, *will not* ſuddenly, or on ſlight Occaſions, *diſturb the Government.* For if it reach no farther than ſome private Mens Caſes, though they have a Right to defend themſelves and to recover by Force, what by unlawful Force is taken from them; yet the Right to do ſo, will not eaſily engage them in a Conteſt, wherein they are ſure to periſh; it being as impoſſible for one, or a few oppreſſed Men to *diſturb the Government*, where the Body of the People do not think themſelves concerned in it, as for a raving Madman, or heady Malecontent to overturn a well-ſettled State; the People being as little apt to follow the one, as the other.

209. But if either theſe illegal Acts have extended to the Majority of the People; or if the Miſchief and Oppreſſion has light only on ſome few, but in ſuch Caſes, as the Precedent, and Conſequences ſeem to threaten all, and they are perſuaded in their Conſciences, and their Laws, and with them their Eſtates, Liberties, and Lives are in danger, and perhaps their Religion too, how they will be hindered from reſiſting illegal Force, uſed againſt them, I cannot tell. This is an *Inconvenience*, I confeſs, *that attends all Governments* whatſoever, when the Governors have brought it to this paſs, to be generally ſuſpected of their People; the moſt dangerous State which they can poſſibly put themſelves in; wherein they are the leſs to be pitied, becauſe it is ſo eaſy to be avoided; it being impoſſible for a Governor, if he really means the Good of his People, and the Preſervation of them, and their Laws together, not to make them ſee and feel it; as it is for the Father of a Family, not to let his Children ſee he loves, and takes care of them.

210. But if all the World ſhall obſerve Pretences of one kind, and Actions of another; Arts uſed to elude the Law, and the Truſt of Prerogative (which is an Arbitrary Power in ſome Things left in the Prince's Hand to do good, not harm to the People) employed, contrary to the End, for which it was given: If the People ſhall find the Miniſters and ſubordinate Magiſtrates choſen ſuitable to ſuch Ends, and favoured, or laid by proportionably, as they promote, or oppoſe them: If they ſee ſeveral Experiments made of arbitrary Power, and that Religion underhand favoured, (though publickly proclaimed againſt) which is readieſt to introduce it; and the Operators in it ſupported, as much as may be; and when that

that cannot be done, yet approved ſtill, and liked the better: If a *long Train of Actings ſhew the Councils* all tending that Way, how can a Man any more hinder himſelf from being perſwaded in his own Mind, which Way Things are going; or from caſting about how to ſave himſelf, than he could from believing the Captain of the Ship he was in, was carrying him, and the reſt of the Company to *Algiers*, when he found him always ſteering that Courſe, though croſs Winds, Leaks in his Ship, and want Men and Proviſions did often force him to turn his Courſe another Way for ſome Time, which he ſteadily returned to again, as ſoon as the Wind, Weather, and other Circumſtances would let him?

CHAP. XIX.

Of the Diſſolution of Government.

211. HE that will with any clearneſs ſpeak of the *Diſſolution of Government*, ought in the firſt Place to diſtinguiſh between the *Diſſolution of the Society*, and the *Diſſolution of the Government*. That which makes the Community, and brings Men out of the looſe ſtate of Nature, into *one politick Society*, is the Agreement which every one has with the reſt to incorporate, and act as one Body, and ſo be one diſtinct Common-wealth. The uſual, and almoſt only way whereby *this Union is diſſolved*, is the Inroad of foreign Force making a Conqueſt upon them. For in that Caſe, (not being able to maintain and ſupport themſelves, as one *intire* and *independent Body*) the Union belonging to that Body which conſiſted therein, muſt neceſſarily ceaſe, and ſo every one return to the State he was in before, with a Liberty to ſhift for himſelf, and provide for his own Safety as he thinks fit in ſome other Society. Whenever the *Society is diſſolved*, 'tis certain the Government of that Society cannot remain. Thus Conquerors Swords often cut up Governments by the Roots, and mangle Societies to Pieces, ſeparating the ſubdued or ſcattered Multitude from the Protection of, and Dependence on that Society which ought to have preſerved them from Violence. The World is too well inſtructed in, and too forward to allow of this Way of diſſolving of Governments, to need any more to be ſaid of it; and there wants not much Argument to prove, that where the *Society is diſſolved*, the Government cannot remain; that being as impoſſible, as for the Frame of an Houſe to ſubſiſt, when the Materials of it are ſcattered, and diſſipated by a Whirl-wind; or jumbled into a confuſed Heap by an Earth-quake.

212. Beſides this over-turning from without, *Governments are diſſolved from within.*

Firſt, When the *Legiſlative* is *altered*. Civil Society being a State of Peace, amongſt thoſe who are of it, from whom the State of War is excluded by the Umpirage, whichthey have provided in their Legiſlatve, for the ending all Differences, that may ariſe amongſt any of them, 'tis in their *Legiſlative*, that the Members of a Common-wealth are united, and combined together in one coherent living Body. This *is the Soul that gives Form, Life, and Unity* to the Common-wealth: From hence the ſeveral Members have their mutual Influence, Sympathy and Connexion: And therefore when the *Legiſlative* is broken, or *diſſolved*, Diſſolution and Death follows. For the *Eſſence and Union of the Society* conſiſting in having one Will, the Legiſlative, when once eſtabliſhed by the Majority, has the declaring, and as it were keeping of that Will. The *Conſtitution of the Legiſlative* is the firſt and fundamental Act of the Society, whereby Proviſion is made for the *Continuation of their Union*, under the Direction of Perſons, and Bonds of Laws, made by Perſons authorized thereunto, by the Conſent and Appointment of the People, without which no one Man, or number of Men, amongſt them, can have Authority of making Laws, that ſhall be binding to the reſt. When any one or more, ſhall take upon them to make Laws, whom the People have not appointed ſo to do, they make Laws without Authority, which the People are not therefore bound to Obey; by which Means they come again to be out of Subjection, and may conſtitute to themſelves a *new Legiſlative*, as they think beſt, being in full Liberty to reſiſt the Force of thoſe, whowithout Authority would impoſe any

any thing upon them. Every one is at the Diſpoſure of his own Will, when thoſe who had by the Deligation, of the Society, the declaring of the Publick Will, are excluded from it, and others uſurp the Place, who have not ſuch Authority or Delegation.

213. This being uſually brought about by ſuch in the Common-wealth, who miſuſe the Power they have; it is hard to conſider it aright, and know at whoſe door to lay it, without knowing the Form of Government in which it happens. Let us ſuppoſe then the Legiſlative placed in the Concurrence of three Diſtinct Perſons.

1. A ſingle hereditary Perſon having the conſtant, ſupream, executive Power, and with it the Power of Convoking and Diſſolving the other two within certain Periods of Time.

2. An Aſſembly of Hereditary Nobility.

3. An Aſſembly of Repreſentatives choſen *pro tempore* by the People: Such a Form of Government ſuppoſed, it is evident,

214. *Firſt*, That when ſuch a ſingle Perſon, or Prince ſets up his own arbitrary Will in Place of the Laws, which are the Will of the Society, declared by the Legiſlative, then the *Legiſlative is changed*. For that being in effect the Legiſlative, whoſe Rules and Laws are put in Execution, and required to be obeyed; when other Laws are ſet up, and other Rules pretended, and inforced, than what the Legiſlative, conſtituted by the Society, have enacted, 'tis plain, that the *Legiſlative is changed*. Whoever introduces new Laws, not being thereunto authorized by the fundamental Appointment of the Society, or ſubverts the old, diſowns and overturns the Power by which they were made, and ſo ſets up a *New Legiſlative*.

215. *Secondly*, When the Prince hinders the Legiſlative from aſſembling in its due Time, or from acting freely, purſuant to thoſe Ends, for which it was conſtituted, the *Legiſlative is altered*. For 'tis not a certain number of Men, no, nor their meeting, unleſs they have alſo Freedom of debating, and Leiſure of perfecting, what is for the good of the Society, wherein the Legiſlative conſiſts; when theſe are taken away or altered, ſo as to deprive the Society of the due exerciſe of their Power, the *Legiſlative* is truly altered. For it is not Names, that conſtitute Governments, but the Uſe and Exerciſe of thoſe Powers, that were intended to accompany them; ſo that he, who takes away the Freedom, or hinders the acting of the Legiſlative in its due Seaſons, in effect takes *away the Legiſlative*, and *puts an End to the Government*.

216. *Thirdly*, When by the arbitrary Power of the Prince, the Electors, or Ways of Election are altered, without the Conſent, and contrary to the common Intereſt of the People, there alſo the *Legiſlative is altered*. For if others, than thoſe whom the Society hath authorized thereunto, do chuſe, or in another Way, than what the Society hath preſcribed, thoſe choſen are not the Legiſlatve appointed by the People.

217. *Fourthly*, The Delivery alſo of the People into the Subjection of foreign Power, either by the Prince, or by the Legiſlative, is certainly a *Change of the Legiſlative*, and ſo a *Diſſolution of the Government*. For the End why People entered into Society being to be preſerved one entire, free, independent Society, to be governed by its own Laws; this is loſt, whenever they are given up into the Power of another.

218. Why in ſuch a Conſtitution as this, the *Diſſolution of the Government* in theſe Caſes is to be imputed to the Prince, is evident; becauſe he having the Force, Treaſure, and Offices of the State to employ, and often perſuading himſelf, or being flattered by others, that as ſupreme Magiſtrate he is uncapable of Controul; he alone is in a Condition to make great Advances toward ſuch Changes, under Pretence of Lawful Authority, and has it in his Hands to terrify or ſuppreſs Oppoſers, as factious, ſeditious, and Enemies to the Government: Whereas no other Part of the Legiſlative, or People is capable by themſelves to attempt any Alteration of the Legiſlative, without open and viſible Rebellion, apt enough to be taken Notice of, which when it prevails, produces Effects very little different from foreign Conqueſt. Beſides, the Prince in ſuch a Form of Government, having the Power of diſſolving the other Parts of the Legiſlative, and thereby rendring them private Perſons, they can never in Oppoſition to him, or without his Concurrence, alter the Legiſlative by a Law, his Conſent being neceſſary to

give

give any of their Decrees that Sanction. But yet ſo far as the other Parts of the Legiſlative any Way contribute to any Attempt upon the Government, and do either promote, or not, what lies in them, hinder ſuch Deſigns, they are guilty, and partake in this, which is certainly the greateſt Crime Men can be guilty of one towards another.

219. There is one way more whereby ſuch a Government may be diſſolved, and that is, when he who has the ſupreme executive Power, neglects and abandons that Charge, ſo that the Laws already made can no longer be put in Execution. This is demonſtratively to reduce all to Anarchy, and ſo effectually *to diſſolve the Government*. For Laws not being made for themſelves, but to be by their Execution, the Bonds of the Society, to keep every part of the Body Politick in its due Place and Function, when that totally ceaſes, the *Government* viſibly *ceaſes*, and the People become a confuſed Multitude without Order or Connexion. Where there is no longer the Adminiſtration of Juſtice, for the ſecuring of Mens Rights, nor any remaining Power within the Community to direct the Force, or provide for the Neceſſities of the Publick, there certainly is *no Government left*. Where the Laws cannot be executed, it is all one, as if there were no Laws, and a Government without Laws, is, I ſuppoſe, a Myſtery in Politicks, unconceivable to human Capacity, and inconſiſtent with human Society.

220. In theſe and the like Caſes, *when the Government is diſſolved*, the People are at Liberty to provide for themſelves, by erecting a new Legiſlative, differing from the other, by the change of Perſons, or Form, or both, as they ſhall find it moſt for their Safety and Good. For the *Society* can never, by the Fault of another, loſe the Native and Original Right it has to preſerve itſelf, which can only be done by a ſettled Legiſlative, and a fair and impartial execution of the Laws made by it. But the ſtate of Mankind is not ſo miſerable that they are not capable of uſing this Remedy, till it be too late to look for any. To tell *People* they *may provide for themſelves* by erecting a new Legiſlative, when by Oppreſſion, Artifice, or being delivered over to a foreign Power, their old one is gone, is only to tell them, they may expect Relief when it is too late, and the Evil is paſt Cure. This is in effect no more, than to bid them firſt be Slaves, and then to take care of their Liberty; and when their Chains are on, tell them, they may act like Freemen. This, if barely ſo, is rather Mockery, than Relief; and Men can never be ſecure from Tyranny, if there be no Means to eſcape it, till they are perfectly under it: And therefore it is, that they have not only a Right to get out of it, but to prevent it.

221. There is therefore Secondly another Way whereby *Governments are diſſolved*, and that is, when the Legiſlative, or the Prince either of them act contrary to their Truſt.

Firſt, The *Legiſlative acts againſt the Truſt* repoſed in them, when they endeavour to evade the Property of the Subject, and to make themſelves or any part of the Community, Maſters or arbitrary Diſpoſers of the Lives, Liberties, or Fortunes of the People.

222. The Reaſon why Men enter into Society, is the Preſervation of their Property; and the End why they chuſe and authorize a Legiſlative, is that there may be Laws made, and Rules ſet, as Guards and Fences to the Properties of all the Members of the Society, to limit the Power, and moderate the Dominion of every Part and Member of the Society. For ſince it can never be ſuppoſed to be the Will of the Society, that the Legiſlative ſhould have a Power to deſtroy that which every one deſigns ſecure, by entering into Society, and for which the People ſubmitted to themſelves Legiſlators of their own making, whenever the *Legiſlators endeavour to take away, and deſtroy the Property of the People*, or to reduce them to Slavery under arbitrary Power, they put themſelves into a ſtate of War with the People, who are thereupon abſolved from any farther Obedience, and are left to the common Refuge, which God hath provided for all Men, againſt Force and Violence. Whenſoever therefore the *Legiſlative* ſhall tranſgreſs this fundamental Rule of Society; and either by Ambition, Fear, Folly or Corruption, *endeavour to graſp* themſelves, *or put into the Hands of any other an abſolute Power* over the Lives, Liberties, and Eſtates of the People: By this Breach of Truſt they *forfeit the Power*, the People had put into their Hands, for quite contrary Ends, and it devolves to the People, who have a Right to reſume their original Liberty,

and, by the eſtabliſhment of the new Legiſlative, (ſuch as they ſhall think fit) provide for their own Safety and Security, which is the End for which they are in Society. What I have ſaid here, concerning the Legiſlative in general, holds true alſo concerning the ſupreme Executor, who having a double Truſt put in him, both to have a part in the Legiſlative and the ſupreme Execution of the Law, acts againſt both, when he goes about to ſet up his own arbitrary Will, as the Law of the Society. He *acts* alſo *contrary to his Truſt*, when he either employs the Force, Treaſure, and Offices of the Society, to corrupt the *Repreſentatives*, and gain them to his Purpoſes; or openly pre-ingages the *Electors*, and preſcribes to their Choice, ſuch, whom he has by Sollicitations, Threats, Promiſes, or otherwiſe won to his Deſigns; and employs them to bring in ſuch, who have promiſed before-hand, what to Vote, and what to Enact. Thus to regulate Candidates and Electors, and new-model the Ways of Election, what is it but to cut up the Government by the Roots, and poiſon the very Fountain of publick Security? For the People having reſerved to themſelves the Choice of their *Repreſentatives*, as the Fence to their Properties, could do it for no other End, but that they might always be freely choſen, and ſo choſen, freely act and adviſe, as the Neceſſity of the Common-wealth, and the publick Good ſhould, upon Examination, and mature Debate, be judged to require. This, thoſe who give their Votes before they hear the Debate, and have weighed the Reaſon on all ſides, are not capable of doing. To prepare ſuch an Aſſembly as this, and endeavour to ſet up the declared Abetters of his own Will, for the true *Repreſentatives* of the People, and the Law-makers of the Society, is certainly as great a *breach of Truſt*, and as perfect a Declaration of a Deſign to ſubvert the Government, as is poſſible to be met with. To which, if one ſhall add Rewards and Puniſhments viſibly employ'd to the ſame End, and all the Arts of perverted Law made uſe of, to take off and deſtroy all, that ſtand in the way of ſuch a Deſign, and will not comply and conſent to betray the Liberties of their Country, 'twill be paſt doubt what is doing. What Power they ought to have in the Society, who thus employ it contrary to the Truſt went along with it in its firſt Inſtitution, is eaſy to determine; and one cannot but ſee, that he, who has once attempted any ſuch thing as this, cannot any longer be truſted.

223. To this perhaps it will be ſaid, that the People being ignorant, and always diſcontented, to lay the Foundation of Government in the unſteady Opinion and uncertain Humour of the People, is to expoſe it to certain Ruin; And *no Government will be able long to ſubſiſt*, if the People may ſet up a new Legiſlative, whenever they take offence at the old one. To this I anſwer, quite the contrary. People are not ſo eaſily got out of their old Forms, as ſome are apt to ſuggeſt. They are hardly to be prevailed with to amend the acknowledg'd Faults, in the Frame they have been accuſtom'd to. And if there be any original Defects, or adventitious ones introduced by time, or Corruption; 'tis not an eaſy thing to get them changed, even when all the World ſees there is an Opportunity for it. This Slowneſs and Averſion in the People to quit their old Conſtitutions, has, in the many Revolutions which have been ſeen in this Kingdom, in this and former Ages ſtill kept us to, or, after ſome interval of fruitleſs Attempts, ſtill brought us back again to our old Legiſlative of King, Lords and Commons: And whatever Provocations have made the Crown be taken from ſome of our Princes Heads, they never carried the People ſo far, as to place it in another Line.

224. But 'twill be ſaid, this *Hypotheſis* lays a *ferment for* frequent *Rebellion*. To which I Anſwer,

Firſt, No more than any other *Hypotheſis*. For when the People are made miſerable, and find themſelves *expoſed to the ill Uſage of arbitrary Power*, cry up their Governors, as much as you will, for Sons of *Jupiter*, let them be Sacred and Divine, deſcended, or authoriz'd from Heaven; give them out for whom or what you pleaſe, the ſame will happen. *The People generally ill treated*, and contrary to Right, will be ready upon any Occaſion to caſe themſelves of a Burden, that ſits heavy upon them. They will wiſh, and ſeek for the Opportunity, which in the change, weakneſs and accidents of human Affairs ſeldom delays long to offer it ſelf. He muſt have lived but a little while in the world, who has not ſeen Examples of this in his time; and he muſt have read very little, who cannot produce Examples of it in all ſorts of Governments in the World.

225. *Secondly*,

225. *Secondly*, I answer, such *Revolutions happen* not upon every little Mismanagement in publick Affairs. *Great Mistakes* in the ruling Part, many wrong and inconvenient Laws, and all the *Slips* of human Frailty will be *born by the People* without Mutiny or Murmur. But if a long train of Abuses, Prevarications and Artifices, all tending the same Way make the Design visible to the People, and they cannot but feel, what they lie under, and see, whither they are going; 'tis not to be wonder'd, that they should then rouze themselves, and endeavour to put the Rule into such Hands, which may secure to them the Ends for which Government was at first erected; and without which, ancient Names, and specious Forms, are so far from being better, that they are much worse, than the state of Nature, or pure Anarchy; the Inconveniencies being all as great and as near, but the Remedy farther off and more difficult.

226. *Thirdly*, I answer, That *this Doctrine* of a Power in the People of providing for their Safety a-new, by a new Legislative, when their Legislators have acted contrary to their Trust, by invading their Property, is *the best Fence against Rebellion*, and the probablest Means to hinder it. For *Rebellion* being an Opposition, not to Persons, but Authority, which is founded only in the Constitutions and Laws of the Government; those whoever they be, who by Force break through, and by Force justify their Violation of them, are truly and properly *Rebels*. For when Men by entering into Society and Civil-Government; have excluded Force, and introduced Laws for the Preservation of Property, Peace, and Unity amongst themselves, those who set up Force again in Opposition to the Laws, do *rebellare*, that is, bring back again the state of War, and are properly Rebels: Which they who are in Power, (by the Pretence they have to Authority, the Temptation of Force they have in their Hands, and the Flattery of those about them) being likeliest to do; the propereſt Way to prevent the Evil, is to shew them the Danger and Injustice of it, who are under the greatest Temptation to run into it.

227. In both the forementioned Cases, when either the Legislative is changed or the Legislators act contrary to the End for which they were constituted; those who are guilty are *guilty of Rebellion*. For if any one by Force takes away the establish'd Legislative of any Society, and the Laws by them made, pursuant to their Trust, he thereby takes away the Umpirage, which every one had consented to, for a peaceable Decision of all their Controversies, and a Bar to the state of War amongst them. They who remove, or change the Legislative, take away this decisive Power, which no Body can have, but by the appointment and consent of the People; and so destroying the Authority, which People did, and no Body else can set up, and introducing a Power, which the People hath not authoriz'd, they actually *introduce a state of War*, which is that of Force without Authority: And thus by removing the Legislative establish'd by the Society, (in whose Decisions the People acquiesced and united, as to that of their own Will) they unty the Knot and *expose the People anew to the state of War*. And if those who by Force take away the Legislative, are *Rebels*, the *Legislators* themselves, as has been shewn, can be no less esteemed so; when they, who were set up for the Protection, and Preservation of the People, their Liberties and Properties, shall by Force invade and endeavour to take them away; and so they putting themselves into a state of War with those, who made them the Protectors and Guardians of their Peace, are properly, and with the greatest Aggravation, *Rebellantes*, Rebels.

228. But if they who say *it lays a Foundation for Rebellion*, mean that it may occasion Civil Wars, or intestine Broils, to tell the People they are absolved from Obedience, when illegal Attempts are made upon their Liberties or Properties, and may oppose the unlawful Violence of those, who were their Magistrates, when they invade their Properties contrary to the Trust put in them; and that therefore this Doctrine is not to be allow'd, being so destructive to the Peace of the World. They may as well say upon the same Ground, that honest Men may not oppose Robbers or Pirats, because this may occasion disorder or bloodshed. If any *Mischief* come in such Cases, it is not to be charged upon him who defends his own Right, but *on him*, *that invades* his Neighbours. If the innocent honest Man must quietly quit all he has for Peace sake, to him, who will lay violent Hands upon it, I desire it may be consider'd, what a kind of Peace there will be in the

the World, which consists only in Violence and Rapine; and which is to be maintain'd only for the benefit of Robbers and Oppressors. Who would not think it an admirable Peace betwixt the Mighty and the Mean, when the Lamb, without Resistance, yielded his Throat to be torn by the imperious Wolf? *Polyphemus*'s Den gives us a perfect Pattern of such a Peace, and such a Government wherein *Ulysses* and his Companions had nothing to do, but quietly to suffer themselves to be devour'd. And no doubt *Ulysses*, who was a prudent Man, preach'd up *Passive Obedience*, and exhorted them to a quiet Submission, by representing to them of what concernment Peace was to Mankind; and by shewing the Inconveniencies might happen, if they should offer to resist *Polyphemus*, who had now the Power over them.

229. The End of Government is the Good of Mankind; and which is *best for Mankind*, that the People should be always expos'd to the boundless Will of Tyranny, or that the Rulers should be sometimes liable to be expos'd, when they grow exorbitant in the Use of their Power, and employ it for the Destruction, and not the Preservation of the Properties of their People?

230. Nor let any one say, that Mischief can arise from hence, as often as it shall please a busy Head, or turbulent Spirit, to desire the Alteration of the Government. 'Tis true, such Men may stir, whenever they please, but it will be only to their own just Ruin and Perdition. For till the Mischief be grown general, and the ill Designs of the Rulers become visible, or their Attempts sensible to the greater part, the People, who are more disposed to suffer, than right themselves by Resistance, are not apt to stir. The Examples of particular Injustice, or Oppression of here and there an unfortunate Man, moves them not. But if they universally have a Persuasion, grounded upon manifest Evidence, that Designs are carrying on against their Liberties, and the general course and tendency of things cannot but give them strong Suspicions of the Evil Intention of their Governors, who is to be blamed for it? Who can help it, if they, who might avoid it, bring themselves, into this Suspicion? Are the People to be blamed, if they have the Sence of rational Creatures, and can think of things no otherwise, than as they find and feel them? And is it not rather *their Fault*, who puts things into such a Posture, that they would not have them thought to be as they are? I grant, that the Pride, Ambition, and Turbulency of private Men have sometimes caused great Disorders in Common-wealths, and Factions have been fatal to States and Kingdoms. But whether *the Mischief* hath *oftener* begun *in the Peoples Wantonness*, and a Desire to cast off the lawful Authority of their Rulers; or *in the Ruler's Insolence*, and Endeavours to get, and exercise an Arbritrary Power over their People; whether Oppression, or Disobedience gave the first Rise to the Disorder, I leave it to impartial History to determine. This I am sure, whoever, either Ruler or Subject, by Force goes about to invade the Rights of either Prince or People, and lays the Foundation for *overturning* the Constitution and Frame of *any Just Government*, is highly guilty of the greatest Crime, I think, a Man is capable of, being to answer for all those Mischiefs of Blood, Rapine, and Desolation, which the breaking to pieces of Governments bring on a Country. And he who does it, is justly to be esteemed the common Enemy and Pest of Mankind; and is to be treated accordingly.

231. That *Subjects* or *Foreigners* attempting by Force on the Properties of any People, may be *resisted* with Force, is agreed on all Hands. But that *Magistrates*, doing the same thing, may be *resisted*, hath of late been denied: As if those who had the greatest Privileges and Advantages by the Law, had thereby Power to break those Laws, by which alone they were set in a better Place than their Brethren: Whereas their Offence is thereby the greater, both as being ungrateful for the greater share they have by the Law, and breaking also that Trust, which is put into their hands by their Brethren.

232. Whosoever uses *Force without Right*, as every one does in Society, who does it without Law, puts himself into a *state of War* with those, against whom he so uses it, and in that state all former Ties are cancelled, all other Rights cease, and every one has a Right to defend himself and *to resist the Aggressor*. This is so evident, that *Barclay* himself, that great Assertor of the Power and Sacredness of Kings, is forced to confess, That it is lawful for the People, in

some

ſome Caſes, to *reſiſt* their King; and that too in a Chapter, wherein he pretends to ſhew, that the Divine Law ſhuts up the People from all manner of Rebellion. Whereby it is evident, even by his own Doctrine, that, ſince they may in ſome Caſes *reſiſt*, all reſiſting of *Princes* is not Rebellion. His Words are theſe. *Quod ſiquis dicat, Ergone populus tyrannicæ crudelitati & furori jugulum ſemper præbebit? Ergone multitudo civitates ſuas fame, ferro, & flammâ vaſtari, ſeque, conjuges, & liberos fortunæ ludibrio & tyranni libidini exponi, inquæ omnia vitæ pericula omneſque miſerias & moleſtias à Rege deduci patientur? Num illis quod omni animantium generi eſt à naturâ tributum denegari debet, ut ſc. vim vi repellant, ſeſeq; ab injuriâ tueantur? Huic brevitur reſponſum ſit, Populo univerſo negari defenſionem, quæ juris naturales eſt, neque ultionem quæ præter naturam eſt adverſus Regem concedi debere. Quapropter ſi Rex non in ſingularis tantum perſonas aliquot privatum odium exerceat, ſed corpus etiam Reipublicæ, cujus ipſe caput eſt,* i. e. *totum populum, vel inſignam aliquam ejus partem immani & intolerandâ ſævitiâ ſeu tyrannide divexet; populo, quidem hoc caſu reſiſtendi ac tuendi ſe ab injuriâ poteſtas competit, ſed tuendi ſe tantum, non enim in principem invadendi: & reſtituendæ injuræ illatæ, non recedendi à debitâ reverentiâ propter acceptam injuriam. Præſentem denique impetum propulſandi non vim præteritam ulciſcendi jus habet. Horum enim alterum à naturâ eſt, ut vitam ſcilicet, corpuſque tueamur. Alterum vero contra naturam, ut inferior de ſuperiori ſupplicium ſumat. Quod itaque populus malum, antequam factum ſit, impedire poteſt, ne fiat, id poſtquam factum eſt, in Regem authorem ſceleris vindicare non poteſt: Populus igitur hoc ampliùs quam privatus quiſpiam habet: Quod huic, vel ipſis adverſariis judicibus, excepto Buchanano, nullum niſi in patientia remedium ſupereſt. Cùm ille ſi intolerabilis tyrannus eſt (modicum enim ferre omnino debet) reſiſtere cum reverentiâ poſſit,* Barclay *contra Monarchom.* L. 3. c. 8.

In *Engliſh* thus.

233. *But if any one ſhould ask, Muſt the People then always lay themſelves open to the Cruelty and Rage of Tyranny? Muſt they ſee their Cities pillaged, and laid in Aſhes, their Wifes and Children expoſed to the Tyrant's Luſt and Fury, and themſelves and Families reduced by their King to Ruin, and all the Miſeries of Want and Oppreſſion, and yet ſit ſtill? Muſt Men alone be debarred the common Priviledge of oppoſing Force with Force, which Nature allows ſo freely to all other Creatures for their Preſervation from Injury? I anſwer: Self-defence is a Part of the Law of Nature; nor can it be denied the Community, even againſt the King himſelf: But to revenge themſelves upon him, muſt by no means be allowed them; it being not agreeable to that Law. Wherefore if the King ſhall ſhew an Hatred, not only to ſome particular Perſons, but ſets himſelf againſt the Body of the Common-wealth, whereof he is the Head, and ſhall, with intolerable ill Uſage, cruelly tyrannize over the whole, or a conſiderable part of the People, in this Caſe the People have a Right to reſiſt and defend themſelves from Injury: But it muſt be with this Caution, that they only defend themſelves, but do not attack their Prince: They may repair the Damages received, but muſt not for any Provocation exceed the Bounds of due Reverence and Reſpect. They may repulſe the preſent Attempt, but muſt not revenge paſt Violences. For it is natural for us to defend Life and Limb, but that an Inferior ſhould puniſh a Superior, is againſt Nature. The Miſchief which is deſigned them, the People may prevent before it be done, but when it is done, they muſt not revenge it on the King, though Author of the Villany. This therefore is the Priviledge of the People in general, above what any private Perſon hath; that particular Men are allowed by our Adverſaries themſelves,* (Buchanan *only excepted*) *to have no other Remedy but Patience; but the Body of the People may with Reſpect reſiſt intolerable Tyranny; for when it is but moderate, they ought to endure it.*

234. Thus far that great Advocate of Monarchical Power allows of *Reſiſtance.*

235. 'Tis true, he has annexed two Limitations to it, to no purpoſe:

Firſt, he ſays, it muſt be with Reverence.

Secondly, it muſt be without Retribution, or Puniſhment; and the Reaſon he gives is, *Becauſe an Inferior cannot puniſh a Superior.*

Firſt,

First, How to *reſiſt Force without ſtriking again*, or how to *ſtrike with Reverence*, will need ſome Skill to make Intelligible. He that ſhall oppoſe an Aſſault only with a Shield to receive the Blows, or in any more reſpectful Poſture, without a Sword in his Hand, to abate the Confidence and Force of the Aſſailant, will quickly be at an end of his *Reſiſtance*, and will find ſuch a Defence ſerve only to draw on himſelf the worſe Uſage. This is as ridiculous a Way of *reſiſting*, as *Juvenal* thought it of fighting; *ubi tu pulſas, ego vapulo tantum.* And the Succeſs of the Combat will be unavoidably the ſame he there deſcribes it:

——*Libertas pauperis hæc eſt:*
Pulſatus rogat, & pugnis conciſus, adorat.
Ut liceat paucis cum dentibus inde reverti.

This will always be the Event of ſuch an imaginary *Reſiſtance*, where Men may not ſtrike again. He therefore *who may reſiſt, muſt be allowed to ſtrike.* And then let our Author, or any Body elſe join a knock on the Head, or a cut on the Face, with as much *Reverence* and *Reſpect* as he thinks fit. He that can reconcile Blows and Reverence, may, for ought I know, deſerve for his Pains, civil, reſpectful Cudgeling, where-ever he can meet with it.

Secondly, As to his Second, *an Inferior cannot puniſh a Superior*; that's true, generally ſpeaking, whilſt he is his Superior. But to reſiſt Force with Force, being *the State of War* that *levels the Parties*, cancels all former Relation of Reverence, Reſpect, and *Superiority*: And then the Odds that remains is, That he who oppoſes the unjuſt Aggreſſor, has this *Superiority* over him, that he has a Right, when he prevails, to puniſh the Offender, both for the Breach of the Peace, and all the Evils that followed upon it. *Barclay* therefore, in another Place, more coherently to himſelf, denies it to be lawful to *reſiſt* a King in any Caſe. But he there Aſſigns two Caſes, whereby a King may un-king himſelf. His Words are,

Quid ergo, nulline caſus incidere poſſunt quibus populo ſeſe erigere atque in Regem impotentius dominantem arma capere & invadere jure ſuo ſuâque Authoritate liceat? Nulli certe quamdiu Rex manet. Semper enim ex divinis id obſtat, Regem honorificato; & qui poteſtati reſiſtit, Dei ordinationi reſiſtit: *Non aliàs igitur in eum populo poteſtas eſt quam ſi id committat propter quod ipſo jure rex eſſe deſinat. Tunc enim ſe ipſe principatu exuit atque in privatis conſtituit liber: Hoc modo populus & ſuperior efficitur, reverſo ad eum ſc. jure illo quod ante regem inauguratum interregno habuit. At ſunt paucorum generum commiſſa ejuſmodi quæ hunc effectum pariunt. At ego cum plurima animo per luſtrem, duo tantum invenio, duos, in quam, caſus quibus rex ipſo facto ex Rege non regem ſe facit & omni honore & dignitate regali atque in ſubditos poteſtate deſtituit; quorum etiam meminit* Winzerus. *Horum unus eſt, Si regnum diſperdat, quemadmodum de Nerone fertur, quod is nempe ſenatum populumque Romanum, atque adeo urbem ipſam ferro flammaque vaſtare, ac novas ſibi ſedes querere decreviſſet. Et de Caligula, quod palam denunciarit ſe neque civem neque principem ſenatui amplius fore, inque animo habuerit interempto utriuſque ordinis Electiſſimo quoque* Alexandriam *commigrare, ac ut populum uno ictu interimeret, unam ei cervicem optavit. Talia cum rex aliquis miditatur & molitur ſerio, omnem regnandi curam & animum illico abjicit, ac proinde imperium in ſubditos amittit, ut dominus ſervi pro derelicto habiti dominium.*

236. *Alter caſus eſt, ſi rex in alicujus clientelam ſe contulit, ac regnum quod liberum à majoribus & populo traditum accepit, alienæ ditioni mancipavit. Nam tunc quamvis forte non eâ mente id agit populo plane ut incommodet: Tamen quia quod præcipuum eſt regiæ dignitatis amiſit, ut ſummus ſcilicet in regno ſecundum Deum ſit, & ſolo Deo inferior, atque populum etiam totum ignorantem vel invitum, cujus libertatem ſartam & tectam conſervare debuit, in alterius gentis ditionem & poteſtatem dedidit; hâc velut quadam regni ab alienatione effecit, ut nec quod ipſe in regno imperium habuit retineat, nec in eum cui collatum voluit, juris quicquam tranſferat; atque ita eo facto liberum jam & ſuæ poteſtatis populum relinquit, cujus rei exemplum unum annales Scotici ſuppeditant.* Barclay contra Monarchom. L. 3. c. 16.

Which

Which in *Engliſh* runs thus.

237. *What then, Can there no Caſe happen wherein the People may of Right, and by their own Authority help themſelves, take Arms, and ſet upon their King, imperiouſly domineering over them? None at all, whilſt he remains a King,* Honour the King, *and* he that reſiſts the Power, reſiſts the Ordinance of God; *are Divine Oracles that will never permit it. The People therefore can never come by a Power over him, unleſs he does ſomething that makes him ceaſe to be a King. For then he diveſts himſelf of his Crown and Dignity, and returns to the State of a private Man, and the People become Free and Superior, the Power which they had in the* Interregnum, *before they crowned him King, devolving to them again. But there are but few Miſcarriages which bring the Matter to this State. After conſidering it well on all Sides, I can find but two. Two Caſes there are, I ſay, whereby a King,* ipſo facto, *becomes no King; and loſes all Power and regal Authority over his People; which are alſo taken Notice of by* Winzerus.

The firſt is, If he endeavour to overturn the Government, that is, if he have a Purpoſe and Deſign to ruin the Kingdom and Common-wealth, as it is recorded of Nero, *that he reſolved to cut off the Senate and People of* Rome, *lay the City waſte with Fire and Sword, and then remove to ſome other Place. And of* Caligula, *that he openly declar'd, that he would be no longer a Head to the People or Senate, and that he had it in his Thoughts to cut off the worthieſt Men of both Ranks, and then retire to* Alexandria: *And he wiſh'd that the People had but one Neck, that he might diſpatch them all at a Blow. Such Deſigns as theſe, when any King harbers in his Thoughts, and ſeriouſly promotes, he immediately gives up all Care and Thought of the Common-wealth; and conſequently forfeits the Power of governing his Subjects, as a Maſter does the Dominion over his Slaves whom he hath abandon'd.*

238. *The other Caſe is, When a King makes himſelf dependent of another, and ſubjects his Kingdom which his Anceſtors left him, and the People put free into his Hands, to the Dominion of another. For however perhaps it may not be his Intention to Prejudice the People; yet becauſe he has hereby loſt the principal Part of regal Dignity,* viz. *to be next and immediately under God, Supreme in his Kingdom: and alſo becauſe he betray'd or forced his People, whoſe Liberty he ought to have carefully preſerved, into the Power and Dominion of a foreign Nation. By this as it were Alienation of his Kingdom, he himſelf loſes the Power he had in it before, without tranſferring any the leaſt Right to thoſe on whom he would have beſtowed it; and ſo by this Act ſets the People free, and leaves them at their own diſpoſal. One Example of this is to be found in the* Scotch *Annals.*

239. In theſe Caſes *Barclay*, the great Champion of Abſolute Monarchy, is forced to allow, that a King may be *reſiſted*, and *ceaſes to be a King*. That is, in ſhort, not to multiply Caſes. In whatſoever he has *no Authority*, there he is *no King*, and may be *reſiſted*: For whereſoever the *Authority ceaſes, the King ceaſes too*, and becomes like other Men who have no Authority. And theſe two Caſes he Inſtances in, differ little from thoſe above-mention'd, to be deſtructive to Governments, only that he has omitted the Principle from which his Doctrine flows; and that is the Breach of Truſt, in not preſerving the Form of Government agreed on, and in not intending the End of Government itſelf, which is the Publick Good, and Preſervation of Property. When a King has dethron'd himſelf, and put himſelf in a State of War with his People, what ſhall hinder them from proſecuting him who is no King, as they would any other Man, who has put himſelf into a State of War with them? *Barclay*, and thoſe of his Opinion, would do well to tell us. This farther I deſire may be taken notice of out of *Barclay*, that he ſays, *The Miſchief that is deſigned them, the People may prevent before it be done*, whereby he allows *Reſiſtance* when Tyranny is but in Deſign. *Such Deſigns as theſe* (ſays he) *when any King harbours in his Thoughts and ſeriouſly promotes, he immediately gives up all Care and Thought of the Common-wealth*; ſo that according to him, the neglect of the publick Good is to be taken as an Evidence of ſuch *Deſign*, or at leaſt for a ſufficient Cauſe of *Reſiſtance*. And the Reaſon of all, he gives in theſe Words, *Becauſe he betray'd or forced his People whoſe Liberty he ought carefully to have preſerved.* What he adds *into the Power and Dominion of a foreign Nation*, ſignifies nothing, the Fault and Forfeiture lying in the Loſs of their *Li-*

berty, which he *ought to have preſerved*, and not in any Diſtinction of the Perſons to whoſe Dominion they were ſubjected. The Peoples Right is equally invaded, and their Liberty loſt, whether they are made Slaves to any of their own, or a *Foreign Nation*; and in this lies the Injury, and againſt this only have they the Right of Defence. And there are Inſtances to be found in all Countries, which ſhew, that 'tis not the change of Nations in the Perſons of their Governors, but the change of Government, that gives the Offence. *Bilſon*, a Biſhop of our Church, and a great Stickler for the Power and Prerogative of Princes, does, if I miſtake not, in his Treatiſe of *Chriſtian Subjection*, acknowledge, That *Princes may forfeit their Power*, and their Title to the Obedience of their Subjects; and if there needed Authority in a Caſe where Reaſon is ſo plain, I could ſend my Reader to *Bracton*, *Forteſcue*, and the Author of *the Mirrour*, and others, Writers that cannot be ſuſpected to be ignorant of our Government, or Enemies to it. But I thought *Hooker* alone might be enough to ſatisfy thoſe Men, who relying on him for their Eccleſiaſtical Polity, are by a ſtrange Fate carry'd to deny thoſe Principles upon which he builds it. Whether they are herein made the Tools of cunninger Workmen, to pull down their own Fabrick, they were beſt look. This I am ſure, their Civil Policy is ſo new, ſo dangerous, and ſo deſtructive to both Rulers and People, that as former Ages never could bear the broaching of it; ſo it may be hoped, thoſe to come, redeemed from the Impoſitions of theſe *Egyptian* Under-taskmaſters, will abhor the Memory of ſuch ſervile Flatterers, who whilſt it ſeemed to ſerve their Turn, reſolv'd all Government into abſolute Tyranny, and would have all Men born to, what their mean Souls fitted them for, Slavery.

240. Here, 'tis like, the common Queſtion will be made, *Who ſhall be judge*, whether the Prince or Legiſlative act contrary to their Truſt? This, perhaps, ill affected and factious Men may ſpread amongſt the People, when the Prince only makes uſe of his due Prerogative. To this I reply; *The People ſhall be Judge*; for who ſhall be *Judge* whether the Truſtee or Deputy acts well, and according to the Truſt repoſed in him, but he who deputes him, and muſt, by having deputed him, have ſtill a Power to diſcard him, when he fails in his Truſt? If this be reaſonable in particular Caſes of private Men, why ſhould it be otherwiſe in that of the greateſt Moment, where the Welfare of Millions is concerned, and alſo where the Evil, if not prevented, is greater, and the Redreſs very difficult, dear, and dangerous?

241. But farther, this Queſton, *(Who ſhall be Judge?)* cannot mean, that there is no Judge at all. For where there is no Judicature on Earth, to decide Controverſies amongſt Men, *God* in Heaven is *Judge*. He alone, 'tis true, is Judge of the Right. But *every Man is Judge for himſelf*, as in all other Caſes, ſo in this, whether another hath put himſelf into a State of War with him, and whether he ſhould appeal to the ſupreme Judge, as *Jephtha* did?

242. If a Controverſy ariſe betwixt a Prince and ſome of the People, in a Matter, where the Law is ſilent, or doubtful, and the Thing be of great Conſequence, I ſhould think the proper *Umpire*, in ſuch a Caſe, ſhould be the Body of the *People*. For in Caſes where the Prince hath a Truſt repoſed in him, and is diſpenſed from the common ordinary Rules of the Law; there, if any Men find themſelves aggrieved, and think the Prince acts contrary to, or beyond that Truſt, who ſo proper to *judge* as the Body of the *People*, (who, at firſt, lodg'd that Truſt in him) how far they meant it ſhould extend? But if the Prince, or whoever they be in the Adminiſtratation, decline that Way of Determination, the Appeal then lies no where but to Heaven. Force between either Perſons, who have no known Superior on Earth, or which permits no Appeal to a Judge on Earth, being properly a State of War, wherein the Appeal lies only to Heaven, and in that State the *injured Party muſt judge* for himſelf, when he will think fit to make uſe of that Appeal, and put himſelf upon it.

243. To conclude, The *Power that every Individual gave the Society*, when he entered into it, can never revert to the Individuals again, as long as the Society laſts, but will always remain in the Community; becauſe without this, there can be no Community, no Common-wealth, which is contrary to the original Agreement: So alſo when the Society hath placed the Legiſlative in any

Aſſembly

Assembly of Men, to continue in them and their Successors, with Direction and Authority for providing such Successors, *the Legislative can never revert to the People* whilst that Government lasts: Because having provided a Legislative with Power to continue for ever, they have given up their Political Power to the Legislative, and cannot resume it. But if they have set Limits to the Duration of their Legislative, and made this supreme Power in any Person or Assembly, only temporary: Or else, when by the Miscarriages of those in Authority, it is forfeited; upon the Forfeiture, or at the Determination of the Time set, *it reverts to the Society*, and the People have a Right to act as Supreme, and continue the Legislative in themselves; or erect a new Form, or under the old Form place it in new Hands, as they think good.

THE

CONTENTS of BOOK I.

Chap. I. THE *Introduction* Page 102
Chap. II. *Of Paternal and Regal Power* p. 103
Chap. III. *Of* Adam's *Title to Sovereignty, by Creation* p. 106
Chap. IV. *Of* Adam's *Title to Sovereignty, by Donation,* Gen. 1. 28. p. 109
Chap. V. *Of* Adam's *Title to Sovereignty, by the Subjection of* Eve p. 116
Chap. VI *Of* Adam's *Title to Sovereignty, by Fatherhood* p. 119
Chap. VII. *Of Fatherdood and Propriety, conſider'd together as Fountains of Sovereiguty* p. 127
Chap. VIII. *Of the Conveyance of* Adam's *Sovereign Monarchical Power* p. 129
Chap. IX. *Of Monarchy, by Inheriance from* Adam p. 130
Chap. X. *Of the Heir to Monarchical Power of* Adam p. 137
Chap. XI. *Who Heir* p. 138

THE

CONTENTS of BOOK II.

Chap. I. THE *Introduction* Page 159
Chap. II. *Of the State of Nature* p. 160
Chap. III. *Of the State of War* p. 163
Chap. IV. *Of Slavery* p. 165
Chap. V. *Of Property* ibid.
Chap. VI. *Of Paternal Power* p. 172
Chap. VII. *Of Political or Civil Society* p. 180
Chap. VIII. *Of the Beginning of Political Societies* p. 185
Chap. IX. *Of the Ends of Political Society and Government* p. 193
Chap. X. *Of the Forms of a Common-wealth* p. 194
Chap. XI. *Of the Extent of the Legiſlative Power* p. 195
Chap. XII. *Of the Legiſlative, Executive, and Federative Power of the Common-wealth* p. 199
Chap. XIII. *Of the Subordination of the Powers of the Common-wealth* p. 200
Chap. XIV. *Of Prerogative* p. 203
Chap. XV. *Of Paternal, Political, and Deſpotical Power, conſidered together* p. 206
Chap. XVI. *Of Conqueſt* p. 207
Chap. XVII. *Of Uſurpation* p. 213
Chap. XVIII. *Of Tyranny* p. 214
Chap. XIX. *Of Diſſolution of Governments* p. 217

The End of the CONTENTS.

A LET-

A LETTER CONCERNING TOLERATION: Humbly Submitted, *&c.*

Ea est summa ratio & sapientia boni civis commoda civium non devellere, atq; omnes æquitate eâdem continere. Cic. de Officiis.

A
LETTER
CONCERNING
TOLERATION:
Humbly Submitted, &c.

TO THE

READER.

THE *Enſuing* Letter concerning Toleration, *firſt printed in* Latin *this very Year, in* Holland, *has already been tranſlated both into* Dutch *and* French. *So general and ſpeedy an Approbation may therefore beſpeak its favourable Reception in* England. *I think indeed there is no Nation under Heaven, in which ſo much has already been ſaid upon that Subject, as Ours. But yet certainly there is no People that ſtand in more need of having ſomething further both ſaid and done amongſt them, in this Point, than We do.*

Our Government has not only been partial in Matters of Religion; but thoſe alſo who have ſuffered under that Partiality, and have therefore endeavoured by their Writings to vindicate their own Rights and Liberties, have for the moſt Part done it upon narrow Principles, ſuited only to the Intereſts of their own Sects.

This narrowneſs of Spirit on all Sides has undoubtedly been the principal Occaſion of our Miſeries and Confuſions. But whatever have been the Occaſion, it is now high Time to ſeek for a thorough Cure. We have need of more generous Remedies than what have yet been made uſe of in our Diſtemper. It is neither Declarations of Indulgence, *nor* Acts of Comprehenſion, *ſuch as have yet been practiſed or projected amongſt us, that can do the Work. The firſt will but palliate, the ſecond encreaſe our Evil.*

Abſolute Liberty, Juſt and True Liberty, Equal and Impartial Liberty, is the Thing that we ſtand in need of. Now tho' this has indeed been much talked of, I doubt it has not been much underſtood; I am ſure not at all practiſed, either by our Governors towards the People in general, or by any diſſenting Parties of the People towards one another.

I cannot therefore but hope that this Diſcourſe, *which treats of that Subject, however briefly, yet more exactly than any we have yet ſeen, demonſtrating both the Equitableneſs and Practicableneſs of the Thing, will be eſteemed highly ſeaſonable, by all Men that have Souls large enough to prefer the true Intereſt of the Publick, before that of a Party.*

It is for the Uſe of ſuch as are already ſo ſpirited, or to inſpire that Spirit into thoſe that are not, that I have tranſlated it into our Language. But the Thing itſelf is ſo ſhort, that it will not bear a longer Preface. I leave it therefore to the Conſideration of my Countrymen, and heartily wiſh they may make the Uſe of it that it appears to be deſigned for.

A LET-

A LETTER CONCERNING TOLERATION.

Honoured Sir,

SINCE you are pleaſed to enquire what are my Thoughts about the mutuale Toleration of Chriſtians in their different Profeſſion, of Religion, I muſt needs anſwer you freely, That I eſteem that Toleration to be the chief characteriſtical Mark of the True Church. For whatſoever ſome People boaſt of the Antiquity of Places and Names, or of the Pomp of their outward Worſhip; Others, of the Reformation of their Diſcipline; All, of the Orthodoxy of their Faith; (for every one is Orthodox to himſelf;) Theſe things, and all others of this nature, are much rather Marks of Men ſtriving for Power and Empire over one another, than of the Church of Chriſt. Let any one have never ſo true a Claim to all theſe Things, yet if he be deſtitute of Charity, Meekneſs, and Good-will in general towards all Mankind, even to thoſe that are not Chriſtians, he is certainly yet ſhort of being a true Chriſtian himſelf. *The Kings of the Gentiles exerciſe Lordſhip over them,* ſaid our Saviour to his Diſciples, *but ye ſhall not be ſo.* The Buſineſs of true Religion is quite another thing. It is not inſtituted in order to the erecting of an external Pomp, nor to the obtaining of Eccleſiaſtical Dominion, nor to the exerciſing of compulſive Force; but to the regulating of Mens Lives according to the Rules of Vertue and Piety. Whoſoever will liſt himſelf under the Banner of Chriſt, muſt in the firſt place, and above all things, make War upon his own Luſts and Vices. It is in vain for any Man to uſurp the Name of Chriſtian, without Holineſs of Life, Purity of Manners, Benignity and Meekneſs of Spirit. *Let every one that nameth the Name of Chriſt, depart from Iniquity. Thou, when thou art converted, ſtrengthen thy Brethren,* ſaid our *Lord* to *Peter.* It would indeed be very hard for one that appears careleſs about his own Salvation, to perſuade me that he were extreamly concern'd for mine. For it is impoſſible that thoſe ſhould ſincerely and heartily apply themſelves to make other People Chriſtians, who have not really embraced the Chriſtian Religion in their own Hearts. If the Goſpel and the Apoſtles may be credited, no Man can be a Chriſtian without *Charity,* and without *that Faith which Works* not by Force but *by Love.* Now I ppeal to the Conſciences of thoſe that perſecute, torment, deſtroy, and kill other Men upon Pretence of Religion, whether they do it out of Friendſhip and Kindneſs towards them, or no: And I ſhall then indeed, and not till then, believe they do ſo, when I ſhall ſee thoſe fiery Zealots correcting, in the ſame manner, their Friends and familiar Acquaintance, for the manifeſt Sins they commit againſt the Precepts of

Luk. 22. 25.

2 Tim. 2. 19.

Luk. 22. 32.

of the Gospel; when I shall see them prosecute with Fire and Sword the Members of their own Communion that are tainted with enormous Vices, and without Amendment are in danger of eternal Perdition; and when I shall see them thus express their Love and Desire of the Salvation of their Souls, by the Infliction of Torments, and Exercise of all manner of Cruelties. For if it be out of a Principle of Charity, as they pretend, and Love to Mens Souls, that they deprive them of their Estates, maim them with corporal Punishments, starve and torment them in noisome Prisons, and in the end even take away their Lives: I say, if all this be done merely to make Men Christians, and procure their Salvation, why then do they suffer *Whoredom, Fraud, Malice, and such like Enormities*, which (according to the Apostle) manifestly relish of heathenish Corruption, to predominate so much and abound amongst their Flocks and People? These, and such like things, are certainly more contrary to the Glory of God, to the Purity of the Church, and to the Salvation of Souls, than any conscientious Dissent from Ecclesiastical Decision, or Sepration from Publick Worship, whilst accompained with Innocency of Life. Why then does this burning Zeal for God, for the Church, and for the Salvation of Souls; burning, I say, literally, with, Fire and Faggot; pass by those moral Vices and Wickednesses, without any Chastisement, which are acknowledged by all Men to be diametrically opposite to the Profession of Christianity; and bend all its Nerves either to the introducing of Ceremonies, or to the establishment of Opinions, which for the most part are about nice and intricate Matters, that exceed the Capacity of ordinary Understandings? Which of the Parties contending about these things is in the right, which of them is guilty of Schism or Heresy, whether those that domineer or those that suffer, will then at last be manifest, when the Cause of their Sepration comes to be judged of. He certainly that follows Christ, embraces his Doctrine, and bears his Yoke, tho' he forsake both Father and Mother, separate from the publick Assemblies and Ceremonies of his Country, or whomsoever, or whatsoever else he relinquishes, will not then be judged an Heretick. Rom. 1.

Now, tho' the Divisions that are amongst Sects should be allowed to be never so obstructive of the Salvation of Souls; yet nevertheless *Adultery, Fornication, Uncleanness, Lasciviousness, Idolatry, and such like things' cannot be denied to be Works of the Flesh*; concerning which the Apostle has expressly declared, that *they who do them shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* Whosoever therefore is sincerely solicitious about the Kingdom of God, and thinks it his Duty to endeavour the Enlargement of it amongst Men, ought to apply himself with no less Care and Industry to the rooting out of these Immoralities, than to the Extirpation of Sects. But if any one do otherwise, and whilst he is cruel and implacable towards those that differ from him in Opinion, he be indulgent to such Iniquities and Immoralities as are unbecoming the Name of a Christian, let such a one talk never so much of the Church he plainly demonstrates by his Actions, that 'tis another Kingdom he aims at, and not the Advancement of the Kingdom of God. Gal. 5.

That any Man should think fit to cause another Man, whose Salvation he heartily desires, to expire in Torments, and that even in an unconverted Estate, would, I confess, seem very strange to me, and, I think, to any other also. But no body, surely, will ever believe that such a Carriage can proceed from Charity, Love, or Good-will. If any one maintain that Men ought to be compelled by Fire and Sword to profess certain Doctrines, and conform to this or that exterior Worship, without any regard had unto their Morals; if any one endeavour to convert those that are erroneous unto the Faith, by forcing them to profess things that they do not believe, and allowing them to practise things that the Gospel does not permit; it cannot be doubted indeed but such a one is desirous to have a numerous Assembly joined in the same Profession with himself; but that he principally intends by those Means to compose a truly Christian Church, is altogether incredible. It is not therefore to be wondered at, if those who do not really contend for the Advancement of the true Religion, and of the Church of Christ, make use of Arms that do not belong to the Christian Warfare. If like the Captain of our Salvation, they sincerely desired the Good of Souls, they would tread in the Steps, and follow the perfect Example of that Prince of Peace, who sent out his Soldiers to the subduing of Nations, and gathering them into his Church, not armed with the Sword, or other Instruments

of Force, but prepared with the Gospel of Peace, and with the exemplary Holiness of their Conversation. This was his Method. Tho' if Infidels were to be converted by Force, if those that are either blind or obstinate were to be drawn off from their Errors by armed Soldiers, we know very well that it was much more easy for him to do it with Armies of heavenly Legions, than for any Son of the Church, how potent soever, with all his Dragoons.

The Toleration of those that differ from others in Matters of Religion, is so agreeable to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and to the genuine Reason of Mankind, that it seems monstrous for Men to be so blind, as not to perceive the Necessity and Advantage of it, in so clear a Light. I will not here tax the Pride and Ambition of some, the Passion and uncharitable Zeal of others. These are Faults from which human Affairs can perhaps scarce ever be perfectly freed; but yet such as no body will bear the plain Imputation of, without covering them with some specious Colour; and so pretend to Commendation, whilst they are carried away by their own irregular Passions. But however, that some may not colour their Spirit of Persecution and unchristian Cruelty, with a Pretence of Care of the Publick Weal and Observation of the Laws; and that others, under Pretence of Religion, may not seek Impunity for their Libertinism and Licentiousness; in a Word, that none may impose either upon himself or others, by the Pretences of Loyalty and Obedience to the Prince, or of Tenderness and Sincerity in the Worship of God; I esteem it above all Things necessary to distinguish exactly the Business of Civil-Government from that of Religion, and to settle the just Bounds that lie between the one and the other. If this be not done, there can be no End put to the Controversies that will be always arising between those that have, or at least pretend to have, on the one side, a Care of the Commonwealth.

The Common-wealth seems to me to be a Society of Men constituted only for the procuring, preserving, and advancing their own *Civil Interests*.

Civil Interests I call Life, Liberty, Health, and Indolency of Body; and the Possession of outward Things, such as Money, Lands, Houses, Furniture, and the like.

It is the Duty of the Civil Magistrate, by the impartial Execution of equal Laws, to secure unto all the People in general, and to every one of his Subjects in particular, the just Possession of these Things belonging to this Life. If any one presume to violate the Laws of Publick Justice and Equity, established for the Preservation of those Things, his Presumption is to be check'd by the Fear of Punishment, consisting of the Deprivation or Diminution of those Civil Interests, or Goods, which otherwise he might and ought to enjoy. But seeing no Man does willingly suffer himself to be punished by the Deprivation of any part of his Goods, and much less of his Liberty or Life, therefore is the Magistrate armed with the Force and Strength of all his Subjects, in order to the Punishment of those that violate any other Man's Rights.

Now that the whole Jurisdiction of the Magistrate reaches only to these Civil Concernments; and that all Civil Power, Right and Dominion, is bounded and confined to the only Care of promoting these Things; and that it neither can nor ought in any manner to be extended to the Salvation of Souls, these following Considerations seem unto me abundantly to demonstrate.

First, Because the Care of Souls is not committed to the Civil Magistrate, any more than to other Men. It is not committed unto him, I say, by God; because it appears not that God has ever given any such Authority to one Man over another, as to compel any one to his Religion. Nor can any such Power be vested in the Magistrate by the *Consent of the People*; because no Man can so far abandon the Care of his own Salvation, as blindly to leave to the Choice of any other, whether Prince or Subject, to prescribe to him what Faith or Worship he shall embrace. For no Man can, if he would, conform his Faith to the Dictates of another. All the Life and Power of true Religion consist in the outward and full Persuasion of the Mind; and Faith is not Faith without believing. Whatever Profession we make, to whatever outward Worship we conform, if we are not fully satisfied in our own Mind that the one is true, and the other well-pleasing unto God, such Profession and such Practice, far from being any Furtherance, are indeed great Obstacles to our Salvation. For in this Manner, instead of expiating

ating other Sins by the exerciſe of Religion, I ſay, in offering thus unto God Almighty ſuch a Worſhip as we eſteem to be diſpleaſing unto him, we add unto the Number of our other Sins, thoſe alſo of Hypocriſy, and Contempt of his Divine-Majeſty.

In the ſecond Place. The Care of Souls cannot belong to the Civil-Magiſtrate, becauſe his Power conſiſts only in outward Force; but true and ſaving Religion conſiſts in the inward Perſuaſion of the Mind, without which nothing can be acceptable to God. And ſuch is the nature of the Underſtanding, that it cannot be compell'd to the Belief of any thing by outward Force. Confiſcation of Eſtate, Impriſonment, Torments, nothing of that Nature can have any ſuch Efficacy as to make Men change the inward Judgment that they have framed of Things.

It may indeed be alledged, that the Magiſtrate may make uſe of Arguments, and thereby draw the Heterodox into the Way of Truth, and procure their Salvation. I grant it; but this is common to him with other Men. In teaching, inſtructing, and redreſſing the Erroneous by Reaſon, he may certainly do what becomes any good Man to do. Magiſtracy does not oblige him to put off either Humanity or Chriſtianity. But it is one thing to perſuade, another to command; one thing to preſs with Arguments, another with Penalties. This Civil Power alone has a Right to do; to the other Good-will is Authority enough. Every Man has Commiſſion to admoniſh, exhort, convince another of Error, and by Reaſoning to draw him into Truth: But to give Laws, receive Obedience, and compel with the Sword, belongs to none but the Magiſtrate. And upon this Ground I affirm, that the Magiſtrate's Power extends not to the eſtabliſhing of any Articles of Faith, or Forms of Worſhip, by the Force of his Laws. For Laws are of no Force at all without Penalties, and Penalties in this Caſe are abſolutely impertinent; becauſe they are not proper to convince the Mind. Neither the Profeſſion of any Articles of Faith, nor the Conformity to any outward Form of Worſhip, (as has been already ſaid) can be available to the Salvation of Souls, unleſs the Truth of the one, and the Acceptableneſs of the other unto God, be thoroughly believed by thoſe that ſo profeſs and practiſe. But Penalties are no ways capable to produce ſuch Belief. It is only Light and Evidence that can work a Change in Mens Opinions; which Light can in no manner proceed from corporal Sufferings, or any other outward Penalties.

In the third Place, The Care of the Salvation of Mens Souls cannot belong to the Magiſtrate; becauſe, though the rigour of Laws and the Force of Penalties were capable to convince and change Mens Minds, yet would not that help at all to the Salvation of their Souls. For there being but one Truth, one way to Heaven; what Hopes is there that more Men would be led into it, if they had no Rule but the Religion of the Court, and were put under the Neceſſity to quit the Light of their own Reaſon, and oppoſe the Dictates of their own Conſciences, and blindly to reſign up themſelves to the Will of their Governors, and to the Religion, which either Ignorance, Ambition, or Superſtition had chanced to eſtabliſh in the Countries where they were born? In the Variety and Contradiction of Opinions in Religion, wherein the Princes of the World are as much divided as in their Secular Intereſts, the narrow Way would be much ſtraitened; one Country alone would be in the right, and all the reſt of the World put under an Obligation of following their Princes in the Ways that lead to Deſtruction; and that which heightens the Abſurdity, and very ill ſuits the Notion of a Deity, Men would owe their eternal Happineſs or Miſery to the Places of their Nativity.

Theſe Conſiderations, to omit many others that might have been urged to the ſame Purpoſe, ſeem unto me ſufficient to conclude that all the Power of Civil-Government relates only to Mens Civil-Intereſts, is confined to the Care of the Things of this World, and hath nothing to do with the World to come.

Let us now conſider what a Church is. A Church then, I take to be a voluntary Society of Men, joining themſelves together of their own accord, in order to the publick worſhipping of God, in ſuch manner as they judge acceptable to him, and effectual to the Salvation of their Souls.

I ſay it is a free and Voluntary Society. No body is born a Member of any Church; otherwiſe the Religion of Parents would deſcend unto Children, by the ſame Right of Inheritance as their Temporal Eſtates, and every one would hold

his Faith by the ſame Tenure he does his Lands; than which, nothing can be imagined more abſurd. Thus therefore that Matter ſtands. No Man by Nature is bound unto any particular Church or Sect, but every one joins himſelf voluntarily to that Society in which he believes he has found that Profeſſion and Worſhip which is truly acceptable to God. The Hopes of Salvation, as it was the only Cauſe of his Entrance into that Communion, ſo it can be the only Reaſon of his ſtay there. For if afterwards he diſcover any thing either erroneous in the Doctrine, or incongruous in the Worſhip of that Society to which he has join'd himſelf, why ſhould it not be as free for him to go out as it was to enter? No Member of a religious Society can be tied with any other Bonds but what proceed from the certain Expectation of eternal Life. A Church then is a Society of Members voluntarily uniting to that End.

It follows now that we conſider what is the Power of this Church, and unto what Laws it is ſubject.

Foraſmuch as no Society, how free ſoever, or upon whatſoever ſlight Occaſion inſtituted, (whether of Philoſophers for Learning, of Merchants for Commerce, or of Men of Leiſure for mutual Converſation and Diſcourſe,) no Church or Company, I ſay, can in the leaſt ſubſiſt and hold together, but will preſently diſſolve and break in pieces, unleſs it be regulated by ſome Laws, and the Members all conſent to obſerve ſome Order. Place, and Time of Meeting muſt be agreed on; Rules for admitting and excluding Members muſt be eſtabliſhed; Diſtinction of Officers, and putting Things into a regular Courſe, and ſuch like, cannot be omitted. But ſince the joining together of ſeveral Members into this Church-Society, as has already been demonſtrated, is abſolutely free and ſpontaneous, it neceſſarily follows, that the Right of making its Laws can belong to none but the Society it ſelf, or at leaſt (which is the ſame thing) to thoſe whom the Society by common Conſent has authoriſed thereunto.

Some perhaps may object, that no ſuch Society can be ſaid to be a true Church, unleſs it have in it a Biſhop or Presbyter, with ruling Authority derived from the very Apoſtles, and continued down to the preſent Times by an uninterrupted Succeſſion.

To theſe I anſwer. *In the firſt Place*, Let them ſhew me the Edict by which Chriſt has impoſed that Law upon his Church. And let not any Man think me impertinent, if in a Thing of this Conſequence, I require that the Terms of that Edict be very expreſs and poſitive. For the Promiſe he has made us, that *wherefoever two or three are gathered together in his Name, he will be in the midſt of them*, ſeems to imply the contrary. Whether ſuch an Aſſembly want any thing neceſſary to a true Church, pray do you conſider. Certain I am, that nothing can be there wanting unto the Salvation of Souls; which is ſufficient to our Purpoſe.

Next, Pray obſerve how great have always been the Diviſions amongſt even thoſe who lay ſo much Streſs upon the divine Inſtitution, and continued Succeſſion of a certain Order of Rulers in the Church. Now their very Diſſention unavoidably puts us upon a Neceſſity of deliberating, and conſequently allows a liberty of chuſing that, which upon Conſideration we prefer.

And in the laſt Place, I conſent that theſe Men have a Ruler in their Church, eſtabliſhed by ſuch a long Series of Succeſſion as they judge neceſſary; provided I may have liberty at the ſame time to join my ſelf to that Society, in which I am perſwaded thoſe Things are to be found which are neceſſary to the Salvation of my Soul. In this manner eccleſiaſtical Liberty will be preſerved on all Sides, and no Man will have a Legiſlator impoſed upon him, but whom himſelf has choſen.

But ſince Men are ſo ſolicitous about the true Church, I would only ask them here by the way, if it be not more agreeable to the Church of Chriſt, to make the Conditions of her Communion conſiſt in ſuch things, and ſuch things only, as the Holy Spirit has in the Holy Scriptures declared, in expreſs Words, to be neceſſary to Salvation; I ask, I ſay, whether this be not more agreeable to the Church of Chriſt, than for Men to impoſe their own Inventions and Interpretations upon others, as if they were of divine Authority, and to eſtabliſh by Eccleſiaſtical Laws, as abſolutely neceſſary to the Profeſſion of Chriſtianity, ſuch things as the Holy Scriptures do either not mention, or at leaſt not expreſly command? Whoſoever requires thoſe Things in order to Eccleſiaſtical Communi-

on,

on, which Chriſt does not require in order to Life Eternal, he may perhaps indeed conſtitute a Society accommodated to his own Opinion and his own Advantage, but how that can be called the Church of Chriſt, which is eſtabliſhed upon Laws that are not his, and which excludes ſuch Perſons from its Communion, as he will one Day receive into the Kingdom of Heaven, I underſtand not. But this being not a proper Place to enquire into the Marks of the true Church, I will only mind thoſe that contend ſo earneſtly for the Decrees of their own Society, and that cry out continually the Church, the Church, with as much Noiſe, and perhaps upon the ſame Principle, as the *Epheſian* Silverſmiths did for their *Diana*; this, I ſay, I deſire to mind them of, that the Goſpel frequently declares that the true Diſciples of Chriſt muſt ſuffer Perſecution; but that the Church of Chriſt ſhould perſecute others, and force others by Fire and Sword, to embrace her Faith and Doctrine, I could never yet find in any of the Books of the New Teſtament.

The End of a Religious Society (as has already been ſaid) is the publick Worſhip of God, and by Means thereof the Acquiſition of Eternal Life. All Diſcipline ought therefore to tend to that End, and all eccleſiaſtical Laws to be thereunto confined. Nothing ought, nor can be tranſacted in this Society, relating to the Poſſeſſion of civil and worldly Goods. No Force is here to be made uſe of, upon any Occaſion whatſoever: Force belongs wholly to the Civil-Magiſtrate, and the Poſſeſſion of all outward Goods is ſubject to his Juriſdiction.

But it may be ask'd, By what Means then ſhall Eccleſiaſtical Laws be eſtabliſhed, if they muſt be thus deſtitute of all compulſive Power? I anſwer, They muſt be eſtabliſh'd by Means ſuitable to the Nature of ſuch Things, whereof the external Profeſſion and Obſervation, if not proceeding from a thorough Conviction and Approbation of the Mind, is altogether uſeleſs and unprofitable. The Arms by which the Members of this Society are to be kept within their Duty, are Exhortations, Admonitions, and Advices. If by theſe Means the Offenders will not be reclaimed, and the Erroneous convinced, there remains nothing farther to be done, but that ſuch ſtubborn and obſtinate Perſons, who give no Ground to hope for their Reformation, ſhould be caſt out and ſeparated from the Society. This is the laſt and utmoſt Force of Eccleſiaſtical Authority: No other Puniſhment can thereby be inflicted, than that, the Relation ceaſing between the Body and the Member which is cut off, the Perſon ſo condemned ceaſes to be a Part of the Church.

Theſe things being thus determin'd, let us enquire in the next Place, How far the Duty of Toleration extends, and what is required from every one by it?

And firſt, I hold, That no Church is bound by the Duty of Toleration to retain any ſuch Perſon in her Boſom, as after Admonition, continues obſtinately to offend againſt the Laws of the Society. For theſe being the Condition of Communion, and the Bond of the Society, if the Breach of them were permitted without any Animadverſion, the Society would immediately be thereby diſſolved. But nevertheleſs, in all ſuch Caſes, Care is to be taken that the Sentence of Excommunication, and the Execution thereof, carry with it no rough Uſage, of Word or Action, whereby the ejected Perſon may any wiſe be damnified in Body or Eſtate. For all Force (as has often been ſaid) belongs only to the Magiſtrate, nor ought any private Perſons, at any Time, to uſe Force; unleſs it be in Self-defence againſt unjuſt Violence. Excommunication neither does nor can, deprive the excommunicated Perſon of any of thoſe civil Goods that he formerly poſſeſſed. All thoſe Things belong'd to the Civil-Government, and are under the Magiſtrate's Protection. The whole Force of Excommunication conſiſts only in this, that the Reſolution of the Society in that Reſpect being declared, the Union that was between the Body and ſome Member comes thereby to be diſſolved; and that Relation ceaſing, the Participation of ſome certain Things, which the Society communicated to its Members, and unto which no Man has any civil Right, comes alſo to ceaſe. For there is no civil Injury done unto the excommunicated Perſon, by the Church-Miniſter's refuſing him that Bread and Wine, in the Celebration of the Lord's-Supper, which was not bought with his, but other Men's Money.

Secondly, No private Perſon has any Right, in any manner to prejudice another Perſon in his civil Enjoyments, becauſe he is of another Church or Religion. All the Rights and Franchiſes that belong to him as a Man, or as a Deniſon, are inviolably

violably to be preſerved to him. Theſe are not the Buſineſs of Religion. No Violence nor Injury is to be offered him, whether he be Chriſtian or Pagan. Nay, we muſt not content our ſelves with the narrow Meaſures of bare Juſtice: Charity, Bounty, and Liberality muſt be added to it. This the Goſpel enjoins, this Reaſon directs, and this that natural Fellowſhip we are born into requires of us. If any Man err from the right Way, it is his own Misfortune, no Injury to thee: Nor therefore art thou to puniſh him in the Things of this Life, becauſe thou ſuppoſeſt he will be miſerable in that which is to come.

What I ſay concerning the mutual Toleration of private Perſons differing from one another in Religion, I underſtand alſo of particular Churches; which ſtand as it were in the ſame relation to each other as private Perſons among themſelves, nor has any one of them any manner of Juriſdiction over any other, no not even when the Civil-Magiſtrate, (as it ſometimes happens) comes to be of this or the other Communion. For the Civil-Government can give no new Right to the Church, nor the Church to the Civil-Government. So that whether the Magiſtrate join himſelf to any Church, or ſeparate from it, the Church remains always as it was before, a free and voluntary Society. It neither requires the Power of the Sword by the Magiſtrate's coming to it, nor does it loſe the Right of Inſtruction and Excommunication by his going from it. This is the fundamental and immutable Right of a ſpontaneous Society, that it has Power to remove any of its Members that tranſgreſs the Rules of its Inſtitution: But it cannot, by the Acceſſion of any new Members, acquire any Right of Juriſdicton over thoſe that are not joined with it. And therefore Peace, Equity, and Friendſhip, are always mutually to be obſerved by particular Churches, in the ſame manner as by private Perſons, without any Pretence of Superiority or Juriſdiction over one another.

That the Thing may be made yet clearer by an Example; let us ſuppoſe two Churches, the one of *Arminians*, the other of *Calviniſts*, reſiding in the City of *Conſtantinople*. Will any one ſay, that either of theſe Churches has Right to deprive the Members of the other of their Eſtates and Liberty, (as we ſee practiſed elſewhere) becauſe of their differing from it in ſome Doctrines and Ceremonies, whilſt the *Turks* in the mean while ſilently ſtand by, and laugh to ſee with what inhuman Cruelty Chriſtians thus rage againſt Chriſtians? But if one of theſe Churches hath this Power of treating the other ill, I ask which of them it is to whom that Power belongs, and by what Right? It will be anſwered, undoubtedly, That it is the Orthodox Church which has the Right of Authority over the Erroneous or Heretical. This is, in great and ſpecious Words, to ſay juſt nothing at all. For every Church is Orthodox to it ſelf; to others Erroneous or Heretical. For whatſoever any Church believes, it believes to be true; and the contrary unto thoſe things, it pronounces to be Error. So that the Controverſy between theſe Churches about the Truth of their Doctrines, and the Purity of their Worſhip, is on both Sides equal; nor is there any Judge, either at *Conſtantinople*, or elſewhere upon Earth, by whoſe Sentence it can be determined. The Deciſion of that Queſtion belongs to the ſupreme Judge of all Men, to whom alſo alone belongs the Puniſhment of the Erroneous. In the mean while, let thoſe Men conſider how heinouſly they Sin, who, adding Injuſtice, if not to their Error, yet certainly to their Pride, do raſhly and arrogantly take upon them to miſuſe the Servants of another Maſter, who are not at all accountable to them.

Nay, further: If it could be manifeſt which of theſe two diſſenting Churches were in the Right, there would not accrue thereby unto the Orthodox any Right of deſtroying the other. The Churches have neither any Juriſdiction in worldly Matters, nor are Fire and Sword any proper Inſtruments wherewith to convince Mens Minds of Error, and inform them of the Truth. Let us ſuppoſe, nevertheleſs, that the Civil-Magiſtrate inclined to favour one of them, and to put his Sword into their Hands, that (by his Conſent) they might chaſtize the Diſſenters as they pleaſed. Will any Man ſay, that any Right can be derived unto a Chriſtian Church, over its Brethren, from a *Turkiſh* Emperor? An Infidel, who has himſelf no Authority to puniſh Chriſtians for the Articles of their Faith, cannot confer ſuch an Authority upon any Society of Chriſtians, nor give unto them a Right which he has not himſelf. This would be the Caſe at *Conſtantinople*. And the Reaſon of the thing is the ſame in any Chriſtian Kingdom. The Civil Power

Power is the ſame in every place: Nor can that Power, in the Hands of a Chriſtian Prince, confer any greater Authority upon the Church, than in the Hands of a Heathen; which is to ſay, juſt none at all.

Nevertheleſs, it is worthy to be obſerved and lamented, that the moſt violent of theſe Defenders of the Truth, the Oppoſers of Errors, the Exclaimers againſt Schiſm, do hardly ever let looſe this their Zeal for God, with which they are ſo warmed and inflamed, unleſs where they have the Civil Magiſtrate on their ſide. But ſo ſoon as ever Court-favour has given them the better end of the Staff, and they begin to feel themſelves the ſtronger, then preſently Peace and Charity are to be laid aſide: Otherwiſe, they are religiouſly to be obſerved. Where they have not the Power to carry on Perſecution, and to become Maſters, there they deſire to live upon fair Terms, and preach up Toleration. When they are not ſtrengthned with the Civil Power, then they can bear moſt patiently, and unmovedly, the Contagion of Idolatry, Superſtition, and Hereſy, in their Neighbourhood; of which, in other Occaſions, the Intereſt of Religion makes them to be extremely apprehenſive. They do not forwardly attack thoſe Errors which are in faſhion at Court, or are countenanced by the Government. Here they can be content to ſpare their Arguments: which yet (with their Leave) is the only right Method of propagating Truth, which has no ſuch Way of prevailing, as when ſtrong Arguments and good Reaſon, are joined with the Softneſs of Civility and good Uſage.

No body therefore, in fine, neither ſingle Perſons, nor Churches, nay, nor even Common-wealths, have any juſt Title to invade the Civil Rights and Worldly Goods of each other, upon Pretence of Religion. Thoſe that are of another Opinion, would do well to conſider with themſelves how pernicious a Seed of Diſcord and War, how powerful a Provocation to endleſs Hatreds, Rapines, and Slaughters, they thereby furniſh unto Mankind. No Peace and Security, no not ſo much as Common Friendſhip, can ever be eſtabliſhed or preſerved amongſt Men, ſo long as this Opinion prevails, That *Dominion is founded in Grace*, and that Religion is to be propagated by Force of Arms.

In the third Place: Let us ſee what the Duty of Toleration requires from thoſe who are diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of Mankind, (from the Laity, as they pleaſe to call us) by ſome Eccleſiaſtical Character and Office; whether they be Biſhops, Prieſts, Presbyters, Miniſters, or however elſe dignified or diſtinguiſhed. It is not my Buſineſs to enquire here into the Original of the Power or Dignity of the Clergy. This only I ſay, That whence-ſoever their Authority be ſprung, ſince it is Eccleſiaſtical, it ought to be confined within the Bounds of the Church, nor can it in any manner be extended to Civil Affairs; becauſe the Church itſelf is a thing abſolutely ſeparate and diſtinct from the Common-wealth. The Boundaries on both ſides are fixed and immoveable. He jumbles Heaven and Earth together, the Things moſt remote and oppoſite, who mixes theſe two Societies; which are in their Original, End, Buſineſs, and in every thing, perfectly diſtinct, and infinitely different from each other. No Man therefore, with whatſoever Eccleſiaſtical Office he be dignified, can deprive another Man that is not of his Church and Faith, either of Liberty, or of any Part of his worldly Goods, upon the account of that Difference between them in Religion. For whatſoever is not lawful to the whole Church, cannot, by any Eccleſiaſtical Right become lawful to any of its Members.

But this is not all. It is not enough that Eccleſiaſtical Men abſtain from Violence and Rapine, and all manner of Perſecution. He that pretends to be a Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, and takes upon him the Office of Teaching, is obliged alſo to admoniſh his Hearers of the Duties of Peace, and Good-will towards all Men; as well towards the Erroneous as the Orthodox; towards thoſe that differ from them in Faith and Worſhip, as well as towards thoſe that agree with them therein: And he ought induſtriouſly to exhort all Men, whether private Perſons or Magiſtrates, (if any ſuch there be in his Church) to Charity, Meekneſs, and Toleration; and diligently endeavour to allay and temper all that Heat, and unreaſonable averſeneſs of Mind, which either any Man's fiery Zeal for his own Sect, or the Craft of others, has kindled againſt Diſſenters. I will not undertake to repreſent how happy and how great would be the Fruit, both in Church and State, if the Pulpits every where ſounded with this Doctrine of Peace and Toleration; leſt I ſhould ſeem to reflect too ſeverely upon thoſe Men whoſe Dignity I

deſire

deſire not to detract from, nor would have it diminiſhed either by others or themſelves. But this I ſay, That thus it ought to be. And if any one that profeſſes himſelf to be a Miniſter of the Word of God, a Preacher of the Goſpel of Peace, teach otherwiſe, he either underſtands not, or neglects the Buſineſs of his Calling, and ſhall one Day give account thereof unto the Prince of Peace. If Chriſtians are to be admoniſhed that they abſtain from all manner of Revenge, even after repeated Provocations and multiplied Injuries, how much more ought they who ſuffer nothing, who have had no harm done them, forbear Violence, and abſtain from all manner of ill Uſage towards thoſe from whom they have received none. This Caution and Temper they ought certainly to uſe towards thoſe who mind only their own Buſineſs, and are ſolicitious for nothing but that (whatever Men think of them) they may worſhip God in that manner which they are perſuaded is acceptable to him, and in which they have the ſtrongeſt Hopes of Eternal Salvation. In private domeſtick Affairs, in the Management of Eſtates, in the Concervation of Bodily Health, every Man may conſider what ſuits his own Conveniency, and follow what Courſe he likes beſt. No Man complains of the ill Management of his Neighbours Affairs. No Man is angry with another for an Error committed in ſowing his Land, or in marrying his Daughter. No Body corrects a Spendthrift for conſuming his Subſtance in Taverns. Let any Man pull down, or build, or make whatſoever Expenſes he pleaſes, no body murmurs, no body controuls him; he has his Liberty. But if any Man do not frequent the Church, if he do not there conform his Behaviour exactly to the accuſtomed Ceremonies, or if he brings not his Children to be initiated in the Sacred Myſteries of this or the other Congregation, this immediately cauſes an Uproar. The Neighbourhood is filled with Noiſe and Clamour. Every one is ready to be the Avenger of ſo great a Crime, And the Zealots hardly have the Patience to refrain from Violence and Rapine, ſo long till the Cauſe be heard, and the poor Man be, according to Form, condemned to the loſs of Liberty, Goods, or Life. Oh that our Eccleſiaſtical Orators, of every Sect, would apply themſelves with all the ſtrength of Arguments that they are able, to the confounding of Mens Errors! But let them ſpare their Perſons. Let them not ſupply their want of Reaſons with the Inſtruments of Force, which belong to another Juriſdiction, and do ill become a Churchman's Hands. Let them not call in the Magiſtrate's Authority to the aid of their Eloquence, or Learning; leſt, perhaps, whilſt they pretend only Love for the Truth, this their intemperate Zeal, breathing nothing but Fire and Sword, betray their Ambition, and ſhew that what they deſire is Temporal Dominion. For it will be very difficult to perſuade Men of Senſe, that he, who with dry Eyes, and Satisfaction of Mind, can deliver his Brother to the Executioner, to be burnt alive, does ſincerely and heartily concern himſelf to ſave that Brother from the Flames of Hell in the World to come,

In the laſt place. Let us now conſider what is the Magiſtrate's Duty in the Buſineſs of Toleration: which certainly is very conſiderable.

We have already proved, That the Care of Souls does not belong to the Magiſtrate: Not a Magiſterial Care, I mean (if I may ſo call it) which conſiſts in preſcribing by Laws, and compelling by Puniſhments. But a charitable Care, which conſiſts in teaching, admoniſhing, and perſuading, cannot be denied unto any Man. The Care therefore of every Man's Soul belongs unto himſelf, and is to be left unto himſelf. But what if he neglect the Care of his Soul? I anſwer, What if he neglect the Care of his Health, or of his Eſtate, which things are nearlier related to the Government of the Magiſtrate than the other? Will the Magiſtrate provide by an expreſs Law, that ſuch an one ſhall not become poor or ſick? Laws provide, as much as is poſſible, that the Goods and Health of Subjects be not injured by the Fraud and Violence of others; they do not guard them from the Negligence or Ill-husbandry of the Poſſeſſors themſelves. No Man can be forced to be rich or healthful, whether he will or no. Nay, God himſelf will not ſave Men againſt their Wills. Let us ſuppoſe, however, that ſome Princes were deſirous to force his Subjects to accumulate Riches, or to preſerve the Health and Strength of their Bodies. Shall it be provided by Law, that they muſt conſult none but *Roman* Phyſicians, and ſhall every one be bound to live according to their Preſcriptions? What, ſhall

no

no Potion, no Broth, be taken, but what is prepared either in the *Vatican*, ſuppoſe, or in a *Geneva* Shop? Or, to make theſe Subjects rich, ſhall they all be oblig'd by Law to become Merchants, or Muſicians? Or, ſhall every one turn Victualler, or Smith, becauſe there are ſome that maintain their Families plentifully, and grow rich in thoſe Profeſſions? But it may be ſaid, there are a thouſand Ways to Wealth, but one only Way to Heaven. 'Tis well ſaid indeed, eſpecially by thoſe that plead for compelling Men into this or the other Way. For if there were ſeveral Ways that lead thither, there would not be ſo much as a Pretence left for Compulſion. But now if I be marching on with my utmoſt Vigour, in that Way which, according to the Sacred Geography, leads ſtreight to *Jeruſalem*; Why am I beaten and ill uſed by others, becauſe perhaps, I wear not Buskins; becauſe my Hair is not of the right Cut; becauſe perhaps I have not been dipt in the right Faſhion; becauſe I eat Fleſh upon the Road, or ſome other Food which agrees with my Stomach; becauſe I avoid certian By-ways, which ſeem unto me to lead into Briars and Precipices; becauſe amongſt the ſeveral Paths that are in the ſame Road, I chuſe that to walk in which ſeems to be the ſtreighteſt and cleaneſt; becauſe I avoid to keep Company with ſome Travellers that are leſs grave, and others that are more ſower than they ought to be; or in fine, becauſe I follow a Guide that either is, or is not, cloathed in White, or crowned with a Mitre? Certainly, if we conſider right, we ſhall find that for the moſt part they are ſuch frivolous Things as theſe, that (without any Prejudice to Religion or the Salvation of Souls, if not accompanied with Superſtition or Hypocriſy) might either be obſerved or omitted; I ſay, they are ſuch-like Things as theſe, which breed implacable Enmities amongſt Chriſtian Brethren, who are all agreed in the ſubſtantial and truly fundamental Part of Religion.

But let us grant unto theſe Zealots, who condemn all Things that are not of their Mode, that from theſe Circumſtances are different Ends. What ſhall we conclude from thence? There is only one of theſe which is the true Way to Eternal Happineſs. But in this great Variety of Ways that Men follow, it is ſtill doubted which is the right one. Now neither the Care of the Common-wealth, nor the right enacting of Laws, does diſcover this Way that leads to Heaven more certainly to the Magiſtrate, than every private Man's Search and Study diſcovers it unto himſelf. I have a weak Body, ſunk under a languiſhing Diſeaſe, for which (I ſuppoſe) there is one only Remedy, but that unknown. Does it therefore belong unto the Magiſtrate to preſcribe me a Remedy, becauſe there is but one, and becauſe it is unknown? Becauſe there is but one Way for me to eſcape Death, will it therefore be ſafe for me to do whatſoever the Magiſtrate ordains? Thoſe Things that every Man ought ſincerely to enquire into himſelf, and by Meditation, Study, Search, and his own Endeavours, attain the Knowledge of, cannot be looked upon as the peculiar Poſſeſſion of any Sort of Men. Princes, indeed, are born Superior unto other Men in Power, but in Nature equal. Neither the Right, nor the Art of Ruling, does neceſſarily carry along with it the certain Knowledge of other Things; and leaſt of all of true Religion. For, if it were ſo, how could it come to paſs that the Lords of the Earth ſhould differ ſo vaſtly as they do in Religious Matters? But let us grant that it is probable the Way to eternal Life may be better known by a Prince than by his Subjects; or at leaſt, that in this Incertitude of Things, the ſafeſt and moſt commodious Way for private Perſons, is to follow his Dictates. You will ſay, what then? If he ſhould bid you follow Merchandiſe for your Livelihood, would you decline that Courſe for fear it ſhould not ſucceed? I anſwer: I would turn Merchant upon the Prince's Command, becauſe in caſe I ſhould have ill Succeſs in Trade, he is abundantly able to make up my Loſs ſome other Way. If it be true, as he pretends, that he deſires I ſhould thrive and grow rich, he can ſet me up again when unſucceſsful Voyages have broke me. But this is not the Caſe, in the Things that regard the Life to come. If there I take a wrong Courſe, if in that reſpect I am once undone, it is not in the Magiſtrate's Power to repair my Loſs, to eaſe my Suffering, nor to reſtore me in any Meaſure, much leſs entirely to a good Eſtate. What Security can be given for the Kingdom of Heaven?

Perhaps ſome will ſay that they do not ſuppoſe this infalible Judgment, that all Men are bound to follow the Affairs of Religion, to be in the Civil Magiſtrate, but in the Church. What the Church has determined, that the Civil

Magiſtrate orders to be obſerved; and he Provides by his Authority that no body ſhall either act or believe, in the Buſineſs of Religion, otherwiſe than the Church teaches. So that the Judgment of thoſe Things is in the Church. The Magiſtrate himſelf yields Obedience thereunto, and requires the like Obedience from others. I anſwer: Who ſees not how frequently the Name of the Church, which was venerable in the Time of the Apoſtles, has been made uſe of to throw Duſt in the Peoples Eyes, in the following Ages? But however, in the preſent Caſe it helps us not. The one only narrow Way which leads to Heaven is not better known to the Magiſtrate than to private Perſons, and therefore I cannot ſafely take him for my Guide, who may probably be as ignorant of the Way as my ſelf, and who certainly is leſs concerned for my Salvation than I my ſelf am. Amongſt ſo many Kings of the *Jews*, how many of them were there whom any *Iſraelite*, thus blindly following, had not fallen into Idolatry, and thereby into Deſtruction? Yet nevertheleſs, you bid me be of good Courage, and tell me that all is now ſafe and ſecure, becauſe the Magiſtrtae does not now enjoin the Obſervance of his own Decrees, in Matters of Religion, but only the Decrees of the Church. Of what Church I beſeech you? Of that certainly which likes him beſt. As if he that compels me by Laws and Penalties to enter into this or the other Church, did not interpoſe his own Judgment in the Matter. What Difference is there whether he lead me himſelf, or deliver me over to be led by others? I depend both Ways upon his Will, and it is he that determines both Ways of my eternal State. Would an *Iſralite*, that had worſhipped *Baal* upon the Command of his King, have been in any better Condition, becauſe ſome body had told him that the King ordered nothing in Religion upon his own Head, nor commanded any thing to be done by his Subjects in Divine Worſhip, but what was approv'd by the Counſel of Prieſts, and declared to be of Divine Right by the Doctors of their Church? If the Religion of any Church become therefore true and ſaving, becauſe the Head of that Sect, the Prelates and Prieſts, and thoſe of that Tribe, do all of them, with all their Might, extol and praiſe it; what Religion can ever be accounted erroneous, falſe and deſtructive? I am doubtful concerning the Doctrine of the *Socinians*, I am ſuſpicious of the Way of Worſhip practiſed by the *Papiſts*, or *Lutherans*; will it be ever a Jot ſafer for me to join either to the one or to the other of thoſe Churches, upon the Magiſtrate's Command, becauſe he Commands nothing in Religion but by the Authority and Counſel of the Doctors of that Church?

But to ſpeak the Truth, we muſt acknowledge that the Church (if a Convention of Clergymen, making Canons, muſt be called by that Name) is for the moſt part more apt to be influenced by the Court, than the Court by the Church. How the Church was under the Viciſſitude of Orthodox and *Arian* Emperors, is very well known. Or if thoſe Things be too remote, our modern *Engliſh* Hiſtory affords us freſh Examples, in the Reigns of *Henry* the 8th, *Edward* the 6th, *Mary*, and *Elizabeth*, how eaſily and ſmoothly the Clergy changed their Decrees, their Articles of Faith, their Form of Worſhip, every Thing according to the Inclination of thoſe Kings and Queens. Yet were thoſe Kings and Queens of ſuch different Minds in Point of Religion, and enjoined thereupon ſuch different Things, that no Man in his Wits (I had almoſt ſaid none but an Atheiſt) will preſume to ſay that any ſincere and upright Worſhipper of God could, with a ſafe Conſcience, obey their ſeveral Decrees. To conclude, It is the ſame Thing whether a King that preſcribes Laws to another Man's Religion, pretend to do it by his own Judgment, or by the eccleſiaſtical Authority and Advice of others. The Deciſions of Churchmen, whoſe Differences and Diſputes are ſufficiently known, cannot be any ſounder, or ſafer than his: Nor can all their Sufferages joined together, add a new ſtrength to the Civil Power. Tho' this alſo muſt be taken notice of, that Princes ſeldom have regard to the Suffrages of Eccleſiaſticks that are not Favourers of their own Faith and Way of Worſhip.

But after all, the *principal Conſideration*, and which abſolutely determines this Controverſy, is this. Although the Magiſtrate's Opinion in Religion be ſound, and the Way that he appoints be truly Evangelical, yet, if I be not thoroughly perſuaded thereof in my own Mind, there will be no Safety for me in following it. No Way whatſoever that I ſhall walk in againſt the Dictates of my Conſcience, will ever bring me to the Manſions of the Bleſſed. I may grow rich by an Art that I take not Delight in; I may be cured of ſome

Diſeaſe

Diſeaſes by Remedies that I have not Faith in; but I cannot be ſaved by a Religion that I diſtruſt, and by a Worſhip that I abhor. It is in vain for an Unbeliever to take up the outward Shew of another Man's Profeſſion. Faith only, and inward Sincerity, are the Things that procure Acceptance with God. The moſt likely and moſt approved Remedy can have no Effect upon the Patient, if his Stomach reject it as ſoon as taken. And you will in vain cram a Medicine down a ſick Man's Throat, which his particular Conſtitution will be ſure to turn into Poiſon. In a Word. Whatſoever may be doubtful in Religion, yet this at leaſt is certain, that no Religion, which I believe not to be true, can be either true, or profitable unto me. In vain therefore do Princes compel their Subjects to come into their Church-Communion, under Pretence of ſaving their Souls. If they believe they will come of their own Accord: if they believe not, their coming will nothing avail them. How great ſoever, in fine, may be the Pretence of Goodwill and Charity, and Concern for the Salvation of Mens Souls, Men cannot be forced to be ſaved whether the will or no. And therefore, when all is done, they muſt be left to their own Conſciences.

Having thus at length freed Men from all Dominion over one another in Matters of Religion, let us now conſider what they have to do. All Men know and acknowledge that God ought to be publickly worſhipped. Why otherwiſe do they compel one another unto the publick Aſſemblies? Men therefore conſtituted in this Liberty, are to enter into ſome religious Society, that they meet together, not only for mutual Edification, but to own to the World that they worſhip God, and offer unto his divine Majeſty ſuch Service as they themſelves are not aſhamed of, and ſuch as they think not unworthy of him, nor unacceptable to him; and finally that by the Purity of Doctrine, Holineſs of Life, and decent Form of Worſhip, they may draw others unto the Love of the true Religion, and perform ſuch other Things in Religion, as cannot be done by each private Man apart.

Theſe religious Societies I call Churches: and theſe I ſay the Magiſtrate ought to tolerate. For the Buſineſs of theſe Aſſemblies of the People is nothing but what is lawful for every Man in particular to take care of; I mean the Salvation of their Souls: nor in this Caſe is there any Difference between the National Church, and other ſeparated Congregations.

But as in every Church there are two Things eſpecially to be conſidered; The outward Form and Rites of Worſhip, And the Doctrines and Articles of Faith; theſe Things muſt be handled each diſtinctly; that ſo the whole Matter of Toleration may the more clearly be underſtood.

Concerning outward Worſhip, I ſay (in the firſt place) that the Magiſtrate has no Power to enforce by Law, either in his own Church, or much leſs in another, the Uſe of any Rites or Ceremonies whatſoever in the Worſhip of God. And this, not only becauſe theſe Churches are free Societies, but becauſe whatſoever is practiſed in the Worſhip of God, is only ſo far juſtifiable as it is believed by thoſe that practiſe it to be acceptable unto him. Whatſoever is not done with that Aſſurance of Faith, is neither well in it ſelf, nor can it be acceptable to God. To impoſe ſuch things therefore upon any People, contrary to their own Judgment, is in effect to command them to offend God; which, conſidering that the End of all Religion is to pleaſe him, and that Liberty is eſſentially neceſſary to that End, appears to be abſurd beyond Expreſſion.

But perhaps it may be concluded from hence, that I deny unto the Magiſtrate all manner of Power about indifferent Things; which if it be not granted, the whole Subject-matter of Law-making is taken away. No, I readily grant that indifferent Things, and perhaps none but ſuch, are ſubjected to the Legiſlative Power. But it does not therefore follow, that the Magiſtrate may ordain whatſoever he pleaſes concerning any thing that is indifferent. The publick Good is the Rule and Meaſure of all Law-making. If a Thing be not uſeful to the Common-wealth, tho' it be never ſo indifferent, it may not preſently be eſtabliſhed by Law.

And farther: Things never ſo indifferent in their own Nature, when they are brought into the Church and Worſhip of God, are removed out of the Reach of the Magiſtrate's Juriſdiction; becauſe in that Uſe they have no Connection at all with Civil Affairs. The only Buſineſs of the Church is the Salvation of Souls: and it no ways concerns the Common-wealth, or any Member of it, that this, or the other Ceremony be there made uſe of. Neither the Uſe, nor the Omiſſion

of any Ceremonies, in thoſe Religious Aſſemblies, does either advantage or prejudice the Life, Liberty, or Eſtate of any Man. For Example: Let it be granted, that the waſhing of an Infant with Water is in itſelf an indifferent Thing. Let it be granted alſo, that the Magiſtrate underſtand ſuch Waſhing to be profitable to the curing or preventing of any Diſeaſe the Children are ſubject unto, and eſteem the Matter weighty enough to be taken Care of by a Law, in that Caſe he may order it to be done. But will any one therefore ſay, that a Magiſtrate has the ſame Right to ordain, by Law, that all Children ſhall be baptized by Prieſts, in the ſacred Font, in order to the Purification of their Souls? The extreme Difference of theſe two Caſes is viſible to every one at firſt Sight. Or, let us apply the laſt Caſe to the Child of a *Jew*, and the Thing ſpeaks itſelf. For what hinders but a Chriſtian Magiſtrate may have Subjects that are *Jews*? Now if we acknowledge that ſuch an Injury may not be done unto a *Jew*, as to compel him, againſt his own Opnion, to practiſe in his Religion a Thing that is in its Nature indifferent; how can we maintain that any thing of this kind may be done to a Chriſtian.

Again: Things in their own Nature indifferent cannot, by any human Authority, be made any Part of the Worſhip of God; for this very Reaſon; becauſe they are indifferent. For, ſince indifferent Things are not capable, by any Virtue of their own, to propitiate the Deity; no human Power or Authority can confer on them ſo much Dignity and Excellency as to enable them to do it. In the common Affairs of Life, that Uſe of indifferent Things which God has not forbidden, is free and lawful; and therefore, in thoſe Things human Authority has Place. But it is not ſo in Matters of Religion. Things indifferent are not otherwiſe lawful in the Worſhip of God than as they are inſtituted by God himſelf; and as he, by ſome poſitive Command, has ordain'd them to be made a part of that Worſhip which he will vouchſafe to accept at the Hands of poor ſinful Men. Nor when an incenſed Deity ſhall ask us, *Who has required theſe, or ſuch like Things at your Hands?* Will it be enough to anſwer him, that the Magiſtrate commanded them. If civil Juriſdiction extend thus far, what might not lawfully be introduced into Religion? What Hodge-podge of Ceremonies, what ſuperſtitious Inventions, built upon the Magiſtrate's Authority, might not (againſt Conſcience) be impoſed upon the Worſhippers of God? For the greateſt part of theſe Ceremonies and Superſtitions conſiſts in the religious Uſe of ſuch Things as are in their own Nature indifferent: nor are they ſinful upon any other Account than becauſe God is not the Author of them. The ſprinkling of Water, and the Uſe of Bread and Wine, are both in their own Nature, and in the ordinary Occaſions of Life, altogether indifferent. Will any Man therefore ſay that theſe Things could have been introduced into Religion, and made a part of divine Worſhip, if not by divine Inſtitution? If any human Authority or civil Power could have done this, why might it not alſo enjoin the eating of Fiſh, and drinking of Ale, in the holy Banquet, as a part of divine Worſhip? Why did not the ſprinkling of Blood of Beaſts in Churches, and Expiations by Water and Fire, and abundance more of this kind? But theſe Things, how indifferent ſoever they be in common Uſes, when they come to be annexed unto divine Worſhip, without divine Authority, they are as abominable to God, as the Sacrifice of a Dog. And why a Dog ſo abominable? What Difference is there between a Dog and a Goat, in reſpect of the divine Nature, equally and infinitely diſtant from all Affinity with Matter; unleſs it be that God required the Uſe of one in his Worſhip, and not of the other? We ſee therefore that indifferent Things, how much ſoever they be under the Power of the civil Magiſtrate, yet cannot upon that Petence be introduced into Religion, and impoſed upon religious Aſſemblies; becauſe in the Worſhip of God they wholly ceaſe to be indifferent. He that worſhips God, does it with Deſign to pleaſe him and procure his Favour. But that cannot be done by him, who, upon the Command of another, offers unto God that which he knows will be diſpleaſing to him, becauſe not commanded by himſelf. This is not to pleaſe God, or appeaſe his Wrath, but willingly and knowingly to provoke him, by a manifeſt Contempt; which is a Thing abſolutely repugnant to the Nature and End of Worſhip.

But it will be here asked: If nothing belonging to divine Worſhip be left to human Diſcretion, how is it then that Churches themſelves have the Power of ordering

ordering any thing about the Time and Place of Worſhip, and the like? To this I anſwer; That in religious Worſhip we muſt diſtinguiſh between what is part of the Worſhip it ſelf, and what is but a Circumſtance. That is a part of the Worſhip which is believed to be appointed by God, and to be well-pleaſing to him; and therefore that is neceſſary. Circumſtances are ſuch Things which, tho' in general they cannot be ſeparated from Worſhip, yet the particular Inſtances or Modifications of them are not determined; and therefore they are indifferent. Of this Sort are the Time and Place of Worſhip, Habit and Poſture of him that worſhips. Theſe are Circumſtances, and perfectly indifferent, where God has not given any expreſs Command about them. For Example: Amongſt the *Jews*, the Time and Place of their Worſhip, and the Habits of thoſe that officiated in it, were not mere Circumſtances, but a part of the Worſhip it ſelf; in which if any thing were defective, or different from the Inſtitution, they could not hope that it would be accepted by God. But theſe, to Chriſtians under the Liberty of the Goſpel, are mere Circumſtances of Worſhip, which the Prudence of every Church may bring into ſuch Uſe as ſhall be judged moſt ſubſervient to the End of Order, Decency, and Edification. But, even under the Goſpel, thoſe who believe the Firſt, or the Seventh Day to be ſet apart by God, and conſecrated ſtill to his Worſhip, to them that Portion of Time is not a ſimple Circumſtance, but a real Part of divine Worſhip, which can neither be changed nor neglected.

In the next Place: As the Magiſtrate has no Power to *impoſe* by his Laws, the Uſe of any Rites and Ceremonies in any Church, ſo neither has he any Power to *forbid* the Uſe of ſuch Rites and Ceremonies as are already received, approved, and practiſed by any Church: Becauſe if he did ſo, he would deſtroy the Church it ſelf: the End of whoſe Inſtitution is only to worſhip God with Freedom, after his own Manner.

You will ſay, by this Rule, if ſome Congregations ſhould have a mind to ſacrifice Infants, or (as the primitive Chriſtians were falſly accuſed) luſtfully pollute themſelves in promiſcous Uncleanneſs, or practiſe any other ſuch heinous Enormities, is the Magiſtrate obliged to tolerate them, becauſe they are committed in a religious Aſſembly? I anſwer, No. Theſe things are not lawful in the ordinary Courſe of Life, nor in any private Houſe; and therefore neither are they ſo in the Worſhip of God, or in an religious Meeting. But indeed if any People congregated upon account of Religion, ſhould be deſirous to ſacrifice a Calf, I deny that that ought to be prohibited by a Law. *Meliboeus*, whoſe Calf it is, may lawfully kill his Calf at Home, and burn any Part of it that he thinks fit. For no Injury is thereby done to any one, no Prejudice to another Man's Goods. And for the ſame Reaſon he may kill his Calf alſo in a religious Meeting. Whether the doing ſo be well-pleaſing to God or no, it is their Part to conſider that do it. The Part of the Magiſtrate is only to take Care that the Common-wealth receive no Prejudice, and that there be no Injury done to any Man, either in Life or Eſtate, and thus what may be ſpent on a Feaſt, may be ſpent on a Sacrifice. But if Paradventure ſuch were the State of Things, that the Intereſt of the Common-wealth required all Slaughter of Beaſts ſhould be forborn for ſome while, in order to the encreaſing of the Stock of Cattel, that had been deſtroyed by ſome extraordinary Murrain; Who ſees not that the Magiſtrate, in ſuch a Caſe, may forbid all his Subjects to kill any Calves for any Uſe whatſoever? Only 'tis to be obſerved, that in this Caſe the Law is not made about a religious, but a political Matter: Nor is the Sacrifice, but the Slaughter of Calves thereby prohibited.

By this we ſee what difference there is between the Church and the Common-wealth. Whatſoever is lawful in the Common-wealth, cannot be prohibited by the Magiſtrate in the Church. Whatſoever is permitted unto any of his Subjects for their ordinary Uſe, neither can nor ought to be forbidden by him to any Sect of People for their religious Uſes. If any Man may lawfully take Bread or Wine, either ſitting or kneeling in his own Houſe, the Law ought not to abridge him of the ſame Liberty in his religious Worſhip; tho' in the Church the Uſe of Bread and Wine be very different, and be there applied to the Myſteries of Faith, and Rites of divine Worſhip. But thoſe Things that are prejudicial to the Common-weal of a People in their ordinary Uſe, and are therefore forbidden by Laws, thoſe Things ought not to be permitted to Churches in their ſacred Rites. Only the

Magiſtrate

Magiſtrate ought always to be very careful that he do not miſuſe his Authority, to the Oppreſſion of any Church, under Pretence of Publick Good.

It may be ſaid, What if a Church be idolatrous, is that alſo to be tolerated by the Magiſtrate? I anſwer, What Power can be given to the Magiſtrate for the Suppreſſion of an idolatrous Church, which may not, in Time and Place, be made uſe of to the Ruin of an orthodox one? For it muſt be remembred, that the Civil Power is the ſame every where, and the Religion of every Prince is orthodox to himſelf. If therefore ſuch a Power be granted unto the Civil Magiſtrate in Spirituals, as that at *Geneva*, (for Example) he may extirpate, by Violence and Blood, the Religion which is there reputed idolatrous; by the ſame Rule another Magiſtrate, in ſome neighbouring Country, may oppreſs the Reformed Religion; and, in *India*, the Chriſtian. The Civil Power can either change every thing in Religion, according to the Prince's Pleaſure, or it can change nothing. If it be once permitted to introduce any thing into Religion, by the Means of Laws and Penalties, there can be no Bounds put to it; but it will in the ſame manner be lawful to alter every thing, according to that Rule of Truth which the Magiſtrate has framed unto himſelf. No Man whatſoever ought therefore to be deprived of his Terreſtrial Enjoyments, upon account of his Religion. Not even *Americans*, ſubjected unto a Chriſtian Prince, are to be puniſhed either in Body or Goods, for not embracing our Faith and Worſhip. If they are perſuaded that they pleaſe God in obſerving the Rites of their own Country, and that they ſhould obtain Happineſs by that Means, they are to be left unto God and themſelves. Let us trace this Matter to the bottom. Thus it is: An inconſiderable and weak Number of Chriſtians, deſtitute of every thing, arrive in a Pagan Country; theſe Foreigners beſeech the Inhabitants, by the Bowels of Humanity, that they would ſuccour them with the Neceſſaries of Life; thoſe Neceſſaries are given them, Habitations are granted, and they all join together, and grow up into one Body of People. The Chriſtian Religion by this Means takes Root in that Country, and ſpreads itſelf; but does not ſuddenly grow the ſtrongeſt. While Things are in this Condition, Peace, Friendſhip, Faith, and equal Juſtice, are preſerved amongſt them. At length the Magiſtrate becomes a Chriſtian, and by that Means their Party becomes the moſt powerful. Then immediately all Compacts are to be broken, all Civil Rights to be violated, that Idolatry may be extirpated: And unleſs theſe innocent Pagans, ſtrict Obſervers of the Rules of Equity and the Law of Nature, and no ways offending againſt the Laws of the Society, I ſay unleſs they will forſake their ancient Religion, and embrace a new and ſtrange one, they are to be turned out of the Lands and Poſſeſſions of their Forefathers, and perhaps deprived of Life itſelf. Then at laſt it appears what Zeal for the Church, joined with the Deſire of Dominion, is capable to produce; and how eaſily the Pretence of Religion, and of the Care of Souls, ſerves for a Cloak to Covetouſneſs, Rapine, and Ambition.

Now whoſoever maintains that Idolatry is to be rooted out of any Place by Laws, Puniſhments, Fire and Sword, may apply this Story to himſelf. For the Reaſon of the Thing is equal, both in *America* and *Europe*. And neither Pagans there, nor any diſſenting Chriſtians here, can with any Right be deprived of their worldly Goods, by the predominating Faction of a Court-Church: nor are any Civil Rights to be either changed or violated upon the account of Religion in one Place more than another.

But *Idolatry* (ſome ſay) is a Sin, and therefore not to be tolerated. If they ſaid it were therefore to be avoided, the Inference were good. But it does not follow, that becauſe it is a Sin it ought therefore to be puniſhed by the Magiſtrate. For it does not belong unto the Magiſtrate to make uſe of his Sword in puniſhing every thing, indifferently, that he takes to be a Sin againſt God. Covetouſneſs, Uncharitableneſs, Idleneſs, and many other things are Sins, by the Conſent of Men, which yet no Man ever ſaid were to be puniſh'd by the Magiſtrate. The Reaſon is, becauſe they are not prejudicial to other Mens Rights, nor do they break the publick Peace of Societies. Nay, even the Sins of Lying and Perjury are no where puniſhable by Laws; unleſs in certain Caſes, in which the real Turpitude of the Thing, and the Offence againſt God, are not conſidered, but only the Injury done unto Mens Neighbours, and to the Common-wealth. And what if in another Country, to a Mahometan or a Pagan Prince, the Chriſtian

ſtian Religion ſeem falſe and offenſive to God; may not the Chriſtians for the ſame Reaſon, and after the ſame Manner, be extirpated there?

But it may be urged farther, That by the Law of *Moſes* Idolaters were to be rooted out. True indeed, by the Law of *Moſes*; but that is not obligatory to us Chriſtians. No body pretends that every thing, generally, enjoined by the Law of *Moſes*; ought to be practiſed by Chriſtians, but there is nothing more frivolous than that common Diſtinction of Moral, Judicial, and Ceremonial Law, which Men ordinarily make uſe of. For no poſitive Law whatſoever can oblige any People but thoſe to whom it is given. *Hear O Iſrael*, ſufficiently reſtrains the Obligation of the Law of *Moſes* only to that People. And this Conſideration alone is Anſwer enough unto thoſe that urge the Authority of the Law of *Moſes*; for the inflicting of capital Puniſhments upon Idolaters. But however, I will examine this Argument a little more particularly.

The Caſe of Idolaters, in reſpect of the *Jewiſh* Common-wealth, falls under a double Conſideration. The firſt is of thoſe, who, being initiated in the *Moſaical* Rites, and made Citizens of that Common-wealth, did afterwrrds apoſtatiſe from the Worſhip of the God of *Iſrael*. Theſe were proceeded againſt as Traytors and Rebels, guilty of no leſs than High-Treaſon. For the Common-wealth of the *Jews*, different in that from all others, was an abſolute Theocracy: Nor was there, or could there be, any Difference between that Common-wealth and the Church. The Laws eſtabliſh'd there concerning the Worſhip of one Inviſible Deity, were the Civil Laws of that People, and a Part of their Political Government, in which God himſelf was the Legiſlator. Now if any one can ſhew me where there is a Common-wealth, at this Time, conſtituted upon that Foundation, I will acknowledge that the Eccleſiaſtical Laws do there unavoidably become a Part of the Civil; and that the Subjects of that Government both may, and ought to be kept in ſtrict Conformity with that Church, by the Civil Power. But there is abſolutely no ſuch Thing, under the Goſpel, as a Chriſtian Common-wealth. There are, indeed, many Cities and Kingdoms that have embraced the Faith of Chriſt, but they have retained their ancient Form of Government; with which the Law of Chriſt hath not at all meddled. He, indeed, hath taught Men how, by Faith and good Works, that they may attain eternal Life. But he inſtituted no Common-wealth. He preſcribed unto his Followers no new and peculiar Form of Government, nor put he the Sword into any Magiſtrate's Hand, with Commiſſion to make uſe of it in forcing Men to forſake their former Religion, and receive his.

Secondly, Foreigners, and ſuch as were Strangers to the Common-wealth of *Iſrael*, were not compell'd by Force to obſerve the Rites of the *Moſaical Law*. But, on the contrary, in the very ſame Place where it is order'd, that *an Iſraelite that was an Idolater ſhould be put to Death*, there it is provided that *Strangers ſhould not be vexed nor oppreſſed*. I confeſs that the ſeven Nations that poſſeſs'd the Land which was promiſed to the *Iſraelites*, were utterly to be cut off. But this was not ſingly becauſe they were Idolaters. For if that had been the Reaſon, why were the *Moabites* and other Nations to be ſpared? No; the Reaſon is this. God being in a peculiar manner the King of the *Jews*, he could not ſuffer the Adoration of any other Deity (which was properly an Act of High-Treaſon againſt himſelf) in the Land of *Canaan*, which was his Kingdom. For ſuch a manifeſt Revolt could no ways conſiſt with his Dominion, which was perfectly Political, in that Country. All Idolatry was therefore to be rooted out of the Bounds of his Kingdom; becauſe it was an Acknowlengment of another God, that is to ſay, another King; againſt the Laws of Empire. The Inhabitants were alſo to be driven out, that the entire Poſſeſſion of the Land might be given to the *Iſraelites*. And for the like Reaſon the *Emims* and the *Horims* were driven out of their Countries by the Children of *Eſau* and *Lot*; and their Lands, upon the ſame Grounds, given by God to the Invaders. But tho' all Idolatry was thus rooted out of the Land of *Canaan*, yet every Idolater was not brought to Execution. The whole Family of *Rahab*, the whole Nation of the *Gibeonites*, articled with *Joſhuah*, and were allowed by Treaty: And there were many Captives amongſt the *Jews*, who were Idolaters. *David* and *Solomon* ſubdued many Countries without the Confines of the Land of Promiſe, and carried their Conqueſts as far as *Euphrates*. Amongſt ſo many Captives taken, ſo many Nations reduced under their Obedience, we find

nor

Magiſtrate ought always to be very careful that he do not miſuſe his Authority, to the Oppreſſion of any Church, under Pretence of Publick Good.

It may be ſaid, What if a Church be idolatrous, is that alſo to be tolerated by the Magiſtrate? I anſwer, What Power can be given to the Magiſtrate for the Suppreſſion of an idolatrous Church, which may not, in Time and Place, be made uſe of to the Ruin of an orthodox one? For it muſt be remembred, that the Civil Power is the ſame every where, and the Religion of every Prince is orthodox to himſelf. If therefore ſuch a Power be granted unto the Civil Magiſtrate in Spirituals, as that at *Geneva*, (for Example) he may extirpate, by Violence and Blood, the Religion which is there reputed idolatrous; by the ſame Rule another Magiſtrate, in ſome neighbouring Country, may oppreſs the Reformed Religion; and, in *India*, the Chriſtian. The Civil Power can either change every thing in Religion, according to the Prince's Pleaſure, or it can change nothing. If it be once permitted to introduce any thing into Religion, by the Means of Laws and Penalties, there can be no Bounds put to it; but it will in the ſame manner be lawful to alter every thing, according to that Rule of Truth which the Magiſtrate has framed unto himſelf. No Man whatſoever ought therefore to be deprived of his Terreſtrial Enjoyments, upon account of his Religion. Not even *Americans*, ſubjected unto a Chriſtian Prince, are to be puniſhed either in Body or Goods, for not embracing our Faith and Worſhip. If they are perſuaded that they pleaſe God in obſerving the Rites of their own Country, and that they ſhould obtain Happineſs by that Means, they are to be left unto God and themſelves. Let us trace this Matter to the bottom. Thus it is: An inconſiderable and weak Number of Chriſtians, deſtitute of every thing, arrive in a Pagan Country; theſe Foreigners beſeech the Inhabitants, by the Bowels of Humanity, that they would ſuccour them with the Neceſſaries of Life; thoſe Neceſſaries are given them, Habitations are granted, and they all join together, and grow up into one Body of People. The Chriſtian Religion by this Means takes Root in that Country, and ſpreads itſelf; but does not ſuddenly grow the ſtrongeſt. While Things are in this Condition, Peace, Friendſhip, Faith, and equal Juſtice, are preſerved amongſt them. At length the Magiſtrate becomes a Chriſtian, and by that Means their Party becomes the moſt powerful. Then immediately all Compacts are to be broken, all Civil Rights to be violated, that Idolatry may be extirpated: And unleſs theſe innocent Pagans, ſtrict Obſervers of the Rules of Equity and the Law of Nature, and no ways offending againſt the Laws of the Society, I ſay unleſs they will forſake their ancient Religion, and embrace a new and ſtrange one, they are to be turned out of the Lands and Poſſeſſions of their Foreſathers, and perhaps deprived of Life itſelf. Then at laſt it appears what Zeal for the Church, joined with the Deſire of Dominion, is capable to produce; and how eaſily the Pretence of Religion, and of the Care of Souls, ſerves for a Cloak to Covetouſneſs, Rapine, and Ambition.

Now whoſoever maintains that Idolatry is to be rooted out of any Place by Laws, Puniſhments, Fire and Sword, may apply this Story to himſelf. For the Reaſon of the Thing is equal, both in *America* and *Europe*. And neither Pagans there, nor any diſſenting Chriſtians here, can with any Right be deprived of their worldly Goods, by the predominating Faction of a Court-Church: nor are any Civil Rights to be either changed or violated upon the account of Religion in one Place more than another.

But *Idolatry* (ſome ſay) is a Sin, and therefore not to be tolerated. If they ſaid it were therefore to be avoided, the Inference were good. But it does not follow, that becauſe it is a Sin it ought therefore to be puniſhed by the Magiſtrate. For it does not belong unto the Magiſtrate to make uſe of his Sword in puniſhing every thing, indifferently, that he takes to be a Sin againſt God. Covetouſneſs, Uncharitableneſs, Idleneſs, and many other things are Sins, by the Conſent of Men, which yet no Man ever ſaid were to be puniſh'd by the Magiſtrate. The Reaſon is, becauſe they are not prejudicial to other Mens Rights, nor do they break the publick Peace of Societies. Nay, even the Sins of Lying and Perjury are no where puniſhable by Laws; unleſs in certain Caſes, in which the real Turpitude of the Thing, and the Offence againſt God, are not conſidered, but only the Injury done unto Mens Neighbours, and to the Common-wealth. And what if in another Country, to a Mahometan or a Pagan Prince, the Chriſtian

ſtian Religion ſeem falſe and offenſive to God; may not the Chriſtians for the ſame Reaſon, and after the ſame Manner, be extirpated there?

But it may be urged farther, That by the Law of *Moſes* Idolaters were to be rooted out. True indeed, by the Law of *Moſes*; but that is not obligatory to us Chriſtians. No body pretends that every thing, generally, enjoined by the Law of *Moſes*; ought to be practiſed by Chriſtians, but there is nothing more frivolous than that common Diſtinction of Moral, Judicial, and Ceremonial Law, which Men ordinarily make uſe of. For no poſitive Law whatſoever can oblige any People but thoſe to whom it is given. *Hear O Iſrael*, ſufficiently reſtrains the Obligation of the Law of *Moſes* only to that People. And this Conſideration alone is Anſwer enough unto thoſe that urge the Authority of the Law of *Moſes*; for the inflicting of capital Puniſhments upon Idolaters. But however, I will examine this Argument a little more particularly.

The Caſe of Idolaters, in reſpect of the *Jewiſh* Common-wealth, falls under a double Conſideration. The firſt is of thoſe, who, being initiated in the *Moſaical* Rites, and made Citizens of that Common-wealth, did afterwrrds apoſtatiſe from the Worſhip of the God of *Iſrael*. Theſe were proceeded againſt as Traytors and Rebels, guilty of no leſs than High-Treaſon. For the Common-wealth of the *Jews*, different in that from all others, was an abſolute Theocracy: Nor was there, or could there be, any Difference between that Common-wealth and the Church. The Laws eſtabliſh'd there concerning the Worſhip of one Inviſible Deity, were the Civil Laws of that People, and a Part of their Political Government, in which God himſelf was the Legiſlator. Now if any one can ſhew me where there is a Common-wealth, at this Time, conſtituted upon that Foundation, I will acknowledge that the Eccleſiaſtical Laws do there unavoidably become a Part of the Civil; and that the Subjects of that Government both may, and ought to be kept in ſtrict Conformity with that Church, by the Civil Power. But there is abſolutely no ſuch Thing, under the Goſpel, as a Chriſtian Common-wealth. There are, indeed, many Cities and Kingdoms that have embraced the Faith of Chriſt, but they have retained their ancient Form of Government; with which the Law of Chriſt hath not at all meddled. He, indeed, hath taught Men how, by Faith and good Works, that they may attain eternal Life. But he inſtituted no Common-wealth. He preſcribed unto his Followers no new and peculiar Form of Government, nor put he the Sword into any Magiſtrate's Hand, with Commiſſion to make uſe of it in forcing Men to forſake their former Religion, and receive his.

Secondly, Foreigners, and ſuch as were Strangers to the Common-wealth of *Iſrael*, were not compell'd by Force to obſerve the Rites of the *Moſaical Law*. But, on the contrary, in the very ſame Place where it is order'd, that *an Iſraelite that was an Idolater ſhould be put to Death*, there it is provided that *Strangers ſhould not be vexed nor oppreſſed*. I confeſs that the ſeven Nations that poſſeſs'd the Land which was promiſed to the *Iſraelites*, were utterly to be cut off. But this was not ſingly becauſe they were Idolaters. For if that had been the Reaſon, why were the *Moabites* and other Nations to be ſpared? No; the Reaſon is this. God being in a peculiar manner the King of the *Jews*, he could not ſuffer the Adoration of any other Deity (which was properly an Act of High-Treaſon againſt himſelf) in the Land of *Canaan*, which was his Kingdom. For ſuch a manifeſt Revolt could no ways conſiſt with his Dominion, which was perfectly Political, in that Country. All Idolatry was therefore to be rooted out of the Bounds of his Kingdom; becauſe it was an Acknowlengment of another God, that is to ſay, another King; againſt the Laws of Empire. The Inhabitants were alſo to be driven out, that the entire Poſſeſſion of the Land might be given to the *Iſraelites*. And for the like Reaſon the *Emims* and the *Horims* were driven out of their Countries by the Children of *Eſau* and *Lot*; and their Lands, upon the ſame Grounds, given by God to the Invaders. But tho' all Idolatry was thus rooted out of the Land of *Canaan*, yet every Idolater was not brought to Execution. The whole Family of *Rahab*, the whole Nation of the *Gibeonites*, articled with *Joſhuah*, and were allowed by Treaty: And there were many Captives amongſt the *Jews*, who were Idolaters. *David* and *Solomon* ſubdued many Countries without the Confines of the Land of Promiſe, and carried their Conqueſts as far as *Euphrates*. Amongſt ſo many Captives taken, ſo many Nations reduced under their Obedience, we find

not

not one Man forced into the *Jewiſh* Religion, and the Worſhip of the True God, and puniſhed for Idolatry, tho' all of them were certainly guilty of it. If any one indeed, becoming a Proſelyte, deſired to be made a Deniſon of their Common-wealth, he was obliged to ſubmit to their Laws; that is, to embrace their Religion. But this he did willingly, on his own accord, not by Conſtraint. He did not unwillingly ſubmit, to ſhew his Obedience; But he ſought and ſolicited for it, as a Privilege. And as ſoon as he was admitted, he became ſubject to the Laws of the Common-wealth, by which all Idolatry was forbidden within the Borders of the Land of *Canaan*. But that Law (as I have ſaid) did not reach to any of thoſe Regions, however ſubjected to the *Jews*, that were ſituated without thoſe Bounds.

Thus far concerning outward Worſhip. Let us now conſider *Articles of Faith*.

The *Articles* of Religion are ſome of them *Practical*, and ſome *Speculative*. Now, tho' both Sorts conſiſt in the Knowledge of Truth, yet theſe terminate ſimply in the Underſtanding, thoſe influence the Will and Manners. Speculative Opinions, therefore, and *Articles of Faith* (as they are called) which are required only to be believed, cannot be impoſed on any Church by the Law of the Land. For it is abſurd that Things ſhould be enjoined by Laws, which are not in Mens Power to perform. And to believe this or that to be true, does not depend upon our Will. But of this enough has been ſaid already. But (will ſome ſay) let Men at leaſt profeſs that they believe. A ſweet Religion indeed, that obliges Men to diſſemble, and tell Lies both to God and Man, for the Salvation of their Souls! If the Magiſtrate thinks to ſave Men thus, he ſeems to underſtand little in the Way of Salvation. And if he does it not in order to ſave them, why is he ſo ſollicitous about the Articles of Faith, as to enact them by a Law?

Farther, The Magiſtrate ought not to forbid the preaching or profeſſing of any ſpeculative Opinions of any Church, becauſe they have no manner of relation to the Civil Rights of the Subjects. If a *Roman Catholick* believe that to be really the Body of Chriſt, which another Man calls Bread, he does no Injury thereby to his Neighbour. If a *Jew* do not believe the New Teſtament to be the Word of God, he does not thereby alter any thing in Mens Civil Rights. If a Heathen doubt of both Teſtaments, he is not therefore to be puniſhed as a pernicious Citizen. The Power of the Magiſtrate, and the Eſtates of the People, may be equally ſecure, whether any Man believe theſe Things or no. I readily grant, that theſe Opinions are falſe and abſurd. But the Buſineſs of Laws is not to provide for the Truth of Opinions, but for the Safety and Security of the Common-wealth, and of every particular Man's Goods and Perſon. And ſo it ought to be. For the Truth certainly would do well enough, if ſhe were once left to ſhift for herſelf. She ſeldom has received, and I fear never will receive much Aſſiſtance from the Power of Great Men, to whom ſhe is but rarely known, and more rarely welcome. She is not taught by Laws, nor has ſhe any need of Force to procure her Enterance into the Minds of Men. Errors indeed prevail by the Aſſiſtance of foreign and borrowed Succours. But if Truth makes not her Way into the Underſtanding by her own Light, ſhe will be but the weaker for any borrowed Force Violence can add to her. Thus much for Speculative Opinions. Let us now procced to *Practical* ones.

A Good Life, in which conſiſts not the leaſt Part of Religion and true Piety, concerns alſo the Civil-Government: and in it lies the Safety both of Mens Souls, and of the Common-wealth. Moral Actions belong therefore to the Juriſdiction both of the outward and inward Court; both of the Civil and Domeſtick Governor; I mean both of the Magiſtrate and Conſcience. Here therefore is great Danger, leſt one of theſe Juriſdictions intrench upon the other, and Diſcord ariſe between the Keeper of the Publick Peace and the Overſeers of Souls. But if what has been already ſaid concerning the Limits of both theſe Governments be rightly conſidered, it will eaſily remove all Difficulty in this Matter.

Every Man has an immortal Soul, capable of eternal Happineſs or Miſery: whoſe Happineſs depending upon his believing and doing thoſe Things in this Life, which are neceſſary to the obtaining of God's Favour, and are preſcribed by God to that End; it follows from thence, 1ſt. That the Obſervance of theſe Things is the higheſt Obligation that lies upon Mankind, and that our utmoſt Care,

Care, Application, and Diligence, ought to be exercised in the Search and Performance of them; Because there is nothing in this World that is of any Consideration in comparison with Eternity. 2*dly*, That seeing one Man does not violate the Right of another, by his erroneous Opinions, and undue Manner of Worship, nor is his Perdition any Prejudice to another Man's Affairs; therefore the Care of each Man's Salvation belongs only to himself. But I would not have this understood, as if I meant hereby to condemn all charitable Admonitions, and affectionate Endeavours to reduce Men from Errors; which are indeed the greatest Duty of a Christian. Any one may employ as many Exhortations and Arguments as he pleases, towards the promoting of another Man's Salvation. But all Force and Compulsion are to be forborn. Nothing is to be done imperiously. No body is obliged in that Matter to yield Obedience unto the Admonitions or Injunctions of another, farther than he himself is persuaded. Every Man, in that, has the supreme and absolute Authority of Judging for himself. And the Reason is, because no body else is concerned in it, nor can receive any Prejudice from his Conduct therein.

But besides their Souls, which are Immortal, Men have also their Temporal Lives here upon Earth; the State whereof being frail and fleeting, and the Duration uncertain: they have need of several outward Conveniencies to the Support thereof, which are to be procured or preserved by Pains and Industry. For those Things that are necessary to the comfortable Support of our Lives, are not the spontaneous Products of Nature, nor do offer themselves fit and prepared for our Use. This Part therefore draws on another Care, and necessarily gives another Employment. But the Pravity of Mankind being such, that they had rather injuriously prey upon the Fruits of other Mens Labours, than take pains to provide for themselves; the Necessity of preserving Men in the Possession of what honest Industry has already acquired, and also of preserving their Liberty and Strength, whereby they may acquire what they farther want; obliges Men to enter into Society with one another; that by mutual Assistance and joint Force, they may secure unto each other their Properties, in the Things that contribute to the Comfort and Happiness of this Life; leaving in the mean while to every Man the Care of his own Eternal Happiness, the Attainment whereof can neither be facilitated by another Man's Industry, nor can the Loss of it turn to another Man's Prejudice, nor the Hope of it be forced from him by any external Violence. But forasmuch as Men thus entring into Societies, grounded upon their mutual Compacts of Assistance, for the Defence of their Temporal Goods, may nevertheless be deprived of them, either by the Rapine and Fraud of their Fellow-Citizens, or by the hostile Violence of Foreigners; the Remedy of this Evil consists in Arms, Riches, and Multitude of Citizens; the Remedy of the other in Laws; and the Care of all Things relating both to one and the other, is committed by the Society to the Civil Magistrate. This is the Original, this is the Use, and these are the Bounds of the Legislative (which is the Supreme) Power in every Common-wealth. I mean, that Provision may be made for the Security of each Man's private Possessions; for the Peace, Riches, and publick Commodities of the whole People; and, as much as possible, for the Increase of their inward Strength, against foreign Invasions.

These Things being thus explain'd, it is easy to understand to what End the Legislative Power ought to be directed, and by what Measures regulated; and that is the temporal Good and outward Prosperity of the Society; which is the sole Reason of Mens entring into Society, and the only Thing they seek and aim at in it. And it is also evident what Liberty remains to Men in reference to their eternal Salvation, and that is, that every one should do what he in his Conscience is persuaded to be acceptable to the Almighty, on whose good Pleasure and Acceptance depends their eternal Happiness. For Obedience is due in the first place to God, and afterwards to the Laws.

But some may ask, *What if the Magistrate should enjoin any thing by his Authority that appears unlawful to the Conscience of a private Person?* I answer, that if Government be faithfully administred, and the Counsels of the Magistrate be indeed directed to the publick Good, this will seldom happen. But if perhaps it do so fall out, I say, that such a private Person is to abstain from the Action that he judges unlawful; and he is to undergo the Punishment, which it is not unlawful for him

to bear. For the private Judgment of any Perſon concerning a Law enacted in Political Matters, for the publick Good, does not take away the Obligation of that Law, nor deſerve a Diſpenſation. But if the Law indeed be concerning Things that lie not within the Verge of the Magiſtrate's Authority; (as for Example, that the People, or any Party amongſt them, ſhould be compell'd to embrace a ſtrange Religion, and join in the Worſhip and Ceremonies of another Church,) Men are not in theſe Caſes obliged by that Law, againſt their Conſciences. For the Political Society is inſtituted for no other End, but only to ſecure every Man's Poſſeſſion of the Things of this Life. The Care of each Man's Soul, and of the Things of Heaven, which neither does belong to the Commonwealth, nor can be ſubjected to it, is left entirely to every Man's ſelf. Thus the Safeguard of Mens Lives, and of the Things that belong unto this Life, is the Buſineſs of the Common-wealth; and the preſerving of thoſe Things unto their Owners, is the Duty of the Magiſtrate. And therefore the Magiſtrate cannot take away theſe worldly Things from this Man, or Party, and give them to that; nor change Propriety amongſt Fellow-Subjects, (no not even by a Law) for a Cauſe that has no relation to the End of Civil-Government; I mean for their Religion; which whether it be true or falſe, does no Prejudice to the worldly Concerns of their Fellow-Subjects, which are the Things that only belong unto the Care of the Common-wealth.

But what if the Magiſtrate believe ſuch a Law as this to be for the publick Good? I anſwer: as the private Judgment of any particular Perſon, if erroneous, does not exempt him from the Obligation of Law, ſo the private Judgment (as I may call it) of the Magiſtrate does not give him any new Right of impoſing Laws upon his Subjects, which neither was in the Conſtitution of the Government granted him, nor ever was in the Power of the People to grant: much leſs, if he make it his Buſineſs to enrich and advance his Followers and Fellow-Sectaries, with the Spoils of others. But what if the Magiſtrate believe that he has a Right to make ſuch Laws, and that they are for the publick Good; and his Subjects believe the contrary? Who ſhall be Judge between them? I anſwer, God alone. For there is no Judge upon Earth between the Supreme Magiſtrate and the People. God, I ſay, is the only Judge in this Caſe, who will retribute unto every one at the laſt Day according to his Deſerts; that is, according to his Sincerity and Uprightneſs in endeavouring to promote Piety, and the publick Weal and Peace of Mankind. But what ſhall be done in the mean while? I anſwer: The principal and chief Care of every one ought to be of his own Soul firſt, and in the next place, of the publick Peace: tho' yet there are very few will think 'tis Peace there, where they ſee all laid waſte. There are two ſorts of Conteſts amongſt Men; the one managed by Law, the other by Force: and theſe are of that nature, that where the one ends, the other always begins. But it is not my Buſineſs to enquire into the Power of the Magiſtrate in the different Conſtitutions of Nations. I only know what uſually happens where Controverſies ariſe, without a Judge to determine them. You will ſay then, the Magiſtrate being the ſtronger will have his Will, and carry his Point. Without doubt. But the queſtion is not here concerning the doubtfulneſs of the event, but the rule of right.

But to come to Particulars. I ſay, *Firſt*, No Opinions contrary to human Society, or to thoſe moral Rules which are neceſſary to the Preſervation of Civil Society, are to be tolerated by the Magiſtrate. But of theſe indeed Examples in any Church are rare. For no Sect can eaſily arrive to ſuch a degree of madneſs, as that it ſhould think fit to teach, for Doctrines of Religion, ſuch things as manifeſtly undermine the Foundations of Society, and are therefore condemned by the Judgment of all Mankind: becauſe their own Intereſt, Peace, Reputation, every thing would be thereby endanger'd.

Another more ſecret Evil, but more dangerous to the Common-wealth, is when Men arrogate to themſelves, and to thoſe of their own Sect, ſome peculiar Prerogative cover'd over with a ſpecious ſhew of deceitful words, but in effect oppoſite to the Civil Right of the Community. For Example. We cannot find any Sect that teaches expreſly and openly, that Men are not obliged to keep their Promiſe; that Princes may be dethroned by thoſe that differ from them in Religion; or that the Dominion of all things belongs only to themſelves. For theſe things, propoſed thus nakedly and plainly, would ſoon draw on them the Eye and Hand of the Magiſtrate, and awaken all the care of the Commonwealth to a watchfulneſs againſt the ſpreading of ſo dangerous an Evil. But nevertheleſs, we find thoſe that ſay the ſame things, in other words. What elſe do they mean, who teach that *Faith is not to be kept with Hereticks?* Their meaning, forſooth,

forſooth, is that the Privilege of breaking Faith belongs unto themſelves: For they declare all that are not of their Communion to be Hereticks, or at leaſt may declare them ſo whenſoever they think fit. What can be the meaning of their aſſerting that *Kings excommunicated forfeit their Crowns and Kingdoms?* It is evident that they thereby arrogate unto themſelves the Power of depoſing Kings: becauſe they challenge the Power of Excommunication, as the peculiar Right of their Hierarchy. That *Dominion is founded in Grace*, is alſo an Aſſertion by which thoſe that maintain it do plainly lay claim to the Poſſeſſion of all Things. For they are not ſo wanting to themſelves as not to believe, or at leaſt as not to profeſs themſelves to be the truly pious and faithful. Theſe therefore, and the like, who attribute unto the Faithful, Religious and Orthodox, that is, in plain terms, unto themſelves, any peculiar Privilege or Power above other Mortals, in civil Concernments; or who upon Pretence of Religion, do challenge any manner of Authority over ſuch, as are not aſſociated with them in their Eccleſiaſtical Communion; I ſay theſe have no right to be tolerated by the Magiſtrate; as neither thoſe that will not own and teach the Duty of tolerating All Men in Matters of mere Religion. For what do all theſe and the like Doctrines ſignify, but that they may, and are ready upon any occaſion to ſeize the Government, and poſſeſs themſelves of the Eſtates and Fortunes of their Fellow-Subiects; and that they only ask leave to be tolerated by the Magiſtrate ſo long, until they find themſelves ſtrong enough to effect it?

Again: That Church can have no right to be tolerated by the Magiſtrate, which is conſtituted upon ſuch a Bottom, that all thoſe who enter into it, do thereby *ipſo facto*, deliver themſelves up to the Protection and Service of another Prince. For by this means the Magiſtrate would give way to the ſettling of a foreign Juriſdiction in his own Country, and ſuffer his own People to be liſted, as it were, for Soldiers againſt his own Government. Nor does the frivolous and fallacious Diſtinction between the Court and the Church afford any Remedy to this Inconvenience; eſpecially when both the one and the other are equally ſubject to the abſolute Authority of the ſame Perſon; who has not only Power to perſuade the Members of his Church to whatſoever he liſts, either as purely Religious, or in order thereunto, but can alſo enjoin it them on pain of eternal Fire. It is ridiculous for any one to profeſs himſelf to be a *Mahumetan* only in his Religion, but in every thing elſe a faithful Subject to a Chriſtian Magiſtrate, whilſt at the ſame time he acknowledges himſelf bound to yield blind Obedience to the *Mufti* of *Conſtantinople*; who himſelf is entirely obedient to the *Ottoman* Emperor, and frames the feigned Oracles of that Religion according to his Pleaſure. But this Mahumetan living amongſt Chriſtians would yet more apparently renounce their Government, if he acknowledged the ſame Perſon to be Head of his Church, who is the ſupreme Magiſtrate in the State.

Laſtly, Thoſe are not at all to be tolerated who deny the Being of a God. Promiſes, Covenants, and Oaths, which are the bonds of human Society, can have no hold upon an Atheiſt. The taking away of God, tho' but even in Thought, diſſolves all. Beſides alſo, thoſe that by their Atheiſm undermine and deſtroy all Religion, can have no Pretence of Religion whereupon to challenge the Privilege of a Toleration. As for other practical Opinions, tho' not abſolutely free from all Error, if they do not tend to eſtabliſh Domination over others, or Civil Impunity to the Church in which they are taught, there can be no Reaſon why they ſhould not be tolerated.

It remains that I ſay ſomething concerning thoſe Aſſemblies which being vulgarly called, and perhaps having ſometimes been *Conventicles*, and Nurſeries of Factions and Seditions, are thought to afford the ſtrongeſt matter of Objection againſt this Doctrine of Toleration. But this has not happened by any thing peculiar unto the Genius of ſuch Aſſemblies, but by the unhappy Circumſtances of an oppreſſed or ill-ſettled Liberty. Theſe Accuſations would ſoon ceaſe, if the Law of Toleration were once ſo ſettled, that all Churches were obliged to lay down Toleration as the Foundation of their own Liberty; and teach that Liberty of Conſcience is every Man's natural Right, equally belonging to Diſſenters as to themſelves; and that no body ought to be compell'd in matters of Religion either by Law or Force. The Eſtabliſhment of this one thing would take away all ground of Complaints and Tumults upon account of Conſcience. And theſe Cauſes of Diſcontents and Animoſities being once removed, there would remain nothing in theſe Aſſemblies that were not more peaceable, and leſs apt to produce Diſturbance of State, than in any other Meetings whatſoever. But let us examine particulary the Heads of theſe Accuſations.

You'll ſay, That *Aſſemblies and Meetings endanger the Publick Peace, and threaten the Common-wealth.* I anſwer: If this be ſo, why are there daily ſuch numerous Meetings in Markets, and Courts of Judicature? Why are Crowds upon the Exchange, and a Concourſe of People in Cities ſuffered? You'll reply; Thoſe are Civil Aſſemblies; but Theſe we object againſt, are Eccleſiaſtical. I anſwer: 'Tis a likley thing indeed, that ſuch Aſſemblies as are altogether remote from Civil Affairs, ſhould be moſt apt to embroil them. O, but Civil Aſſemblies are compoſed of Men that differ from one another in Matters of Religion; but theſe Eccleſiaſtical Meetings are of Perſons that are all of one Opinion. As if an Agreement in Matters of Religion, were in effect a Conſpiracy againſt the Common-wealth; or as if Men would not be ſo much the more warmly unanimous in Religion, the leſs Liberty they had of aſſembling. But it will be urged ſtill, That Civil Aſſemblies are open, and free for any one to enter into; whereas religious Conventicles are more private, and thereby give Opportunity to clandeſtine Machinations. I anſwer, That this is not ſtrictly true: For many Civil Aſſemblies are not open to every one. And if ſome religious Meetings be private, who are they (I beſeech you) that are to be blamed for it? thoſe that deſire, or thoſe that forbid their being publick? Again; You'll ſay, that religious Communion does exceedingly unite Mens Minds and Affections to one another, and is therefore the more dangerous. But if this be ſo, why is not the Magiſtrate afraid of his own Church; and why does he not forbid their Aſſemblies, as things dangerous to his Government? You'll ſay, Becauſe he himſelf is a Part, and even the Head of them. As if he were not alſo a Part of the Common-wealth, and the Head of the whole People.

Let us therefore deal plainly. The Magiſtrate is afraid of other Churches, but not of his own; becauſe he is kind and favourable to the one, but ſevere and cruel to the other. Theſe he treats like Children, and indulges them even to Wantonneſs. Thoſe he uſes as Slaves; and how blameleſly ſoever they demean themſelves, recompenſes them no otherwiſe than by Gallies, Priſons, Confiſcations and Death. Theſe he cheriſhes and defends: Thoſe he continually ſcurges and oppreſſes. Let him turn the Tables: Or let thoſe Diſſenters enjoy but the ſame Privileges in Civils as his other Subjects, and he will quickly find that theſe religious Meetings will be no longer dangerous. For if Men enter into ſeditious Conſpiracies, 'tis not Religion inſpires them to it in their Meetings; but their Sufferings and Oppreſſions that make them willing to eaſe themſelves. Juſt and moderate Governments are every where quiet, every where ſafe. But Oppreſſion raiſes Ferments and makes Men ſtruggle to caſt off an uneaſy and tyrannical Yoke. I know that Seditions are very frequently raiſed upon Pretence of Religion. But 'tis as true that, for Religion, Subjects are frequently ill treated, and live miſerably. Believe me, the Stirs that are made, proceed not from any peculiar Temper of this or that Church or religious Society; but from the common Diſpoſition of all Mankind, who when they groan under any heavy Burthen, endeavour naturally to ſhake off the Yoke that galls their Necks. Suppoſe this Buſineſs of Religion were let alone, and that there were ſome other Diſtinction made between Men and Men, upon account of their different Complexions, Shapes, and Features, ſo that thoſe who have black Hair (for example) or grey Eyes, ſhould not enjoy the ſame Privileges as other Citizens; that they ſhould not be permitted either to buy or ſell, or live by their Callings; that Parents ſhould not have the Government and Education of their own Children; that all ſhould either be excluded from the Benefit of the Laws, or meet with partial Judges; can it be doubted but theſe Perſons, thus diſtinguiſhed from others by the Colour of their Hair and Eyes, and united together by one common Perſecution, would be as dangerous to the Magiſtrate, as any others that had aſſociated themſelves merely upon the account of Religion? Some enter into Company for Trade and Profit: Others, for want of Buſineſs, have their Clubs for Claret. Neighbourhood joins ſome, and Religion others. But there is one only thing which gathers People into ſeditious Commotions, and that is Oppreſſion.

You'll ſay; What, will you have People to meet at divine Service *againſt the Magiſtrate's Will?* I anſwer; Why, I pray, againſt his Will? Is it not both lawful and neceſſary that they ſhould meet? Againſt his Will, do you ſay? That's what I complain of. That is the very Root of all the Miſchief. Why are Aſſemblies leſs ſufferable in a Church than in a Theatre or Market? Thoſe that meet there are not either more vicious, or more turbulent, than thoſe that meet elſewhere. The Buſi-

neſs

neſs in that is, that they are ill uſed, and therefore they are not to be ſuffered. Take away the Partiality that is uſed towards them in Matters of common Right; change the Laws, take away the Penalties unto which they are ſubjected, and all things will immediately become ſafe and peaceable; nay, thoſe that are averſe to the Religion of the Magiſtrate, will think themſelves ſo much the more bound to maintain the Peace of the Common-wealth, as their Condition is better in that Place than elſewhere; and all the ſeveral ſeparate Congregations, like ſo many Guardians of the Publick Peace, will watch one another, that nothing may be innovated or changed in the Form of the Government: Becauſe they can hope for nothing better than what they already enjoy; that is, an equal Condition with their Fellow-Subjects, under a juſt and moderate Government. Now if that Church, which agrees in Religion with the Prince, be eſteemed the chief Support of any Civil Government, and that for no other Reaſon (as has already been ſhewn) than becauſe the Prince is kind, and the Laws are favourable to it; how much greater will be the Security of Government, where all good Subjects, of whatſoever Church they be, without any Diſtinction upon account of Religion, enjoying the ſame Favour of the Prince, and the ſame Benefit of the Laws, ſhall become the common Support and Guard of it; and where none will have any occaſion to fear the Severity of the Laws, but thoſe that do Injuries to their Neighbours, and offend againſt the Civil Peace?

That we may draw towards a Concluſion. The *Sum of all* we drive at is, *That every Man may enjoy the ſame Rights that are granted to others.* It is permitted to worſhip God in the *Roman* manner? Let it be permitted to do it in the *Geneva* Form alſo. Is it permitted to ſpeak *Latin* in the Market-place? Let thoſe that have a mind to it, be permitted to do it alſo in the Church. Is it lawful for any Man in his own Houſe, to kneel, ſtand, ſit, or uſe any other Poſture; and to cloath himſelf in white or black, in ſhort or in long Garments? Let it not be made unlawful to eat Bread, drink Wine, or waſh with Water in the Church. In a Word: Whatſoever things are left free by Law in the common Occaſions of Life, let them remain free unto every Church in Divine Worſhip. Let no Man's Life, or Body, or Houſe, or Eſtate, ſuffer any manner of Prejudice upon theſe Accounts. Can you allow of the *Preſbyterian* Diſcipline? Why ſhould not the *Epiſcopal* alſo have what they like? Eccleſiaſtical Authority, whether it be adminiſtred by the Hands of a ſingle Perſon, or many, is every where the ſame; and neither has any Juriſdiction in things Civil, nor any manner of Power of Compulſion, nor any thing at all to do with Riches and Revenues.

Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies, and Sermons, are juſtified by daily Experience, and publick Allowance. Theſe are allowed to People of ſome one Perſuaſion: Why not to all? If any thing paſs in a religious Meeting ſeditiouſly and contrary to the publick Peace, it is to be puniſhed in the ſame manner, and no otherwiſe, than as if it had happened in a Fair or Market. Theſe Meetings ought not to be Sanctuaries for factious and flagitious Fellows: Nor ought it to be leſs lawful for Men to meet in Churches than in Halls: Nor are one part of the Subjects to be eſteemed more blameable, for their meeting together, than others. Every one is to be accountable for his own Actions, and no Man is to be laid under a Suſpicion, or Odium, for the Fault of another. Thoſe that are Seditious, Murderers, Thieves, Robbers, Adulterers, Slanderers, &c. of whatſoever Church, whether National or not, ought to be puniſhed and ſuppreſſed. But thoſe whoſe Doctrine is peaceable, and whoſe Manners are pure and blameleſs, ought to be upon equal Terms with their Fellow-Subjects. Thus if ſolemn Aſſemblies, Obſervations of Feſtivals, publick Worſhip, be permitted to any one Sort of Profeſſors; all theſe Things ought to be permitted to the *Preſbyterians*, *Independents*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Arminians*, *Quakers*, and others, with the ſame Liberty. Nay, if we may openly ſpeak the Truth, and as becomes one Man to another, neither *Pagan* nor *Mahumetan*, nor *Jew*, ought to be excluded from the Civil Rights of the Common-wealth, becauſe of his Religion. The Goſpel commands no ſuch thing. The Church, which *judgeth not thoſe that are without*, wants it not. 1 Cor. 5. 12, 13. And the Commonwealth, which embraces indifferently all Men that are honeſt, peaceable and induſtrious, requires it not. Shall we ſuffer a *Pagan* to deal and trade with us, and ſhall we not ſuffer him to pray unto and worſhip God? If we allow the *Jews* to have private Houſes and Dwellings amongſt us, why ſhould we not allow them to have Synagogues? Is their Doctrine more falſe, their Worſhip more abominable, or is

the

the Civil Peace more endangered, by their meeting in publick than in their private Houſes? But if theſe things may be granted to *Jews* and *Pagans*, ſurely the Condition of any Chriſtians ought not to be worſe than theirs in a Chriſtian Common-wealth.

You'll ſay, perhaps, yes, it ought to be: Becauſe they are more inclineable to Factions, Tumults, and Civil-Wars. I anſwer: Is this the Fault of the Chriſtian Religion? If it be ſo, truly the Chriſtian Religion is the worſt of all Religions, and ought neither to be embraced by any particular Perſon, nor tolerated by any Common-wealth. For if this bethe Genius; this the Nature of the Chriſtian Religion, to be turbulent, and deſtructive to the Civil Peace, that Church it ſelf which the Magiſtrate indulges, will not always be innocent. But far be it from us to ſay any ſuch thing of that Religion, which carries the greateſt Oppoſition to Covetouſneſs, Ambition, Diſcord, Contention, and all manner of inordinate Deſires; and is the moſt modeſt and peaceable Religion that ever was. We muſt therefore ſeek another Cauſe of thoſe Evils that are charged upon Religion. And if we conſider right, we ſhall find it to conſiſt wholly in the Subject that I am treating of. It is not the Diverſity of Opinions, (which cannot be avoided) but the Refuſal of Toleration to thoſe that are of different Opinions, (which might have been granted) that has produced all the Buſtles and Wars, that have been in the Chriſtian World, upon account of Religion. The Heads and Leaders of the Church, moved by Avarice and inſatiable Deſire of Dominion, making uſe of the immoderate Ambition of Magiſtrates, and the credulous Superſtition of the giddy Multitude, have incenſed and animated them againſt thoſe that diſſent from themſelves; by preaching unto them, contrary to the Laws of the Goſpel, and to the Precepts of Charity, that Schiſmaticks and Hereticks are to be outed of their Poſſeſſions, and deſtroyed. And thus have they mixed together, and confounded two Things, that are in themſelves moſt different, the Church and the Common-wealth. Now as it is very difficult for Men patiently to ſuffer themſelves to be ſtript of the Goods, which they have got by their honeſt Induſtry; and contrary to all the Laws of Equity, both human and divine, to be delivered up for a Prey to other Mens Violence and Rapine; eſpecially when they are otherwiſe altogether blameleſs; and that the Occaſion for which they are thus treated, does not at all belong to the Juriſdiction of the Magiſtrate, but intirely to the Conſcience of every particular Man; for the Conduct of which he is accountable to God only; what elſe can be expected, but that theſe Men, growing weary of the Evils under which they labour, ſhould in the end think it lawful for them to reſiſt Force with Force, and to defend their natural Rights (which are not forfeitable upon account of Religion) with Arms as well as they can? That this has been hitherto the ordinary Courſe of Things, is abundantly evident in Hiſtory: And that it will continue to be ſo hereafter, is but too apparent in Reaſon. It cannot indeed be otherwiſe, ſo long as the Principle of Perſecution for Religion ſhall prevail, as it has done hitherto, with Magiſtrate and People; and ſo long as thoſe that ought to be the Preachers of Peace and Concord, ſhall continue, with all their Art and Strength, to excite Men to Arms, and ſound the Trumpet of War. But that Magiſtrates ſhould thus ſuffer theſe Incendiaries, and Diſturbers of the Publick Peace, might juſtly be wondered at; if it did not appear that they have been invited by them unto a Participation of the Spoil, and have therefore thought fit to make uſe of their Covetouſneſs and Pride, as means whereby to increaſe their own Power. For who does not ſee that *theſe Good Men* are indeed more Miniſters of the Government, than Miniſters of the Goſpel; and that by flattering the Ambition, and favouring the Dominion of Princes and Men in Authority, they endeavour with all their Might to promote that Tyranny in the Common-wealth which otherwiſe they ſhould not be able to eſtabliſh in the Church? This is the unhappy Agreement that we ſee between the Church and State. Whereas if each of them would contain itſelf within its own Bounds, the one attending to the worldly Welfare of the Common-wealth, the other to the Salvation of Souls, it is impoſſible that any Diſcord ſhould ever have hapned between them. *Sed, pudet hæc opprobria, &c.* God Almighty grant I beſeech him, that the Goſpel of Peace may at length be preached, and that Civil Magiſtrates growing more careful to conform their own Conſciences to the Law of God, and leſs ſolicitous about the binding of other Mens Conſciences by human Laws, may like Fathers of their Country, direct all their Counſels and Endeavours to promote univerſally the civil Welfare of all their Children; except only of ſuch as are arrogant, ungovernable, and injurious to their Bretheren and that all eccleſiaſtical Men, who

boaſt

boaſt themſelves to be the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, walking peaceably and modeſtly in the Apoſtle's Steps, without intermeddling with State-Affairs, may apply themſelves wholly to promote the Salvation of Souls.

Farewell.

PErhaps it may not be amiſs to add a few Things concerning *Hereſy* and *Schiſm*. A *Turk* is not, nor can be, either Heretick or Schiſmatick, to a *Chriſtian*: and if any Man fall off from the Chriſtian Faith to Mahumetiſm, he does not thereby become a Heretick or Schiſmatick, but an Apoſtate and an Infidel. This no body doubts of. And by this it appears that Men of different Religions cannot be Hereticks or Schiſmaticks to one another.

We are to enquire therefore, what Men are of the ſame Religion. Concerning which, it is manifeſt that thoſe who have one and the ſame Rule of Faith and Worſhip, are of the ſame Religion: and thoſe who have not the ſame Rule of Faith and Worſhip, are of different Religions. For ſince all Things that belong unto that Religion are contained in that Rule, it follows neceſſarily that thoſe who agree in one Rule, are of one and the ſame Religion: and *vice verſâ*. Thus *Turks* and *Chriſtians* are of different Religions: becauſe theſe take the *Holy Scriptures* to be the Rule of their Religion, and thoſe the *Alcoran*. And for the ſame Reaſon, there may be different Religions alſo even amongſt Chriſtians. The *Papiſts* and *Lutherans*, tho' both of them profeſs Faith in Chriſt, and are therefore called Chriſtians, yet are not both of the ſame Religion: becauſe theſe acknowledge nothing but the Holy Scriptures to be the Rule and Foundation of their Religion; thoſe take in alſo Traditions and the Decrees of Popes, and of theſe together make the Rule of their Religion. And thus the Chriſtians of St. *John*, (as they are called) and the Chriſtians of *Geneva* are of different Religions: becauſe theſe alſo take only the Scriptures; and thoſe I know not what Traditions, for the Rule of their Religion.

This being ſettled, it follows; *Firſt*, That Hereſy is a Separation made in Eccleſiaſtical Communion between Men of the ſame Religion, for ſome Opinions no way contained in the Rule itſelf. And *Secondly*, That amongſt thoſe who acknowledge nothing but the Holy Scriptures to be their Rule of Faith, Hereſy is a Separation made in their Chriſtian Communion, for Opinions not contained in the expreſs Words of Scripture. Now this Separation may be made in a twofold manner.

1. When the greater Part, or (by the Magiſtrate's Patronage) the ſtronger Part of the Church ſeparates itſelf from others, by excluding them out of her Communion, becauſe they will not profeſs their Belief of certain Opinions which are not the expreſs Words of the Scripture. For it is not the Paucity of thoſe that are ſeparated, nor the Authority of the Magiſtrate, that can make any Man guilty of Hereſy. But he only is an Heretick who divides the Church into Parts, introduces Names and Marks of Diſtinction, and voluntarily makes a Separation becauſe of ſuch Opinions.

2. When any one ſeparates himſelf from the Communion of a Church, becauſe that Church does not publickly profeſs ſome certain Opinions which the Holy Scriptures do not expreſly teach.

Both theſe are *Hereticks, becauſe they err in Fundamentals, and they err obſtinately againſt Knowledge.* For when they have determined the Holy Scriptures to be the only Foundation of Faith, they nevertheleſs lay down certain Propoſitions as Fundamental, which are not in the Scripture: and becauſe others will not acknowledge theſe additional Opinions of theirs, nor build upon them as if they were neceſſary and fundamental, they therefore make a Separation in the Church; either by withdrawing themſelves from others, or expelling the others from them. Nor does it ſignify any thing for them to ſay that their Confeſſions and Symboles are agreeable to Scripture, and to the Analogy of Faith. For if they be conceived in the expreſs Words of Scripture, there can be no queſtion about them; becauſe thoſe things are acknowledged by all Chriſtians to be of divine Inſpiration, and therefore fundamental. But if they ſay that the Articles which they require to be profeſs'd, are Conſequences deduced from the Scripture; it is undoubtedly well done of them who believe and profeſs ſuch things as ſeem unto them ſo agreeable to the Rule of Faith. But it would be very ill done to obtrude thoſe Things upon others, unto whom they do not ſeem to be the indubitable Doctrines of the Scripture. And to make a

Separation

Separation for ſuch Things as theſe, which neither are nor can be Fundamental, is to become Hereticks. For I do not think there is any Man arrived to that Degree of Madneſs, as that he dare give out his Conſequences and Interpretations of Scripture as divine Inſpirations, and compare the Articles of Faith that he has framed according to his own Fancy with the Authority of Scripture. I know there are ſome Propoſitions ſo evidently agreeable to Scripture, that no Body can deny them to be drawn from thence: but about thoſe therefore there can be no Difference. This only I ſay, that however clearly we may think this or the other Doctrine to be deduced from Scripture, we ought not therefore to impoſe it upon others, as a neceſſary Article of Faith, becauſe we believe it to be agreeable to the Rule of Faith; unleſs we would be content alſo that other Doctrines ſhould be impoſed upon us in the ſame manner; and that we ſhould be compell'd to receive and profeſs all the different and contradictory Opinions of *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, *Remonſtrants*, *Anabaptiſts*, and other Sects, which the Contrivers of Symbols, Syſtems, and Confeſſions, are accuſtomed to deliver to their Followers, as genuine and neceſſary Deductions from the Holy Scripture. I cannot but wonder at the extravagant Arrogance of thoſe Men, who think that they themſelves can explain Things neceſſary to Salvation more clearly than the Holy Ghoſt, the eternal and infinite Wiſdom of God.

Thus much concerning *Hereſy*; which Word in common Uſe is applied only to the doctrinal Part of Religion. Let us now conſider *Schiſm*, which is a Crime near a-kin to it. For both theſe Words ſeem unto me to ſignify an *ill-grounded Separation in Eccleſiaſtical Communion, made about Things not neceſſary*. But ſince Uſe, which is the ſupreme Law in Matter of Language, has determined that Hereſy relates to Errors in Faith, and Schiſm to thoſe in Worſhip or Diſcipline, we muſt conſider them under that Diſtinction.

Schiſm then, for the ſame Reaſons that have already been alledged, is nothing elſe but a Separation made in the Communion of the Church, upon account of ſomething in Divine Worſhip, or Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, that is not any neceſſary Part of it. Now nothing in Worſhip or Diſcipline can be neceſſary to Chriſtian Communion, but what Chriſt our Legiſlator, or the Apoſtles, by Inſpiration of the Holy Spirit, have commanded in expreſs Words.

In a Word: He that denies not any thing that the Holy Scriptures teach in expreſs Words, nor makes a Separation upon occaſion of any thing that is not manifeſtly contained in the ſacred Text; however he may be nick-named by any Sect of Chriſtians, and declared by ſome, or all of them, to be utterly void of true Chriſtianity; yet in deed and in truth this Man cannot be either a Heretick or Schiſmatick.

Theſe Things might have been explained more largely, and more advantageouſly; but it is enough to have hinted at them, thus briefly, to a Perſon of your Parts.

A SE-

A SECOND

LETTER

CONCERNING

TOLERATION.

A SECOND LETTER CONCERNING TOLERATION

TO THE

AUTHOR

OF THE

Argument of the Letter concerning Toleration, briefly conſidered and anſwered.

SIR,

YOU will pardon me if I take the ſame Liberty with you, that you have done with the Author of the Letter concerning Toleration; to conſider your Arguments, and endeavour to ſhew you the Miſtakes of them. For ſince you have ſo plainly yielded up the Queſtion to him, and do own that *the Severities* he would diſſuade Chriſtians from, *are utterly unapt, and improper to bring Men to embrace that Truth which muſt ſave them:* I am not without ſome Hopes to prevail with you, to do that your ſelf, which you ſay is the only juſtifiable Aim of Men differing about Religion, even in the uſe of the ſevereſt Methods, *viz. Carefully and impartially to weigh* the whole Matter, and thereby to remove that Prejudice which makes you yet favour ſome Remains of Perſecution: Promiſing my ſelf that ſo ingenious a Perſon will either be convinced by the Truth which appears ſo very clear and evident to me; or elſe confeſs, that, were either you or I in Authority, we ſhould very unreaſonably and very unjuſtly uſe any Force upon the other, which differ'd from him, upon any Pretence of want of Examination. And if Force be not to be uſed in your Caſe or mine, becauſe unreaſonable, or unjuſt; you will, I hope, think fit that it ſhould be forborn in all others, where it will be equally unjuſt and unreaſonable; as I doubt not but to make it appear it will unavoidably be, where-ever you will go about to puniſh Men for want of Conſideration. For the true way to try ſuch Speculations as theſe, is to ſee how they will prove when they are reduc'd into Practice. Pag. 12, 13, 14.

The firſt thing you ſeem ſtartled at, in the Author's Letter, is the Largeneſs of the Toleration he propoſes: And you think it ſtrange that he would not have ſo much as a *Pagan, Mahumetan, or Jew, excluded from the Civil Rights of the Common-wealth, becauſe of his Religion.* We pray every Day for their Converſion, and I think it our Duty ſo to do: But it will, I fear, hardly be believed that we pray in earneſt, if we exclude them from the other ordinary and probable Means of Converſion; either by driving them from, or perſecuting them when they are amongſt us. Force, you allow, is improper to convert Men to any Religion. Toleration is but the removing that Force. So that why thoſe ſhould not be tolerated as well as others, if you wiſh their Converſion, I do not ſee. But you ſay, *It ſeems hard to conceive how the Author of that Letter ſhould think to do any Service to Religion in general, or to the Chriſtian Religion, by recommending and perſuading ſuch a Toleration. For how much ſoever it may tend to the Advancement of Trade and Commerce, (which ſome ſeem to place above all other Conſiderations) I ſee no reaſon, from any Experiment that has been made, to expect that true Religion would be a Gainer by it; that it would be either the better preſerved, the more widely propagated, or rendered any whit the more fruitful in the Lives of its Profeſſors by it.* Before I come to your Doubt itſelf, *Whether true* Pag. 11. Pag. 21.

Religion would be a Gainer by ſuch a Toleration; give me leave to take Notice, that if, by *other Conſiderations*, you mean any thing but Religion, your Parentheſis is wholly beſides the Matter; and that if you do not know that the Author of the Letter *places the Advancement of Trade above Religion*, your Inſinuation is very uncharitable. But I go on.

You ſee no reaſon, you ſay, *from any Experiment that has been made, to expect that true Religion would be a Gainer by it.* True Religion and Chriſtian Religion are, I ſuppoſe, to you and me, the ſame thing. But of this you have an Experiment in its firſt appearance in the World, and ſeveral hundreds of Years after. It was then better *preſerv'd, more widely propagated* (in proportion) *and render'd more fruitful in the Lives of its Profeſſors*, than ever ſince; tho' then *Jews* and *Pagans* were tolerated, and more than tolerated by the Governments of thoſe Places where it grew up. I hope you do not imagine the Chriſtian Religion has loſt any of its firſt Beauty, Force, or Reaſonableneſs, by having been almoſt 2000 Years in the World; that you ſhould fear it ſhould be leſs able now to ſhift for it ſelf, without the help of Force. I doubt not but you look upon it ſtill to be *the Power and Wiſdom of God for our Salvation*; and therefore cannot ſuſpect it leſs capable to prevail now, by its own Truth and Light, than it did in the firſt Ages of the Church, when poor contemptible Men, without Authority, or the Countenance of Authority, had alone the Care of it. This, as I take it, has been made uſe of by Chriſtians generally, and by ſome of our Church in particular, as an Argument for the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion; that it grew and ſpread, and prevailed, without any Aid from Force, or the Aſſiſtance of the Powers in being. And if it be a Mark of the true Religion, that it will prevail by its own Light and Strength, (but that falſe Religions will not, but have need of Force and foreign Helps to ſupport them) nothing certainly can be more for the Advantage of true Religion, than to take away Compulſion every where. And therefore it is *no more hard to conceive how the Author of the Letter ſhould think to do Service to Religion in general, or to the Chriſtian Religion*, that it is hard to conceive that he ſhould think there is a true Religion, and that the Chriſtian Religion is it; which its Profeſſors have always own'd not to need Force, and have urged that as a good Argument to prove the truth of it. The *Inventions* of Men in Religion need the Force and Helps of Men to ſupport them. A Religion that is of God wants not the Aſſiſtance of Human Authority to make it prevail. I gueſs, when this dropp'd from you, you had narrow'd your Thoughts to your own Age and Country: But if you will enlarge them a little beyond the Confines of *England*, I do not doubt but you will eaſily imagine that if in *Italy*, *Spain*, *Portugal*, &c. the Inquiſition; and in *France* their Dragooning; and in other Parts thoſe Severities that are uſed to keep or force Men to the national Religion were taken away; and inſtead thereof the Toleration propos'd by the Author were ſet up, the *true Religion would be a Gainer by it.*

The Author of the Letter ſays, *Truth would do well enough, if ſhe were once left to ſhift for her ſelf. She ſeldom hath received, and he fears never will receive much Aſſiſtance from the Power of great Men, to whom ſhe is rarely known, and more rarely welcome. Errors indeed prevail, by the Aſſiſtance of foreign and borrowed Succours. Truth makes way into our Underſtanding, by her own Light, and is but the weaker for any borrowed Force that Violence can add to her.* Theſe Words of his *(how hard ſoever they may ſeem to you)* may help you *to conceive how he ſhould think to do Service to true Religion, by recommending and perſuading ſuch a Toleration as he propoſed.* And now, pray tell me your ſelf, whether you do not think True Religion would *be a Gainer by it*, if ſuch a Toleration eſtabliſh'd there, would permit the Doctrine of the Church of *England* to be freely preached, and its Worſhip ſet up, in any Popiſh, Mahumetan, or Pagan Country? If you do not, you have a very ill Opinion of the Religion of the Church of *England*, and muſt own that it can only be propagated and ſupported by Force. If you think it would gain in thoſe Countries, by ſuch a Toleration, you are then of the Author's Mind, and do not find it ſo *hard to conceive* how the recommending ſuch a Toleration, *might do Service to* that which you think *True Religion.* But if you allow ſuch a Toleration uſeful to Truth in other Countries, you muſt find ſomething very peculiar in the Air, that muſt make it leſs uſeful to Truth in *England.* And 'twill favour of much Partiality, and be too abſurd, I fear, for you to own, that Toleration will be advantageous to True Religion all the World over, except only in this Iſland; Though, I much ſuſpect, this, as abſurd as it is, lies at the bottom; and you build all you ſay, upon this lurking Suppoſition, that the national Religion now in *England*, back'd

back'd by the Publick Authority of the Law, is the only true Religion, and therefore no other is to be tolerated. Which being a Suppoſition, equally unavoidable, and equally juſt in other Countries, (unleſs we can imagine that every where but in *England* Men believe what at the ſame time they think to be a Lie) will in other Places exclude Toleration, and thereby hinder Truth from the means of propagating it ſelf.

What the Fruits of Toleration are, which in the next Words you complain do *remain ſtill among us*, and which you ſay *give no Encouragement to hope for any Advantages from it*; what Fruits, I ſay, theſe are, or whether they are owing to the want or wideneſs of Toleration among us, we ſhall then be able to judge, when you tell us what they are. In the mean time I will boldly ſay, that if the Magiſtrates will ſeverely and impartially ſet themſelves againſt Vice, in whomſoever it is found, and leave Men to their own Conſciences, in their Articles of Faith, and Ways of Worſhip; *True Religion will be ſpread wider, and be more fruitful in the Lives of its Profeſſors*, than ever hitherto it has been, by the Impoſition of Creeds and Ceremonies.

You tell us, that *no Man can fail of finding the way to Salvation, who ſeeks it as he ought*. I wonder you had not taken notice, in the Places you quote for this, how we are directed there to the right way of ſeeking. The Words (*John* vii. 17.) are; *If any Man will do his Will, he ſhall know of the Doctrine whether it be of God.* And, *Pſalm* xxv. 9. 12, 14. which are alſo quoted by you, tell us, *The Meek will he guide in Judgment, and the Meek will he teach his Way. What Man is he that feareth the Lord, him ſhall he teach in the way that he ſhall chuſe. The Secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will ſhew them his Covenant.* So that theſe Places, if they prove what you cite them for, that *no Man can fail of finding the Way of Salvation, who ſeeks it as he ought*; they do alſo prove, that a good Life is the only Way to ſeek as we ought, and that therefore the Magiſtrates, if they would put Men upon ſeeking the Way of Salvation as they ought, ſhould, by their Laws and Penalties, force them to a good Life: A good Converſation being the readieſt and ſureſt Way to a right Underſtanding. Puniſhments and Severities thus apply'd, we are ſure, are both practicable, juſt, and uſeful. How Puniſhments will prove in the way you contend for, we ſhall ſee when we come to conſider it. Pag. 7.

Having given us theſe broad Marks of your Good-will to Toleration, you tell us, *'Tis not your Deſign to argue againſt it, but only to enquire what our Author offers for the Proof of his Aſſertion.* And then you give us this Scheme of his Argument. Pag. 3.

1. *There is but one Way of Salvation, or but one True Religion.*

2. *No Man can be ſaved by this Religion, who does not believe it to be the True Religion.*

3. *This Belief is to be wrought in Men by Reaſon and Argument, not by outward Force and Compulſion.*

4. *Therefore all ſuch Force is utterly of no uſe for the promoting True Religion, and the Salvation of Souls.*

5. *And therefore no body can have any Right to uſe any Force or Compulſion, for the bringing Men to the True Religion.*

And you tell us, *the whole Strength of what that Letter urged for the Purpoſe of it, lies in this Argument*, which I think you have no more reaſon to ſay, than if you ſhould tell us, that only one Beam of a Houſe had any Strength in it, when there are ſeveral others that would ſupport the Building, were that gone.

The Purpoſe of the Letter is plainly to defend Toleration, exempt from all Force; eſpecially civil Force, or the Force of the Magiſtrate. Now if it be a true Conſequence *that Men muſt be tolerated, if Magiſtrates have no Commiſſion or Authority to puniſh them for Matters of Religion*; then the *only ſtrength of the Letter lies not in the Unfitneſs of Force to convince Mens Underſtanding.* Vid. Let. p. 234.

Again; If it be true that *Magiſtrates being as liable to Error as the reſt of Mankind, their uſing of Force in Matters of Religion, would not at all advance the Salvation of Mankind*, (allowing that even Force could work upon them, and Magiſtrates had Authority to uſe it in Religion) then the Argument you mention is not *the only one in that Letter, of ſtrength to prove the Neceſſity of Toleration.* V. Let. p. 235. For the Argument of the unfitneſs of Force to convince Mens Minds being quite taken away, either of the other would be a ſtrong Proof for Toleration. But let us conſider the Argument as you have put it.

The two firſt Propoſitions, you ſay, *you agree to.* As to the third, you grant *that Force is very improper to be uſed to induce the Mind to aſſent to any Truth.* But yet you Pag. 4.

deny,

deny, *that Force is utterly uſeleſs for the promoting true Religion, and the Salvation of Mens Souls*; which you call the Author's 4*th* Propoſition; but indeed that is not the Author's 4*th* Propoſition, or any Propoſition of his, to be found in the Pages you quote, or any where elſe in the whole Letter, either in thoſe Terms, or in the Senſe you take it. In the 245*th* Page, which you quote, the Author is ſhewing that the Magiſtrate has no Power, that is not Right, to make uſe of Force in Matters of Religion, for the Salvation of Mens Souls. And the Reaſon he gives for it there, is, becauſe Force has no Efficacy to convince Mens Minds; and that without a full perſuaſion of Mind, the Profeſſion of the true Religion it ſelf is not acceptable to God. *Upon this Ground*, ſays he, *I affirm that the Magiſtrate's Power extends not to the eſtabliſhing any Articles of Faith, or Forms of Worſhip, by the Force of his Laws. For Laws are of no Force at all without Penalties; and Penalties in this caſe are abſolutely impertinent, becauſe they are not proper to convince the Mind.* And ſo again, *Pag.* 243. which is the other Place you quote, the Author ſays; *Whatſoever may be doubted in Religion, yet this at leaſt is certain; that no Religion which I believe not to be true, can be either true, or profitable unto me. In vain therefore do Princes compel their Subjects to come into their Church-Communion, under the Pretence of ſaving their Souls.* And more to this Purpoſe. But in neither of thoſe Paſſages, nor any where elſe, that I remember, does the Author ſay that it is impoſſible that Force ſhould any way, at any time, upon any Perſon by any Accident, be uſeful towards the promoting of true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls; for that is it which you mean by *utterly of no uſe*. He does not deny that there is any thing which God in his Goodneſs does not, or may not, ſometimes, graciouſly make uſe of, towards the Salvation of Mens Souls (as our Saviour did of Clay and Spittle to cure Blindneſs) and that ſo, Force alſo may be ſometimes uſeful. But that which he denies, and you grant, is, that Force has any *proper Efficacy* to enlighten the Underſtanding, or produce Belief. And from thence he infers, that therefore the Magiſtrate cannot lawfully compel Men in Matters of Religion. This is what the Author ſays, and what I imagine will always hold true, whatever you or any one can ſay or think to the contrary.

Pag. 5. That which you ſay is, *Force indirectly, and at a diſtance may do ſome Service.* What you mean by *doing ſervice at a diſtance*, towards the *bringing Men to Salvation, or to embrace the Truth*, I confeſs I do not underſtand; unleſs perhaps it be what others, in Propriety of Speech, call by *Accident*. But be it what it will, it is ſuch a Service as cannot be aſcribed to the direct and *proper Efficacy* of Force. And ſo, ſay you, *Force, indirectly, and at a diſtance, may do ſome Service.* I grant it: Make your beſt of it. What do you conclude from thence, to your Purpoſe? That therefore the Magiſtrate may make uſe of it? That I deny, that ſuch an *indirect, and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*, will authorize the Civil Power in the uſe of it, that will never be prov'd. Loſs of Eſtate and Dignities may make a proud Man humble: Sufferings and Impriſonment may make a wild and debauch'd Man ſober: And ſo theſe things may *indirectly, and at a diſtance, be ſerviceable towards the Salvation of Mens Souls.* I doubt not but God has made ſome, or all of theſe, the Occaſions of good to many Men. But will you therefore infer, that the Magiſtrate may take away a Man's Honour, or Eſtate, or Liberty, for the Salvation of his Soul; or torment him in this, that he may be happy in the other World? What is otherwiſe unlawful in it ſelf (as it certainly is to puniſh a Man without a Fault) can never be made lawful by ſome Good that, *indirectly, and at a diſtance*, or if you pleaſe, *indirectly and by accident*, may follow from it. Running a Man through may ſave his Life, as it has done by chance, opening a lurking Impoſthume. But will you ſay therefore, that this is lawful, juſtifiable Chirurgery? The Gallies, 'tis like, might reduce many a vain, looſe Proteſtant to Repentance, Sobriety of Thought, and a true Senſe of Religion: And the Torments they ſuffer'd in the late Perſecution, might make ſeveral conſider the Pains of Hell, and put a due eſtimate of Vanity and Contempt on all things of this World. But will you ſay, becauſe thoſe Puniſhments might, *indirectly, and at a Diſtance*, ſerve to the Salvation of Mens Souls, that therefore the King of *France* had Right and Authority to make uſe of them? If your *indirect and at a diſtance Serviceableneſs*, may authorize the Magiſtrate to uſe Force in Religion, all the Cruelties uſed by the Heathens againſt Chriſtians, by Papiſts againſt Proteſtants, and all the perſecuting of Chriſtians one amongſt another, are all juſtifiable.

But what if I ſhould tell you now of other Effects, contrary Effects, that Puniſhments in Matters of Religion may produce; and ſo may ſerve to keep Men from the

Truth

Truth and from *Salvation?* What then will become of your *indirect and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*; For in all Pleas for any thing becauſe of its *Uſefulneſs*, it is not enough to ſay as you do, (and is the utmoſt that can be ſaid for it) *that it may be ſerviceable*: But it muſt be conſidered not only what it may, but what it is likely to produce. And the greater Good or Harm likely to come from it, ought to determine of the Uſe of it. To ſhew you what Effects one may expect from Force, of what *Uſefulneſs it is to bring Men to embrace the Truth*, be pleaſed to read what you your ſelf have writ. *I cannot but remark*, ſay you, *that theſe Methods* (viz. *depriving Men of their Eſtates, corporal Puniſhments, ſtarving and tormenting them in Priſons, and in the End even taking away their Lives, to make them Chriſtians*) *are ſo very improper in reſpect to the Deſign of them, that they uſually produce the quite contrary Effect. For whereas all the Uſe which Force can have for the advancing true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, is* (as has already been ſhewed) *by diſpoſing Men to ſubmit to Inſtruction; and to give a fair Hearing to the Reaſons which are offer'd for the enlightning their Minds, and diſcovering the Truth to them; theſe Cruelties have the Misfortune to be commonly look'd upon as ſo juſt a Prejudice againſt any Religion that uſes them, as makes it needleſs to look any farther into it; and to tempt Men to reject it, as both falſe and deteſtable without ever vouchſafing to conſider the rational Grounds and Motives of it. This Effect they ſeldom fail to work upon the Sufferers of them. And as to the Spectators, if they be not beforehand well inſtructed in thoſe Grounds and Motives, they will be much tempted likewiſe, not only to entertain the ſame Opinion of ſuch a Religion, but withal to judge much more favourably of that of the Sufferers; who, they will be apt to think, would not expoſe themſelves to ſuch Extremities, which they might avoid by Compliance, if they were not thoroughly ſatisfy'd of the Juſtice of their Cauſe.* Here then you allow that *taking away Mens Eſtates*, or *Liberty*, and *Corporal Puniſhments*, are apt to drive away both *Sufferers* and *Spectators*, from the Religon that makes uſe of them, rather than to it. And ſo theſe you renounce. Now if you give up Puniſhments of a Man, in his Perſon, Liberty, and Eſtate, I think we need not ſtand with you, for any other Puniſhments that may be made uſe of. But, by what follows, it ſeems you ſhelter your ſelf under the Name of *Severities*. For *moderate Puniſhments*, as you call them in another Place, you think *may be ſerviceable; indirectly, and at a Diſtance ſerviceable, to bring Men to the Truth.* And I ſay, any ſort of Puniſhments diſproportion'd to the Offence, or where there is no Fault at all, will always be *Severity, unjuſtifiable Severity*, and will be thought ſo by the *Sufferers* and *By-ſtanders*; and ſo will *uſually produce the Effects* you have mention'd, contrary to the Deſign they are uſed for. Not to profeſs the National Faith, whilſt one believes it not to be true; nor to enter into the Church-Communion with the Magiſtrate, as long as one judges the Doctrine there profeſs'd to be erronious, or the Worſhip not ſuch as God has either preſcrib'd, or will accept; this you allow, and all the World with you muſt allow, not to be a Fault. But yet you would have Men puniſhed for not being of the National Religion; that is, as you your ſelf confeſs, for no Fault at all. Whether this be not Severity, nay ſo open and avow'd Injuſtice, *that it will give Men a juſt Prejudice againſt the Religion that uſes it*, and produces all thoſe ill Effects you there mention, I leave you to conſider. So that the Name of *Severities*, in Oppoſition to the *moderate Puniſhments* you ſpeak for, can do you no Service at all. For where there is no Fault, there can be no *moderate Puniſhment*: All Puniſhment is immoderate, where there is no Fault to be puniſhed. But of your *moderate Puniſhment* we ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak more in another Place. It ſuffices here to have ſhewn, that, whatever Puniſhments you uſe, they are as likely to drive Men from the Religion that uſes them, as to bring them to the Truth; and much more likely; as we ſhall ſee before we have done: And ſo, by your own Confeſſion, they are not to be uſed.

Pag. 5.

Pag. 13.

Pag. 14.

One thing in this Paſſage of the Author, it ſeems, appears *abſurd* to you; that he ſhould ſay, *That to take away Mens Lives, to make them Chriſtians, was but an ill way of expreſſing a Deſign of their Salvation.* I grant there is a great Abſurdity ſomewhere in the Caſe. But it is in the Practice of thoſe who, perſecuting Men under a Pretence of *bringing them to Salvation*, ſuffer the Temper of their Good-Will to betray itſelf, in taking away their Lives. And whatever Abſurdities there be in this way of proceeding, there is none in the Author's way of expreſſing it; as you would more plainly have ſeen, if you had looked into the Latin Original, where the Words are, *Vita deniq; ipſa privant, ut fideles, ut ſalvi fiant,* (Pag. 5.)

which

which tho' more literally, might be thus render'd, *To bring them to the Faith and to Salvation*; yet the Tranſlator is not to be blamed, if he choſe to expreſs the Senſe of the Author, in Words that very lively repreſented the extreme Abſurdity they are guilty of, who under Pretence of Zeal for the Salvation of Souls, proceed to the taking away their Lives. An Example whereof we have in a neigbouring Country, where the Prince declares he will have all his diſſenting Subjects ſav'd, and purſuant thereunto has taken away the Lives of many of them. For thither at laſt Perſecution muſt come: As I fear, notwithſtanding your Talk of *moderate Puniſh-*

Pag. 23. *ments*, you your ſelf intimate in theſe Words; *Not that I think the Sword is to be uſed in this Buſineſs, (as I have ſufficiently declared already) but becauſe all coactive Power reſolves at laſt into the Sword; ſince all (I do not ſay, that will not be reformed in this Matter by leſſer Penalties, but) that refuſe to ſubmit to leſſer Penalties, muſt at laſt fall under the Stroke of it.* In which Words, if you mean any thing to the Buſineſs in Hand, you ſeem to have a Reſerve for greater Puniſhments, when leſſer are not ſufficient to bring Men to be convinced. But let that paſs.

Pag. 5. You ſay, *If Force be uſed, not inſtead of Reaſon and Arguments, that is not to convince by its own proper Efficacy, which it cannot do*, &c. I think thoſe who make Laws, and uſe Force, to bring Men to Church-Conformity in Religion, ſeek only the Compliance, but concern themſelves not for the Conviction of thoſe they puniſh; and ſo never uſe Force to *convince*. For, pray tell me, when any Diſſenter conforms, and enters into the Church-Communion, is he ever examin'd to ſee whether he does it upon Reaſon, and Conviction, and ſuch Grounds as would become a Chriſtian concern'd for Religion? If Perſecution (as is pretended) were for the Salvation of Mens Souls, this would be done; and Men not driven to take the Sacrament to keep their Places, or to obtain Licences to ſell Ale, (for ſo low have theſe holy Things been proſtituted) who perhaps knew nothing of its Inſtitution; and conſidered no other Uſe of it but the ſecuring ſome poor ſecular Advantage, which without taking of it they ſhould have loſt. So that this Exception of yours, of the *Uſe of Force, inſtead of Arguments, to convince Men*, I think is needleſs; thoſe who uſe it, not being (that ever I heard) concern'd that Men ſhould be convinced.

Pag. 5. But you go on in telling us your Way of uſing Force, *only to bring Men to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments, which are proper and ſufficient to convince them; but which, without being forced, they would not conſider.* And, ſay you, *Who can deny but that, indirectly, and at a diſtance, it does ſome Service, towards bringing Men to embrace that Truth, which either through Negligence they would never acquaint themſelves with, or through Prejudice they would reject and condemn unheard?* Whether this way of Puniſhment is like to increaſe, or remove *Prejudice*, we have already ſeen. And what that *Truth* is, which you can poſitively ſay, any Man, *without being forced by Puniſhment, would through Careleſneſs never acquaint himſelf with*, I deſire you to name. Some are called at the third, ſome at the ninth, and ſome at the eleventh Hour. And whenever they are called, they embrace all the Truth neceſſary to Salvation. But theſe Slips may be forgiven, amongſt ſo many groſs and palpable Miſtakes, as appear to me all through your Diſcourſe. For Example; You tell us that *Force uſed to bring Men to conſider, does indirectly and at a Diſtance, ſome Service.* Here now you walk in the Dark, and endeavour to cover your ſelf with Obſcurity, by omitting two neceſſary Parts. As, firſt, who muſt uſe this Force: which, tho' you tell us not here, yet by other Parts of your Treatiſe 'tis plain you mean the Magiſtrate. And, ſecondly, you omit to ſay upon whom it muſt be uſed, who it is muſt be puniſhed: And thoſe, if you ſay any thing to your purpoſe, muſt be *Diſſenters* from the National Religion, thoſe who come not into Church-Communion with the Magiſtrate. And then your Propoſition, in fair plain Terms, will ſtand thus. *If the Magiſtrate puniſh Diſſenters, only to bring them to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are proper to convince them; who can deny but that indirectly and at a Diſtance, it may do Service, &c. towards bringing Men to embrace that Truth which otherwiſe they could never be acquainted with?* &c. In which Propoſition, 1. There is ſomething impracticable. 2. Something unjuſt. And, 3. Whatever Efficacy there is in Force (your way apply'd) to bring Men to conſider and be convinced, it makes againſt you.

1. It is impractical to puniſh *Diſſenters*, as *Diſſenters, only to make them conſider.* For if you puniſh them as Diſſenters (as certainly you do, if you puniſh them alone, and them all without Exception) you puniſh them for not being of the National Religion,

ligion. And to puniſh a Man for not being of the National Religion, is not to puniſh him *only to make him conſider*; unleſs not to be of the National Religion, and not to *conſider*, be the ſame thing. But you will ſay the Deſign is only to make Diſſenters conſider; and therefore they may be puniſhed *only to make them conſider*. To this I reply; It is impoſſible you ſhould puniſh one with a Deſign only to make him conſider, whom you puniſh for ſomething elſe beſides want of Conſideration; or if you puniſh him whether he conſider or no; as you do, if you lay Penalties on Diſſenters in general. If you ſhould make a Law to puniſh all Stammerers; could any one believe you, if you ſaid it was deſigned only to make them leave Swearing? Would not every one ſee it was impoſſible that Puniſhment ſhould be only againſt Swearing, when all Stammerers were under the Penalty? Such a Propoſal as this, is in itſelf, at firſt ſight, monſtrouſly abſurd. But you muſt thank your ſelf for it. For to lay Penalties upon Stammerers, *only* to make them not ſwear, is not more abſurd and impoſſible, than it is to lay Penalties upon Diſſenters *only to make them conſider*.

2. To puniſh Men out of the Communion of the National Church, *to make them conſider*, is unjuſt. They are puniſhed becauſe out of the National Church: and they are out of the National Church, becauſe they are not yet convinced. Their ſtanding out therefore in this State, whilſt they are not yet convinced, nor ſatisfied in their Minds, is no Fault; and therefore cannot juſtly be puniſhed. But your Method is, *Puniſh them, to make them conſider ſuch Reaſons and Arguments as are proper to convince them.* Which is juſt ſuch Juſtice, as it would be for the Magiſtrate to puniſh you for not being a Carteſian, *only to bring you to conſider ſuch Reaſons and Arguments as are proper and ſufficient to convince you.* When it is poſſible, 1. That you being ſatisfied of the Truth of your own Opinion in Philoſophy, did not judge it worth while to conſider that of *Des Cartes*. 2. It is poſſible you are not able to conſider, and examine, all the Proofs and Grounds upon which he endeavours to eſtabliſh his Philoſophy. 3. Poſſibly you have examined, and can find no *Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince you.*

3. Whatever *indirect Efficacy* there be in Force, apply'd by the Magiſtrate your Way, it makes againſt you. *Force uſed by the Magiſtrate to bring Men to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments, which are proper and ſufficient to convince them, but which without being forced they would not conſider; may,* ſay you, *be ſerviceable indirectly, and at a diſtance, to make Men embrace the Truth which muſt ſave them.* And thus, ſay I, it may be *ſerviceable to bring Men to receive and embrace* Falſhood, which will deſtroy them. So that Force and Puniſhment, by your own Confeſſion, not being able directly, by its *proper Efficacy*, to do Men any Good, in reference to their future Eſtate; though it be ſure directly to do them harm, in reference to their preſent Condition here; and indirectly, and in your way of applying it, being proper to do at leaſt as much harm as good; I deſire to know what the *Uſefulneſs* is which ſo much recommends it, even to a degree that you pretend it needful and neceſſary. Had you ſome new untry'd Chymical Preparation, that was as proper to kill as to ſave an infirm Man, (of whoſe Life I hope you would not be more tender than of a weak Brother's Soul) would you give it your Child, or try it upon your Friend, or recommend it to the World for its rare Uſefulneſs? I deal very favourably with you, when I ſay as proper to kill as to ſave. For Force, in your *indirect* Way, of the Magiſtrates *applying it to make Men conſider thoſe Arguments that otherwiſe they would not; to make them lend an Ear to thoſe who tell them they have miſtaken their Way, and offer to ſhew them the right*; I ſay, in this Way, Force is much more proper, and likely, to make Men receive and embrace Error than the Truth.

1. Becauſe Men out of the right way are as apt, I think I may ſay apter, to uſe Force, than others. For Truth, I mean the Truth of the Goſpel, which is that of the true Religion, is mild, and gentle, and meek, and apter to uſe Prayers and Intreaties, than Force, to gain a Hearing.

2. Becauſe the Magiſtrates of the World, or the *Civil Sovereigns* (as you think it more proper to call them) being few of them in the right Way; (not one often, take which ſide you will) perhaps you will grant not one of an hundred, being of the True Religion; 'tis likely *your indirect Way of uſing of Force* would do an hundred, or at leaſt ten times as much harm as good: Eſpecially if you conſider, that as the Magiſtrate will certainly uſe it to force Men to hearken to the *proper Miniſters of his Religion*, let it be what it will; ſo you having ſet no Time, nor Bounds, to this Conſideration of Arguments and Reaſons, ſhort of being convinced; you, under a- Pag. 16.

nother Pretence, put into the Magiſtrate's Hands as much Power to force Men to his Religion, as any the openeſt Perſecutors can pretend to. For what difference, I beſeech you, between puniſhing you to bring you to Maſs, and puniſhing you to conſider *thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are proper and ſufficient to convince you* that you ought to go to Maſs? For till you are *brought to conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince you*; that is, till you are convinced; you are puniſhed on. If you reply, you meant *Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince* them of the Truth. I anſwer, if you meant ſo, why did you not ſay ſo? But if you had, it would in this Caſe do you little Service. For the Maſs, in *France*, is as much ſuppoſed the Truth, as the Liturgy here. And your way of applying Force will as much promote Popery in *France*, as Proteſtantiſm in *England*. And ſo you ſee how ſerviceable it is to make Men *receive and embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them.*

Pag. 5. However you tell us, in the ſame Page, that *if Force ſo applied, as is abovementioned, may in ſuch ſort as has been ſaid*, i. e. *indirectly, and at a diſtance, be ſerviceable to bring Men to receive and embrace Truth, you think it ſufficient to ſhew the Uſefulneſs of it in Religion.* Where I ſhall obſerve, *1ſt*, That this *Uſefulneſs* amounts to no more but this, That it is not impoſſible but that it may be uſeful. And ſuch a *Uſefulneſs* one cannot deny to auricular Confeſſion, doing of Penance, going of a Pilgrimage to ſome Saint, and what not. Yet our Church does not think fit to uſe them: Tho' it cannot be deny'd, but they may have ſome of your *indirect, and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*; that is, perhaps may do ſome Service, indirectly, and by accident.

2. Force, your way apply'd, as it may be uſeful, ſo alſo it may be uſeleſs. For, *1ſt*, Where the Law puniſhes Diſſenters, without telling them it is to make them conſider, they may through Ignorance and Overſight neglect to do it, and ſo your Force prove uſeleſs. 2. Some Diſſenters may have conſidered already, and then Force employ'd upon them muſt needs be uſeleſs; unleſs you can think it uſeful to puniſh a Man to make him do that which he has done already. 3. God has not directed it: And therefore we have no reaſon to expect he ſhould make it ſucceſsful.

3. It may be hurtful: nay it is likely to prove more hurtful than uſeful. *1ſt*, Becauſe to puniſh Men for that, which 'tis viſible cannot be known whether they have perform'd or no, is ſo palpable an Injuſtice, that it is likelier to give them an Averſion to the Perſons, and Religion that uſes it, than to bring them to it. *2dly*, Becauſe the greateſt part of Mankind, being not able to diſcern betwixt Truth and Falſhood, that depend upon long and many Proofs, and remote Conſequences; nor have Ability enough to diſcover the falſe Grounds, and reſiſt the captious and fallacious Arguments of learned Men verſed in Controverſies; are ſo much more expos'd, by the *Force* which is uſed *to make them hearken to the Information and Inſtruction of Men appointed* to it by the Magiſtrate, or thoſe of his Religion, to be led into Falſhood and Error, than they are likely this way to be *brought to embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*; by how much the National Religions of the World are, beyond Compariſon, more of them falſe or erroneous, than ſuch as have God for their Author, and Truth for their Standard. And that ſeeking and examining, without the ſpecial Grace of God, will not ſecure even knowing and learned Men from Error. We have a famous Inſtance in the two *Reynold*'s (both Scholars, and Brothers, but one a Proteſtant, the other a Papiſt) who upon the exchange of Papers between them, were both turn'd; but ſo that neither of them, with all the Arguments he could uſe, could bring his Brother back to the Religion which he himſelf had found reaſon to embrace. Here was Ability to examine and judge, beyond the ordinary rate of moſt Men. Yet one of theſe Brothers was ſo caught by the Sophiſtry and Skill of the other, that he was brought into Error, from which he could never again be extricated. This we muſt unavoidably conclude; unleſs we can think, that wherein they differ'd, they were both in the right; or that Truth can be an Argument to ſupport a Falſhood; both which are poſſible. And now, I pray, which of theſe two Brothers would you have puniſhed, to make him *bethink himſelf*, and bring him back to the Truth? For 'tis certain ſome ill-grounded Cauſe of aſſent *alienated one of them from it.* If you examine your Principles, you will find that according to your Rule, the Papiſt muſt be puniſhed in *England*, and the Proteſtant in *Italy*. So that, in effect, (by your Rule) *Paſſion, Humour, Prejudice, Luſt, Impreſſions of Education, Admiration of Perſons, worldly Reſpect, and the like incompetent Motives*, muſt always be ſuppoſed on that ſide on which the Magiſtrate is not.

I have

I have taken the Pains here, in a ſhort Recapitulation, to give you the view of the *Uſefulneſs* of Force, your way applied, which you make ſuch a Noiſe with, and lay ſo much Streſs on. Whereby I doubt not but it is viſible that its Uſefulneſs and Uſeleſneſs laid in the Balance againſt each other, the pretended *Uſefulneſs* is ſo far from outweighing, that it can neither encourage nor excuſe the uſing of Puniſhments; which are not lawful to be uſed in our Caſe without ſtrong probability of Succeſs. But when to its Uſeleſneſs Miſchief is added, and it is evident that more, much more, harm may be expected from it than good, your own Argument returns upon you. For if it be reaſonable to uſe it, becauſe *it may be ſerviceable to promote true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls*, it is much more reaſonable to let it alone, if it may be more ſerviceable to the promoting Falſhood, and the Perdition of Souls. And therefore you will do well hereafter not to build ſo much on the *Uſefulneſs of Force*, apply'd your way, *your indirect, and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*, which amounts but to the ſhadow and poſſibility of *Uſefulneſs*, but with an overbalancing weight of Miſchief and Harm annexed to it. For upon a juſt Eſtimate, this *indirect, and at a diſtance, Uſefulneſs can* directly go for nothing; or rather leſs than nothing.

But ſuppoſe Force, apply'd your way, were as *uſeful* for the promoting true Religion, as I ſuppoſe I have ſhew'd it to be the contrary; it does not from thence follow that it is lawful, and may be uſed. It may be very uſeful in a Pariſh that has no Teacher, or as bad as none, that a Layman who wanted not Abilities for it (for ſuch we may ſuppoſe to be) ſhould ſometimes preach to them the Doctrine of the Goſpel, and ſtir them up to the Duties of a good Life. And yet this, (which cannot be deny'd, may be at laſt *indirectly, and at a diſtance ſerviceable towards the promoting true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls*) you will not (I imagine) allow, for this *Uſefulneſs*, to be lawful: And that, becauſe he has not Commiſſion and Authority to do it. The ſame might be ſaid of the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, and any other Function of the Prieſtly Office. This is juſt our Caſe. Granting *Force*, as you ſay, *indirectly, and at a diſtance, uſeful* to the Salvation of Mens Souls; yet it does not therefore follow that it is lawful for the Magiſtrates to uſe it: Becauſe, as the Author ſays, the Magiſtrate has no Commiſſion or Authority to do ſo. For however you have put it thus, (as you have fram'd the Author's Argument) *Force is utterly of no uſe for the promoting of true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls; and therefore no body can have any right to uſe any Force or Compulſion for the bringing Men to the true Religion*; yet the Author does not, in thoſe Pages you quote, make the latter of theſe Propoſitions an Inference barely from the former; but makes uſe of it as a Truth proved by ſeveral Arguments he had before brought to that purpoſe. For tho' it be a good Argument; it is not uſeful, therefore not fit to be uſed: yet this will not be good Logick; it is *uſeful*, therefore any one has a right to uſe it. For if the *Uſefulneſs* makes it lawful, it makes it lawful in any hands that can ſo apply it; and ſo private Men may uſe it.

Who can deny, ſay you, *but that Force indirectly, and at a diſtance, may do ſome Service towards the bringing Men to embrace that Truth, which otherwiſe they would never acquaint themſelves with.* If this be good arguing in you, for the *Uſefulneſs of Force towards the ſaving of Mens Souls*; give me leave to argue after the ſame faſhion. 1. I will ſuppoſe, which you will not deny me, that as there are many who take up their Religion upon wrong Grounds, to the endangering of their Souls; ſo there are many that abandon themſelves to the heat of their Luſts, to the endangering of their Souls. 2*dly*, I will ſuppoſe, that as Force apply'd your way is apt to make the Inconſiderate conſider, ſo Force apply'd another way is apt to make the Laſcivious chaſte. The Argument then, in your Form, will ſtand thus: *Who can deny but that Force indirectly, and at a diſtance may*, by Caſtration, *do ſome Service towards bringing Men to embrace* that Chaſtity, *which otherwiſe they would never acquaint themſelves with.* Thus you ſee, Caſtration may, *indirectly, and at a diſtance, be ſerviceable towards the Salvation of Mens Souls.* But will you ſay, from ſuch an Uſefulneſs as this, becauſe it may *indirectly, and at a diſtance*, conduce to the ſaving of any of his Subjects Souls, that therefore the Magiſtrate has a right to do it, and may by Force make his Subjects Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven? It is not for the Magiſtrate or any body elſe, upon an Imagination of its *Uſefulneſs*, to make uſe of any other Means for the Salvation of Mens Souls, than what the Author and Finiſher of our Faith hath directed. You may be miſtaken in what you think *uſeful*. *Dives* thought, and ſo perhaps ſhould you and I too, if not better inform'd by the Scriptures, that

it would be *useful* to rouze and awaken Men if one should come to them from the Dead. But he was mistaken. And we are told, that if Men will not *hearken to Moses and the Prophets*, the Means appointed, neither will the Strangeness nor Terror of one coming from the Dead persuade them. If what we are apt to think *useful*, were thence to be concluded so, we should (I fear) be obliged to believe the Miracles pretended to by the Church of *Rome*. For Miracles, we know, were once *useful* for the promoting true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls; which is more than you can say for your political Punishments: But yet we must conclude that God thinks them not useful now; *unless we will say (that which without Impiety cannot be said) that the wise and benign Disposer and Governor of all Things* does not now use all useful *Means for promoting his own Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls.* I think this Consequence will hold, as well as what you draw in near the same Words.

Let us not therefore be more wise than our Maker, in that stupendious and supernatural Work of our Salvation. The Scripture, that reveals it to us, contains all that we can know, or do, in order to it: and where that is silent, 'tis in us Presumption to direct. When you can shew any Commission in Scripture, for the use of Force to compel Men to hear, any more than to embrace the Doctrines of others that differ from them, we shall have reason to submit to it, and the Magistrate have some ground to set up this new way of Persecution. But till then, 'twill be fit for
Mark 4. 24. us to obey that Precept of the Gospel, which bids us *take heed what we hear.* So that hearing is not always so useful as you suppose. If it had, we should never have had so direct a Caution against it. 'Tis not any imaginary *Usefulness*, you can suppose, which can make that a punishable Crime, which the Magistrate was never authorized to meddle with. *Go and teach all Nations*, was a Commission of our Saviour's: But there was not added to it, Punish those that will not hear and consider what you say. No, but *if they will not receive you, shake off the Dust of your Feet*; leave them, and apply your selves to some others. And St. *Paul* knew no other Means to make Men hear, but the Preaching of the Gospel; as will appear to any one who will read *Romans* the 10*th*, 14, &c. *Faith cometh by Hearing, and Hearing by the Word of God.*

You go on, and in favour of your beloved *Force*, you tell us it is not only *useful*
Pag. 6. but *needful.* And here, after having at large, in the four following Pages, set out the Negligence or Aversion, or other Hinderances that keep Men from *examining, with that Application and Freedom of Judgment* they *should*, the *Grounds* upon which they *take* up and *persist* in their Religion, you come to conclude Force necessary. Your Words
Pag. 10. are: *If Men are generally averse to a due Consideration of Things, where they are most concerned to use it; if they usually take up their Religion without examining it as they ought, and then grow so opiniative and so stiff in their Prejudice, that neither the gentlest Admonitions, nor the most earnest Intreaties, shall ever prevail with them afterwards to do it; what Means is there left (besides the Grace of God) to reduce those of them that are got into a wrong Way, but to lay Thorns and Briars in it? That since they are deaf to all Persuasions, the Uneasiness they meet with may at least put them to a stand, and incline them to lend an Ear to those who tell them they have mistaken their Way, and offer to shew them the right Way. What Means is there left*, say you, *but Force.* What to do? *To reduce Men, who are out of it, into the right Way.* So you tell us here. And to that, I say, there is other Means besides Force; that which was appointed and made use of from the beginning, the Preaching of the Gospel.

But, say you, *to make them hear, to make them consider, to make them examine*, there is *no other Means but Punishment*; and therefore it is *necessary.*

I answer. 1*st.* What if God, for Reasons best known to himself, would not have Men compell'd to hear; but thought the good Tidings of Salvation, and the Proposals of Life and Death, Means and Inducements enough to make them hear, and consider, now as well as heretofore? Then your *Means*, your *Punishments*, are not necessary. What if God would have Men left to their Freedom in this Point, if they will hear, or if they will forbear, will you constrain them? Thus we are sure he did
Ezek. 11. 5 7. with his own People: And this when they were in Captivity: And 'tis very like were ill treated for being of a different Religion from the National, and so were punished as Dissenters. Yet then God expected not that those Punishments should force them to hearken more than at other times: As appears by *Ezek.* 3. 11. And this also is the Method of the Gospel. *We are Ambassadors for Christ; as if God did beseech by us, we pray in Christ's stead*, says St. *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20. If God had thought it necessary to have Men punish'd to make them give Ear, he could have call'd Magistrates to be Spreaders

and

and Miniſters of the Goſpel, as well as poor Fiſher-men, or *Paul* a Perſecutor, who yet wanted not Power to puniſh, where Puniſhment was neceſſary, as is evident in *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, and the inceſtuous *Corinthian*.

2*dly*. What if God, foreſeeing this Force would be in the Hands of Men as *paſſionate*, as *humourſome*, as *liable to the Prejudice* and *Error* as the reſt of their Brethren, did not think it a proper Means to bring Men into *the right Way?*

3*dly*. What if there be other Means? Then yours ceaſes to be neceſſary, upon the account that there is *no Means left*. For you your ſelf allow, *That the Grace of God is another Means*. And I ſuppoſe you will not deny it to be both a proper and ſufficient Means; and which is more, the only Means; ſuch Means as can work by it ſelf, and without which all the Force in the World can do nothing. God alone can open the Ear that it may hear, and open the Heart that it may underſtand: and this he does in his own good Time, and to whom he is graciouſly pleas'd; but not according to the Will and Fancy of Man, when he thinks fit, by Puniſhments, to compel his Brethren. If God has pronounced againſt any Perſon or People, what he did againſt the *Jews*, (Iſ. 6. 10.) *Make the Heart of this People fat, and make their Ears heavy, and ſhut their Eyes; leſt they ſee with their Eyes, and hear with their Ears, and underſtand with their Hearts, and convert, and be healed*: Will all the Force you can uſe, be a Means to make them hear and underſtand, and be converted?

But, Sir, to return your Argument; You ſee *no other Means left (taking the World as we now find it) to make Men throughly and impartially examine a Religion, which they embraced upon ſuch Inducements as ought to have no Sway at all in the Matter, and with little or no Examination of the proper Grounds of it*. And thence you conclude the uſe of *Force* by the *Magiſtrate* upon Diſſenters, *neceſſary*. And, I ſay, *I ſee no other Means left (taking the World as we now find it*, wherein the Magiſtrates never lay Penalties, for Matters of Religion, upon thoſe of their own Church, nor is it to be expected they ever ſhould;) *to make Men* of the National Church, any where, *throughly and impartially examine a Religion, which they embraced upon ſuch Inducements as ought to have no Sway at all in the Matter, and therefore with little or no Examination of the proper Grounds of it*. And therefore, I conclude the uſe of Force by Diſſenters upon Conformiſts neceſſary. I appeal to the World, whether this be not as juſt and natural a Concluſion as yours. Though, if you will have my Opinion, I think the more genuine Conſequence is, that Force, to make Men examine Matters of Religion, is not neceſſary at all. But you may take which of theſe Conſequences you pleaſe. Both of them, I am ſure, you cannot avoid. It is not for you and me, out of an Imagination that they may be *uſeful*, or are *neceſſary*, to preſcribe Means in the great and myſterious Work of Salvation, other than what God himſelf has directed. God has appointed Force as *uſeful* and *neceſſary*, and therefore it is to be uſed; is a Way of arguing, becoming the Ignorance and Humility of poor Creatures. But I think Force *uſeful* or *neceſſary*, and therefore it is to be uſed; has, methinks, a little too much Preſumption in it. You ask, *What Means elſe is there left?* None, ſay I, to be uſed by Man, but what God himſelf has directed in the Scriptures, wherein are contained all the Means and Methods of Salvation. *Faith is the Gift of God*. And we are not to uſe any other Means to procure this Gift to any one, but what God himſelf has preſcribed. If he has there appointed that any ſhould be forced *to hear thoſe who tell them they have miſtaken their Way, and offer to ſhew them the right*; and that they ſhould be puniſhed by *the Magiſtrate* if they did not; 'twill be paſt doubt, it is to be made uſe of. But till that can be done, 'twill be in vain to ſay *what other Means is there left*. If all the Means God has appointed, to make Men hear and conſider, be *Exhortation in Seaſon and out of Seaſon*, &c. together with Prayer for them, and the Example of Meekneſs and a good Life; this is all ought to be done, *Whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear*.

By theſe Means the Goſpel at firſt made it ſelf to be heard through a great part of the World; and in a crooked and perverſe Generation, led away by *Luſts, Humours, and Prejudice*, (as well as this you complain of) prevail'd with Men to hear and *embrace the Truth, and take care of their own Souls*; without the Aſſiſtance of any ſuch *Force* of the Magiſtrate, which you now think *needful*. But whatever *Neglect* or *Averſion* there is in ſome Men, *impartially* and *throughly* to be inſtructed; there will, upon a due Examination (I fear) be found no leſs a Neglect and Averſion in others, *impartially* and *throughly* to inſtruct them. 'Tis not the talking even general Truths in plain and clear Language; much leſs a Man's

own

own Fancies in Scholaſtick or uncommon ways of ſpeaking, an hour or two, once a Week, in publick; that is enough to inſtruct even willing Hearers in the Way of Salvation, and the Grounds of their Religion. They are not politick Diſcourſes which are *the Means of right Information in the Foundations of Religion.* For with ſuch (ſometimes venting antimonarchical Principles, ſometimes again preaching up nothing but abſolute Monarchy and Paſſive Obedience, as the one or other have been in vogue, and the way to Preferment) have our Churches rung in their Turns, ſo loudly, that *Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince* Men of the Truth in the controverted Points of Religion, and to direct them in the right Way to Salvation, were ſcarce any where to be heard. But how many, do you think, by Friendly and Chriſtian Debates with them at their Houſes, and by the gentile Methods of the Goſpel made uſe of in private Converſation, might have been brought into the Church; who, by railing from the Pulpit, ill and unfriendly Treatment out of it, and other Neglects and Miſcarriages of thoſe who claimed to be their Teachers, have been driven from hearing them? Paint the Defects and Miſcarriages frequent on this ſide, as well as you have done thoſe on the other, and then do you, with all the World, conſider whether thoſe who you ſo handſomely declaim againſt, for being miſſed by *Education, Paſſion, Humour, Prejudice, Obſtinacy,* &c. do deſerve all the Puniſhments. Perhaps it will be anſwered; If there be ſo much Toil in it, that particular Perſons muſt be apply'd to, who then will be a Miniſter? And what if a Layman ſhould reply: If there be ſo much Toil in it, that Doubts muſt be cleared, Prejudice removed, Foundations examined, &c. Who then will be a Proteſtant; The Excuſe will be as good hereafter for the one as for the other.

This new Method of yours, which you ſay no *body can deny but that indirectly, and at a diſtance, it does ſome Service towards* bringing *Men to embrace the Truth*; was never yet thought on by the moſt refined Perſecutors. Tho' indeed it is not altogether unlike the Plea made uſe of to excuſe the late barbarous Uſage of the Proteſtants in *France* (deſigned to extirpate the Reformed Religion there) from being a Perſecution for Religion. The *French* King requires all his Subjects to come to Maſs: Thoſe who do not, are puniſhed with a witneis. For what? Not for their Religion, ſay the Pleaders for that Diſcipline, but for diſobeying the King's Laws. So by your Rule, the Diſſenters (for thither you would, and thither you muſt come if you mean any thing) muſt be puniſhed. For what? Not for their Religion, ſay you, not for *following the Light of their own Reaſon, not for obeying the Dictates of their own Conſciences.* That you think not fit. For what then are they to be puniſhed? To *make* them, ſay you, *examine the Religion they have embraced, and the Religion they have rejected.* So that they are puniſhed, not for having offended againſt a Law: For there is no Law of the Land that requires them to *examine.* And which now is the fairer Plea, pray judge. You ought, indeed, to have the Credit of this new Invention. All other Law-makers have conſtantly taken this Method; that where any thing was to be amended, the Fault was firſt declared, and then Panalties denounced againſt all thoſe, who, after a Time ſet ſhould be found guilty of it. This the common Senſe of Mankind, and the very Reaſon of Laws (which are intended not for Puniſhment, but Correction) has made ſo plain, that the ſubtileſt and moſt refined Law-makers have not gone out of this Courſe, nor have the moſt ignorant and barbarous Nations miſt it. But you have outdone *Solon* and *Lycurgus*, *Moſes* and our Saviour, and are reſolved to be a Law-maker of a way by your ſelf. 'Tis an old and abſolute way, and will not ſerve your turn, to begin with Warnings and Threats of Penalties to be inflicted on thoſe who do not reform, but continue to do that which you think they fail in. To allow of Impunity to the Innocent, or the Opportunity of Amendment to thoſe who would avoid the Penalties, are Formalities not worth your Notice. You are for a ſhorter and ſurer Way. Take a whole Tribe, and puniſh them at all Adventures; whether guilty or no, of the Miſcarriage which you have amended; or without ſo much as telling them what it is you would have them do, but leaving them to find it out if they can. All theſe Abſurdities are contained in your Way of Proceeding; and are impoſſible to be avoided by any one who will puniſh Diſſenters, and only Diſſenters; to make them *conſider and weigh the Grounds of their Religion, and impartially examine whether it be true no, and upon what Grounds they took it up,* that ſo *they may find and embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them.* But that this new ſort of Diſcipline may have all fair play, let us enquire.

Firſt,

First, Who it is you would have be puniſhed. In the Place above-cited, they are *thoſe who are got into a wrong Way, and are deaf to all Perſuaſions.* If theſe are the Men to be puniſhed, let a Law be made againſt them: you have my Conſent; and that is the proper Courſe to have Offenders puniſhed. For you do not, I hope, intend to puniſh any Fault by a Law, which you do not name in the Law; nor make a Law againſt any Fault you would not have puniſhed. And now, if you are ſincere, and in earneſt, and are (as a fair Man ſhould be) for what your Words plainly ſignify, and nothing elſe; what will ſuch a Law ſerve for? *Men in the wrong Way are to be puniſhed:* but who are *in the wrong Way* is the Queſtion. You have no more reaſon to determine it againſt one, who differs from you; than he has to conclude againſt you, who differ from him. No, not tho' you have the Magiſtrate and the National Church on your ſide. For, if to differ from them be to be *in the wrong Way*; you, who are *in the right Way* in *England*, will be *in the wrong Way* in *France*. Every one here muſt be Judge for himſelf: And your Law will reach no body, till you have convinced him he is *in the wrong Way*. And then there will be no need of Puniſhment to make him conſider; unleſs you will affirm again, what you have deny'd, and have Men puniſhed for embracing the Religion they believe to be true, when it differs from yours or the Publick. Pag. 10.

Beſides being *in the wrong Way*, thoſe who you would have puniſhed muſt be ſuch as are *deaf to all Perſuaſions*. But any ſuch, I ſuppoſe, you will hardly find, who hearken to no body, not to thoſe of their own Way. If you mean by *deaf to all Perſuaſions*, all Perſuaſions of a contrary Party, or of a different Church; ſuch, I ſuppoſe, you may abundantly find in your own Church, as well as elſewhere; and I preſume to them you are ſo charitable, that you would not have them puniſhed for not lending an Ear to Seducers. For Conſtancy in the Truth, and Perſeverance in the Faith, is (I hope) rather to be encouraged, than by any Penalties check'd in the Orthodox. And your Church, doubtleſs as well as others, is Orthodox to itſelf in all its Tenets. If you mean by *all Perſuaſion*, all your Perſuaſion, or all Perſuaſion of thoſe of your Communion; you do but beg the Queſtion, and ſuppoſe you have a right to puniſh thoſe who differ from, and will not comply with you.

Your next Words are, *When Men fly from the Means of a right Information, and will not ſo much as conſider how reaſonable it is, throughly and impartially to examine a Religion, which they embraced upon ſuch Inducements as ought to have no Sway at all in the matter, and therefore with little or no Examination of the proper Grounds of it; what human Method can be uſed, to bring them to act like Men, in an Affair of ſuch Conſequence, and to make a wiſer and more rational Choice, but that of laying ſuch Penalties upon them, as may balance the Weight of thoſe Prejudices which inclin'd them to prefer a falſe Way before the true, and recover them to ſo much Sobriety and Reflection, as ſeriouſly to put the Queſtion to themſelves; Whether it be really worth the while to undergo ſuch Inconveniencies, for adhering to a Religion, which, for any thing they know, may be falſe, or for rejecting another (if that be the Caſe) which, for any thing they know, may be true, till they have brought it to the Bar of Reaſon, and given it a fair Tryal there.* Here you again bring in ſuch as *prefer a falſe Way before a true*: To which having anſwered already, I ſhall here ſay no more, but that, ſince our Church will not allow thoſe to be in a *falſe Way* who are out of the Church of *Rome*, becauſe the Church of *Rome* (which pretends Infallibility) declares hers to be the only *true Way*; certainly no one of our Church (nor any other, which claims not Infallibility) can require any one to take the Teſtimony of any Church, as a ſufficient Proof of the Truth of her own Doctrine. So that *true and falſe* (as it commonly happens, when we ſuppoſe them for our ſelves, or our Party) in effect, ſignify juſt nothing, or nothing to the Purpoſe; unleſs we can think that *true or falſe* in *England*, which will not be ſo at *Rome*, or *Geneva*: and *vice verſâ*. As for the reſt of the Deſcription, of thoſe *on whom* you are here *laying Penalties*; I beſeech you conſider whether it will not belong to any of your Church, let it be what it will. Conſider, I ſay, if there be none in your Church *who have embrac'd her Religion, upon ſuch Inducements as ought to have no Sway at all in the matter, and therefore with little or no Examination of the proper Grounds of it*; who *have not been inclin'd by Prejudices*; who do not *adhere to a Religion, which for any thing they know may be falſe*, and who have *rejected another which for any thing they know may be true*. If you have any ſuch in your Communion (and 'twill be an admirable, tho' I fear but a little, Pag. 11.

a little, Flock that has none ſuch in it) conſider well what you have done. You have prepared Rods for them, for which I imagine they will con you no Thanks. For to make any tolerable Senſe of what you here propoſe, it muſt be underſtood that you would have Men of all Religions puniſhed, to make them conſider *whether it be really worth the while to undergo ſuch Inconveniencies for adhering to a Religion which for any thing they know may be falſe.* If you hope to avoid that, by what you have ſaid of *true* and *falſe*; and pretend that the ſuppoſed *Preference of the true Way* in your Church, ought to preſerve its Members from your Puniſhment; you manifeſtly trifle. For every Church's Teſtimony, that it has choſen the *true Way*, muſt be taken for itſelf; and then none will be liable; and your new Invention of Puniſhment is come to nothing: Or elſe the differing Church's Teſtimonies muſt be taken one for another; and then they will be all out of the *true Way*, and your Church *need* Penalties as well as the reſt. So that, upon your Principles, they muſt all or none be puniſhed. Chuſe which you pleaſe: One of them, I think, you cannot eſcape.

Pag. 11. What you ſay in the next Words; *Where Inſtruction is ſtifly refuſed, and all Admonitions and Perſuaſions prove vain and ineffectual*; differs nothing but in the Way of expreſſing, from *Deaf to all Perſuaſions*: And ſo that is anſwer'd already.

Pag. 20. In another Place, you give us another Deſcription of thoſe you think ought to be puniſhed, in theſe Words; *Thoſe who refuſe to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Spiritual Government of the proper Miniſters of Religion, who by ſpecial Deſignation are appointed to exhort, admoniſh, reprove*, &c. Here then, thoſe to be puniſhed, *are ſuch who refuſe to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Government of the proper Miniſters of Religion.* Whereby we are as much ſtill at Uncertainty, as we were before, who thoſe are who (by our Scheme, and Laws ſuitable to it) are to be puniſhed. Since every Church has, as it thinks, its *proper Miniſters of Religion.* And *if you mean thoſe that refuſe to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Government of the Miniſters of another Church*; then all Men will be guilty, and muſt be puniſhed; even thoſe of your Church, as well as others. If you mean *thoſe who refuſe*, &c. *the Miniſters of their* own Church; very few will incur your Penalties. But if, by theſe *proper Miniſters of Religion*, the Miniſters of ſome particular Church are intended, why do you not name it? Why are you ſo reſerv'd, in a Matter wherein, if you ſpeak not out, all the reſt that you ſay will be to no Purpoſe? Are Men to be puniſhed for *refuſing to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Government, of the proper Miniſters of the Church of* Geneva? For this time, (ſince you have declared nothing to the contrary) let me ſuppoſe you of that Church: And then, I am ſure, that is it that you would name. For of whatever Church you are, if you think the Miniſters of any one Church ought to be hearken'd to, and obey'd, it muſt be thoſe of your own. There are Perſons to be puniſhed, you ſay. This you contend for, all through your Book; and lay ſo much ſtreſs on it, that you make the Preſervation and Propagation of Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, to depend on it: And yet you deſcribe them by ſo general and equivocal Marks; that, unleſs it be upon Suppoſitions which no body will grant you, I dare ſay, neither you, nor any body elſe, will be able to find one guilty. Pray find me, if you can, a Man whom you can judicially prove (for he that is puniſhed by the Law muſt be fairly tried) *is in a wrong Way*, in reſpect of his Faith, I mean, who is *deaf to all Perſuaſions, who flies from all Means of a right Information, who refuſes to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Government of the Spiritual Paſtors.* And when you have done that, I think, I may allow you what Power you pleaſe to puniſh him; without any Prejudice to the Toleration the Author of the Letter propoſes.

But why, I pray, all this bogling, all this looſe talking, as if you knew not what you meant, or durſt not ſpeak it out? Would you be for puniſhing ſome body, you know not whom? I do not think ſo ill of you. Let me then ſpeak out for you. The Evidence of the Argument has convinced you that Men ought not to be perſecuted for their Religion; That the Severities in uſe amongſt Chriſtians cannot be defended; That the Magiſtrate has not Authority to compel any one to his Religion. This you are forced to yield. But you would fain retain ſome Power in the Magiſtrate's Hands to puniſh Diſſenters, upon a new Pretence; *viz.* not for having embraced the Doctrine and Worſhip they believe to be true and right, but for not having well conſider'd their own and the Magiſtrate's Religion. To ſhew you that I do not ſpeak wholly without-Book; give me leave to mind you of one

Paſſage

Paſſage of yours. The Words are, *Penalties to put them upon a ſerious and impartial Examination of the Controverſy between the Magiſtrates and them.* Though theſe Words be not intended to tell us who you would have puniſhed, yet it may be plainly inferr'd from them. And the more clearly point out whom you aim at, than all the foregoing Places, where you ſeem to (and ſhould) deſcribe them. For they, are ſuch as *between whom and the Magiſtrate there is a Controverſy:* That is, in ſhort who differ from the Magiſtrate in Religion. And now indeed you have given us a Note by which theſe you would have puniſhed may be known. We have, with much ado, found at laſt whom it is we may preſume you would have puniſhed. Which in other Caſes is uſually not very difficult: Becauſe there the Faults to be mended eaſily deſign the Perſons to be corrected. But yours is a new Method, and unlike all that ever went before it. Pag. 26.

In the next Place; Let us ſee for what you would have them puniſhed. You tell us, and it will eaſily be granted you, that not to *examine* and *weigh impartially, and without Prejudice or Paſſion,* (all which, for ſhortneſs-ſake, we will expreſs by this one Word *Conſider*) *the Religion one embraces or refuſes,* is a Fault very common, and very prejudicial to true Religion and the Salvation of Mens Souls. But Penalties and Puniſhments are very neceſſary, ſay you, to remedy this Evil.

Let us ſee now how you apply this Remedy. Therefore, ſay you, let all Diſſenters be puniſhed. Why? Have no Diſſenters conſidered of Religion? Or have all Conformiſts conſidered? That you your ſelf will not ſay. Your Project therefore is juſt as reaſonable, as if a Lethargy growing Epidemical in *England*; you ſhould propoſe to have a Law made to bliſter and ſcarify and ſhave the Heads of all who wear Gowns: Though it be certain that neither all who wear Gowns are Lethargick, nor all who are Lethargick wear Gowns.

——*Dii te Damaſippe Deaq;*
Verum ob conſilium donent tonſore.

For there could not be certainly a more learned Advice, than that one Man ſhould be pull'd by the Ears, becauſe another is aſleep. This, when you have conſider'd of it again, (for I find, according to your Principle, all Men have now and then need to be jogg'd) you will, I gueſs, be convinced is not like a fair Phyſician, to apply a Remedy to a Diſeaſe; but, like an engag'd Enemy, to vent one's Spleen upon a Party. Common Senſe, as well as Common Juſtice, requires, that the Remedies of Laws and Penalties ſhould be directed againſt the Evil that is to be removed, where-ever it be found. And if the Puniſhment, you think ſo neceſſary, be (as you pretend) to cure the Miſchief you complain of, you muſt let it purſue and fall on the Guilty, and thoſe only, in what Company ſoever they are; and not, as you here propoſe, and is the higheſt Injuſtice, puniſh the innocent *conſidering* Diſſenter, with the Guilty, and, on the other ſide, let the *inconſiderate* guilty Conformiſt ſcape, with the Innocent. For one may rationally preſume that the National Church has ſome, nay more in Proportion, of thoſe who little conſider or concern themſelves about Religion, than any Congregation of Diſſenters. For Conſcience, or the Care of their Souls, being once laid aſide; Intereſt of courſe leads Men into that Society, where the Protection and Countenance of the Government, and hopes of Preferment, bid faireſt to all their remaining Deſires. So that if careleſs, negligent, inconſiderate Men in Matters of Religion, *who without being forced would not conſider,* are to be rouzed into a Care of their Souls, and a Search after Truth, by Puniſhments; the National Religion, in all Countries, will certainly have a right to the greateſt ſhare of thoſe Puniſhments; at leaſt, not to be wholly exempt from them.

This is that which the Author of the Letter, as I remember, complains of; and that juſtly, *viz. That the pretended Care of Mens Souls always expreſſes itſelf, in thoſe who would have Force any way made uſe of to that end, in very unequal Methods; ſome Perſons being to be treated with Severity, whilſt others guilty of the ſame Faults, are not to be ſo much as touched.* Tho' you are got pretty well out of the deep Mud, and renounce Puniſhments directly for Religion; yet you ſtick ſtill in this part of the Mire; whilſt you would have Diſſenters puniſhed to make them *conſider* but would not have any thing done to Conformiſts, tho' never ſo negligent on this Point of *Conſidering.* The Author's Letter pleas'd me, becauſe it is

equal to all Mankind, is direct, and will, I think, hold every where; which I take to be a good Mark of Truth. For I shall always suspect, that neither to comport with the Truth of Religion, or the Design of the Gospel, which is suited to only some one Country, or Party. What is true and good in *England*, will be true and good at *Rome* too, in *China* or *Geneva*. But whether your great and *only Method* for
Pag. 12. the propagating of Truth, by bringing the Inconsiderate by Punishments to *consider*, would (according to your way of applying your Punishments only to Dissenters from the National Religion) be of use in those Countries, or any where but where you suppose the Magistrate to be in the Right, judge you. Pray, Sir, consider a little, whether Prejudice has not some share in your way of Arguing. For this is your Position; *Men are generally negligent in examining the Grounds of their Religion.* This I grant. But could there be a more wild and incoherent Consequence drawn from it, than this; *Therefore Dissenters must be punished?*

But that being laid aside, let us now see to what End they must be punished. Some-
Pag. 5. times it is, *To bring them to consider those Reasons and Arguments which are proper and sufficient to convince them.* Of what? That it is not easy to set *Grantham* Steeple upon *Paul's* Church? Whatever it be you wou'd have them convinced of, you are not
Pag. 10. willing to tell us. And so it may be any thing. Sometimes it is, *To incline them to lend an Ear to those who tell them they have mistaken their Way, and offer to shew them the right.* Which is to lend an Ear to all who differ from them in Religion; as
Pag. 27. well *crafty Seducers*, as others. Whether this be for *the procuring the Salvation of*
Pag. 23. *their Souls*, the End for which you say this Force is to be used, judge you. But this I am sure; Whoever will *lend an Ear to all who will tell them they are out of the way*, will not have much Time for any other Business.

Pag. 11. Sometimes it is, *To recover Men to so much Sobriety and Reflection, as seriously to put the Question to themselves, Whether it be really worth their while to undergo such Inconveniences, for adhering to a Religion which, for any thing they know, may be false; or for rejecting another (if that be the Case) which, for ought they know, may be true, till they have brought it to the Bar of Reason, and given it a fair Trial there.* Which, in short, amounts to thus much, *viz. To make them examine whether their Religion be True, and so worth the holding, under those Penalties that are annexed to it.* Dissenters are indebted to you for your great Care of their Souls. But what, I beseech you, shall become of those of the National Church, every where (which make far the greater part of Mankind) who have no such Punishments to make them *consider*; who have not this *only Remedy* provided for them; but are left in that deplorable Condition you mention, of *being suffer'd quietly, and without Molestation, to take no Care at all of their Souls, or in doing of it to follow their own Prejudices, Humours, or some crafty Seducers?* Need not those of the National Church, as well as others, *bring their Religion to the Bar of Reason, and give it a fair Trial there?* And if they need to do so, (as they must, if all National Religion cannot be supposed true) they will
Pag. 27.
Pag. 12. always need that which, you say, is the *only Means* to make them do so. So *that if you are sure*, as you tell us, that *there is need of your Method*; I am sure, there is as much need of it in National Churches, as any other. And so for ought I can see, you must either punish them, or let others alone; Unless you think it reasonable that the far greater part of Mankind should constantly be without that sovereign and only Remedy, which they stand in need of equally with other People.

Pag. 13. Sometimes the End for which Men must be punished is, *to dispose them to submit to Instruction, and to give a fair Hearing to the Reasons are offer'd for the enlightning their Minds, and discovering the Truth to them.* If their own Words may be taken for it, there are as few Dissenters as Conformists, in any Country, who will not profess they have done, and do this. And if their own Words may not be taken; who I pray must be judge? You and your Magistrates? If so, then it is plain you punish them not to *dispose them to submit to Instruction*, but *to* your *Instruction*; *not to dispose them to give a fair Hearing to Reasons offer'd for the enlightning their Minds*, but to give an obedient *Hearing* to your *Reasons*. If you mean this; it had been fairer and shorter to have spoken out plainly, than thus in fair Words, of indefinite Signification, to say that which amounts to nothing. For what Sense is it, to punish a Man *to dispose him to submit to Instruction, and give a fair Hearing to Reasons offer'd for the enlightning his Mind, and discovering Truth to him*, who goes two or three times a Week several Miles on purpose to do it, and that with the hazard of his Liberty or Purse? Unless you

mean

mean your *Inſtructions*, your *Reaſons*, your *Truth*: Which brings us but back to what you have diſclaimed, plain Perſecution for differing in Religion.

Sometimes this is to be done, *To prevail with Men to weigh Matters of Religion carefully and impartially.* Diſcountenance and Puniſhment put into one Scale, with Impunity and Hopes of Preferment put into the other, is as ſure a way to make a Man *weigh impartially*, as it would be for a Prince to bribe and threaten a Judge to make him judge uprightly. Pag. 14.

Sometimes it is *To make Men bethink themſelves, and put it out of the Power of any fooliſh Humour, or unreaſonable Prejudice, to alienate them from Truth and their own Happineſs.* Add but this, *to put it out of the Power of any Humour or Prejudice* of their own, or other Mens; and I grant the End is good, if you can find the Means to procure it. But why it ſhould not be put out of the Power of other Mens *Humour* or *Prejudice*, as well as their own, wants (and will always want) a Reaſon to prove. Would it not, I beſeech you, to an indifferent By-ſtander, appear *Humour* or *Prejudice*, or ſomething as bad; to ſee Men, who profeſs a Religion reveal'd from Heaven, and which they own contains all in it neceſſary to Salvation, exclude Men from their Communion, and perſecute them with the Penalties of the Civil Law, for not joining in the uſe of Ceremonies which are no where to be found in that reveal'd Religion? Would it not appear *Humour* or *Prejudice*, or ſome ſuch thing, to a ſober impartial Heathen; to ſee Chriſtians exclude and perſecute one of the ſame Faith, for Things which they themſelves confeſs to be indifferent, and not worth contending for? Pag. 20.

Prejudice, Humour, Paſſion, Luſts, Impreſſions of Education, Reverence and Admiration of Perſons, worldly Reſpects, Love of their own Choice, and the like, (to which you juſtly impute many Mens taking up, and perſiſting in their Religion) are indeed good Words; and ſo, on the other ſide, are theſe following; *Truth, the right Way, enlightning Reaſon, ſound Judgment*; but they ſignify nothing at all to your Purpoſe, till you can evidently and unqueſtionably ſhew the World that the latter (viz. *Truth and the right Way, &c.*) are always, and in all Countries, to be found only in the National Church; and the former (viz. *Paſſion and Prejudice*, &c.) only amongſt the Diſſenters. But to go on: Pag. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

Sometimes it is, *To bring Men to take ſuch care as they ought of their Salvation.* What *Care is ſuch as Men ought to take*, whilſt they are out of your Church, will be hard for you to tell me. But you endeavour to explain your ſelf, in the following Words; *that they may not blindly leave it to the Choice neither of any other Perſon, nor yet of their own Luſts and Paſſions, to preſcribe to them what Faith or what Worſhip they ſhall embrace.* You do well to make uſe of Puniſhment to ſhut *Paſſion* out of the Choice: becauſe you know fear of Suffering is no *Paſſion*. But let that paſs. You would have Men puniſhed, *to bring them to take ſuch Care of their Salvation, that they may not blindly leave it to the Choice of any other Perſon to preſcribe to them.* Are you ſincere? Are you in earneſt? Tell me then truly: Did the Magiſtrate or National Church, any where, or yours in particular, ever puniſh any Man, to bring him to *have this Care* which, you ſay, *he ought to take of his Salvation?* Did you ever puniſh any Man, that he might not *blindly leave it to the Choice* of his Pariſh-Prieſt, or Biſhop, or the Convocation, *what Faith or Worſhip he ſhould embrace?* 'Twill be ſuſpected Care of a Party, or any thing elſe rather than *Care of the Salvation of Mens Souls*; if, having found out ſo *uſeful*, ſo *neceſſary* a Remedy, *the only Method there is room left for*, you will apply it but partially, and make Trial of it only on thoſe who you have truly leaſt Kindneſs for. This will, unavoidably, give one Reaſon to imagine, you do not think ſo well of your Remedy as you pretend, who are ſo ſparing of it to your Friends; but are very free of it to Strangers, who in other Things are uſed very much like Enemies. But your Remedy is like the *Helleboraſter*, that grew in the Woman's Garden for the cure of Worms in her Neighbour's Children: For truly it wrought too roughly, to give it to any of her own. Methinks your Charity, in your preſent Perſecution, is much what as prudent, as juſtifiable, as that good Woman's. I hope I have done you no Injury, that I here ſuppoſe you of the Church of *England*. If I have, I beg your Pardon. It is no Offence of Malice, I aſſure you: For I ſuppoſe no worſe of you, than I confeſs of my ſelf. Pag. 12.

Sometimes this Puniſhment that you contend for, is *to bring Men to act according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment.* Pag. 22.

Tertius è Cœlo cecidit Cato.

This is Reformation indeed. If you can help us to it, you will deſerve Statues to be erected to you, as to the Reſtorer of decay'd Religion. But if all Men have not *Reaſon and ſound Judgment*, will Puniſhment put it into them? Beſides, concerning this Matter, Mankind is ſo divided, that he *acts according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment* at *Ausburg*, who would be judged to do the quite contrary at *Edinburgh*. Will Puniſhment make Men know what is *Reaſon and ſound Judgment?* If it will not, 'tis impoſſible it ſhould make them *act according to it*. *Reaſon and ſound Judgment* are the *Elixir* it ſelf, the univerſal Remedy: And you may as reaſonably puniſh Men to bring
Pag. 26. them to have the Philoſopher's Stone, as to *bring them to act according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment*.

Sometimes it is, *To put Men upon a ſerious and impartial Examination of the Controverſy between the Magiſtrate and them, which is the way for them to come to the Knowledge of the Truth*. But what if the Truth be on neither ſide (as I am apt to imagine you will think it is not, where neither the Magiſtrate nor the Diſſenter is either of them of your Church) how will the *examining the Controverſy between the Magiſtrate and him be the way to come to the Knowledge of the Truth?* Suppoſe the Controverſy between a Lutheran and a Papiſt; or, if you pleaſe, between a Presbyterian Magiſtrate and a Quaker Subject, *Will the examining the Controverſy between the Magiſtrate and the Diſſenting Subject*, in this Caſe, *bring him to the Knowledge of the Truth?* If you ſay yes, then you grant one of theſe to have the Truth on his ſide. For the examining the Controverſy between a Presbyterian and a Quaker, leaves the Controverſy either of them as with the Church of *England*, or any other Church, untouch'd. And ſo one, at leaſt, of thoſe being already *come to the Knowledge of the Truth*, ought not to be put under your Diſcipline of Puniſhment; which is only to *bring him to the Truth*. If you ſay no, and that *the examining the Controverſy between the Magiſtrate and the Diſſenter*, in this Caſe, will not *bring him to the Knowledge of the Truth*; you confeſs your Rule to be falſe, and your Method to no Purpoſe.

To conclude, your Syſtem is, in ſhort, this. You would have all Men (laying aſide *Prejudice, Honour, Paſſion, &c.*) *examine the Grounds of their Religion, and ſearch for the Truth*. This, I confeſs, is heartily to be wiſh'd. The Means that you propoſe to make Men do this, is that Diſſenters ſhould be puniſhed to make them do ſo. It is as if you had ſaid: Men generally are guilty of a Fault; therefore let one Sect, who have the ill luck to be of an Opinion different from the Magiſtrate, be puniſhed. This at firſt ſight ſhocks any who has the leaſt ſpark of Senſe, Reaſon or Juſtice. But having ſpoken of this already, and concluding that upon ſecond Thoughts, you your ſelf will be aſhamed of it; let us conſider it put ſo as to be conſiſtent with common Senſe, and with all the Advantage it can bear; and then let us ſee what you can make of it. *Men* are *negligent in examining the Religions they embrace, refuſe, or perſiſt in; therefore it is fit they ſhould be puniſhed to make them do it*. This is a Conſequence indeed which may without defiance to common Senſe, be drawn from it. This is the Uſe, the only Uſe, which you think Puniſhnent can *indirectly, and at a diſtance* have, in Matters of Religion. You would have Men by Puniſhments driven to examine. What? *Religion*. To what End? *to bring them to the Knowledge of the Truth*. But I anſwer.

Firſt, Every one has not the Ability to do this.

Secondly, Every one has not the Opportunity to do it.

Would you have every poor Proteſtant, for Example, in the *Palatinate, examine throughly*; whether the Pope be infallible; or Head of the Church whether there be a Purgatory; whether Saints are to be pray'd to, or the Dead pray'd for; whether the Scripture be the only Rule of Faith; whether there be no Salvation out of the Church; and whether there be no Church without Biſhops; and an hundred other Queſtions in Controverſy between the Papiſts and thoſe Proteſtants; and when he had maſter'd theſe, go on to fortify himſelf againſt the Opinions and Objections of other Churches he differs from? This, which is no ſmall Task, muſt be done; before a Man can have *brought his Religion to the Bar of Reaſon, and given it a fair Trial there*. And if you will puniſh Men till this be done; the Countryman muſt leave off plowing and ſowing, and betake himſelf to the ſtudy of Greek and Latin; and the Artiſan muſt ſell his Tools, to buy Fathers and School-men, and leave his Family to ſtarve. If ſomething leſs than this will ſatisfy you, pray tell me what is enough. Have they conſidered and examined enough, if they are ſatisfied themſelves where the Truth lies? If this be the Limits of their Examination, you will find few to puniſh; unleſs you will puniſh them to make them do what they have done already. For, however he

came

came by his Religion, there is ſcarce any one to be found who does not own himſelf ſatisfied that he is in the right. Or elſe, muſt they be puniſhed to make them *conſider* and *examine* till they embrace that which you chooſe for Truth? If this be ſo, what do you but in effect chooſe for them, when yet you would have Men puniſhed, *To bring them to ſuch a Care of their Souls, that no other Perſon might chooſe for them?* If it be Truth in general you would have them by Puniſhments driven to ſeek; that is to offer Matter of Diſpute, and not a Rule of Diſcipline. For to puniſh any one to make him ſeek till he find Truth, without a Judge of Truth; is to puniſh for you know not what; and is all one as if you ſhould whip a Scholar to make him find out the ſquare Root of a Number you do not know. I wonder not therefore that you could not reſolve with your ſelf what Degree of Severity you would have uſed, nor how long continued; when you dare not ſpeak out directly whom you would have puniſhed, and are far from being clear to what End they ſhould be under Penalties. Pag. 22.

Conſonant to this Uncertainty, of whom, or what to be puniſhed; you tell us, *That there is no queſtion of the Succeſs of this Method. Force will certainly do, if duly proportioned to the Deſign of it.* Pag. 12.

What I pray is the *Deſign of it?* I challenge you, or any Man living, out of what you have ſaid in your Book, to tell me directly what it is. In all other Puniſhments that ever I heard of yet, till now that you have taught the World a new Method, the Deſign of them has been to cure the Crime they are denounced againſt; and ſo I think it ought to be here. What I beſeech you is the Crime here? Diſſenting? That you ſay not, any where, is a Fault. Beſides you tell us, *That the Magiſtrate hath not an Authority to compel any one to his Religion:* And Pag. 21. that *you do not require that Men ſhould have no Rule but the Religion of the Country.* Pag. 25. And the *Power you aſcribe to the Magiſtrate is given him to bring Men, not to his own, but to the true Religion.* Pag. 26. If Diſſenting be not the Fault; is it that a Man does not examine his own Religion, and the Grounds of it? Is that the Crime your Puniſhments are deſigned to cure? Neither that dare you ſay; leſt you diſpleaſe more than you ſatisfy with your new Diſcipline. And then again, (as I ſaid before) you muſt tell us how far you would have them examine, before you puniſh them for not doing it. And I imagine, if that were all we required of you, it would be long enough before you would trouble us with a Law, that ſhould preſcribe to every one how far he was to examine Matters of Religion; wherein if he fail'd and came ſhort, he was to be puniſhed; if he perform'd, and went in his Examination to the Bounds ſet by the Law, he was acquitted and free. Sir, when you conſider it again, you will perhaps think this a Caſe reſerv'd to the Great Day, when the Secrets of all Hearts ſhall be laid open. For I imagine it is beyond the Power or Judgment of Man, in that Variety of Circumſtances, in reſpect of Parts, Tempers, Opportunities, Helps, *&c.* Men are in this World, to determine what is every one's Duty in this great Buſineſs of Search, Enquiry, Examination, or to know when any one has done it. That which makes me believe you will be of this mind, is, that where you undertake for the *Succeſs of this Method, if rightly uſed*, it is with a Limitation, *upon ſuch as are not altogether incurable.* Pag. 12. So that when your Remedy is prepared according to Art, (which Art is yet unknown) and rightly apply'd, and given in a due Doſe, (all which are Secrets) it will then infallibly cure. Whom? All that are not incurable by it. And ſo will a Pippin Poſſet, eating Fiſh in *Lent*, or a Presbyterian Lecture, certainly cure all that are not incurable by them. For I am ſure you do not mean it will cure all, but thoſe who are abſolutely incurable; becauſe you your ſelf allow one Means left of Cure, when yours will not do, *viz. The Grace of God.* Your Words are, *What means is there left (except the Grace of God) to reduce them, but to lay Thorns and Briars in their way.* Pag. 10. And here alſo, in the Place we were conſidering, you tell us *the incurable are to be left to God.* Whereby, if you mean they are to be left to thoſe Means he has ordained for Mens Converſion and Salvation, yours muſt never be made uſe of: For he indeed has preſcribed Preaching and Hearing of his Word; but as for thoſe who will not hear, I do not find any where that he has commanded they ſhould be compell'd or beaten to it. Pag. 12.

There is a third thing that you are as tender and reſerv'd in, as either naming the Criminals to be puniſhed, or poſitively telling us the End for which they ſhould be puniſhed: And that is with what ſort of Penalties, what Degree of Puniſhment they

they ſhould be forced. You are indeed ſo gracious to them, that you renounce the *Severities* and Penalties hitherto made uſe of. You tell us, they ſhould be but *mode-*
Pag. 24. *rate Penalties.* But if we ask you what are moderate Penalties, you confeſs you cannot tell us. So that by *Moderate*, here, you yet mean nothing. You tell us,
Pag. 15. the *outward Force to be apply'd ſhould be duly temper'd.* But what that due Temper is, you do not, or cannot ſay; and ſo in effect, it ſignifies juſt nothing. Yet if in this you are not plain and direct, all the reſt of your Deſign will ſignify nothing. For it being to have ſome Men, and to ſome End, puniſhed; yet if it cannot be found what Puniſhment is to be uſed, it is (notwithſtanding all you have ſaid)
Pag. 12. utterly uſeleſs. *You tell us modeſtly, That to determine preciſely the juſt Meaſure of the Puniſhment, will require ſome Conſideration.* If the Faults were preciſely determined, and could be proved, it would require no more Conſideration to determine the Meaſure of the Puniſhment, in this, than it would in any other Caſe, where thoſe were known. But where the Fault is undefined, and the Guilt not to be proved, (as I ſuppoſe it will be found in this preſent Buſineſs of *examining*) it will without doubt *require Conſideration* to proportion the Force to the Deſign. Juſt ſo much Conſideration as it will require to fit a Coat to the Moon, or proportion a Shoe to the Feet of thoſe who inhabit her. For to proportion a Puniſhment to a Fault that you do not name, (and ſo we in Charity ought to think you do not yet know) and a Fault that when you have named it, will be impoſſible to be proved who are or are not guilty of it; will I ſuppoſe require as much *Conſideration*, as to fit a Shoe to Feet whoſe Size and Shape are not known.

However, you offer ſome Meaſures whereby to regulate your Puniſhments; which when they are looked into, will be found to be juſt as good as none; they being impoſſible to be any Rule in the Caſe. The firſt is, *So much Force, or ſuch Penal-*
Pag. 14. *ties as are ordinarily ſufficient to prevail with Men of common Diſcretion, and not deſperately perverſe and obſtinate, to weigh Matters of Religion carefully and impartially, and without which ordinarily they will not do this.* Where it is to be obſerved:

Firſt, That who are theſe Men of *Common Diſcretion*, is hard as to know, as to know what is a fit Degree of Puniſhment in the Caſe; and ſo you do but regulate one Uncertainty by another. Some Men will be apt to think, that he who will not *weigh Matters of Religion*, which are of infinite Concernment to him, without Puniſhment, cannot in reaſon be thought a Man of *Common Diſcretion*. Many Women of *Common Diſcretion* enough to manage the ordinary Affairs of their Families, are not able to read a Page in an ordinary Author, or to underſtand and give an account what it means, when read to them. Many Men of *Common Diſcretion* in their Callings, are not able to judge when an Argument is concluſive or no; much leſs to trace it through a long Train of Conſequences. *What Penalties ſhall be ſufficient to prevail* with ſuch (who upon Examination, I fear, will not be found to make the leaſt part of Mankind) *to examine and weigh Matters of Religion carefully and impartially?* The Law allows all to have *Common Diſcretion*, for whom it has not provided Guardians or *Bedlam*. So that, in effect, your Men of *Common Diſcretion* are all Men, not judg'd Ideots or Madmen: And *Penalties ſufficient to prevail with Men of Common Diſcretion*, are Penalties ſufficient to prevail with all Men, but Ideots and Madmen. Which what a Meaſure it is to regulate Penalties by, let all Men of Common Diſcretion judge.

Secondly, you may be pleaſed to conſider, That all Men of the ſame Degree of *Diſcretion*, are not apt to be moved by the ſame Degree of Penalties. Some are of a more yielding, ſome of a more ſtiff Temper; and what is ſufficient to prevail on one, is not half enough to move the other; tho' both Men of *Common Diſcretion*. So that *Common Diſcretion* will be here of no uſe to determine the Meaſure of Puniſhment: Eſpecially, when in the ſame Clauſe you except Men *deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, who are as hard to be known, as what you ſeek; *viz.* the juſt Proportions of Puniſhments neceſſary *to prevail with Men to conſider, examine, and weigh Matters of Religion*; wherein, if a Man tells you he has *conſider'd*, he has *weigh'd*, he has *examin'd*, and ſo goes on in his former Courſe, 'tis impoſſible for you ever to know whether he has done his Duty, or whether he be *deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*. So that this Exception ſignifies juſt nothing.

There are many Things in your uſe of Force and Penalties, different from any I ever met with elſewhere. One of them, this Clauſe of yours, concerning the meaſure

meaſure of Puniſhments, now under Conſideration, offers me: Wherein you proportion your Puniſhments only to the Yielding and Corrigible, not to the Perverſe and Obſtinate; contrary to the Common Diſcretion which has hitherto made Laws in other Caſes, which levels the Puniſhments againſt refractory Offenders, and never ſpares them becauſe they are obſtinate. This however I will not blame, as an Overſight in you. Your new Method, which aims at ſuch impracticable and inconſiſtent Things as Laws cannot bear, nor Penalties be uſeful to, forced you to it. The Uſeleſneſs, Abſurdity, and Unreaſonableneſs of great *Severities*, you had acknowledg'd in the foregoing Paragraphs. Diſſenters you would have brought *to conſider by moderate Penalties.* They lie under them; but whether they have conſider'd or no (for that you cannot tell,) they ſtill continue Diſſenters. What is to be done now? Why, *the incurable are to be left to God*, as you tell us, *P.* 12. Your Puniſhments were not meant *to prevail on the deſperately Perverſe and Obſtinate*, as you tell us here. And ſo whatever be the Succeſs, your Puniſhments are however juſtified. Pag. 13, 14.

You have given us in another Place, ſomething like another Boundary to your *moderate Penalties*: But when examined, it proves juſt like the reſt, trifling only, in good Words, ſo put together as to have no direct Meaning; an Art very much in uſe amongſt ſome ſort of learned Men. The Words are theſe; *Such Penalties as may not tempt Perſons who have any Concern for their Eternal Salvation, (and thoſe who have none, ought not to be conſidered) to renounce a Religion which they believe to be true, or profeſs one which they do not believe to be ſo.* If by *any Concern*, you mean a true *Concern for their Eternal Salvation*, by this Rule you may make your Puniſhments as great as you pleaſe; and all the Severities you have diſclaim'd may be brought in play again: For none of thoſe will be able to make a Man, *who is truly concerned for his Eternal Salvation, renounce a Religion he believes to be true, or profeſs one he does not believe to be ſo.* If by *thoſe who have any Concern*, you mean ſuch who have ſome faint Wiſhes for Happineſs hereafter, and would be glad to have Things go well with them in the other World, but will venture nothing in this World for it; theſe the moderateſt Puniſhments you can imagine, will make change their Religion. If by *any Concern*, you mean whatever may be between theſe two; the Degrees are ſo infinite, that to proportion your Puniſhments by that, is to have no Meaſure of them at all. Pag. 26.

One thing I cannot but take notice of in this Paſſage, before I leave it: And that is that you ſay here, *Thoſe who have no Concern for their Salvation, deſerve not to be conſidered.* In other Parts of your Letter you pretend to have Compaſſion on the Careleſs, and provide Remedies for them: But here, of a ſudden, your Charity fails you; and you give them up to Eternal Perdition, without the leaſt Regard, the leaſt Pity, and ſay *they deſerve not to be conſidered.* Our Saviour's Rule was, *The ſick, and not the whole, need a Phyſician.* Your Rule here is, Thoſe that are Careleſs, are not to be conſidered, but are to be left to themſelves. This would ſeem ſtrange, if one did not obſerve what drew you to it. You perceiv'd that if the Magiſtrate was to uſe no Puniſhments but ſuch as would make no body change their Religion, he was to uſe none at all: For the Careleſs would be brought to the National Church, with any ſlight Puniſhments; and when they are once there, you are, it ſeems, ſatisfied, and look no farther after them. So that by your own Meaſures, *if the Careleſs, and thoſe who have no Concern for their Eternal Salvation*, are to be regarded and taken care of; if the Salvation of their Souls is to be promoted, there is to be no Puniſhments uſed at all: And therefore you leave them out as *not to be conſidered.*

There remains yet one thing to enquired into, concerning the Meaſure of the Puniſhments, and that is the length of their Duration. *Moderate Puniſhments* that are continued, that Men find no end of, know no way out of, ſit heavy, and become immoderately uneaſy. *Diſſenters* you would have *puniſhed, to make them conſider.* Your Penalties have had the Effect on them you intended; they have made them conſider; and they have done their utmoſt in conſidering. What now muſt be done with them? They muſt be puniſh'd on; for they are ſtill Diſſenters. If it were juſt, if you had reaſon at firſt to puniſh a Diſſenter, to make him *conſider*, when you did not know but that he had *conſidered* already; it is as juſt, and you have as much reaſon to puniſh him on, even when he has perform'd what your Puniſhments was deſigned for, when he has *conſidered*, but yet remains a Diſſenter. For I may juſtly ſuppoſe, and you muſt grant, that a Man may remain a Diſſenter, after

after all the Conſiderations your *moderate Penalties* can *bring* him to; when we ſee greater Puniſhments, even thoſe *Severities* you diſown, as too great, are not able to make Men *conſider* ſo far as to be *convinced*, and brought over to the National Church.

If your Puniſhments may not be inflicted on Men, to make them *conſider*, who have, or may have conſidered already for ought you know; then Diſſenters are never to be once puniſhed, no more than any other ſort of Men. If Diſſenters are to be puniſhed, to make them *conſider*, whether they have conſidered or no; then their Puniſhments, tho' they do *conſider*, muſt never ceaſe, as long as they are Diſſenters, which whether it be to puniſh them only to bring them to conſider, let all Men judge. This I am ſure; Puniſhments, in your Method, muſt either never begin upon Diſſenters, or never ceaſe. And ſo pretend Moderation as you pleaſe, the Puniſhments which your Method requires, muſt be either very immoderate, or none at all.

And now, you having yielded to our Author, and that upon very good Reaſons which you your ſelf urge, and which I ſhall ſet down in your own Words, *That to proſecute Men with Fire and Sword, or to deprive them of their Eſtates, to maim them with corporal Puniſhments, to ſtarve and torture them in noiſom Priſons, and in the end even to take away their Lives, to make them Chriſtians, is but an ill way of expreſſing Mens Deſire of the Salvation of thoſe whom they treat in this manner. And that it will be very difficult to perſuade Men of Senſe, that he who with dry Eyes and ſatisfaction of Mind can deliver his Brother to the Executioner, to be burnt alive, does ſincerely and heartily concern himſelf to ſave that Brother from the Flames of Hell in the World to come. And that theſe Methods are ſo very improper, in reſpect to the Deſign of them, that they uſually produce the quite contrary Effect. For whereas all the uſe which Force can have for the advancing true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, is (as has already been ſhewed) by diſpoſing Men to ſubmit to Inſtruction, and to give a fair Hearing to the Reaſons which are offered, for the enlightning their Minds, and diſcovering the Truth to them, theſe Cruelties have the misfortune to be commonly look'd upon as ſo juſt a Prejudice againſt any Religion that uſe them, as makes it needleſs to look any farther into it; and to tempt Men to reject it, as both falſe and deteſtable, without ever vouchſafing to conſider the rational Grounds and Motives of it. This Effect they ſeldom fail to work upon the Sufferers of them; and as to the Spectators, if they be not before-hand well inſtructed in thoſe Grounds and Motives, they will be much tempted likewiſe, not only to entertain the ſame Opinion of ſuch a Religion, but withal to judge much more favourable of that of the Sufferers: who they will be apt to think, would not expoſe themſelves to ſuch Extremities, which they might avoid by Compliance, if they were not throughly ſatisfied of the Juſtice of their Cauſe.* And upon theſe Reaſons you conclude, That *theſe Severities are utterly unapt and improper for the bringing Men to embrace that Truth which muſt ſave them.* Again, you have acknowledged, *That the Authority of the Magiſtrate is not an Authority to compel any one to his Religion.* And again, *That the Rigor of Laws, and Force of Penalties are not capable to convince and change Mens minds.* And yet farther, *That you do not require that Men ſhould have no Rule, but the Religion of the Court; or that they ſhould be put under a Neceſſity to quit the Light of their own Reaſon, and oppoſe the Dictates of their own Conſciences, and blindly reſign up themſelves to the Will of their Governors; but that the Power you aſcribe to the Magiſtrate, is given him to bring Men not to his own, but to the true Religion.* Now you having, I ſay, granted this, whereby you directly condemn and aboliſh all Laws that have been made here, or any where elſe (that ever I heard of) to compel Men to Conformity; I think the Author, and whoſoever elſe are moſt for Liberty of Conſcience, might be content with the Toleration you allow, by condemning the Laws about Religion, now in force; and reſt ſatisfied, until you had made your new Method conſiſtent and practicable, by telling the World plainly and directly;

Pag. 13, 14.

Pag. 21.

Pag. 24.

Pag. 25.

1. Who are to be Puniſhed.
2. For what.
3. With what Puniſhments.
4. How long.
5. What Advantage to true Religion it would be, if Magiſtrates every where did ſo puniſh.
6. And laſtly, Whence the Magiſtrate had Commiſſion to do ſo.

When you have done this plainly and intelligibly, without keeping in the uncertainty of general Expreſſions, and without ſuppoſing all along your Church in the right, and your Religion the true; (which can no more be allow'd to you in this Caſe, whatever

whatever your Church or Religion be, than it can be to a Papiſt or a Lutheran, a Presbyterian, or an Anabaptiſt; nay no more to you, than it can be allowed to a Jew or a Mahometan); when, I ſay, you have by ſettling theſe Points, fram'd the Parts of your new Engine, ſet it together, and ſhew'd that it will work, without doing more harm than good in the World; I think then Men may be content to ſubmit to it. But imagining this, and an Engine to ſhew the perpetual Motion, will be found out together; I think Toleration in a very good State, notwithſtanding your Anſwer; wherein you having ſaid ſo much for it, and for ought I ſee, nothing againſt it; unleſs an impracticable Chimera be, in your Opinion, ſomething mightily to be apprehended.

We have now ſeen and examined the main of your Treatiſe; and therefore I think I might here end, without going any farther. But, that you may not think your ſelf, or any of your Arguments neglected, I will go over the remainder, and give you my Thoughts on every thing I ſhall meet with in it, that ſeems to need any anſwer. In one place you argue againſt the Author thus: *If then the Author's Fourth Propoſition*, as you call it, *viz.* That Force is of no uſe for promoting true Religion and the Salvation of Souls, *be not true (as perhaps by this time it appears it is not) then the laſt Propoſition, which is built upon it, muſt fall with it:* Which laſt Propoſition is this, viz. *That no body can have any Right to uſe any outward Force or Compulſion, to bring Men to the true Religion, and ſo to Salvation.* If this Propoſition were built, as you alledge, upon that which you call his fourth, then indeed if the fourth fell, this built upon it would fall with it. But that not being the Author's Propoſition, (as I have ſhew'd) nor this built wholly on it, but one other Reaſons, (as I have already prov'd, and any one may ſee in ſeveral parts of his Letter, particularly *P.* 234, 235.) what you alledge falls of it ſelf. Pag. 15.

The buſineſs of the next Paragraph is to prove, That if *Force be uſeful, then ſome body muſt certainly have a right to uſe it.* The firſt Argument you go about to prove it by is this, That *Uſefulneſs is as good an Argument to prove there is ſomewhere a right to uſe it, as Uſeleſneſs is to prove no body has ſuch a Right.* If you conſider the Things of whoſe Uſefulneſs or Uſeleſneſs we are ſpeaking, you will perhaps be of another mind. It is Puniſhment, or Force uſed in puniſhing. Now all Puniſhment is ſome Evil, ſome Inconvenience, ſome Suffering; by taking away or abridging ſome good thing, which he who is puniſhed has otherwiſe a right to. Now to juſtify the bringing any ſuch Evil upon any Man, two things are requiſite. Firſt, That he who does it has Commiſſion and Power ſo to do. Secondly, That it be directly uſeful for the procuring ſome greater Good. Whatever Puniſhment one Man uſes to another, without theſe two Conditions, whatever he may pretend, proves an Injury and Injuſtice, and ſo of right ought to have been let alone. And therefore, though Uſefulneſs (which is one of the Conditions that makes Puniſhments juſt) when it is away, may hinder Puniſhments from being lawful in any body's hands; yet Uſefulneſs, when preſent (being but one of thoſe Conditions (cannot give the other, which is a Commiſſion to puniſh; without which alſo Puniſhment is unlawful. From whence it follows, That though uſeleſs Puniſhment be unlawful from any hand; yet uſeful Puniſhment from every hand is not lawful. A Man may have the Stone, and it may be uſeful (more than *indirectly, and at a diſtance uſeful*) to him to be cut; but yet this Uſefulneſs will not juſtify the moſt skilful Chirurgeon in the World, by Force to make him endure the Pain and Hazard of cutting; becauſe he has no Commiſſion, no Right without the Patient's own conſent to do ſo. Nor is it a good argument cutting will be uſeful to him; therefore there is a right ſomewhere to cut him, whether he will or no? Much leſs will there be an Argument for any right, if there be only a poſſibility that it may prove uſeful *indirectly* and by accident.

Your other Argument is this; *If Force or Puniſhment be of neceſſary uſe, then it muſt be acknowledged, that there is a right ſomewhere to uſe it; unleſs we will ſay (what without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things has not furniſhed Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour in the World, and the good of Souls.* If your way of arguing be true; 'tis demonſtration, that *Force* is not of *neceſſary uſe.* For I argue thus, in your form. We muſt acknowledge Force not to be of neceſſary uſe; *unleſs we will ſay (what without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things did not*, for above 300 Years after Chriſt, furniſh his Church *with competent Means for promoting his own Honour in the World, and the good of Souls.* 'Tis for you to conſider whether theſe Arguments be concluſive or no. This I am ſure; the one is as concluſive as the other. But if your ſuppoſed *Uſefulneſs* places a right ſomewhere to uſe it, pray tell me in whoſe hands it places it in *Turky*, *Perſia*, or *China*, or any Country

where Christians of different Churches live under a Heathen or *Mahometan* Sovereign? And if you cannot tell me in whose Hands it places it there, (as I believe you will find it pretty hard to do) there are then (it seems) some Places where (upon your Supposition of the necessary Usefulness of Force) *the wise and benign Governor and Disposer of all Things, has not furnish'd Men with competent Means for promoting his own Honour, and the good of Souls*; unless you will Grant, *that the wise benign Disposer and Governor of all Things, hath for the promoting of his Honour, and the good of Souls*, placed a Power in *Mahometan* or *Heathen* Princes, to punish Christians, *to bring them to consider Reasons and Arguments proper to convince them.* But this is the Advantage of so fine an Invention, as that of Force *doing some Service indirectly, and at a distance*; which Usefulness, if we may believe you, places a Right in *Mahometan* or *Pagan* Princes hands, to use Force upon Christians; for fear lest Mankind in those Countries, should be *unfurnish'd with Means for the promoting God's Honour and the Good of Souls.*

Pag. 15. For thus you argue; *If there be so great Use of Force, then there is a Right somewhere to*
Pag. 16. *use it. And if there be such a Right somewhere, where should it be but in the Civil Sovereign?* Who can deny now, but that you have taken Care, great Care, for the promoting of Truth and the Christian Religion? But yet it is as hard for me, I confess, and I believe for others, to conceive how you should think to do any Service to Truth and the Christian Religion, by putting a Right into *Mahometans* or Heathens hands to punish Christian Religion; as it was for you *to conceive how the Author should think to do any Service to Truth, and the Christian Religion*, by exempting the Professor of it from Punishment every where; since there are more *Pagan, Mahometan*, and erroneous Princes in the World, than Orthodox; Truth, and the Christian Religion (*taking the World as we find it*) is sure to be more punished and suppress'd, than Error and Falshood.

The Author having endeavour'd to shew that no body at all, of any Rank or Condition, had a Power to punish, torment, or use any Man ill, for Matters of Religion; you
Pag. 17. tell us *you do not yet understand, why Clergymen are not as capable of such Power as other Men.* I do not remember that the Author any where, by excepting Ecclesiasticks more than others, give you any occasion to shew your Concern in this Point. Had he foreseen that this would have touch'd you so nearly, and that you set your Heart so much upon the Clergy's Power of punishing; 'tis like he would have told you, he thought Ecclesiasticks as capable of it as any Man; and that if forwardness and diligence in the exercise of such Power may recommend any to it, Clergymen, in the opinion of the World, stand fairest for it. However, you do well to put in your Claim for them, tho' the Author excludes them no more than their Neighbours. Nay, they must be allow'd the Pretence of the fairest Title. For I never read of any Severities that were to bring Men to Christ, but those of the Law of *Moses*; which is therefore call'd a *Pedagogue.* (*Gal.* 3. 14.) And the next Verse tells us, That *after that Faith is come, we are no longer under a Schoolmaster.* But yet if we are still to be driven to Christ by a Rod, I shall not envy them the Pleasure of wielding it: Only I desire them, when they have got the Scourge into their Hands, to remember our Saviour, and follow his Example, who never us'd it but once; and that they would, like him, employ it only to drive vile and scandalous Traffickers for the things of this World, out of their Church, rather than to drive whoever they can into it. Whether that latter be not a proper Method to make their Church what our Saviour there pronounced of the Temple, they who use it were best look. For in Matters of Religion, none are so easy to be driven, as those who have nothing of Religion at all; and next to them, the Vicious, the Ignorant, the Worldling, and the Hypocrite; who care for no more of Religion but the Name, nor no more of any Church, but its Prosperity and Power; and who, not unlike those describ'd by our Saviour, (*Luke* 20. 47.) for a Shew come to, or cry up the Prayers of the Church, *That they may devour Widows*, and other helpless People's *Houses.* I say not this of the serious Professors of any Church, who are in earnest in Matters of Religion. Such I value, who conscientiously, and out of a sincere Persuasion, embrace any Religion, tho' different from mine, and in a Way, I think, mistaken. But no body can have reason to think otherwise than what I have said, of those who are wrought upon to be of any Church, by secular Hopes and Fears. Those truly *place Trade above all other Considerations*, and merchandize with Religion itself, who regulate their Choice by worldly Profit and Loss.

You endeavour to prove, against the Author, that Civil Society is not instituted only for Civil Ends, *i. e.* The *procuring, preserving, and advancing* Mens Civil Inte-
Pag. 18. rests. Your Words are: *I must say, that our Author does but beg the Question, when he affirms*

affirms that the Common-wealth is conſtituted only for the procuring, preſerving, and advancing of the Civil Intereſts of the Members of it. That Common-wealths are inſtituted for theſe Ends, no Man will deny. But if there be any other Ends beſides theſe, attainable by the Civil Society and Government, there is no reaſon to affirm, That theſe are the only Ends for which they are deſigned. Doubtleſs Common-wealths are inſtituted for the attaining of all the Benefits which Political Government can yield. And therefore, if the Spiritual, and Eternal Intereſts of Men may any way be procured or advanced by Political Government, the procuring and advancing thoſe Intereſts muſt in all reaſon be reckon'd among the Ends of Civil Societies, and ſo, conſequently, fall within the compaſs of the Magiſtrate's Juriſdiction. I have ſet down your Words at large, to let the Reader ſee, That you of all Men had the leaſt reaſon to tell the Author, he does but beg the Queſtion; unleſs you mean to juſtify your ſelf by the Pretence of his Example. You argue thus, *If there be any other Ends attainable by Civil Society, then Civil Intereſts are not the only Ends for which Common-wealths are inſtituted.* And how do you prove there be other Ends? Why thus, *Doubtleſs Common-wealths are inſtituted for the attaining of all the Profits which political Government can yield.* Which is as clear a Demonſtration, as *Doubtleſs* can make it to be. The Queſtion is, Whether Civil Society be inſtituted only for Civil Ends? You ſay No; and your Proof is, Becauſe, *Doubtleſs* it is inſtituted for other Ends. If I now ſay, *Doubtleſs* this is a good Argument; is not every one bound without more ado to admit it for ſuch? If not, *Doubtleſs* you are in Danger to be thought to beg the Queſtion.

But notwithſtanding you ſay here, That the Author begs the Queſtion, in the following Page you tell us, That the *Author offers three Conſiderations which ſeem to him abundantly to demonſtrate, that the Civil Power neither can, nor ought in any manner to be extended to the Salvation of Souls.* He does not then *beg the Queſtion.* For the Queſtion being, *Whether Civil Intereſt be the only End of Civil Society,* he gives this Reaſon for the Negative; *That Civil Power has nothing to do with the Salvation of Souls; and offers three Conſiderations* for the Proof of it. For it will always be a good Conſequence, that if the Civil Power has nothing to do with the Salvation of Souls, *then Civil Intereſt is the only End of Civil Society.* And the reaſon of it is plain; becauſe a Man having no other Intereſt, but either in this World or the World to come; if the End of Civil Society not to a Man's Intereſt in the other World, (all which is comprehended in the Salvation of his Soul) 'tis plain, that the ſole End of Civil Society is Civil Intereſt, under which the Author comprehends the good Things of this World.

And now let us examine the Truth of your main Poſition, viz. *That Civil Society is inſtituted for the attaining all the Benefits that may any way yield.* Which, if true, then this Poſition muſt be true, *viz. That all Societies whatſoever are inſtituted for the attaining all the Benefits that may any way yield*; there being nothing peculiar to Civil Society in the Caſe, why that Society ſhould be *inſtituted for the attaining all the Benefits it can any way yield*, and other Societies not. By which Argument it will follow, That all Societies are inſtituted for one and the ſame End: *i. e.* for the *attaining all the Benefits that they can any way yield.* By which Account there will be no Difference between Church and State; a Common-wealth and Army; or between a Family and the *Eaſt-India* Company; all which have hitherto been thought diſtinct ſorts of Societies, inſtituted for different Ends. If your Hypotheſis hold good, one of the Ends of the Family muſt be to preach the Goſpel, and adminiſter the Sacraments; and one Buſineſs of an Army to teach Languages, and propagate Religion; becauſe theſe are Benefits *ſome way or other attainable* by thoſe Societies: Unleſs you take want of Commiſſion and Authority to be a ſufficient Impediment: And that will be ſo too in other Caſes.

'Tis a Benefit to have true Knowledge and Philoſophy embraced and aſſented to, in any Civil Society or Government. But will you ſay, therefore, that it is a Benefit to the Society, or one of the Ends of Government, that all who are not Peripateticks ſhould be puniſhed, to make Men find out the Truth, and profeſs it. This indeed might be thought a fit Way to make ſome Men embrace the peripatetick Philoſophy, but not a proper Way to find the Truth. For, perhaps peripatetick Philoſophy may not be true; perhaps a great many have not Time, nor Parts to ſtudy it: perhaps a great many who ſtudied it, cannot be convinced of the Truth of it: And therefore it cannot be a Benefit to the Common-wealth, nor one of the Ends of it, that theſe Members of the Society ſhould be diſturb'd and diſeas'd to no Purpoſe, when they are guilty of no Fault. For juſt the ſame Reaſon, it cannot

be a Benefit to Civil Society, that Men ſhould be puniſhed in *Denmark*, for not being *Lutherans*; in *Geneva*, for not being *Calviniſts*; and in *Vienna*, for not being *Papiſts*; as a Means to make them find out the true Religion. For ſo, upon your Grounds, Men muſt be treated in thoſe Places, as well as in *England*, for not being of the *Church* of *England*. And then, I beſeech you, conſider the great Benefit will accrue to Men in Society by this Method; and I ſuppoſe it will be a hard thing for you to prove, That ever Civil-Governments were inſtituted to puniſh Men for not being of this, or that Sect in Religion; however by accident, *indirectly, and at a diſtance*, it may be an Occaſion to one perhaps of a thouſand, or an hundred, to ſtudy that Controverſy, which is all you expect from it. If it be a *Benefit*, pray tell me what *Benefit* it is. A Civil *Benefit* it cannot be. For Mens Civil Intereſts are diſturb'd, injur'd, and impair'd by it. And what *Spiritual* Benefit that can be to any Multitude of Men, to be puniſhed for diſſenting from a falſe or erroneous Profeſſion, I would have you find out: unleſs it be a Spiritual Benefit to be in danger to be driven into a wrong way. For if in all differing Sects, one is in the wrong, 'tis a hundred to one but that from which one diſſents, and is puniſhed for diſſenting from, is the wrong.

I grant it is paſt doubt, That the Nature of Man is ſo covetous of Good, that no one would have excluded from any Action he does, or from any Inſtitution he is concerned in, any manner of Good or Benefit that it might any way yield. And if this be your Meaning, it will not be denied you. But then you ſpeak very improperly, or rather very miſtakenly, if you call ſuch Benefits as may any way (i.e. *indirectly, and at a diſtance*, or by accident) be attain'd by Civil or any other Society, the Ends for which it is inſtituted. Nothing can *in reaſon be reckon'd amongſt the Ends of any Society*, but what may *in reaſon* be ſuppoſed to be deſigned by thoſe who enter into it. Now no body can *in reaſon* ſuppoſe, that any one entred into Civil Society for the *procuring, ſecuring, or advancing* the Salvation of his Soul; when he, for that End, needed not the Force of Civil Society. The *procuring*, therefore, *ſecuring, and advancing* the *Spiritual and Eternal Intereſt of Men, cannot in reaſon be reckon'd amongſt the Ends of Civil Societies*; tho' perhaps it might ſo fall out, that in ſome particular Inſtance, ſome Man's ſpiritual Intereſt might be advanced by your or any other way of *applying Civil Force*. A Nobleman, whoſe Chapel is decayed or fallen, may make uſe of his Dining-room for Praying and Preaching. Yet whatever Benefit were attainable by this uſe of the Room, no body can *in reaſon reckon this amongſt the Ends for which it was built:* no more than the accidental breeding of ſome Bird in any part of it (tho' it were a Benefit it yielded) could *in reaſon* be reckon'd among the Ends of building the Houſe.

But, ſay you, *Doubtleſs Common-wealths are inſtituted for the attaining of all the Benefits which Political Government can yield; and therefore if the Spiritual and Eternal Intereſts of Men may any way be procur'd or advanc'd by Political Government, the procuring and advancing thoſe Intereſts, muſt in all reaſon be recon'd amongſt the Ends of Civil Society, and ſo conſequently fall within the compaſs of the Magiſtrate's Juriſdiction.* Upon the ſame Grounds, I thus reaſon. *Doubtleſs* Churches are inſtituted for the attaining of all the Benefits which Eccleſiaſtical Government can yield: And therefore, if the Temporal and Secular Intereſts of Men may *any way* be procured or advanced by Eccleſiaſtical Polity, the procuring and advancing thoſe Intereſts muſt in all reaſon be reckon'd among the Ends of Religious Societies, and ſo conſequently fall within the compaſs of Churchmens Juriſdiction. The Church of *Rome* has openly made its Advantage of *Secular Intereſts to be procured or advanced, indirectly, and at a diſtance*, and *in ordine ad ſpiritualia*; all which ways (if I miſtake not *Engliſh*) are comprehended under your *any way*. But I do not remember that any of the Reformed Churches have hitherto directly profeſſed it. But there is a Time for all things. And if the Common-wealth once invades the ſpiritual Ends of the Church, by meddling with the Salvation of Souls (which ſhe has always been ſo tender of) who can deny, that the Church ſhould have Liberty to make herſelf ſome Amends by Repriſals?

But, Sir, however you and I may argue from wrong Suppoſitions, yet unleſs the Apoſtle, (*Eph.* 4.) where he reckons up the Church-Officers which Chriſt hath inſtituted in his Church, had told us they were for ſome other Ends than for the *perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Miniſtry, for the edifying of the Body of Chriſt*; the advancing of their ſecular Intereſts will ſcarce be allow'd to be their Buſineſs

ſineſs or *within the compaſs of their Juriſdiction.* Nor till it can be ſhewn that Civil Society is inſtituted for Spiritual Ends, or that the Magiſtrate has Commiſſion to interpoſe his Authority, or uſe Force in Matters of Religion; your Suppoſition of *Spiritual Benefits indirectly and at a diſtance attainable* by Political Government, will never prove the advancing of thoſe Intereſts by Force, to be the Magiſtrate's Buſineſs, and *to fall within the compaſs of his Juriſdiction.* And till then, the Force of the Arguments which the Author has brought againſt it, (in the ſeventh and following Pages of his Letter) will hold good.

Common-wealths, or Civil Societies and Governments, if you will believe the judicious Mr. *Hooker*, are as St. *Peter* calls them (1 *Pet.* 2. 13.) ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, the Contrivance and Inſtitution of Man; and he ſhews there for what End; *viz. for the Puniſhments of evil Doers, and the Praiſe of them that do well.* I do not find any where, that it is for the Puniſhment of thoſe who are not in Church-Communion with the Magiſtrate, to make them ſtudy Controverſies in Religion, or *hearken* to thoſe who will tell them *they have miſtaken there Way, and offer to ſhew them the right one.* You muſt ſhew them ſuch a Commiſſion, if you ſay it is from God. And in all Societies inſtituted by Man, the Ends of them can be no other than what the Inſtitutors appointed; which I am ſure could not be their *Spiritual and Eternal Intereſt.* For they could not ſtipulate about theſe one with another, nor ſubmit this Intereſt to the Power of the Society, or any Sovereign they ſhould ſet over it. There are Nations in the *Weſt-Indies*, which have no other End of their Society, but their mutual Defence againſt their Common Enemies. In theſe, their Captain, or Prince, is ſovereign Commander in time of War; but in time of Peace, neither he nor any body elſe has any Authority over any of the Society. You cannot deny but other, even temporal Ends, are attainable by theſe Common-wealths, if they had been otherwiſe inſtituted and appointed to thoſe Ends. But all your ſaying, *doubtleſs Common-wealths are inſtituted for the attaining of all the Benefits which they can yield*, will not give Authority to any one, or more, in ſuch a Society, by *Political Government or Force*, to procure directly or indirectly other Benefits than that for which it was inſtituted: And therefore, there it *falls not within the compaſs of thoſe Princes Juriſdictions* to puniſh any one of the Society for injuring another; becauſe he has no Commiſſion ſo to do; whatever Reaſon you may think there is, that that ſhould be reckoned amongſt the Ends of their Society.

But to conclude: Your Argument has that Defect in it which turns it upon your ſelf. And that is, that the *procuring and advancing the Spiritual and Eternal Intereſt of Souls*, your way, is not a *Benefit* to the Society: And ſo, upon your own Suppoſition, the *procuring and advancing the Spiritual Intereſt of Souls, any way*, cannot be one of the *Ends of Civil Society*; unleſs the *procuring and advancing the Spiritual Intereſt of Souls*, in a way proper to do more Harm than Good towards the Salvation of Souls, be to be accounted ſuch a *Benefit* as to be one of the Ends of Civil Societies. For that yours is ſuch a way, I have proved already. So that were it hard to prove that Political Government, whoſe only Inſtrument is Force, could no way by *Force*, (however applied) more *advance* than hinder the *Spiritual and Eternal Intereſt* of Men; yet having prov'd againſt your particular new way of *applying Force*, I have ſufficiently vindicated the Author's Doctrine from any thing you have ſaid againſt it. Which is enough for my preſent Purpoſe.

Your next Page tells us, That this reaſoning of the Author, viz. *That the Power* Pag. 19.
of the Magiſtrate cannot be extended to the Salvation of Souls, becauſe the Care of Souls is not committed to the Magiſtrate; is proving the thing by it ſelf. As if you ſhould ſay, when I tell you that you could not extend your Power to meddle with the Money of a young Gentleman you travelled with, as Tutor, becauſe the Care of his Money was not commited to you, were proving the thing by it ſelf. For it is not neceſſary that you ſhould have the Power of his Money; it may be intruſted to a Steward who travels with him; or it may be left to himſelf. If you have it, it is but a delegated Power. And in all delegated Powers, I thought this a fair Proof; you have it not, or cannot uſe it, (which is what the Author means here by *extended to*) becauſe it is not committed to you. In the ſumming up of this Argument, (P. 18.) the Author ſays, *No body therefore, in fine, neither Common-wealths, &c. hath any Title to invade the Civil Rights and worldly Goods of another, upon Pretence of Religion.* Which is an Expoſition of what he means in the begining of the Argument, by *the Magiſtrate's Power cannot be extended to the Salvation of Souls.* So that

if

if we take theſe laſt cited Words equivalent to thoſe in the former Place, his Proof will ſtand thus, *The Magiſtrate has no Title to invade the Civil Right or Worldly Goods of any one, upon Pretence of Religion; becauſe the Care of Souls is not committed to him.* This is the ſame in the Author's Senſe with the former. And whether either this, or that, *be a proving the ſame Thing by it ſelf*, we muſt leave to others to judge.

You quote the Author's Argument, which he brings to prove that the Care of
Pag. 21. Souls is not committed to the Magiſtrate, in theſe Words, *It is not commited to him by God, becauſe it appears not that God has ever given any ſuch Authority to one Man over another, as to compel any one to his Religion.* This, when firſt I read it, I confeſs, I thought a good Argument. But you ſay, *this is quite beſides the Buſineſs*; and the Reaſon you give, is, *For the Authority of the Magiſtrate is not an Authority to compel any one to his Religion, but only an Authority to procure all his Subjects the Means of diſcovering the Way of Salvation, and to procure withal, as much as in him lies, that none remain ignorant of it*, &c. I fear, Sir, you forget your ſelf. The Author was not writing againſt your new Hypotheſis, before it was known in the World. He may be excuſed if he had not the Gift of Prophecy, to argue againſt a Notion which was not yet ſtarted. He had in view only the Laws hitherto made, and the Puniſhments (in Matters of Religion) in uſe in the World. The Penalties, as I take it, are lain on Men for being of different Ways of Religion. Which what is it other, but to *compel* them to relinquiſh their own, and to conform themſelves to that from which they differ? If this be not to *compel them to the Magiſtrate's Religion*, pray tell us what is? This muſt be neceſſarily ſo underſtood; unleſs it can be ſuppoſed that the Law intends not to have that done, which with Penalties it commands to be done: or that Puniſhments are not Compulſion, not that Compulſion the Author complains of. The Law ſays, *Do this and live*; embrace this Doctrine conform to this Way of Worſhip, and be at eaſe, and free; or elſe be fined, impriſoned, baniſhed, burnt. If you can ſhew among the Laws that have been made in *England*, concerning Religion, (and I think I may ſay any where elſe) any one that puniſhes Men for not having *impartially examin'd the Religion they have embrac'd, or refus'd*, I think I may yield you the Cauſe. Law-makers have been generally wiſer than to make Laws that could not be executed: and therefore their Laws were againſt Non-Conformiſts, which could be known; and not for *impartial Examination*, which could not. 'Twas not then *beſides* the Author's *Buſineſs*, to bring an Argument againſt the Perſecutions here in faſhion. He did not know that any one who was ſo free as to acknowledge that the *Magiſtrate has not an Authority to compel any one to his Religion*, and thereby at once (as you have done) give up all the Laws now in force againſt Diſſenters, had yet Rods in ſtore for them, and by a new Trick would bring them under the Laſh of the Law, when the old Pretences were too much exploded to ſerve any longer. Have you never heard of ſuch a thing as the *Religion eſtabliſhed by Law?* Which is, it ſeems, the lawful Religion of a Country, and to be comply'd with as ſuch. There being ſuch Things, ſuch Notions yet in the World, it was not *quite beſides the Author's Buſineſs* to alledge, that *God never gave ſuch Authority to one Man over another, as to compel any one to his Religion.* I will grant, if you pleaſe, *Religion eſtabliſhed by Law* is a pretty odd Way of ſpeaking in the Mouth of a Chriſtian; (and yet it is much in faſhion) as if the Magiſtrate's Authority could add any Force or Sanction to any Religion, whether true or falſe. I am glad to find you have ſo far conſidered *the Magiſtrate's Authority*, that you agree with the Author, that he *hath none to compel Men to his Religion.* Much leſs can he, by any Eſtabliſhment of Law, add any thing to the Truth or Validity of his own, or any Religion whatſoever.

It remains now to examine, whether the Author's Argument will not hold good, even againſt Puniſhments in your Way. For if *the Magiſtrate's Authority* as you
Pag. 21. here ſay, *only to procure all his Subjects*, (mark what you ſay, *ALL HIS SUBJECTS*) *the Means of diſcovering the Way of Salvation, and to procure withal, as much as in him lies, that* NONE *remain ignorant of it, or refuſe to embrace it, either for want of uſing thoſe Means, or by reaſon of any ſuch Prejudices as may render them ineffectual.* If this be the Magiſtrate's Buſineſs, in reference to *ALL HIS SUBJECTS*; I deſire you, or any Man elſe, to tell me how this can be done by the Application of Force only to a Part of them; unleſs you will ſtill vainly ſuppoſe *Ignorance, Negligence, or Prejudice*, only amongſt that Part which any where differs

fers from the Magiſtrate. If thoſe of the Magiſtrate's Church may be *ignorant of the way of Salvation*; If it be poſſible there may be amongſt them, thoſe who *refuſe to embrace it, either for want of uſing thoſe Means, or by reaſon of any ſuch Prejudices as may render them ineffectual*: What, in this caſe, becomes of the *Magiſtrate's Authority to procure all his Subjects the Means of diſcovering the way of Salvation?* Muſt theſe of his Subjects be neglected, and left without the *Means he has Authority to procure them?* Or muſt he uſe Force upon them too? And then, pray, ſhew me how this can be done. Shall the Magiſtrate puniſh thoſe of his own Religion, *to procure them the Means of diſcovering the way of Salvation, and to procure as much as in him lies, that they remain not ignorant of it, or refuſe not to embrace it?* Theſe are ſuch Contradictions in Practice, this is ſuch Condemnation of a Man's own Religion, as no one can expect from the Magiſtrate; and I dare ſay you deſire not of him. And yet this is that he muſt do, *If his Authority be to procure all his Subjects the Means of diſcovering the way to Salvation.* And if it be ſo *needful*, as you ſay it is, that he ſhould uſe it, I am ſure *Force* cannot do that till it be apply'd wider, and Puniſhment be laid upon more than you would have it. For if the *Magiſtrate be by Force to procure, as much as in him lies, that none remain ignorant of the way of Salvation*; muſt he not puniſh all thoſe who are *ignorant of the way of Salvation?* And pray tell me how is this any way practicable, but by ſuppoſing none in the National Church ignorant, and all out of it ignorant of the way of Salvation Which, what is it, but to puniſh Men barely for not being of the Magiſtrate's Religion; The very Thing you deny he has Authority to do? So that *the Magiſtrate having*, by your own Confeſſion, *no Authority* thus to uſe *Force*; and it being otherways impracticable for the *procuring all his Subjects the Means of diſcovering the way of Salvation*; there is an end of *Force*. And ſo *Force* being laid aſide, either as unlawful, or unpracticable, the Author's Argument holds good againſt *Force*, even in your Way of applying it.

But if you ſay, as you do in the foregoing Page, That the Magiſtrate has Authority *to lay ſuch Penalties upon thoſe who refuſe to embrace the Doctrine of the proper Miniſters of Religion, and to ſubmit to their Spiritual Government, as to make them bethink themſelves ſo as not to be alienated from the Truth. (For as for fooliſh Humour, and uncharitable Prejudice*, &c. which are but Words of courſe that oppoſite Parties give one another, as Marks of Diſlike and Preſumption, I omit them, as ſignifying nothing to the Queſtion; being ſuch as will with the ſame Reaſon be retorted by the other Side;) Againſt that alſo the Author's Argument holds, That the Magiſtrate has no ſuch Authority. *1ſt*, Becauſe God never gave the Magiſtrate an Authority to be Judge of Truth for another Man in Matters of Religion: and ſo he cannot be judge whether any Man be *alienated from the Truth or no.* *2dly*, Becauſe the Magiſtrate had never Authority given him to lay any *Penalties on thoſe who refuſe to embrace the Doctrine of the proper Miniſters of his Religion*, (or of any other) *or to ſubmit to their ſpiritual Government*, more than on any other Men. Pag. 20.

To the Author's Argument, that the Magiſtrate cannot receive ſuch Authority from the People; becauſe no Man has Power to leave it to the choice of any other Man to chuſe a Religion for him; you give this pleaſant Anſwer. *As the Power of the Magiſtrate, in reference to Religion, is ordained for the bringing Men to take ſuch care as they ought of their Salvation, that thay may not blindly leave it to the Choice, neither of any other Perſon, nor yet of their own Luſts and Paſſions, to preſcribe to them what Faith or Worſhip they ſhall embrace: So if we ſuppoſe this Power to be veſted in the Magiſtrate by the conſent of the People; this will not import their abandoning the Care of their Salvation, but rather the contrary. For if Men in chuſing their Religion, are ſo generally ſubject, as has been ſhewed, when left wholly to themſelves, to be ſo much ſway'd by Prejudice and Paſſion, as either not at all, or not ſufficiently to regard the Reaſons and Motives which ought alone to determine their Choice; then it is every Man's true Intereſt, not to be left wholly to himſelf in this Matter; but that Care ſhould be taken, that in an Affair of ſo vaſt Concernment to him, he may be brought even againſt his own Inclination, if it cannot be done otherwiſe, (which is ordinarily the Caſe) to act according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment. And then what better Courſe can Men take to provide for this, than by veſting the Power I have deſcribed, in him who bears the Sword?* Wherein I beſeech you conſider; *1ſt*, Whether it be not pleaſant, that you ſay *the Power of the Magiſtrate is ordain'd to bring Men to take ſuch Care*; and thence infer, *Then it is every one's Intereſt to veſt ſuch Power in the Magiſtrate?* For if it be *the Power of the Magiſtrate*, it is his. And what need the People *veſt* it in him, unleſs there be Pag. 22.

need

need, and *it be the beſt Courſe they can take, to veſt a Power in the Magiſtrate*, which he has already? 2dly, Another pleaſant thing you here ſay, is; That *the Power of the Magiſtrates is to bring Men to ſuch a Care of their Salvation, that they may not blindly leave it to the Choice of any Perſon, or their own Luſts or Paſſions, to preſcribe to them what Faith or Worſhip they ſhall embrace*; And yet that 'tis *their beſt Courſe to veſt a Power in the Magiſtrate*, liable to the ſame *Luſts, and Paſſions* as themſelves, to chuſe for them. For if they veſt a Power in the Magiſtrate to puniſh them, when they diſſent from his Religion; *to bring them to act, even againſt their own Inclination, according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment*; which is, (as you explain your ſelf in another place) *to bring them to conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince them*: How far is this from *leaving it to the Choice of another Man to preſcribe to them what Faith or Worſhip they ſhall embrace?* Eſpecially if we conſider, that you think it
Pag. 27. a ſtrange thing, *That the Author would have the Care of every Man's Soul left to himſelf alone.* So that this Care being veſted in the Magiſtrate with a Power *to puniſh Men to make them conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince them* of the Truth of his Religion; the Choice is evidently in the Magiſtrate; as much as it can be in the Power of one Man to chuſe for another what Religion he ſhall be of, which conſiſts only in a Power compelling him by Puniſhments to embrace it.

I do neither you nor the Magiſtrate Injury, when I ſay that the Power you give the Magiſtrate of *puniſhing Men, to make them conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince them*, is to convince them of the Truth of his Religion, and to bring them to it. For Men will never, in his Opinion, *act according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment*, (which is the thing you here ſay Men *ſhould be brought to by the Magiſtrate, even againſt their own Inclination*) till they embrace his Religion. And if you have the Brow of an honeſt Man, you will not ſay the Magiſtrate will ever puniſh you, *to bring you to conſider* any other *Reaſons* and *Arguments*, but ſuch as are *proper to convince* you of the Truth of his Religion, and to bring you to that. Thus you ſhift forwards and backwards. You ſay *The Magiſtrate has no Power to puniſh Men, to compel them to his Religion*; but only *to compel them to conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince them* of the Truth of his Religion, which is all one as to ſay, no body has Power to chuſe your way for you to *Jeruſalem*; but yet the Lord of the Mannor has Power to puniſh you, *to bring you to conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince you.* (Of what?) That the Way he goes in, is the right, and ſo to make you join in Company, and go along with him. So that, in effect, what is all your going about, but to come at laſt to the ſame place again; and put a Power into the Magiſtrate's hands (under another Pretence) to compel Men to his Religion; which uſe of *Force*, the Authority has ſufficiently overthrown, and you your ſelf have quitted. But I am tired to follow you ſo often round the ſame Circle.

You ſpeak of it here as the moſt deplorable Condition imaginable, that Men *ſhould*
Pag. 22. *be left to themſelves, and not be forced to conſider and examine the Grounds of their Religion, and ſearch impartially and diligently after the Truth.* This you make the great Miſcarriage of Mankind. And for this you ſeem ſolicitous, all through your Treatiſe, to find out a Remedy; and there is ſcarce a Leaf wherein you do not offer yours.
Pag. 7. But what if, after all, now you ſhould be found to prevaricate? *Men have contrived to themſelves*, ſay you, *a great variety of Religions*: 'Tis granted. *They ſeek not the Truth in this Matter with that application of Mind, and that freedom of Judgment which is requiſite*: 'Tis confeſſed. *All the falſe Religions now on foot in the World, have taken their Riſe from the ſlight and partial Conſideration, which Men have contented themſelves with, in ſearching after the true; and Men take them up, and perſiſt in them for want of due Examination*: Be it ſo. *There is need of a Remedy for this, and I have found one whoſe Succeſs cannot be queſtioned*: Very well. What is it? Let us hear it. Who, *Diſſenters muſt be puniſhed.* Can any body that hears you ſay ſo, believe you in earneſt; and that want of Examination is the thing you would have amended, when want of Examination is not the thing you would have puniſhed? If want of Examination be the Fault, want of Examination muſt be puniſhed; if you are, as you pretend, fully ſatisfied, that Puniſhment is the proper and *only Means* to remedy it. But if, in all your Treatiſe, you can ſhew me one place, where you ſay That the ignorant, the careleſs, the inconſiderate, the negligent *in examining throughly the Truth of their own and others Religion*, &c. are to be puniſhed; I will allow your Remedy for a good one. But you have not ſaid any thing like this; and which is more, I tell you before-hand, you dare not ſay it. And whilſt you do not, the World has reaſon

to

to judge, that however want of Examination be a general Fault, which you with great Vehemency have exaggerated; yet you uſe it only for a Pretence to puniſh Diſſenters; and either diſtruſt your Remedy, that it will not cure this Evil, or elſe care not to have it generally cur'd. This evidently appears from your whole Management of the Argument. And he that reads your Treatiſe with Attention, will be more confirm'd in this Opinion, when he ſhall find, that you (who are ſo earneſt to have Men puniſh'd, to bring them to *conſider and examine*, that ſo they may *diſcover the Way to Salvation*) have not ſaid one Word of conſidering, ſearching, and heakned to the Scripture; which had been as good a Rule for a Chriſtian to have ſent them to, as to *Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince them*, of you know not what; *As to the Inſtruction and Government of the proper Miniſters of Religion*, which who they are, Men are yet far from being agreed; *Or as to the Information of thoſe, who tell them they have miſtaken their Way, and offer to ſhew them the right*; and to the like uncertain and dangerous Guides; which were not thoſe that our Saviour and the Apoſtles ſent Men to, but to the Scriptures. *Search the Scriptures, for in them you think you have eternal Life*, ſays our Saviour to the unbelieving perſecuting *Jews*, (*John* 5. 39.) And 'tis the Scriptures which St. *Paul* ſays, *are able to make wiſe unto Salvation*, (2 Tim. 3. 15.)

Talk no more, therefore, if you have any Care of your Reputation, how much *it is every Man's Intereſt not to be left to himſelf, without Moleſtation, without Puniſhment in Matters of Religion.* Talk not of *bringing Men to embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, by putting them upon *Examination.* Talk no more of *Force* and *Puniſhment*, as the *only Way left to bring Men to examine.* 'Tis evident you mean nothing leſs. For, tho' want of Examination be the only Fault you complain of, and *Puniſhment* be in your Opinion the *only Way to bring Men to it*; and this the whole Deſign of your Book; yet you have not once propoſed in it, that thoſe, who do not impartially *examine*, ſhould be forced to it. And, that you may not think I talk at random, when I ſay you dare not; I will, if you pleaſe, give you ſome Reaſons for my ſaying ſo.

Firſt, Becauſe, if you propoſe that all ſhould be puniſhed, who are ignorant, who have not uſed *ſuch Conſideration as is apt and proper to manifeſt the Truth*; but *have been determined in the Choice of their Religion by Impreſſions of Education, Admiration of Perſons, worldly Reſpects, Prejudices, and the like incompetent Motives; and have taken up their Religion, without examining it as they ought*; you will propoſe to have ſeveral of your own Church (be it what it will) puniſhed; which would be a Propoſition too apt to offend too many of it, for you to venture on. For whatever need there be of Reformation, every one will not thank you for propoſing ſuch an one as muſt begin at (or at leaſt reach to) the Houſe of God.

Secondly, Becauſe, if you ſhould propoſe that all thoſe who are ignorant, careleſs and negligent in examining, ſhould be puniſhed, you would have little to ſay in this Queſtion of Toleration. For if the Laws of the State were made as they ought to be, equal to all the Subjects, without Diſtinction of Men of different Profeſſions in Religion; and the Faults to be amended by Puniſhments, were impartially puniſhed, in all who are guilty of them; this would immediately produce a perfect Toleration, or ſhew the Uſeleſneſs of Force in Matters of Religion. If therefore you think it ſo neceſſary, as you ſay, for the *promoting of true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, that Men ſhould be puniſhed to make them examine*; do but find a Way to apply Force to all that have not *throughly and impartially examined*, and you have my Conſent. For tho' Force be not the proper Means of promoting Religion; yet there is no better Way to ſhew the Uſeleſneſs of it, than the applying it equally to Miſcarriages, in whomſoever found; and not to diſtinct Parties or Perſuaſions of Men, for the Reformation of them alone, when others are equally faulty.

Thirdly, Becauſe, without being for as large a Toleration as the Author propoſes, you cannot be truly and ſincerely for a *free and impartial Examination.* For whoever examines, muſt have the Liberty to judge, and follow his Judgment; or elſe you put him upon Examination to no Purpoſe. And whether that will not as well lead Men from, as to your Church, is ſo much a Venture, that by your Way of Writing, 'tis evident enough you are loath to hazard it; and if you are of the National Church, 'tis plain your Brethren will not bear with you in the Allowance of ſuch a Liberty. You muſt therefore either change your *Method*; and if the Want of Examination be that great and dangerous Fault you would have corrected, you muſt equally puniſh

all that are equally guilty of any Neglect in this Matter, and then take your *only Means*, your beloved *Force*, and make the beſt of it; or elſe you muſt put off your Mask, and confeſs that you deſign not your Puniſhments to bring Men to *Examination*, but to *Conformity*. For the Fallacy you have uſed is too groſs to paſs upon this Age.

What follows to *pag.* 26. I think I have conſidered ſufficiently already. But there you have found out ſomething worth notice. In this Page, out of abundant Kindneſs, when the Diſſenters have their Heads (without any Cauſe) broken, you pro-

Pag. 26. vide them a Plaiſter. For, ſay you, *If upon ſuch Examination of the Matter*, (*i. e.* brought to it by the Magiſtrate's Puniſhment) *they chance to find, that the Truth does not lie on the Magiſtrate's Side; they have gain'd thus much however, even by the Magiſtrate's miſapplying his Power, that they know better than they did before, where the Truth does lie.* Which is as true, as if you ſhould ſay, Upon Examination I find ſuch an one is out of the Way to *York*; therefore I know better than I did before, that I am in the right. For neither of you may be in the right. This were true indeed, if there were but two Ways in all; a right and a wrong. But where there be an hundred Ways, and but one right; your knowing upon *Examination*, that that which I take is wrong, makes you not know any thing better than before, that yours is the right. But if that be the beſt Reaſon you have for it, 'tis ninety eight to one ſtill againſt you, that you are in the wrong. Beſides, he that has been puniſhed, may have examin'd before, and then you are ſure he gains nothing. However, you think you do well to encourage the Magiſtrate in puniſhing, and comfort the Man who has ſuffer'd unjuſtly, by ſhewing what he ſhall *gain by it*. Whereas, on the contrary, in a Diſcourſe of this Nature, where the Bounds of right and wrong are enquired into, and ſhould be eſtabliſhed, the Magiſtrate was to be ſhew'd the Bounds of his Authority, and warn'd of the Injury he did when he *miſapplies his Power*, and puniſh'd any Man who deſerv'd it not; and not be ſooth'd into Injuſtice, by Conſideration of *Gain* that might thence accrue to the Sufferer. *Shall we do Evil that Good may come of it?* There are a Sort of People who are very wary of touching upon the Magiſtrate's Duty, and tender of ſhewing the Bounds of his Power, and the Injuſtice and ill Conſequences of his *miſapplying it*; at leaſt, ſo long as it is miſapply'd in favour of them, and their Party. I know not whether you are of their Number. But this I am ſure; you have the Misfortune here to fall into their Miſtake. The Magiſtrate, you confeſs, may in this Caſe *miſapply his Power*; and inſtead of repreſenting to him the Injuſtice of it, and the Account he muſt give to his Sovereign, one Day, of this great Truſt put into his Hands, for the equal Protection of all his Subjects: You pretend Advantages which the Sufferer may receive from it: And ſo inſtead of diſheartning from, you give Encouragement to, the Miſchief. Which, upon your Principle, join'd to the natural Thirſt in Man after arbitrary Power, may be carried to all manner of Exorbitancy, with ſome Pretence of Right.

Pag. 15. For thus ſtands your Syſtem. *If Force*, i. e. *Puniſhment, may be any way uſeful for*

Pag. 16. *the promoting the Salvation of Souls, there is a Right ſomewhere to uſe it.* And *this Right* (ſay you) *is in the Magiſtrate.* Who then, upon your Grounds, may quickly find Reaſon, where it ſuits his Inclination, or ſerves his Turn, to puniſh Men directly to bring them to his Religion. For if he may uſe *Force*, becauſe it *may be, indirectly, and at a Diſtance, any way, uſeful towards the Salvation of Souls*, towards the procuring any Degree of Glory; why may he not, by the ſame Rule, uſe it where it may be uſeful, at leaſt *indirectly, and at a Diſtance*, towards the procuring a greater Degree of Glory? For St. *Paul* aſſures us, that *the Afflictions of this Life work for us a far more exceeding Weight of Glory.* So that why ſhould they not be puniſhed, if in the wrong, to bring them into the right Way; If in the right, to make them by their Sufferings *Gainers of a far more exceeding Weight of Glory?* But whatever you ſay of *Puniſhment being lawful, becauſe indirectly, and at a Diſtance it may be uſeful*; I ſuppoſe, upon cooler Thoughts, you will be apt to ſuſpect that, however Sufferings may promote *the Salvation* of thoſe who make a good Uſe of them, and to ſet Men ſurer in the right Way, or higher in a State of Glory; yet thoſe who make Men unduly ſuffer, will have the heavier Account, and greater Weight of Guilt upon them, to ſink them deeper in the Pit of Perdition; and that therefore they ſhould be warn'd to take Care of ſo uſing their Power. Becauſe whoever be *Gainers* by it, they themſelves will (without Repentance and Amendment) be ſure to be Loſers. But by granting that *the Magiſtrate miſapplies his Power*, when he puniſhes thoſe who have the Right on their Side, whether it be to bring them to his own Religi-

on,

on, or whether it be *to bring them to conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince them*, you grant all that the Author contends for. All that he endeavours, is to ſhew the Bounds of Civil Power; and that in puniſhing others for Religion, the Magiſtrate *miſapplies* the Force he has in his Hands, and ſo goes beyond Right, beyond the Limits of his Power. For I do not think the Author of the Letter ſo vain (I am ſure for my part I am not) as to hope by Arguments, though never ſo clear, to reform preſently all the Abuſes in this Matter; eſpecially whilſt Men of Art, and Religion, endeavour ſo induſtriouſly to palliate and diſguiſe, what Truth, yet, ſometimes, unawares forces from them.

Do not think I make a wrong Uſe of your ſaying, *the Magiſtrate miſapplies his Power*, when I ſay you therein grant all that the Author contends for. For if the Magiſtrate *miſapplies*, or makes a wrong Uſe of *his Power*, when he puniſhes in Matters of Religion any one who is in the right, though it be but to make him conſider, (as you grant he does) he alſo *miſapplies*, or makes wrong Uſe of his Power, when he puniſhes any one, whomſoever in Matters of Religion, to make him conſider. For every own is here Judge for himſelf, what is right; and in Matters of Faith, and Religious Worſhip, another cannot judge for him. So that to puniſh any one in Matters of Religion, though it be but to make him conſider, is by your own Confeſſion beyond the Magiſtrate's Power. And that puniſhing in Matters of Religion is beyond the Magiſtrate's Power, is *what the Author contends for.*

You tell us in the following Words, *All the Hurt that comes to them by it, is only the* Pag. 26.
ſuffering ſome tolerable Inconveniences, for their following the Light of their own Reaſon, and the Dictates of their own Conſciences; which certainly is no ſuch Miſchief to Mankind, as to make it more elegible that there ſhould be no ſuch Power veſted in the Magiſtrate, but the Care of every Man's Soul ſhould be left to himſelf alone (as this Author demands it ſhould be;) that is, that every Man ſhould be ſuffer'd, quietly, and without the leaſt Moleſtation, either to take no Care at all of his Soul, if he be ſo pleaſed; or in doing it, to follow his own groundleſs Prejudices, or unaccountable Humour, or any crafty Seducer, whom he may think fit to take for his Guide. Why ſhould not *the Care of every Man's Soul be left to himſelf*, rather than the *Magiſtrate?* Is the *Magiſtrate* like to be more concern'd for it? Is the *Magiſtrate* like to take more Care of it? Is the *Magiſtrate* commonly more careful of his own, than other Men are of theirs? Will you ſay the *Magiſtrate* is leſs expos'd in Matters of Religion, to *Prejudices, Humours, and crafty Seducers*, than other *Men?* If you cannot lay your Hand upon your Heart, and ſay all this, what then will be got by the Change? And *why may not the Care of every Man's Soul be left to himſelf?* Eſpecially, if a Man be in ſo much Danger to miſs the Truth, who is *ſuffer'd quietly, and without the leaſt Moleſtation, either to take no Care of his Soul, if he be ſo pleaſed, or to follow his own Prejudices*, &c. For if want of *Moleſtation* be the dangerous State, wherein Men are likelieſt to miſs the right Way; it muſt be confeſſed, that of all Men, the Magiſtrate is moſt in Danger to be in the wrong, and ſo the unfitteſt (if you take the *Care of Men's Souls from themſelves*) of all Men, to be intruſted with it. For he never meets with that great and only Antidote of yours againſt Error, which you here call *Moleſtation.* He never has the benefit of your ſovereign Remedy, *Puniſhment*, to make him conſider; which you think ſo neceſſary, that you look on it as a moſt dangerous State for Men to be without it; and therefore tell us, *'tis every Man's true* Intereſt, not to be left *wholly to himſelf in Matters of Religion.*

Thus, Sir, I have gone through your whole Treatiſe, and as I think, have omitted nothing in it material. If I have, I doubt not but I ſhall hear of it. And now I refer it to your ſelf, as well as to the Judgment of the World, whether the Author of the Letter, in ſaying no body hath a Right; or you, in ſaying, the Magiſtrate hath a Right to uſe Force in Matters of Religion; has moſt Reaſon. In the mean time, I leave this Requeſt with you: That if ever you write again, about the *Means of bringing Souls to Salvation*, (which certainly is the beſt Deſign any one can employ his Pen in) you would take Care not to prejudice ſo good a Cauſe, by ordering it ſo, as to make it look as if you writ for a Party. I am,

SIR,

May 27, 1690. *Your moſt Humble Servant,*

PHILANTHROPUS.

A

THIRD LETTER

FOR

TOLERATION,

To the AUTHOR of the

THIRD LETTER

CONCERNING

Toleration.

The Reader may be pleaſed to take notice, that

L. 1. Stands for the Letter concerning Toleration.

A. For the Argument of the Letter concerning Toleration briefly conſider'd and anſwer'd.

L. 2. The Second Letter concerning Toleration.

Pag. The Pages of the Third Letter concerning Toleration.

A THIRD LETTER FOR TOLERATION.

CHAP. I.

SIR,

THE Buſineſs which your Letter concerning Toleration found me ingaged in, has taken up ſo much of the Time my Health would allow me ever ſince, that I doubt whether I ſhould now at all have troubled you or the World with an Anſwer, had not ſome of my Friends, ſufficiently ſatisfied of the Weakneſs of your Arguments, with repeated Inſtances, perſuaded me it might of Uſe to Truth in a Point of ſo great Moment, to clear it from thoſe Fallacies which might perhaps puzzle ſome unwary Readers; and therefore prevailed on me to ſhew the wrong Grounds and miſtaken Reaſonings you make uſe of to ſupport your new Way of *Perſecution*. Parden me, Sir, that I uſe that Name, which you are ſo much offended at: For if Puniſhment be Puniſhment, though it come ſhort of the Diſcipline of Fire and Faggot, 'tis as certain that Puniſhment for Religion is truly Perſecution, though it be only ſuch Puniſhment as you in your Clemency think fit to call *moderate and convenient Penalties*. But however you pleaſe to call them, I doubt not but to let you ſee, that if you will be true to your own Principles, and ſtand to what you have ſaid, you muſt carry your *ſome Degrees of Force* (as you phraſe it) to all thoſe Degrees which in Words you declare againſt.

You have indeed in this laſt Letter of yours, altered the Queſtion; for *pag. 26.* you tell me the Queſtion between us, is, *Whether the Magiſtrate hath any Right to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion?* Whereas you your ſelf own the Queſtion to be, *Whether the Magiſtrate has a Right to uſe Force in Matters of Religion?* Whether this Pag. 76. Alteration be at all to the Advantage of Truth, or your Cauſe, we ſhall ſee. But hence you take Occaſion all along to lay load on me for charging you with the Abſurdities of a Power in the Magiſtrates to puniſh Men, to bring them to their Religion: Whereas you here tell us they have a Right to uſe Force *only to bring Men to the true*. But whether I were more to blame to ſuppoſe you to talk coherently and mean Senſe, or you in expreſſing your ſelf ſo doubtfully and uncertainly, where you were concerned to be plain and direct, I ſhall leave to our Readers to judge; only here in the Beginning I ſhall endeavour to clear my ſelf of that Imputation, I ſo often meet with, of charging on you Conſequences you do not own, and arguing againſt an Opinion that is not yours, in thoſe Places, where I ſhew how little Advantage it would be to Truth, or the Salvation of Men's Souls, that all Magiſtrates ſhould have a Right to uſe Force to bring Men to imbrace their Religion. This I ſhall do by proving, that if upon your Grounds the Magiſtrate, as you pretend, be obliged to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion, it will neceſſarily follow, that every

Magiſtrate,

Magiſtrate, who believes his Religion to be true, is obliged to uſe Force to bring Men to his.

Pag. 31. You tell us, *That by the Law of Nature the Magiſtrate is inveſted with coactive Power, and obliged to uſe it for all the good Purpoſes which it might ſerve, and for which it ſhould be found needful, even for the reſtraining of falſe and corrupt Religion:* And that it is the Pag. 31. Magiſtrate's *Duty*, to which he is *commiſſioned by the Law of Nature, but the Scripture does not properly give it him.*

I ſuppoſe you will grant me, that any thing laid upon the Magiſtrate as a Duty, is ſome Way or other practicable. Now the *Magiſtrate being obliged* to uſe Force in Matters of Religion, but yet ſo as to bring Men only to the true Religion, he will not be in any Capacity to perform this Part of his Duty, unleſs the Religion he is thus to *promote*, be what he can certainly know, or elſe what it is ſufficient for him to believe to be the true: Either his Knowledge or his Opinion muſt point out that Religion to him, which he is by *Force* to *promote*; or elſe he may promiſcuouſly and indifferently promote any Religion, and puniſh Men at a Venture, to bring them from that they are in, to any other. This laſt I think no body has been ſo wild as to ſay.

If therefore it muſt be either his Knowledge or his Perſuaſion that muſt guide the Magiſtrate herein, and keep him within the Bounds of his Duty; if the Magiſtrates of the World cannot know, certainly know the true Religion to be the true Religion; but it be of a Nature to exerciſe their Faith, (for where Viſion, Knowledge and Certainty is, there Faith is done away) then that which gives them the laſt Determination herein, muſt be their own Belief, their own Perſuaſion.

To you and me the Chriſtian Religion is the true, and that is built (to mention no other Articles of it) on this, that Jeſus Chriſt was put to death at *Jeruſalem*, and roſe again from the Dead. Now do you or I know this, (I do not ask with what Aſſurance we believe it, for that in the higheſt Degree not being Knowledge, is not what we now inquire after) Can any Magiſtrate demonſtrate to himſelf (and if he can to himſelf, he does ill not to do it to others) not only all the Articles of his Church, but the fundamental Ones of the Chriſtian Religion? For whatever is not capable of Demonſtration (as ſuch remote Matters of Fact are not) is not, unleſs it be ſelf-evident, capable to produce Knowledge, how well grounded and great ſoever the Aſſurance of Faith may be wherewith it is received; but Faith it is ſtill, and not Knowledge; Perſuaſion, and not Certainty. This is the higheſt the Nature of the Thing will permit us to go in Matters of revealed Religion, which are therefore called Matters of Faith: A Perſuaſion of our own Minds, ſhort of Knowledge, is the laſt Reſult that determines us in ſuch Truths. 'Tis all God requires in the Goſpel for Men to be ſaved: and 'twould be ſtrange if there were more requir'd of the Magiſtrate for the Direction of another in the Way to Salvation, than is required of him for his own Salvation. Knowledge then, properly ſo called, not being to be had of the Truths neceſſary to Salvation, the Magiſtrate muſt be content with Faith and Perſuaſion for the Rule of that Truth he will recommend and inforce upon others; as well as of that whereon he will venture his own eternal Condition. If therefore it be the Magiſtrates Duty to *uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion.* it can be only to that Religion which he believes to be true: So that if Force be at all to be uſed by the Magiſtrate in Matters of Religion, it can only be for the *promoting* that Religion which he only believes to be true, or none at all. I grant that a ſtrong Aſſurance of any Truth ſettled upon prevalent and well-grounded Arguments of Probability, is often called Knowledge in popular Ways of talking: But being here to diſtinguiſh between Knowledge and Belief, to what Degrees of Confidence ſoever raiſed, their Boundaries muſt be kept, and their Names not confounded. I know not what greater Pledge a Man can give of a full Perſuaſion of the Truth of any thing, than his venturing his Soul upon it, as he does, who ſincerely imbraces any Religion, and receives it for true. But to what Degree ſoever of Aſſurance his Faith may riſe, it ſtill comes ſhort of Knowledge. Nor can one now, I think, arrive to greater Evidence of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, than the firſt Converts in the Time of our Saviour and the Apoſtles had; of whom yet nothing more was required but to believe.

But ſuppoſing all the Truths of the Chriſtian Religion neceſſary to Salvation could be ſo known to the Magiſtrate, that in his Uſe of Force for the bringing Men to embrace theſe, he could be guided by infallible Certainty; yet I fear this would not ſerve your Turn, nor authorize the Magiſtrate to uſe Force to bring Men in *England*,

or

or any where elſe, into the Communion of the National Church, in which Ceremonies of human Inſtitution were impoſed, which could not be known, nor (being confeſſed things in their own Nature indifferent) ſo much as thought neceſſary to Salvation.

But of this I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak in another Place: all the Uſe I make of it here, is to ſhew, that the Croſs in Baptiſm, kneeling at the Sacrament, and ſuch like things, being impoſſible to be known neceſſary to Salvation, a certain Knowledge of the Truth of the Articles of Faith of any Church, could not authorize the Magiſtrate to compel Men to embrace the Communion of that Church, wherein any thing were made neceſſary to Communion, which he did not know was neceſſary to Salvation.

By what has been already ſaid, I ſuppoſe it is evident, that if the Magiſtrate be to uſe Force only for promoting *the true Religion*, he can have no other Guide but his own Perſuaſion of what is *the true Religion*, and muſt be led by that in his Uſe of Force, or elſe not uſe it all in Matters of Religion. If you take the latter of theſe Conſequences you and I are agreed: if the former, you muſt allow all Magiſtrates, of whatſoever Religion, the Uſe Force to bring Men to theirs, and ſo be involved in all thoſe ill Conſequences which you cannot it ſeems admit, and hoped to decline by your uſeleſs Diſtinction of Force to be uſed, not for any, but for the true Religion.

'Tis the Duty, you ſay, *of the Magiſtrate to uſe Force for promoting the true Religion.* And in ſeveral places you tell us, he is *obliged* to it. Perſuade Magiſtrates in general of this, and then tell me how any Magiſtrate ſhall be reſtrained from the Uſe of Force, for the promoting what he thinks to be the true? For he being perſuaded that it is his Duty to uſe Force to promote the true Religion, and being alſo perſuaded his is the true Religion, What ſhall ſtop his Hand? Muſt he forbear the Uſe of Force till he be got beyond believing, into a certain Knowledge that all he requires Men to embrace, is neceſſary to Salvation? If that be it you will ſtand to, you have my Conſent, and I think there will be no need of any other Toleration. But if the believing his Religion to be the true, be ſufficient for the Magiſtrate to uſe Force for the promoting of it, will it be ſo only to the Magiſtrates of the Religion that you profeſs? And muſt all other Magiſtrates ſit ſtill, and not do their Duty till they have your Permiſſion? If it be your Magiſtrate's Duty to uſe Force for the promoting the Religion he believes to be the true, it will be every Magiſtrate's Duty to uſe Force for the promoting what he believes to be the true, and he ſins if he does not receive and promote it as if it were true. If you will not take this upon my Word, yet I deſire you to do it upon the ſtrong Reaſon of a very judicious and reverend Prelate of the preſent Church of *England*, *In a Diſcourſe concerning Conſcience*, printed in 4to, 87. *p.* 18. You will find theſe following Words, and much more to this Purpoſe: *Where a Man is miſtaken in his Judgment, even in that Caſe it is always a Sin to act againſt it. Though we ſhould take that for a Duty which is really a Sin, yet ſo long as we are thus perſuaded, it will be highly Criminal in us to act in Contradiction to this Perſuaſion: and the Reaſon of this is evident, becauſe by ſo doing, we wilfully act againſt the beſt Light which at preſent we have for the Direction of our Actions. So that when all is done, the immediate Guide of our Actions can be nothing but our Conſcience, our Judgment and Perſuaſion. If a Man, for Inſtance, ſhould of a Jew become a Chriſtian, whilſt yet in his Heart he believed that the Meſſiah is not yet come, and that our Lord Jeſus was an Impoſtor: Or if a Papiſt ſhould renounce the Communion of the Roman Church, and join with ours, whilſt yet he is perſuaded that the Roman Church is the only Catholick Church, and that our Reformed Churches are Heretical or Schiſmatical; though now there is none of us that will deny that the Men in both theſe Caſes have made a good Change, as having changed a falſe Religion for a true one, yet for all that I dare ſay we ſhould all agree they were both of them great Villians for making that Change, becauſe they made it not upon honeſt Principles, and in Purſuance of their Judgment, but in direct Contradiction to both.* So that it being the *Magiſtrate's Duty to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion*; and he being perſuaded his is the true, I ſuppoſe you will no longer queſtion but that he is as much *obliged to uſe Force to bring Men to it*, as if it were the true. And then, Sir, I hope you have too much Reſpect for Magiſtrates, not to allow them to believe the Religions to be true which they profeſs. Theſe things put together, I deſire you to conſider whether *if Magiſtrates are obliged to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion*, every Magiſtrate is not oblig'd to uſe Force to bring Men to that Religion he believes to be true?

This being ſo, I hope I have not argued ſo wholly beſides the Purpoſe, as you all through your Letter accuſe me, for charging on your Doctrine all the ill Conſequences, all the Prejudice it would be to the true Religion, that Magiſtrates ſhould have Power, to uſe Force to bring Men to their Religions: And I preſume you will think your ſelf concerned to give to all theſe Places in the *firſt and ſecond Letter con-*
Pag. 24. *cerning Toleration*, which ſhew the Inconveniences and Abſurdities of ſuch an Uſe of Force, ſome other Anſwer, than that you *are for puniſhing only ſuch as reject the true Religion. That 'tis plain the Force you ſpeak of is not Force*, my *Way applied*, i. e. *applied to the true promoting the true Religion only, but to the promoting all the National Religions in*
Pag. 29. *the World.* And again, to my arguing that Force your Way applied, if it can propagate any Religion, it is likelier to be the falſe than the true, becauſe few of the Magiſtrates of the World are in the right Way. You reply, This *would have been to the Purpoſe, if* you *had aſſerted that every Magiſtrate may uſe Force* your *indirect Way (or any Way) to bring Men to his own Religion, whatever it be. But if* you aſſerted *no ſuch thing,*
Pag. 27. *(as no Man* you *think but an Atheiſt will aſſert it) then this is quite beſides the Buſineſs.* This is the great Strength of your Anſwer, and your Refuge almoſt in every Page. So that I preſume it reaſonable to expect that you ſhould clearly and directly anſwer what I have here ſaid, or elſe find ſome other Anſwer than what you have done to the *ſecond Letter concerning Toleration.* However acute you are in your Way in ſeveral Places on this Occaſion, as *p.* 11, 12. for my Anſwer to which I ſhall refer you to another Place.

To my Argument againſt Force, from the Magiſtrate's being as liable to Error as
Pag. 15. the reſt of Mankind, you anſwer, That *I might have conſidered that this Argument concerns none but thoſe who aſſert that every Magiſtrate has a Right to uſe Force to promote his own Religion, whatever it be, which* you *think no Man that has any Religion will aſſert.* I ſuppoſe you may think now this anſwer will ſcarce ſerve, and you muſt aſſert either no Magiſtrate to have Right to promote his Religion by Force, or elſe be involv'd in the Condemnation you paſs on thoſe who aſſert it of all Magiſtrates. And here I think, as to the Deciſion of the Queſtion betwixt us, I might leave this Matter: but there being in your Letter a great many other groſs Miſtakes, wrong Suppoſitions, and fallacious Arguings, which in thoſe general and plauſible Terms you have made uſe of in ſeveral Places, as beſt ſerved your Turn, may poſſibly have impoſed on your ſelf, as well as they are fitted to do ſo on others, and therefore will deſerve to have ſome Notice taken of them; I ſhall give my ſelf the Trouble of examining your Letter a little farther.

To my ſaying, " It is not for the Magiſtrate, upon an Imagination of its Uſefulneſs, to make uſe of any other Means than what the Author and Finiſher of our
Pag. 31. " Faith had directed; you reply, *Which how true ſoever, is not, I think, very much to the Purpoſe. For if the Magiſtrate does only aſſiſt that Miniſtry which our Lord has appointed, by uſing ſo much of his coactive Power for the Furthering their Service, as common Experience diſcovers to be uſeful and neceſſary for that End; there is no manner of Ground to ſay, that* " upon an Imagination of its Uſefulneſs, *he makes uſe* of any other Means " for the Salvation of Men's Souls, than what the Author and Finiſher of our Faith " has directed. *'Tis true indeed,* the Author and Finiſher of our Faith *has given the Magiſtrate no new Power or Commiſſion, nor was there any Need that he ſhould, (if himſelf had had any Temporal Power to give:) for he found him already, even by the Law of Nature,* the Miniſter of God to the People for Good, and bearing the Sword not in vain, *i. e. veſted with coactive Power, and obliged to uſe it for all the good Purpoſes which it might ſerve, and for which it ſhould be found needful; even for the Reſtraining of falſe and corrupt Religion; as* Job *long before (perhaps before any Part of the Scriptures were written) acknowledged, when he ſaid, that the Worſhipping the* Sun *or the* Moon, *was* an Iniquity to be puniſhed by the Judge. *But though our Saviour has given the Magiſtrates no new Power, yet being* King of Kings, *he expects and requires that they ſhould ſubmit themſelves to his Scepter, and uſe the Power which always belonged to them, for his Service, and for the advancing his Spiritual Kingdom in the World. And even that* Charity *which our great Maſter ſo earneſtly recommends, and ſo ſtrictly requires of all his Diſciples, as it obliges all Men to ſeek and promote the Good of others, as well as their own, eſpecially their Spiritual and Eternal Good, by ſuch Means as their ſeveral Places and Relations enable them to uſe; ſo does it eſpecially oblige the Magiſtrate to do it as a* Magiſtrate, i. e. *by that Power which enables him to do it above the Rate of other Men.*

So

So far therefore is the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, when he gives his helping Hand to the Furtherance of the Goſpel, by laying convenient Penalties upon ſuch as reject it, or any part of it from uſing any other Means *for the Salvation of Mens Souls*, than what the Author and Finiſher of our Faith has directed, *that he does no more than his Duty to God, to his Redeemer, and to his Subjects, requires of him.*

The Sum of your Reply amounts to this, that *by the Law of Nature* the Magiſtrate may make uſe of his coactive Power where it is *uſeful* and *neceſſary* for the Good of the People. If it be from the *Law of Nature*, it muſt be to all Magiſtrates equally: And then I ask whether this Good they are to promote without any *new Power or Commiſſion* from our Saviour, be what they think to be ſo, or what they certainly know to be ſo. If it be what they think to be ſo, then all Magiſtrates may uſe Force to bring Men to their Religion: And what Good this is like to be to Men, or of what Uſe to the true Religion, we have elſewhere conſidered. If it be only that Good which they certainly know it to be ſo, they will be very ill enabled to do what you require of them, which you here tell us is *to aſſiſt that Miniſtry which our Lord has appointed.* Which of the Magiſtrates of your Time did you know to have ſo well ſtudied the Controverſies about Ordination and Church-Government, to be ſo well verſed in Church-Hiſtory and Succeſſion, that you can undertake that he certainly knew which was *the Miniſtry which our Lord had appointed*, either that of *Rome*, or that of *Sweden*, whether the Epiſcopacy in one Part of this Iſland, or the Presbytery in another, were *the Miniſtry which our Lord had appointed?* If you ſay, being firmly perſuaded of it, be ſufficient to authorize the Magiſtrate to uſe Force; you with the *Atheiſts*, as you call them, *who do ſo*, give the People up in every Country to the coactive Force of the Magiſtrate to be employ'd for the *aſſiſting the Miniſters* of his Religion: And King *Lewis* of good Right comes in with his Dragoons; for 'tis not much doubted that he as ſtrongly believ'd his Popiſh Prieſts and Jeſuits to be *the Miniſtry which our Lord appointed*, as either King *Charles* or King *James* the Second believed that of the Church of *England* to be ſo. And of what Uſe ſuch an Exerciſe of the coactive Power of all Magiſtrates, is to the People, or to the true Religion, you are concerned to ſhew. But 'tis (you know) but to tell me, *I only trifle*, and this is all anſwered.

What in other Places you tell us, is to make Men *hear*, *conſider*, *ſtudy*, *embrace*, and *bring Men to the true Religion*, you here do very well to tell us is to *aſſiſt the Miniſtry*: And to that 'tis true, *common Experience diſcovers the Magiſtrate's coactive Force to be uſeful and neceſſary, viz.* to thoſe who taking the Reward, but not over-buſying themſelves in the Care of Souls, find it for their Eaſe, that the Magiſtrate's coactive Power ſhould ſupply their want of Paſtoral Care, and be made uſe of to bring thoſe into an outward Conformity to the National Church, whom either for want of Ability, they cannot, or want of due and friendly Application, join'd with an exemplary Life, they never ſo much as endeavoured to prevail on heartily to embrace it. That there may be ſuch Neglects in the beſt-conſtitued National Church in the World, the Complaints of every knowing Biſhop of our Church, in a late *Diſcourſe of the* PASTORAL CARE, is too plain an Evidence.

Without ſo great an Authority I ſhould ſcarce have ventured (though it lay juſt in my Way) to have taken notice of what is ſo viſible, that it is in every one's Mouth, for fear you ſhould have told me again, that *I made my ſelf an Occaſion to ſhew my good Will toward the Clergy.* For you will not, I ſuppoſe, ſuſpect that eminent Prelate to have any ill Will to them.

If this were not ſo, that ſome were negligent, I imagine the Preachers of the true Religion (which lies, as you tell us, ſo *obvious* and *expoſed*, as to be eaſily diſtinguiſh'd from the falſe) would need or deſire no other Aſſiſtance from the *Magiſtrate's coactive Power*, but what ſhould be directed againſt the Irregularity of Mens Lives; *their Luſts* being that alone, as you tell us, that makes Force neceſſary to aſſiſt the true Religion; which, were it not for our depraved Nature, would by its Light and Reaſonableneſs have the Advantage againſt all falſe Religions.

You tell us too, That the Magiſtrate may impoſe *Creeds* and *Ceremonies*; indeed Pag. 13.
you ſay *ſound Creeds*, and *decent Ceremonies*, but that helps not your Cauſe: For who muſt be Judge of that *ſound*, and that *decent?* If the Impoſer, then thoſe Words ſignify nothing at all, but that the Magiſtrate may impoſe thoſe Creeds and Ceremonies which he thinks *ſound and decent*, which is in effect ſuch as he thinks fit. Indeed you telling us a little above, in the ſame Page, that it is a *Vice not to wor-*

ſhip God in Ways preſcribed by thoſe to whom God has left the Ordering of ſuch Matters; you ſeem to make others Judges of what is *ſound* and *decent*, and the Magiſtrate but the Executioner of their Decrees, with the *Aſſiſtance* of his *coactive Power*. A pretty Foundation to eſtabliſh *Creeds* and *Ceremonies* on, that God has left the *Ordering* of them to thoſe who cannot *impoſe* them, and the *Impoſing* of them to thoſe who cannot *order* them. But ſtill the ſame Difficulty returns; for after they have *preſcribed*, muſt the Magiſtrate judge them to be *ſound* and *decent*, or muſt he impoſe them, tho' he judge them not *ſound* or *decent*? If he muſt judge them ſo himſelf, we are but where we were: If he muſt impoſe them when preſcribed, though he judge them not *ſound* nor *decent*, 'tis a pretty ſort of Drudgery is put on the Magiſtrate. And how far is this ſhort of implicite Faith? But he muſt not judge what is *ſound* and *decent*, he muſt judge at leaſt who *are thoſe to whom God das left the Ordering of ſuch Matters*; and then the King of *France* is ready again with his Dragoons for the *ſound* Doctrine, and *decent Ceremonies* of his Preſcribers in the Council of *Trent*, and that upon this Ground, with as good Right as any other has for the Preſcriptions of any others. Do not miſtake me again, Sir; I do not ſay, he judges as right; but I do ſay, that whilſt he judges the Council of *Trent*, or the Clergy of *Rome* to be thoſe to *whom God has left the Ordering of thoſe Matters*, he has as much Right to follow their Decrees, as any other to follow the Judgment of any other Set of mortal Men whom he believes to be ſo.

But whoever is to be Judge of what is *ſound* or *decent* in the Caſe, I ask,

Of what *Uſe* and *Neceſſity* is it to impoſe Creeds and Ceremonies? For that *Uſe* and *Neceſſity* is all the Commiſſion you can find the Magiſtrate hath to uſe his coactive Power to impoſe them.

1. Of what Uſe and Neceſſity is it among Chriſtians that own the Scripture to be the Word of God and Rule of Faith, to make and impoſe a Creed? What Commiſſion for this hath the Magiſtrate from the Law of Nature? God hath given a Revelation that contains in it all Things neceſſary to Salvation, and of this his People are all perſuaded. What Neceſſity now is there? How does their Good require it, that the Magiſtrate ſhould ſingle out, as he thinks fit, any Number of thoſe Truths as more neceſſary to Salvation than the reſt, if God himſelf has not done it?

2. But next, are theſe Creeds in the Words of the Scripture, or not? If they are, they are certainly *ſound*, as containing nothing but Truth in them: And ſo they were before, as they lay in the Scripture. But thus though they contain nothing but ſound Truths, yet they may be imperfect, and ſo *unſound* Rules of Faith, ſince they may require more or leſs than God requires to be believed as neceſſary to Salvation. For what greater Neceſſity, I pray, is there that a Man ſhould believe that Chriſt ſuffered under *Pontius Pilate*, than that he was born at *Bethlehem* of *Judah*? Both are certainly true, and no Chriſtian doubts of either: But how comes one to be made an Article of Faith, and impoſed by the Magiſtrate as neceſſary to Salvation, (for otherwiſe there can be no Neceſſity of Impoſition) and the other not?

Do not miſtake me here, as if I would lay by that Summary of the Chriſtian Religion, which is contained in that which is called the Apoſtle's Creed; which tho' no body, who examines the Matter, will have Reaſon to conclude of the Apoſtles compiling, yet is certainly of reverend Antiquity, and ought ſtill to be preſerved in the Church. I mention it not to argue againſt it, but againſt your Impoſition, and to ſhew that even that Creed, though of that Antiquity, though it contain in it all the *Credenda* neceſſary to Salvation, cannot yet upon your Principles be impoſed by the *coercive Power of the Magiſtrate*, who even by the Commiſſion you have found out for him, can uſe his Force for nothing but what is abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation.

But if the Creed to be impoſed be not in the Words of Divine Revelation; then it is in plainer, more clear and intelligible Expreſſions, or not: If no plainer, what Neceſſity of changing thoſe, which Men inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt made uſe of? If you ſay, they are plainer; then they explain and determine the Senſe of ſome obſcure and dubious Places of Scripture, which Explication not being of Divine Revelation; though *ſound* to one Man, may be *unſound* to another, and cannot be impoſed as Truths neceſſary to Salvation. Beſides that, this deſtroys what you tell
Pag. 29. us of the *Obviouſneſs* of all Truths neceſſary to Salvation.

And

And as to Rites and Ceremonies, are there any neceſſary to Salvation, which Chriſt has not inſtituted? If not, how can the Magiſtrate impoſe them? What Commiſſion has he from the Care he ought to have *for the Salvation of Mens Souls*, to uſe his *coactive* Force for the Eſtabliſhment of any new ones which our Lord and Saviour (with due Reverence be it ſpoken) had forgotten? He inſtituted two Rites in his Church; can any one add any new one to them? Chriſt commanded ſimply to baptize in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt; but the ſigning of the Croſs, how came that neceſſary? *Human Authority which is neceſſary to aſſiſt the Truth againſt the Corruption of human Nature*, has made it ſo. But 'tis a *decent* Ceremony. I ask, is it ſo decent that the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, ſimply, as our Saviour inſtituted, would be indecent without it? If not, then there is no Reaſon to impoſe it for *Decency*'s ſake; for there can be no Reaſon to alter or add any thing to the Inſtitution of Chriſt, or introduce any Ceremony or Circumſtance into Religion for Decency, where the Action would be *decent* without it. The Command to do *all things decently, and in Order*, gave no Authority to add to Chriſt's Inſtitution any new Ceremony, it only preſcribed the Manner how, what was neceſſary to be done in the Congregation, ſhould be there done, *viz.* after ſuch a Manner, that if it were omitted, there would appear ſome Indecency, whereof the Congregation or collective Body was to be Judge, for to them that Rule was given: And if that Rule go beyond what I have ſaid, and gives Power to Men to introduce into Religious Worſhip whatever they ſhall think decent, and impoſe the Uſe of it; I do not ſee how the greateſt Part of the infinite Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome* could be complained of, or refuſed, if introduced into another Church, and there impoſed by the Magiſtrate. But if ſuch a Power were given to the Magiſtrate, that whatever he thought a *decent Ceremony*, he might *de novo* impoſe, he would need ſome expreſs Commiſſion from God in Scripture, ſince the Commiſſion you ſay he has from the Law of Nature, will never give him a Power to inſtitute new Ceremonies in the Chriſtian Religion, which, be they *decent*, or what they will, can never be neceſſary to Salvation.

The Goſpel was to be preached in their Aſſemblies; the Rule then was, that the Habit, Geſture, Voice, Language, *&c.* of the Preacher (for theſe were neceſſary Circumſtances of the Action) ſhould have nothing ridiculous or indecent in it. The Praiſes of God were to be ſung; it muſt be then in ſuch Poſtures and Tunes as became the Solemnity of that Action. And ſo a Convert was to be baptized, Chriſt inſtituted the eſſential Part of that Action, which was waſhing with Water in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt; in which Care was alſo to be had, that in the doing this nothing ſhould be omitted that preſerved a Decency in all the Circumſtances of the Action. But no body will ſay, that if the Croſs were omitted, that upon that Account there would be any thing indecent in Baptiſm.

What is to be done in the Aſſemblies of Chriſtians, for the Salvation of Souls, is ſufficiently preſcribed in Scripture: But ſince the Circumſtances of the Actions were ſo various, and might in ſeveral Countries and Ages have different Appearances (as that appears decent in one Country which is quite contrary in another) concerning them there could be no other Rule given than what is, *viz. decently, in Order*, and *to Edification*; and in avoiding Indecencies, and not adding any new Ceremonies, (how decent ſoever) this Rule conſiſts.

I judge no Man in the Uſe of the Croſs in Baptiſm. The Impoſition of that, or any other Ceremony not inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf, is what I argue againſt, and ſay, is more than you upon your Principles can make good.

Common Senſe has ſatisfied all Mankind, that it is above their Reach to determine what Things in their own Nature indifferent, were fit to be made uſe of in Religion, and would be acceptable to the ſuperior Beings in their Worſhip, and therefore they have every where thought it neceſſary to derive that Knowledge from the immediate Will and Dictates of the Gods themſelves, and have taught that their Forms of Religion, and outward Modes of Worſhip were founded upon Revelation, no body daring to do ſo abſurd and inſolent a thing, as to take upon him to preſume with himſelf, or to preſcribe to others by his own Authority which ſhould in theſe indifferent and mean Things be worthy of the Deity, and make an acceptable Part of his Worſhip. Indeed they all agreed in the Duties of natural Religion, and we find them by common Conſent owning that Piety and Virtue, that clean Hands, and a pure Heart not polluted with the Breaches of the Law of Nature was the beſt Worſhip of the Gods.

Reaſon

Reaſon diſcovered to them that a good Life was the moſt acceptable thing to the Deity; this the common Light of Nature put paſt Doubt. But for their Ceremonies and outward Performances, for them they appeal always to a Rule received from the immediate Direction of the ſuperior Powers themſelves, there they made uſe, and had need of Revelation. A plain Confeſſion of Mankind that in theſe Things we have neither Knowledge to diſcern, nor Authority to preſcribe: That Men cannot by their own Skill find out what is fit, or by their own Power make any thing worthy to be a Part of religious Worſhip. 'Tis not for them to invent and impoſe Ceremonies that ſhall recommend Men to the Deity. 'Twas ſo obvious and viſible, that it became Men to have Leave from God himſelf, before they dared to offer to the divine Majeſty any of theſe trifling, mean, and to him uſeleſs Things, as a grateful and valuable Part of his Worſhip, that no body any where amongſt the various and ſtrange Religions they lead Men into, bid ſuch open Defiance to common Senſe, and the Reaſon of all Mankind, as to preſume to do it without vouching the Appointment of God himſelf. *Plato*, who of all the Heathens, ſeems to have had the moſt ſerious Thoughts about Religion, ſays that the Magiſtrate, or whoever has any Senſe, will never introduce of his own head any new Rites into his Religion, for which he gives this convincing Reaſon; *for*, ſays he, *he muſt know it is impoſſible for human Nature to know any thing certainly concerning theſe Matters*. Epinom. poſt medium. It cannot therefore but be Matter of Aſtoniſhment, that any who call themſelves *Chriſtians*, who have ſo ſure, and ſo full a Revelation, which declares all the Counſel of God concerning the Way of attaining eternal Salvation, ſhould dare by their own Authority to add any thing to what is therein preſcribed, and impoſe it on others as a neceſſary Part of religious Worſhip, without the Obſervance of which human Inventions, Men ſhall not be permitted the publick Worſhip of God. If thoſe Rites and Ceremonies preſcribed to the *Jews* by God himſelf, and delivered at the ſame Time, and by the ſame Hand to the *Jews* that the moral Law was, were call'd beggarly Elements under the Goſpel, and laid by as uſeleſs and burthenſome, what ſhall we call thoſe Rites which have no other Foundation, but the Will and Authority of Men, and of Men very often, who have not much Thought of the Purity of Religion, and practiſed it leſs.

Becauſe you think your Argument for the Magiſtrate's Right to uſe Force has not had its due Conſideration; I ſhall here ſet it down in your own Words, as it
A. P. 16. ſtands, and endeavour to give you Satisfaction to it. You ſay there, *If ſuch a Degree of outward Force as has been mentioned, be of great and even neceſſary Uſe, for the advancing thoſe Ends, (as taking the World as we find it, I think it appears to be,) then it muſt be acknowledg'd that there is a Right ſomewhere to uſe it for the advancing thoſe Ends, unleſs we will ſay (what without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things has not furniſhed Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls.*

And if there be ſuch a Right ſomewhere, where ſhould it be, but where the Power of compelling reſides? That is principally, and in reference to the Publick in the Civil Sovereign. Which Words, if they have any Argument in them, it in ſhort ſtands thus. Force is *uſeful and neceſſary*: The good and wiſe God (who without Impiety cannot be ſuppoſed not to have *furniſhed* Men with competent Means for their Salvation) has therefore given a Right to ſome Men to uſe it, and thoſe Men are the Civil Sovereigns.

To make this Argument of any Uſe to your Purpoſe, you muſt ſpeak a little more diſtinctly, (for here you, according to your laudable and ſafe Way of Writing, are wrap'd up in the Uncertainty of general Terms) and muſt tell us, beſides the End for which it is *uſeful and neceſſary*, to whom it is *uſeful and neceſſary*. Is it *uſeful and neceſſary* to all Men? That you will not ſay, for many are brought to embrace the true Religion by bare Preaching, without any Force. Is it then neceſſary to all thoſe, and thoſe only, who, as you tell us, *reject the true Religion tendred with ſufficient Evidence, or at leaſt ſo far manifeſted to them, as to oblige them to receive it, and to leave them without Excuſe if they do not!* To all therefore, who rejecting the true Religion ſo tendered, are without Excuſe, your *moderate Force is uſeful and neceſſary*. But is it to all thoſe *competent*, i. e. *ſufficient Means?* That 'tis evident in Matter of Fact, it is not; for after all, many ſtand out. 'Tis like you will ſay, which is all you have to ſay, that thoſe are ſuch, to whom, having reſiſted this laſt Means, *moderate Force*, God always refuſeth his Grace, without which no Means is efficacious. So that your *competent* at laſt, are only ſuch *Means* as are the utmoſt that God has appointed

pointed, and will have uſed, and which when Men reſiſt, they are without Excuſe, and ſhall never after have the Aſſiſtance of his Grace to bring them to *that Truth they have reſiſted*, and ſo be as the Apoſtle, 2 *Tim.* 3. 8. calls ſuch, *Men of corrupt Minds, reprobate concerning the Faith.* If then it ſhall be, that the Day of Grace ſhall be over to all thoſe who *reject the Truth manifeſted* to them, with ſuch Evidence, *as leaves them without Excuſe*, and that bare Preaching and Exhortation ſhall be according to the good Pleaſure of the benign Diſpoſer of all things, enough (when neglected) *to make their Hearts fat, their Ears heavy, and ſhut their Eyes that they ſhould not perceive nor underſtand, nor be converted* that *God ſhould heal them.* I ſay, if this ſhould be the Caſe, then your *Force*, whatever you imagine of it, will neither be *competent*, *uſeful*, nor *neceſſary*. So that it will reſt upon you to prove that your *moderate Degrees* of Force are thoſe Means of Grace which God will have, as neceſſary to Salvation, tried upon every one before he will paſs that Sentence in *Iſaiah*, *Make his Heart fat*, &c. and that your Degree of moderate Force is that beyond which God will have no other or more powerful Means uſed, but that thoſe whom that works not upon, ſhall be left *reprobate concerning Faith.* And till you have proved this, you will in vain pretend your *moderate Force* (whatever you might think of it, if you had the ordering of that Matter in the Place of God) to be *uſeful*, *neceſſary*, and *competent* Means. For if Preaching, Exhortation, Inſtruction, *&c.* as ſeems by the whole Current of the Scripture, (and it appears not that *Iſaiah*, in the Place above-cited, *made their Hearts fat* with any thing but his Words) be that Means, which when rejected to ſuch a Degree, as he ſees fit, God will puniſh with a *Reprobate* Mind, and that there be no other Means of Grace to come after; you muſt confeſs, that whatever good Opinion you have of your moderate Force after this Sentence is paſſed, it can do no good, have no Efficacy neither *directly* nor *indirectly*, and *at a diſtance*, towards the bringing Men to the Truth.

If your moderate Force be not that preciſe utmoſt Means of Grace, which when ineffectual, God will not afford his Grace to any other, then your moderate Force is not the *competent Means* you talk of. This therefore you muſt prove, that Preaching alone is not, but that your moderate Force join'd to it, is that Means of Grace, which when neglected or reſiſted, God will aſſiſt no other Means with his Grace to bring Men into the Obedience of the Truth; and this let me tell you, you muſt prove by Revelation. For it is impoſſible to know, but by Revelation, the juſt Meaſures of God's Long-ſuffering, and what thoſe Means are, which when Mens Corruptions have rendered ineffectual, his Spirit ſhall no longer ſtrive with them, nor his Grace aſſiſt any other Means for their Converſion or Salvation. When you have done this, there will be ſome Ground for you to talk of your *moderate Force*, as the Means which God's Wiſdom and Goodneſs is engaged to furniſh Men with; but to ſpeak of it, as you do now, as if it were that both *neceſſary* and *competent* Means, that it would be an Imputation to the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God, if Men were not furniſhed with it, when 'tis evident, that the greateſt Part of Mankind have always been deſtitute of it, will I fear be not eaſily cleared from that *Impiety* you mention; for tho' the Magiſtrate had the *Right* to uſe it, yet where-ever that *moderate Force* was not made uſe of, there Men were not furniſhed with your *competent Means* of Salvation.

'Tis neceſſary for the Vindication of God's Juſtice and Goodneſs, that thoſe who miſcarry ſhould do ſo by their own Fault, that their Deſtruction ſhould be from themſelves, and they left inexcuſable: But pray how will you ſhew us, that it is neceſſary, that any who have reſiſted the Truth tendred to them only by Preaching ſhould be ſaved, any more than it is neceſſary that thoſe who have reſiſted the Truth when moderate Force has been joined to the ſame Preaching, ſhould be ſaved? They are inexcuſable one as well as the other, and thereby have incurred the Wrath of God, under which he may juſtly leave the one as well as the other? and therefore he cannot be ſaid not to have been furniſhed with competent Means of Salvation, who having rejected the Truth preached to him, has never any Penalties laid on him by the Magiſtrate to make him conſider the Truths he before rejected.

All the Streſs of your *Hypotheſis* for the Neceſſity of Force, lies on this, That the Majority of Mankind are not prevailed on by Preaching, and therefore the Goodneſs and Wiſdom of God is obliged to furniſh them with ſome more effectual Means, as you think. But who told you that the Majority of Mankind ſhould ever be brought into the ſtrait Way, and narrow Gate? Or that Force in your moderate Degree was the *neceſſary* and *competent*, *i. e.* the juſt fit Means to do it, neither over nor under,

but

but that that only, and nothing but that could do it? If to vindicate his Wisdom and Goodness God must furnish Mankind with other Means, as long as the Majority, yet unwrought upon, shall give any forward Demander Occasion to ask, *What other Means is there left?* He must also after your *moderate Penalties* have left the greater Part of Mankind unprevailed on, be bound to furnish Mankind with higher Degrees of Force upon this Man's Demand: and those Degrees of Force proving ineffectual to the Majority to make them truly and sincerely Christians, God must be bound to furnish the World again with a new Supply of Miracles upon the Demand of another wise Controuler, who having set his Heart upon Miracles, as you have yours on Force, will demand what other Means is there left but Miracles? For 'tis like this last Gent. would take it very much amiss of you, if you should not allow this to be a good and unquestionable Way of arguing; or if you should deny that after the utmost Force had been used, Miracles might not do *some Service* at least, *indirectly and at a distance*, towards the *bringing Men to embrace the Truth*. And if you cannot *prove* that Miracles may not thus *do some Service*, he will conclude just as you do, that the Cause is his.

Let us try your Method a little farther. Suppose that when *neither the gentlest Admonitions, nor the most earnest Intreaties will prevail*, something else is to be done as the only Means left, What is it must be done? What is this *necessary competent Means* that
Pag. 10. you tell us of? *It is to lay Briars and Thorns in their Way.* This therefore being supposed necessary, you say, *there must somewhere be a Right to* use it. Let it be so. Suppose I tell you that Right is in God, who certainly has a Power *to lay Briars and Thorns in the Way* of those who *are got into a wrong one*, whenever he is graciously pleased that other Means besides Instructions and Admonitions should be used to *reduce* them. And we may as well expect that those *Thorns and Briars* laid in their Way by God's Providence, without telling them for what End, should work upon them as effectually, *though indirectly, and at a distance*, as those laid in their Way by the Magistrate, without telling them for what End. God alone knows where it is necessary, and on whom it will be useful, which no Man being capable of knowing, no Man, tho' he has coercive Power in his Hand, can be supposed to be authorized to use it by the Commission he has to do Good, on whomsoever you shall judge it to be *of great and even necessary Use*: No more than your judging it to be of *great and even necessary Use*, would authorize any one, who had got one of the Incision-Knives of the Hospital in his Hand, to cut those for the Stone with it, whom he could not know needed cutting, or that cutting would do them any good, when the Master of the Hospital had given him no express Order to use his Incision-Knife in that Operation; nor was it known to any but the Master, who needed, and on whom it would be useful; nor would he fail to use it himself where-ever he found it necessary.

Be Force of as *great and necessary Use* as you please; let it be so, the *competent Means for the promoting the Honour of God in the World, and the good of Souls*, that *the Right to use it* must necessarily *be somewhere*. This *Right* cannot possibly be, where you would have it, in the *Civil Sovereigns*, and that for the very Reason you give, *viz.* because it must be *where the Power of compelling resides*. For since *Civil Sovereigns* cannot compel themselves, nor can the *compelling* Power of one *Civil Sovereign* reach another Civil Sovereign, it will not in the Hands of the *Civil Sovereigns* reach the most considerable Part of Mankind, and those, who both for their own and their Subjects Good, have most need of it. Besides, if it go along with the *Power of compelling*, it must be in the Hands of all *Civil Sovereigns* alike: which by this, as well as several other Reasons I have given, being unavoidable to be so, this Right will be so far from useful, that whatever Efficacy Force has, it will be employed to the doing more Harm than Good; since the greatest Part of *Civil Sovereigns* being of false Religions, Force will be employed for the promoting of those.

But let us grant what you can never prove, that though all *Civil Sovereigns* have *compelling Power*, yet only those of the true Religion have a Right to use Force in Matters of Religion: Your own Argument of *Mankind being unfurnished* (which is Impiety to say) *with competent Means for the promoting the Honour of God, and the Good of Souls*, still presses you. For the *compelling Power* of each *Civil Sovereign* not reaching beyond his own Dominions, *the Right of using Force* in the Hands only of the Orthodox *Civil Sovereigns*, leaves the rest, which is the far greater Part of the World, destitute

deſtitute of this your neceſſary *and competent Means for promoting the Honour of God in the World, and the Good of Souls.*

Sir, I return you my Thanks for having given me this Occaſion to take a Review of your Argument, which you told me I had miſtaken; which I hope I now have not, and have anſwered to your Satisfaction.

I confeſs I miſtook when I ſaid that cutting being judg'd uſeful, could not authorize even a skilful Surgeon to cut a Man without any farther Commiſſion: for it ſhould have been thus; that though a Man has the Inſtruments in his Hand, and Force enough to cut with, and cutting be judg'd by you *of great and even neceſſary* Uſe in the Stone; yet this, without any farther Commiſſion, will not authorize any one to uſe his Strength and Knife in Cutting, who knows not who has the Stone, nor has any Light or Meaſures to judge to whom Cutting may be neceſſary or uſeful.

But let us ſee what you ſay in anſwer to my Inſtance: 1. *That the Stone does not al-* Pag. 53. *ways kill, though it be not cured; but Men do often live to a great Age with it, and die at laſt of other Diſtempers. But Averſion to the true Religion is certainly and inevitably mortal to the Soul, if not cured, and ſo of abſolute Neceſſity to be cured. Is it of abſolute Neceſſity to be cured* in all? If ſo, will you not here again think it requiſite that the *wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all things*, ſhould *furniſh competent Means* for what is of *abſolute Neceſſity?* For will it not be *Impiety* to ſay, that God hath left Mankind *unfurniſhed of competent*, i. e. *ſufficient Means* for what is *abſolutely neceſſary?* For it is plain in your Account, Men have not been furniſhed with *ſufficient* Means for what is of *abſolute Neceſſity* to be cured in all, if in any of them it be left uncured. For as you allow none to be *ſufficient* Evidence, but what certainly gains Aſſent; ſo by the ſame Pag. 51. Rule you cannot call that *ſufficient* Means which does not work the Cure. It is in vain to ſay, the Means were *ſufficient*, had it not been for their own Fault, when that Fault of theirs is the very Thing to be cured. You go on; *And yet if we ſhould* Pag. 53. *ſuppoſe the* Stone *as certainly deſtructive of this Temporal Life, as that Averſion is of Mens Eternal Salvation: even ſo the Neceſſity of curing it would be as much leſs than the Neceſſity of curing that Averſion, as this Temporal Life falls ſhort in Value of that which is Eternal.* This is built upon a Suppoſition, that the Neceſſity of the Means is encreaſed by the Value of the End, which being in this Caſe the Salvation of Mens Souls, that is of infinite Concernment to them, you conclude Salvation *abſolutely neceſſary*: which makes you ſay that *Averſion, &c.* being *inevitably mortal to the Soul*, is of *abſolute Neceſſity to be cured.* Nothing *is of abſolute Neceſſity* but God: whatſoever elſe can be ſaid to be of *Neceſſity*, is ſo only relatively in reſpect to ſomething elſe; and therefore nothing can indefinitely thus be ſaid to be of *abſolute Neceſſity*, where the thing it relates to is not abſolutely neceſſary. We may ſay, *Wiſdom* and *Power* in God are *abſolutely neceſſary*, becauſe God himſelf is *abſolutely neceſſary*: but we cannot crudely ſay, the curing in Men their Averſion to the true Religion, is *abſolutely neceſſary*, becauſe it is not *abſolutely neceſſary* that Men ſhould be ſaved. But this is very proper and true to be ſaid, that curing this *Averſion* is *abſolutely neceſſary* in all that ſhall be ſaved. But I fear that would not ſerve your Turn, though it be certain that your *abſolute Neceſſity* in this Caſe reaches no farther than this, that to be cured of this *Averſion* is *abſolutely neceſſary* to Salvation, and Salvation is abſolutely neceſſary to Happineſs; but neither of them, nor the Happineſs it ſelf of any Man can be ſaid to be *abſolutely neceſſary.*

This Miſtake makes you ſay, that ſuppoſing *the Stone certainly deſtructive of this Temporal Life, yet the Neceſſity of curing it would be as much leſs than the Neceſſity of curing that Averſion, as this Temporal Life falls ſhort in Value of that which is Eternal.* Which is quite otherwiſe: for if the Stone will certainly kill a Man without Cutting, is as *abſolutely neceſſary* to cut a Man of the Stone for the ſaving of his Life, as it is to cure the Averſion for the ſaving of his Soul. Nay, if you have but Eggs to fry, Fire is as abſolutely neceſſary as either of the other, though the Value of the End be in theſe Caſes infinitely different; for in one of them you loſe only your Dinner, in the other your Life, and in other your Soul. But yet in theſe Caſes, Fire, Cutting and *Curing that Averſion*, are each of them abſolutely and equally neceſſary to their reſpective Ends, becauſe thoſe Ends cannot be attained without them.

You ſay farther, *Cutting for the Stone is not always neceſſary in order to the Cure:* Pag. 53. *But the Penalties you ſpeak of are altogether neceſſary (without extraordinary Grace) to cure that pernicious and otherwiſe untractable Averſion.* Let it be ſo; but do the Surgeons know who has this *Stone*, this *Averſion* ſo, that it will certainly deſtroy him unleſs

unleſs he be cut? Will you undertake to tell when the *Averſion* is ſuch in any Man, that it is incurable by Preaching, Exhortation and Intreaty, if his Spiritual Phyſician will be inſtant with him in Seaſon, and out of Seaſon; but certainly curable, if moderate Force be made uſe of? Till you are ſure of the former of theſe, you can never ſay, your moderate Force is *neceſſary*: Till you are ſure of the latter, you can never ſay, it is *competent* Means. What you will determine concerning *extraordinary Grace*, and when God beſtows that, I leave you to conſider, and ſpeak clearly of it at your Leiſure.

Pag. 53. You add, That even where *Cutting for the Stone is neceſſary, it is withal hazardous by my Confeſſion. But your Penalties can no way endanger or hurt the Soul, but by the Fault of him that undergoes them.* If the Magiſtrate uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion, he muſt judge which is the true Religion; and he can judge no other to be it but that which he believes to be the true Religion, which is his own Religion. But for the Magiſtrate to uſe Force to bring Men to his own Religion, has ſo much Danger in it to Mens Souls, that by your own Confeſſion, *none but an Atheiſt* will ſay that Magiſtrates may uſe Force to bring Men to their own Religion.

This I ſuppoſe is enough to make good all that I aimed at in my Inſtance of Cutting for the Stone, which was, that though it were judg'd *uſeful*, and I add now *neceſſary* to cut Men for the Stone, yet that was not enough to authorize a Surgeon to cut a Man, but he muſt have beſides that general one of doing Good, ſome more ſpecial Commiſſion; and that which I there mentioned, was the Patient's Conſent.

Pag. 54. But you tell me, *That though, as things now ſtand, no Surgeon has any Right to cut his calculous Patient without his Conſent; yet if the Magiſtrate ſhould by a publick Law appoint and authorize a competent Number of the moſt Skilful in that Art, to viſit ſuch as labour under that Diſeaſe, and to cut thoſe (whether they conſent or not) whoſe Lives they unanimouſly judge it impoſſible to ſave otherwiſe:* you are *apt to think I ſhould find it hard to prove that in ſo doing he exceeded the Bounds of his Power; And* you are *ſure it would be as hard to prove that thoſe Artiſts would have no Right in that Caſe to cut ſuch Perſons.* Shew ſuch a Law from the great Governour of the Univerſe, and I ſhall yield that your Surgeons ſhall go to work as faſt as you pleaſe. But where is the publick Law? Where is the *competent Number of Magiſtrates skilful in this Art, who muſt unanimouſly judge of the Diſeaſe and its Danger?* You can ſhew nothing of all this, yet you are ſo liberal of this Sort of Cure, that one cannot take you for leſs than cutting *Morecraft* himſelf. But, Sir, if there were a competent Number of skilful and impartial Men, who were to uſe the Inciſion-Knife on all in whom they found this Stone of *Averſion* to the true Religion; what do you think, would they find no Work in your Hoſpital?

Averſion to the true Religion you ſay is *of abſolute Neceſſity to be cured:* What I beſeech you is that *true Religion?* that of the Church of *England?* For that you own

Pag. 11. to be the *only true Religion*, and whatever you ſay, you cannot upon your Principles name any other National Religion in the World, that you will own to be the true. It being then of *abſolute Neceſſity* that Mens *Averſion* to the National Religion of *England* ſhould be cured: Has all Mankind in whom it has been *abſolutely neceſſary* to be cured, been furniſhed with *competent* and *neceſſary* Means for the Cure of this *Averſion?*

In the next Place, what is your *neceſſary and ſufficient Means* for this Cure *that is of abſolute Neceſſity?* and that is *moderate Penalties* made uſe of by the Magiſtrate, *where the National* is the *true Religion*, and ſufficient Means are *provided for all Mens Inſtruction in the true Religion.* And here again I ask, Have all Men to whom this Cure is of *abſolute Neceſſity*, been furniſhed with this neceſſary Means?

Thirdly, How is your *neceſſary* Remedy to be applied? And that is in a Way wherein it cannot work the Cure, though we ſhould ſuppoſe the true Religion the National every where, and all the Magiſtrates in the World zealous for it. To this true Religion, ſay you, Men have a natural and great *Averſion of abſolute Neceſſity to be cured*, and the only cure for it is Force your Way applied, *i. e.* Penalties muſt be laid upon all that diſſent from the National Religion, till they conform. Why are Men averſe to the true? Becauſe it croſſes the Profits and Pleaſures of this Life; and for the ſame Reaſon they have an Averſion to Penalties: Theſe therefore, if they be oppoſed one to another, and Penalties be ſo laid that Men muſt quit their Luſts, and heartily embrace the true Religion, or elſe endure the Penalties, there may be ſome Efficacy in Force towards bringing Men to the true Religion: But if there be no

Oppoſition

Oppoſition between an outward Profeſſion of the true Religion, and Mens Luſts; Penalties laid on Men till they outwardly conform, are not a Remedy laid to the Diſeaſe. Puniſhments ſo applied have no Oppoſition to Mens Luſts, nor from thence can be expected any Cure. Men muſt be driven from their Averſion to the true Religion by Penalties they have a greater Averſion to. This is all the Operation of Force. But if by getting into the Communion of the Notional Church they can avoid the Penalties, and yet retain their natural Corruption and Averſion to the true Religion, what Remedy is there to the Diſeaſe by Penalties ſo applied? You would, you ſay, have Men made *uneaſy*. This no doubt will work on Men, and make them endeavour to get out of this uneaſy State as ſoon as they can. But it will always be by that Way wherein they can be moſt eaſy; for 'tis the Uneaſineſs alone they fly from, and therefore they will not exchange one Uneaſineſs for another; not for a greater, nor a nequal, nor any at all, if they can help it. If therefore it be ſo *uneaſy* for Men to *mortify* their *Luſts*, as you tell us, *which the true Religion requires of them*, if they embrace it in earneſt: But which outward Conformity to the true Religion, or any National Church, does not require, what need or uſe is there of Force applied ſo, that it meets not at all with Mens Luſts, or Averſion to the true Religion, but leaves them the Liberty of a quiet Enjoyment of them, free from Force and Penalties in a legal and approved Conformity? Is a Man negligent of his Soul, and will not be brought to conſider? Obſtinate and will not embrace the Truth? Is he careleſs, and will not be at the Pains to examine Matters of Religion? Corrupt, and will not part with his Luſts, which are dearer to him than his Firſt-born? 'Tis but owning the National Profeſſion, and he may be ſo ſtill: If he conform, the Magiſtrate has done puniſhing, he is a Son of the Church, and need not conſider any thing farther for fear of Penalties, they are removed, and all is well. So that at laſt there neither being an abſolute Neceſſity that *Averſion to the true Religion* ſhould in all Men be cured: Nor the Magiſtrate being a competent Judge who have this Stone of *Averſion*, or who have it to that Degree as to need Force to cure it, or in whom it is curable, were Force a proper Remedy as it is not: Nor having any Commiſſion to uſe it, notwithſtanding what you have anſwered: It is ſtill not only *as*, but *more* reaſonable for the Magiſtrate, upon Pretence of its Uſefulneſs or Neceſſity, to cut any one for the Stone without his own Conſent, than to uſe Force your Way to cure him of Averſion to the true Religion.

Pag. 7.

To my Queſtion, In whoſe Hands this Right (we were a little above ſpeaking of) was in *Turkey*, *Perſia* or *China*? you tell me, *You anſwer roundly and plainly, in the Hands of the Sovereign, to uſe convenient Penalties for the Promoting the true Religion.* I will not trouble you here with a Queſtion you will meet with elſewhere; Who in theſe Countires muſt be Judge of the true Religion? But I will ask, Whether you or any wiſe Man would have put a Right of uſing Force into a *Mahumetan* or *Pagan* Prince's Hand, for the promoting of Chriſtianity? which of Pagans or Mahumetans would have done otherwiſe?

Pag. 55.

But God, you ſay, has done it, and you make it good by telling me in the following Words, *If this ſtartle me, then you muſt tell me further, that you look upon the ſupreme Power to be the ſame all the World over, in what Hands ſoever it is placed, and this Right to be contained in it: And if thoſe that have it do not uſe it as they ought, but inſtead of promoting true Religion by proper Penalties, ſet themſelves to enforce* Mahumetaniſm *or* Paganiſm, *or any other falſe Religion: All that can, or that needs be ſaid to the Matter, is, that God will one Day call them to an Account for the Neglect of their Duty, for the Diſhonour they do to him, and for the Souls that periſh by their Fault.* Your taking this *Right* be a Part of the *ſupreme Power* of all *Civil Sovereigns*, (which is the thing in Queſtion) is not, as I take it, proving it to be ſo. But let us take it ſo for once, what then is your Anſwer? *God will one Day call thoſe Sovereigns to an Account for the Neglect of their Duty.* The Queſtion is not, What God will do with the *Sovereigns* who have neglected their Duty; but how *Mankind* is *furniſhed* with your *competent Means for the promoting of God's Honour in the World, and the good of Souls* in Countries where the *Sovereign* is of a wrong Religion? For there, how clearly ſoever the Right of uſing it be in the *Sovereign*, yet as long as he uſes not Force to bring his Subjects to the true Religion, they are deſtitute of your *competent* Means. For I imagine you do not make the *Right* to uſe that Force, but the actual Application of it by Penal Laws to be your *uſeful and neceſſary Means*. For if you think the bare having that *Right* be enough, if that be your *ſufficient Means* without the actual Uſe of Fore, we readily allow it you. And (as I tell you elſe-

where) I see not then what need you had of Miracles to *supply the Want of the Magistrate's Assistance, till Christianity was supported and encouraged by the Laws of the Empire*: For, by your own Rule, the Magistrates of the World, during the three first Centuries after the Publishing the Christian Religion, had the same *Right*, if that had been enough, that they have now in *Turkey*, *Persia*, or *China*. That this *is all that can be said in this Matter*, I easily grant you; but that *it is all that needs be said* to make good your Doctrine, I must beg your Pardon.

In the same Sentence wherein you tell me, *I should have added Necessity to Usefulness*, I call it necessary Usefulness, which I imagine is not much different. But that with the following Words wherein my Argument lay, had the ill Luck to be overseen; but if you please to take my Argument, as I have now again laid it before you, it will serve my Turn.

L. 2. p. 282. In your next Paragraph you tell me, That *what is said* by me *is with the same Ingenuity I have used in other Places*; my Words in that Place are these: "The Au-" thority having endeavoured to shew that no body at all, of any Rank or Condition, " had any Power to punish, torment, or use any Man ill for Matter of Religion: " You tell us, you *do not understand why Clergymen are not as capable of such Power* " *as other Men*: Which Words of mine containing in them nothing but true Matter of Fact, give you no Reason to Tax my *Ingenuity*: Nor will what you alledge make it otherwise *than such Power*; for if the Power you there *speak of*, were *externally coactive Power*, is not that the same Power the Author was speaking of, made use of to those Ends he mentions of Tormenting and Punishing? And do not you own that those who have that Power, ought to punish those who offend in rejecting the true Religion? As to the remaining Part of that Paragraph, I shall leave the Reader to judge whether *I sought any Occasion* so much as to name the *Clergy*; or whether the Itching of your Fingers to be handling the Rod, guided not your Pen to what was nothing to the Purpose: For the Author had not said any thing so much as tending to exclude the Clergy from secular Employments, but only (if you will take your own Report of it) that no Ecclesiastical Officer, as such, has any externally coactive Power; whereupon you cry out, that *you do not yet understand why Ecclesiasticks or Clergymen are not as capable of such Power as other Men*. Had you stood to be Constable of your Parish, or of the Hundred, you might have had Cause to vindicate thus your Capacity, if Orders had been objected to you; or if your Aim be at a Justice of the Peace, or Lord Chief Justice of *England*, much more. However you must be allowed to be a Man of Forecast, in clearing the Way to secular Power, if you know your self, or any of your Friends desirous of it: Otherwise I confess you have Reason to be on this Occasion a little out of Humour, as you are, for bringing this Matter in Question so wholly out of Season. Now will (I fear) the ill-fitted Excuse you bring,

A. p. 17. give your self, or one who consults the Places in both yours and the Author's Letter, a much better Opinion of it. However I cannot but thank you for your wonted Ingenuity, in saying, that it *seems I wanted an Occasion to shew my good Will to the Clergy, and so I made my self one*. And to find more Work for the excellent Gift you have this Way, I desire you to read over that Paragraph of mine again, and tell me, whether you can find any thing said in it not true? Any Advice in it that you your self would disown? any thing that any worthy Clergyman that adorns his Function is concerned in? And when you have set it down in my Words, the World shall be Judge, whether I have shewed any ill Will to the *Clergy*. Till then I may take the Liberty to own, that I am more a Friend to them and their Calling, than those amongst them, who shew their Forwardness to *leave the Word of God to serve other Employments*. The Office of a Minister of the Gospel requires so the whole Man, that the very looking after their Poor was by the joint Voice of the Twelve Apostles,

Acts 4. 2. called, *leaving the Word of God, and serving of Tables*. But if you think no Mens Faults can be spoken of without *ill Will*, you will make a very ill Preacher: Or if you think this to be so only in speaking of Mistakes in any of the Clergy, there must be in your Opinion something peculiar in their Case, that makes it so much a Fault to mention any of theirs; which I must be pardoned for, since I was not aware of it: And there will want but a little cool Reflection to convince you, that had not the present Church of *England* a greater Number in Proportion, than possibly any other Age of the Church ever had, of those who by their pious Lives and Labours in their Ministry adorn their Profession, such busy Men as cannot be content to be Divines without being Lay-men too, would so little keep up the Reputation which ought

ought to diſtinguiſh the Clergy, or preſerve the Eſteem due to a holy, *i.e.* a ſeparate Order, that no body can ſhew greater good Will to them, than by taking all Occaſions to put a Stop to any Forwardneſs, to be meddling out of their Calling. This I ſuppoſe made a learned Prelate of our Church, out of Kindneſs to the Clergy, mind them of their Stipulation and Duty in a late Treatiſe, and tell them that *the Paſtoral Care is to be a Man's entire Buſineſs, and to poſſeſs both his Thoughts and his Time.* Diſc. of Paſt. Care, *p.* 121.

To your ſaying, *That the Magiſtrate may lay Penalties upon thoſe who refuſe to embrace the Doctrine of the proper Miniſters of Religion, or are alienated from the Truth:* A. p. 20. I anſwered, "God never gave the Magiſtrate an Authority to be Judge of Truth L. 1. p. 187. "for another Man. This you grant; but withal ſay, *That if the Magiſtrate knows* Pag. 64. *the Truth, though he has no Authority to judge of Truth for another Man; yet he may be Judge whether other Men be alienated from the Truth or no; and ſo may have Authority to lay ſome Penalties upon thoſe whom he ſees to be ſo, to bring them to judge more ſincerely for themſelves.* For Example, *The Doctrine of the proper Miniſters of Religion* is, that the three Creeds, *Nice*, *Athanaſius*'s, and that commonly called the *Apoſtles Creed*, ought to be thoroughly received and believed: As alſo that the Old and New Teſtament cantain all things neceſſary to Salvation. The one of theſe *Doctrines* a *Papiſt* Subject *embraces not*; and a *Socinian* the other. What now is the Magiſtrate by your Commiſſion to do? He is to lay Penalties upon them, and continue them: How long? Only 'till they comform, *i. e.* till they profeſs they embrace theſe Doctrines for true. In which Caſe he does *not judge of the Truth for other Men:* he only *judges* that other Men are *alienated from the Truth.* Do you not now admire your own Subtilty and Acuteneſs? I that cannot comprehend this, tell you my dull Senſe in the Caſe. He that thinks another Man in an Error, judges him, as you Phraſe it, *alienated* from the Truth, and then judges of Truth and Falſhood only for himſelf. But if he lays any Penalty upon others, which they are to lie under till they embrace for a Truth what he judges to be ſo, he is then ſo far *a Judge of Truth* for thoſe others. This is what I think to *Judge of Truth for another*, means: If you will tell me what elſe it ſignifies, I am ready to learn.

You *grant*, you ſay, *God never gave the Magiſtrate any Authority to be Judge of Truth for another Man:* and then add, *But how does it follow from thence that he cannot be Judge, whether any Man be alienated from the Truth or no?* And I ask you, who ever ſaid any ſuch thing did follow from thence? That which I ſay, and which you ought to diſprove, is, That whoever puniſhes others for not being of the Religion he judges to be true, judges of Truth for others. But you prove that a *Man* may *be Judge of Truth*, with having *Authority to Judge of it for other Men, or to preſcribe to them what they ſhall believe*; which you might have ſpared, till you meet with ſome body that denies it. But yet your Proof of it is worth remembring: *Rectum* (ſay you) *eſt Index ſui & obliqui. And certainly whoever does but know the Truth, may eaſily judge whether other Men be alienated from it or no.* But though *Rectum* be *Index ſui & obliqui*, yet a Man may be ignorant of that which is the right, and may take Error for Truth. The Truth of Religion, when known, ſhews what contradicts it is falſe: But yet that Truth may be unknown to the Magiſtrate, as well as to any other Man. But you conclude (I know not upon what ground) as if the Magiſtrate could not miſs it, or where ſurer to find it than other Men. I ſuppoſe you are thus favourable only to the Magiſtrate of your own Profeſſion, as no doubt in Civility a Papiſt or a Presbyterian would be to thoſe of his. And then infer; *And therefore if the Magiſtrate knows the Truth, though he has no Authority to judge of Truth for other Men, yet he may be Judge whether other Men be alienated from the Truth or no.* Without doubt! who denies it him? 'Tis a Privilege that he and all Men have, that when they know the Truth, or believe the Truth, and have embraced an Error for Truth, they may *judge whether other Men are alienated from it or no*, if thoſe other Men own their Opinions in that Matter.

You go on with your Inference, *And ſo may have Authority to lay ſome Penalties upon thoſe whom he ſees to be ſo.* Now, Sir, you go a little to faſt. This he cannot do without making himſelf Judge of Truth for them: The Magiſtrate, or any one, may judge as much as he pleaſes, of Mens Opinions and Errors; he in that judges only for himſelf: But as ſoon as he uſes Force to bring them from their own to his Opinion, he makes himſelf *Judge of Truth for them*; let it be to *bring them to judge more ſincerely for themſelves*, as you here call it, or under what Pretence or Colour ſoever; for that, what

you

you ſay, is but a Pretence, the very Expreſſion diſcovers. For does any one ever judge inſincerely *for himſelf*, that he needs Penalties to make him judge *more ſincerely for himſelf?* A Man may judge wrong for himſelf, and may be known or thought to do ſo: But who can either know or ſuppoſe another is not *ſincere* in the Judgment he makes for himſelf, or (which is the ſame thing) that any one knowingly puts a Mixture of Falſhood into the Judgment he makes? For as ſpeaking inſincerely is to ſpeak otherwiſe than one thinks, let what he ſays be true or falſe; ſo judging inſincerely muſt be to judge otherwiſe than one thinks, which I imagine is not very feaſible. But how improper ſoever it be to talk of judging inſincerely for one's ſelf, it was better for you in that Place to ſay, Penalties were *to bring Men to judge more ſincerely*, rather than to ſay, more rightly, or more truly: for had you ſaid, the Magiſtrate might uſe Penalties *to bring Men to judge more* truly, that very Word had plainly diſcovered, that he *made* himſelf a *Judge of Truth for them.* You therefore wiſely choſe to ſay what might beſt cover this Contradiction to your ſelf, whether it were Senſe or no, which perhaps whilſt it ſounded well, every one would not ſtand to examine.

One thing give me leave here to obſerve to you, which is, That when you ſpeak of the Entertainment Subjects are to give to Truth, *i. e.* the true Religion, you call it *Believing*; but this in the Magiſtrate you call *Knowing*. Now let me ask you, Whether any Magiſtrate, who laid Penalties on any who diſſented from what he judged the true Religion, or as you call it here, were *Alienated from the Truth*, was or could be determined in his judging of that Truth by any Aſſurance greater than Believing? When you have reſolved that, you will then ſee to what Purpoſe is all you have ſaid here concerning the Magiſtrate's *knowing* the Truth; which at laſt amounting to no more than the Aſſurance wherewith a Man certainly believes and receives a thing for true, will put every Magiſtrate under the ſame, if there be any Obligation to uſe Force, whilſt he believes his own Religion. Beſides, if a Magiſtrate *knows* his Religion to be true, he is to uſe Means not to make his People believe, but know it alſo; Knowledge of them, if that be the Way of entertaining the Truths of Religion, being as neceſſary to the Subjects as the Magiſtrate. I never heard yet of a Maſter of Mathematicks, who had the Care of informing others in thoſe Truths, who ever went about to make one believe one of *Euclid*'s Propoſitions.

Pag. 65, 66. A. p. 22. The Pleaſantneſs of your Anſwer, notwithſtanding what you ſay, doth remain ſtill the ſame: for you making, (as is to be ſeen) *the Power of the Magiſtrate* ORDAINED *for the bringing Men to take ſuch Care as they ought of their Salvation*; the Reaſon why *it is every Man's Intereſt to veſt* this Power in the Magiſtrate, muſt ſuppoſe this Power ſo *ordained*, before the People veſted it; or elſe it could not be an Argument for their *veſting* it in the Magiſtrate. For if you had not here built upon your fundamental Suppoſition, that this Power of the Magiſtrate is *ordained* by God to that End, the proper and intellible Way of expreſſing your Meaning had not been to ſay as you do; A. p. 22. *As the Power of the Magiſtrate is ordained for bringing*, &c. *ſo if we ſuppoſe this* POWER *veſted in the Magiſtrate by the People:* in which Way of Speaking this *Power* of the Magiſtrate is evidently ſuppoſed already *Ordained*. But a clear Way of making your Meaning underſtood, had been to ſay, That for the People to ordain ſuch a Power of the Magiſtrate, or to veſt ſuch a Power in the Magiſtrate, (which is the ſame thing) was their *true Intereſt:* but whether it were your Meaning or your Expreſſion that was guilty of the Abſurdity, I ſhall leave it with the Reader.

As to the other pleaſant thing of your Anſwer, it will ſtill appear by barely reciting it: the pleaſant Thing I charge on you is, that you ſay, That *the Power of the Ma-* I. 2. p. 288. A. p. 22. *giſtrate is to bring Men to ſuch a Care of their Salvations that they may not blindly leave it to the Choice of any Perſon, or their own Luſts or Paſſions, to preſcribe to them what Faith or Worſhip they ſhall embrace*; and yet that 'tis their beſt Courſe *to veſt a Power in the Magiſtrate* liable to the ſame *Luſts and Paſſions* as themſelves, to chuſe for them. To this you anſwer, by asking *where* it is that you *ſay that it is the Peoples beſt Courſe to veſt a Power in the Magiſtrate to chooſe for them. That* you tell me *I do not pretend to ſhew?* If you had given your ſelf the Pains to have gone on to the End of the Paragraph, or will be pleaſed to Read it as I have here again ſet it down for your Peruſal, you will find that I at leaſt *pretended to ſhew* it: My Words are theſe; "If "they veſt a Power in the Magiſtrate, to puniſh them when they diſſent from his "Religion, *to bring them to act even againſt their own Inclination, according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment*, which is (as you explain your ſelf in another Place) *to bring them to conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince them*; how far is this from

leaving

" leaving it to the Choice of another Man to preſcribe to them what Faith or Wor-
" ſhip they ſhall embrace? Thus far you cite my Words, to which let me join the remaining Part of the Paragraph, to let you ſee that I *pretended to ſhew* that the Courſe you propoſed to the People as beſt for them, was *to veſt a Power in the Magiſtrate to chuſe for them.* My Words which follow thoſe where you left off, are theſe;
" Eſpecially if we conſider, that you think it a ſtrange thing, that *the Author would*
" *have the Care of Man's Soul left to himſelf.* So that this Care being veſted in the L. 2. p. 88.
" Magiſtrate, with a Power *to puniſh Men to make them conſider Reaſons and Arguments*
" *proper and ſufficient to convince them* of the Truth of his Religion; the Choice is evi-
" dently in the Magiſtrate, as much as it can be in the Power of one Man to chuſe for
" another what Religion he ſhall be of; which conſiſts only in a Power of compel-
" ling him by Puniſhments to embrace it. But all this you tell me, *is juſt nothing to* Pag. 66.
my Purpoſe: Why I beſeech you? Becauſe you *ſpeak not of the Magiſtrate's Religion, but of the true Religion, and that propoſed with ſufficient Evidence.*

The Caſe in ſhort is this: Men are apt to be miſled by their *Paſſions, Luſts,* and *other Men* in the Choice of their Religion. For this great Evil you propoſe a Remedy, which is, That Men (for you muſt remember you are here ſpeaking of the People putting this Power into the Magiſtrate's Hand) ſhould chuſe ſome of their Fellow-Men, and give them a Power by Force to guard them, that they might not be *alienated from the Truth* by their *own Paſſions, Luſts,* or by *other Men.* So it was in the firſt Scheme; or, as you have it now, to puniſh them, whenever they *rejected the true Religion, and that propoſed with ſufficient Evidence of the Truth of it.* A pretty Remedy, and manifeſtly effectual at firſt ſight: That becauſe Men were all promiſcuouſly apt to be miſled in their Judgment, or Choice of their Religion, by *Paſſion, Luſt,* and *other Men,* therefore they ſhould chuſe ſome amongſt themſelves, who might, they and their Succeſſors, Men made juſt like themſelves, *puniſh them when they rejected the true Religion.*

If the blind lead the blind, both ſhall fall into the Ditch, ſays our Saviour. If Men apt to be miſled by their *Paſſions* and *Luſts,* will gaurd themſelves from falling into Error, by Puniſhments laid on them, by Men as apt to be miſled by Paſſions and Luſts as themſelves, how are they the ſafer from falling into Error? Now hear the infallible Remedy for this Inconvenience, and admire; the Men to whom they have given this Power, muſt not uſe it, till they find thoſe who gave it them in an Error. A Friend, to whom I ſhewed this Expedient, anſwered, This is none: For why is not a Man as fit to judge for himſelf when he is in an Error, as another to judge for him, who is a liable to Error himſelf? I anſwered, This Power however in the other can do him no harm, but may *indirectly, and at a diſtance,* do him good; becauſe the Magiſtrate who has this Power to puniſh him, muſt never uſe it but when he is in the right, and he that is puniſh'd is in the wrong. But, ſaid my Friend, who ſhall be Judge whether he be in the right or no? For Men in an Error think themſelves in the right, and that as confidently as thoſe who are moſt ſo. To which I replied, No body muſt be Judge; but the Magiſtrate *may know* when he is in the right. And ſo may the Subject too (ſaid my Friend) as well as the Magiſtrate, and therefore it was as good ſtill be free from a Puniſhment, that gives a Man no more Security from Error than he had without it. Beſides, ſaid he, who muſt be Judge whether the Magiſtrate knows or no? For he may miſtake, and think it to be Knowledge and Certainty, when it is but Opinion and Belief. It is no matter, for that in this Scheme, replied I, the Magiſtrate, we are told, *may know* which is the true Religion, and he muſt not uſe Force but to bring Men to the true Religion; and if he does, God will one day call him to an Account for it, and ſo all is ſafe. As ſafe as beating the Air can make a thing, replied my Friend: for if believing, being aſſured, confidently being perſuaded that they know that the Religion they profeſs is true, or any thing elſe ſhort of true Knowledge will ſerve the turn, all Magiſtrates will have this Power alike, and ſo Men will be well guarded, or recovered from falſe Religions, by putting it into the Magiſtrate's Hand to puniſh them *when they have alienated themſelves from it.*

If the Magiſtrate be not to puniſh Men but when he *knows,* i. e. is infallibly certain (for ſo is a Man in what he knows) that his National Religion is all true, and *knows* alſo, that it has been *propoſed* to thoſe he puniſhes *with ſufficient Evidence of the Truth of it:* 'Twould have been as good this Power had never been given him, ſince he will never be in a Condition to exerciſe it; and at beſt it was given him to no Purpoſe, ſince thoſe who gave it him were one with another as little indiſpoſed to

conſider

conſider impartially, examine diligently, ſtudy, find, and infallibly know the Truth as he. But, ſaid he at parting, to talk thus of the Magiſtrate's puniſhing Men that *reject the true Religion*, without telling us, who thoſe Magiſtrates are, who have a Power to judge which is the *true Religion*, is to put this Power in all Magiſtrate's Hands alike, or none. For to ſay he only is to be Judge which is the true Religion, who is of it, is but to begin the Round of Enquiries again, which can at laſt end no where but in every one's ſuppoſing his own to be it. But, ſaid he, if you will continue to talk on thus, there is nothing more to be done with you, but to pity or laugh at you, and ſo he left me.

I aſſure you, Sir, I urged this Part of your Hypotheſis, with all the Advantage I thought your Anſwer afforded me; and if I have erred in it, or there be any Way to get out of the Strait (if Force muſt in your Way be uſed) either of the Magiſtrate's puniſhing Men for rejecting the true Religion, without judging which is the true Religion; or elſe that the Magiſtrate ſhould judge which is the true Religion; which Way ever of the two you ſhall determine it, I ſee not of what Advantage it can be to the People (to keep them from chuſing amiſs) that this Power of puniſhing them ſhould be put into the Magiſtrate's Hands.

And then, if the Magiſtrate muſt judge which is the true Religion, (as how he ſhould without judging, puniſh any one who rejects it, is hard to find) and puniſh Men who reject it till they do embrace it, (let it be to make them conſider, or what you pleaſe) he does, I think, chuſe their Religion for them. And if you have not the Dexterity to chuſe the National Religion where-ever you are, I doubt not but you would think ſo too if you were in *France*, though there were none but moderate Penalties laid on you to *bring* you *even againſt your own Inclination to act according* to what they there call *Reaſon and ſound Judgment*.

That Paragraph and mine to which it is an Anſwer, runs thus.

L. 2. pag. 288. "I do neither "you nor the Magiſtrate Injury, "when I ſay that the Power you "give the Magiſtrate of *puniſh-* "*ing Men to make them conſider* "*Reaſons and Arguments proper* "*and ſufficient to convince them*, "is to convince them of the "Truth of his Religion, and "to bring them to it. For Men "will never, in his Opinion, *act* "*according to Reaſon and ſound* "*Judgment*, (which is the thing "you here ſay Men *ſhould be* "*brought to by the Magiſtrate*, "*even againſt their own Inclina-* "*tion*) till they embrace his Re- "ligion, And if you have the "Brow of an honeſt Man, you "will not ſay the Magiſtrate "will ever puniſh you, *to bring* "*you to conſider* any other *Rea-* "*ſons and Arguments*, but ſuch "as are *proper to convince* you "of the Truth of his Religion, "and to bring you to that. "Thus you ſhift forwards and "backwards. You ſay, *The Ma-* "*giſtrate has no Power to puniſh* "*Men to compel them to his Re-* "*ligion*; but only *to compel them* "*to conſider Reaſons and Argu-* "*ments proper to convince them* "of the Truth of his Religion; "which

L. 3. pag. 67. *But it ſeems you have not done with this yet: For you ſay, you* do neither me nor the Magiſtrate Injury, when you ſay that the Power I give the Magiſtrate, of puniſhing Men to make them conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince them, is to convince them of the truth of his Religion, (*whatever that be*) and to bring them to it. *Which ſeems a little ſtrange and pleaſant too. But thus you prove it:* For Men will never, in his Opinion, act according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment, till they embrace his Religion. And if you have the Brow of an honeſt Man, you will not ſay the Magiſtrate will ever puniſh you, to bring you to conſider any other Reaſons and Arguments but ſuch as are proper to convince you of the Truth of his Religion, and to bring you to that. *Which (beſides the pleaſant Talk of ſuch* Reaſons and Arguments as are proper and ſufficient to convince Men of the Truth of the Magiſtrate's Religion, *though it be a falſe one) is juſt as much as to ſay, It is ſo, becauſe in the* Magiſtrate's Opinion *it is ſo; and becauſe it is not to be expected that he will act againſt his* Opinion. *As if the Magiſtrate's Opinion could change the Nature of Things, and turn a Power to promote the true Religion, into a Power to promote a falſe one. No, Sir, the Magiſtrate's Opinion has no ſuch Virtue. It may indeed keep him from exerciſing the Power he has to promote the true Religion; and it may lead him to abuſe the Pretence of it, to the promoting a falſe one: But it can neither deſtroy that Power, nor make it any thing but what it is. And therefore, whatever the Magiſtrate's Opinion be, his* Power *was given him (as the Apoſtles Power was to them)* for Edification *only*, not for Diſtruction: *And*

" which is all one as to ſay, no " Body has Power to chuſe your " way for you to *Jeruſalem*; but " yet the Lord of the Mannor " has Power to puniſh you, " *to bring you to conſider Reaſons* " *and Arguments proper and ſuffici-* " *ent to convince you* (of what?) " that the way he goes in, is the " right, and ſo to make you join " in Company, and go along " with him. So that, in Effect, " what is all your going about, " but to come at laſt to the ſame " Place again; and put a Power " into the Magiſtrate's Hands, " (under another Pretence) to " compel Men to his Religion; " which Uſe of *Force* the Au- " thor has ſufficiently over- " thrown, and you your ſelf " have quitted. But I am " tired to follow you ſo often " round the ſame Circle.

And it may always be ſaid of him, (what St Paul *ſaid of himſelf) that he* can do nothing againſt the Truth, but for the Truth. *And therefore if the Magiſtrate puniſhes me, to bring me to a falſe Religion; it is not his Opinion that will excuſe him, when he comes to anſwer for it to his Judge. For certainly Men are as accountable for their Opinions (thoſe of them, I mean, which influence their Practice) as they are for their Actions.*

Here is therefore no ſhifting forwards and backwards, *as you pretend; nor any* Circle, *but in your own Imagination. For tho' it be true that I ſay,* The Magiſtrate has no Power to puniſh Men, to compel them to his Religion; *yet I no where ſay, nor will it follow from any thing I do ſay, That he has Power* to compel them to conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince them of the Truth of his Religion. *But I do not much wonder that you endeavour to put this upon me. For I think by this time it is pretty plain, that otherwiſe you would have but little to ſay: And it is* an Art very much in Uſe among ſome ſort of learned Men, *when they cannot confute what an Adverſary does ſay, to make him ſay what he does not; that they may have ſomething which they can confute.*

The beginning of this Anſwer is Part of the old Song of Triumph; *What! Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince Men of the Truth of Falſhood?* Yes, Sir, the Magiſtrate may uſe Force to make Men conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments, which he thinks proper and ſufficient to convince Men of the Truth of his Religion, though his Religion be a falſe one. And this is as poſſible for him to do, as for a Man as learned as your ſelf, to write a Book, and uſe Arguments, as he thinks proper and ſufficient to convince Men of the Truth of his Opinion, though it be a Falſhood.

As to the remaining Part of your Anſwer, the Queſtion is not, Whether *the Magiſtrate's Opinion can change the Nature of Things, or the Power* he has, or *excuſe* him *to his Judge* for miſuſing of it? But this, that ſince all Magiſtrates, in your Opinion, have Commiſſion, and are obliged to promote the true Religion by Force, and they can be guided in the diſcharge of this Duty by nothing but their own Opinion of the true Religion, What Advantage can this be to the true Religion, what Benefit to their Subjects, or whether it amounts to any more than a Commiſſion to every Magiſtrate to uſe Force for the promoting his own Religion? To this Queſtion therefore you will do well to apply your Anſwer, which a Man of leſs Skill than you, will be ſcare able to do.

You tell us indeed, that *whatever the Magiſtrate's Opinion be, his Power was given him (as the Apoſtles Power was to them) for Edification only, and not for Deſtruction.* But if the Apoſtles Power had been given them for one End, and St. *Paul*, St. *Peter*, and nine others of the Twelve had had nothing to guide them but their own Opinion, which led them to another End; I ask you whether the Edification of the Church could have been carry'd on as it was?

You tell us farther, that *it may always be ſaid of the Magiſtrate (what St.* Paul *ſaid of himſelf) that he can do nothing againſt the Truth, but for the Truth.* Witneſs the K. of *France*. If you ſay this in the ſame Senſe that St. *Paul* ſaid it of himſelf, who in all things requiſite for *Edification*, had the immediate Direction and Guidance of the unerring Spirit of God, and ſo was infallible, we need not go to *Rome* for an *infallible* Guide, every Country has one in their Magiſtrate. If you apply theſe Words to the Magiſtrate in another Senſe, than what St. *Paul* ſpoke them in of himſelf, ſober Men will be apt to think, you have a great Care to inſinuate into others a high Veneration for the Magiſtrate; but that you your ſelf have no over-great Reverence for the Scripture, which you thus uſe; nor for the Truth, which you thus defend.

To

To deny the Magiſtrate to have a Power *to compel Men to his Religion*: But yet to ſay the *Magiſtrate* has a *Power*, and is *bound to puniſh Men* to make them *conſider*, till they ceaſe to *reject* the *true Religion*; of which true Religion he muſt be Judge, or elſe nothing can be done in Diſcharge of this his Duty, is ſo like going round about to come to the ſame Place, that it will always be a Circle in mine and other Peoples Imagination, and not only there, but in your Hypotheſis.

Pag. 76. All that you ſay turns upon the Truth or Falſhood of this Propoſition; *That whoever puniſhes any one in Matters of Religion to make him conſider, takes upon him to be Judge for another what is right in Matters of Religion.* This you think plainly involves a Contradiction; and ſo it would, if theſe general Terms had in your Uſe of them their ordinary and uſual Meaning. But, Sir, be but pleaſed to take along with you, That *whoever puniſhes any Man* your way *in Matters of Religion, to make him conſider*, as you uſe the Word *conſider*, *takes upon him to be Judge for another what is right in Matters of Religion*; and you will find it ſo far from a Contradiction, that it is a plain Truth. For your way of puniſhing is a peculiar way, and is this; That the Magiſtrate, where the National Religion is the true Religion, ſhould puniſh thoſe who diſſent from it, to *make them conſider as they ought*, i. e. till they ceaſe *to reject*; or, in other Words, till they conform to it. If therefore he puniſhes none but thoſe who diſſent from, and puniſhes them till they conform to that which he judges the true Religion, does he not take on him to judge for them what is the true Religion?

'Tis true indeed what you ſay, there is no other Reaſon to *puniſh another to make him conſider, but that he ſhould judge for himſelf*; And this will always hold true amongſt thoſe, who when they ſpeak of *conſidering*, mean *conſidering*, and nothing elſe. But then theſe Things will follow from thence: 1. That in inflicting of Penalties to make Men *conſider*, the Magiſtrate of a Country, where the National Religion is falſe, no more miſapplies his Power, than he whoſe Religion is true; for one

Pag. 27. has as much Right to puniſh the Negligent to make him *conſider*, *ſtudy*, and *examine* Matters of Religion, as the other. 2. If the Magiſtrate puniſhes Men in Matters of Religion, truly to make them *conſider*, he will puniſh all that do not *conſider*, whether Conformiſts or Nonconformiſts. 3. If the Magiſtrate puniſhes in Matters of Religion to make Men *conſider*, it is, as you, *to make Men judge for themſelves*: For *there is no uſe of conſidering, but in order to judging.* But then when a Man has judg'd for himſelf, the Penalties for not *conſidering* are to be taken off: For elſe your ſaying that a Man is puniſh'd *to make him conſider, that he may judge for himſelf*, is plain Mockery. So that either you muſt reform your Scheme, or allow this Propoſition to be true, *viz. Whoever puniſhes any Man in Matters of Religion, to make him* in your Senſe *conſider, takes upon him to judge for another what is Right in Matters of Religion*: and with it the Concluſion, *viz.* Therefore *whoever puniſhes any one in Matters of Religion, to make him conſider, takes upon him to do what no Man can do, and conſequently miſapplies his Power of puniſhing, if he has that Power.* Which *Concluſion*, you ſay, you *ſhould readily admit as ſufficiently demonſtrated, if the Propoſition* before-mention'd were true.

But farther, if it could enter into the Head of any Law-maker but you, to puniſh Men for the Omiſſion of, or to make them perform any internal Act of the Mind, ſuch as is Conſideration; whoever in Matters of Religion would lay an Injunction on Men to make them conſider, could not do it without judging for them *in Matters of Religion*, unleſs they had no Religion at all; and then they come not within our Author's Toleration, which is a Toleration only of Men of different Religions, or of different Opinions in Religion. For ſuppoſing you the Magiſtrate with full Power, and (as you imagin'd) Right of *puniſhing any one in Matters of Religion*, how could you poſſibly puniſh any one *to make him conſider*, without judging for him what is right in matters of Religion? I will ſuppoſe my ſelf brought before your Worſhip, under what Character you pleaſe, and then I deſire to know what one or more Queſtions you would ask me, upon my Anſwer to which you could judge me fit to be puniſhed to make me conſider, without taking upon you to judge for me what is right in matters of Religon? For I conclude from the Faſhion of my Coat, or the Colour of my Eyes, you would not judge that I ought to be *puniſhed in Matters of Religion to make me conſider*. If you could, I ſhould allow you not only as capable, but much more *capable of coactive Power than other Men.*

But

But ſince you could not judge me to need Puniſhment in Matters of Religion, to make me conſider, without knowing my Thoughts concerning Religion, we will ſuppoſe you (being of the Church of *England*) would examine me in the Catechiſm and Liturgy of that Church, which poſſibly I could neither ſay nor anſwer right to. 'Tis like, upon this, you would judge me fit to be puniſhed to make me conſider. Wherein, 'tis evident, you judg'd for me, that the Religion of the Church of *England* was right; for without that Judgment of yours you would not have puniſhed me. We will ſuppoſe you to go yet farther, and examine me concerning the Goſpel, and the Truth of the Principles of the Chriſtian Religion, and you find me anſwer therein not to your liking: Here again no doubt you will puniſh me to make me conſider; but is it not becauſe you judge for me, that the Chriſtian Religion is the right? Go on thus as far as you will, and till you find I had no Religion at all, you could not puniſh me to make me to conſider, without taking upon you to judge for me what is right in Matters of Religion.

To puniſh without a Fault, is Injuſtice; and to puniſh a Man without judging him guilty of that Fault, is alſo Injuſtice; and to puniſh a Man, who has any Religion to make him conſider, or, which is the ſame thing, for not having ſufficiently conſidered, is no more nor leſs, but puniſhing him for not being of the Religion you think beſt for him; that is the Fault, and that is the Fault you judge him guilty of, call it *conſidering* as you pleaſe. For let him fall into the Hands of a Magiſtrate of whoſe Religion he is, he judgeth him to have conſidered ſufficiently. From whence 'tis plain, 'tis Religion is judg'd of, and not Conſideration, or Want of Conſideration. And 'tis in vain to pretend that he is puniſh'd *to make him judge for himſelf:* For he that is of any Religion, has already judg'd for himſelf; and if you puniſh him after that, under Pretence to make him conſider that he may judge for himſelf, 'tis plain you puniſh him to make him judge otherwiſe than he has already judg'd, and to judge as you have judg'd for him.

Your next Paragraph complains of my not having contradicted the following Words of yours, which I had cited out of your *A.* p. 26. which that the Reader may judge of, I ſhall here ſet down again. *And all the Hurt that comes to them by it, is only the ſuffering ſome tolerable Inconveniences, for their following the Light of their own Reaſon, and the Dictates of their own Conſciences: which certainly is no ſuch Miſchief to Mankind, as to make it more eligible, that there ſhould be no ſuch Power veſted in the Magiſtrate; but the Care of every Man's Soul ſhould be left to him alone, (as this Author demands it ſhould be:) that is, that every Man ſhould be ſuffered quietly, and without the leaſt Moleſtation; either to take no Care at all of his Soul, if he be ſo pleaſed; or in doing it, to follow his own groundleſs Prejudices, or unaccountable Humour, or any crafty Seducer, whom he may think fit to take for his Guide.* To which I ſhall here ſubjoin my Anſwer and your Reply.

L. 2. p. 291. "*Why ſhould* not the *Care of every Man's Soul be left to himſelf*, rather than the Magiſtrate? Is the Magiſtrate like to be more concern'd for it? Is the Magiſtrate like to take more Care of it? Is the Magiſtrate commonly more careful of his own, than other Men are of theirs? Will you ſay the Magiſtrate is leſs expos'd, in Matters of Religion, to *Prejudices*,

L. 3. p. 76. *Which Words you ſet down at large; but inſtead of contradicting them, or offering to ſhew that the* Miſchief *ſpoken of, is* ſuch as makes it more eligible, *&c. you only demand,* Why ſhould not the Care of every Man's Soul be left to himſelf, rather than the Magiſtrate? Is the Magiſtrate like to be more concern'd for it? Is the Magiſtrate like to take more Care of it, *&c. As if not to leave the Care of every Man's Soul to* himſelf alone, *were, as you expreſs it afterwards,* to take the Care of Mens Souls from themſelves: *Or as if to veſt a Power in the Magiſtrate, to procure as much as in him lies* (i. e. *as far as it can be procured by convenient Penalties*) *that Men take ſuch Care of their Souls as they ought to do, were to leave the Care of their Souls* to the Magiſtrate rather than to themſelves: *Which no Man but your ſelf will imagine. I acknowledge as freely as you can do, that as every Man is more concern'd than any Man elſe can be, ſo he is likewiſe more oblig'd to take Care of his Soul; and that no Man can by any Means be diſcharged of the Care of his Soul; which, when all is done, will never be ſaved but by his own Care of it. But do I contradict any thing of this, when I ſay, that the Care of every Man's Soul ought not to be left to* himſelf alone? *Or, that it is the Intereſt*

" *Humours*, and *crafty Seducers*, than other Men? If you cannot lay your Hand on your Heart, and ſay all this, what then will be got by the Change? And *why may not the Care of every Man's Soul be left to himſelf?* Eſpecially, if a Man be in ſo much Danger to miſs the Truth, *who is ſuffered quietly, and without the leaſt Moleſtation, either to take no Care of his Soul, if he be ſo pleaſed, or to follow his own Prejudices*, &c. For if Want of *Moleſtation* be the dangerous State wherein Men are likelieſt to miſs the right Way, it muſt be confeſſed, that of all Men, the Magiſtrate is moſt in Danger to be in the wrong, and ſo the unfitteſt (if you take the *Care of Mens Souls from themſelves*) of all Men, to be entruſted with it. For he never meets with that great and only Antidote of yours againſt Error, which you here call *Moleſtation*. He never has the Benefit of your ſovereign Remedy, *Puniſhment*, to make him conſider, which you think ſo neceſſary, that you look on it as a moſt dangerous State for Men to be without it; and therefore tell us, *'Tis every*

Intereſt of Mankind, that the Magiſtrate be entruſted and obliged to take Care, as far as lies in him, that no Man neglect his own Soul: I thought, I confeſs, that every Man was in ſome ſort charged with the Care of his Neighbour's *Soul. But in your Way of Reaſoning, he that affirms this, takes away the Care of every Man's Soul from* himſelf, *and leaves it to his* Neighbour *rather than to himſelf. But if this be plainly abſurd, as every one ſees it is, then ſo it muſt be likewiſe to ſay, That he that veſts ſuch a Power as we here ſpeak of in the Magiſtrate,* takes away the Care of Mens Souls from themſelves, *and places it in the* Magiſtrate, rather than in themſelves.

What trifling then is it to ſay here, If you cannot lay your Hand upon your Heart, and ſay all this, (viz. *that the Magiſtrate is* like to be more concerned for other Men's Souls than themſelves, &c.) What then will be got by the Change? *For 'tis plain, here is no ſuch* Change *as you would inſinuate: But the Care of Souls which I aſſert to the Magiſtrate, is ſo far from diſcharging any Man of the Care of his own Soul, or leſſening his Obligation to it, that it ſerves to no other Purpoſe in the World, but to bring Men, who otherwiſe would not, to conſider, and do what the Intereſt of their Souls obliges them to.*

'Tis therefore manifeſt, that the thing here to be conſider'd is not, Whether the Magiſtrate be like to be more concern'd for other Mens Souls, *or* to take more Care of them than themſelves: *nor, Whether he be* commonly more careful of his own Soul, than other Men are of theirs: *nor, Whether he be* leſs expoſed, *in Matters of Religion,* to Prejudices, Humours, and crafty Seducers, than other Men: *nor yet, Whether he be not* more in danger to be in the wrong than other Men, in regard that he never meets with that great and only Antidote of *mine (as you call it)* againſt Error, which I here call Moleſtation. *But the Point upon which this Matter turns, is only this, Whether the Salvation of Souls be not better provided for, if the Magiſtrate be obliged to procure, as much as in him lies, that every Man take ſuch Care as he ought of his Soul, than if he be not ſo obliged, but the Care of every Man's Soul be left to himſelf alone: Which certainly any Man of common Senſe may eaſily determine. For as you will not, I ſuppoſe, deny but God has more amply provided for the Salvation of your own Soul, by obliging your Neighbour, as well as your ſelf, to take Care of it; tho' 'tis poſſible your Neighbours may not be* more concern'd *for it than your ſelf; or may not be* more careful *of his own Soul, than you are of yours; or may be no leſs* expoſed, *in his Matters of Religion, to* Prejudices, &c. *than you are; becauſe if you are your ſelf wanting to your own Soul, it is more likely that you will be brought to take Care of it, if your Neighbour be obliged to admoniſh and exhort you to it, than if he be not; though it may fall out that he will not do what he is obliged to do in that Caſe: So I think it cannot be denied, but the Salvation of all Mens Souls is better provided for, if beſides the Obligation which every Man has to take Care of his own Soul (and that which every Man's Neighbour has likewiſe to do it) the Magiſtrate alſo be entruſted and obliged to ſee that no Man neglect his Soul, than it would be, if every Man were left to himſelf in this Matter: Becauſe tho' we ſhould admit that the Magiſtrate is not* like to be, *or is not ordinarily* more concern'd for other Mens Souls, than they themſelves are, *&c. it is nevertheleſs undeniably true ſtill, that whoever neglects his Soul, is more likely to be brought to take Care of it, if the Magiſtrate*

" *every Man's true* " Intereſt, not to be " left *wholly to him-* " *ſelf in Matters of* " *Religion.*

giſtrate be obliged to do what lies in him to bring him to do it, than if he be not. Which is enough to ſhew, that it is every Man's true Intereſt, *that the Care of his Soul ſhould noe be left to himſelf alone, but that the* Magiſtrate *ſhould be ſo far entruſted with it as I contend that he is.*

Your Complaint of my not having formally contradicted the Words above-cited out of *A.* p. 26. looking as if there were ſome weighty Argument in them : I muſt Pag. 27. inform my Reader, that you are ſubjoin'd to thoſe, wherein you recommend the Uſe of Force in Matters of Religion, by the *Gain* thoſe that are puniſh'd ſhall make by it, though it be miſapplied by the Magiſtrate to bring them to a wrong Religion. So that theſe Words of yours, *all the Hurt that comes to them by it*, is *all the Hurt* that comes to Men by a Miſapplication of the Magiſtrate's Power, when being of a falſe Religion, he uſes Force to bring Men to it. And then your Propoſition ſtands thus, That *the ſuffering* what you call *tolerable Inconveniences for their following the Light of their own Reaſons, and the Dictates of their own Conſciences, is no ſuch Miſchief to Mankind as to make it more eligible, that there ſhould be no Power veſted in the Magiſtrate* to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion, though the Magiſtrates *miſapply* the Power, *i. e.* uſe it to bring Men to their own Religion when falſe.

This is the Sum of what you ſay, if it has any coherent Meaning in it : For it being to ſhew the Uſefulneſs of ſuch a Power veſted in the Magiſtrate, under the Miſcarriages and Miſapplications it is in common Practice obſerved to be liable to, can have no other Senſe. But I having proved, that if ſuch a Power be by the Law of Nature veſted in the Magiſtrate, every Magiſtrate is obliged to uſe it for the promoting of his Religion as far as he believes it to be true, ſhall not much trouble my ſelf, if like *a Man of Art* you ſhould uſe your Skill to give it another Senſe : For ſuch is your natural Talent, or great Caution, that you love to ſpeak indefinitely, and, as ſeldom as may be, leave your ſelf accountable for any Propoſitions of a clear determined Senſe ; but under Words of doubtful, but ſeeming plauſible Signification, conceal a Meaning, which plainly expreſſed would, at firſt ſight, appear to contradict your own Poſitions, or common Senſe. Inſtances whereof, more than one, we have here in this Sentence of yours. For, 1. The Words *tolerable Inconveniences* carry a very fair Shew of ſome very ſlight Matter ; and yet when we come examine them, may compehend any of thoſe Severities lately uſed in *France*. For theſe *tolerable Inconveniences* are the ſame you in this very Page and elſewhere call *convenient Penalties*. *Convenient* for what ? In this very Place they muſt be ſuch, as may keep Men *from following their own groundleſs Prejudices, unaccountable Humours, and crafty Seducers*. And you tell us, the Magiſtrate may require Men under *convenient Penalties* Pag. 48. *to forſake their falſe Religions, and embrace the true*. Who now muſt be Judge, in theſe Caſes, what are *convenient Penalties* ? Common Senſe will tell us, the Magiſtrate that uſe them : But beſides, we have your Word for it, that the Magiſtrate's *Pru-* A. p. 50. *dence* and *Experience enables him to judge* beſt *what Penalties do agree with* your Rule of Moderation, which, as I have ſhewn, is no Rule at all. So that at laſt your *tolerable Inconveniences* are ſuch as the Magiſtrate ſhall judge *convenient* to oppoſe to Mens *Prejudices, Humours*, and to *Seducers* ; ſuch as he ſhall think *convenient* to bring Men from their falſe Religions, or to puniſh their rejecting the true ; which whether they will not reach Mens Eſtates and Liberties, or go as far as any the King of *France* has uſed, is more than you can be Security for. 2. Another Set of good Words we have here, which at firſt hearing are apt to engage Mens Concern, as if too much could not be done to recover Men from ſo perilous a State as they ſeem to deſcribe ; and thoſe are Men *following* their own *groundleſs Prejudices, unaccountable Humours, or crafty Seducers*. Are not theſe Expreſſions to ſet forth a deplorable Condition, and to move Pity in all that hear them ? Enough to make the unattentiae Reader ready to cry out, Help for the Lord's ſake ; do any thing rather than ſuffer ſuch poor, prejudiced, ſeduced People to be eternally loſt. Whereas he that examines what Perſons theſe Words can in your Scheme deſcribe, will find they are only ſuch as any where diſſent from thoſe Articles of Faith, and Ceremonies of outward Worſhip, which the Magiſtrate, or at leaſt you his Director, approve of. For whilſt you talk thus of the true Religion in general, (and that ſo general, that you cannot allow your ſelf to deſcend ſo near to Particulars, as to recommend the

Searching

Searching and Study of the Scriptures to find it) and that the Power in the Magiſtrate's Hands to uſe Force, is to bring Men to the true Religion; I ask, whether you do not think, either he or you muſt be Judge, which is the true Religion, before he can exerciſe that Power? and then he muſt uſe his Force upon all thoſe who diſſent from it, who are then the *prejudiced*, *humourſome*, and *ſeduced* you here ſpeak of. Unleſs this be ſo, and the Magiſtrate be Judge, I ask, Who ſhall reſolve which is the *prejudiced* Perſon, the Prince with his Politicks, or he that ſuffers for his Religion? Which the more dangerous *Seducer*, *Lewis* the XIVth with his Dragoons, or Mr. *Claud* with his Sermons? It will be no ſmall Difficulty to find out the Perſons who are guilty of *following groundleſs Prejudices*, *unaccountable Humours*, *or crafty Seducers*, unleſs in thoſe Places where you ſhall be graciouſly pleaſed to decide the Queſtion; and out of the Plenitude of your Power and Infallibility to declare which of the *Civil Sovereigns* now in Being do, and which do not eſpouſe the one only true Religion, and then we ſhall certainly know that thoſe who diſſent from the Religion of thoſe Magiſtrates, are theſe *prejudiced*, *humourſome*, *ſeduced Perſons*.

But truly as you put it here, you leave the Matter perplex'd, when you defend the Eligibleneſs of veſting a Power in the Magiſtrate's Hands, to remedy by Penalties Mens *following their own groundleſs Prejudices*, *unaccountable Humours*, *and crafty Seducers*, when in the ſame Sentence you ſuppoſe the Magiſtrate who is veſted with this Power, may inflict thoſe Penalties on Men, *for their following the Light of their own Reaſon, and the Dictates of their own Conſciences*; which when you have conſidered, perhaps you will not think my Anſwer ſo wholly beſides the Matter, tho' it ſhewed you but that one Abſurdity, without a formal Contradiction to ſo looſe and undetermin'd a Propoſition, that it required more Pains to unravel the Senſe of what was covered under deceitful Expreſſions, than the Weight of the Matter contained in them was worth.

For beſides what is already ſaid to it: How is it poſſible for any one (who had the greateſt Mind in the World to Contradiction) to deny it to be *more eligible* that ſuch a Power ſhould be veſted in the Magiſtrate, till he knows, to whom you affirm it to be *more eligible*? Is it *more eligible* to thoſe who ſuffer by it, *for following the Light of their own Reaſon, and the Dictates of their own Conſciences*? For theſe you know are *Gainers* by it, *for they know better than they did before where the Truth does lie*. Is it *more eligible* to thoſe who have no other Thoughts of Religion, but to be of that of their Country without any farther Examination? Or is it *more eligible* to thoſe who think it their Duty to examine Matters of Religion, and to follow that which upon Examination appears to them the Truth? The former of theſe two make, I think, the greater Part of Mankind, though the latter be the better adviſed: but upon what Grounds it ſhould be more eligible to either of them, that the Magiſtrate ſhould, than that he ſhould not have a *Power veſted* in him to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion, when it cannot be employed but to bring Men to that which he thinks the true, *i. e.* to his own Religion, is not eaſy to gueſs. Or is it more *eligible* to the Prieſts and Miniſters of National Religions every where, that the Magiſtrate ſhould be veſted with this Power? Who being ſure to be Orthodox, will have Right to claim the Aſſiſtance of the Magiſtrate's Power to bring thoſe whom their Arguments cannot prevail, or no Arguments can prevail on, to *embrace* their *true Religion*, and *to worſhip God in decent Ways preſcribed by thoſe to whom God has left the Ordering of ſuch Matters*. Or laſt of all, Is it more *eligible* to all Mankind? And are the Magiſtrates of the World ſo careful or ſo lucky in the Choice of their Religion, that it would be an Advantage to Mankind, that they ſhould have a Right to *do what in them lies*, i. e. to uſe all the Force they have, if they think convenient, to bring Men to the Religion they think true? When you have told us to which of theſe, or what other, *it is more eligible*; I ſuppoſe the Reader will without my contradicting it, ſee how little Truth there is in it, or how little to your Purpoſe.

If you will pardon me for not having contradicted that Paſſage of yours we have been conſidering, I will endeavour to make you amends in what you ſay in Reply to my Anſwer to it, and tell you that, notwithſtanding all you ſay to the contrary, ſuch a Power as you would have to be *veſted in the Magiſtrate*, takes away the Care of Mens Souls from themſelves, and places it in the Magiſtrate, rather than in themſelves. For if when Men have examined, and upon Examination embrace what appears to them the true Religion, the Magiſtrate has a Right to treat them as miſled by a *Prejudice*, *Humour*, or *Seducers*; if he may uſe what Force, and inflict what Puniſh-

ments

ments he ſhall think *convenient* till they conform to the Religionthe Magiſtrate judges the true, I think you will ſcarce deny, but that the Care of their Souls is by ſuch a Power placed rather in the Magiſtrate than in themſelves, and taken as much from them as by Force and Authority it can be. This, whatever you pretend, is the Power which your Syſtem places in the Magiſtrate. Nor can he upon your Principles exerciſe it otherwiſe, as I imagine I have ſhewed.

You ſpeak here, as if this *Power*, which you would have to be *veſted* in the Magiſtrate, did not at all *diſcharge*, but aſſiſt the Care every one has or ought to have of his own Soul. I grant, were the Power you would place in the Magiſtrate ſuch as every Man has to take Care of his Neigbour's Soul, which is to expreſs it ſelf only by Council, Arguments and Perſuaſion; it left him ſtill the free Liberty of judging for himſelf; and ſo the Care of his Soul remain'd ſtill in his own Hands. But if Men be perſuaded, that the wiſe and good God has *veſted a Power in the Magiſtrate*, to be ſo far Judge for them, what is *the true Religion*, as to puniſh them for *rejecting* the Religion which the Magiſtrate thinks the true, when offer'd with ſuch *Evidence* as he judges *ſufficient* to convince them; and to puniſh them on till they conſider ſo as to embrace it; what remains, but that they render themſelves to the Care and Conduct of a Guide, that God in his Goodneſs has appointed them, who have Authority and Commiſſion from God to be Judge for them, which is the true Religion, and what are Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince any one of it; and he himſelf being convinc'd of it, why ſhould they be ſo fooliſh, as to ſuffer Puniſhments in Oppoſition to a Power which is in the Right, and they ought to ſubmit to? To what Purpoſe ſhould they, under the Weight of Penalties, waſte Time and Pains in examining, ſince whatever they ſhould judge upon examination, the Magiſtrate judging the Arguments and Reaſons he offers for the truth of his Religion, *proper and ſufficient to convince* them, they muſt ſtill lie under the Puniſhment the Magiſtrate ſhall think *convenient* till they do comply?

Beſides, when they are thus puniſhed by their Magiſtrate for not conforming, what need they examine? Since you tell them, *It is not ſtrictly neceſſary to Salvation, that all that are of the true Religion ſhould underſtand the Grounds of it.* The Magiſtrate being of the one only true Religion, *knows* it to be ſo; and he *knows* that that Religion was *tender'd* to them with *ſufficient Evidence*, and therefore is oblig'd to puniſh them for rejecting it. This is that which Men muſt upon your Scheme ſuppoſe; for it is, what you your ſelf muſt ſuppoſe, before the Magiſtrate can exerciſe that Power you contend to be *veſted* in him, as is evident to any one, who will put your Syſtem together, and particularly weigh what you ſay.

When therefore Men are put into ſuch a State as this, that the Magiſtrate Pag. 48.
may judge which *is the true Religion*; the Magiſtrate may judge what is *ſufficient Evidence* of its Truth; the Magiſtrate may be Judge to whom it is tender'd with *ſufficient Evidence*, and *puniſh* them that *reject it ſo propoſed*, with ſuch Penalties as he alſo ſhall judge *convenient*, and all this by God's Appointment, and an Authority receiv'd from the *wiſe and benign Governor of all Things*, I ask, whether the Care of Mens Souls are not taken out of their own Hands, and put into the Magiſtrates? Whether in ſuch a State they can or will think there is any Need, or that it is to any Purpoſe for them to examine? And whether this be a Cure for the natural Averſion that is in Men to conſider and weigh Matters of Religion; and the way to Force, or ſo much as encourage them to examine?

But, ſay you, *the Salvation of all Mens Souls is better provided for, beſides the Ob-* Pag. 78.
ligation that every Man has to take Care of his own Soul, the Magiſtrate alſo be intruſted and obliged to ſee that no Man neglect his own Soul, than it would be if every Man were left to himſef in that Matter. Whatever Ground another may have to ſay this, you can have none: You who give ſo good Reaſon why Conformiſts, tho' never ſo igno- Pag. 64.
rant and negligent in examining *matters of Religion*, cannot yet be puniſhed to make them conſider, muſt acknowledge that *ALL Mens Salvation is not the better provided for by a Power* veſted in the *Magiſtrate*, which cannot reach the far greateſt Part of Men, which are every-where the *Conformiſt* to the *National Religion*. You that plead Pag. 22.
ſo well for the Magiſtrate's not examining whether thoſe that conform, do it upon *Reaſon or Conviction*, but ſay it is *ordinary preſumable* they do ſo; Wherein I beſeech you do you put this Care of Mens Salvation that is placed in the Magiſtrate? even in bringing them to outward Conformity to the National Religion, and there leaving them. And are the Souls of all Mankind the *better provided for*, if the Magiſtrates of the

the World are veſted with a Power to uſe Force to bring Men to an outward Profeſſion of what they think the true Religion, without any other Care of their Salvation? For thither, and no farther, reaches their uſe of Force in your way of applying it.

Give me leave therefore to *triſle with you once again*, and to deſire you to lay your Hand upon your Heart, and tell me what Mankind ſhall gain by the Change? For I hope by this Time it is not ſo much a Paradox to you, that if the Magiſtrate be commiſſion'd by God to take Care of Mens Souls, in your way it takes away the Care of Mens Souls from themſelves in all thoſe who have need of this Aſſiſtance of the Magiſtrate, *i. e.* all thoſe who neglect to conſider, and are averſe to Examination.

One thing more give me leave to obſerve to you, that is, that *taking Care of Mens Souls*, or *taking Care that they neglect not their Souls*, and laying Penalties on them to bring them in outward Profeſſion to the National Religion, are two very different things, tho' in this Place and elſewhere you confound them, and would have Penal Laws, requiring Church-Conformity, paſs under the Name of *Care of Mens Souls*, for that is the utmoſt your way of applying Force does or can reach to; and what *Care* is therein taken *of Mens Souls*, may be ſeen by the Lives and Knowledge obſervable in not a few Conformiſts. This is not ſaid to lay any Blame on Conformity, but to ſhew how improperly you ſpeak, when you call Penal Laws made to promote Conformity, and Force uſed to bring Men to it, a *Care of Mens Souls*; when even the exacteſt Obſervers, and moſt zealous Advancers of Conformity may be as irreligious, ignorant, and vicious as any other Men.

In the firſt Treatiſe we heard not a Syllable of any other Uſe or End of Force in Matters of Religion, but only to make Men conſider. But in your Second,
Pag. 13. being forced to own bare-faced the puniſhing of Men for their Religion, you call it a *Vice* to *reject the true Faith*, and to refuſe *to worſhip God in decent ways preſcribed*
Pag. 20. *by thoſe to whom God has left the ordering of it*; and tell us, that it is a *Fault* which *may juſtly be puniſhed* by the Magiſtrate, *not to be of the National Religion, where the True is the National Religion.* To make this Doctrine of Perſecution ſeem limited, and go down the better, to your telling us it muſt be only where the *National Religion* is the *True*, and that the Penalties muſt be *moderate* and *convenient*; both which Limitations having no other Judge but the Magiſtrate, (as I have ſhew'd
Pag. 20. elſewhere, are no Limitations at all, you in Words add a Third, that in effect ſignifies juſt as much as the other two: and that is, *If there be ſufficient Means of Inſtruction provided for all for inſtructing them in the Truth of it*; of which Proviſion the Magiſtrate alſo being to be Judge, your Limitations leave him as free to puniſh all Diſſenters from his own Religion, as any Perſecutor can wiſh; for what he will think *ſufficient Means of Inſtruction*, it will be hard for you to ſay.

In the mean time, as far as may be gathered from what you ſay in another
Pag. 63. Place, we will examine what you think *ſufficient Proviſion for inſtructing Men*, which you have expreſs'd in theſe Words: *For if the Magiſtrate provide ſufficiently for the Inſtruction of all his Subjects in the true Religion, and then requires them all under convenient Penalties to hearken to the Teachers and Miniſters of it, and to profeſs and exerciſe it with one Accord under their Direction in publick Aſſemblies.* That which ſtumbles one at the firſt View of this your Method of Inſtruction, is, that you leave it uncertain, whether Diſſenters muſt firſt be inſtructed, and then profeſs; or elſe firſt profeſs, and then be inſtructed in the National Religion. This you will do well to be a little more clear in the next time; for you mentioning no Inſtruction but in publick Aſſemblies, and perhaps meaning it for a Country where there is a little other Pains taken with Diſſenters but the Confutation and Condemnation of them in Aſſemblies, where they are not, they muſt ceaſe to be Diſſenters before they can partake of this ſufficient Means of Inſtruction.

And now for thoſe who do *with one Accord* put themſelves *under the Direction of the Miniſters of* the National, and *hearken to* theſe *Teachers* of the true Religion. I ask whether one half of thoſe whereof moſt of the Aſſemblies are made up, do or can (ſo ignorant as they are) underſtand what they hear from the Pulpit? And then whether if a Man did underſtand, what in many Aſſemblies ordinarily is deliver'd once a Week there for his Inſtruction, he might not yet at threeſcore Years end be ignorant of the Grounds and Principles of the Chriſtian Religion? Your having ſo often in your Letter mentioned *ſufficient Proviſion of Inſtruction*, has forced theſe two ſhort Queſtions from me. But I forbear to tell you what I have heard very ſober People, even of the Church of *England* ſay upon this Occaſion: For you have warn'd me already, that

it

it ſhall be interpreted to be a Quarrel to the Clergy in general, if any thing ſhall be taken notice of in any of them worthy to be mended. I leave it to thoſe whoſe Profeſſion it is to judge, whether Divinity be a Science wherein Men may be inſtructed by an Harangue or two once a Week, upon any Subject at a Venture, which has no Coherence with that which preceded, or that which is to follow, and this made to People that are ignorant of the firſt Principles of it, and are not capable of underſtanding ſuch Ways of Diſcourſes. I am ſure he that ſhould think this *a ſufficient Means of inſtructing* People in any other Science, would at the End of ſeven or twenty Years find them very little advanced in it. And bating perhaps ſome Terms and Phraſes belonging to it, would be as far from all true and uſeful Knowledge of it as when they firſt began. Whether it be ſo in Matters of Religion, thoſe who have the Opportunity to obſerve muſt judge. And if it appear that amongſt thoſe of the National Church there be very many ſo ignorant, that there is nothing more frequent than for the Miniſters themſelves to complain of it, it is manifeſt from thoſe of the National Church (whatever may be concluded from Diſſenters) that the *Means of Inſtruction* provided by the Law, are not ſufficient, unleſs that be ſufficient Means of Inſtruction, which Men of ſufficient Capacity for other things, may live under many Years, and yet know very little by. If you ſay it is for want of Conſideration, muſt not your Remedy of Force be uſed to bring them to it? Or how will the Magiſtrate anſwer for it, if he uſe Force to make Diſſenters conſider, and let thoſe of his own Church periſh for want of it?

This being all one can well underſtand by your *ſufficient Means of Inſtruction*, as you there explain it, I do not ſee but Men have no Averſion to be inſtructed, may yet fail of it, notwithſtanding ſuch a Proviſion. Perhaps by *exerciſing the true Religion with one Accord under the Direction of the Miniſters of it in publick Aſſemblies*, you mean ſomething farther; but that not being an ordinary Phraſe, will need your Explication to make it underſtood.

CHAP. II.

Of the Magiſtrate's Commiſſion to uſe Force in Matters of Religion.

THOUGH in the foregoing Chapter our examining your Doctrine concerning the Magiſtrates, who may or may not uſe Force in Matters of Religion, we have in ſeveral Places happened to take notice of the Commiſſion whereby you authorize Magiſtrates to act; yet we ſhall in this Chapter more particularly conſider that Commiſſion. You tell us, *To uſe Force*, in Matters of Religion, *is a Duty* of the Magiſtrate *as old as the Law of Nature, in which the Magiſtrate's Commiſſion lies: for the Scripture does not properly give it him, but ſuppoſes it.* And more at large you give us an Account of the Magiſtrate's Commiſſion in theſe Words: *'Tis true indeed,* the Author and Finiſher of our Faith *has given the Magiſtrate no new Power or Commiſſion: nor was there any need that he ſhould, (if himſelf had any Temporal Power to give:) For he found him already, even by the Law of Nature, the Miniſter of God to the People for Good, and bearing the Sword not in vain,* i. e. *inveſted with coactive Power, and obliged to uſe it for all the good Purpoſes which it might ſerve, and for which it ſhould be found needful; even for the Reſtraining of falſe and corrupt Religion: as* Job *long before (perhaps before any Part of the Scriptures were written) acknowledged, when he ſaid, that the Worſhipping* the Sun or the Moon, was an Iniquity to be puniſhed by the Judge. *But though our Saviour has given the Magiſtrates no new Power; yet being* King of Kings, *he expects and requires that they ſhould ſubmit themſelves to his Scepter, and uſe the Power which always belonged to them, for his Service, and for the Advancing his ſpiritual Kingdom in the World. And even that* Charity *which our great Maſter ſo earneſtly recommends, and ſo ſtrictly requires of all his Diſciples, as it obliges all Men to ſeek and promote the Good of others, as well as their own, eſpecially their Spiritual and Eternal Good, by ſuch Means as their ſeveral Places and Relations enable them to uſe: ſo does eſpecially oblige the Magiſtrate to do it* as a Magiſtrate, i. e. *by that Power which enables him to do it above the Rate of other Men.*

Pag. 35. Pag. 31. Job 21. 26, 27, 28.

So far therefore is the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, when he gives his Helping-hand to the Furtherance of the Goſpel, by laying convenient Penalties upon ſuch as reject it, or any Part of

of it, from the uſing any other Means for the Salvation of Mens Souls, than what the Author and Finiſher of our Faith has directed, that he does no more than his Duty to God, to his Redeemer, and to his Subjects requires of him.

Chriſt, ſay you, *has given no new Power or Commiſſion to the Magiſtrate*: and for this you give ſeveral Reaſons. 1. *There was no need that he ſhould.* Yet it ſeems ſtrange that the *Chriſtian Magiſtrate* alone ſhould have an Exerciſe of *coactive Power* in Matters of Religion, and yet our Saviour ſhould ſay nothing of it, but leave them to that Commiſſion which was common to them with all other Magiſtrates. The Chriſtian Religion in Caſes of leſs Moment is not wanting in its Rules; and I know not whether you will not charge the New Teſtament with a great Defect, if that Law alone which teaches the only true Religion, that Law which all Magiſtrates who are of the true Religion, receive and embrace, ſhould ſay nothing at all of ſo neceſſary and important a Duty to thoſe who alone are in a Capacity to diſcharge it, but leave them only to that general Law of Nature, which others who are not qualified to uſe this Force, have in common with them.

This at leaſt ſeems *needful*, if a new Commiſſion does not, that the *Chriſtian Magiſtrates* ſhould have been inſtructed what Degree of Force they ſhould uſe, and been limited to your *moderate Penalties*: ſince for above theſe 1200 Years, though they have readily enough found out your Commiſſion to uſe Force, they never found out your *moderate* Uſe of it, which is that alone which you aſſure us is *uſeful* and *neceſſary*.

2. You ſay, *If our Saviour had any Temporal Power to give*; whereby you ſeem to give this as a Reaſon why he gave not the Civil Magiſtrate Power to uſe Force in Matters of Religion, that he had it not to give. You tell us in the ſame Paragraph, that he is *King of Kings*; and he tells us himſelf, *That all Power is given unto him in Heaven and in Earth*: So that he could have given what Power, to whom, and to what Purpoſe he had pleaſed: and concerning this there needs no *If*. Matt. 28. 18.

3. *For he found him already by the Law of Nature inveſted with coactive Power, and obliged to uſe it for all the good Purpoſes which it might ſerve, and for which it ſhould be found needful.* He found alſo Fathers, Husbands, Maſters, inveſted with their diſtinct Powers by the ſame Law, and under the ſame Obligation; and yet he thought it needful to preſcribe to them in the Uſe of thoſe Powers: But *there was no need he ſhould* do ſo to the Civil Magiſtrates in the Uſe of their Power in Matters of Religion; becauſe tho' Fathers, Husbands, Maſters, were liable to Exceſs in the Uſe of theirs, yet Chriſtian Magiſtrates were not, as appears by their having always kept thoſe *moderate* Meaſures, which you aſſure us to be the only *neceſſary and uſeful*.

And what at laſt is their Commiſſion? Even that *of Charity, which obliges all Men to ſeek and promote the Good of others, eſpecially their Spiritual and Eternal Good, by ſuch Means as their ſeveral Places and Relations enable them to uſe, eſpecially Magiſtrates as Magiſtrates.* This Duty of Charity is well diſcharged by the *Magiſtrate as Magiſtrate*, is it not? in bringing Men to an outward Profeſſion of any, even of the true Religion, and leaving them there? But, Sir, I ask you who muſt be Judge, what is for the *Spiritual and Eternal Good* of his Subjects, the Magiſtrate himſelf or no? If not he himſelf, who for him? Or can it be done without any one's judging at all? If he, the Magiſtrate, muſt judge every where himſelf what is *for the ſpiritual and eternal Good* of his Subjects, as I ſee no Help for it; if the Magiſtrate be every where by the *Law of Nature obliged to promote their Spiritual and Eternal Good*, is not the true Religion like to find great Advantage in the World by the uſe of Force in the Magiſtrate's Hands? And is not this a plain Demonſtration that God has by the Law of Nature given by Commiſſion to the Magiſtrate to uſe Force for the promoting the true Religion, ſince (as it is evident) the Execution of ſuch a Commiſſion will do ſo much more Harm than Good?

Pag. 17. To ſhew that your *indirect and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*, with *a general Neceſſity of Force, authorizes the Civil Power in the Uſe of it*, you uſe the following Words, *That Force does ſome Service towards the making of Scholars and Artiſts, I ſuppoſe you will eaſily grant. Give me leave therefore to ask, how it does it? I ſuppoſe you will ſay, not by its direct and proper Efficacy, (for Force is no more capable to work Learning or Arts, than the Belief of the true Religion in Men, by its direct and proper Efficacy;) but by prevailing upon thoſe who are deſigned for Scholars or Artiſts, to receive Inſtruction, and to apply themſelves to the Uſe of thoſe Means and Helps which are proper to make them what they are deſigned to be: that is, it does it indirectly, and at a diſtance. Well then, if all the Uſefulneſs of the Force towards the bringing Scholars or Apprentices to the Learning or Skill they are deſigned to attain, be only an* indirect and at a diſtince Uſefulneſs

neſs; *I pray what is it that warrants and authorizes Schoolmaſters, Tutors or Maſters, to uſe Force upon their Scholars or Apprentices, to bring them to Learning, or the Skill of their Arts and Trades, if ſuch an* indirect, and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs *of Force, together with that* Neceſſity *of it which Experience diſcovers, will not do it: I believe you will acknowledge that even ſuch an Uſefulneſs, together with that Neceſſity, will ſerve the Turn in theſe Caſes. But then I would fain know, why the ſame kind of Uſefulneſs, joined with the like Neceſſity, will not as well do it in the caſe before us? I confeſs I ſee no reaſon why it ſhould not; nor do I believe you can aſſign any.* You ask here, *what authorizes Schoolmaſters or Maſters to uſe Force on their Scholars and Apprentices, if ſuch an* indirect and at diſtance Uſefulneſs, *together with* Neceſſity, *does not do it?* I anſwer, neither your *indirect, and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*, nor the *Neceſſity* you ſuppoſe of it. For I do not think you will ſay, that any Schoolmaſter has a Power to teach, much leſs to uſe Force on any one's Child, without the Conſent and Authority of the Father: but a Father, you will ſay, has a Power to uſe Force to correct his Child to bring him to *Learning* or *Skill in that Trade he is deſigned to*; and to this the Father is authorized by the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of Force. This I deny, that the mere-ſuppoſed Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of Force authorizes the Father to uſe it; for then whenever he judg'd it uſeful and neceſſary for his Son, to prevail with him to apply himſelf to any *Trade*, he might uſe Force upon him to that purpoſe; which I think neither you nor any body elſe will ſay, a Father has a Right to do on his idle and perhaps married Son at 30 or 40 Years old.

There is then ſomething elſe in the caſe; and whatever it be that authorizes the Father to uſe Force upon his Child, to make him a Proficient in it, authorizes him alſo to chuſe that *Trade, Art* or Science he would have him a Proficient in: for the Father can no longer uſe Force upon his Son, to make him attain any *Art* or *Trade*, than he can preſcribe to him the Art or Trade he is to attain. Put your Parallel now if you pleaſe: The Father by the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of Force is authorized to uſe it upon his Child, to make him attain any *Art* or Science; therefore the Magiſtrate is authorized to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion, becauſe it is uſeful and neceſſary. Thus far you have uſed it, and you think it does well. But let us go on with the Parallel: This Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of Force authorizes the Father to uſe it, to make his Son apply himſelf to the uſe of the Means and Helps which are proper to make him *what he is deſigned to be*, no longer than it authorizes the Father to deſign what his Son ſhall be, and to chuſe for him the *Art* or *Trade* he ſhall be of: and ſo the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity you ſuppoſe in Force to bring Men to any Church, cannot authorize the Magiſtrate to uſe Force any farther, than he has a Right to chuſe for any one what Church or Religion he ſhall be of. So that if you will ſtick to this Argument, and allow the Parallel between a Magiſtrate and a Father, and the Right they have to uſe Force for the inſtructing of their Subjects in Religion, and Children in Arts, you muſt either allow the Magiſtrate to have Power to chuſe what Religion his Subjects ſhall be of, which you have denied, or elſe that he has no Power to uſe Force to make them uſe Means to be of it.

A Father being entruſted with the Care and Proviſion for his Child, is as well bound in Duty, as fitted by natural Love and Tenderneſs, to ſupply the Defects of his tender Age. When it is born the Child cannot move it ſelf for the Eaſe and Help of natural Neceſſities, the Parents Hands muſt ſupply that Inability, and feed, cleanſe and ſwaddle it. Age having giving more Strength, and the exerciſe of the Limbs, the Parents are diſcharged from the trouble of putting Meat into the Mouth of the Child, clothing or unclothing, or carrying him in their Arms. The ſame Duty and Affection which required ſuch kind of Helps to the Infant, makes them extend their Thoughts to other Cares for him when he is grown a little bigger; 'tis not only a preſent Support, but a future comfortable Subſiſtence begins to be thought on: To this ſome Art or Science is neceſſary, but the Child's Ignorance and want of Proſpect makes him unable to chuſe. And hence the Father has a Power to chuſe for him, that the flexible and docile part of Life may not be ſquandred away, and the Time of Inſtruction and Improvement be loſt for want of Direction. The Trade or Art being choſen by the Father, 'tis the Exerciſe and Induſtry of the Child muſt acquire it to himſelf: But Induſtry uſually wanting in Children, the Spur which Reaſon and Foreſight gives to the Endeavours of grown Men, the Father's Rod and Correction is fain to ſupply that Want, to make him *apply himſelf to the Uſe of thoſe Means and Helps which are proper to make him what he is deſigned to be.* But when the the Child is once come to the State

of Manhood, and to be the Poſſeſſor and free Diſpoſer of his Goods and Eſtate, he is then diſcharged from this Diſcipline of his Parents, and they have no longer any right to chuſe any Art, Science, or Courſe of Life for him, or by Force to make him apply himſelf to the uſe of thoſe Means which are proper to make him be *what he deſigns to be*. Thus the want of Knowledge to chuſe a fit Calling, and want of Knowledge of the Neceſſity of Pains and Induſtry to attain Skill in it, puts a Power into the Parents Hands to uſe Force where it is neceſſary to procure the Application and Diligence of their Children in that, which their Parents have thought fit to ſet them to; but it gives this Power to the Parents only, and to no other, whilſt they live; and if they die whilſt their Children need it, to their Subſtitutes; and there it is ſafely placed: for ſince their want of Knowledge during their Nonage, makes them want Direction; and want of Reaſon often makes them need Puniſhment and Force to excite their Endeavours, and keep them intent to the Uſe of thoſe Means that lead to the End they are directed to, the Tenderneſs and Love of Parents will engage them to uſe it only for their Good, and generally to quit it too, when by the Title of Manhood they come to be above the Direction and Diſcipline of Children. But how does this prove that the Magiſtrate has any right to force Men to *apply themſelves to the Uſe of thoſe Means and Helps which are proper to make them of any Religion*, more than it proves that the Magiſtrate has a Right to chuſe for them what Religion they ſhall be of?

To your Queſtion therefore, *What is it that warrants and authorizes Schoolmaſters, Tutors and Maſters to uſe Force upon their Scholars or Apprentices?* I anſwered, A Commiſſion from the Father or Mother, or thoſe who ſupply their Places; for without that no *indirect, or at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*, or ſuppoſed *Neceſſity*, could authorize them.

But then you will ask, Is it not this *Uſefulneſs* and *Neceſſity* that gives this Power to the Father and Mother? I grant it. *I would fain know then*, ſay you, *why the ſame Uſefulneſs joined with the like Neceſſity, will not as well do in the Caſe before us?* And I, Sir, will as readily tell you: Becauſe the Underſtanding of the Parents is to ſupply the want of it in the Minority of their Children, and therefore they have a Right not only to uſe Force to make their Children apply themſelves to the Means of acquiring any *Art* or *Trade*, but to chuſe alſo the Trade or Calling they ſhall be of. But when being come out of the State of Minority, they are ſuppoſed of Years of Diſcretion to chuſe what they will deſign themſelves to be, they are alſo at liberty to judge what Application and Induſtry they will uſe for the attaining of it; and then how negligent ſoever they are in the Uſe of the Means, how averſe ſoever to Inſtruction or Application, they are paſt the Correction of a Schoolmaſter, and their Parents can no longer chuſe or *deſign* for them what they ſhall be, nor uſe Force *to prevail with them to apply themſelves to the Uſe of thoſe Means and Helps which are proper to make them what they are deſigned to be*. He that imagines a Father or Tutor may ſend his Son to School at Thirty or Forty Years old, and order him to be whipp'd there, or that any *indirect and at a diſtance* Uſefulneſs will *authorize* him to be ſo uſed, will be thought fitter to be ſent thither himſelf, and there to receive due Correction.

When you have conſider'd 'tis otherwiſe in the caſe of the Magiſtrate uſing Force your Way in Matters of Religion; that there his Underſtanding is not to ſupply the Defect of Underſtanding in his Subjects, and that only for a time; that he cannot chuſe for any of his Subjects what Religion he ſhall be of, as you your ſelf confeſs; and that this Power of the Magiſtrate, if it be (as is claimed by you) over Men of all Ages, Parts and Endowments, you will perhaps *ſee ſome reaſon why it ſhould not do in the Caſe before us, as well* as *in that of Schoolmaſters and Tutors*, though you *believe I cannot aſſign any*. But, Sir, will your *indirect and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*, together with your ſuppoſed *Neceſſity*, authorize the Maſter of the Shoe-makers Company to take any one who comes in his Hands, and puniſh him for not being of the Shoe-makers Company, and not coming to their Guild, when he, who has a Right to chuſe of what Trade and Company he will be, thinks in not his Intereſt to be a Shoe-maker? Nor can he or any body elſe imagine that this Force, this Puniſhment is uſed to make him a good Shoe-maker, when it is ſeen and avowed that the Puniſhments ceaſe, and they are free from it who enter themſelves of the Company, whether they are really Shoe-makers, or in earneſt apply themſelves to be ſo or no. How much it differs from this, that the Magiſtrate ſhould puniſh Men for not being of his Church, who chuſe not to be of it, and when they are once entered into the Communion of it, are puniſhed no more, though they are as ignorant, unskilful, and unpractiſed in the Religion of it as before: how much, I ſay, this differs from the Caſe I propoſed,

poſed, I leave you to conſider. For after all your Pretences of uſing Force *for the Salvation of Souls*, and conſequently *to make Men really Chriſtians*, you are fain to allow, and you give Reaſons for it, that Force is uſed only to thoſe who are out of your Church: but whoever are once in it, are free from Force, whether they be *really Chriſtians*, and apply themſelves to thoſe Things which are *for the Salvation of their Souls*, or no.

As to what you ſay, That whether they chuſe it or no, they ought to chuſe it; for your Magiſtrate's Religion is the true Religion, that is the Queſtion between you and them: but be that as it will, if Force be to be uſed in the caſe, I have proved that, be the Magiſtrate's Religion true or falſe, he, whilſt he believes it to be true, is under an Obligation to uſe Force, as if it were true.

But ſince you think your Inſtance of Children ſo weighty and preſſing, give me leave to return you your Queſtion; I ask you then, Are not Parents as much *authorized* to teach their Children their Religion, as they are to teach them their Trade, when they have *deſigned* them to it? May they not as lawfully correct them to make them learn their Catechiſe, or the Principles of their Religion, as they may to make them learn *Clenard's* Grammar? Or may they not uſe Force to make them go to Maſs, or whatever they believe to be the Worſhip of the true Religion, as to go to School, or to learn any Art or Trade? If they may, as I think you will not deny, unleſs you will ſay, that none but Orthodox Parents may teach their Children any Religion: If they may, I ſay then, pray tell me a Reaſon (if your Arguments from the Diſcipline of Children be good) why the Magiſtrate may not uſe Force to bring Men to his Religion, as well as Parents may uſe Force to inſtruct Children, and bring them up in theirs? When you have conſidered this, you will perhaps find ſome difference between the State of Children and grown Men, betwixt thoſe under Tutelage, and thoſe who are free and at their own Diſpoſal; and be inclined to think that thoſe Reaſons which ſubject Children in their Non-age to the Uſe of Force, may not, nor do concern Men at Years of Diſcretion.

You tell us farther, That *Common-wealths are inſtituted for the attaining of all the Benefits which Political Government can yield: And therefore if the ſpiritual and eternal Intereſts of Men may any way be procured or advanced by Political Government, the procuring and advancing thoſe Intereſts muſt in all Reaſon be received amongſt the Ends of Civil Society, and ſo conſequently fall within the Compaſs of the Magiſtrate's Juriſdiction.* Concerning the Extent of the Magiſtrate's Juriſdiction, and the Ends of Civil Society, whether the Author or you have begg'd the Queſtion, which is the chief Buſineſs of your 56*th*, and two or three following Pages, I ſhall leave it to the Readers to judge, and bring the Matter, if you pleaſe, to a ſhorter Iſſue. The Queſtion is, Whether the Magiſtrate has any Power to interpoſe Force in Matters of Religion, or for the Salvation of Souls? The Argument againſt it is, That Civil Societies are not conſtituted for that End, and the Magiſtrate cannot uſe Force for Ends for which the Common-wealth was not conſtituted. A. p. 18.

The End of a Common-wealth conſtituted can be ſuppoſed no other, than what Men in the Conſtitution of, and entring into it propos'd; and that could do nothing but Protection from ſuch Injuries from other Men, which they deſiring to avoid, nothing but Force could prevent or remedy: all things but this being as well attainable by Men living in a Neighbourhood without the Bonds of a Common-wealth, they could propoſe to themſelves no other thing but this in quitting their natural Liberty, and putting themſelves under the Umpirage of a *Civil Sovereign*, who therefore had the Force of all the Members of the Common-wealth put into his Hands, to make his Degrees to this End be obeyed. Now ſince no Man, or Society of Men can by their Opinions in Religion, or Ways of Worſhip, do any Man who differed from them, any Injury, which he could not avoid or redreſs, if he deſired it, without the help of Force; the puniſhing any Opinion in Religion, or Ways of Worſhip by the Force given the Magiſtrate, could not be intended by thoſe who conſtituted, or entered into the Common-wealth, and ſo could be no End of it, but quite the contrary. For Force from a ſtronger Hand to bring a Man to a Religion, which another thinks the true, being an Injury which in the State of Nature every one would avoid, Protection from ſuch Injury is one of the Ends of a Common-wealth, and ſo every Man has a Right to Toleration.

If you will ſay, that Common-wealths are not voluntary Societies conſtituted by Men, and by Men freely entered into, I ſhall deſire you to prove it.

In

In the mean time allowing it you for good, that Common-wealths are conſtituted by God for Ends which he has appointed, without the Conſent and Contrivance of Men. If you ſay, that one of thoſe Ends is the Propagation of the true Religion, and the Salvation of Mens Souls; I ſhall deſire you to ſhew me any ſuch End expreſly appointed by God in Revelation; which ſince, as you confeſs, you cannot do, you have recourſe to the general Law of Nature? and what is that; The Law of Reaſon, whereby every one is commiſſioned to do good. And the Propagating the true Religion for the Salvation of Mens Souls, being doing good, you ſay, the *Civil Sovereigns* are commiſſioned and required by that Law to uſe their Force for thoſe Ends. But ſince by this Law all *Civil Sovereigns* are commiſſioned and obliged alike to uſe their *coactive Power* for the Propagating the true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls; and it is not poſſible for them to execute ſuch a Commiſſion, or obey that Law, but by uſing Force to bring Men to that Religion which they judge the true; by which uſe of Force, much more harm than good would be done towards the Propagating the true Religion in the World, as I have ſhewed elſewhere: Therefore no ſuch Commiſſion, whoſe Execution would do more harm than good, more hinder than promote the End for which it is ſuppoſed given, can be a Commiſſion from God by the Law of Nature. And this I ſuppoſe may ſatisfy you about the End of Civil-Societies or Common-wealths, and anſwer what you ſay concerning the Ends attainable by them.

But that you may not think the great Poſition of yours, which is ſo often uſher'd in with *doubtleſs*, (for which you imagine you have ſufficient Warrant in a miſapplied School-Maxim) is paſt over too ſlightly, and is not ſufficiently anſwered; I ſhall give you that farther Satisfaction.

Pag. 58. You ſay, *Civil Societies are inſtituted for the attaining all the Benefits which Civil Society or Political Government can yield*; and the Reaſon you give for it, becauſe *it has hitherto been univerſally acknowledged that no Power is given in vain*: And therefore if I *except any of thoſe Benefits*, I ſhall *be obliged to admit that the Power of attaining them was given in vain.* And if I do admit it, no harm will follow in human Affairs: Or if I may borrow an elegant Expreſſion of yours out of the foregoing Leaf, *The Fortune of* Europe *does not turn upon it.* In the voluntary Inſtitution, and beſtowing of Power, there is no Abſurdity or Inconvenience at all, that Power, ſufficient for ſeveral Ends, ſhould be limited by thoſe that give the Power only to one or ſome part of them. The Power which a General, commanding a potent Army, has, may be enough to take more Towns than one from the Enemy; or to ſuppreſs a domeſtick Sedition, and yet the Power of attaining thoſe Benefits, which is in his Hand, will not authorize him to emply the Force of the Army therein, if he be commiſſion'd only to beſiege and take one certain Place. So it is in a Common-wealth. The Power that is in the Civil Sovereign is the Force of all the Subjects of the Common-wealth, which ſuppoſing it ſufficient for other Ends, than the preſerving the Members of the Common-wealth in Peace from Injury and Violence: Yet if thoſe who gave him that Power, limited the Application of it to that ſole End, no Opinion of any other Benefits attainable by it can authorize him to uſe it otherwiſe.

Matth. 28. 18. Our Saviour tells us expreſly, That *all Power was given him in Heaven and Earth.* By which Power I imagine you will not ſay, *that the ſpiritual and eternal Intereſt* of thoſe *Men* whom you think need the Help of Political Force, and of all other Men too, could not *any way be procured or advanced*; and yet if you will hear him in another Place, you will find this Power (which being all Power, could certainly have wrought on all Men) limited to a certain Number: He ſays, *Thou haſt given him* [i. e. *thy Son*] *Power over all Fleſh, that he ſhould give Eternal Life to as many as thou haſt given him.* Whether your *univerſally acknowledged Maxim of Logick* be true enough to authorize you to ſay, that any Part of this *Power* was given him in vain, and to enable you to draw Conſequences from it, you were beſt ſee.

Joh. 17. 2. But were your Maxim ſo true that it proved, that ſince it might *indirectly and at a diſtance* do ſome Service towards the *procuring or advancing the ſpiritual Intereſt* of ſome few Subjects of a Common-wealth, therefore Force was to be em-

Pag. 56. ployed to that End; yet that will ſcarce make good this Doctrine of yours; *Doubtleſs, Common-wealths are Inſtituted for the attaining all thoſe Benefits which Political Government can yield; therefore if the Spiritual and Eternal Intereſts of Men may*

any

any way be procured or advanced by Political Government, the procuring and advancing thoſe Intereſts muſt in all Reaſon be reckoned among the Ends of Civil Societies, and ſo conſequently fall within the Compaſs of the Magiſtrate's Juriſdiction. For granting it true *that Common-wealths are inſtituted for the attaining all thoſe Benefits which Political Government can yeild*, it does not follow that *the procuring and advancing the ſpiritual and eternal Intereſt* of ſome few Members of the Common-wealth by an Application of Power, which *indirectly, and at a diſtance*, or by Accident, may do ſome Service that Way, whilſt at the ſame time it prejudices a far greater Number in their Civil Intereſts, can with Reaſon *be reckon'd amongſt the Ends of Civil Society.*

That Common-wealths are inſtituted for theſe Ends, viz. *for the procuring, preſerving, and advancing Mens Civil Intereſts*, you ſay, *No Man will deny.* To ſacrafice therefore theſe Pag. 55.
Civil Intereſts of a great Number of People, which are the allowed Ends of the Common-wealths, to the uncertain Expectation of ſome Service to be done *indirectly and at a diſtance* to a far leſs Number, as Experience has always ſhewed thoſe really converted to the true Religion by Force to be, if any at all, cannot be one of the Ends of the Common-wealth. Though the *advancing of the ſpiritual and eternal Intereſt* be of infinite Advantage to the Perſons who receive that Benefit, yet if it can be thought a Benefit to the Common-wealth when it is procured them with the diminiſhing or deſtroying the Civil Intereſts of great Numbers of their Fellow-Citizens, then the Ravaging of an Enemy, the Plague, or a Famine may be ſaid to bring a Benefit to the Common-wealth: For either of theſe may *indirectly and at a diſtance* do ſome Service towards the advancing or procuring the ſpiritual and eternal Intereſt of ſome of thoſe who ſuffer in it.

In the two latter Paragraphs you except againſt my want of Exactneſs, in ſetting Pag. 57.
down your Opinion I am arguing againſt. Had it been any way to take off the Force of what you ſay, or that the Reader could have been miſled by my Words in any Part of the Queſtion I was arguing againſt, you had had Reaſon to complain: If not, you had done better to have entertain'd the Reader with a clearer Anſwer to my Argument, than ſpent your Ink and his Time needleſly, to ſhew ſuch Niceneſs,

My Argument is as good againſt your Tenet in your own Words, as in mine
which you except againſt: Your Words are, *Doubtleſs Common-wealths are inſtituted for* A. p. 18.
the attaining all the Benefits which Political Government can yield; and therefore if the ſpiritual and eternal Intereſt of Men may any way be procured or advanced by Political Government, the procuring and advancing thoſe Intereſts muſt in all Reaſon be reckon'd amongſt the Ends of Civil Societies.

To which I anſwer'd, That if this be ſo, " Then this Poſition muſt be true, *viz.* L. 1. p. 183.
" *That all Societies whatſoever are inſtituted for the attaining all the Benefits that they may* " *any way yield*; there being nothing peculiar to Civil Society in the Caſe, why that " Society ſhould be *inſtituted for the attaining all the Benefits it can any way yield*, and " other Societies not. By which Argument it will follow, that all Societies are in- " ſtituted for one and the ſame End, *i. e.* for the *attaining all the Benefits that they can* " *any way yield.* By which Account there will be no Difference between Church and " State, a Common-wealth and an Army, or between a Family and the *Eaſt-India* " Company; all which have hitherto been thought diſtinct Sorts of Societies, inſti- " tuted for different Ends. If your Hypotheſis hold good, one of the Ends of the " Family muſt be to preach the Goſpel, and adminiſter the Sacraments; and one " Buſineſs of an Army to teach Languages, and propagate Religion; becauſe " theſe are Benefits ſome way or other *attainable* by thoſe Societies; unleſs you " take want of Commiſſion and Authority to be a ſufficient Impediment: And " that will be ſo in other Caſes. To which you reply, *Nor will it follow from* Pag. 58.
hence, that all Societies are inſtituted for one and the ſame End, (as you imagine it will) unleſs you ſuppoſe all Societies enabled by the Power they are endued with to attain the ſame End, which I believe no Man hitherto did ever affirm. And therefore, notwithſtanding this Poſition, there may be ſtill as great a Difference *as you pleaſe between Church and State, a Common-wealth and an Army, or between a Family and the* Eaſt-India *Company. Which ſeveral Societies, as they are inſtituted for different Ends, ſo are they likewiſe furniſhed with different* Powers *proportionate to their reſpective Ends.* In which the Reaſon you give to deſtroy my Inference, I am to thank you for, if you underſtood the Force of it, it being the very ſame I bring to ſhew that my Inference from your Way of arguing is good, I ſay, that from

your

your Way of Reaſonings about the Ends of Government, " It would follow that " all Societies were inſtituted for one and the ſame End; unleſs you take Want of " Commiſſion and Authority to be a ſufficient Impediment. And you tell me here it will not follow, *unleſs I ſuppoſe all Societies enabled by the Powers they are endued with, to attain the ſame End*; which in other Words is, unleſs I ſuppoſe all who have in their Hands the Force of any Society, to have all of them the ſame Commiſſion.

The natural Force of all the Members of any Society, or of thoſe who by the Society can be procured to aſſiſt it, is in one Senſe called the Power of that Society. This Power or Force is generally put into ſome one or few Perſons Hands with Direction and Authority how to uſe it; and this in another Senſe is called alſo the Power of the Society: And this is the Power you here ſpeak of, and in theſe following Words, *viz. Several Societies, as they are inſtituted for different Ends; ſo likewiſe are they furniſhed with different Powers proportionate to their reſpective Ends.* The Power therefore of any Society in this Senſe, is nothing but the Authority and Direction given to thoſe that have the Management of the Force or natural Power of the Society, how and to what Ends to uſe it, by which Commiſſion the Ends of Societies are known and diſtinguiſhed. So that all Societies wherein thoſe who are intruſted with the Management of the Force or natural Power of the Society, have Commiſſion and Authority to uſe the Force or natural Power of the Society, to attain the ſame Benefits, are inſtituted for the ſame End. And therefore, if in all Societies thoſe who have the Management of the Force or natural Power of the Society, are commiſſion'd or authorized to uſe that Force to attain all the Benefits attainable by it, all Societies are inſtituted to the ſame End: And ſo what I ſaid will
Pag. 51. ſtill be true, *viz.* " That a Family and an Army, a Common-wealth and a Church, " have all the ſame End. And if your Hypotheſis hold good, one of the Ends of " a Family muſt be to preach the Goſpel, and adminiſter the Sacraments; and one " Buſineſs of an Army to teach Languages, and propagate Religion becauſe theſe " are Benefits *ſome way or other attainable* by thoſe Societies; unleſs you take want " of Commiſſion and Authority to be a ſufficient Impediment: And that will be ſo " too in other Caſes. To which you have ſaid nothing but what does confirm it, which you will a little better ſee, when you have conſidered that any Benefit attainable by Force or natural Power of a Society, does not prove the Society to be inſtituted for that End, till you alſo ſhew, that thoſe to whom the Management of the Force of the Society is intruſted, are commiſſion'd to uſe it to that End.

Pag. 58. And therefore to your next Paragraph, I ſhall think it Anſwer enough to print here ſide by ſide with it, that Paragraph of mine to which you intended it as an Anſwer.

L. 2. pag. 283. " 'Tis a Benefit to have " true Knowledge and Philoſophy embraced " and aſſented to, in any Civil Society or " Government. But will you ſay, there- " fore, that it is a Benefit to the Society, " or one of the Ends of Government, that " all who are not Peripateticks ſhould be " puniſhed, to make Men find out the Truth, " and profeſs it? This indeed might be " thought a fit Way to make ſome Men em- " brace the Peripatetick Philoſophy, but " not a proper Way to find the Truth. For, " perhaps the Peripatetick Philoſophy may " not be true; perhaps a great many have " not Time, nor Parts to ſtudy it; perhaps " a great many who have ſtudied it, cannot " be convinced of the Truth of it: And " therefore it cannot be a Benefit to the " Common-wealth, nor one of the Ends of " it, that theſe Members of the Society " ſhould be diſturb'd, and diſeas'd to no " Purpoſe, when they are guilty of no Fault.

For

L. 3. p. 58. *To your next Paragraph, after what has already been ſaid, I think it may ſuffice to ſay as follows. Tho'* perhaps the Peripatetick Philoſophy may not be true, *(and* perhaps *it is no great matter, if it be not) yet the true Religion is undoubtedly* true. *And though* perhaps a great many have not Time, nor Parts to ſtudy *that Philoſophy, (and* perhaps *it may be no great matter neither, if they have not) yet all who have the true Religion duly tender'd them,* have Time, *and all, but Ideots and Madmen,* have Parts *likewiſe to* ſtudy it, *as much as it is neceſſary for them to ſtudy it. And though* perhaps a great many who have ſtudied *that Philoſophy* cannot be convinced of the Truth of it, *(which* perhaps *is no great Wonder) yet no Man ever ſtudied the true Religion with ſuch Care and Diligence as he might and ought to uſe,*

and

" For juſt the ſame Reaſon, it cannot be a " Benefit to Civil Society, that Men ſhould " be puniſhed in *Denmark* for not being *Lu-* " *therans*, in *Geneva* for not being *Calviniſts*, " and in *Vienna* for not being *Papiſts*, as a " Means to make them find out the true Re- " ligion. For ſo, upon your Grounds, Men " muſt be treated in thoſe Places as well as in " *England*, for not being of the Church of " *England*. And then, I beſeech you, conſider " the great Benefit will accrue to Men in So- " ciety by this Method; and I ſuppoſe it will " be a hard thing for you to prove, that ever " Civil Governments were inſtituted to pu- " niſh Men for not being of this or that Sect " in Religion; however by Accident, *indi-* " *rectly, and at a diſtance*, it may be an Occa- " ſion to one perhaps of a Thouſand, or an " Hundred, to ſtudy that Controverſy, which " is all you expect from it. If it be a *Benefit*, " pray tell me what *Benefit* it is. A Civil " *Benefit* it cannot be. For Mens Civil In- " tereſts are diſturb'd, injur'd, and impair'd " by it. And what *Spiritual Benefit* that can " be to any Multitude of Men to be puniſh- " ed for diſſenting from a falſe or erroneous " Profeſſion, I would have you find out; un- " leſs it be a ſpiritual Benefit to be in Dan- " ger to be driven into a wrong Way. For " if in all differing Sects one is in the wrong, " 'tis a Hundred to one but that from which " any one diſſents, and is puniſhed for diſ- " ſenting from, is the wrong.

You tell us, *the true Religion is undoubtedly true.* If you hold us too, who is undoubtedly Judge of it, you had put all paſt doubt: but till you will be pleaſed to determine that, it would be undoubtedly true, that the King of *Denmark* is as undoubtedly Judge of it at *Copenhagen*, and the Emperor at *Vienna*, as the King of *England* in this Iſland: I do not ſay they judge as right, but they are by as much Right Judges, and therefore have as much Right to puniſh thoſe who diſſent from Lutheraniſm and Popery in thoſe Countries, as any other Civil Magiſtrate has to puniſh any Diſſenters from the National Religion any where elſe. And who can deny but theſe *Briars and Thorns* laid in their Way by the penal Laws of thoſe Countries, may *do ſome Service indirectly and at a diſtance*, to bring Men there ſeverely and *impartially to examine* Matters of Religion, and ſo *to embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, which the bare outward Profeſſion of any Religion in the World will not do?

This *true Religion which is undoubtedly true*, you tell us too, *never any body ſtudied with ſuch Care and Diligence as he might and ought to uſe, and with an honeſt Mind, but he was convinced of the Truth of it.*

If you will reſolve it in your ſhort circular Way, and tell me *ſuch Diligence as one ought to uſe*, is ſuch Diligence as brings one *to be convinced*, it is a Queſtion too eaſy to be asked. If I ſhould deſire to know plainly what is to be underſtood by it, it would be a Queſtion too hard for you to anſwer, and therefore I ſhall not trouble you with demanding what this *Diligence* which a Man *may and ought to uſe*, is; nor what you mean by an *honeſt Mind*. I only ask you, Whether Force, your Way applied, be able to produce them? that ſo the Common-wealth may have the *Benefits* you propoſe from Mens being convinced of, and conſequently embracing *the true Religion*, which you ſay no body can miſs, who is brought to that *Diligence*, and that *honeſt Mind*.

and with an honeſt Mind, but he was convinced of the Truth of it. *And that thoſe who cannot otherwiſe be brought to do this, ſhall be a little* diſturb'd and diſeas'd *to bring them to it, I take to be the Intereſt, not only of thoſe particular Perſons who by this Means may be brought into the Way of Salvation, but of the* Common-wealth *likewiſe, upon theſe two Accounts.*

1. *Becauſe the true Religion, which this Method propagates, makes good Men; and good Men are always the beſt Subjects, or Members of a Common-wealth; not only as they do more ſincerely and zealouſly promote the Publick Good than other Men; but likewiſe in regard of the Favour of God, which they often procure to the Societies of which they are Members. And,*

2. *Becauſe this Care in any Common-wealth, of God's Honour and Mens Salvation, entitles it to his ſpecial Protection and Bleſſing. So that where this Method is uſed, it proves both a* Spiritual *and a* Civil Benefit *to the* Common-wealth.

The Benefits to the Common-wealth are, 1. *That the true Religion that this Method propagates, makes good Men, and good Men are always the beſt Subjects, and often procure the Favour of God to the Society they are Members of.* Being forward enough to grant that nothing contributes ſo much to the Benefit of a Society, as that it be made up of good Men, I began preſently to give in to your Method, which promiſes ſo ſure a Way to make Men ſo *ſtudy* the true Religion, that they cannot miſs the being *convinced* of the Truth of it, and ſo hardly avoid being really of the true Religion, and conſequently good Men. But that I might not miſtake in a thing of that Conſequence, I began to look about in thoſe Countries where Force had been made uſe of to propagate what you allowed to be the true Religion, and found Complaints of as great a Scarcity of good Men there as in other Places. A Friend whom I diſcourſed on this Point, ſaid, it might poſſibly be that the World had not yet had the Benefit of your Method; becauſe Law-makers had not yet been able to find that juſt Temper of Penalties on which your Propagation of the true Religion was built; and that therefore it was great Pity you had not yet diſcovered this great Secret, but 'twas to be hoped you would. Another, who ſtood by, ſaid, he did not ſee how your Method could make Men it wrought on, and brought to Conformity, better than others, unleſs corrupt Nature with Impunity were like to produce better Men in one outward Profeſſion than another. To which I replied, That we did not look on Conformiſts through a due Medium; for if we did with you allow it *preſumable* that all who conformed did it upon *Conviction*, there could be no juſt Complaint of the Scarcity of good Men: And ſo we got over that Difficulty.

The ſecond Benefit you ſay your Uſe of Force brings to the Common-wealth, is, That *this Care in any Common-wealth, of God's Honour and Mens Salvation, entitles it to his ſpecial Protection and Bleſſing.* Then certainly all *Common-wealths*, that have any regard to the *Protection* and *Bleſſing* of God, will not neglect to *intitle themſelves* to it, by uſing of Force to promote that Religion they believe to be true. But I beſeech you what Care is this *of the Honour of God, and Mens Salvation*, you ſpeak of? Is it, as you have owned it, a Care by Penalties to make Men outwardly conform, and without any farther Care or Enquiry to preſume that they do it *upon Conviction*, and with a ſincere embracing of, and Obedience to the Truth? But if the *Honour of God and Mens Salvation*, conſiſts not in an outward Conformity to any Religion, but in ſomething farther, what Bleſſing they may expect whoſe Care goes ſo far, and then *preſume* the reſt, which is the hardeſt Part, and therefore leaſt to be *preſumed*, the Prophet *Jeremy* will tell you, who ſays, *Curſed be he that does the Work of the Lord negligently:* Which thoſe who think it is the Magiſtrate's Buſineſs to uſe Force to bring Men *heartily to embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, were beſt ſeriouſly to conſider.

Chap. 48. 10.

Pag. 59. Your next Paragraph containing nothing but Poſitions of yours, which you ſuppoſe elſewhere proved, and I elſewhere examined, 'tis not fit the Reader ſhould be troubled any farther about them.

I once knew a Gentleman, who having crack'd himſelf with an ungovernable Ambition, could never afterwards hear the Place he aimed at mentioned, without ſhewing Marks of his Diſtemper. I know not what the matter is, that when there comes in your way but the mention of Secular Power in your or Eccleſiaſtick Hands, you cannot contain your ſelf: We have Inſtances of it in other Parts of your Letter; and here again you fall into a Fit, which ſince it produces rather Marks of your Breeding, than Arguments for your Cauſe, I ſhall leave them as they are to the Reader, if you can make them go down with him for Reaſons from a grave Man, or for a ſober Anſwer to what I ſay in that and the following Paragraph.

Pag. 60.

Pag. 61. Much-what of the ſame Size is your ingenious Reply to what I ſay in the next Paragraph, *viz.* "Common-wealths, or Civil Societies and Governments, if you will "believe the judicious Mr. *Hooker*, are, as St. *Peter* calls them, ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις, *the* "*Contrivance and Inſtitution of Man.* To which you ſmartly reply, for your Choler was up, *'Tis well for St.* Peter *that he had the Judicious Mr.* Hooker *on his Side.* And it would have been well for you too to have ſeen that Mr. *Hooker*'s Authority was made uſe of not to confirm the Authority of St. *Peter*, but to confirm that Senſe I gave of St. *Peter*'s Words, which is not ſo clear in our Tranſlation, but that there are thoſe who, as I doubt not but you know, do not allow of it. But this being ſaid when Paſſion it ſeems rather employed your Wit than your Judgment,

1 Pet. 2. 13.

though

though nothing to the Purpoſe, may yet perhaps *indirectly and at a diſtance* do ſome Service.

And now, Sir, if you can but imagine that Men in the corrupt State of Nature might be authorized and required by Reaſon, the Law of Nature, to avoid the Inconveniences of that State, and to that Purpoſe to put the Power of Governing them into ſome one or more Mens Hands, in ſuch Forms, and under ſuch Agreements as they ſhould think fit: which Governours ſo ſet over them for a good End by their own Choice, though they received all their Power from thoſe, who by the Law of Nature had a Power to confer it on them, may very fitly be called *Powers ordained of God*; being choſen and appointed by thoſe who had Authority from God ſo to do. (For he that receives Commiſſion (limited according to the Diſcretion of him that gives it) from another who had Authority from his Prince ſo to do, may truly be ſaid, ſo far as his Commiſſion reaches, to be appointed or ordained by the Prince himſelf.) It may ſerve as an Anſwer to your two next Paragraphs, and to ſhew that there is no Oppoſition or Difficulty in all that St. *Peter*, St. *Paul*, or the judicious Mr. *Hooker* ſays; nor any thing, in what either of them ſays, to your Purpoſe. And tho' it be true, thoſe Powers that are, *are ordained of God*; yet it may nevertheleſs be true, that the Power any one has, and the Ends for which he has it, may be by the Contrivance and Appointment of Men.

To my ſaying, "The Ends of Common-wealths appointed by the Inſtitutors of them, "could not be their Spiritual and Eternal Intereſt, becauſe they could not ſtipulate "about thoſe one with another, nor ſubmit this Intereſt to the Power of the Society, "or any Sovereign they ſhould ſet over them. You reply, *Very true, Sir; but they* Pag. 52. *can ſubmit to be puniſhed in their Temporal Intereſt, if they deſpiſe or neglect thoſe greater Intereſts.* How they can ſubmit to be puniſhed by any Men in their Temporal Intereſt, for that which they cannot ſubmit to be judg'd by any Man, when you can ſhew, I ſhall admire your Politicks. Beſides, if the Compact about Matters of Religion be, that thoſe ſhould *be puniſhed in their Temporal*, who *neglect or deſpiſe* their Eternal *Intereſt*, who I beſeech you is by this Agreement rather to be puniſhed, a ſober Diſſenter, who appears concerned for Religion and his Salvation, or an irreligious Profane or debauched Conformiſt? By ſuch as *deſpiſe or neglect thoſe greater Intereſts*, you here mean only Diſenters from the National Religion: for thoſe only you puniſh, though you repreſent them under ſuch a Deſcription as belongs not peculiarly to them; but that matters not, ſo long as it beſt ſutes your Occaſion.

In your next Paragraph you wonder at my *News, from the Weſt-Indies*, I ſuppoſe becauſe you found it not in your Books of *Europe* or *Aſia*. But whatever you may think, I aſſure you all the World is not *Mile-End*. But that you may be no more ſurprized with News, let me ask you, Whether it be not poſſible that Men, to whom the Rivers and Woods afford the ſpontaneous Proviſions of Life, and ſo with no private Poſſeſſions of Land, had no enlarged Deſires after Riches or Power, ſhould live together in Society, make one People of one Language under one Chieftain, who ſhall have no other Power but to command them in time of War againſt their common Enemies, without any municipal Laws, Judges, or any Perſon with Superiority, eſtabliſh'd amongſt them, but ended all their private Differences, if any aroſe, by the extemporary Determination of their Neighbours, or of Arbitrators choſen by the Parties. I ask you whether in ſuch a Common-wealth, the Chieftain who was the only Man of Authority amongſt them, had any Power to uſe the Force of the Common-wealth to any other End but the Defence of it againſt an Enemy, though other *Benefits* were *attainable* by it;

The Paragraph of mine to which you mean your next for an Anſwer, ſhall anſwer for it ſelf.

L. 2. *p.* 286. "You quote the Author's Argument, which he "brings to prove that the Care of Souls is not committed to the Ma- "giſtrate, in theſe Words: *It is not committed to him by God, be- "cauſe it appears not God has ever given any ſuch ſuch Authority to one "Man over another, as to compel any one to his Religion.* This, "when firſt I read it, I confeſs I thought a good Argument. But "you ſay, *this is quite beſides the Buſineſs*; and the Reaſon you give, "is; *For the Authority of the Magiſtrate is not an Authority to com- "pel any one to his Religion, but only an Authority to procure all his "Subjects*

L. 3. p. 63. *As to your next Paragraph, I think I might now wholly paſs it over. I ſhall only tell you, that as I have often* heard, *ſo I hope I*

" *Subjects the Means of diſcovering the Way of Salvation, and to pro-*
" *cure withal, as much as in him lies, that none remain ignorant of*
" *it*, &c. I fear, Sir, you forget your ſelf. The Author was not
" writing againſt your new Hypotheſis, before it was known in the
" World. He may be excuſed, if he had not the Gift of Prophe-
" cy, to argue againſt a Notion which was not yet ſtarted. He had in
" View only the Laws hitherto made, and the Puniſhments (in
" Matters of Religion) in uſe in the World. The Penalties, as I
" take it, are laid on Men for being of different Ways of Religion:
" which, what is it other but to *compel* them to relinquiſh their
" own, and to conform themſelves to that from which they differ?
" If this be not to *compel them to the Magiſtrate's Religion*, pray
" tell us what is? This muſt be neceſſarily ſo underſtood; unleſs it
" can be ſuppoſed that the Law intends not to have that done,
" which with Penalties it commands to be done; or that Puniſh-
" ments are not Compulſion, not that Compulſion the Author
" complains of. The Law ſays, *Do this, and live*; embrace this
" Doctrine, conform to this Way of Worſhip, and be at Eaſe and
" Free; or elſe be Fined, Impriſoned, Baniſhed, Burnt. If you
" can ſhew among the Laws that have been made in *England* con-
" cerning Religion, (and I think I may ſay any where elſe) any
" one that puniſhes Men for not having *impartially examined the Re-*
" *ligion they have embraced or refuſed*, I think I may yield you the
" Cauſe. Law-makers have been generally wiſer than to make
" Laws that could not be executed: and therefore their Laws
" were againſt Nonconformiſts, which could be known; and not
" for *impartial Examination*, which could not. 'Twas not then
" *beſides* the Author's *Buſineſs*, to bring an Argument againſt the Perſecutions here
" in faſhion. He did not know that any one, who was ſo free as to acknowledge that
" the *Magiſtrate has not an Authority to compel any one to his Religion*, and thereby at
" once (as you have done) give up all the Laws now in Force againſt Diſſenters, had
" yet Rods in ſtore for them, and by a new Trick would bring them under the Laſh
" of the Law, when the old Pretences were too much exploded to ſerve any longer:
" Have you never heard of ſuch a thing as the *Religion Eſtabliſh'd by Law?* which is
" it ſeems the Lawful Religion of a Country, and to be complied with as ſuch.
" There being ſuch Things, ſuch Notions yet in the World, it was not *quite beſides*
" *the Author's Buſineſs* to alledge, that *God never gave ſuch Authority to one Man over*
" *another, as to compel any one to his Religion.* I will grant, if you pleaſe, *Religion*
" *Eſtabliſh'd by Law* is a pretty odd Way of ſpeaking in the Mouth of a Chriſtian,
" (and yet it is much in Faſhion) as if the Magiſtrate's Authority could add any Force
" or Sanction to any Religion, whether true or falſe. I am glad to find you have ſo
" far conſidered *the Magiſtrate's Authority*, that you agree with the Author, that he
" *hath none to compel Men to his Religion.* Much leſs can he, by any Eſtabliſhment of
" Law, add any thing to the Truth or Validity of his own, or any Religion
" whatſoever.

I ſhall always bear of Religion eſtabliſhed by Law. *For tho' the Magiſtrate's Authority can* add no Force or Sanction to any Religion, whether true or falſe, nor any thing to the Truth or Validity of his own, or any Religion whatſoever; *yet I think it may do much toward the* upholding *and* preſerving *the true Religion within his Juriſdiction; and in that reſpect may properly enough be ſaid to* eſtabliſh *it.*

That above-annexed is all the Anſwer you think this Paragragh of mine deſerves. But yet in that little you ſay, you muſt give me leave to take notice, *that if*, as you ſay, *the Magiſtrate's Authority may do much towards the upholding and preſerving the true Religion within his Juriſdiction*; ſo alſo may it do much towards the upholding and preſerving of a falſe Religion, *and in that reſpect*, if you ſay true, *may be ſaid to eſtabliſh it.* For I think I need not mind you here again, that it muſt unavoidably depend upon his Opinion, what ſhall be eſtabliſhed for true, or rejected as falſe.

And thus you have my Thoughts concerning the moſt material of what you ſay touching the Magiſtrate's Commiſſion to uſe Force in Matters of Religion, together with ſome incident Places in your Anſwer, which I have taken notice of as they have come in my Way.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Who are to be puniſhed by your Scheme.

TO juſtify the Largeneſs of the Author's Toleration, who would not have *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Pagans* excluded from them Civil Rights of the Common-wealth, becauſe of their Religion; I ſaid, "I feared it will hardly be believed, that we pray L. 2. p. 2.
"in earneſt for their Converſion, if we exclude them from the ordinary and probable
"Means of it, either by driving them from us, or perſecuting them when they are
"among us. You reply; *Now I confeſs I thought Men might live quietly enough* Pag. 2.
among us, and enjoy the Protection of the Government againſt all Violence and Injuries, without being endenizon'd, *or made Members of the* Common-wealth; *which alone can entitle them to the* Civil Rights *and Privileges of it. But as to* Jews, Mahometans *and* Pagans, *if any of them do not care to live among us, unleſs they may be admitted to the* Rights *and Privileges of the* Common-wealth; *the refuſing them that Favour is not, I ſuppoſe, to be looked upon as* driving them from us, *or* excluding them the ordinary and probable Means of Converſion; *but as a juſt and neceſſary Caution in a Chriſtian Common-wealth, in reſpect to the Members of it: Who, if ſuch as profeſs* Judaiſm, *or* Mahometaniſm, *or* Paganiſm, *were permitted to enjoy the ſame Rights with them, would be much the more in Danger to be ſeduced by them; ſeeing they would loſe no worldly Advantage by ſuch a Change of their Religion: Whereas if they could not turn to any of thoſe Religions, without forfeiting the* Civil Rights of the Common-wealth *by doing it, 'tis likely they would conſider well before they did it, what Ground there was to expect that they ſhould get any thing by the Exchange, which would countervail the Loſs they ſhould ſuſtain by it.* I thought Protection and Impunity of Men, not offending in Civil Things, might have been accounted the Civil Rights of the Common-wealth, which the Author meant: but you, to make it ſeem more, add the Word *Privileges*. Let it be ſo. Live amongſt you then *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Pagans* may; but *endenizon'd* they muſt not be. But why? Are there not thoſe who are *Members* of your *Common-wealth*, who do not *embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, any more than they? What think you of *Socinians*, *Papiſts*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Quakers*, *Presbyterians?* If they do not *reject the Truth neceſſary to Salvation*, why do you puniſh them? Or if ſome that are in the Way to Perdition, may be Members of the Common-wealth, why muſt theſe be excluded upon the account of Religion? For I think there is no great Odds, as to ſaving of Souls (which is the only End for which they are puniſhed) amongſt thoſe Religions, each whereof will make thoſe who are of it miſs Salvation. Only if there be any fear of *ſeducing* thoſe who are of the National Church, the Danger is moſt from that Religion which comes neareſt to it, and moſt reſembles it. However, this you think *but a juſt and neceſſary Caution in a Chriſtian Common-wealth in reſpect of the Members of it.* I ſuppoſe (for you love to ſpeak doubtfully) *theſe Members of a Chriſtian Common-wealth* you take ſuch Care of, are Members alſo of the National Church, whoſe Religion is the true; and therefore you call them in the next Paragraph, *Subjects of Chriſt's Kingdom, to whom he has a ſpecial Regard.* For Diſſenters, who are puniſhed to be made *good Chriſtians*, to whom Force is uſed to *bring them to the true Religion, and to the Communion of the Church of God*, 'tis plain are not in your Opinion *good Chriſtians*, or of *the true Religion*; unleſs you puniſh them to make them what they are already. The Diſſenters therefore who are already perverted, and *reject the Truth that muſt ſave them*, you are not, I ſuppoſe, ſo careful of, leſt they ſhould be *ſeduced*. Thoſe who have already the Plague, need not be guarded from Infection: nor can you fear that Men ſo *deſperately perverſe*, that Penalties and Puniſhments, joined to the *Light* and *Strength* of the *Truth*, have not been able to bring from the Opinions they have *eſpouſed*, into the *Communion of the Church*, ſhould be *ſeduced* to *Judaiſm*, *Mahometaniſm* or *Paganiſm*, neither of which has the Advantage of Truth or Intereſt to prevail by. 'Tis therefore thoſe of the National Church, as I conclude alſo from the cloſe of this Paragraph, (where you ſpeak of *God's own peculiar People*) whom you think *would be much the more* in Danger to be ſeduced by them, if they were *endenizon'd, ſince they would loſe no worldly Advantage by ſuch a Change of their Religion*, i. e. by quitting the National Church, to turn *Jews*, *Mahometans*, or *Pagans*.

This

This ſhews, whatever you ſay of the *ſufficient Means of Inſtruction provided by the Law*, how well you think the Members of the National Church are inſtructed in the true Religion. It ſhews alſo, whatever you ſay of its being *preſumable*, that they embrace it *upon Conviction*, how much you are ſatisfied that the Members of the National Church are convinc'd of the Truth of the Religion they profeſs, or rather herd with, ſince you think them in great Danger to change it for *Judaiſm*, *Mahometaniſm*, or *Paganiſm* it ſelf upon equal Terms, and *becauſe they ſhall loſe no worldly Advantage by ſuch a Change*. But if *the forfeiting the Civil Rights of the Common-wealth*, be the proper Remedy to keep Men in the Communion of the Church, why is it uſed to keep Men from *Judaiſm* or *Paganiſm*, and not from *Phanaticiſm*? Upon this Accout why might not Jews, Pagans and Mehometans be admitted to the Rights of the Common-wealth, as far as Papiſts, Independants, and Quakers? But you diſtribute to every one according to your good Pleaſure: and doubleſs are fully juſtified by theſe following Words:

A. p. 3. *And whether this be not a reaſonable and neceſſary Caution, any Man may judge, who does but conſider within how few Ages after the Flood Superſtition and Idolatry prevailed over the World, and how apt even God's own peculiar People were to receive that mortal Infection, notwithſtanding all that he did to keep them from it.*

What the State of Religion was in the firſt Ages after the Flood, is ſo imperfectly known now, that, as I have ſhewed you in another Place, you can make little Advantage to your Cauſe from thence. And ſince it was the ſame Corruption then, which as you own, withdraws Men now from the true Religion, and hinders it from pevailing by its own Light, without the Aſſiſtance of Force; and it is the ſame Corruption that keep *Diſſenters*, as well as *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Pagans*, from embracing of the Truth: why different Degrees of Puniſhments ſhould be uſed to them, till there be found in them different Degrees of Obſtinacy, would need ſome better Reaſon. Why this common *Pravity of humane Nature* ſhould make Judaiſm, Mahometaniſm or Paganiſm more catching than any ſort of Nonconformity, which hinders Men from embracing the true Religion; ſo that Jews, Mahometans and Pagans muſt, for fear of infecting others, be ſhut out from the Common-wealth, when others are not, I would fain know? Whatever it was that ſo diſpoſed the Jews to Idolatry before the Captivity, ſure it is, they firmly reſiſted it, and refuſed to change, not only where they might have done it on equal Terms, but have had great Advantage to boot; and therefore 'tis poſſible that there is ſomething in this Matter, which neither you nor I do fully comprehend, and may with a becoming Humility ſit down and confeſs, that in this, as well as other Parts of his Providence, God's Ways are paſt finding out. But this we may be certain from this Inſtance of the Jews, that it is not reaſonable to conclude, that becauſe they were once inclin'd to Idolatry, that therefore they, or any other People are in *Danger* to turn Pagans, whenever they *ſhall loſe no worldly Advantage by ſuch a Change*. But if we may oppoſe nearer and known Inſtances no more remote and uncertain, look into the World, and tell me, ſince Jeſus Chriſt brought Life and Immortality to light through the Goſpel, where the Chriſtian Religion meeting Judaiſm, Mahometaniſm or Paganiſm upon equal Terms, loſt ſo plainly by it, that you have Reaſon to ſuſpect the Members of a Chriſtian Common-wealth would *be in Danger to be ſeduced* to either of *them*, if *they ſhould loſe no worldly Advantage by ſuch a Change of their Religon*, rather than likely to increaſe among them? Till you can find then ſome better Reaſon for excluding Jews, *&c.* from *the Rights of the Common-wealth*, you muſt give us leave to look on this as a bare Pretence. Beſides, I think you are under a Miſtake, which ſhews your Pretence againſt admitting Jews, Mahometans and Pagans, to the Civil Rights of the Common-wealth, is ill grounded: for what Law I pray is there in *England*, that they *who turn to any of thoſe Religions, forfeit the Civil Rights of the Common-wealth by doing it?* Such a Law I deſire you to ſhew me; and if you cannot, all the Pretence is out of Doors, and Men of your Church, ſince on that Account *they would loſe no worldly Advantage by the Change, are in as much Danger to be ſeduced*, whether Jews, Mahometans and Pagans are endenizon'd or no.

Pag. 3. But that you may not be thought too gracious, you tell us, That *as to Pagans particularly*, you *are ſo far from thinking that they ought not to be excluded from the Civil Rights of the Common-wealth, becauſe of their Religion, that* you *cannot ſee how their Religion can be ſuffered by any Common-wealth that knows and worſhips the only true God, if they would be thought to retain any Jealouſy for his Honour, or even for that of humane Nature.* Thus then you order the Matter; *Jews* and *Mahometans* may be permitted

permitted to live in a Chriſtian Common-wealth with the Exerciſe of their Religion, but not be endenizon'd: *Pagans* may alſo be permitted to live there, but not to have the Exerciſe of their Religion, nor be endenizon'd.

This according to the beſt of my Apprehenſion is the Senſe of your Words; for the Clearneſs of your Thoughts, or your Cauſe does not always ſuffer you to ſpeak plainly and directly; as here, having been ſpeaking a whole Page before what Uſage the Perſons of *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Pagans*, were to have, you on a ſudden tell us their Religion is not to be ſuffered, but ſay not what muſt be done with their Perſons. For do you think it reaſonable that Men who have any Religion, ſhould live amongſt you without the Exerciſe of that Religion, in order to their Converſion? which is no other but to make them down-right irreligious, and render the very Notion of a Deity inſignificant, and of no Influence to them in Order to their Converſion: It being leſs dangerous to Religion in general, to have Men ignorant of a Deity, and ſo without any Religion; than to have them acknowledge a ſuperior Being, but yet to teach or allow them to neglect or refuſe worſhipping him in that Way, that they believe he requires, to render them acceptable to him: It being a great deal leſs Fault (and that which we were every one of us once guilty of) to be ignorant of him, than acknowledging a God, and not to pay him the Honour which we think due to him. *I do not ſee* therefore how thoſe *who retain any Jealouſy for the Honour of God*, can permit Men to live amongſt them in Order to their Converſion, and require of them not to honour God according to the beſt of their Knowledge: Unleſs you think it a Preparation to your true Religion, to require Men ſenſibly and knowingly to affront the Deity; and to perſuade them that the Religion you would bring them to, can allow Men to make bold with the Senſe they have of him, and to refuſe him the Honour which in their Conſciences they are perſuaded is due to him, which muſt to them and every body elſe appear inconſiſtent with all Religion. Since therefore to admit their Perſons without the Exerciſe of their Religion, cannot be reaſonable, nor conducing to their Converſion; if the Exerciſe of their Religion, as you ſay, be not to be *ſuffered among us till they are converted*, I do not ſee how their Perſons can be ſuffered among us, if that Exception muſt be added, *till they are converted*; and whether then they are not *excluded from the ordinary Means of Converſion*, I leave you to conſider. Pag. 62.

I wonder this Neceſſity had not made you think on another Way of their having the ordinary Means of Converſion, without their living amongſt us, that Way by which in the Beginning of Chriſtianity it was brought to the Heathen World by the Travels and Preaching of the Apoſtles. But the Succeſſors of the Apoſtles are not, it ſeems, Succeſſors to this Part of this Commiſſion, *Go and teach all Nations*. And indeed it is one thing to be an Embaſſador from God to People that are already converted, and have provided good Benefices, another to be an Embaſſador from Heaven in a Countryw here you have neither the Countenance of the Magiſtrate, nor the devout Obedience of the People. And who ſees not how one is bound to be zealous for the propagating of the true Religion, and the convincing, converting and ſaving of Souls, in a Country where it is eſtabliſh'd by Law? Who can doubt but that there thoſe who talk ſo much of it are in earneſt? Tho' yet ſome Men will hardly forbear doubting, that thoſe Men, however they pray for it, are not much concern'd for the Converſion of *Pagans*, who will neither go to them to inſtruct them, nor ſuffer them to come to us for the Means of Converſion.

'Tis true what you ſay, *what* Pagans *call Religion, is Abomination to the Almighty*. But if that requires any thing from thoſe *who retain any Jealouſy for the Honour of God*, it is ſomething more than barely about the Place where thoſe Abominations ſhall be *committed*. The true Concern *for the Honour of God* is not, that Idolatry ſhould be ſhut out of *England*, but that it ſhould be leſſen'd every where, and by the Light and Preaching of the Goſpel be baniſh'd out of the World. If *Pagans* and Idolaters are, as you ſay, the *greateſt Diſhonour conceiveable to God Almighty*, they are as much ſo on t'other ſide of *Tweed*, or the Sea, as on this; for he from his Throne equally beholds all the Dwellers upon Earth. Thoſe therefore who are truly *jealous for the Honour of God*, will not, upon the Account of his *Honour*, be concern'd for their being in this or in that Place, while there are Idolators in the World; but that the Number of thoſe who are ſuch a *Diſhonour* to him, ſhould every Day beas much as poſſible diminiſhed, and they be brought to give him his due Tribute of Honour and Praiſe in a right Way of Worſhip. 'Tis in this that a *Jealouſy*, which is in earneſt for *God's Honour*, truly ſhews it ſelf in wiſhing and endeavouring to ab ate the *Aomination*, and drive *Idolatry*

out

out of the World, not in driving Idolaters out of any one Country, or ſending them away to Places and Company, where they ſhall find more Encouragement to it. 'Tis a ſtrange *Jealouſy for the Honour of God*, that looks not beyond ſuch a Mountain or River as divides a Chriſtian and Pagan Country. Where-ever Idolatry is committed, there God's *Honour* is concerned; and thither Mens *Jealouſy for his Honour*, if it be ſincere indeed, will extend, and be in Pain to leſſen and take away the Provocation. But the Place God is provoked and diſhonoured in, which is a narrow Conſideration in reſpect of the Lord of all the Earth, will no otherwiſe imploy their Zeal, who are in earneſt, than as it may more or leſs conduce to the Converſion of the Offenders.

But if your *Jealouſy for the Honour of God*, engages you ſo far againſt Mens committing Idolatry in certain Places, that you think thoſe ought to be excluded from the Rights of the Common-wealth, and not to be ſuffered to be Denizons, who according to that Place in the *Romans* brought by you, *are without Excuſe, becauſe when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, but became vain in their Imaginations, and changed the Glory of the incorruptible God, into an Image made like to corruptable Man.* I ſhall only change ſome of the Words in the Text you cite out of *Iſaiah*; *I have baked part thereof on the Coals, and eaten it, and ſhall I make the Reſidue thereof a God? Shall I fall down to that which comes of a Plant?* And ſo leave them with you to conſider whether your Jealouſy in earneſt carries you ſo far as you talk of; and whether when you have looked about you, you are ſtill of the Mind, that thoſe who do ſuch things ſhould be diſfranchiſed and ſent away, and the Exerciſe of no ſuch Religion be any where permitted amongſt us? for thoſe things are no leſs an Abomination to God under a Chriſtian than Pagan Name. One Word more I have to ſay to your *Jealouſy for the Honour of God*, that if it be any thing more than in Talk, it will ſet it ſelf no leſs earneſtly againſt other *Abominations*, and the Practicers of them, than againſt that of Idolatry.

As to that in *Job* xxxi. 26, 27, 28. where he ſays Idolatry *is to be puniſhed by the Judge*; this Place alone, were there no other, is ſufficient to confirm their Opinion, who conclude that Book to be writ by a *Jew*. And how little the puniſhing of Idolatry in that Common-wealth concerns our preſent Caſe, I refer you for Information to the Author's Letter. But how does your *Jealouſy for the Honour of God*, carry you to an Excluſion of the *Pagan* Religion from amongſt you, but yet admit of the *Jewiſh* and *Mahometan*? Or is not the Honour of God concern'd in their denying our Saviour?

If we are to look upon *Job* to have been writ before the time of *Moſes*, as the Author would have it, *p.* 32. and ſo by a Stranger to the Common-wealth of *Iſrael*. 'Tis plain the general Apoſtacy he lays ſo much Streſs on, was not ſpread ſo far, but that there was a Government by his own Confeſſion, eſtabliſhed out of *Judæa*, free from, nay zealous againſt Idolatry. And why there might not be many more as well as this, which we hear of but by chance, it will concern him to ſhew.

Pag. 4. You go on, *But as the converting* Jews, Mahometans *and* Pagans *to Chriſtianity, I fear there will be no great Progreſs made in it, till Chriſtians come to a better Agreement and Union among themſelves. I am ſure our Saviour prayed that all that ſhould believe in him,* might be one in the Father and him, (i. e. *I ſuppoſe in that holy Religion, which he taught them from the Father*) that the World might believe that the Father had ſent him: *And therefore when he comes to make Inquiſition, why no more* Jews, Mahometans *and* Pagans, *have been converted to his Religion, I very much fear, that a great part of the Blame will be found to lie upon the Authors and Promoters of Sects and Diviſions among the Profeſſors of it: which therefore, I think, all that are guilty, and all that would not be guilty, ought well to conſider.*

I eaſily grant that our *Saviour pray'd that all might be one in that holy Religion which he taught them,* and in that very Prayer teaches what that Religion is, *This is Life eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.* But muſt it be expected, that therefore they ſhould all be of one Mind in things not neceſſary to Salvation? For whatever Unity it was our Saviour pray'd for here, 'tis certain the Apoſtles themſelves did not all of them agree in every thing: but even the chief of them have had Differences amongſt them in Matters of Religion, as appears, *Gal.* ii. 11.

Joh. 17. 2.

An Agreement in Truths neceſſary to Salvation, and the maintaining of Charity and brotherly Kindneſs with the Diverſity of Opinions in other things, is that which will very well conſiſt with Chriſtian Unity, and is all poſſibly to be had in this World, in ſuch

ſuch an incurable Weakneſs and Difference of Mens Underſtandings. This probably would contribute more to the Converſion of *Jews*, *Mahometans* and *Pagans*, if there were propoſed to them and others, for their Admittance into the Church, only the plain and ſimple Truths of the Goſpel neceſſary to Salvation, than all the fruitleſs Pudder and Talk about Uniting Chriſtians in Matters of leſs Moment, according to the Draught and Preſcription of a certain Set of Men any where.

What Blame will lie on the Authors and Promoters of Sects and Diviſions, and (let me add) Animoſities amongſt Chriſtians, *when Chriſt comes to make Inquiſition why no more* Jews, Mahometans *and* Pagans *were converted*, they who are concerned *ought certainly well to conſider*. And to abate in great Meaſure this Miſchief for the future, they who talk ſo much of *Sects and Diviſions*, would do well to conſider too, whether thoſe are not moſt Authors and Promoters of Sects and Diviſions, who impoſe Creeds, Ceremonies and Articles of Mens making: and make Things not neceſſary to Salvation, the neceſſary Terms of Communion, excluding and driving from them ſuch as out of Conſcience and Perſuaſion cannot aſſent and ſubmit to them; and treating them as if they were utter Aliens from the Church of God, and ſuch as were deſervedly ſhut out as unfit to be Members of it; who narrow Chriſtianity within Bounds of their own making, and which the Goſpel knows nothing of; and often for Things by themſelves confeſſed indifferent, thruſt Men out of their Communion, and then puniſh them for not being of it.

Who ſees not, but the Bond of Unity might be preſerved, in the different Perſuaſions of Men concerning Things not neceſſary to Salvation, if they were not made neceſſary to Church-Communion? What two thinking Men of the Church of *England* are there who differ not one from the other in ſeveral material Points of Religion, who nevertheleſs are Members of the ſame Church, and in Unity one with another? Make but one of thoſe Points the *Shibboleth* of a Party, and erect it into an Article of the National Church, and they are preſently divided; and he of the two, whoſe Judgment happens not to agree with National Orthodoxy, is immediately cut off from Cummunion. Who I beſeech you is it in this Caſe that makes the Sect? Is it not thoſe who contract the Church of Chriſt within Limits of their own Contrivance? who by Articles and Ceremonies of their own forming, ſeparate from their Communion all that have not Perſuaſions which juſt jump with their Model?

'Tis frivolous here to pretend Authority. No Man has or can have Authority to ſhut any one out of the Church of Chriſt, for that for which Chriſt himſelf will not ſhut him out of Heaven. Whoſoever does ſo, is truly the Author and Promoter of Schiſm and Diviſion, ſets up a Sect, and tears in Pieces the Church of Chriſt, of which every one who believes, and practiſes what is neceſſary to Salvation, is a Part and Member; and cannot, without the Guilt of Schiſm, be ſeparated from, or kept out of its external Communion. In this *lording it over the Heritage of God*, and thus *overſeeing* by Impoſition on the unwilling, and not conſenting, which ſeems to be the Meaning of St. *Peter*, moſt of the laſting Sects which ſo mangle Chriſtianity, had their Original, and continue to have their Support: and were it not for theſe eſtabliſh'd Sects under the ſpecious Names of National Churches, which by their contracted and arbitrary Limits of Communion, juſtify againſt themſelves the Separation and like Narrowneſs of others, the Difference of Opinions which do not ſo much begin to be, as to appear and be owned under Toleration, would either make no Sect nor Diviſion; orelſe, if they were ſo extravagant as to be oppoſite to what is neceſſary to Salvation, and ſo neceſſitate a Separation, the clear Light of the Goſpel, joined with a ſtrict Diſcipline of Manners, would quickly chaſe them out of the World. But whilſt needleſs Impoſitions, and moot Points in Divinity are eſtabliſhed by the penal Laws of Kingdoms, and the ſpecious Pretences of Authority, what Hopes is there, that there ſhould be ſuch an Union amongſt Chriſtians any where, as might invite a rational *Turk* or Infidel to embrace a Religion, whereof he is told they have a Revelation from God, which yet in ſome Places he is not ſuffered to read, and in no Place ſhall he be permitted to underſtand for himſelf, or to follow according to the beſt of his Underſtanding, when it ſhall at all thwart (though in things confeſſed not neceſſary to Salvation) any of thoſe ſelect Points of Doctrine, Diſcipline, or outward Worſhip, whereof the National Church has been pleaſed to make up its Articles, Polity, and Ceremonies? And I ask, what a ſober ſenſible Heathen muſt think of the Diviſions amongſt Chriſtians not owing to Toleration, if he ſhould find in an Iſland, where Chriſtianity ſeems to be in its greateſt Purity, the

1 Pet. 5. 2, 3.

the South and North Parts eſtabliſhing Churches upon the Differences of only whether fewer or more, thus and thus choſen, ſhould govern; though the Revelation they both pretend be their Rule, ſay nothing directly one way or t'other: each contending with ſo much Eagerneſs, that they deny each other to be Churches of Chriſt, that is, in effect, to be true Chriſtians? To which if one ſhould add Tranſubſtantiation, Conſubſtantiation, Real Preſence, Articles and Diſtinctions ſet up by Men without Authority from Scripture, and other leſs Differences, (which good Chriſtians may diſſent about without endangering their Salvations) *eſtabliſhed by Law* in the ſeveral Parts of Chriſtendom: I ask, Whether the Magiſtrate interpoſing in Matters of Religion, and eſtabliſhing National Churches by the Force of Penalties of Civil Laws, with their diſtinct (and at home reputed neceſſary) Confeſſions and Ceremonies, do not by Law and Power authorize and perpetuate Sects among Chriſtians, to the great Prejudice of Chriſtianity, and Scandal to Infidels, more than any thing that can ariſe from a mutual Toleration, with Charity and a good Life?

Thoſe who have ſo much in their Mouths, the *Authors of Sects and Diviſions*, with ſo little Advantage to their Cauſe, I ſhall deſire to conſider, whether National Churches eſtabliſhed as now they are, are not as much Sects and Diviſions in Chriſtianity, as ſmaller Collections, under the Name of diſtinct Churches, are in reſpect of the National? Only with this Difference, that theſe Sub-diviſions and diſcountenanced Sects, wanting Power to enforce their peculiar Doctrines and Diſcipline, uſually live more friendly like Chriſtians, and ſeem only to demand Chriſtian Liberty; whereby there is leſs Appearance of unchriſtian Diviſion among them: Whereas thoſe National Sects, being back'd by the Civil Power, which they never fail to make uſe of, at leaſt as a Pretence of Authority over their Brethren, uſually breathe out nothing but Force and Perſecution, to the great Reproach, Shame, and Diſhonour of the Chriſtian Religion.

I ſaid, "That if the Magiſtrates would ſeverely and impartially ſet themſelves "againſt Vice in whomſoever it is found, and leave Men to their own Conſciences "in their Articles of Faith, and Ways of Worſhip, true Religion would ſpread wi-"der, and be more fruitful in the Lives of its Profeſſors, than ever hitherto it has "done by the impoſing of Creeds and Ceremonies. Here I call only Immorality of Manners, *Vice*; you on the contrary, in your Anſwer, give the Name of *Vice* to
Pag 13. Errors in Opinion, and Difference in Ways of Worſhip from the National Church: For this is the Matter in queſtion between us, expreſs it as you pleaſe. This being a Conteſt only about the Signification of a ſhort Syllable in the *Engliſh* Tongue, we muſt leave to the Maſters of that Language to judge which of theſe two is the proper Uſe of it. But yet, from my uſing the Word *Vice*, you conclude preſently, (taking it in your Senſe, not mine) that the Magiſtrate has a Power in *England* (for *England* we are ſpeaking of) to puniſh Diſſenters from the National Religion, becauſe it is a *Vice*. I will, if you pleaſe, in what I ſaid, change the Word *Vice* into that I meant by it, and ſay thus, [If the Magiſtrates will ſeverely and impartially ſet themſelves againſt the Diſhoneſty and Debauchery of Mens Lives, and ſuch Immoralities as I contra-diſtinguiſh from Errors in ſpeculative Opinions of Religion, and Ways of Worſhip:] and then pray ſee how your Anſwer will look, for thus it runs; *It ſeems then with you the rejecting the true Religion, and refuſing to worſhip God in decent Ways preſcribed by thoſe to whom God has left the Ordering of thoſe Matters, are not comprehended in the Name* Vice. But you tell me, *If I except theſe Things, and will not allow them to be called by the Name of* Vice, *perhaps other Men may think it as reaſonable to except ſome other Things* [i. e. from being called Vices] *which they have a Kindneſs for: For Inſtance, ſome may perhaps except arbitrary Divorce, Polygamy, Concubinage, ſimple Fornication, or Marrying within Degrees thought forbidden.* Let them except theſe, and if you will, Drunkenneſs, Theft, and Murder too, from the Name of *Vice*; nay, call them Vertues: Will they, by their calling them ſo, be exempt from the Magiſtrate's Power of puniſhing them? Or can they claim an Impunity by what I have ſaid? Will theſe Immoralities by the Names any one ſhall give, or forbear to give them, become *Articles of Faith, or Ways of Worſhip?* Which is all, as I expreſly ſay in the Words you here cite of mine, that I would have the Magiſtrates leave Men to their own Conſciences in. But, Sir, you have, for me, Liberty of Conſcience to uſe Words in what Senſe you pleaſe; only I think, where another is concerned, it favours more of Ingenuity and Love of Truth, rather to mind

the

the Senſe of him that ſpeaks, than to make a Duſt and Noiſe with a miſtaken Word, if any ſuch Advantage were given you.

You ſay, *That ſome Men would through Careleſneſs never acquaint themſelves with the Truth which muſt ſave them, without being forced to do it, which* (you *ſuppoſe*) *may be very true, notwithſtanding that* (*as* I *ſay*) *ſome are called at the third Hour, ſome at the ninth, and ſome at the eleventh Hour; and whenever they are called, they embrace all the Truths neceſſary to Salvation. At leaſt I do not ſhew why it may not: And therefore this may be no Slip for any thing I have ſaid to prove it to be one.* This I take not to be an Anſwer to my Argument, which was, That ſince ſome are not called till the eleventh Hour, no body can know who thoſe are, who *would never acquaint themſelves with thoſe Truths that muſt ſave them, without Force*, which is therefore neceſſary, and may *indirectly and at a diſtance do* them *ſome Service*. Whether that was my Argument or no, I leave the Reader to judge: But that you may not miſtake it now again, I tell you here it is ſo, and needs another Anſwer.

Your Way of uſing Puniſhments in ſhort is this, That all that conform not to the National Church, where it is true, as in *England*, ſhould be puniſhed; what for? *To make them conſider*. This I told you had ſomething of impracticable. To which you reply, That you uſed the Word *only* in another Senſe, which I miſtook: Whether I miſtook your Meaning in the Uſe of that Word or no, or whether it Pag. 24. was natural ſo to take it, or whether that Opinion which I charged on you by that Miſtake, when you tell us, *That not examining, is indeed the next End for which* Pag. 45. *they are puniſhed*, be not your Opinion, let us leave to the Reader: For when you have that Word in what Senſe you pleaſe, what I ſaid will be nevertheleſs true, *viz.* "That to puniſh Diſſenters, as Diſſenters, to make them conſider, has ſome-"thing impracticable in it, unleſs not to be of the National Religion, and not to "conſider, be the ſame thing. Theſe Words you anſwer nothing to, having as you thought a great Advantage of talking about my Miſtake of your Word *only*. But unleſs you will ſuppoſe, not to be of the National Church, and not to conſider, be the ſame thing, it will follow, that to puniſh Diſſenters, as Diſſenters, to make them conſider, has ſomething of impracticable in it.

The Law puniſhes all Diſſenters: For what? To make them all conform, that's evident; To what End? To make them all *conſider*, ſay you: That cannot be, for it ſays nothing of it; nor is it certain that all Diſſenters have not conſidered; nor is there any Care taken by the Law to enquire whether they have conſidered, when they do conform; yet this was the End intended by the Magiſtrate. So then with you it is practicable and allowable in making Laws, for the Legiſlator to lay Puniſhments by Law on Men, for an End which they may be ignorant of, for he ſays nothing of it; on Men, whom he never takes Care to enquire, whether they have done it or no, before he relax the Puniſhment, which had no other *next End*, but to make them do it. But though he ſays nothing of conſidering, in laying on the Penalties, nor asks any thing about it, when he takes them off; yet every body muſt underſtand that he ſo meant it. Sir, *Sancho Pancha* in the Government of his Iſland, did not expect that Men ſhould underſtand his Meaning by his Gaping: But in another Iſland it ſeems, if you had the Management, you would not think it to have any thing of impracticable or impolitick in it. For how far the Proviſion of Means of Inſtruction takes this off, we ſhall ſee in another Place. And laſtly, to lay Puniſhments on Men for an End which is already attained, (for ſome among the Diſſenters may have conſidered) is what other Law-makers look on as impracticable, or at leaſt unjuſt. But to this you anſwer, in your uſual way of Circle. That *if* Pag. 24. I *ſuppoſe* you *are for puniſhing Diſſenters whether they conſider or no*, I am *in a great Miſtake; for the Diſſenters* (*which is* my *Word, not* yours) *whom* you *are for puniſhing, are only ſuch as reject the true Religion propoſed to them, with Reaſons and Arguments ſufficient to convince them of the Truth of it, who therefore can never be ſuppoſed to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments as they ought, whilſt they perſiſt in rejecting that Religion, or* (*in* my *Language*) continue Diſſenters; *for if they did ſo conſider them, they would not continue Diſſenters*. Of the Fault for which Men were to be puniſhed, diſtinguiſhed from the *End* for which they were to be puniſhed, we heard nothing, as I remember, in the firſt Draught of your Scheme, which we had in *The Argument conſidered*, &c. But I doubt not but in ſome of your general Terms you will be able to find it, or what elſe you pleaſe: For now having ſpoken out, that Men, who are of a different Religion from the true, which has been *tendered them with ſufficient Evidence*,

(and who are they whom *the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all things has not furniſhed with competent Means* of Salvation) are Criminals, and are by the Magiſtrate to be puniſhed as ſuch, 'tis neceſſary your Scheme ſhould be compleated; and whither that will carry you, 'tis eaſy to ſee.

But pray, Sir, are there no Conformiſts that ſo *reject the true Religion?* And would you have them puniſhed too, as you here profeſs? Make that practicable by your Scheme, and you have done ſomething to perſuade us that your *End* in earneſt, in the Uſe of Force, is to make Men *conſider*, underſtand, and be of the true Religion; and that the *rejecting the true Religion tender'd, with ſufficient Evidence*, is the Crime which *bonâ fide* you would have puniſhed; and till you do this, all that you may ſay concerning puniſhing Men to make them *conſider as they ought, to make them receive the true Religion, to make them embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, &c. will with all ſober, judicious, and unbiaſſed Readers, paſs only for the Mark of great Zeal, if it ſcape amongſt Men as warm and as ſagacious as you are, a harſher Name: Whilſt thoſe Conformiſts, who neglect Matters of Religion, who *reject* the ſaving Truths of the Goſpel, as viſibly and as certainly as any Diſſenters, have yet no Penalties laid upon them.

You talk much of *conſidering* and *not conſidering as one ought*; *of embracing and rejecting the true Religion*, and abundandance more to this Purpoſe; which all, however very good and ſavory Words, that look very well, when you come to the Application of Force, to procure that End expreſſed in them, amount to no more but Conformity and Non-conformity. If you ſee not this, I pity you; for I would fain think you a fair Man, who means well, though you have not light upon the right Way to the End you propoſe: But if you ſee it, and perſiſt in your Uſe of theſe good Expreſſions to lead Men into a Miſtake in this Matter; conſider what my *Pagans* and *Mahometans* could do worſe to *ſerve a bad Cauſe.*

Whatever you may imagine, I write ſo in this Argument, as I have before my Eyes the Account, I ſhall one Day render for my Intention, and Regard to Truth in the Management of it. I look on my ſelf as liable to Error as others; but this I am ſure of, I would neither impoſe on you, my ſelf, nor any body; and ſhould be very glad to have the Truth in this Point clearly eſtabliſh'd: and therefore it is, I deſire you again to examine, whether all the Ends you name to be intended by your Uſe of Force, do in effect, when Force is to be your Way put in Practice, reach any farther than bare outward Conformity? Pray conſider whether it be not that which makes you ſo ſhy of the Term *Diſſenters*, which you tell me *is* mine *not* your *Word.* Since none are by your Scheme to be puniſhed, but thoſe who do not conform to the National Religion. *Diſſenters*, I think, is the proper Name to call them by; and I can ſee no Reaſon you have to boggle at it, unleſs your Opinion has ſomething in it you are unwilling ſhould be ſpoke out, and call'd by its right Name: But whether you like it or no, *Perſecution*, and *Perſecution of Diſſenters*, are Names that belongs to it as it ſtands now.

Pag. 24. And now I think I may leave you your Queſtion, wherein you ask, *But cannot Diſſenters be puniſhed for not being of the National Religion, as the Fault, and yet only to make them conſider, as the End for which they were puniſhed?* To be anſwered by your ſelf, or to be uſed again, where you think there is any need of ſo nice a Diſtinction, as between the *Fault* for which Men are puniſhed by *Laws*, and the *End* for which they are puniſhed: For to me I confeſs it is hard to find any other immediate End of Puniſhment in the Intention of human Laws, but the Amendment of the Fault puniſhed; though it may be ſubordinate to other and remoter Ends. If the Law be only to puniſh Non-conformity, one may truly ſay, to cure that Fault, or to produce Conformity, is the End of that Law; and there is nothing elſe immediately aimed at by that Law, but Conformity; and whatever elſe it tends to as an End, muſt be only as a Conſequence of Conformity, whether it be Edification, Increaſe of Charity, or ſaving of Souls, or whatever elſe may be thought a Conſequence of Conformity. So that in a Law, which with Penalties requires Conformity, and nothing elſe; one cannot ſay (properly I think) that Conſideration is the End of that Law, unleſs Conſideration be a Conſequence of Conformity, to which Conformity is ſubordinate, and does naturally conduce, or elſe is neceſſary to it.

Pag. 24. To my arguing that it is unjuſt as well as impracticable, you reply, *Where the National Church is the true Church of God, to which all Men ought to join themſelves, and*

and ſufficient Evidence is offered to convince Men that it is ſo: There it is a Fault *to be* out of the National Church, *becauſe it is a Fault not to be* convinced *that the National Church is that true Church of God. And therefore ſince there Mens not being ſo* convinced, *can only be imputed to their not* conſidering *as they ought, the Evidence which is offered to convince them; it cannot be unjuſt to puniſh them to make them ſo to conſider it.* Pray tell me, which is a Man's Duty, to be of the National Church firſt; or to be convinced firſt, that its Religion is true, and then to be of it? If it be his Duty to be convinced firſt, why then do you puniſh him for not being of it, when it is his Duty to be convinced of the Truth of its Religion, before it is his Duty to be of it? If you ſay it is his Duty to be of it firſt; why then is not Force uſed to him afterwards, though he be ſtill ignorant and unconvinced? But you anſwer, *It is his Fault not to be convinced.* What, every one's Fault every where? No, you limit it to Places where *ſufficient Evidence is offered to convince Men that the National Church is the true Church of God.* To which pray let me add, the National Church is ſo the true Church of of God, that no body out of its Communion can embrace the Truth that muſt ſave him, or be in the Way to Salvation. For if a Man may be in the Way to Salvation out of the National Church, he is enough in the true Church, and needs no Force to bring him into any other: For when a Man is in the Way to Salvation, there is no Neceſſity of Force to bring him into any Church of any Denomination, in order to his Salvation. So that not to be of the National Church, though true, will not be a Fault which the Magiſtrate has a Right to puniſh, until *ſufficient Evidence* is offered to prove that a Man cannot be ſaved out of it. Now ſince you tell us, that by *ſufficient Evidence you mean ſuch as will certainly win Aſſent*; when you have offered ſuch Evidence to convince Men, that the National Church, any where, is ſo the true Church, that Men cannot be ſaved out of its Communion, I think I may allow them to be ſo faulty as to deſerve what Puniſhment you ſhall think fit. If you hope to mend the Matter by the following Words, where you ſay, that where ſuch *Evidence is offered, there Mens not being convinced, can only be imputed to Mens not conſidering as they ought*, they will not help you. For *to conſider as they ought*, being by your own Interpretation, *to conſider ſo as not to reject*; then your Anſwer amounts to juſt thus much, *That it is a Fault not to be convinced that the National Church is the true Church of God, where ſufficient Evidence is offered to convince Men that it is ſo. Sufficient Evidence is ſuch as will certainly gain Aſſent with thoſe who conſider as they ought*, i. e. *who conſider ſo as not to reject, or to be moved heartily to embrace*, which I think is to be *convinced.* Who can have the Heart now to deny any of this? Can there be any thing ſurer, than that Mens not being convinc'd, is to be imputed to them if they are not convinc'd, where ſuch Evidence is offered to them as does convince them? And to puniſh all ſuch you have my free Conſent.

Pag. 51. Pag. 25. Pag. 40.

Whether all you ſay have any thing more in it than this, I appeal to my Readers; and ſhould willingly do it to you, did not I fear, that the Jumbling of thoſe good and plauſible Words in your Head, of *ſufficient Evidence, conſider as you ought*, &c. might a little jargogle your Thoughts, and lead you hoodwink'd the Round of your own beaten Circle. This is a Danger thoſe are much expoſed to, who accuſtom themſelves to relative and doubtful Terms, and ſo put together, that though aſunder they ſignify ſomething, yet when their Meaning comes to be caſt up as they are placed, it amounts to juſt nothing.

You go on, *What Juſtice* it would be *for the Magiſtrate to puniſh one for not being a* Carteſian, *it will be time enough to conſider when I have proved it to be as neceſſary for Men to be* Carteſians, *as it is to be Chriſtians, or Members of God's Church.* This will be a much better Anſwer to what I ſaid, when you have proved that *to be a Chriſtian*, or a *Member of God's Church*, it is neceſſary for a Diſſenter to be of the Church of *England.* If it be not Juſtice to puniſh a Man for not being a *Carteſian*, becauſe it is not as neceſſary to be a *Carteſian*, as to be a Chriſtian; I fear the ſame Argument will hold againſt puniſhing a Man for not uſing the Croſs in Baptiſm, or not kneeling at the Lord's Supper; and it will lie on you to prove, that it is as neceſſary to uſe the Croſs in Baptiſm, or kneeling at the Lord's Supper, as it is to be a Chriſtian: For if they are not as neceſſary as it is to be a Chriſtian, you cannot by your own Rule, without Injuſtice, puniſh Men for not conforming to a Church wherein they are made an indiſpenſible Part of Conformity; and by this Rule it will be Injuſtice to puniſh

Pag. 25.

any

any Man for not being of that Church wherein any thing is required not neceſſary to Salvation; for that, I think, is the Neceſſity of being a Chriſtian.

L. 2. p. 270. To ſhew the Unreaſonableneſs of puniſhing Diſſenters to make them examine, I ſaid, that ſo they were puniſhed for not having offended againſt a Law; for there is on

Pag. 45. Law of the Land that requires them to examine. Your Reply is, That *you think the contrary is plain enough: For where the Laws provide ſufficient Means of Inſtruction in the true Religion, and then require all Men to embrace that Religion*; you *think the moſt natural Conſtruction of thoſe Laws is, that they require Men to embrace it upon Inſtruction and Conviction, as it cannot be expected they ſhould do without examining the Grounds upon which it ſtands.* Your Anſwer were very true, if they could not embrace without Examining and Conviction. But ſince there is a ſhorter Way to embracing which coſt no more Pains than walking as far as the Church, your Anſwer no more proves, that the Law requires examining, than if a Man at *Harwich* being ſubpœna'd to appear in *Weſtminſter-Hall* next Term, you ſhould ſay the Subpœna required him to come by Sea, becauſe there was ſufficient Means provided for his Paſſage in the ordinary Boat that by Appointment goes conſtantly from *Harwich* to *London*: But he taking it to be more for his Eaſe and Diſpatch, goes the ſhorter Way by Land, and finds that having made his Appearance in Court as was required, the Law is ſatisfied, and there is no Enquiry made, what Way he came thither.

If therefore Men can embrace ſo as to ſatisfy the Law without examining, and it

A. p. 6, &c. be true that they ſo *fly from the Means of right Information*, are ſo *negligent* in, and *averſe to examining*, that there is need of Penalties to make them do it, as you tell us at large; How is it a *natural Conſtruction* of thoſe Laws, that they require Men to examine, which having provided ſufficient Means of Inſtruction, require Men only to conform, without ſaying any thing of examining? eſpecially when the Cauſe aſſigned by you of Mens neglecting to examine, is not want of *Means of Inſtruction*, but want

Pag. 43. of *Penalties* to *over-balance* their *Averſion* to the uſing thoſe Means; which you your ſelf confeſs, where you ſay, *When the beſt Proviſion is made that can be, for the Inſtruction of the People*, you *fear a great Part of them will ſtill need Penalties to bring them to*

L. 2. p. 281. *hear and receive Inſtruction*: And therefore perhaps the Remainder of that Paragraph, when you have conſidered it again, will not appear ſo impertinent a *Declamation* as you are pleaſed to think it: For it charged your Method (as it then ſtood) of puniſhing Men for not conſidering and examining with theſe Abſurdities. That it puniſhed Men for not doing that which the Law did not require of them, nor declare the Neglect of to be a Fault, contrary to the Ends of all Laws, contrary to the common Senſe of Mankind, and the Practice of all Law-makers, who always firſt declared the Fault, and then denounced the Penalties againſt thoſe who after a Time ſet, ſhould be found guilty of it. It charged your Method, that it allows not Impunity to the Innocent, but puniſhes whole Tribes together, the Innocent with the Guilty; and that the Thing deſigned in the Law was not mentioned in it, but left to the People (whoſe Fault was want of Conſideration) to be by Conſideration found out.

To avoid theſe Abſurdities, you have reformed your Scheme, and now in your Reply own with the frankeſt Perſecutors, that you puniſh Men downright for their Religion, and that to be a Diſſenter from the true Religion, is a *Fault* to be puniſhed by the Magiſtrate. This indeed is plain Dealing, and clears your Method from theſe Abſurdities as long as you keep to it: but where-ever you tell us, that your Laws are to make Men *hear*, to make Men *conſider*, to make Men *examine*; whilſt the Laws themſelves ſay nothing of *hearing*, *conſidering* and *examining*, there you are ſtill chargeable with all theſe Abſurdities: Nor will the Diſtinction, which without any Difference you would ſet up, between the Fault for which Men are to be puniſhed, and the *End* for which they are to be puniſhed, do you any Service herein, as I have ſhewed you in another Place.

To what I ſaid *L.* 2. from *p.* 271. to *p.* 275. concerning thoſe who by your Scheme are to be puniſhed, you having thought fit to anſwer any thing, I ſhall here again offer it to your Conſideration.

"Let us inquire, Firſt, Who it is you would have be puniſhed. In the Place "above-cited, they are *thoſe who are got into a wrong Way, and are deaf to all Perſuaſions.* "If theſe are the Men to be puniſhed, let a Law be made againſt them: you have "my Conſent; and that is the proper Courſe to have Offenders puniſhed. For you "do not, I hope, intend to puniſh any Fault by a Law, which you do not name "in the Law; nor make a Law againſt any Fault you would not have puniſh-

"ed.

" ed. And now, if you are ſincere, and in earneſt, and are (as a fair Man ſhould " be) for what your Words plainly ſignify, and nothing elſe; what will ſuch a Law " ſerve for? *Men in the wrong Way are to be puniſhed:* But who are *in the wrong Way*, " is the Queſtion. You have no more Reaſon to determine it againſt one, who dif- " fers from you, than he has to conclude againſt you, who differ from him: No, not " tho' you have the Magiſtrate and the National Church on your Side. For if to " differ from them be to be *in the wrong Way*; you who are *in the right Way* in *England*, " will be *in the wrong Way* in *France*. Every one here muſt be Judge for himſelf: And " your Law will reach no body, till you have convinced him he is *in the wrong Way*: " And then there will be no need of Puniſhment to make him conſider; unleſs you " will affirm again what you have denied, and have Men puniſhed for embracing the " Religion they believe to be true, when it differs from yours or the publick.

" Beſides being *in the wrong Way*, thoſe who you would have puniſhed, muſt be " ſuch as are *deaf to all Perſuaſions*. But any ſuch, I ſuppoſe, you will hardly find; " who hearken to no body, not to thoſe of their own Way. If you mean by *deaf to* " *all Perſuaſions*, all Perſuaſions of a contrary Party, or of a different Church; ſuch, " I ſuppoſe, you may abundantly find in your own Church, as well as elſewhere; " and I preſume to them you are ſo charitable, that you would not have them pu- " niſhed for not lending an Ear to Seducers. For Conſtancy in the Truth, and Per- " ſeverance in the Faith, is (I hope) rather to be encouraged, than by any Penal- " ties check'd in the Orthodox. And your Church doubtleſs, as well as all others, " is Orthodox to it ſelf in all its Tenets. If you mean by *all Perſuaſion*, all your " Perſuaſion, or all Perſuaſion of thoſe of your Communion; you do but beg the " Queſtion, and ſuppoſe you have a Right to puniſh thoſe who differ from, and will " not comply with you.

" Your next Words are, *When Men fly from the Means of a right Information, and* " *will not ſo much as conſider how reaſonable it is throughly and impartially to examine a Re-* " *ligion, which they embraced upon ſuch Inducements as ought to have no Sway at all in the* " *Matter, and therefore with little or no Examination of the proper Grounds of it; What* " *humane Method can be uſed to bring them to act like Men, in an Affair of ſuch Conſequence,* " *and to make a wiſer and more rational Choice, but that of laying ſuch Penalties upon them,* " *as may balance the Weight of thoſe Prejudices which inclined them to prefer a falſe Way* " *before the true, and recover them to ſo much Sobriety and Reflection, as ſeriouſly to put the* " *Queſtion to themſelves, Whether it be really worth the while to undergo ſuch Inconveniencies* " *for adhering to a Religion, which, for any thing they know, may be falſe, or for rejecting* " *another (if that be the Caſe) which, for any thing they know, may be true, till they have* " *brought to the Bar of Reaſon, and given it a fair Trial there?* Here you again bring " in ſuch as *prefer a falſe Way before a true*: To which having anſwered already, " I ſhall here ſay no more, but, That ſince our Church will not allow thoſe to be " in a *falſe Way* who are out of the Church of *Rome*, becauſe the Church of *Rome* " (which pretends Infallibility) declares hers to be the *only true Way*; certainly no " one of our Church (nor any other, which claims not Infallibility) can require " any one to take the Teſtimony of any Church, as a ſufficient Proof of the " Truth of her own Doctrine. So that *true and falſe* (as it commonly happens, " when we ſuppoſe them for our ſelves, or our Party) in effect, ſignify juſt nothing, " or nothing to the Purpoſe; unleſs we can think that *true or falſe* in *England*, " which will not be ſo at *Rome* or *Geneva*; and *Viſa verſâ*. As for the reſt of the " Deſcription of thoſe, *on whom* you are here *laying Penalties*; I beſeech you con- " ſider whether it will not belong to any of your Church, let it be what it will: " Conſider, I ſay, if there be none in your Church *who have embraced her Reli-* " *gion upon ſuch Inducements as ought to have no Sway at all in the Matter, and there-* " *fore with little or no Examination of the proper Grounds of it*; who *have not been* " *inclined by Prejudices*; who do not *adhere to a Religion which, for any thing they* " *know, may be falſe*; and who have *rejected another, which, for any thing they know,* " *may be true*. If you have any ſuch in your Communion, (and 'twill be an admira- " ble, tho' I fear but a little Flock that has none ſuch in it) conſider well what you " have done. You have prepared Rods for them, for which I imagine they will con " you no Thanks. For to make any tolerable Senſe of what you here propoſe, it " muſt be underſtood that you would have Men of Religions puniſhed, to make " them conſider *Whether it be really worth the while to undergo ſuch Inconveniencies for* " *adhering to a Religion, which for any thing they know may be falſe.* If you hope to avoid

" that,

" that, by what you have ſaid of *true and falſe*; and pretend that the ſuppoſed *Pre-*
" *ference of the true Way* in your Church, ought to preſerve its Members from your
" Puniſhment; you manifeſtly triſle. For every Church's Teſtimony, that it has
" choſen the *true Way*, muſt be taken for it ſelf; and then none will be liable; and
" your new Invention of Puniſhment is come to nothing: Or elſe the differing
" Churches Teſtimonies muſt be taken one for another; and then they will be all
" out of the *true Way*, and your Church *need* Penalties as well as the reſt. So that,
" upon your Principles, they muſt all or none be puniſhed. Chuſe which you pleaſe;
" one of them, I think, you cannot eſcape.

" What you ſay in the next Words; *Where Inſtruction is ſtifly refuſed, and all Ad-*
" *monitions and Perſuaſions prove vain and ineffectual*; differs nothing but in the Way
" of expreſſing, from *Deaf to all Perſuaſions*: And ſo that is anſwered already.

" In another Place, you give us another Deſcription of thoſe you think ought to
" be puniſhed, in theſe Words; *Thoſe who refuſe to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to*
" *the Spiritual Government of the proper Miniſters of Religion, who by ſpecial Deſignation,*
" *are appointed to exhort, admoniſh, reprove*, &c. Here then, thoſe to be puniſhed, *are*
" *ſuch who refuſe to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Government of the proper Mi-*
" *niſters of Religion.* Whereby we are as much ſtill at Uncertainty as we were be-
" fore, who thoſe are who (by your Scheme, and Laws ſutable to it) are to be pu-
" niſhed; ſince every Church has, as it thinks, its *proper Miniſters of Religion*: And
" if you mean *thoſe that refuſe to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Government of*
" *the Miniſters of another Church*; then all Men will be guilty, and muſt be puniſhed,
" even thoſe of your own Church as well as others. If you mean *thoſe who refuſe*, &c.
" *the Miniſters of their own Church*, very few will incur your Penalties: But if by theſe
" *proper Miniſters of Religion*, the Miniſters of ſome particular Church are intended,
" why do you not name it? Why are you ſo reſerved in a Matter, wherein, if you
" ſpeak not out, all the reſt that you ſay will be to no purpoſe? Are Men to be
" puniſhed for *refuſing to embrace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Government of the pro-*
" *per Miniſters of the Church of* Geneva? For this time (ſince you have declared no-
" thing to the contrary) let me ſuppoſe you of that Church; and then I am ſure,
" that is it that you would name: for of what ever Church you are, if you think
" the Miniſters of any one Church ought to hearkened to, and obeyed, it muſt be
" thoſe of your own. There are Perſons to be puniſhed, you ſay: This you con-
" tend for all through your Book, and lay ſo much Streſs on it, that you make the
" Preſervation and Propagation of Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, to depend
" on it: And yet you deſcribe them by ſo general and equivocal Marks, that, un-
" leſs it be upon Suppoſitions which no body will grant you, I dare ſay, neither
" you nor any body elſe will be able to find one guilty. Pray find me, if you can,
" a Man whom you can judicially prove (for he that is to be puniſhed by Law,
" muſt be fairly tried) *is in a wrong Way*, in reſpect of his Faith; I mean, who is
" *deaf to all Perſuaſions, who flies from all Means of a right Information, who refuſes to em-*
" *brace the Doctrine, and ſubmit to the Government of the Spiritual Paſtors.* And when
" you have done that, I think I may allow you what Power you pleaſe to puniſh
" him, without any Prejudice to the Toleration the Author of the Letter pro-
" poſes.

" But why, I pray, all this boggling, all this looſe talking, as if you knew not what
" you meant, or durſt not ſpeak it out? Would you be for puniſhing ſome body, you
" know not whom? I do not think ſo ill of you. Let me then ſpeak out for you.
" The Evidence of the Argument has convinced you that Men ought not to be per-
" ſecuted for their Religion; That the Severities in uſe among Chriſtians cannot be
" defended; That the Magiſtrate has not Authority to compel any one to his Reli-
" gion. This you are forced to yield. But you would fain retain ſome Power in
" the Magiſtrate's Hands to puniſh Diſſenters, upon a new Pretence, *viz.* not for hav-
" ing embraced the Doctrine and Worſhip they believe to be true and right, but for
" not having well conſidered their own and the Magiſtrate's Religion. To ſhew you
" that I do not ſpeak wholly without Book, give me leave to mind you of one Paſ-
" ſage of yours: the Words are, *Penalties to put them upon a ſerious and impartial Ex-*
" *amination of the Controverſy between the Magiſtrate and them.* Though theſe Words
" be not intended to tell us who you would have puniſhed, yet it may be plainly
" inferr'd from them. And they more clearly point out whom you aim at, than
" all the foregoing Places, where you ſeem to (and ſhould) deſcribe them.

" For

" For they are such as *between whom and the Magistrate there is a Controversy*; that is, " in short, who differ from the Magistrate in Religion. And now indeed you have " given us a Note by which these you would have punished, may be known. We " have, with much ado, found at last whom it is we may presume you would have " punished. Which in other Cases is usually not very difficult: because there the " Faults to be amended, easily design the Persons to be corrected. But yours is a " new Method, and unlike all that ever went before it.

" In the next Place, let us see for what you would have them punished. You tell " us, and it will easily be granted you, that not to *examine* and *weigh impartially and* " *without Prejudice or Passion*, (all which, for Shortness-sake, we will express by this " one Word *Consider*) *the Religion one embraces or refuses*, is a Fault very common, and " very prejudicial to true Religion, and the Salvation of Mens Souls. But Penalties " and Punishments are very necessary, say you, to remedy this Evil.

" Let us now see how you apply this Remedy. Therefore, say you, let all Dis- " senters be punished. Why? Have no Dissenters considered of Religion? Or have " all Conformists considered? That you your self will not say. Your Project there- " fore is just as reasonable, as if a Lethargy growing Epidemical in *England*, you " should propose to have a Law made to blister and scarify, and shave the Heads of " all who wear Gowns; tho' it be certain that neither all who wear Gowns are " Lethargick, nor all who are Lethargick wear Gowns.

——Dii te, Damasippe, Deæq;
Verum ob consilium donent tonsore.

" For there could not be certainly a more learned Advice, than that one Man should " be pull'd by the Ears, because another is asleep. This, when you have consider'd " of it again, (for I find, according to your Principle, all Men have now and then " need to be jogg'd) you will, I guess, be convinced is not like a fair Physician, to ap- " ply a Remedy to a Disease; but, like an engaged Enemy, to vent one's Spleen upon " a Party. Common Sense, as well as common Justice, requires, that the Remedies " of Laws and Penalties should be directed against the Evil that is to be removed, " where-ever it be found. And if the Punishment you think so necessary, be (as " you pretend) to procure the Mischief you complain of, you must let it pursue, and " fall on the Guilty, and those only, in what Company soever they are; and not, " as you here propose, and is the highest Injustice, punish the innocent *considering* Dis- " senter, with the Guilty; and on the other side, let the *inconsiderate* guilty Confor- " mist 'scape, with the innocent. For one may rationally presume that the National " Church has some, nay, more, in proportion of those who little consider or con- " cern themselves about Religion, than any Congregation of Dissenters. For Con- " science, or the Care of their Souls, being once laid aside; Interest, of Course, " leads Men into that Society, where the Protection and Countenance of the Go- " vernment, and Hopes of Preferment, bid fairest to all their remaining Desires. " So that if careless, negligent, inconsiderate Men in Matters of Religion, *who,* " *without being forced, would not consider*, are to be rouzed into a Care of their Souls, " and a Search, after Truth, by Punishment; the National Religion, in all Coun- " tries, will certainly have a Right to the greatest Share of those Punishments, at " least, not to be wholly exempt from them.

" This is that which the Author of the Letter, as I remember, complains of, and " that justly, *viz. That the pretended Care of Mens Souls always expresses it self, in those* " *who would have Force any way made use of to that End, in very unequal Methods; some* " *Persons being to be treated with Severity, whilst others guilty of the same Faults, are not* " *to be so much as touched.* Though you are got pretty well out of the deep Mud, " and renounce Punishments directly for Religion; yet you stick still in this Part " of the Mire; whilst you would have Dissenters punished to make them *consider*, " but would not have any thing done to Conformists, though never so negligent in " this Point of *Considering*. The Author's Letter pleased me, because it is equal to " all Mankind, is direct, and will, I think, hold every-where; which I take to " be a good Mark of the Truth. For I shall always suspect that neither to comport " with the Truth of Religion, or the Design of the Gospel, which is suited to only " some one Country or Party. What is the True and Good in *England*, will be True " and Good at *Rome* too, in *China* or *Geneva*. But whether your great and *only* " *Method* for the propagating of Truth, by bringing the inconsiderate by Punish- " ments

" ments to *conſider*, would (according to your Way of applying your Puniſhments on-
" ly to Diſſenters from the National Religion) be of uſe in thoſe Countries, or any
" where but where you ſuppoſe the Magiſtrate to be in the right, judge you. Pray,
" Sir, conſider a little, whether Prejudice has not ſome Share in your Way of argu-
" ing. For this is your Poſition; *Men are generally negligent in examining the Grounds*
" *of their Religion.* This I grant. But could there be a more wild and incoherent
" Conſequence drawn from it, than this; *Therefore Diſſenters muſt be puniſhed?*

All this you are pleas'd to paſs over without the leaſt Notice: But perhaps you think you have made me full Satisfaction in your Anſwer to my Demand, Who are to be puniſh'd? We will here therefore conſider that as it ſtands, where you tell us,

Pag. 48. *Thoſe* who are to be puniſhed *according to the whole Tenor of your Anſwer, are no other but ſuch, as having ſufficient Evidence tender'd them of the true Religion, do yet reject it; whether utterly refuſing to conſider that Evidence, or not conſidering as they ought, viz. with ſuch Care and Diligence as the Matter deſerves and requires, and with honeſt and unbiaſſed Minds; and what Difficulty there is in this,* you ſay you *cannot imagine.* You promiſed you

Pag. 46. would *tell the World* who they were, *plainly and directly.* And though you tell us, you *cannot imagine what Difficulty there is in this* your Account of who are to be puniſhed, yet there are ſome Things in it, that make it to my Apprehenſion not very *plain and direct.* For firſt they muſt be only thoſe *who have the true Religion tender'd them with ſufficient Evidence:* Wherein there appears ſome *Difficulty to me,* who ſhall be Judge what *is the true Religion:* and for that, in every Country 'tis moſt probable the Magiſtrate will be. If you think of any other, pray tell us. Next there ſeems ſome *Difficulty* to know, who ſhall be Judge what is *ſufficient Evidence.* For where a Man is to be puniſhed by Law, he muſt be convicted of being guilty; which ſince in this Caſe he cannot be, unleſs it be proved he has had the *true Religion tender'd to him with ſufficient Evidence,* it is neceſſary that ſome body there muſt be Judge what is *the true Religion,* and what is *ſufficient Evidence*; and others to prove it has been ſo *tender'd.* If you were to be of the Jury, we know what would be your Verdict con-

Pag. 51. cerning *ſufficient Evidence,* by theſe Words of yours, *To ſay that a Man who has the true Religion propoſed to him with ſufficient Evidence of its Truth, may conſider it as he ought, or do his* utmoſt in conſidering, *and yet not perceive the Truth of it, is neither more nor leſs, than to ſay that ſufficient Evidence is not ſufficient: For what does any Man mean by ſufficient Evidence, but ſuch as will certainly win Aſſent where-ever it is duly conſidered?* Upon which his conforming, or not conforming, would without any farther Queſtions determine the Point. But whether the reſt of the Jury could upon this be able ever to bring in any Man guilty, and ſo liable to Puniſhment, is a Queſtion. *For if ſufficient Evidence be* only that *which certainly wins Aſſent,* where-ever a Man *does his utmoſt in conſidering,* 'twill be very hard to prove that a Man who rejects the *true Religion,* has had it tender'd with *ſufficient Evidence,* becauſe it will be very hard to prove he has not *done his utmoſt in conſidering it.* So that notwithſtanding all you have here ſaid, to puniſh any Man by your Method is not yet ſo very practicable.

But you clear all in your following Words, which ſay, *There is nothing more evident than that thoſe who reject the true Religion, are culpable, and deſerve to be puniſhed.* By whom? By Men: That's ſo far from being evident, as you talk, that it will require better Proofs than I have yet ſeen for it. Next you ſay, *'Tis eaſy enough to know when Men reject the true Religion.* Yes, when the true Religion is known, and agreed on what ſhall be taken to be ſo in judicial Proceedings, which can ſcarce be till 'tis agreed who ſhall determine what is *true Religion,* and what not. Suppoſe a Penalty ſhould in the Univerſity be laid on thoſe who rejected the *true Perepatick* Doctrine, could that Law be executed on any one, unleſs it were agreed who ſhould be Judge what was the *true Perepatick* Doctrine? If you ſay it may be known out of *Ariſtotle*'s Writings: Then I anſwer, that it would be a more reaſonable Law to lay the Penalty on any one, who rejected the Doctrine contained in the Books allowed to be *Ariſtotle*'s, and printed under his Name. You may apply this to the *true Religion,* and the Books of the Scripture, if you pleaſe: Though after all, there muſt be a Judge agreed on, to determine what Doctrines are contained in either of thoſe Writings, before the Law can be practicable.

Pag. 48. But you go on to prove, that *it is eaſy to know when Men reject the true Religion: For,* ſay you, *that requires no more than that we know that that Religion was tender'd to them with ſufficient Evidence of the Truth of it.* And that *it may be tender'd to Men with ſuch Evidence, and that it may be known when it is ſo tender'd, theſe Things,* you ſay, you *take leave here to ſuppoſe.* You ſuppoſe then more than can be allowed you. For that

it can be judicially *known that the true Religion has been tender'd to any one with ſufficient Evidence*, is what I deny, and that for Reaſons above-mentioned, which, were there no other Difficulty in it, were ſufficient to ſhew the Unpracticableneſs of your Method.

You conclude this Paragraph thus, *Which is all that needs be ſaid upon this Head to ſhew the Conſiſtency and Practicableneſs of this Method: And what do you any where ſay againſt this?* Whether I ſay any thing or no againſt it, I will bring a Friend of yours that will ſay that Diſſenters ought to be Puniſhed for being out of the Communion of the Church of *England*. I will ask you now, how it can be proved that ſuch an one is guilty of rejecting the *one only true Religion?* Perhaps it is becauſe he ſcruples the Croſs in Baptiſm, or Godfathers and Godmothers as they are uſed, or kneeling at the Lord's Supper; perhaps it is becauſe he cannot pronounce all damn'd that believe not all *Athanaſius*'s Creed, or cannot join with ſome of thoſe Repetitions in our Common-Prayer, thinking them to come within the Prohibition of our Saviour, each of which ſhuts a Man out from the Communion of the Church of *England*, as much as if he denied Jeſus Chriſt to be the Son of God. Now, Sir, I beſeech you, how can it be known, that ever ſufficient Evidence was tender'd to ſuch a Diſſenter to prove, that what he rejects is a Part of that one only true Religion, which unleſs he be of, he cannot be ſaved? Or indeed how can it be known, that any Diſſenter rejects that one only true Religion, when being puniſhed barely for not conforming, he is never asked, what Part it is he diſſents from or rejects? and ſo it may be ſome of thoſe things which I imagine will always want ſufficient Evidence to prove them to be Parts of that only one true Religion, without the hearty Embracing whereof no Man can be ſaved.

CHAP. IV.

What Degrees of Puniſhment.

HOW much ſoever you have endeavoured to reform the Doctrine of Perſecution to make it ſerve your Turn, and give it the Colour of Care and Zeal for the true Religion in the Country where alone you are concern'd it ſhould be made uſe of; yet you have laboured in vain, and done no more, but given the old Engine a new Varniſh to ſet it off the better, and make it look leſs frightful: For by what has been ſaid in the foregoing Chapters, I think it will appear, that if any Magiſtrate have Power to puniſh Men in Matters of Religion, all have; and that Diſſenters from the National Religion muſt be puniſhed every where or no where. The horrid Cruelties that in all Ages, and of late in our View, have been committed under the Name, and upon the Account of Religion, give ſo juſt an Offence and Abhorrence to all who have any Remains, not only of Religion, but Humanity left, that the World is aſhamed to own it. This Objection therefore, as much as Words or Profeſſions can do, you have laboured to fence againſt it; and to exempt your Deſign from the Suſpicion of any Severities, you take Care in every Page almoſt to let us hear of *Moderate* Force, *Moderate* Penalties; but all in vain: and I doubt not but when this Part too is examined, it will appear, that as you neither have, nor can limit the Power of Puniſhing to any diſtinct Sort of Magiſtrates, nor exempt from Puniſhment the Diſſenters from any National Religion: So neither have, nor can you limit the Puniſhment to any Degree ſhort of the higheſt, if you will uſe Puniſhments at all in Matters of Religion. What you have done in this Point beſides giving us good Words, I will now examine.

You tell me, I *have taken a Liberty which will need Pardon*, becauſe I ſay, "You "have plainly yielded the Queſtion by owning thoſe greater Severities to be impro- Pag. 1.
"per and unfit. But if I ſhall make it out, that thoſe are as proper and fit as your *Moderate Penalties*; and that if you will uſe one, you muſt come to the other, as will appear from what you your ſelf ſay: whatever you may think, I ſhall not imagine other Readers will conclude I have *taken* too great a *Liberty*, or ſhall much *need Pardon*. For if as you ſay in the next Page, *Authority may reaſonably and juſtly uſe ſome Degrees* Pag. 2.
of Force where it is needful; I ſay they may alſo uſe any Degree of Force where it is *needful*. Now upon your Grounds, Fire and Sword, tormenting and undoing, and thoſe other Puniſhments which you *condemn*, will be needful, even

to Torments of the higheſt Severity, and be as neceſſary as thoſe moderate Penalties which you will not name. For I ask you, to what Purpoſe do you uſe any Degree of Force? Is is to prevail with Men to do ſomething that is in their Power, or that is not? The latter I ſuppoſe you will not ſay, till your Love of Force is ſo increaſed, that you ſhall think it neceſſary to be made uſe of to produce Impoſſibilities: If Force then be to be uſed only to bring Men to do what is in their Power, what is the Neceſſity you aſſign of it? only this, as I remember, *viz.* That *when gentle Admonitions and earneſt Entreaties will not prevail, what other Means is there left but Force?* And I upon the ſame ground Reply; If leſſer Degrees of Force will not prevail, what other Means is there left but greater; If the loweſt Degree of Force be neceſſary where gentler Means will not prevail, becauſe there is no other Means left; higher Degrees of Force are Neceſſary, where lower will not prevail, for the ſame Reaſon. Unleſs you will ſay all Degrees of Force work alike; and that lower Penalties prevail as much on Men as greater, and will equally bring them to do what is in their Power. If ſo, a Phlip on the Forehead, or a Farthing Mulct, may be Penalty enough to bring Men to what you propoſe. But if you ſhall laugh at theſe, as being for their Smalneſs inſufficient, and therefore will think it neceſſary to increaſe them, I ſay, where-ever Experience ſhews any Degree of Force to be inſufficient to prevail, there will be ſtill the ſame neceſſity to increaſe it. For where-ever the End is *neceſſary*, and Force is the Means, *the only Means left* to procure it, both which you ſuppoſe in our Caſe, there it will be found always neceſſary to increaſe the Degrees of Force, where the lower prove ineffectual, as well till you come to the higeſt as when you begin with the loweſt. So that in your preſent Caſe I do not wonder you uſe ſo many Shifts, as I ſhall ſhew by and by you do, to decline naming the higheſt Degree of what you call *Moderate*. If any Degree be *neceſſary*, you cannot aſſign any one (*condemn* it in Words as much as you pleaſe) which may not be ſo, and which you muſt not come to the Uſe of. If there be no ſuch Neceſſity of Force as will juſtify thoſe higher Degrees of it, which are *Severities* you *condemn*, neither will it juſtify the Uſe of your lower Degrees.

Pag. 7. If, as you tell us, *falſe Religions prevail againſt the true, merely by the Advantage they have in the Corruption and Pravity of humane Nature left to itſelf unbridled by Authority.* If the not receiving the true Religion be a Mark and Effect merely of the Prevalency of the Corruption of humane Nature; may not, nay, muſt not the Magiſtrate, if leſs will not do, uſe his utmoſt Force to bring Men to the true Religion? his Force being given him to ſuppreſs that Corruption; eſpecially ſince you give it for a Meaſure of the Force to be uſed, that it muſt be *ſo much, as without which ordinarily they will not embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them.* What *ordinarily* ſignifies here to make any determinate Meaſure is hard to gueſs; but ſignify it what it will, ſo much Force muſt be uſed, as *without which Men will not embrace the Truth*; which, if it ſignify any thing intelligible, requires, that where lower Degrees will not do, greater muſt be uſed, till you come to what will *ordinarily* do; but what that *ordinarily* is, no Man can tell. If one Man will not be wrought on by as little Force as another, muſt not greater Degrees of Force be uſed to him? Shall the Magiſtrate who is *obliged to do what lies in him*, be excuſed, for letting him be damn'd, without the Uſe of all the Means was in his Power? And will it be ſufficient for him to plead, that though he did not *all that lay in him*, yet he did what *ordinarily prevailed*, or what prevailed on ſeveral others. Force, if that be the Remedy, muſt be proportion'd to the Oppoſition. If the Doſe that has frequently wrought on others, will nor purge a Man whoſe Life lies on it, muſt it not therefore be made ſufficient and effectual, becauſe it will be more than what is called *ordinarily*? Or can any one ſay the Phyſician has done his Duty, who lets his Patient in an extraordinary Caſe periſh in the Uſe of only moderate Remedies, and pronounces him incurable, before he has tried the utmoſt he can with the powerfulleſt Remedies which are in his reach?

Having renounced *Loſs of Eſtate, Corporal Puniſhment, Impriſonment*, and ſuch ſort
Pag. 19. of *Severities*, us unfit to be uſed in Matters of Religion; you ask, *Will it follow from hence that the Magiſtrate has no Right to uſe any Force at all?* Yes, it will follow, till you give ſome Anſwer to what I ſay in that Place, *viz.* That if you give up Puniſhments of a Man in his *Perſon, Liberty and Eſtate, I think we need not ſtand with you for any Puniſhment may be made uſe of.* But this you paſs by without any notice. I doubt not but you will here think you have a ready Anſwer, by telling

me,

me, you mean only *depriving Men of their Eſtates, maiming them with corporal Puniſhments, Starving and Tormenting them in noiſome Priſons*, and other ſuch Severities which you have by name excepted; but *lower Penalties* may yet be uſed, for *Penalties* is the Word you carefully uſe, and diſclaim that of *Puniſhment*, as if you diſowned the thing. I wiſh you would tell us too by name, what thoſe *lower Penalties* are you would have uſed, as well as by name you tell us thoſe Severities you diſallow. They may not *maim a Man with corporal Puniſhments*; may they uſe any corporal Puniſhments at all? They may not *ſtarve and torment them in noiſome Priſons* for Religion; that you *condemn* as much as I. May they put them in any Priſon at all? They may not *deprive Men of their Eſtates*; I ſuppoſe you mean their whole Eſtates: May they take away half, or a quarter, or an hundred Part? 'Tis ſtrange you ſhould be able to name the Degrees of Severity that will *hinder* more than *promote* the Progreſs of Religion, and cannot name thoſe Degrees that will *promote* rather than *hinder* it; that thoſe who would take their Meaſures by you, and follow your Scheme, might know how to proceed ſo, as not to do more Harm than Good: For ſince you are ſo certain, that there are Degrees of *Puniſhments* or *Penalties* that will do Good, and other Degrees of them that will do Harm; ought you not to have told us, what that true Degree is, or how it may be known, without which all your goodly Scheme is of no uſe? For allowing all you have ſaid to be as true as you would have it, no Good can be done without ſhewing the juſt Meaſure of Puniſhment to be uſed. Pag. 1.

If the Degree be too great, it will, you confeſs, do Harm: Can one then not err on the other hand, by uſing too little? If you ſay ſo, we are agreed, and I deſire no better *Toleration*. If therefore too great will do Harm, and too little, in your Opinion will do no Good, you ought to tell us the juſt Mean. This I preſſed upon you; whereof that the Reader may be Judge, I ſhall here trouble him with the Repetition.

"There is a third Thing, that you are as tender and reſerv'd in, as either naming L. 2 p. 271.
"the Criminals to be puniſhed, or poſitively telling us the End for which they ſhould
"be puniſhed; and that is, with what ſort of Penalties, what Degree of Puniſhment
"they ſhould be forced. You are indeed ſo gracious to them, that you Renounce
"the *Severities* and *Penalties* hitherto made uſe of. You tell us, they ſhould be but A. p. 24.
"*Moderate Penalties*. But if we ask you what are Moderate Penalties, you confeſs
"you cannot tell us: So that by *Moderate* here, you yet mean nothing. You tell A. p. 14.
"us, The *outward Force to be applied, ſhould be duly tempered*. But what that due
"Temper is, you do not, or cannot ſay; and ſo, in effect, it ſignifies juſt nothing.
"Yet if in this you are not plain and direct, all the reſt of your Deſign will ſignify
"nothing. For it being to have ſome Men, and to ſome End, puniſhed; yet if it
"cannot be found what Puniſhment is to be uſed, it is (notwithſtanding all you have
"ſaid) utterly uſeleſs. You tell us modeſtly, *That to determine preciſely the juſt* A. p. 22.
"*Meaſure of the Puniſhment, will require ſome Conſideration*. If the Faults were preciſely determined, and could be proved, it would require no more Conſideration
"to determine the Meaſure of the Puniſhment in this, than it would in any other
"Caſe, where thoſe were known. But where the Fault is undefined, and the Guilt
"not to be proved, (as I ſuppoſe it will be found in this preſent Buſineſs of *examining*) it will without doubt require Conſideration to proportion the Force to the
"Deſign: Juſt ſo much Conſideration as it will require to fit a Coat to the Moon,
"or proportion a Shoe to the Feet of thoſe who inhabit her. For to proportion a
"Puniſhment to a Fault that you do not name, (and ſo we in Charity ought to
"think you do not yet know) and a Fault that when you have named, it will be
"impoſſible to be proved who are or are not guilty of it, will, I ſuppoſe, *require*
"*as much Conſideration* as to fit a Shoe to Feet whoſe Size and Shape are not
"known.

"However, you offer ſome Meaſures whereby to regulate your Puniſhments; which
"when they are looked into, will be found to be juſt as good as none, they be-
"ing impoſſible to be any Rule in the Caſe. The firſt is, *So much Force, or ſuch* A. p. 24.
"*Penalties as are ordinarily ſufficient to prevail with Men of common Diſcretion,*
"*and not deſperately perverſe and obſtinate, to weigh Matters of Religion carefully and*
"*impartially, and without which ordinarily they will not do this*. Where it is to be
"obſerved:

"Firſt,

" Firſt, That who are theſe Men of *common Diſcretion*, is as hard to know, as to know " what is a fit Degree of Puniſhment in the Caſe; and ſo you do but regulate one " Uncertainty by another. Some Men will be apt to think, that he who will not " *weigh Matters of Religion*, which are of infinite Concernment to him, without Pu- " niſhment, cannot in Reaſon be thought a Man of *common Diſcretion*. Many Woman " of *common Diſcretion* enough to manage the ordinary Affairs of their Families, are " not able to read a Page in an ordinary Author, or to underſtand and give an Account " what it means, when read to them. Many Men of *common Diſcretion* in their Cal- " lings, are not able to judge when an Argument is concluſive or no; much leſs to " trace it through a long Train of Conſequences. *What Penalties ſhall be ſufficient to* " *prevail* with ſuch (who upon Examination, I fear, will not be found to make the " leaſt Part of Mankind) *to examine and weigh Matters of Religion carefully and im-* " *partially?* The Law allows all to have *common Diſcretion*, for whom it has not " provided Guardians or *Bedlam*. So that, in effect, your Men of *common Diſcretion*, " are all Men, not judg'd Idiots or Madmen: And *Penalties ſufficient to prevail with* " *Men of common Diſcretion*, are Penalties ſufficient to prevail with all Men but Idiots " and Madmen. Which what a Meaſure it is to regulate Penalties by, let all Men " of common Diſcretion judge.

" Secondly, You may be pleaſed to conſider, that all Men of the ſame Degree of " *Diſcretion*, are not apt to be moved by the ſame Degree of Penalties. Some are of " a more yielding, ſome of a more ſtiff Temper; and what is ſufficient to prevail on " one, is not half enough to move the other; though both Men of *common Diſcreti-* " *on*. So that *common* Diſcretion will be here of no Uſe to determine the Meaſure of " Puniſhment: eſpecially, when in the ſame Clauſe you except Men *deſperately per-* " *verſe and obſtinate*; who are as hard to be known, as what you ſeek, *viz.* the juſt " Proportions of Puniſhments neceſſary *to prevail with Men to conſider, examine, and* " *weigh Matters of Religion*; wherein, if a Man tells you he has *conſidered*, he has " *weighed*, he has *examined*, and ſo goes on in his former Courſe, 'tis impoſſible for " you ever to know whether he has done his Duty, or whether he be *deſperately per-* " *verſe and obſtinate*. So that this Exception ſignifies juſt nothing.

" There are many things in your Uſe of Force and Penalties, different from any " I ever met with elſewhere. One of them, this Clauſe of yours concerning the Mea- " ſure of Puniſhments, now under Conſideration, offers me; wherein you proportion " your Puniſhments only to the Yielding and Corrigible, not to the Perverſe and Ob- " ſtinate; contrary to the common Diſcretion which has hitherto made Laws in other " Caſes, which levels the Puniſhments againſt refractory Offenders, and never ſpares " them becauſe they are obſtinate. This however I will not blame as an Over-ſight " in you. Your new Method, which aims at ſuch impracticable and inconſiſtent " Things as Laws cannot bear, nor Penalties be uſeful to, forced you to it. The Uſe- " leſsneſs, Abſurdity, and Unreaſonableneſs of great *Severities*, you had acknowledg- " ed in the foregoing Paragraphs: Diſſenters you would have brought *to conſider by* " *Moderate Penalties*; they lie under them; but whether they have conſidered or no, " (for that you cannot tell) they ſtill continue Diſſenters. What is to be done now?
A. p. 12. " Why, *the Incurable are to be left to God*, as you tell us. Your Puniſhments were not " meant *to prevail on the deſperately Perverſe and Obſtinate*, as you tell us here. And " ſo whatever be the Succeſs, your Puniſhments are however juſtified.

The Fulneſs of your Anſwer to my Queſtion, *With what Puniſhments?* made you poſſibly paſs by theſe two or three Pages without making any particular Reply to any thing I ſaid in them: we will therefore examine that Anſwer of yours, where
Pag. 49. you tell us, That *having in* your *Anſwer declared that* you *take the Severities ſo often mentioned (which either deſtroy Men, or make them miſerable) to be utterly unapt and improper (for Reaſons there given) to bring Men to embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them:* but *juſt how far within thoſe Bounds that Force extends it ſelf, which is really ſerviceable to that End,* you *do not preſume to determine.* To determine how far *Moderate* Force reaches, when it is neceſſary to your Buſineſs that it ſhould be deter- mined, is not *preſuming*: You might with more Reaſon have called it *preſuming*, to talk of *Moderate* Penalties, and not to be able to *determine* what you mean by them; or to promiſe, as you do, That you will tell *plainly and directly, with what Puniſh- ments*; and here to tell us, You *do not preſume to determine.* But you give a Rea- ſon for this Modeſty of yours, in what follows, where you tell me, I *have not ſhewn any Cauſe why* you *ſhould.* And yet you may find in what is above repeated to you,

theſe

theſe Words, " If in this you are not plain and direct, all the reſt of your Deſign " will ſignify nothing. But had I failed in ſhewing *any Cauſe why* you *ſhould*; and your Charity would not enlighten us, unleſs driven by my Reaſons, I dare ſay yet, if I *have not ſhewn any Cauſe why* you *ſhould determine* in this Point, I can *ſhew a Cauſe why* you ſhould not. For I will be anſwerable to you, that you cannot name any Degree of Puniſhment, which will not be either ſo great, as to come among thoſe you condemn, and ſhew what your Moderation, what your Averſion to Perſecution is; or elſe too little to attain thoſe Ends for which you propoſe it. But whatever you tell me, that I have *ſhewn no Cauſe why* you *ſhould determine*, I thought it might have paſſed for a Cauſe why you ſhould *determine* more particularly, that (as you will find in thoſe Pages) I had proved that the Meaſures, you offer whereby to regulate your Puniſhments, are juſt as good as none.

Your Meaſures in your *Argument conſidered*, and which you repeat here again, are in theſe Words; *So much Force, or ſuch Penalties as are ordinarily ſufficient to prevail* Pag. 49. *with Men of common Diſcretion, and not deſperately perverſe, to weigh Matters of Religion carefully and impartially, and without which ordinarily they will not do this; ſo much Force, or ſuch Penalties may fitly and reaſonably be uſed for the promoting true Religion in the World, and the Salvation of Souls. And what juſt Exception this is liable to*, you *do not underſtand.* Some of the Exceptions it is liable to, you might have ſeen in what I have here again cauſed to be reprinted, if you had thought them worth your Notice. But you go on to tell us here, That *when* you *ſpeak of Men of common Diſcre-* Ibid. *tion, and not deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, you *think 'tis plain enough, that by common Diſcretion* you *exclude not Idiots only, and ſuch as we uſually call Madmen, but likewiſe the deſperately Perverſe and Obſtinate, who perhaps may well enough deſerve that Name, though they be not wont to be ſent to* Bedlam.

Whether by this you have at all taken off the Difficulty, and ſhewn your Meaſure to be any at all in the Uſe of Force, I leave the Reader to judge. I asked, Since great ones are unfit, what Degrees of Puniſhment or Force are to be uſed? You anſwer, *So much Force, and ſuch Penalties as are ordinarily ſufficient to prevail with Men of ordinary Diſcretion.* I tell you 'tis as hard to know who thoſe Men of *common Diſcretion* are, as what Degree of Puniſhment you would have uſed; unleſs we will take the " Determination of the Law, which allows all to have common Diſcretion, for " whom it has not provided Guardians or *Bedlam*: So that in Effect, your Men of " common Diſcretion are all Men not judg'd Idiots or Madmen. To clear this, you tell us, When you *ſpeak of Men of common Diſcretion, and not deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, you *think 'tis plain enough, by common Diſcretion you exclude not Idiots only, and ſuch as are uſually called Madmen, but likewiſe the deſperately perverſe and obſtinate.* It may be you did, for you beſt know what you meant in writing: But if by *Men of common Diſcretion*, you *excluded the deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, let us put what you meant by the Words, *Men of common Diſcretion*, in the Place of thoſe Words themſelves, and then according to your Meaning, your Rule ſtands thus; *Penalties ordinarily ſufficient to prevail with Men not deſperately perverſe and obſtinate, and with Men not deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*: So that at laſt, by *Men of common Diſcretion*, either you excluded only Idiots and Madmen; or if we muſt take your Word for it, that by them you *excluded likewiſe the deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, and ſo meant ſomething elſe; 'tis plain, you meant only a very uſeleſs and inſignificant Tautology.

You go on, and tell us, *If the Penalties* you *ſpeak of, be intended for the curing* Pag. 49. *Mens unreaſonable Prejudices and Refractorineſs againſt the true Religion, then the reaſon why the deſperately perverſe and obſtinate are not to be regarded in meaſuring theſe Penalties, is very apparent. For as Remedies are not provided for the Incurable, ſo in the preparing and tempering them, Regard is to be had only to thoſe for whom they are deſigned.* Which, true or falſe, is nothing to the Purpoſe, in a Place where you profeſs to inform us, *what Puniſhments are to be uſed.* We are enquiring who are the *deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, and not whether they are to be puniſhed or no. You pretend to give us a Rule to know what *Degrees of Force* are to be uſed, and tell us, it is *ſo much as is ordinarily ſufficient to prevail with Men of common Diſcretion, and not deſperately perverſe and obſtinate.* We again ask, Who are your *Men of common Diſcretion?* You tell us, ſuch as are *not Madmen or Idiots, or deſperately perverſe and obſtinate.* Very well; But who are thoſe *deſperately perverſe and obſtinate?* How ſhall we know them? And to this

you

you tell us, *they are not to be regarded in measuring these Penalties.* Whereby certainly we have got a plain Measure of your *moderate Penalties.* No, not yet, you go
Pag. 50. on in the next Paragraph to perfect it, where you say, To *prevent a little Cavil, it may be needful to note that there are Degrees of Perverseness and Obstinacy, and that Men may be perverse and obstinate without being desperately so.* So then now we have your Measure compleat; and to determine the just Degrees of Punishments; and to clear up the Doubt, who are the *desperately perverse and obstinate*, we need but be told that *there are Degrees of Perverseness and Obstinacy; and that Men may be perverse and obstinate without being desperately so: And that therefore some perverse and obstinate Persons may be thought curable, though such as are desperately so, cannot.* But does all this tell us who are the *desperately perverse and obstinate?* Which is the Thing we want to be informed in; nor till you have told us that, have you removed the Objection.

But if by *desperately perverse and obstinate*, you will tell us, you meant those, that are not wrought upon by your moderate Penalties, as you seem to intimate in your Reason, why the *desperately perverse and obstinate* are not to be *regarded in measuring*
Pag. 49. *these Penalties: For*, say you, *as Remedies are not provided for the incurable; so in preparing and tempering them, Regard is to be had only to those for whom they are designed.* So that by the *desperately perverse and obstinate*, you will perhaps say 'twas plain you meant the *incurable*; for you ordinarily shift off the Doubtfulness of one Place, by appealing to as doubtful an Expression in another. If you say then, that by *desperately perverse and obstinate*, you mean *Incurable*; I ask you again by what *incurable?* By your *lower Degrees of Force?* For I hope where Force is proper to work, those who are not wrought on by lower Degrees, may yet be by higher. If you mean so, then your Answer will amount to thus much, *Moderate Penalties* are such as are sufficient to prevail on those who are not *desperately perverse and obstinate. The desperately perverse and obstinate* are those who are *incurable*, and the *Incurable* are those on whom *moderate Penalties* are not sufficient to prevail: Whereby at last we have got a sure Measure of what are *moderate Penalties*; just such an one, as if having a sovereign universal Medicine put into your Hand, which will never fail, if you can hit the right Dose, which the Inventer tells you must be *moderate*: You should ask him what was the *moderate* Quantity it is to be given in; and he should answer, In such a Quantity as was *ordinarily sufficient* to work on common Constitutions, and not *desperately perverse and obstinate.* And to you asking again, Who were of *desperately perverse and obstinate* Constitutions? It should be answered, Those that were *incurable.* And who were *incurable?* Those whom a *moderate* Quantity would not work on. And thus to your Satisfaction, you know the *moderate* Dose by the *desperately perverse and obstinate*; and the *desperately perverse and obstinate* by *being incurable*; and the *Incurable* by the *moderate* Dose. For if, as you say, *Remedies are not provided for the incurable*, and none but *moderate Penalties* are to be provided, is it not plain, that you mean, that all that will not be wrought on by your *moderate Penalties*, are in your Sense *incurable?*

To ease you, Sir, of justifying your self, and shewing that I have mistaken you, do but tell us positively what in Penalties is the highest Degree of *moderate*; who are *desperately perverse and obstinate*; or who are *incurable*, without this relative and circular Way of defining one by the other; and I will yield my self to have mistaken you, as much as you please.

If by *incurable* you mean such as no Penalties, no Punishments, no Force is sufficient to work on; then your Measure of *moderate* Penalties will be this, that they are such, as are sufficient to prevail with Men not *incurable*, i. e. who cannot be prevailed on by any Punishments, any Force whatsoever; which will be a Measure of *moderate Punishments*, which (whatsoever you do) some will be very apt to approve of.

But let us suppose by these Marks (since you will afford us no better) that we can find who are *desperately perverse and obstinate*, we are yet as far as ever from finding the Measures of your moderate Punishments, till it can be known, what Degree of Force it is, that is *ordinarily sufficient to prevail* with all that are Men of *common Discretion, and not desperately perverse and obstinate*; for you are told, that all Men of the same Degree of Discretion are not apt to be moved with the same Degree of Penalties: But to this too you answer nothing, and so we are still without any Rule or Means of knowing how to adjust your Punishments, that being *ordinarily sufficient* to prevail upon one, the double whereof is not *ordinarily sufficient* to prevail on another.

I tell

I tell you in the ſame Place, " That you have given us in another Place, ſome- L. 2. p. 279.
" thing like another Boundary to your *moderate Penalties*: But when examined, it
" proves juſt like the reſt, amuſing us only with good Words, ſo put together as to
" have no direct Meaning; an Art very much in Uſe amongſt ſome Sort of learned
" Men: The Words are theſe; *Such Penalties as may not tempt Perſons who have any Con-*
" *cern for their eternal Salvation (and thoſe who have none, ought not to be conſidered) to re-*
" *nounce a Religion which they believe to be true, or profeſs one which they do not believe to be ſo.*
" If by *any Concern*, you mean *ſuch as Men ought to have for their eternal Salvation*: By
" this Rule you may make your Puniſhments as great as you pleaſe; and all the Se-
" verities you have diſclaimed may be brought in Play again: For none of thoſe
" will be able to make a Man, who is truly *concerned for his eternal Salvation, renounce*
" *a Religion he believes to be true, or profeſs one he does not believe to be ſo.* If by thoſe
" who have *any Concern*, you mean ſuch, who have ſome faint Wiſhes for Happi-
" neſs hereafter, and would be glad to have Things go well with them in the other
" World, but will venture nothing in this World for it; theſe the moderateſt Pu-
" niſhments you can imagine will make to change their Religion. If by *any Concern*,
" you mean whatever may be between theſe two; the Degrees are ſo infinite, that
" to proportion your Puniſhments by that, is to have no Meaſure of them at all.
To which all the Reply I can find is only this, That *there are Degrees of Careleſneſs* Pag. 50.
in Men of their Salvation, as well as of Concern for it. So that ſuch as have ſome Concern for their Salvation, may yet be careleſs of it to a great Degree. And therefore if thoſe who have any Concern for their Salvation, deſerve Regard and Pity; then ſo may ſome careleſs Perſons: Though thoſe who have no Concern for their Salvation, deſerve not to be conſidered, which ſpoils a little Harangue you give us, P. 43. If you think this to be an Anſwer to what I ſaid, or that it can ſatisfy any one concerning the Way of knowing what Degrees of Puniſhment are to be uſed, pray tell us ſo. The Enquiry is, what Degrees of Puniſhment will *tempt* a Man, *who has any Concern for his eternal Salvation, to renounce a Religion he believes to be true?* And 'tis anſwered, *There are Degrees of Careleſneſs in Men of their Salvation, as well as Concern for it.* A happy Diſcovery! What's the Uſe of it? *So that ſuch as have ſome Concern for their Salvation, may yet be careleſs of it to a great Degree.* Very true: By this we may know what Degree of Force is to be uſed. No, not a Word of that, but the Inference is, *And therefore if thoſe who have any Concern for their Salvation, deſerve Regard and Pity, then ſo may ſome careleſs Perſons; though thoſe who have no Concern for their Salvation, deſerve not to be conſidered.* And by this time we know what Degree of Force will make a Man, *who has any Concern for his Salvation, renounce a Religion he believes true, and profeſs one he does not believe to be ſo.* This might do well at croſs Queſtions: but you are ſatisfied with what you have done, and what that is, you tell me in the next Words, *which ſpoils a little Harangue of yours given us*, Pag. 43. The Harangue I ſuppoſe is contained in theſe Words.

" One Thing I cannot but take notice of in this Paſſage before I leave it: and that L. 2. p. 279.
" is, that you ſay here, *Thoſe who have no Concern for their Salvation, deſerve not to be*
" *conſidered.* In other Parts of your Letter you pretend to have Compaſſion on the
" Careleſs, and provide Remedies for them: But here of a ſudden your Charity
" fails you, and you give them up to eternal Perdition, without the leaſt Regard, the
" leaſt Pity, and ſay, *They deſerve not to be conſidered.* Our Saviour's Rule was, the
" Sick and not the Whole need a Phyſician: Your Rule here is; *Thoſe that are care-*
" *leſs, are not to be conſidered, but are to be left to themſelves.* This would ſeem ſtrange,
" if one did not obſerve what drew you to it. You perceiv'd that if the Magiſtrate
" was to uſe no Puniſhments, but ſuch as would make no body change their Religion,
" he was to uſe none at all: For the Careleſs would be brought to the National
" Church with any ſlight Puniſhments; and when they are once there, you are it
" ſeems ſatisfied, and look no farther after them. So that by your own Meaſures,
" if the *Careleſs*, and thoſe *who have no Concern for their eternal Salvation*, are to be re-
" garded and taken Care of, if the Salvation of their Souls is to be promoted, there
" is to be no Puniſhments to be uſed at all: And therefore you leave them out as not
" to be *conſidered.*

What you have ſaid is ſo far from ſpoiling that Harangue, as you are pleaſed to call it, that you having nothing elſe to ſay to it, allows what is laid to your Charge in it.

Pag. 50. You wind up all concerning the Measures of your Force in these Words; *And as those Medicine are thought safe and advisable, which do ordinarily cure, though not always (as none do;) so those Penalties or Punishments, which are ordinarily found sufficient (as well as necessary) for the Ends for which they are designed, may fitly and reasonably be used for the compassing these Ends.* Here your *ordinarily* comes to your Help again; and here one would think that you meant such as cure sometimes, *not always*; some though not all: And in this Sense will not the utmost *Severities* come within your Rule? For can you say, if Punishmets are to be used to prevail on any, that the greater will (where lower fail) prevail on none? At least can you be sure of it till they have been tried for the *compassing these Ends?* Which as we shall see in another Place, you have assigned various enough. I shall only notice of two or three often repeated by you, and those are to make Men *hear*, to make Men *consider*, to make Men *consider as they ought*, i. e. as you explain it, to make Men *consider* so, as not to *reject*. The Greatness of the Force then, according to this Measure, must be *sufficient* to make Men *hear*, *sufficient* to make Men *consider*, and *sufficient* to make Men *embrace the* true Religion.

And now the Magistrate has all your Rules about the Measures of Punishments to be used, and may confidently and safely go to work to establish it by Law: for he having these Marks to guide him, that they must be great enough ordinarily to *prevail with those who are not Idiots or Madmen, nor desperately perverse and obstinate*, great enough *ordinarily* to prevail with Men to *hear*, *consider*, and *embrace the true Religion*, and yet not so great as *might tempt Persons, who have any Concern for their eternal Salvation, to renounce a Religion which they believe to be true, or profess one which they do not believe to be so:* Do you not think you have sufficiently instructed him in your Meaning, and enabled him to find the just Temper of his Punishments according to your Scheme, neither too much, nor too little? But however you may be satisfied with them, I suppose others, when it comes to be put in Practice, will by these Measures (which are all I can find in your Scheme) be scarce able to find, what are the Punishments you would have used.

In *Eutopia* there is a Medicine call'd *Hiera Picra*, which 'tis supposed would cure a troublesome Disease of that Country: but it is not to be given, but in the Dose prescribed by the Law, and in adjusting the Dose lies all the Skill: For if you give too much, it heightens the Distemper, and spreads the mortal Contagion; and if too little, it does no good at all. With this Difficulty the Law-makers have been perplexed these many Ages, and could not light on the right Dose, that would work the Cure, till lately there came an Undertaker, who would shew them how they could not mistake. He bid them then prescribe so much, as would *ordinarily be effectual* upon all that were not *Idiots* or *Madmen*, or in whom the Humour was not *desperately perverse and obstinate*, to produce *the End* for which it was designed; but not so much as would make a Man in Health, who had *any Concern for his Life*, fall into a mortal Disease. These were good Words, and he was rewarded for them: but when by them they came to fix the Dose, they could not tell whether it ought to be a Grain, a Dram, or an Ounce, or a whole Pound, any more than before; and so the Dose of their *Hiera Picra*, notwithstanding this Gentleman's Pains, is as uncertain, and that soveraign Remedy as useless as ever it was.

Pag. 50. In the next Paragraph you tell us, You *do not see what more can be required to justify the Rule here given.* So quick a Sight needs no Spectacles. *For if I demand that it should express what Penalties particularly are such as it says may fitly and reasonably be used; this I must give* you *leave to tell* me *is a very unreasonable Demand.* It is an unreasonable Demand, if your Rule be such, that by it I may know without any more ado, the particular Penalties that are fit; otherwise it is not *unreasable to demand* them by Name, if your Marks be not sufficient to know them by. But let us hear your Reason, *For what Rule is there that expresses the Particulars that agree with it?* And it is an admirable Rule with which one can find no Particulars that agree; for I challenge you to instance one: *A Rule*, you say, *is intended for a common Measure by which Particulars are to be examined, and therefore must necessarily be general.* So general, loose, and inconsistent, that no Particulars can be examined by it: For again I challenge you, or any Man living, to measure out any Punishment by this your *common Measure*, and establish it by a Law. You go on; *And those to whom it is given, are supposed to be able to apply it, and to judge of Particulars by it. Nay it is often seen that they are better able to do this than those that give it: And so it is in the present Case, the Rule hereby laid down is that by which* you *suppose Governors and Law-givers ought to*

examine

examine the Penalties they uſe for the promoting the true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls. Such a Rule it ought to be I grant, and ſuch an one is deſired: but that yours is ſuch a Rule as Magiſtrates can take any Meaſure by, for the Puniſhments they are to ſettle by Law, is denied, and you are again deſired to ſhew. You proceed; *But certainly no* Pag. 50. *Man doubts but their Prudence and Experience enables them to uſe and apply it better than other Men, and to judge more exactly what Penalties do agree with it, and what do not*; *and therefore* you *think* I *muſt excuſe* you *if* you *do not take upon* you *to teach them what it becomes* you *rather to learn from them.* If we are not to *doubt but their Prudence and Experience enables Magiſtrates to judge beſt what Penalties are fit*, you have indeed given us at laſt a way to know the Meaſure of Puniſhments to be uſed: but it is ſuch an one as puts an End to your Diſtinction of *Moderate Penalties*: For no Magiſtrates that I know, when they once began to uſe Force to bring Men to their Religion, ever ſtopp'd till they came to ſome of thoſe Severities you condemn; and if you pretend to teach them Moderation for the future, with Hopes to ſucceed, you ought to have ſhewed them the juſt Bounds, beyond which they ought not to go, in a Model ſo wholly new, and beſides all Experience. But if it be to be determined by their *Prudence and Experience*, whatever Degrees of Force they ſhall uſe, will always be the right.

Law-makers and *Governors* however beholden to you for your good Opinion of their *Prudence* and *Experience*; yet have no reaſon to thank you for your Complement, by giving ſuch an Exerciſe to their *Prudence* and *Experience*, as to put it upon them to find out the juſt Meaſures of Puniſhments by Rules you give them, which are ſuch, that neither your ſelf, nor any body elſe can find out any Meaſures by. The other Part of your Complement will be ſuſpected not to be ſo much out of your abundant Reſpect to *Law-makers and Governors*, as out of the great Regard you have to your ſelf; for you in vain pretend you forbear to name any particular Puniſhments, becauſe you will *not take upon you to teach Governors and Law-makers*, when you your ſelf own in the ſame Breath, that you are laying down *Rules by which* they are to proceed in the Uſe of Penalties for promoting Religion, which is little different from *teaching*: and your whole Book is nothing elſe but about the Magiſtrate's Power and Duty. I *excuſe* you therefore for your own ſake from naming any particular Puniſhments by your Rules: for you have a Right to it, as all Men have a Right to be excuſed from do-what is impoſſible to be done.

Since therefore you grant that thoſe Severities you have named, *are more apt to hinder than promote true Religion*; and you cannot aſſign any Meaſures of Puniſhment (ſhort of thoſe great ones you have *condemned)* which are fit to promote it, I think it Argument enough to prove againſt you, that no Puniſhments are fit, till you have ſhewed ſome others, either by Name, or ſuch Marks as they may certainly be known by, which are fit to promote the true Religion: and therefore nothing you have ſaid there, or any where elſe, will ſerve to ſhew that *'tis with little Reaſon*, as you tell me, Pag. 19. *that* I *ſay*, "*that if* your *indirect and at a diſtance Serviceableneſs* may authorize the "Magiſtrate to uſe Fore in Religion, all the Cruelties uſed by the Heathens againſt "Chriſtians, by Papiſts againſt Proteſtants, and all the perſecuting of Chriſtians one "amongſt another, are all juſtifiable. To which you add, *Not to take notice at preſent how oddly it ſounds, that that which authorizes the Magiſtrates to uſe Moderate Penalties to promote the true Religion, ſhould juſtify all the Cruelties that ever were uſed to promote Heatheniſm or Popery.*

As oddly as it ſounds to you, it will be evidently true, as long as that which *authorizes* one, *authorizes* all Magiſtrates of any Religion, which they believe to be true, to uſe Force to promote it; and as long as you cannot aſſign any Bounds to your *Moderate* Puniſhments, ſhort of thoſe great ones; which you therefore are not able to do, becauſe your Principles, whatever your Words deny, will carry you to thoſe Degrees of Severity, which in Profeſſion you *condemn*: and this, whatever you do, I dare ſay every conſidering Reader beſides you will plainly ſee. So that this Imputation is not ſo unreaſonable, ſince it is evident, that you muſt either renounce all Puniſhment whatſoever in Religion, or make uſe of thoſe you *condemn*: for in the next Page you tell us, Pag. 20. That *all who have ſufficient Means of Inſtruction provided for them, may juſtly be puniſhed for not being of the National Religion, where the true is the National Religion; becauſe it is a Fault in all ſuch not to be of the National Religion.* In *England* then, for Example, not to be of the National Religion is a *Fault*, and a *Fault to be puniſhed* by the Magiſtrate. The Magiſtrate, to cure this Fault, lays, on thoſe who diſſent, a

lower Degree of Penalties, a Fine of 1 *d. per* Month. This proving insufficient, what is the Magistrate to do? If he be *obliged*, as you say, to amend this Fault by Penalties, and that low one of 1 *d. per* Month be not sufficient to procure its Amendment, is he not to increase the Penalty? He therefore doubles the Fine to 2 *d. per* Month. This too proves ineffectual, and therefore 'tis still for the same Reason doubled, till it come to 1 *s.* 5 *s.* 10 *l.* 100 *l.* 1000 *l.* None of these Penalties working, but yet by being constantly levied, leaving the Delinquents no longer able to pay, Imprisonment and other corporal Punishments follow to enforce an Obedience, till at last this gradual Increase of Penalties and Force, each Degree whereof wrought on some few, rises to the highest Severities against those who stand out. For the Magistrate, who is *obliged* to correct this *Vice*, as you call it, and *to do what in him lies* to cure this *Fault*, which opposes their Salvation; and who (if I mistake not, you tell us) is
Pag. 8. *answerable for all that may follow from his neglect*, had no reason to raise the Fine from 1 *d.* to 2 *d.* but because the first was ineffectual: And if that were a sufficient Reason for raising from the first to the second Degree, why is it not a sufficient to proceed from the second to the third, and so gradually on? I would fain have any one shew me, where, and upon what ground, such a gradual Increase of Force can stop, till it come to the utmost Extremities. If therefore Dissenting from the Church of *England*, be a Fault to be punished by the Magistrate, I desire you to tell me, where he shall hold his Hand; to name the Sort or Degree of Punishment, beyond which he ought not to go in the Use of Force, to cure them of that Fault, and bring them to Conformity. Till you have done that, you might have spared that
Pag. 19. Paragraph, where you say, *With what Ingenuity I draw* you *in to condemn Force in general, only because* you *acknowledge the ill Effects of Prosecuting Men with Fire and Sword*, &c. you *may leave every Man to judge*. And I leave whom you will to judge, whether from your own Principles it does not unavoidably follow, that if you condemn any Penalties, you must condemn all, as I have shewn; if you will retain any, you must retain all; you must either take or leave all together. For, as I have said, and
Pag. 10. you deny not, "Where there is no Fault, there no punishment is Moderate; so I add, Where there is a Fault to be corrected by the Magistrate's Force, there no Degrre of Force, which is ineffectual, and not sufficient to amend it, can be immoderate; especially if it be a Fault of great Moment in its Consequences, as certainly that must be, which draws after it the Loss of Mens Eternal Happiness.

You will, 'tis likely, be ready to say here again, (for a good Subterfuge is never to be forsaken) that you except the *desperately perverse and obstinate*. I desire to know for what Reason you except them? Is it because they cease to be Faulty? Next I ask you, Who are in your Sense the *desparately perverse and obstinate?* Those that 1 *s.* or 5 *s.* or 5 *l.* or 100 *l.* or no Fine will work upon? Those who can bear loss of Estate, but not loss of Liberty? or loss of Liberty and Estate, but not corporal Pains and Torments? or all this, but not loss of Life? For to these Degrees do Men differently stand out. And since there are Men wrought on by the Approaches of Fire and Faggot, which other Degrees of Severity could not prevail with, where will you bound your *desperately perverse and obstinate?* The King of *France*, though you will allow him not to have Truth of his side, yet when he came to Dragooning, found few so *desperately perverse and obstinate*, as not to be wrought on. And why should Truth, in which your Opinion wants Force, and nothing but Force, to help it, not have the Assistance of those Degrees of Force, (when less will not do to make it prevail) which are able to bring Men over to false Religions, which have no *Light* and *Strength* of their own to help them? You will do well therefore to consider whether your Name of *Severities*, in Opposition to the *Moderate Punishments* you speak of, has or can do you any Service; whether the Distinction between *compelling* and *coactive*
Pag. 41. *Power* be of any use or difference at all. For you deny the Magistrate to have Power
Pag. 27. to *compel*: And you contend for his Use of his *coactive Power*; which will then be a good Distinction, when you can find a Way to use *coactive*, or, which is the same, *compelling* Power without Compulsion. I desire you also to consider, if in Matters of Religion, Punishments are to be employed, because they may be useful, whether you can stop at any Degree that is ineffectual to the End which you propose, let that End be what it will. If it be barely to gain a *Hearing*, as in some Places you seem to say, I think for that small Punishments will generally prevail, and you do well to put that and *Moderate Penalties* together. If it be to make Men consider, as in other Places you speak, you cannot tell when you have obtained that End. But if

your

your End be, which you ſeem moſt to inſiſt on, to *make Men conſider as they ought*, i. e. *till they embrace*, there are many on whom all your *Moderate Penalties*, all under thoſe *Severities you condemn*, are too weak to prevail. So that you muſt either confeſs, *not conſidering ſo as to embrace the true Religion*, i. e. *not conſidering as one ought*, is no Fault to be puniſhed by the *coactive Force of the Magiſtrate*; or elſe you muſt reſume thoſe Severities which you have renounced: Chuſe you whether of the two you pleaſe.

Therefore 'twas not ſo much at random that I ſaid, That thither at laſt Peſecution muſt come. Indeed from what you had ſaid of *falling under the Stroke of the Sword*, which was nothing to the Purpoſe, I added, "That if by that you meant "any thing to the Buſineſs in Hand, you ſeem to have a Reſerve for greater Puniſhments, when leſs are not ſufficient to bring Men to be convinced. Which hath produced this warm Reply of yours; *And will you ever pretend to Conſcience or Modeſty after this? For I beſeech you, Sir, what Words could I have uſed more expreſs or effectual to ſignify, that in my Opinion no Diſſenters from the true Religion ought to be puniſhed with the Sword, but ſuch as chooſe rather to rebel againſt the Magiſtrate, than to ſubmit to leſſer Penalties? (For how any ſhould refuſe to ſubmit to thoſe Penalties, but by rebelling againſt the Magiſtrate, I ſuppoſe you will not undertake to tell me.) 'Twas for this very Purpoſe that I uſed thoſe Words to prevent Cavils, (as I was then ſo ſimple as to think I might:) And I dare appeal to any Man of common Senſe and common Honeſty, whether they are capable of any other Meaning. And yet the very thing which I ſo plainly diſclaim in them, you pretend (without ſo much as offering to ſhew how) to collect from them.* "Thither, *you* ſay, at laſt, (*viz.* to the taking away "Mens Lives for the ſaving of their Souls) Peſecution muſt come: As *you* fear, "notwithſtanding *my* talk of Moderate Puniſhments, *I my ſelf* intimate in thoſe "Words: And if I mean any thing in them to the Buſineſs in hand, I ſeem to have "a Reſerve for greater Puniſhments, when leſſer are not ſufficient to bring Men to be "convinced. *Sir, I ſhould expect fairer Dealing from one of your* Pagans *or* Mahometans. *But I ſhall only add, that I would never wiſh that any Man who has undertaken a bad Cauſe, ſhould more plainly confeſs it than by ſerving it, as here (and not here only) you ſerve yours.* Good Sir, be not ſo angry, leſt to obſerving Men you increaſe the Suſpicion. One may, without Forfeiture of *Modeſty* or *Conſcience*, fear what Mens Principles threaten, though their Words diſclaim it. Noncomformity to the National, when it is the true Religion, as in *England*, is a *Fault*, a *Vice*, ſay you, to be corrected by the *coactive Power of the Magiſtrate*. If ſo, and *Force* be the proper Remedy, he muſt increaſe it, till it be ſtrong enough to work the Cure; and muſt not neglect his *Duty* (for ſo you make it) when he has Force enough in his Hand to make this Remedy more powerful. For where-ever Force is proper to work on Men, and bring them to a Compliance, its not producing that Effect can only be imputed to its being too little: And if ſo, whither at laſt muſt it come, but to the late Methods of procuring Conformity (and as his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty called it, of ſaving of Souls) in *France*, or Severities like them, when more Moderate ones cannot produce it? For to continue inefficacious Penalties, inſufficient upon Trial to maſter the Fault they are applied to, is unjuſtifiable Cruelty; and that which no body can have a Right to uſe, it ſerving only to diſeaſe and harm People, without amending them: For you tell us, they ſhould be *ſuch Penalties as* ſhould *make them uneaſy*.

I. 2. p. 264.

A. p. 13.

Pag. 11.

Pag. 44.

He that ſhould vex and pain a Sore you had, with frequent dreſſing it with ſome *moderate*, painful, but ineffieacious Plaiſter, that promoted not the Cure, would juſtly be thought, not only an ignorant, but a diſhoneſt Surgeon. If you are in the Surgeon's Hands, and his Help is requiſite, and the Cure that way to be wrought, Corroſives and Fire are the moſt merciful, as well as only juſtifiable Way of Cure, when the Caſe needs them. And therefore I hope I may ſtill *pretend to Modeſty and Conſcience*, though I ſhould have thought you ſo rational a Man, as to be led by your own Principles; and ſo honeſt, charitable, and zealous for the Salvation of Mens Souls, as not to vex and diſeaſe them with inefficacious Remedies to no purpoſe, and let them miſs of Salvation, for want of more vigorous Proſecutions. For if Conformity to the Church of *England* be neceſſary to Salvation, (for elſe what Neceſſity can you pretend of puniſhing Men at all to bring them to it?) it is Cruelty to their Souls (if you have Authority for any ſuch Means) to uſe ſome, and not to uſe ſufficient Force to bring them to conform. And I dare ſay you are ſatisfied,

that

that the *French* Diſcipline of Dragooning would have made many in *England* Conformiſts, whom your *lower Penalties* will not prevail on to be ſo.

But to inform you that my Apprehenſions were not ſo wholly out of the Way, I beſeech you to read here, what you have writ in theſe Words, *For how confidently ſoever you tell me here, that it is more than I can ſay for my* Political Puniſhments, *that they* were ever uſeful for the promoting true Religion; *I appeal to all obſerving Perſons, whether where-ever true Religion or ſound Chriſtianity has been Nationally received* and eſtabliſhed *by moderate Penal Laws, it has not always loſt Ground by the Relaxation of thoſe Laws: Whether Sects or Hereſies, (even the wildeſt and moſt abſurd) and even* Epicuriſm *and* Atheiſm, *have not continually thereupon ſpread themſelves; and whether the very Spirit and Life of Chriſtianity has not ſenſibly decayed, as well as the Number of ſound Profeſſors of it been daily leſſen'd upon it: Not to ſpeak of what at this time our Eyes cannot but ſee, for fear of giving Offence; though I hope it will be none to any that have a juſt Concern for Truth and Piety, to take notice of the Books and Pamphlets which now fly ſo thick about this Kingdom, manifeſtly tending to the multiplying of Sects and Diviſions, and even to the promoting of* Scepticiſm *in Religion among us.* Here you bemoan the decaying State of Religion amongſt us at preſent, by reaſon of taking off the Penalties from Proteſtant Diſſenters: And I beſeech you what Penalties were they? Such whereby many have been ruined in their Fortunes; ſuch whereby many have loſt their Liberties, and ſome their Lives in Priſons; ſuch as have ſent ſome into Baniſhment, ſtripp'd of all they had. Theſe were the *Penal Laws* by which the National Religion was Eſtabliſh'd in *England*; and theſe you call *Moderate*: For you ſay, *Where-ever true Religion or ſound Chriſtianity has been Nationally received and eſtabliſhed by Moderate Penal Laws*; and I hope you do not here exclude *England* from having its Religion ſo *Eſtabliſhed by Law*, which we ſo often here of; or if to ſerve the preſent Occaſion, you ſhould, would you alſo deny, that in the following Words you ſpeak of the preſent Relaxation in *England*? where after your *Appeal* to all obſerving People for the diſmal Conſequences, which you ſuppoſe to have every where followed from ſuch Relaxations, you add theſe pathetical Words, *Not to ſpeak of what at this time our Eyes cannot but ſee, for fear of giving Offence*: So heavy does the preſent Relaxation ſit on your Mind; which ſince it is of *Penal Laws* you call *Moderate*, I ſhall ſhew you what they are.

Pag. 34.

In the firſt Year of Q. *Elizabeth*, there was a Penalty of 1 *s.* a Sunday and Holiday laid upon every one, who came not to the Common-Prayer then Eſtabliſhed. This Penalty of 1 *s.* a time not prevailing, as was deſired, in the Twenty third Year of her Reign was increaſed to 20 *l.* a Month, and Impriſonment for Non-payment within three Months after Judgment given. In the Twenty ninth Year of *Eliz.* to draw this yet cloſer, and make it more forcible, 'twas enacted, That whoever upon one Conviction did not continue to pay on the 20 *l. per* Month, without any other Conviction or Proceedings againſt him till he ſubmitted and conformed, ſhould forfeit all his Goods, and two Thirds of his Land for his Life. But this being not yet thought ſufficient, it was in the Thirty fifth Year of that Queen compleated, and the *Moderate Penal Laws*, upon which our *National Religion* was *Eſtabliſhed*, and whoſe *Relaxation* you cannot bear, but from thence date the *Decay of the very Spirit and Life of Chriſtianity*, were brought to Perfection. For then going to Conventicles, or a Month's Abſence from Church, was to be puniſhed with Impriſonment, till the Offender conformed; and if he conformed not within three Months, then he was to abjure the Realm, and forfeit all his Goods and Chattels for ever, and his Lands and Tenements during his Life: And if he would not abjure, or abjuring, did not depart the Realm within a Time prefix'd, or returned again, he was to ſuffer Death as a Felon. And thus your *Moderate Penal Laws* ſtood for the *Eſtabliſhed Religion*, till their Penalties were, in reſpect of Proteſtant Diſſenters, lately taken off. And now let the Reader judge whether your Pretence to Moderate Puniſhments, or my Suſpicion of what a Man of your Principles might have in ſtore for Diſſenters, have more of *Modeſty* or *Conſcience* in it; ſince you openly declare you regret for the taking away ſuch an Eſtabliſhment, as by the gradual Increaſe of Penalties reached Mens Eſtates, Liberties and Lives; and which you muſt be preſumed to allow and approve of, till you tell us plainly, where, according to your Meaſures, thoſe Penalties ſhould; or, according to your Principles, they could have ſtopp'd.

You tell us, That where this only true Religion, *viz.* of the Church of *England*, is received, other Religions ought *to be diſcouraged in ſome meaſure.* A pretty Expreſſion

preſſion for Undoing, Impriſonment, Baniſhment, for thoſe have been ſome of the *Diſcouragements* given to Diſſenters here in *England*. You will again, no doubt, cry aloud, that you tell me you *condemn* theſe as much as I do. If you heartily condemn them, I wonder you ſhould ſay ſo little to diſcourage them; I wonder you are ſo ſilent in repreſenting to the Magiſtrate the Unlawfulneſs and Danger of uſing them, in a Diſcourſe where you are treating of the Magiſtrate's Power and Duty in Matters of Religion; eſpecially this being the Side on which, as far as we may gueſs by Experience, their Prudence is apteſt to err: But your Modeſty, you know, leaves all to the Magiſtrate's *Prudence and Experience* on that Side, tho' you over and over again encourage them not to neglect their Duty in the Uſe of Force, to which you ſet no Bounds.

You tell us, *Certainly no Man doubts but the Prudence and Experience of Governors and* Pag. 50. *Law-givers enables them to uſe and apply it, viz.* your Rule for the Meaſure of Puniſhments, which I have ſhewed to be no Rule at all; *And to judge more exactly what Penalties do agree with it; and therefore* you *muſt be excuſed if* you *do not take upon* you *to teach them what it becomes* you *rather to learn from them.* If your Modeſty be ſuch, and you then did what became you, you could not but learn from your Governors and Law-givers; and ſo be ſatisfied till within this Year or two, that thoſe Penalties which they meaſured out for the Eſtabliſhment of true Religion, though they reach'd to Mens Eſtates, Liberties and Lives, were ſuch as were fit. But what you have learned of your Law-makers and Governors ſince the Relaxation, or what Opinion you have of their Experience and Prudence now, is not ſo eaſy to ſay.

Perhaps you will ſay again, that you have in expreſs Words declared againſt *Fire and Sword, loſs of Eſtate, maiming with corporal Puniſhments, ſtarving and tormenting in noiſome Priſons*; and one cannot either in *Modeſty* or *Conſcience* disbelieve you: Yet in the ſame Letter you with Sorrow and Regret ſpeak of the Relaxation of ſuch Penalties laid on Nonconformity, by which Men have loſt their Eſtates, Liberties, and Lives too, in noiſome Priſons, and in this too muſt we not believe you? I dare ſay, there are very few who read that Paſſage of yours, ſo feelingly it is penn'd, who want *Modeſty* or *Conſcience* to believe you therein to be in earneſt; and the ra- Pag. 34. ther, becauſe what drops from Men by Chance, when they are not upon their Guard, is always thought the beſt Interpretation of their Thoughts.

You name *Loſs of Eſtate, of Liberty, and of Tormenting*, which is *corporal Puniſhment*, as if you were againſt them: Certainly you know what you meant by theſe Words, when you ſaid, you *condemn'd* them; was it any Degree of *Loſs of Liberty or Eſtate*, any Degree of *corporal Puniſhment* that you condemn'd, or only the utmoſt, or ſome Degree between theſe? unleſs you had then ſome Meaning, and unleſs you pleaſe to tell us, what that Meaning was; where 'tis, that in your Opinion the Magiſtrate ought to ſtop, who can believe you are in earneſt? This I think you may and ought to do for our Information in your Syſtem, without any Apprehenſion that Governors and Law-makers will deem themſelves much taught by you, which your *Modeſty* makes you ſo cautious of. Whilſt you refuſe to do this, and keep your ſelf under the Mask of moderate, convenient, and ſufficient Force and Penalties, and other ſuch like uncertain and undetermin'd Puniſhments, I think a conſciencious and ſober Diſſenter might expect fairer dealing from one of my *Pagans* or *Mahometans*, as you pleaſe to call them, than from one, who ſo profeſſes Moderation, that what Degrees of Force, what kind of Puniſhments will ſatisfy him, he either knows not, or will not declare. For your *moderate* and *convenient* may, when you come to interpret them, ſignify what Puniſhments you pleaſe: For the Cure being to be wrought by Force, that will be *convenient*, which the Subbornneſs of the Evil requires; and that *moderate*, which is but enough to work the Cure. And therefore I ſhall return your own Complement, *That I would never wiſh that any Man who has undertaken a bad Cauſe, ſhould more plainly confeſs it than by ſerving it, as here (and not here only) you ſerve yours.* I ſhould beg your Pardon for this Sort of Language, were it not your own. And what Right you have to it, the Skill you ſhew in the Managemet of general and doubtful Words and Expreſſions, of uncertain and undetermined Signification, will, I doubt not, abundantly convince the Reader. An Inſtance we have in the Argument before us: For I appeal to any ſober Man, who Pag. 49. ſhall carefully read what you write, where you pretend to *tell the World plainly and directly what Puniſhments* are to be uſed by your Scheme, whether after having weighed

weighed all you ſay concerning that Matter, he can tell, what a Nonconformiſt is to expect from you, or find any Thing but ſuch Acuteneſs and Strength as lies in the Uncertainty and Reſerve of your Way of talking; which whether it be any way ſuted to your *Modeſty* and *Conſcience*, where you have undertaken to tell us *what the Puniſhments are*, whereby you would have Men brought to embrace the true Religion, I leave you to conſider.

Pag. 34. If having ſaid, *Where-ever true Religion or ſound Chriſtianity has been Nationally received and eſtabliſhed by moderate Penal Laws*; you ſhall for your Defence of the Eſtabliſhment of the Religion in *England* by Law, ſay, which is all is left you to ſay, that though ſuch ſevere Laws were made, yet it was only by the Execution of moderate Penal Laws, that it was eſtabliſhed and ſupported: But that thoſe ſevere Laws that touch'd Mens Eſtates, Liberties and Lives, were never put in Execution. Why then do you ſo ſeriouſly bemoan the Loſs of them? But I adviſe you to make uſe of that Plea, for there are Examples in the Memory of Hundreds now living, of every one of thoſe Laws of Queen *Elizabeth* being put in Execution; and pray remember, if by denying it you require this Truth to be made good, 'tis you that force the publiſhing of a Catalogue of Men that have loſt there Eſtates, Liberties and Lives in Priſon, which it would be more for the Advantage of the *Religion eſtabliſhed by Law*, ſhould be forgotten.

But to conclude this great Accuſation of yours: If you were not conſcious to your ſelf of ſome Tendency that Way, why ſuch an Outcry? Why was *Modeſty* and *Conſcience* call'd in Queſtion? Why was it leſs fair *Dealing than you could have expected from a* Pagan *or* Mahometan, for me to ſay, *if in thoſe Words* " you meant any thing " to the Buſineſs in Hand, you ſeemed to have a Reſerve for greater Puniſhments? Your Buſineſs there being to prove, that there was a Power veſted in the Magiſtrate to uſe Force in Matters of Religion, what could be more beſides the *Buſineſs in hand*, than to tell us, as you interpret your Meaning here, that the Magiſtrate had a Power to uſe Force againſt thoſe who rebell'd (for whoever denied that) whether Diſſenters or not Diſſenters? Where was it queſtion'd by the Author or me, that *whoever rebell'd, were to fall under the Stroak of the Magiſtrate's Sword?* And therefore without Breach of *Modeſty* or *Conſcience*, I might ſay, what I again here repeat, " That if in thoſe Words you meant any Thing to the Buſineſs in hand, you ſeem- " ed to have a Reſerve for greater Puniſhments.

One Thing more give me leave to add in Defence of my *Modeſty and Conſcience*, or rather to juſtify my ſelf from having gueſſed ſo wholly beſide the Matter, If I ſhould have ſaid, (which I did not) *that I feared you had a Reſerve for greater Puniſhments*. For

L. 2. p. 269. I having brought the Inſtances of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, to ſhew that the Apoſtles wanted not Power to puniſh, if they found it neceſſary to uſe it; you infer, that

Pag. 38. therefore *Puniſhments may be ſometimes neceſſary*. What Puniſhments I beſeech you, for theirs coſt them their Lives? He that, as you do, concludes from thence, that therefore *Puniſhments may be ſometimes neceſſary*, will hardly avoid (whatever he ſays) to conclude capital *Puniſhments neceſſary*: And when they are *neceſſary*, it is you know the Magiſtrate's *Duty* to uſe them. You ſee how natural it is for Men to go whither their Principles lead them, tho' at firſt Sight perhaps they thought it too far.

If to avoid this, you now ſay you meant it of the Puniſhment of the inceſtuous *Corinthian*, whom I alſo mentioned in the ſame Place; I think, ſuppoſing your ſelf to lie under the Imputation of a Reſerve of greater Puniſhments; you ought in Prudence to have ſaid ſo there. Next you know not what Puniſhment it was the inceſtuous *Corinthian* underwent, but it being *for the Deſtruction of the Fleſh*, it ſeems to be no very light one: And if you will take your Friend St. *Auſtin*'s Word for it, as he in the very Epiſtle you quote tells you, it was a very ſevere one, making as much Difference between it, and the Severities Men uſually ſuffer in Priſon, as there is between the Cruelty of the Devil and that of the moſt barbarous Jailor: So that if your *moderate Puniſhments* will reach to that laid on the inceſtuous *Corinthian* for the Deſtruction of the Fleſh, we may preſume them to be, what other People call *Severities*.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

How long your Puniſhments are to continue.

THE Meaſure of Puniſhments being to be eſtimated as well by the Length of their Duration, as the Intenſeneſs of their Degrees, 'tis fit we take a View alſo of your Scheme in this Part.

" I told you that *moderate Puniſhments* that are continued, that Men find no End " of, know no Way out of, ſit heavy, and become immoderately uneaſy. Diſſenters " you would have puniſhed, to make them *conſider*. Your Penalties have had the Ef- " fect on them you intended; they have made them *conſider*; and they have done their " utmoſt in conſidering. What now muſt be done with them? They muſt be pu- " niſhed on, for they are ſtill Diſſenters. If it were juſt, and you had Reaſon at " firſt to puniſh a Diſſenter, to make him *conſider*, when you did not know but that " he had conſidered already; it is as juſt, and you have as much Reaſon to puniſh " him on, even when he has performed what your Puniſhment was deſigned for, and " has conſidered, but yet remains a Diſſenter. For I may juſtly ſuppoſe, and you " muſt grant, that a Man may remain a Diſſenter after all the Conſideration your " moderate Penalties can bring him to; when we ſee great Puniſhments, even thoſe " Severities you diſown as too great, are not able to make Men *conſider* ſo far as to " be convinced, and brought over to the National Church. If your Puniſhments may " not be inflicted on Men, to make them *conſider*, who have or may have conſidered " already, for ought you know; then Diſſenters are never to be once puniſhed, no " more than any other Sort of Men. If Diſſenters are to be puniſhed, to make them " *conſider*, whether they have conſidered or no; then their Puniſhments, tho' they " do *conſider*, muſt never ceaſe as long as they are Diſſenters, which whether it be " to puniſh them only to bring them to *conſider*, let all Men judge. This I am ſure; " Puniſhments in your Method, muſt either never begin upon Diſſenters, or never " ceaſe. And ſo pretend Moderation if you pleaſe, the Puniſhments which your " Method requires, muſt be either very immoderate, or none at all. But to this you ſay nothing, only for the adjuſting of the Length of your Puniſhments, and therein vindicating the Conſiſtency and Practicableneſs of your Scheme, you tell us, *That as long as Men reject the true Religion duly propoſed to them, ſo long they offend and deſerve Puniſhment, and therefore it is but juſt that ſo long they ſhould be left liable to it.* You promiſed to anſwer to this Queſtion, amongſt others, *plainly and directly*. The Queſtion is, How long they are to be puniſhed? And your Anſwer is, *It is but juſt that ſo long they ſhould be liable to Puniſhment.* This extraordinary Caution in ſpeaking out, if it were not very natural to you, would be apt to make one ſuſpect, it was accommodated more to ſome Difficulties in your Scheme, than to your Promiſe of anſwering *plainly and directly*; or poſſibly you thought, it would not agree to that Character of Moderation you aſſume, to own, that all the Penal Laws which were lately here in Force, and whoſe Relaxion you bemoan, ſhould be conſtantly put in Execution. But your Moderation in this Point comes too late. For as your Charity, as you tell us in the next Paragraph, *requires that they be kept ſubject to Penalties*: So the watchful *Charity* of others in this Age hath found out Ways to encourage Informers, and put it out of the Magiſtrate's Moderation to ſtop the Execution of the Law againſt Diſſenters, if he ſhould be inclined to it.

L. 2. p. 179.

Pag. 51.

Pag. 46.

We will therefore take it for granted, that if Penal Laws be made concerning Religion, (for more Zeal uſually animates them than others) they will be put in Execution: And indeed I have heard it argued to be very abſurd, to make or continue Laws, that are not conſtantly put in Execution. And now to ſhew you how well your Anſwer conſiſts with other Parts of your Scheme, I ſhall need only to mind you, that if Men muſt be *puniſhed as long as they reject the true Religion*, thoſe who puniſh them, muſt be Judges what is the true Religion. But this Objection, with ſome other, to which this Part of your Anſwer is obnoxious, having been made to you more at large elſewhere, I ſhall here omit, and proceed to other Parts of your Anſwer.

Pag. 50. You begin with your Reaſon for the Anſwer you afterwards give us in the Words I laſt quoted: Your Reaſon runs thus; *For certainly nothing is more reaſonable than that Men ſhould be ſubject to Puniſhment as long as they continue to offend. As long as Men reject the true Religion tender'd them with ſufficient Evidence of the Truth of it, ſo long 'tis certain they offend.* It is certainly very *reaſonable*, that Men ſhould be *ſubject to Puniſhment* from thoſe they *offend as long as* they continue to offend: But it will not from hence follow, that thoſe who offend God, are always *ſubject to Puniſhment* from Men. For if they be, why does not the Magiſtrate puniſh Envy, Hatred and Malice, and all Uncharitableneſs? If you anſwer, becauſe they are not capable of judicial Proofs: I think I may ſay 'tis as eaſy to prove a Man guilty of Envy, Hatred or Uncharitableneſs, as it is to prove him guilty of *rejecting the true Religion tender'd him with ſufficient Evidence of the Truth of it.* But if it be his Duty to puniſh all *Offences* againſt God, why does the Magiſtrate never puniſh Lying, which is an Offence againſt God, and is an Offence capable of being judicially proved? It is plain therefore that it is not the Senſe of all Mankind, that it is the Magiſtrate's Duty to puniſh all Offences againſt God; and where it is not his Duty to uſe Force, you will grant the Magiſtrate is not to uſe it in Matters of Religion, becauſe where it is neceſſary, it is his Duty to uſe it; but where it is not neceſſary, you your ſelf ſay, it is not lawful. It would be convenient therefore for you to reform your Propoſition from that looſe Generality it now is in, and then prove it, before it can be allowed you to be to your Purpoſe; though it be never ſo true, that *you know not a greater Crime a Man can be guilty of, than rejecting the true Religion.*

Pag. 51. You go on with your Proof, that ſo long as Men reject the true Religion, &c. ſo long they offend, and conſequeutly may juſtly be puniſhed; *Becauſe*, ſay you, *it is impoſſible for any Man, innocently to reject the true Religion, ſo tender'd to him. For whoever rejects that Religion ſo tender'd, does either apprehend and perceive the Truth of it, or he does not. If he does, I know not what greater Crime any Man can be guilty of. If he does not perceive the Truth of it, there is no Account to be given of that, but either that he ſhuts his Eyes againſt the Evidence which is offer'd him, and will not at all conſider it; or that he does not conſider it as he ought*, viz. *with ſuch Care as is requiſite, and with a ſincere Deſire to learn the Truth; either of which does manifeſtly involve him in Guilt.*

To ſay here that a Man who has the true Religion propoſed to him with ſufficient Evidence of its Truth, may conſider it as he ought, or do his utmoſt in conſidering, *and yet not perceive the Truth of it; is neither more nor leſs, than to ſay, that ſufficient Evidence is not ſufficient Evidence. For what does any Man mean by ſufficient Evidence, but ſuch as will certainly win Aſſent where-ever it is duly conſidered?*

I ſhall not trouble my ſelf here to examine when *requiſite Care, duly conſidered*, and ſuch other Words, which bring one back to the ſame Place from whence one ſet out, are caſt up, whether all this fine Reaſoning will will amount to any thing, but begging what is in the Queſtion: But ſhall only tell you, that what you ſay here and in other Places about *ſufficient Evidence*, is built upon this, that the Evidence wherewith a Man propoſes the true Religion, he may know to be ſuch, as will not fail to gain the Aſſent of whoſoever does what lies in him in conſidering it. This is the Suppoſition, without which all your Talk of *ſufficient Evidence* will do you no Service, try it where you will. But it is a Suppoſition that is far enough from carrying with it ſufficient Evidence to make it be admitted without Proof.

Whatever *gains* any Man's *Aſſent*, one may be ſure had *ſufficient Evidence* in reſpect of that Man: But that is far enough from proving it *Evidence ſufficient* to prevail on another, let him conſider it as long and as much as he can. The Tempers of Mens Minds; the Principles ſettled there by Time and Education, beyond the Power of the Man himſelf to alter them; the different Capacities of Mens Underſtandings, and the ſtrange Ideas they are often filled with, are ſo various and uncertain, that it is impoſſible to find that *Evidence* (eſpecially in Things of a mixed Diſquiſition, depending on ſo long a Train of Conſequences, as ſome Points of the true Religion may) which one can confidently ſay will be *ſufficient* for all Men. 'Tis Demonſtration that 31876 is the Product of 9467172 divided by 297, and yet I challenge you to find one Man of a thouſand, to whom you can tender this Propoſition with demonſtrative or *ſufficient Evidence* to convince him of the Truth of it in a dark Room; or ever to make this *Evidence* appear to a Man, that cannot write and read, ſo as to make him embrace it as a Truth, if another whom he hath more Confidence in, tells him it is not ſo. All the demonſtrative

monſtrative *Evidence* the Thing has, all the *Tender* you can make of it, all the *Conſideration* he can employ about it, will never be able to diſcover to him that Evidence which ſhall convince him it is true, unleſs you will at threeſcore and ten (for that may be the Caſe) have him neglect his Calling, go to School, and learn to write and read, and caſt Account, which he may be able to attain to.

You ſpeak more than once of Mens being brought to lay aſide their *Prejudices* to make them conſider as they ought, and judge right of Matters in Religion; and I grant without doing ſo they cannot: But it is impoſſible for Force to make them do it, unleſs it could ſhew them, which are Prejudices in their Minds, and diſtinguiſh them from the Truths there. Who is there almoſt that has not *Prejudices*, that he does not know to be ſo; and what can Force do in that Caſe? It can no more remove them, to make way for Truth, than it can remove one Truth to make way for another; or rather remove an eſtabliſh'd Truth, or that which is look'd on as an unqueſtionable Principle (for ſo are often Mens Prejudices) to make way for a Truth not yet known, nor appearing to be one. 'Tis not every one knows, or can bring himſelf to *Des Cartes*'s Way of doubting, and ſtrip his Thoughts of all Opinions, till he brings them to ſelf-evident Principles, and then upon them builds all his future Tenets.

Do not think all the World, who are not of your Church, abandon themſelves to an utter Careleſneſs of their future State. You cannot but allow there are many *Turks* who ſincerely ſeek Truth, to whom yet you could never bring *Evidence ſufficient* to convince them of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, whilſt they looked on it as a Principle not to be queſtion'd, that the *Alcoran* was of Divine Revelation. This poſſibly you will tell me is a *Prejudice*, and ſo it is; but yet if this Man ſhall tell you 'tis no more a *Prejudice* in him, than it is a *Prejudice* in any one amongſt Chriſtians, who having not examin'd it, lays it down as an unqueſtionable Principle of his Religion, that the Scripture is the Word of God; What will you anſwer to him? And yet it would ſhake a great many Chriſtians in their Religion, if they ſhould lay by that Prejudice, and ſuſpend their Judgment of it, until they had made it out to themſelves with *Evidence ſufficient* to convince one who is not prejudiced in Favour of it; and it would require more Time, Books, Languages, Learning and Skill, than falls to moſt Mens Share to eſtabliſh them therein, if you will not allow them, in this ſo diſtinguiſhing and fundamental a Point, to rely on the Learning, Knowledge and Judgment of ſome *Perſons* whom they have in *Reverence* or *Admiration*. This tho' you blame it as an ill Way, yet you can allow in one of your own Religion, even to that Degree, that he may be ignorant of the *Grounds* of his Religion. And why then may you not allow it to a *Turk*, not as a good Way, or as having led him to the Truth; but as a Way, as fit for him, as for one of your Church to acquieſce in; and as fit to exempt him from your Force, as to exempt any one of your Church from it? Pag. 42.

To prevent your commenting on this, in which you have ſhewn ſo much Dexterity, give me leave to tell you, that for all this I do not think all *Religions equally true or equally certain*. But this, I ſay, is impoſſible for you, or me, or any Man, to know, whether another has done his Duty in examining the Evidence on both Sides, when he embraces that Side of the Queſtion, which we (perhaps upon other Views) judge falſe: and therefore we can have no Right to puniſh or perſecute him for it. In this, whether and how far any one is faulty, muſt be left to the Searcher of Hearts, the great and righteous Judge of all Men, who knows all their Circumſtances, all the Powers and Workings of their Minds; where 'tis they ſincerely follow, and by what Default they at any time miſs Truth: And he, we are ſure, will judge uprightly.

But when one Man ſhall think himſelf a competent Judge, that the true Religion is propoſed with *Evidence ſufficient* for another; and thence ſhall take upon him to puniſh him as an Offender, becauſe he embraces not (upon Evidence that he the Propoſer judges ſufficient) the Religion that he judges true, had need be able to look into the Thoughts of Men, and know their ſeveral Abilities: Unleſs he will make his own Underſtanding and Faculties to be the Meaſure of thoſe of all Mankind, which if they be no higher elevated, no larger in their Comprehenſion, no more Diſcerning, than thoſe of ſome Men, he will not only be unfit to be a Judge in that, but in almoſt any Caſe whatſoever.

But ſince, 1. You make it a Condition to the making a Man an Offender in not being of the true Religion, that it has been *tendered him with ſufficient Evidence*. 2. Since you think it ſo eaſy for Men to determine when the true Religion has been tender'd to any one *with ſufficient Evidence*. And 3. Since you pronounce *it Impiety to ſay that*

A. p. 16. *that God hath not furniſhed Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls.* Give me leave to ask you a Queſtion or two. 1. Can any one be ſaved without *embracing* the one only true Religion? 2. Were any of the *Americans* of that *one only true Religion*, when the *Europeans* firſt came amongſt them? 3. Whether any of the *Americans*, before the *Chriſtians* came amongſt them, had *offended* in rejecting the true Religion tendred with ſufficient Evidence? When you have thought upon, and fairly anſwerd theſe Queſtions, you will be fitter to determine, how competent a Judge Man is, what is ſufficient Evidence; who do offend in not being of the true Religion; and what Puniſhments they are liable to for it.

But methinks here, where you ſpend almoſt a whole Page upon the *Crime* of rejecting the true Religion duly tendred, and the Puniſhment that is juſtly due to it from the Magiſtrate, you forget your ſelf, and the Foundation of your Plea for Force; which is, that it is *neceſſary*: which you are ſo far from proving it to be in this Caſe of puniſhing the *Offence* of rejecting the true Religion, that in this very Page you diſtinguiſhed it from what is *neceſſary*; where you tell us, Your *Deſign does rather oblige* you *to conſider how long Men may need Puniſhment, than how long it may be juſt to puniſh them.* So that tho' they offend, yet if they do not *need* Puniſhment, the Magiſtrate cannot uſe it, if you *ground*, as you ſay you do, the *Lawfulneſs* of Force for promoting the true Religion upon the *Neceſſity* of it. Nor can you ſay, that by his Commiſſion from the Law of Nature, of doing Good, the Magiſtrate, beſides reducing his wandring Subjects out of the wrong into the right Way, is appointed alſo to be the Avenger of God's Wrath on Unbelievers, or thoſe that err in Matters of Religion. This at leaſt you thought not fit to own in the firſt Draught of your Scheme; for I do not remember in all your *Argument conſider'd*, one Word of *Crime* or *Puniſhment*: Nay, in writing this ſecond Treatiſe, you were ſo ſhy of owning any thing of *Puniſhment*, that to my Remembrance, you ſcrupulouſly avoided the Uſe of that Word, till you came to this Place; and always where the Repeating my Words did not oblige you to it, carefully uſed the Term of *Penalties* for it, as any one may obſerve, who reads the preceding Part of this Letter of yours, which I am now examining. And you were ſo nice in the Point, that three or four Leaves backwards, where I ſay, By your Rule Diſſenters muſt be puniſhed, you mend it, and ſay, *Or if I pleaſe, ſubjected to moderate Penalties.* But here when the Enquiry How long Force was to be continued on Men, ſhewed the Abſurdity of that Pretence, that they were to be puniſhed on without End, to make them conſider; rather than part with your beloved Force, you open the Matter a little farther, and profeſs directly the *puniſhing* Men for their Religion. For tho' you do all you can to cover it under the Name of *rejecting the true Religion duly propoſed*; yet it is in truth no more but being of a Religion different from yours, that you would have them puniſhed for: For all that the Author pleads for, and you can oppoſe in writing againſt him, is Toleration of Religion. Your Scheme therefore being thus mended, your Hypotheſis enlarged, being of a different Religion from the National found criminal, and Puniſhments found juſtly to belong to it, it is to be hoped, that in good Time your Puniſhments may grow too, and be advanced to all thoſe Degrees you in the Beginning *condemned*; when having conſidered a little farther, you cannot miſs finding, that the Obſtinacy of the Criminals does not leſſen their Crime, and therefore Juſtice will require ſeverer Execution to be done upon them.

Pag. 51. But you tell us here, *Becauſe* your *Deſign does rather oblige* you *to conſider how long Men may need Puniſhment, than how long it may be juſt to puniſh them*; *therefore* you *ſhall add, That as long as Men refuſe to embrace the true Religion, ſo long Penalties are neceſſary for them to diſpoſe them to conſider and embrace it: And that therefore as Juſtice allows, ſo Charity requires, that they be kept ſubject to Penalties, till they embrace the true Religion.* Let us therefore ſee the *Conſiſtency* of this with other Parts of your Hypotheſis, and examine it a little by them.

Your Doctrine is, That where *Entreaties* and *Admonitions* upon Trial do not prevail, Puniſhments are to be uſed; but they muſt be *moderate*. Moderate Puniſhments have been tried, and they prevail not; What now is to be done? Are not greater to be uſed? No: For what Reaſon? Becauſe thoſe whom *moderate Penalties* will not prevail on, being *deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, Remedies are not to be *provided for the Incurable*, as you tell us in the Page immediately preceding.

Moderate Puniſhments have been tried upon a Man once, and again, and a third Time, but prevail not at all, make no Impreſſion; they are repeated as many times more,

more, but are ſtill found ineffectual: Pray tell me a Reaſon why ſuch a Man is concluded ſo *deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, that greater Degrees will not work upon him; but yet not ſo *deſperately perverſe and obſtinate*, but that the ſame Degrees repeated may work upon him? I will not urge here, that this is to pretend to know the juſt Degree of Puniſhment that will or will not work on any one, which I ſhould imagine a pretty intricate Buſineſs: But this I have to ſay, that if you can think it reaſonable and uſeful to continue a Man ſeveral Years, nay his whole Life, under the ſame repeated Puniſhments, without going any higher, tho' they work not at all; becauſe 'tis poſſible ſome time or other they may work on him; why is it not as reaſonable and uſeful (I am ſure it is much more juſtifiable and *charitable*) to leave him all his Life under the Means, which all agree God has appointed, without going any higher, becauſe 'tis not impoſſible that ſome time or other Preaching, and a Word ſpoken in due Seaſon, may work upon him? For why ſhould you deſpair of the Succeſs of Preaching and Perſuaſion upon a fruitleſs Trial, and thereupon think your ſelf authorized to uſe Force; and yet not ſo deſpair of the Succeſs of moderate Force, as after Years of fruitleſs Trial, to continue it on, and not to proceed to higer Degrees of Puniſhment, you are concerned for the Vindication of your Syſtem to ſhew a Reaſon.

I mention the Trial of Preaching and Perſuaſion, to ſhew the Unreaſonableneſs of your Hypotheſis, ſuppoſing ſuch a Trial made: Not that in yours, or the common Method, there is or can be a fair Trial made what Preaching and Perſuaſion can do. For Care is taken by Puniſhment and ill Treatment, to indiſpoſe and turn away Mens Minds, and to add Averſion to their Scruples; an excellent Way to ſoften Mens Inclinations, and temper them for the Impreſſion of Arguments and Entreaties; tho' theſe two are only talked of: For I cannot but wonder to find you mention, as you do, giving Ear to *Admonitions*, *Entreaties* and *Perſuaſions*, when theſe are ſeldom, if ever made uſe of, but in Places, where thoſe, who are to be wrought on by them, are known to be out of hearing; nor can be expected to come there, till by ſuch Means they have been wrought on.

'Tis not without reaſon therefore you cannot part with your Penalties, and would have no End put to your Puniſhments, but continue them on; ſince you leave ſo much to their Operation, and make ſo little uſe of other Means to work upon Diſſenters.

CHAP. VI.

Of the End for which Force is to be uſed.

HE that ſhould read the Beginning of your *Argument conſider'd*, would think it in earneſt to be your Deſign to have Force employed to make Men ſeriouſly conſider, and nothing elſe: But he that ſhall look a little farther into it, and to that add alſo your Defence of it, will find by the Variety of Ends you deſign your Force for, that either you know not well what you would have it for, or elſe, whatever 'twas you aimed at, you called it ſtill by that Name which beſt fitted the Occaſion, and would ſerve beſt in that Place to recommend the Uſe of it.

You ask me, *Whether the Mildneſs and Gentleneſs of the Goſpel deſtroys the coactive Power of the Magiſtrate?* I anſwer, as you ſuppoſe, No: Upon which you infer, *Then it ſeems the Magiſtrate may uſe his coactive Power, without offending againſt the Mildneſs and Gentleneſs of the Goſpel.* Yes, where he has Commiſſion and Authority to uſe it. *And ſo*, ſay you, *it will conſiſt well enough with the Mildneſs and Gentleneſs of the Goſpel for the Magiſtrate to uſe his coactive Power to procure them* [I ſuppoſe you mean the Miniſters and Preachers of the National Religion] *a Hearing where their Prayers and Entreaties will not do it.* No, it will not conſiſt with the gentle and mild Method of the Goſpel, unleſs the Goſpel has directed it, or ſomething elſe to ſupply its want, till it could be had. As for Miracles, which you pretend to have ſupplied the want of Force in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, you will find that conſidered in another Place. But, Sir, ſhew me a Country where the Miniſters and Teachers of the National and True Religion go about with *Prayers and Entreaties to procure a Hearing*, and cannot obtain it, and there I think I need not ſtand with you for the Magiſtrate to uſe Force to procure it them; but that I fear will not ſerve your Turn. Pag. 17.

To

To ſhew the Inconſiſtency and Unpracticableneſs of your Method, I had ſaid,

L. 2. p. 273. "Let us now ſee to what End they muſt be puniſhed:

A. p. 5. "Sometimes it is, *To bring them to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are proper and ſufficient to convince them:* Of what? That it is not eaſy to ſet *Grantham* "Steeple upon *Paul*'s Church? Whatever it be you would have them convinced of, "you are not willing to tell us; and ſo it may be any thing.

A. p. 10. "Sometimes it is, *To incline them to lend an Ear to thoſe who tell them they have miſtaken their Way, and offer to ſhew them the right.* Which is, to lend an Ear to all who "differ from them in Religion, as well *crafty Seducers*, as others. Whether this be for

A. p. 27. "*the procuring the Salvation of their Souls*, the End for which you ſay this Force is to be

A. p. 23. "uſed, judge you. But this I am ſure, Whoever will *lend an Ear to all who tell them* "*they are out of the Way*, will not have much Time for any other Buſineſs.

A. p. 11. "Sometimes it is, *To recover Men to ſo much Sobriety and Reflection, as ſeriouſly to put* "*the Queſtion to themſelves, Whether it be really worth their while to undergo ſuch Inconveniences, for adhering to a Religion which, for any thing they know, may be falſe; or for* "*rejecting another (if that be the Caſe) which, for ought they know, may be true, till they* "*have brought it to the Bar of Reaſon, and given it a fair Trial there.* Which in ſhort "amounts to thus much, *viz. To make them examine whether their Religion be true, and* "*ſo worth the holding, under thoſe Penalties that are annexed to it.* Diſſenters are indebted "to you for your great Care of their Souls. But what, I beſeech you, ſhall become of thoſe of the National Church, every where (which make far the greater "Part of Mankind) who have no ſuch Puniſhments to make them *conſider*; who "have not this *only Remedy* provided for them, but are left in that deplorable Condi-

A. p. 27. "tion, you mention, of *being ſuffered quietly, and without Moleſtation, to take no Care* "*at all of their Souls, or in doing of it to follow their own Prejudices, Humours, or ſome* "*crafty Seducers?* Need not thoſe of the National Church, as well as others, *bring* "*their Religion to the Bar of Reaſon, and give it a fair Trial there?* And if they need "to do ſo, (as they muſt, if all National Religions cannot be ſuppoſed true) they "will always need that which you ſay is the *only Means* to make them do ſo. So that

A. p. 12. "*if you are ſure*, as you tell us, that *there is need of your Method*; I am ſure, there is "as much need of it in National Churches, as any other. And ſo, for ought I "can ſee, you muſt either puniſh them, or let others alone; unleſs you think it "reaſonable that the far greater Part of Mankind ſhould conſtantly be without that "Sovereign and only Remedy, which they ſtand in need of equally with other People.

A. p. 13. "Sometimes the End for which Men muſt be puniſhed is, *to diſpoſe them to ſubmit* "*to Inſtruction, and to give a fair Hearing to the Reaſons are offer'd for the enlightning their* "*Minds, and diſcovering the Truth to them.* If their own Words may be taken for "it, there are as few Diſſenters as Conformiſts, in any Country, who will not profeſs they have done, and do this. And if their own Words may not be taken, who, "I pray, muſt be Judge? You and your Magiſtrates? If ſo, then it is plain you puniſh them not to *diſpoſe them to ſubmit to Inſtruction*, but *to* your *Inſtruction*; *not to* "*diſpoſe them to give a fair Hearing to Reaſons offer'd for the enlightning their Minds*, but "to give an obedient *Hearing* to your *Reaſons*. If you mean this, it had been fairer "and ſhorter to have ſpoken out plainly, than thus in fair Words, of indefinite Signification, to ſay that which amounts to nothing. For what Senſe is it, to puniſh "a Man *to diſpoſe him to ſubmit to Inſtruction, and give a fair Hearing to Reaſons offer'd for the enlightning his Mind, and diſcovering Truth to him*, who goes two or three "times a Week ſeveral Miles on purpoſe to do it, and that with the Hazard of his "Liberty or Purſe; unleſs you mean your *Inſtructions*, your *Reaſons*, your *Truth?* "Which brings us but back to what you have diſclaimed, plain Perſecution for differing in Religion.

A. p. 14. "Sometimes this is to be done, *To prevail with Men to weigh Matters of Religion* "*carefully and impartially.* Diſcountenance and Puniſhment put into one Scale, with "Impunity and Hopes of Preferment put into the other, is as ſure a Way to make a "Man *weigh impartially*, as it would be for a Prince to bribe and threaten a Judge "to make him judge uprightly.

A. p. 20. "Sometimes it is, *To make Men bethink themſelves, and put it out of the Power of any* "*fooliſh Humour, or unreaſonable Prejudice, to alienate them from Truth and their own Happineſs.* Add but this, *to put it out of the Power of any Humour or Prejudice* of their "own, or other Mens, and I grant the End is good, if you can find the Means to "procure it. But why it ſhould not be put out of the Power of other Mens

"*Humour*

" *Humour* or *Prejudice*, as well as their own, want (and will always want) a Reaſon " to prove. Would it not, I beſeech you, to an indifferent By-ſtander, appear *Hu-* " *mour* or *Prejudice*, or ſomething as bad; to ſee Men who profeſs a Religion reveal'd " from Heaven, and which they own contains all in it neceſſary to Salvation, ex- " clude Men from their Communion, and perſecute them with the Penalties of the " Civil Law, for not joining in the Uſe of Ceremonies, which are no where to be " found in that reveal'd Religion? Would it not appear *Humour* or *Prejudice*, or ſome " ſuch Thing, to a ſober impartial Heathen; to ſee Chriſtians exclude and perſe- " cute one of the ſame Faith, for Things which they themſelves confeſs to be indif- " ferent, and not worth the contending for? *Prejudice, Humour, Paſſion, Luſts, Im-* A. p. 6, 7. " *preſſions of Educations, Reverence and Admiration of Perſons, worldly Reſpects, Love of* 8, 9, 10. " *their own Choice, and the like*, (to which you juſtly impute many Mens taking up and " perſiſting in their Religion) are indeed good Words; and ſo, on the other Side, " are theſe following, *Truth, the right Way, Enlightning, Reaſon, ſound Judgment*; " but they ſignify nothing at all to your Purpoſe, till you can evidently and unque- " ſtionably ſhew the World, that the latter (viz. *Truth, and the right Way*, &c.) " are always, and in all Countries, to be found only in the National Church; and " the former (viz. *Paſſion and Prejudice*, &c.) only amongſt the Diſſenters. But to " go on:

" Sometimes it is, *To bring Men to take ſuch Care as they ought of their Salvation.* A. p. 22. " What *Care it ſuch as Men ought to take*, whilſt they are out of your Church, will " be hard for you to tell me. But you endeavour to explain your ſelf in the follow- " Words, *That they may not blindly leave it to the Choice neither of any other Perſon, nor* " *yet of their own Luſts and Paſſions, to preſcribe to them what Faith or Worſhip they ſhall* " *embrace.* You do well to make uſe of Puniſhment to ſhut *Paſſion* out of the Choice; " becauſe you know Fear of ſuffering is no *Paſſion.* But let that paſs. You would " have Men puniſhed, *to bring them to take ſuch Care of their Salvation, that they may* " *not blindly leave it to the Choice of any other Perſon to preſcribe to them.* Are you ſin- " cere? Are you in earneſt? Tell me then truly: Did the Magiſtrate or the Natio- " nal Church, any where, or yours in particular, ever puniſh any Man, to bring " him to *have this Care*, which, you ſay, *he ought to take of his Salvation?* Did you " ever puniſh any Man, that he might not *blindly leave it to the Choice* of his Pa- " riſh-Prieſt, or Biſhop, or the Convocation, *what Faith or Worſhip he ſhould embrace?* " 'Twill be ſuſpected Care of a Party, or any Thing elſe, rather than *Care of the* " *Salvation of Mens Souls*; if, having found out ſo *uſeful*, ſo *neceſſary* a Remedy, *the* A. p. 11. " *only Method there is room left for*, you will apply it but partially, and make Trial " only on thoſe who have truly leaſt Kindneſs for. This will, unavoidably, give " one Reaſon to imagine, you do not think ſo well of your Remedy as you pre- " tend, who are ſo ſparing of it to your Friends; but are very free of it to Stran- " gers, who in other Things are uſed very much like Enemies. But your Remedy " is like the *Helleboraſter*, that grew in the Woman's Garden, for the Cure of " Worms in her Neighbour's Children: For truly it wrought too roughly to give it " to any of her own. Methinks your Charity, in your preſent Perſecution, is much- " what as prudent, as juſtifiable, as that good Woman's. I hope I have done you " no Injury, that I here ſuppoſe you of the Church of *England*; if I have, I beg " your Pardon. It is no Offence of Malice, I aſſure you: For I ſuppoſe no worſe " of you, than I confeſs of my ſelf.

" Sometimes this Puniſhment that you contend for, is, *to bring Men to act according* A. p. 22. " *to Reaſon and ſound Judgment.*

Tertius è Cælo cecidit Cato.

" This is Reformation indeed. If you can help us to it, you will deſerves Statues " to be erected to you, as to the Reſtorer of decay'd Religion. But if all Men have " not *Reaſon and ſound Judgment*, will Puniſhment put it into them? Beſides, concern- " ing this Matter Mankind is ſo divided, that he *acts according to Reaſon and ſound* " *Judgment* at *Auſpurg*, who would be judged to do the quite contrary at *Edinburgh*. " Will Puniſhment make Men know what is *Reaſon and ſound Judgment?* If it " will not, 'tis impoſſible it ſhould make them *act according to it. Reaſon and* " *ſound Judgment* are the *Elixir* it ſelf, the univerſal Remedy: And you may as

" reaſonably

" reaſonably puniſh Men to bring them to have the Philoſopher's Stone, as to *bring*
A. p. 26. " *them to act according to Reaſon and ſound Judgment.*

" Sometimes it is, *To put Men upon a ſerious and impartial Examination of the Contro-*
" *verſy between the Magiſtrate and them, which is the Way for them to come to the Know-*
" *ledge of the Truth.* But what if the Truth be on neither Side, (as I am apt to ima-
" gine you will think it is not, where neither the Magiſtrate nor the Diſſenters ei-
" ther of them of your Chaurch,) how will the *examining the Controverſy between the*
" *Magiſtrate and him be the Way to come to the Knowledge of the Truth?* Suppoſe the
" Controverſy between a *Lutheran* and a *Papiſt*; or, if you pleaſe, between a Presby-
" terian Magiſtrate and a Quaker Subject. *Will the examining the Controverſy between*
" *the Magiſtrate and the diſſenting Subject*, in this Caſe, *bring him to the Knowledge of*
" *the Truth?* If you ſay, Yes, then you grant one of theſe to have the Truth on his
" Side. For the examining the Controverſy between a *Presbyterian* and a *Quaker*,
" leaves the Controverſy either of them has with the Church of *England*, or any
" other Church, untouched. And ſo one, at leaſt, of thoſe being already *come to*
" *the Knowledge of the Truth*, ought not to be put under your Diſcipline of Puniſh-
" ment; which is only to bring him to the Truth. If you ſay, No, and that
" *the examining the Controverſy between the Magiſtrate and the Diſſenter*, in this Caſe,
" will not *bring him to the Knowledge of the Truth*; you confeſs your Rule to be falſe,
" and your Method to no purpoſe.

" To conclude, your Syſtem is, in ſhort, this. You would have all Men (laying
" aſide *Prejudice, Humour, Paſſion*, &c.) *examine the Grounds of their Religion, and ſearch*
" *for the Truth.* This, I confeſs, is heartily to be wiſh'd. The Means that you
" propoſe to make Men do this, is, that Diſſenters ſhould be puniſhed to make them
" do ſo. It is as if you had ſaid, Men generally are guilty of a Fault: therefore
" let one Sect, who have the ill Luck to be of an Opinion different from the Magi-
" ſtrate, be puniſhed. This, at firſt Sight, ſhocks any one who has the leaſt Spark
" of Senſe, Reaſon, or Juſtice. But having ſpoken of this already, and concluding
" that, upon ſecond Thoughts, you your ſelf will be aſhamed of it; let us conſider
" it put ſo as to be conſiſtent with common Senſe, and with all the Advantage it
" can bear, and then let us ſee what you can make of it. *Men* are *negligent in exa-*
" *mining the Religions they embrace, refuſe, or perſiſt in; therefore it is fit they ſhould be pu-*
" *niſhed to make them do it.* This is a Conſequence indeed which may, without De-
" fiance to common Senſe, be drawn from it. This is the Uſe, the only Uſe,
" which you think Puniſhment can *indirectly and at a Diſtance* have in Matters of
" Religion. You would have Men by Puniſhments driven to examine. What?
" *Religion.* To what End? *To bring them to the Knowledge of the Truth.* But I
" anſwer.

" *Firſt*, Every one has not the Ability to do this.

" *Secondly*, Every one has not the Opportunity to do it.

" Would you have every poor *Proteſtant*, for Example, in the *Palatinate, examine*
" *throughly* whether the Pope be infallible, or Head of the Church; whether there be
" a Purgatory; whether Saints are to be pray'd to, or the Dead pray'd for; whether
" the Scripture be the only Rule of Faith; whether there be no Salvation out of the
" Church; and whether there be no Church without Biſhops; and an hundred other
" Queſtions in Controverſy between the *Papiſts* and thoſe *Proteſtants:* And when he
" had maſter'd theſe, go on to fortify himſelf againſt the Opinions and Objections
" of other Churches he differs from? This, which is no ſmall Task, muſt be done,
" before a Man can have *brought his Religion to the Bar of Reaſon, and given it fair Trial*
" *there.* And if you will puniſh Men till this be done, the Countryman muſt leave
" off plowing and ſowing, and betake himſelf to the Study of *Greek* and *Latin*;
" and the Artiſan muſt ſell his Tools, to buy Fathers and Schoolmen, and leave his
" Family to ſtarve. If ſomething leſs than this will ſatisfy you, pray tell me what is
" enough. Have they conſider'd and examin'd enough, if they are ſatisfied them-
" ſelves where the Truth lies? If this be the Limits of their Examination, you
" will find few to puniſh; unleſs you will puniſh them to make them do what
" they have done already. For, however he came by his Religion, there is ſcarce
" any one to be found who does not own himſelf ſatisfied that he is in the right.
" Or elſe, muſt they be puniſhed to make them conſider and examine, till they
" embrace that which you chuſe for Truth? If this be ſo, what do you but in

" effect

" effect chuſe for them, when yet you would have Men puniſhed, *to bring them to ſuch* A. p. 22.
" *a Care of their Souls that no other Perſon might chuſe for them?* If it be Truth in general
" you would have them by Puniſhments driven to ſeek; that is to offer Matter of
" Diſpute, and not a Rule of Diſcipline. For to puniſh any one to make him ſeek
" till he find Truth, without a Judge of Truth, is to puniſh for you know not
" what; and is all one as if you ſhould whip a Scholar to make him find out the
" ſquare Root of a Number you do not know. I wonder not therefore that you could
" not reſolve with your ſelf what Degree of Severity you would have uſed, nor how
" long continued; when you dare not ſpeak out directly whom you would have pu-
" niſhed, and are far from being clear to what End they ſhould be under Pe-
" nalties.

" Conſonant to this Uncertainty, of whom, or what, to be puniſhed; you tell us,
" *That there is no Queſtion of the Succeſs of this Method. Force will certainly do, if duly* A. p. 12.
" *proportioned to the Deſign of it.*

" What, I pray, is *the Deſign of it?* I challenge you, or any Man living, out of
" what you have ſaid in your Book, to tell me directly what it is. In all other Pu-
" niſhments that ever I heard of yet, till now that you have taught the World a
" new Method, the Deſign of them has been to cure the Crime they are denounced
" againſt; and ſo I think it ought to be here. What, I beſeech you, is the Crime
" here? Diſſenting? That you ſay not, any where, is a Fault. Beſides, you tell
" us, *That the Magiſtrate hath not an Authority to compel any one to his Religion.* And A. p. 21.
" that *you do not require that Men ſhould have no Rule but the Religion of the Country.* And A. p. 25.
" the *Power you aſcribe to the Magiſtrate is given him to bring Men, not to his own, but* A. p. 26.
" *to the true Religion.* If diſſenting be not the Fault; is it that a Man does not exa-
" mine his own Religion, and the Grounds of it? Is that the Crime your Puniſh-
" ments are deſigned to cure? Neither that dare you ſay, leſt you diſpleaſe more
" than you ſatisfy with your new Diſcipline. And then again, (as I ſaid before)
" you muſt tell us how far you would have them examine, before you puniſh them
" for not doing it. And I imagine, if that were all were required of you, it would
" be long enough before you would trouble us with a Law, that ſhould preſcribe to
" every one how far he was to examine Matters of Religion; wherein if he fail'd,
" and came ſhort, he was to be puniſh'd; if he performed, and went in his Exami-
" nation to the Bounds ſet by the Law, he was acquitted and free. Sir, when you con-
" ſider it again, you will perhaps think this a Caſe reſerv'd to the Great Day, when
" the Secrets of all Hearts ſhall be laid open. For I imagine it is beyond the Power
" or Judgment of Man, in that Variety of Circumſtances, in reſpect of Parts,
" Tempers, Opportunities, Helps, *&c.* Men are in, in this World, to determine
" what is every one's Duty in this great Buſineſs of Search, Enquiry, Examination,
" or to know when any one has done it. That which makes me believe you will be
" of this Mind, is, that where you undertake for *the Succeſs of this Method, if rightly* A. p. 124
" *uſed,* it is with a Limitation, *upon ſuch as are not altogether incurable.* So that when
" your Remedy is prepared accourding to Art, (which Art is yet unknown) and
" rightly apply'd, and given in a due Doſe, (all which are Secrets) it will then in-
" fallibly cure. Whom? All that are not incurable by it. And ſo will a Pippin-
" Poſſet, eating Fiſh in *Lent*, or a Presbyterian Lecture certainly cure all that are
" not incurable by them. For I am ſure you do not mean it will cure all, but thoſe
" who are abſolutely incurable; becauſe you your ſelf allow one Means left of Cure,
" when yours will not do, viz. *The Grace of God.* Your Words are, *What Means is* A. p. 10.
" *there left (except the Grace of God) to reduce them, but to lay Thorns and Briars in their*
" *way?* And here alſo, in the Place we were conſidering, you tell us, *The Incurable* A. p. 12.
" *are to be left to God.* Whereby, if you mean they are to be left to thoſe Means
" he has ordained for Mens Converſion and Salvation, yours muſt never be made
" uſe of: For he indeed has preſcribed Preaching, and Hearing of his Word; but
" as for thoſe who will not hear, I do not find any where that he has commanded
" that they ſhould be compell'd or beaten to it.

I muſt beg my Reader's Pardon for ſo long a Repetition, which I was forced to, that he might be Judge whether what I there ſaid, either deſerves no Anſwer, or be fully anſwer'd in that Paragraph, where you undertake to vindicate your Method Pag. 48.
from all Impracticableneſs and Inconſiſtency chargeable upon it, in reference to the End for which you would have Men puniſhed. Your Words are, For what? *By which,* you

ſay, you *perceive* I *mean two Things: For ſometimes* I *ſpeak of the* Fault, *and ſometimes of the* End *for which Men are to be puniſhed, (and ſometimes* I *plainly confound them.) Now if it be enquired, For what Fault Men are to be puniſhed?* you *anſwer, For rejecting the true Religion, after ſufficient Evidence tender'd them of the Truth of it: Which certainly is a Fault, and deſerves Puniſhment. But if* I *enquire for what End ſuch as do reject the true Religion, are to be puniſhed?* you *ſay, To bring them to embrace the true Religion; and in order to that to bring them to conſider, and that carefully and impartially, the Evidence which is offered to convince them of the Truth of it: Which are undeniably juſt and excellent Ends; and which, through God's Bleſſing, have often been procured, and may yet be procured by convenient Penalties inflicted for that Purpoſe. Nor do* you *know of any Thing* I *ſay againſt any Part of this, which is not already anſwered.* Whether I in this *confound* two Things diſtinct, or you diſtinguiſh where there is no Difference, the Reader may judge by what I have ſaid elſewhere. I ſhall here only conſider the *Ends* of Puniſhing, you here again in your Reply to me aſſign; and thoſe, as I find them ſcattered, are theſe.

Pag. 27. Sometimes you ſpeak of this End, as if it were barely *to gain a Hearing* to thoſe who *by Prayers and Intreaty cannot:* And thoſe may be the Preachers of any Religion. But I ſuppoſe you mean the Preachers of the true Religion. And who I beſeech you muſt be Judge of that?

Pag. 28. *Where the Law provides ſufficient Means of Inſtruction for all, as well as Puniſhment for Diſſenters, it is plain to all concerned, that the Puniſhment is intended to make them conſider.* What? The Means the Law provides for their Inſtruction. Who then is Judge of what they are to be inſtructed in, and the Means of Inſtruction, but the Law-Maker?

Pag. 37. It is *to bring Men to hearken to Inſtruction.* From whom? From any body? *And to conſider and examine Matters of Religion as they ought to do, and to bring thoſe who are out of the right Way, to hear, conſider, and embrace the Truth.* When is this End attained, and the Penalties which are the Means to this End taken off? When a Man conforms to the National Church. And who then is Judge of what is the Truth to be embraced, but the Magiſtrate?

Pag. 26. It is *to bring Men to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are proper and ſufficient to convince them; but which, without being forced, they would not conſider.* And when have they done this? When they have once conformed: For after that there is no Force uſed to make them conſider farther.

Pag. 40. It is *to make Men conſider as they ought*; and that you tell us, is ſo to conſider, as
Pag. 28. *to be moved heartily to embrace, and to reject Truth neceſſary to Salvation.* And when is the Magiſtrate, that has the Cure of Mens Souls, and does all this for their Salvation, ſatisfied that they have ſo conſidered? As ſoon as they outwardly join in Communion with the National Church.

Pag. 2. It is *to bring Men to conſider and examine thoſe Controverſies which they are bound to conſider and examine,* i. e. *thoſe wherein they cannot err without diſhonouring God, and endangering*
Pag. 58. *their own and other Mens Salvations.* And *to ſtudy the true Religion with ſuch Care and Diligence as they might and ought to uſe, and with an honeſt Mind.* And when, in your Opinion, is it *preſumable* that any Man has done all this? Even when he is in the Communion of your Church.

Pag. 53. It is to *cure Mens unreaſonable Prejudices and Refractorineſs againſt, and Averſion to the true Religion.* Whereof none retain the leaſt Tincture or Suſpicion, who are once got within the Pale of your Church.

Pag. 30, 58. It is *to bring Men into the right Way, into the Way of Salvation,* which Force does, when it has conducted them within the Church-Porch, and there leaves them.

Pag. 26. It is *to bring Men to embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them.* And here, in the Para-
Pag. 49. graph wherein you pretend to tell us *for what* Force is to be uſed, you ſay, It is *to bring Men to embrace the true Religion, and in order to that to bring them to conſider, and that carefully and impartially, the Evidence which is offered to convince them of the Truth of it, which,*
Pag. 47. as you ſay, *are undeniable juſt and excellent Ends*; but yet ſuch as Force in your Method can never practically be made a Means to, without ſuppoſing what you ſay you *have no need* to ſuppoſe, *viz.* That your Religion is the true; unleſs you had rather every where to leave it to the Magiſtrate to judge which is the right Way, what is the true Religion; which Suppoſition, I imagine, will leſs accommodate you than the other. But take which of them you will, you muſt add

this

this other Suppoſition to it, harder to be granted you than either of the former, *viz.* That thoſe who conform to your Church here, (if you make your ſelf the Judge) or to the National Church any where, (if you make the Magiſtrate judge of *the Truth that muſt ſave Men*) and thoſe only have attained theſe Ends.

The Magiſtrate, you ſay, is obliged to do what in him lies to bring *all* his Subjects *to examine carefully and impartially Matters of Religion*, and *to conſider them as they ought*, i. e. ſo as to *embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*. The proper and neceſſary Means, you ſay, to attain theſe Ends is Force. And your Method of uſing this Force is to puniſh all the Diſſenters from the National Religion, and none of thoſe who outwardly conform to it. Make this Practicable now in any Country in the World, without allowing the Magiſtrate to be Judge *what is the Truth that muſt ſave them*, and without ſuppoſing alſo, that whoever do embrace the outward Profeſſion of the National Religion, do in their Hearts *embrace*, i. e. believe and obey *the Truth that muſt ſave them*; and then I think nothing in Government can be too hard for your Undertaking.

You conclude this Paragraph in telling me, You *do not know of any thing I ſay a-* Pag. 49.
gainſt any Part of this, which is not already anſwered. Pray tell me where 'tis you have anſwered thoſe Objections I made to thoſe ſeveral Ends which you aſſigned in your *Argument conſidered*, and for which you would have Force uſed, and which I have here reprinted again, becauſe I do not find you ſo much as to take notice of them: And therefore the Reader muſt judge whether they needed any Anſwer or no.

But to ſhew that you have not here, where you promiſe and pretend to do it, *clearly and directly* told us *for what* Force and Penalties are to be uſed, I ſhall in the next Chapter examine what you mean by *bringing Men to embrace the true Religion.*

CHAP. VII.

Of your bringing Men to the true Religion.

TRUE Religion is on all Hands acknowledged to be ſo much the Concern and Intereſt of all Mankind, that nothing can be named, which ſo much effectually beſpeaks the Approbation and Favour of the Publick. The very intitling one's ſelf to that, ſets a Man on the right ſide. Who dares queſtion ſuch a Cauſe, or oppoſe what is offered for the promoting the true Religion? This Advantage you have ſecured to your ſelf from unattentive Readers, as much as by the often repeated mention of the true Religion, is poſſible, there being ſcarce a Page wherein the *true Religion* does not appear, as if you had nothing elſe in your Thoughts, but the bringing Men to it for the Salvation of their Souls. Whether it be ſo in earneſt, we will now ſee.

You tell us, *Whatever Hardſhips ſome falſe Religions may impoſe, it will however al-* Pag. 7.
ways be eaſier to carnal and Worldly-minded Men, to give even the firſt-born for their Tranſgreſſions, than to mortify the Luſts from which they ſpring, which no Religion but the true requires of them. Upon this you Ground the Neceſſity of Force to bring Men to *the true Religion*, and charge it on the Magiſtrate as his Duty to uſe it to that End. What now in Appearance can expreſs greater Care to bring Men to the true Religion? But let us ſee what you ſay in *p.* 64. and we ſhall find that in your Scheme nothing leſs is meant: there you tell us, *The Magiſtrate inflicts the Penalties only upon them that break the Laws:* And that Law requiring nothing but Conformity to the National Religion, none but Nonconformiſts are puniſhed. So that unleſs an outward Profeſſion of the National Religion be by the Mortification of Mens Luſts harder than their *giving their Firſt-born for their Tranſgreſſion*, all the Penalties you contend for concern not, nor can be intended to bring Men effectually to the true Religion; ſince they leave them before they come to the Difficulty, which is *to mortify their Luſts*, as the *true Religion requires*. So that your bringing Men to the true Religion, being to bring them to Conformity to the National, for then you have done with Force, how far that outward Conformity is from being heartily of the true Religion, may be known by the Diſtance there is between the eaſieſt and the

the hardeſt thing in the World. For there is nothing eaſier, than to profeſs in Words; nothing harder, than to ſubdue the Heart, and bring Thoughts and Deeds into Obedience of the Truth: The latter is what is required to be of the true Religion; the other all that is required by Penalties your way applied. If you ſay, Conformiſts to the National Religion are required by the Law Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, to lead good Lives, which is the difficult Part of the True Religion: I anſwer, Theſe are not the Laws we are here ſpeaking of, nor thoſe which the Defenders of Toleration complain of, but the Laws that put a Diſtinction between outward Conformiſts and Nonconformiſts: and thoſe they ſay, whatever may be talked *of the true Religion*, can never be meant to bring Men really to the True Religion, as long as the true Religion is, and is confeſſed to be a Thing of ſo much greater Difficulty than outward Conformity.

Miracles, ſay you, ſupplied the want of Force in the beginning of Chriſtianity; and therefore ſo far as they ſupplied that Want, they muſt be ſubſervient to the ſame End. The End then was to bring Men into the Chriſtian Church, into which they were admitted and received as Brethren, when they acknowledged that Jeſus was the Chriſt, the Son of God. Will that ſerve the Turn? No: Force muſt be uſed to make Men embrace *Creeds* and *Ceremonies*, i. e. outwardly conform to the Doctrine and Worſhip of your Church. Nothing more than that is required by your Penalties; nothing leſs than that will excuſe from Puniſhment; that, and nothing but that, will ſerve the Turn; that therefore, and only that, is what you mean by *the True Religion* you would have Force uſed to bring Men to.

L. 2 p. 260. When I tell you, "You have a very ill Opinion of the Religion of the Church of "*England*, and muſt own it can only be propagated and ſupported by Force, if you do "not think it would be a Gainer by a general Toleration all the World over: You ask,

Pag. 10. *Why* you *may not have as good an Opinion of the Church of* England's, *as you have of* Noah's *Religion, notwithſtanding* you *think it cannot now be propagated or ſupported without uſing ſome kinds or degrees of Force.* When you have proved that *Noah's* Religion, that from eight Perſons ſpread and continued in the World till the Apoſtles Times, as I have proved in another place, *was propagated and ſupported* all that while by *your kinds or degrees of Force*, you may have ſome reaſon to think *as well of the Religion of the Church of* England, as you *have of* Noah's *Religion*, though you *think it cannot be propagated and ſupported without ſome kinds or degrees of Force.* But till you can prove that, you cannot upon that Ground ſay you have reaſon to *have ſo good an Opinion* of it.

Pag. 11. You tell me, *If* I *will take* your *Word for it*, you *aſſure me* you *think there are many other Countries in the World* beſides England, *where* my *Toleration would be as little uſeful to Truth as in* England. If you will name thoſe Countries, which will be no great Pains, I will take your Word for it, that you believe Toleration there would be prejudicial to Truth: but if you will not do that, neither I nor any body elſe can believe you. I will give you a Reaſon why I ſay ſo, and that is, Becauſe no body can believe that, upon your Principles, you can allow any National Religion, differing from that of the Church of *England*, to be true; and where the National Religion is not true, we have already your Conſent, as in *Spain* and *Italy*, &c. for Toleration. Now that you cannot, without Renouning your own Principles, allow any National Religion, differing from that eſtabliſh'd here by Law, to be true, is evident: For why do you puniſh Nonconformiſts here? *To bring* them, ſay you, *to the True Religion.* But what if they hold nothing, but what that other differing National Church does, ſhall they be nevertheleſs puniſhed if they conform not? You will certainly ſay, Yes: and if ſo, then you muſt either ſay, they are not of *the True Religion*, or elſe you muſt own you puniſh thoſe, *to bring them to the True Religion*, whom you allow to be of the True Religion already.

Pag. 11. You tell me, *If* I *own with our Author, that there is but one True Religion, and* I *owning my ſelf to be of the Church of* England, you *cannot ſee how* I *can avoid ſuppoſing, that the National Religion now in* England, *back'd by the publick Authority of the Law, is the only True Religion.* If I own, as I do, all that you here expect from me, yet it will not ſerve to draw that Concluſion from it, which you do, *viz.* That *the National Religion now in* England *is the only True Religion*; taking the true Religion in the Senſe that I do, and you ought to take it. I grant that there is but one True Religion in the World, which is that whoſe Doctrine and Worſhip are neceſſary to Salvation. I grant too that the true Religion, neceſſary to Salvation, is taught and profeſſed in the Church of *England*: and yet it will not follow from hence, that the Religion of the

Church

Church of *England, as eſtabliſhed by Law*, is *the only true Religion*; if there be any thing eſtabliſhed in the Church of *England* by Law, and made part of its Religion, which is not neceſſary to Salvation, and which any other Church, teaching and profeſſing all that is neceſſary to Salvation, does not receive.

If the National Religion now in England, *back'd by the Authority of the Law*, be, as you would have it, *the only true Religion*; ſo the only true Religion, that a Man cannot be ſaved without being of it. Pray reconcile this, with what you ſay in the immediately preceding Paragraph, *viz.* That *there are many other Countries in the World where my Toloration would be as little uſeful as in* England. For if there be other National Religions differing from that of *England*, which you allow to be true, and wherein Men may be ſaved, the National Religion of *England*, as now *eſtabliſhed by Law*, is not the *only true Religion*, and Men may be ſaved without being of it. And then the Magiſtrate can upon your Principles have no Authority to uſe Force to bring Men to be of it. For you tell us, Force is not lawful, unleſs it be neceſſary; and therefore the Magiſtrate can never lawfully uſe it, but to bring Men to believe and practiſe what is neceſſary to Salvation. You muſt therefore either hold, that there is nothing in the Doctrine, Diſcipline and Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, as it is eſtabliſhed by Law, but what is neceſſary to Salvation: Or elſe you muſt reform your Terms of Communion, before the Magiſtrate upon your Principles can uſe Penalties to make Men conſider till they conform; or you can ſay that the National Religion of *England* is the *only true Religion*, though it contain the only true Religion in it; as poſſibly moſt, if not all, the differing Chriſtian Churches now in the World do.

You tell us further in the next Paragraph, *That where-ever this only true Religion*, i.e. the National Religion now in *England*, *is received, all other Religions ought to be diſcouraged.* Why I beſeech you diſcourag'd, if they be true any of them? For if they be *true*, what Pretence is there for Force to bring Men who are of them *to the true Religion?* If you ſay all other Religions, varying at all from that of the Church of *England*, are falſe; we know then your Meaſure of the *one only true Religion.* But that your Care is only of Conformity to the Church of *England*, and that by *the true Religion* you mean nothing elſe, appears too from your Way of expreſſing your ſelf in this Paſſage, where you *own* that you *ſuppoſe that as this only true Religion* (to wit, the National Religion now in *England*, back'd with the publick Authority of Law) *ought to be received where-ever it is preached; ſo where-ever it is received, all other Religions ought to be diſcouraged in ſome Meaſure by the Civil Powers.* If the Religion eſtabliſh'd by Law in *England*, be the only true Religion, ought it not to be preached and received every where, and all other Religions diſcouraged throughout the World? And ought not the Magiſtrates of all Countries take Care that it ſhould be ſo? But you only ſay, *where-ever* it is preach'd it ought to be received; and *where-ever* it is received, other Religions ought to be diſcouraged, which is well ſuted to your Scheme for enforcing Conformity in *England*, but could ſcarce drop from a Man whoſe Thoughts were on the true Religion, and the promoting of it in other Parts of the World.

Pag. 11.

Ibid.

Force then muſt be uſed in *England*, and Penalties laid on Diſſenters there. For what? *to bring them to the true Religion*, whereby it is plain you mean not only the Doctrine but Diſcipline and Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, and make them a Part of the only true Religion: Why elſe do you puniſh all Diſſenters for rejecting the true Religion, and uſe Force to bring them to it? When yet a great, if not the greateſt Part of Diſſenters in *England* own and profeſs the Doctrine of the Church of *England* as firmly as thoſe in the Communion of the Church of *England*. They therefore, though they believe the ſame Religion with you, are excluded from the true Church of God, that you would have Men brought to, and are amongſt thoſe who *reject the true Religion.*

I ask whether they are not in your Opinion out of the *way of Salvation*, who are not joined in Communion with the true Church? And whether there can be any true Church without Biſhops? If ſo, all but Conformiſts in *England* that are of any Church in *Europe*, beſides the Lutherans and Papiſts, are out of the *way of Salvation*, and ſo according to your Syſtem have need of Force to be brought into it: And theſe too, one for their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, the other for that of Conſubſtantiation, (to omit other things vaſtly differing from the Church of *England*) you will not, I ſuppoſe, allow to be of the true Religion: And who then are left of the true Religion but the Church of *England?* For the *Abyſſines* have too wide a Difference in many Points for me to imagine, that is one of thoſe Places you mean where *Toleration would do*

Harm

Harm as well as in England. And I think the Religion of the Greek Church can ſcarce be ſuppoſed by you to be the true. For if it ſhould, it would be a ſtrong Inſtance againſt your Aſſertion, that the true Religion cannot ſubſiſt, but would quickly be effectually extirpated without the Aſſiſtance of Authority, ſince this has ſubſiſted without any ſuch Aſſiſtance now above 200 Years. I take it then for granted, (and others with me cannot but do the ſame, till you tell us, what other Religion there is of any Church, but that of *England*, which you allow to be the true Religion) that all you ſay of bringing Men to the true Religion, is only bringing them to the Religion of the Church of *England*. If I do you an Injury in this, it will be capable of a very eaſy Vindication: for it is but naming that other Church differing from that of *England*, which you allow to have the true Religion, and I ſhall yield my ſelf con-
Pag. 27. vinc'd, and ſhall allow theſe Words, *viz. The National Religion now in* England, *back'd by the publick Authority of Law, being the only true Religion*, only as a little haſty Sally of your Zeal. In the mean time I ſhall argue with you about the Uſe of Force to bring Men to the Religion of the Church of *England*, as eſtabliſhed by Law: ſince it is more eaſy to know what that is, than what you mean by the *true Religion*, if you mean any thing elſe.

To proceed therefore; in the next place I tell you, by uſing Force your Way to bring Men to the Religion of the Church of *England*, you mean only to bring them to an outward Profeſſion of that Religion? and that, as I have told you elſewhere, becauſe Fore uſed your Way, being applied only to Diſſenters, and ceaſing as ſoon as they conform, (whether it be intended by the Law-maker for any thing more or no, which we have examined in another Place) cannot be to bring Men to any thing more than outward Conformity. For if Force be uſed to Diſſenters, and them only, to bring Men to the true Religion, and always as ſoon as it has brought Men to Conformity, it be taken off, and laid aſide, as having done all is expected from it; 'tis plain, that by *bringing Men to the true Religion*, and bringing them to outward Conformity, you mean the ſame thing. You uſe and continue Force upon Diſſenters, becauſe you expect ſome Effect from it: when you take it off, it has wrought that Effect, or elſe being in your Power, why do you not continue it on? The Effect then that you talk of, being the *embracing the true Religion*, and the thing you are ſatisfied with without any farther Puniſhment, Expectation, or Enquiry, being outward Conformity, 'tis plain *embracing the true Religion* and outward Conformity with you, are the ſame Things.

Neither can you ſay it is *preſumable* that thoſe who outwardly conform do really underſtand, and inwardly in their Hearts embrace with a lively Faith and a ſincere Obedience, the Truth that muſt ſave them. 1. Becauſe it being, as you tell us, the *Magiſtrate's Duty* to do all *that in him lies* for the Salvation of all his Subjects, and it being in his Power to examine, whether they know and live ſuitable to the Truth that muſt ſave them, as well as conform, he can or ought no more to preſume, that they do ſo, without taking an Account of their Knowledge and Lives, than he can or ought to preſume that they conform, without taking any Account of their coming to Church. Would you think that Phyſician diſcharged his Duty, and had (as was pretended) a Care of Mens Lives, who having got them into his Hands, and knowing no more of them, but that they come once or twice a Week to the Apothecary's Shop, to hear what is preſcribed them, and ſit there a while, ſhould ſay it was *preſumable* they were recovered, without ever examining whether his Preſcriptions had any Effect, or what Eſtate their Health was in?

2. I cannot be *preſumable*, where there are ſo many viſible Inſtances to the contrary. He muſt paſs for an admirable Preſumer, who ſeriouſly affirm that it is *preſumable* that all thoſe who conform to the National Religion where it is true, do ſo underſtand, believe and practice it, as to be in *the way of Salvation.*

3. It cannot be *preſumable*, that Men have parted with their *Corruption* and *Luſts* to avoid Force, when they fly to Conformity, which can ſhelter them from Force
Pag. 7. without quitting their Luſts. That which is dearer to Men than their Firſt-born, is, you tell us, *their Luſts*; that which is harder than the *Hardſhips* of falſe Religions, is the *mortifying* thoſe *Luſts*: here lies the Difficulty of the true Religion, that it requires the mortifying of thoſe Luſts; and till that be done, Men are not of *the true Religion, nor in the Way of Salvation*: And 'tis upon this Account only that you pretend Force to be needful. Force is uſed to make them *hear*; it prevails, Men hear but that is not enough, becauſe the Difficulty lies not in that; they may hear Arguments for the Truth, and yet retain their Corruption. They muſt do more, they

muſt

muſt *conſider* thoſe Arguments. Who requires it of them? The Law that inflicts the Puniſhment, does not; but this we may be ſure their Love of their Luſts, and their Hatred of Puniſhment requires of them, and will bring them to, *viz.* to *conſider* how to retain their beloved Luſts, and yet avoid the Uneaſineſs of the Puniſhment they lie under; this is *preſumable* they do; therefore they go one eaſy Step farther, they conform, and then they are ſafe from Force, and may ſtill retain their Corruption. Is it therefore *preſumable* they have parted with their Corruption, becauſe Force has driven them to take Sanctuary againſt Puniſhment in Conformity, where Force is no longer to moleſt them, or pull them from their darling Inclinations? The Difficulty in Religion is, you ſay, for Men to part with their Luſts; this makes Force neceſſary: Men find out a Way by conforming to avoid Force without parting with their Luſts, therefore it is *preſumable* when they conform, that Force which they can avoid without quitting their Luſts, has made them part with them; which is indeed not to part with their Luſts, becauſe of Force, but to part with them *gratis*; which if you can ſay is *preſumable*, the Foundation of your need of Force (which you place in the Prevalency of Corruption, and Mens adhering to their Luſts) will be gone, and ſo there will be no need of Force at all. If the great Difficulty in Religion be for Men to part with or mortify their Luſts, and the only Counter-ballance in the other Scale, to aſſiſt the true Religion, to prevail againſt their Luſts, be Force; which I beſeech you is *preſumable*, if they can avoid Force, and retain their Luſts, that they ſhould quit their Luſts, and heartily embrace the true Religion, which is incompatible with them; or elſe that they ſhould avoid the Force, and retain their Luſts? To ſay the former of theſe, is to ſay that it is *preſumable*, that they will quit their Luſts, and heartily embrace the true Religion for its own ſake: for he that heartily embraces the true Religion, becauſe of a Force which he knows he can avoid at Pleaſure, without quitting his Luſts, cannot be ſaid to embrace it, becauſe of that Force: Since a Force he can avoid without quitting his Luſts, cannot be ſaid to aſſiſt Truth in making him quit them: For in this Truth has no Aſſiſtance from it at all. So that this is to ſay there is no need of Force at all in the Caſe.

Take a covetous Wretch, whoſe Heart is ſo ſet on Money, that he would give *his Firſt-born* to ſave his Bags; who is purſued by the Force of the Magiſtrate to an Arreſt, and compelled to hear what is alledg'd againſt him; and the Proſecution of the Law threatning Impriſonment or other Puniſhment, if he do not pay the juſt Debt which is demanded of him: If he enters himſelf in the *King's-Bench*, where he can enjoy his Freedom without paying the Debt, and parting with his Money; will you ſay that it is *preſumable* he did it to pay the Debt, and not to avoid the Force of the Law? The Luſt of the Fleſh and Pride of Life are as ſtrong and prevalent as the Luſt of the Eye: And if you will deliberately ſay again, that it is *preſumable*, that Men are driven by Force to conſider, ſo as to part with their Luſts, when no more is known of them, but that they do what diſcharges them from the Force, without any Neceſſity of parting with their Luſts; I think I ſhall have Occaſion to ſend you to my *Pagans* and *Mahometans*, but ſhall have no need to ſay any thing more to you of this Matter my ſelf.

I agree with you, that there is but one only true Religion; I agree too that that one only true Religion is profeſſed and held in the Church of *England*; and yet I deny, if Force may be uſed to bring Men to that true Religion, that upon your Principles it can lawfully be uſed to bring Men to the National Religion in *England* as eſtabliſhed by Law; becauſe Force, according to your own Rule, being only lawful becauſe it is neceſſary, and therefore unfit *to be uſed where not neceſſary*, i. e. neceſ- Pag. 30.
ſary to bring Men to Salvation, it can never be lawful to be uſed to bring a Man to any thing, that is not neceſſary to Salvation, as I have more fully ſhewn in another Place. If therefore in the National Religion of *England*, there be any Thing put in as neceſſary to Communion, that is, tho' true, yet not neceſſary to Salvation, Force cannot be lawfully uſed to bring Men to that Communion, tho' the Thing ſo required in it ſelf may perhaps be true.

There be a great many Truths contained in Scripture, which a Man may be ignorant of, and conſequently not believe, without any Danger to his Salvation, or elſe very few would be capable of Salvation: For I think I may truly ſay, there was never any one, but he that was the Wiſdom of the Father, who was not ignorant of ſome, and miſtaken in others of them. To bring Men therefore to embrace ſuch Truths, the Uſe of Force by your own Rule cannot be lawful; becauſe the Belief or Knowledge of

thoſe

thoſe Truths themſelves not being neceſſary to Salvation, there can be no Neceſſity Men ſhould be brought to embrace them, and ſo no Neceſſity to uſe Force to bring Men to embrace them.

The only true Religion which is neceſſary to Salvation, may in one National Church have that joined with it, which in it ſelf is manifeſtly falſe and repugnant to Salvation; in ſuch a Communion no Man can join without quitting the Way of Salvation. In another National Church, with this only true Religion may be joined, what is neither repugnant nor neceſſary to Salvation; and of ſuch there may be ſeveral Churches differing one from another in Confeſſions, Ceremonies and Diſcipline, which are uſually call'd different Religions, with either or each of which a good Man (if ſatisfied in his own Mind) may communicate without Danger, whilſt another not ſatisfied in Conſcience concerning ſomething in the Doctrine, Diſcipline, or Worſhip, cannot ſafely, nor without Sin, communicate with this or that of them. Nor can Force be lawfully uſed, on your Principles, to bring any Man to either of them, becauſe ſuch Things are required to their Communion, which not being requiſite to Salvation, Men may ſeriouſly and conſcientiouſly differ, and be in doubt about, without endangering their Souls.

That which here raiſes a Noiſe, and gives a Credit to it, whereby many are miſled into an unwarrantable Zeal, is, that theſe are called different Religions; and every one thinking his own the true, the only true, condemns all the reſt as falſe Religions. Whereas thoſe who hold all Things neceſſary to Salvation, and add not thereto any Thing in Doctrine, Diſcipline or Worſhip, inconſiſtent with Salvation, are of one and the ſame Religion, tho' divided into different Societies or Churches, under different Forms: Which whether the Paſſion and Polity of Deſigning; or the ſober and pious Intention of well-meaning Men, ſet up, they are no other, than the Contrivances of Men, and ſuch they ought to be eſteemed in whatſoever is required in them, which God has not made neceſſary to Salvation, however in its own Nature it may be indifferent, lawful or true. For none of theſe Articles, or Confeſſions of any Church, that I know, containing in them all the Truths of Religion, tho' they contain ſome that are not neceſſary to Salvation, to garble thus the Truths of Religion, and by their own Authority take ſome not neceſſary to Salvation, and make them the Terms of Communion; and leave out others as neceſſary to be known and believed, is purely the Contrivance of Men: God never having appointed any ſuch diſtinguiſhing Syſtem; nor, as I have ſhew'd, can Force, upon your Principles, lawfully be uſed to bring Men to embrace it.

Concerning Ceremonies, I ſhall here only ask you whether you think Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, or the Croſs in Baptiſm, are neceſſary to Salvation? I mention theſe as having been Matter of great Scruple: If you will not ſay they are, how can you ſay that Force can be lawfully uſed to bring Men into a Communion, to which theſe are made neceſſary? If you ſay, Kneeling is neceſſary to a decent Uniformity, (for of the Croſs in Baptiſm I have ſpoken elſewhere) tho' that ſhould be true, yet 'tis an Argument you cannot uſe for it, if you are of the Church of *England*: For if a decent Uniformity may be well enough preſerved without Kneeling at Prayer, where Decency requires it at leaſt as much as at receiving the Sacrament, why may it not well enough be preſerved without kneeling at the Sacrament? Now that Uniformity is thought ſufficiently preſerved without kneeling at Prayer, is evident by the various Poſtures Men are at liberty to uſe, and may be generally obſerved, in all our Congregations, during the Miniſter's Prayer in the Pulpit before and after his Sermon, which it ſeems can conſiſt well enough with Decency and Uniformity; tho' it be at Prayer, addreſſed to the great God of Heaven and Earth, to whoſe Majeſty it is that the Reverence to be expreſſed in our Geſtures is due, when we put up Petitions to him, who is invariably the ſame, in what or whoſe Words ſoever we addreſs our ſelves to him.

The Preface to the Book of Common-Prayer tells us, That *the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be uſed in Divine Worſhip, are Things in their own Nature indifferent and alterable.* Here I ask you, whether any human Power can make any Thing, in its own Nature indifferent, neceſſary to Salvation? If it cannot, then neither can any human Power be juſtified in the Uſe of Force, to bring Men to Conformity in the Uſe of ſuch Things. If you think Men have Authority to make any Thing, in it ſelf indifferent, a neceſſary Part of God's Worſhip, I ſhall deſire you to conſider what our Author ſays of this Matter, which has not yet deſerved your Notice.

The

The misapplying *his Power*, you say, is a *Sin* in the *Magistrate, and lays him open to Divine Vengeance.* And is it not a misapplying of his Power, and a Sin in him to use Force to bring Men to such a Compliance in an indifferent Thing, which in religious Worship may be a Sin to them? Force, you say, may be used to punish those who dissent from the Communion of the Church of *England.* Let us suppose now all its Doctrines not only true, but necessary to Salvation; but that there is put into the Terms of its Communion some indifferent Action which God has not enjoin'd, nor made a Part of his Worship, which any Man is persuaded in his Conscience not to be lawful; suppose kneeling at the Sacrament, which having been superstitiously used in Adoration of the Bread, as the real Body of Christ, may give occasion of Scruple to some now, as well as eating of Flesh offered to Idols did to others in the Apostles Time; which tho' lawful in it self, yet the Apostle said, he would *eat no Flesh while the Word standeth,* rather than to make his weak Brother offend. And if to lead, by Example, the Scrupulous into any Action, in it self indifferent, which they thought unlawful, be a Sin, as appears at large, *Rom.* xiv. how much more is it to add Force to our Example, and to compel Men by Punishments to that, which, tho' indifferent in it self, they cannot join in without sinning? I desire you to shew me how Force can be *necessary* in such a Case, without which you acknowledge it not to be lawful. Not to kneel at the Lord's Supper, God not having ordained it, isnot a Sin; and the Apostles receiving it in the Posture of sitting or lying, which was then used at Meat, is an Evidence it may be receiv'd not kneeling. But to him that thinks kneeling is unlawful, it is certainly a Sin. And for this you may take the Authority of a very Judicious and Reverend Prelate of our Church, in these Words? *Where a Man is mistaken in his Judgment, even in that Case, it is always a Sin to act against it; by so doing, he wilfully acts against the best Light which at present he has for the Direction of his Actions.* I need not here repeat his Reasons, having already quoted him above more at large; tho' the whole Passage, writ (as he uses) with great Strength and Clearness, deserves to be read and considered. If therefore the Magistrate enjons such an unnecessary Ceremony, and uses Force to bring any Man to a sinful Communion with our Church in it, let me ask you, Doth he *sin*, or *misapply* his Power or no?

1 Cor. 18. 13.

Disc. of Conscience, p. 18.

True and false Religions are Names that easily engage Mens Affections on the hearing of them; the one being the Aversion, the other the Desire (at least as they persuade themselves) of all Mankind. This makes Men forwardly give into these Names, where-ever they meet with them; and when Mention is made of bringing Men from false to the true Religion (very often without knowing what is meant by those Names) they think nothing can be done too much in such a Business, to which they entitle God's Honour, and the Salvation of Mens Souls.

I shall therefore desire of you, if you are that fair and sincere Lover of Truth you profess, when you write again, to tell us what you mean by *true*, and what by a *false Religion*, that we may know which in your Sense are so: For as you now have used these Words in your Treatise, one of them seems to stand only for the Religion of the Church of *England*, and the other for that of all other Churches. I expect here you should make the same Outcries against me, as you have in your former Letter, for imposing a Sense upon your Words contrary to your Meaning; and for this you will appeal to your own Words in some other Places: But of this I shall leave the Reader Judge, and tell him, this is a Way very easy and very usual to Men, who having not clear and consistent Notions, keep themselves as much as they can, under the Shelter of general, and variously applicable Terms, that they may save themselves from the Absurdities and Consequences of one Place, by a Help from some general or contrary Expression in another: Whether it be a Desire of Victory, or a little too warm Zeal for a Cause you have been hitherto persuaded of, which hath led you into this Way of writing; I shall only mind you, that the Cause of God requires nothing, but what may be spoken out plainly in a clear determined Sense, without any Reserve or Cover. In the mean time this I shall leave with you as evident, That Force upon your Ground cannot be lawfully used to bring Men to the Communion of the Church of *England*, (that being all that I can find you clearly mean by *the true Religion*) till you have proved that all that is required of one in that Communion, is necessary to Salvation.

However therefore you tell us, That *convenient Force used to bring Men to the true Religion, is all that* you *contend for, and all that* you *allow.* Pag. 21. That it is for *promoting the true Religion.* Pag. 17, 18. That it is *to bring Men to consider, so as not to reject the Truth necessary to Salvation.* Pag. 28, 29. To *bring Men to embrace the Truth that must save them.* Pag. 26. And abundance

more to this Purpoſe. Yet all this Talk of the *true Religion* amounting to no more but the National Religion eſtabliſhed by Law in *England*; and your *bringing Men to it*, to no more than bringing them to an outward Profeſſion of it; it would better have ſuited that Condition, (*viz.* without *Prejudice*, and *with an honeſt Mind*) which you require in others, to have ſpoke plainly what you aimed at, rather than prepoſſeſs Mens Minds in favour of your Cauſe, by the Impreſſions of a Name that in Truth did not properly belong to it.

L. 2. p. 2. It was not therefore without Ground that I ſaid, "I ſuſpected you built all on this "lurking Suppoſition, that the National Religion now in *England*, back'd by the "publick Authority of the Law, is the only true Religion, and therefore no other is "to be tolerated: which being a Suppoſition equally unavoidable, and equally juſt "in other Countries; unleſs we can imagine, that every where but in *England*, Men "believe what at the ſame time they think to be a Lie, *&c.* Here you erect your Plumes, and to this your triumphant Logick gives you not Patience to anſwer, without an Air of Victory in the Entrance: *How, Sir, is this Suppoſition equally unavoidable, and equally juſt in other Countries, where falſe Religions are the National? (for that you muſt mean, or nothing to the Purpoſe.)* Hold, Sir, you go too faſt: take your own Syſtem with you, and you will perceive it will be enough to my Purpoſe, if I mean thoſe Religions which you take to be falſe; for if there be any other National Churches, which agreeing with the Church of *England* in what is neceſſary to Salvation, yet have eſtabliſhed Ceremonies different from thoſe of the Church of *England*; ſhould not any one who diſſented here from the Church of *England* upon that account, as preferring that to our Way of Worſhip, be juſtly puniſhed? If ſo, then Puniſhment in Matters of Religion being only to bring Men to the *true Religion*, you muſt ſuppoſe him not to be yet of it, and ſo the National Church he approves of, not to be of the *true Religion*. And yet is it not equally unavoidable, and equally juſt, that that Church ſhould ſuppoſe its Religion the only true Religion, as it is that yours ſhould do ſo, it agreeing with yours in Things neceſſary to Salvation, and having made ſome Things, in their own Nature indifferent, requiſite to Conformity for Decency and Order, as you have done? So that my ſaying, It is equally unavoidable, and equally juſt in *other Countries*, will hold good, without meaning what you charge on me, that that Suppoſition is equally unavoidable, and equally juſt, where the *National Religion* is abſolutely *falſe*.

Pag. 11.

But in that large Senſe too, what I ſaid will hold good; and you would have ſpared your uſeleſs Subtilties againſt it, if you had been as willing to take my Meaning, and anſwered my Argument, as you were to turn what I ſaid to a Senſe which the Words themſelves ſhew I never intended. My Argument in ſhort was this, That granting Force to be uſeful to propagate and ſupport Religion, yet it would be no Advantage to the true Religion, that you a Member of the Church of *England*, ſuppoſing yours to be the true Religion, ſhould thereby claim a Right to uſe Force, ſince ſuch a Suppoſition to thoſe who were Members of other Churches, and believed other Religions, was equally unavoidable, and equally juſt. And the Reaſon I annexed, ſhews both this to be my Meaning, and my Aſſertion to be true: My Words are, "Unleſs we can imagine that every where but in *England*, Men believe what at the ſame time they think "to be a Lie. Having therefore never ſaid, nor thought that it is equally unavoidable, or equally juſt, that Men in every Country ſhould believe the National Religion of the Country; but that it is equally unavoidable, and equally juſt, that Men believing the National Religion of their Country, be it true or falſe, ſhould ſuppoſe it to be true; and let me here add alſo, ſhould endeavour to propagate it: You however go on thus to reply; *If ſo, then I fear it will be equally true too, and equally rational: for otherwiſe I ſee not how it can be equally unavoidable, or equally juſt: for if it be not equally true, it cannot be equally juſt; and if it be not equally rational, it cannot be equally unavoidable. But if it be equally true, and equally rational, then either all Religions are true, or none is true: for if they be all equally true, and one of them be not true, then none of them can be true.* I challenge any one to put theſe four good Words, *unavoidable*, *juſt*, *rational*, and *true*, more *equally* together, or to make a better-wrought Deduction: But after all, my Argument will nevertheleſs be good, that it is no Advantage to your Cauſe, for you or any one of it, to ſuppoſe yours to be the only true Religion; ſince it is equally unavoidable, and equally juſt for any one, who believes any other Religion, to ſuppoſe the ſame Thing. And this will always be ſo, till you can ſhew, that Men cannot receive falſe Religions upon Arguments that appear to them to be good; or that having received Falſhood under the Appearance of Truth, they can, whilſt it ſo appears, do otherwiſe than value it, and be acted by it, as if it were true. For the *Equality* that is here in queſtion, depends not upon the

Truth

Truth of the Opinion embraced, but on this, that the Light and Perſwaſion a Man has at preſent, is the Guide which he ought to follow, and which in his Judgment of Truth he cannot avoid to be governed by. And therefore the terrible Conſequences you dilate on in the following Part of that Page, I leave you for your private Uſe on ſome fitter Occaſion.

You therefore who are ſo apt, without Cauſe, to complain of want of Ingenuity in others, will do well hereafter to conſult your own, and another time change your Stile; and not under the undefined Name of *the True Religion*, becauſe that is of more Advantage to your Argument, mean only the Religion eſtabliſhed by Law in *England*, ſhutting out all other Religions now profeſſed in the World. Tho' when you have defined what is the True Religion, which you would have ſupported and propagated by Force; and have told us 'tis to be found in the Liturgy and Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of *England*; and it be agreed to you, that that is *the only True Religion*, your Argument (for Force as neceſſary to Mens Salvation) from the want of Light and Strength enough in the True Religion to prevail againſt Mens Luſts, and the Corruption of their Nature, will not hold: becauſe your *bringing* Men by Force, your Way applied, to the True Religion, be it what you will, is but bringing them to an outward Conformity to the National Church. But the bringing them ſo far, and no farther, having no Oppoſition to their Luſts, no Inconſiſtency with their corrupt Nature, is not on that account at all neceſſary, nor does at all help, where only, on your Grounds, you ſay, there is need of the Aſſiſtance of Force towards their Salvation.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Salvation to be procured by Force your Way.

THERE cannot be imagined a more laudable Deſign than the promoting the Salvation of Mens Souls, by any one who ſhall undertake it. But if it be a Pretence made uſe of to cover ſome other By-Intereſt, nothing can be more odious to Men, nothing more provoking to the great God of Heaven and Earth, nothing more misbecoming the Name and Character of a Chriſtian. With what Intention you took your Pen in Hand to defend and encourage the Uſe of Force in the Buſineſs of Mens Salvation, 'tis fit in Charity we take your Word; but what your Scheme, as you have delivered it, is guilty of, 'tis my Buſineſs to take notice of, and repreſent to you.

To my ſaying, that if Perſecution, as is pretended, were for the Salvation of Mens Souls, bare Conformity would not ſerve the turn, but Men would be examined whether they do it upon Reaſon and Conviction: You anſwer, *Who they be that pretend that Perſecution is for the Salvation of Mens Souls, you know not.* Whatever you know not, I know one, who in the Letter under Conſideration pleads for Force, as *uſeful for the promoting the Salvation of Mens Souls*: and that the Uſe of Force is no *other Means for the Salvation of Mens Souls, than what the Author and Finiſher of our Faith has directed.* That *ſo far is the Magiſtrate, when he gives his Helping-Hand to the Furtherance of the Goſpel, by laying convenient Penalties upon ſuch as reject it, or any Part of it, from uſing any other Means for the Salvation of Mens Souls than what the Author and Finiſher of our Faith has directed, that he does no more than his Duty for promoting the Salvation of Souls.* And *as the Means by which Men may be brought into the Way of Salvation.* Ay, but where do you ſay that *Perſecution* is for the *Salvation of Souls?* I thought you had been arguing againſt my Meaning, and againſt the Things I ſay, and not againſt my Words in your Meaning, which is not againſt me. That I uſed the Word *Perſecution* for what you call Force and Penalties, you knew: For in *pag.* 21. that immediately precedes this, you take notice of it, with ſome little kind of Wonder, in theſe Words, *Perſecution, ſo it ſeems you call all Puniſhments for Religion.* That I do ſo then (whether properly or improperly) you could not be ignorant; and then, I beſeech you, apply your Anſwer here to what I ſay: My Words are, "If Perſecution (as is pretended) were for the Salvation of Mens "Souls, Men that conform would be examined whether they did ſo upon Rea- "ſon and Conviction. Change my Word *Perſecution* into *Puniſhment for Religion*, and

L. 2. p. 164.

Pag. 22.

Pag. 17.

Pag. 31.

Pag. 32.

Pag. 58.

and then conſider the Truth or Ingenuity of your Anſwer: for in that Senſe of the Word *Perſecution*, Do *you know no body that pretends Perſecution is for the Salvation of Mens Souls?* So much for your Ingenuity, and the Arts you allow your ſelf to *ſerve* a good *Cauſe*. What do you think of one of my *Pagans* or *Mahometans?* Could he have done better? For I ſhall often have occaſion to mind you of them. Now to your Argument. I ſaid, "That I thought thoſe who make Laws, and uſe Force, to bring Men "to Church-Conformity in Religion, ſeek only the Compliance, but concern themſelves not for the Conviction of thoſe they puniſh, and ſo never uſe Force to convince. For pray tell me, When any Diſſenter conforms, and enters into the "Church-Communion, is he ever examined to ſee whether he does it upon *Reaſon* "*and Conviction, and ſuch Grounds* as would *become a Chriſtian concerned for Religion?* If "Perſecution (as is pretended) were for the Salvation of Mens Souls, this would be "done, and Men not driven to take the Sacrament to keep their Places, or obtain "Licences to ſell Ale, (for ſo low have theſe holy Things been proſtituted.) To this

Pag. 22. you here reply, *As to thoſe Magiſtrates, who having provided ſufficiently for the Inſtruction of all under their Care, in the true Religion, do make Laws, and uſe moderate Penalties, to bring Men to the Communion of the Church of God, and Conformity to the Rules and Orders of it, I think their Behaviour does plainly enough ſpeak them to ſeek and concern themſelves for the Conviction of thoſe whom they puniſh, and for their Compliance only as the Fruit of their Conviction.* If Means of Inſtruction were all, that is neceſſary to convince People, the *providing ſufficiently for Inſtruction* would be an Evidence, that thoſe that did ſo, did *ſeek and concern themſelves* for Mens *Conviction*: But if there be ſomething as neceſſary for Conviction as the Means of Inſtruction, and without which thoſe Means will ſignify nothing, and that be *ſevere and impartial Examination*; and if Force be, as you ſay, ſo neceſſary to make Men thus *examine*, that they can by no other Way but Force be brought to do it: If Magiſtrates do not lay their Penalties on Non-Examination, as well as *provide Means of Inſtruction*, whatever you may ſay you *think*, few People will find Reaſon to believe you *think* thoſe Magiſtrates *ſeek and concern themſelves* much *for the Conviction of thoſe they puniſh*, when that Puniſhment is not levell'd at that, which is a Hindrance to their Conviction, *i. e.* againſt their Averſion to *ſevere and impartial Examination*. To that Averſion no Puniſhment can be pretended to be a Remedy, which does not reach and combat the Averſion; which 'tis plain no Puniſhment does, which may be avoided without parting with, or abating the Prevalency of that Averſion. This is the Caſe, where Men undergo Puniſhments for not conforming, which they may be rid of, without *ſeverely and impartially examining Matters of Religion.*

Ibid. To ſhew that what I mentioned was no Sign of Unconcernedneſs in the Magiſtrate, for Mens Conviction; You add, *Nor does the contrary appear from the not examining Diſſenters when they conform, to ſee whether they do it upon Reaſon and Conviction: For where ſufficient Inſtruction is provided, it is ordinarily preſumable that when Diſſenters conform, they do it upon Reaſon and Conviction.* Here if *ordinarily* ſignifies any thing, (for it is a Word you make much uſe of, whether to expreſs or cover your Senſe, let the Reader judge,) then you ſuppoſe there are Caſes wherein it is *not preſumable*; and I ask you, Whether in thoſe, or any Caſes, it be examin'd whether Diſſenters when they conform, do it upon *Reaſon and Conviction?* At beſt that it is *ordinarily preſumable*, is but *gratis dictum*, eſpecially ſince you ſuppoſe, that it is the *Corruption* of their *Nature* that hinders them from *conſidering as they ought, ſo as upon Reaſon and Conviction to embrace the Truth*: Which Corruption of Nature, that they may retain with Conformity I think is very *preſumable*. But be that as it will, this I am ſure is *ordinarily* and always *preſumable*, that if thoſe who uſe Force were as intent upon Mens Conviction, as they are on their Conformity, they would not wholly content themſelves with the one, without ever examining and looking into the other.

Ibid. Another Excuſe you make for this Neglect, is, That *as to irreligious Perſons who only ſeek their ſecular Advantage, how eaſy it is for them to pretend Conviction, and to offer ſuch Grounds, (if that were required) as would become a Chriſtian concerned for Religion; that is, what no Care of Man can certainly prevent.* This is an admirable Juſtification of your Hypotheſis. Men are to be puniſhed: To what End? To make them *ſeverely and impartially conſider Matters of Religion*, that they may be convinced, and thereupon ſincerely embrace the Truth. But what need of Force or Puniſhment for this? Becauſe their Luſts and Corruptions will otherwiſe keep them both

from

from *conſidering as they ought*, and embracing the true Religion; and therefore they muſt lie under Penalties till they have *conſider'd as they ought*, which is when they have upon Conviction embraced. But how ſhall the Magiſtrate know when they upon Conviction *embrace*, that he may then take off their Penalties? That indeed cannot be known, and ought not to be enquired after, becauſe *irreligious Perſons who only ſeek their ſecular Advantage*; or, in other Words, all thoſe who deſire at their Eaſe to retain their beloved Luſts and Corruptions, may *eaſily pretend Conviction, and offer ſuch Grounds (if it were required) as would become a Chriſtian concerned for Religion: This is what no Care of Man can certainly prevent.* Which is Reaſon enough, why no buſy Forwardneſs in Man to diſeaſe his Brother, ſhould uſe Force upon Pretence of prevailing againſt Mans Corruptions, that hinder their conſidering and embracing the Truth upon Conviction, when 'tis confeſſed, it cannot be known, whether they have *conſidered*, are *convinced*, or have really embraced the true Religion or no. And thus you have ſhewn us your admirable Remedy, which is not it ſeems for the *irreligious*, (for 'tis *eaſy*, you ſay, *for* them *to pretend to Conviction*, and ſo avoid Puniſhment) but for thoſe who would be religious without it.

But here, in this Caſe, as to the Intention of the Magiſtrate, how can it be ſaid, that the Force he uſes is deſigned by ſubduing Mens Corruptions, to make way for conſidering and embracing the Truth, when it is ſo applied, that it is confeſſed here, that a Man may get rid of the Penalties without parting with the Corruptions, they are pretended to be uſed againſt? But you have a ready Anſwer, *This is what no Care of Man can certainly prevent*; which is but in other Words to proclaim the Ridiculouſneſs of your Uſe of Force, and to avow that your Method can do nothing. If by not *certainly*, you mean it may any way, or to any degree *prevent*, why is it not ſo done? If not, why is a Word that ſignifies nothing put in, unleſs it be for a Shelter on Occaſion? A Benefit you know how to draw from this Way of Writing: But this here taken how you pleaſe, will only ſerve to lay Blame on the Magiſtrate, or your Hypotheſis, chuſe you whether. I for my part have a better Opinion of the Ability and Management of the Magiſtrate: What he aimed at in his Laws, that I believe he mentions in them, and as wiſe Men do in Buſineſs, ſpoke out plainly what he had a mind ſhould be done. But *certainly* there cannot a more ridiculous Character be put on Law-makers, than to tell the World they intended to make Men *conſider*, *examine*, &c. but yet neither required nor named any thing in their Laws but Conformity. 'Tho' yet when Men are certainly to be puniſhed for not really embracing the true Religion, there ought to be *certain Matters* of Fact, whereby thoſe that do, and thoſe that do not ſo embrace the Truth, ſhould be diſtinguiſhed; and for that you have, 'tis true, a clear and eſtabliſhed Criterion, *i. e.* Conformity and Nonconformity: which do very certainly diſtinguiſh the Innocent from the Guilty; thoſe that really and ſincerely *do embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, from thoſe that do not.

But, Sir, to reſolve the Queſtion, Whether the Conviction of Mens Underſtandings, and the Salvation of their Souls, be the Buſineſs and Aim of thoſe who uſe Force to bring Men into the Profeſſion of the National Religion; I ask, whether if that were ſo, there could be ſo many as there are, not only in moſt Country Pariſhes, but, I think I may ſay, may be found in all Parts of *England*, groſly ignorant in the Doctrines and Principles of the Chriſtian Religion, if a ſtrict Enquiry were made into it? If Force be neceſſary to be uſed to bring Men to Salvation, certainly ſome Part of it would find out ſome of the Ignorant and Unconſidering that are in the National Church, as well as it does ſo diligently all the Nonconformiſts out of it, whether they have conſidered, or are knowing or no. But to this you give a very ready Anſwer; *Would you have the Magiſtrate puniſh all indifferently, thoſe who obey the Law as well as them that do not?* What is the Obedience the Law requires? That you tell us in theſe Words, *If the Magiſtrate provides ſufficiently for the Inſtruction of all his Subjects in the true Religion, and then requires all under convenient Penalties to hearken to the Teachers and Miniſters of it, and to profeſs and exerciſe it with one Accord under their Direction in publick Aſſemblies:* Which in other Words is but Conformity, which here you expreſs a little plainer in theſe Words; *But as thoſe Magiſtrates who having provided ſufficiently for the Inſtruction of all under their Care in the true Religion do make Laws, and uſe moderate Penalties to bring Men to the Communion of the Church of God, and to confirm to the Rules and Orders of it.* You add, *Is there any Pretence to ſay that in ſo doing, he* [the Magiſtrate] *applies Force only to a Part of the Subjects, when the Law is general, and excepts none?* There is no Pretence, I confeſs, to ſay

Pag. 64. Pag. 63. Pag. 22.

that

that in ſo doing he applies Force only to a Part of his Subjects, to make them Conformiſts, from that it is plain the Law excepts none. But if Conformiſts may be ignorant, groſly ignorant of the Principles and Doctrines of Chriſtianty; if there be no Penalties uſed to make them *conſider as they ought*, ſo as to underſtand, be convinced of, believe and obey the Truths of the Goſpel, are not they exempt from that Force
Pag. 37. which you ſay is *to make Men conſider and examine Matters of Religion as they ought to do?* Force is applied to all indeed to make them Conformiſts: But if being Conformiſts once, and frequenting the Places of publick Worſhip, and there ſhewing an outward Compliance with the Ceremonies preſcribed, (for that is all the Law *requires of all*, call it how you pleaſe) they are exempt from all Force and Penalties, though they are never ſo ignorant, never ſo far from underſtanding, believing, receiving the
Pag. 16. Truths of the Goſpel; I think it is evident that then Force is not applied to all *to*
Pag. 26. *procure the Conviction of the Underſtanding. To bring Men to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are proper to convince the Mind, and which without being forced, they would*
Pag. 29. *not conſider. To bring Men to that Conſideration, which nothing elſe but Force (beſides the*
Pag. 23. *extraordinary Grace of God) would bring them to. To make Men good Chriſtians. To make*
Pag. 43. *Men receive Inſtruction. To cure their Averſion to the true Religion. To bring Men to con-*
Pag. 58. *ſider and examine the Controverſies which they are bound to conſider and examine*, i. e. *thoſe*
Pag. 2. *wherein they cannot err without diſhonouring God, and endangering their own and other Mens*
Pag. 16. *eternal Salvation. To weigh Matters of Religion carefully and impartially. To bring Men*
Pag. 13. *to the true Religion and to Salvation.* That then Force is not applied to all the Subjects for theſe Ends, I think you will not deny. Theſe are the Ends for which you tell us in the Places quoted, that Force is to be uſed in Matters of Religion: 'Tis by its *Uſefulneſs* and *Neceſſity* to thoſe Ends, that you tell us, the Magiſtrate is authorized and obliged to uſe Force in Matters of Religion. Now if all theſe Ends be not attained by a bare Conformity, and yet if by a bare Conformity Men are wholly exempt from all Force and Penalties in Matters of Religion, will you ſay that for theſe Ends Force is applied to all the Magiſtrate's Subjects? If you will, I muſt ſend you to my *Pagans* and *Mahometans* for a little *Conſcience* and *Modeſty*. If you confeſs Force is not applied to all for theſe Ends, notwithſtanding any Laws obliging all to Conformity, you muſt alſo confeſs, that what you ſay concerning the *Laws being general*, is nothing to the Purpoſe; ſince all that are under Penalties for not conforming are not under any Penalties for Ignorance, Irreligion, or the Want of thoſe Ends for which you ſay Penalties are *uſeful* and *neceſſary*.

Pag. 22. You go on, *And therefore if ſuch Perſons profane the Sacrament to keep their Places, or to obtain Licences to ſell Ale, this is an horrible Wickeneſs.* I excuſe them not. *But it is their own, and they alone muſt anſwer for it.* Yes, and thoſe who threatned poor ignorant and *irreligious* Ale-ſellers, whoſe Livelihood it was, to take away their Licences, if they did not conform and receive the Sacrament, may be thought perhaps to have
Pag. 23. ſomething to anſwer for. You add, *But it is very unjuſt to impute it to thoſe who make ſuch Laws, and uſe ſuch Force, or to ſay that they proſtitute holy Things, and drive Men to profane them.* Nor is it juſt to inſinuate in your Anſwer, as if that had been ſaid which was not. But if it be true that a poor ignorant looſe irreligious Wretch ſhould be threatned to be turn'd out of his Calling and Livelihood, if he would not take the Sacrament: May it not be ſaid theſe holy Things have been ſo low proſtituted? And if this be not profaning them, pray tell me what is?

This I think may be ſaid without Injuſtice to any body, that it does not appear, that thoſe who make ſtrict Laws for Conformity, and take no Care to have it examined upon what Grounds Men conform, are not very much concern'd, that Mens Underſtandings ſhould be *convined:* And tho' you go on to ſay, that *they deſign by their Laws to do what lies in them to make Men good Chriſtians:* That will ſcarce be be-
Pag. 58. lieved, if what you ſay be true, that Force is neceſſary to bring *thoſe who cannot be otherwiſe brought to it, to ſtudy the true Religion, with ſuch Care and Diligence as they might and ought to uſe, and with an honeſt Mind.* And yet we ſee a great Part, or any of thoſe who are ignorant in the true Religion, have no ſuch Force applied to them,
Ibid. eſpecially ſince you tell us, in the ſame Place, that *no Man ever ſtudied the true Religion with ſuch Care and Diligence as he might and ought to uſe, and with an honeſt Mind, but he was convinced of the Truth of it.* If then Force and Penalties can produce that *Study, Care, Diligence* and *honeſt Mind*, which will produce *Knowledge* and *Conviction* and (that as you ſay in the following Words) make *good Men*; I ask you, if there be found in the Communion of the Church, exempt from Force upon the Account of

Religion,

Religion, ignorant, irreligious, ill Men; and that to ſpeak moderately, not in great Diſproportion fewer than amongſt the Nonconformiſts, will you believe your ſelf, when you ſay the *Magiſtrates do by their Laws all that in them lies to make them good Chriſtians*; when they uſe not that Force to them which you, not I, ſay is *neceſſary*; and that they are, where it is neceſſary, *obliged* to uſe? And therefore I give you leave to repeat again the Words you ſubjoin here, *But if after all they* [*i. e.* the Magiſtrates] *can do, wicked and godleſs Men will ſtill reſolve to be ſo, they will be ſo, and I know not who but God Almighty can help it.* But this being ſpoken of Conformiſts, on whom the Magiſtrates lay no Penalties, uſe no Force for Religion, give me leave to mind you of the Ingenuity of one of my *Pagans* or *Mahometans*. Pag. 23.

You tell us, That the Uſefulneſs of Force to make Scholars learn, authorizes Schoolmaſters to uſe it. And would you not think a Schoolmaſter diſcharged his Duty well, and had a great Care of their Learning, who uſed his Rod only to bring Boys to School; but if they come there once a Week, whether they ſlept, or only minded their Play, never examined what Proficiency they made, or uſed the Rod to make them ſtudy and learn, tho' they would not apply themſelves without it?

But to ſhew you how much you your ſelf are in earneſt for the Salvation of Souls in this your Method, I ſhall ſet down what I ſaid, *p.* 288. of my Letter on that Subject, and what you anſwer, *p.* 68. of yours.

L. 2. *p.* 288. "You ſpeak of it here as the moſt "deplorable Condition imaginable, that Men *ſhould* "*be left to themſelves, and not be forced to conſider* "*and examine the Grounds of their Religion, and* "*ſearch impartially and diligently after the Truth.* "This you make the great Miſcarriage of Mankind; "and for this you ſeem ſolicitous, all through your "Treatiſe, to find out a Remedy? and there is "ſcarce a Leaf wherein you do not offer yours. "But what if after all, now you ſhould be found "to prevaricate? *Men have contrived to themſelves,* "ſay you, *a great Variety of Religions:* 'Tis granted. "*They ſeek not the Truth in this Matter with that* "*Application of Mind, and that Freedom of Judg-* "*ment which is requiſite:* 'Tis confeſſed. *All the* "*falſe Religions now on foot in the World, have taken* "*their Riſe from the ſlight and partial Conſideration,* "*which Men have contented themſelves with in ſearch-* "*ing after the true; and Men take them up, and per-* "*ſiſt in them for want of due Examination:* Be it ſo. "*There is need of a Remedy for this; and I have found* "*one whoſe Succeſs cannot be queſtioned:* Very well. "What is it? Let us hear it. Why, *Diſſenters muſt* "*be puniſhed.* Can any body that hears you ſay ſo, "believe you in earneſt; and that want of Exami- "nation is the Thing you would have amended, "when want of Examination is not the Thing "you would have puniſhed? If want of Examina- "tion be the Fault, want of Examination muſt be "puniſhed; if you are, as you pretend, fully ſa- "tisfied that Puniſhment is the proper and *only* "*Means* to remedy it. But if in all your Trea- "tiſe you can ſhew me one Place, where you "ſay that the Ignorant, the Careleſs, the Inconſi- "derate, the Negligent *in examining throughly the* "*Truth of their own and others Religion,* &c. are to "be puniſhed, I will allow your Remedy for a good "one. But you have not ſaid any Thing like this; "and which is more, I tell you before-hand, you "dare not ſay it. And whilſt you do not, the "World has Reaſon to judge, that however want "of

L. 3. p. 68. *Your next Paragraph runs high, and charges me with nothing leſs than* Prevarication. *For whereas, as you tell me, I ſpeak of it here as the moſt deplorable Condition imaginable, that Men ſhould be left to themſelves, and not be forced to conſider and examine the Grounds of their Religion, and ſearch impartially and diligently after the Truth,* &c. *It ſeems all the* Remedy *I offer, is no more than this,* Diſſenters muſt be puniſhed. *Upon which thus you inſult;* Can any body that hears you ſay ſo, believe you in earneſt, &c. *Now here I acknowledge, that though want or neglect of Examination be a general Fault, yet the Method I propoſe for curing it, does not reach to all that are guilty of it, but is limited to thoſe who reject the true Religion, propoſed to them with ſufficient Evidence. But then to let you ſee how little Ground you have to ſay that I* prevaricate *in this Matter, I ſhall only deſire you to conſider, what it is that the Author and my ſelf were enquiring after: For it is not, What Courſe is to be taken to* confirm *and eſtabliſh thoſe in the Truth, who have already embraced it? Nor, How they may be enabled to* propagate *it to others, (for both which Purpoſes I have already acknowledged it very uſeful, and a Thing much to be deſired, that all ſuch*

Perſons

" of Examination be a general Fault, which you " with great Vehemency have exaggerated; yet you " uſe it only for a Pretence to puniſh Diſſenters; and " either diſtruſt your Remedy, that it will not cure " this Evil, or elſe care not to have it generally cur'd. " This evidently appears from your whole Manage- " ment of the Argument. And he that reads your " Treatiſe with Attention, will be more confirm'd " in this Opinion, when he ſhall find that you " (who are ſo earneſt to have Men puniſhed, to " bring them to *conſider and examine*, that ſo they " may *diſcover the Way to Salvation*) have not ſaid " one Word of conſidering, ſearching, and heark- " ning to the Scripture; which had been as good a " Rule for a Chriſtian to have ſent them to, as to " *Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince them*, of " you know not what: As to *the Inſtruction and Go-* " *vernment of the proper Miniſters of Religion*, which " who they are, Men are yet far from being agreed; " Or as to *the Information of thoſe, who tell them* " *they have miſtaken their Way, and offer to ſhew them* " *the right*; and to the like uncertain and dange- " rous Guides; which were not thoſe that our Sa- " viour and the Apoſtles ſent Men to, but to the
Joh. 5. 39. " Scriptures. *Search the Scriptures, for in them you* " *think you have Eternal Life*, ſays our Saviour to " the unbelieving perſecuting *Jews*. And 'tis the
2 Tim. 3. 15. " Scriptures which St. *Paul* ſays, *are able to make* " *wiſe unto Salvation.*

" Talk no more therefore, if you have any Care " of your Reputation, how much *it is every Man's* " *Intereſt not to be left to himſelf, without Moleſtation,* " *without Puniſhment in Matters of Religion.* Talk " not of *bringing Men to embrace the Truth that* " *muſt ſave them*, by putting them upon *Examina-* " *tion.* Talk no more of *Force* and *Puniſhment*, as " the *only Way left to bring Men to examine.* 'Tis " evident you mean nothing leſs: For tho' want " of Examination be the only Fault you complain " of, and *Puniſhment* be in your Opinion the *only* " *Way to bring Men to it*; and this the whole De- " ſign of your Book; yet you have not once propo- " ſed in it, that thoſe who do not impartially *ex-* " *amine*, ſhould be forced to it. And that you may " not think I talk at random, when I ſay you dare " not; I will, if you pleaſe, give you ſome Reaſons " for my ſaying ſo.

" *Firſt*, Becauſe if you propoſe that all ſhould be " puniſhed, who are ignorant, who have not uſed " *ſuch Conſiderations as is apt and proper to manifeſt* " *the Truth*; but *have been determined in the Choice of* " *their Religion by Impreſſions of Education, Admira-* " *tion of Perſons, worldly Reſpects, Prejudices, and the* " *like incompetent Motives; and have taken up their* " *Religion, without examining it as they ought*; you will " propoſe to have ſeveral of your own Church (be it " what it will) puniſhed; which would be a Propo- " ſition too apt to offend too many of it, for you to " venture on. For whatever need there be of Re- " formation, every one will not thank you for pro- " poſing ſuch an one as muſt begin at (or at leaſt " reach to) the Houſe of God. " *Se-*

Perſons ſhould, as far as they are able, ſearch into the Grounds upon which their Religion ſtands, and challenges their Belief;) but the Subject of our Enquiry is on- ly, *What Method is to be uſed, to* bring *Men to the true Religion. Now if this be the only Thing we were enquiring after, (as you cannot deny it to be) then every one ſees that in ſpeaking to this Point, I had nothing to do with any who have already embraced the true Religion; becauſe they are not to be* brought *to that Religion, but only to be* confirmed *and* edified *in it; but was only to conſider how thoſe who* reject *it, may be brought to em- brace it. So that how much ſoever any of thoſe who own the true Religion may be guilty of neglect of Examination; 'tis evident, I was only concerned to ſhew how it may be* cured *in thoſe, who by reaſon of it, reject the true Religion, duly propoſed or tendered to them. And certain- ly to confine my ſelf to this, is not to* prevaricate, *unleſs to keep within the Bounds which the Queſtion under Debate preſcribes me, be to prevaricate.*

In telling me therefore that I dare not ſay that the Ignorant, the Careleſs, the Inconſiderate, the Negligent in examining, *&c. (i. e.* all *that are ſuch)* are to be puniſhed, *you only tell me that I* dare *not be impertinent. And therefore I hope you will excuſe me, if I take no notice of the three Reaſons you offer in your next Page for your ſaying ſo. And yet if I had a mind to talk impertinently, I know not why I might not have* dared *to do ſo, as well as other Men.*

There is one Thing more in this Paragraph, which though nothing more pertinent than the reſt, I ſhall not wholly paſs over. It lies in thoſe Words; He that reads your Treatiſe with At- tention, will be more confirm'd in this Opinion, *(viz. That Inſe- want of Examination only for a Pretence to puniſh Diſſenters,* &c.) when he ſhall find that you (who are ſo earneſt to have Men puniſh'd, to bring them

to

" *Secondly*, Becauſe if you ſhould propoſe that all " thoſe who are ignorant, careleſs and negligent " in examining, ſhould be puniſhed, you would have " little to ſay in this Queſtion of Toleration: For " if the Laws of the State were made as they ought " to be, equal to all the Subjects, without Diſtinction of Men of different Profeſſions in Religion; " and the Faults to be amended by Puniſhments, " were impartially puniſhed in all who are guilty of " them; this would immediately produce a perfect " Toleration, or ſhew the Uſeleſneſs of Force in " Matters of Religion. If therefore you think it " ſo neceſſary, as you ſay, for the *promoting of true* " *Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, that Men ſhould* " *be puniſhed to make them examine*; do but find a Way " to apply Force to all that have not *throughly and* " *impartially examined*, and you have my Conſent. " For tho' Force be not the proper Means of pro- " moting Religion; yet there is no better Way to " ſhew the the Uſeleſneſs of it, than the applying it " equally to Miſcarriages, in whomſoever found, " and not to diſtinct Parties or Perſuaſions of Men, " for the Reformation of them alone, when others " are equally faulty.

" *Thirdly*, Becauſe without being for as large a " Toleration as the Author propoſes, you cannot be " truly and ſincerely for a *free and impartial Exami-* " *nation*. For whoever examines, muſt have the " Liberty to judge, and follow his Judgment; or " elſe you put him upon Examination to no purpoſe. " And whether that will not as well lead Men from, " as to your Church, is ſo much a Venture, that " by your Way of Writing, 'tis evident enough you " are loath to hazard it; and if you are of the Na- " tional Church, 'tis plain your Brethren will not " bear with you in the Allowance of ſuch a Liberty. " You muſt therefore either change your *Method*; " and if the want of Examination be that great and " dangerous Fault you would have corrected, you muſt " equally puniſh all that are equally guilty of any " Neglect in this Matter, and then take your *only* " *Means*, your beloved *Force*, and make the beſt of it; " or elſe you muſt put off your Mask, and confeſs " that you deſign not your Puniſhments to bring Men " to *Examination*, but to *Conformity*. For the Fallacy " you have uſed, is too groſs to paſs upon this Age. to conſider and examine that ſo they may diſcover the Way of Salvation) have not ſaid one Word of conſidering, ſearching and hearkning to the Scripture; which had been as good a Rule for a Chriſtian to have ſent them to, as to Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince them, of you know not what, &c. *How this* confirms *that* Opinion, *I do not ſee; nor have you thought fit to inſtruct me. But as to the thing it ſelf*, viz. *my* not ſaying one Word of conſidering, ſearching, and hearkning to the Scripture; *whatever Advantage a captious Adverſary may imagine he has in it, I hope it will not ſeem ſtrange to any indifferent and judicious Perſon, who ſhall but conſider that throughout my Treatiſe I ſpeak of the true Religion only in* general, *i. e. not as limited to any particular Diſpenſation, or to the Times of the* Scriptures; *but as reaching from the Fall of* Adam *to the End of the World, and ſo comprehending the Times which preceded the Scriptures; wherein yet God* left not himſelf without Witneſs, *but furniſhed Mankind with ſufficient Means of knowing him and his Will, in order to their eternal Salvation. For I appeal to all Men of Art, whether, ſpeaking of the True Religion under this Generality, I could be allowed to deſcend to any ſuch* Rules *of it, as belong only to ſome particular Times, or Diſpenſations; ſuch as you cannot but acknowledge the* Old *and* New Teſtaments *to be.*

In this your Anſwer, you ſay, *the Subject of our Enquiry is only what Method is to be uſed to bring Men to the True Religion.* He that reads what you ſay, again and again, That the *Magiſtrate* is impower'd and *obliged* to *procure as much as in him lies*, i. e. *as far as by Penalties it can be procured that NO MAN neglect his Soul*, and ſhall remember how many Pages you employ, *A.* p. 6. &c. And here *p.* 6. &c. to ſhew that it is the Corruption of human Nature which hinders Men from doing what they may and ought for the Salvation of their Souls, and that therefore Penalties, no other Means being left, and Force were neceſſary to be uſed by the Magiſtrate to remove theſe great Obſtacles of *Luſts* and *Corruptions*, that *none of his Subjects might remain ignorant of the Way of Salvation, or refuſe to embrace it.* One would think your *Enquiry* had been after the Means of *CURING MENS Averſion to the True Religion*, (which you tell us, *p.* 53. *if not cured, is certainly deſtructive of Mens Eternal Salvation*) that ſo they might heartily embrace it for their Salvation. But here you tell us, *your Enquiry is only what Method is to be uſed to bring Men to the True Religion:* Pag. 76, 77, 78.

gion: Whereby you evidently mean nothing but outward Conformity to that which you think the true Church, as appears by the next following Words; *Now if this be the only thing we were enquiring after, then every one ſees that in ſpeaking to this Point, I had nothing to do with any who have already embraced the True Religion.* And alſo every one ſees that ſince amongſt thoſe with whom (having *already embraced the True Religion*) *you* and your Penalties *have nothing to do*; there are thoſe who have not *conſidered and examined Matters of Religion as they ought*, whoſe Luſts and corrupt Natures keep them as far alienated from believing, and as averſe to a real obeying the Truth that muſt ſave them, as any other Men; it is manifeſt that *embracing the True Religion in your Senſe* is only embracing the outward Profeſſion of it, which is nothing but outward Conformity. And that being the fartheſt you would have your Penalties purſue Men, and there leave them with as much of their Ignorance of the Truth, and Careleſneſs of their Souls, as they pleaſe, who can deny but that it would be *impertinent* in you to conſider how want of *impartial Examination*, or *Averſion* to the True Religion, ſhould in them be cured? Becauſe they are none of thoſe Subjects of the Common-wealth, whoſe *ſpiritual and eternal Intereſts* are by Political Government to be *procured or advanced*, none of thoſe Subjects whoſe *Salvation* the Magiſtrate is to *take Care* of.

And therefore I *excuſe* you, as you deſire, *for not taking notice of my three Reaſons*; but whether the Reader will do ſo or no, is more than I can undertake. I hope you too will excuſe me for having uſed ſo harſh a Word as *prevaricate*, and impute it to my want of Skill in the *Engliſh* Tongue. But when I find a Man pretend to a great Concern for the Salvation of Mens Souls, and make it one of the great *Ends* of Civil Government, that the Magiſtrate ſhould make uſe of Force to bring all his Subjects to *conſider*, *ſtudy* and *examine*, *believe* and *embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*: when I ſhall have to do with a Man, who to this Purpoſe hath writ two Books to find out and defend the proper Remedies for that general Backwardneſs and Averſion (which depraved humane Nature keeps Men in) to an impartial Search after, and hearty embracing the true Religion; and who talks of nothing leſs than Obligations on Sovereigns, both from their particular Duty, as well as from common Charity, to take Care that none of their Subjects ſhould want the Aſſiſtance of this only Means left for their Salvation; nay, who has made it ſo neceſſary to Mens Salvation, that he talks as if the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God would be brought in Queſtion, if thoſe who needed it ſhould be deſtitute of it? and yet notwithſtanding all this Shew of Concern for Mens Salvation, contrives the Application of this ſole Remedy ſo, that a great many who lie under the Diſeaſe, ſhould be out of the Reach and Benefit of his Cure, and never have this only Remedy applied to them: When this I ſay is ſo manifeſtly in his Thoughts all the while, that he is forced to confeſs *that though Want or Neglect of Examination be a general Fault, yet the Method* he *propoſes for curing it does not reach to all that are guilty of it*; but frankly owns, that he was not *concerned to ſhew* how the Neglect of Examination might *be cured* in thoſe who conform, but *only in thoſe who by reaſon of it reject the true Religion duly propoſed to them*: which rejecting the true Religion will require *a Man of Art* to ſhew to be here any thing but Nonconformity to the National Religion. When, I ſay, I meet with a Man another time that does this, who is ſo much a *Man of Art*, as to talk of all, and mean but ſome; talk of *hearty embracing the true Religion*, and mean nothing but Conformity to the National; pretend one thing, and mean another; if you pleaſe to tell me what Name I ſhall give it, I ſhall not fail: for who knows how ſoon again I may have an Occaſion for it.

If I would puniſh Men for Nonconformity without owning of it, I could not uſe a better Pretence than to ſay it was to make them hearken *to Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince them*, or to make them ſubmit *to the Inſtruction and Government of the proper Miniſters of Religion*, without any thing elſe, ſuppoſing ſtill at the bottom the *Arguments* for, and the *Miniſters* of my Religion to be theſe, that till they outwardly complied with, they were to be puniſhed. But if (inſtead of outward Conformity to my Religion covered under theſe indefinite Terms) I ſhould tell them, they were to examine the Scripture, which was the fixed Rule for them and me, not examining could not give me a Pretence to puniſh them, unleſs I ſhould alſo puniſh Conformiſts, as ignorant and unverſed in the Scripture as they, which would not do my Buſineſs.

But

But what need I uſe Arguments to ſhew, that your Puniſhing to make Men examine is deſigned only againſt Diſſenters, when in your Anſwer to this very Paragraph of mine, you in plain Words *acknowledge, that though want of Examination be a general Fault, yet the Method you propoſe for curing does not reach to all that are guilty of it?* Pag. 68. To which if you pleaſe to add what you tell us, That when *Diſſenters conform,* the Magiſtrate cannot know, and therefore never examines whether they do it *upon Reaſon and Conviction* or no, though it be certain that upon conforming Penalties, the neceſſary Means ceaſe, it will be obvious, that whatever be talked, Conformity is all that is aimed at, and that want of Examination is but the Pretence to puniſh Diſſenters Pag. 22.

And this I told you, any one muſt be convinced of, who obſerves that you (who are ſo earneſt to have Men puniſhed to bring them *to conſider and examine,* that ſo they may *diſcover the Way of Salvation*) have not ſaid one Word of conſidering, ſearching, and hearkning to the Scripture, which, you were told, was as good a Rule for a Chriſtian to have ſent Men to, as to *the Inſtruction and Government of the proper Miniſters of Religion,* or to the *Information of thoſe who tell them they have miſtaken their Way, and offer to ſhew them the right.* For this paſſing by the Scripture you give us this Reaſon, that *throughout* your *Treatiſe* you *ſpeak of the True Religion only in general,* i. e. *not as limited to any particular Diſpenſation, or to the Times of the Scriptures, but as reaching from the Fall of* Adam *to the End of the World,* &c. And then you *appeal to all Men of Art, whether ſpeaking of the True Religion, under this Generality, you could be allowed to deſcend to any ſuch Rules of it as belong only to ſome particular Times or Diſpenſations, ſuch as I cannot but acknowledge the Old and New Teſtament to be.* L. 2. p. 198. Pag. 69.

The Author that you write againſt, making it his Buſineſs (as no body can doubt who reads but the firſt Page of his Letter) to ſhew that it is the Duty of Chriſtians to tolerate both Chriſtians and others who differ from them in Religion, 'tis pretty ſtrange (in aſſerting againſt him that the Magiſtrate might and ought to uſe Force to bring Men to the *true Religion*) you ſhould mean any other Magiſtrate than the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, or any other Religion than the Chriſtian Religion. But it ſeems you took ſo little Notice of the Deſign of your Adverſary, which was to prove, that Chriſtians were not to uſe Force to bring any one to the true Chriſtian Religion; that you would prove, that Chriſtians now were to uſe Force, not only to bring Men to the Chriſtian, but alſo to the Jewiſh Religion; or that of the true Church before the Law, or to ſome *true Religion* ſo *general* that it is none of theſe. *For,* ſay you, *throughout your Treatiſe you ſpeak of the true Religion only in general,* i. e. *not as limited to any particular Diſpenſation:* Though one that were *not a Man of Art* would ſuſpect you to be of another Mind your ſelf, when you told us, the ſhutting out of the *Jews* from the Rights of the Common-wealth, *is a juſt and neceſſary Caution in a Chriſtian Common-wealth:* Which you ſay to juſtify your Exception in the Beginning of your *A.* againſt the Largeneſs of the Author's Toleration, who would not have *Jews* excluded. But *ſpeak of the true Religion only in general* as much as you pleaſe, if your *true Religion* be that by which Men muſt be ſaved, can you ſend a Man to any better Guide to that *true Religion* now than the Scriptures? Pag. 3.

If when you were in your Altitudes, writing the firſt Book, *your Men of Art could* not *allow* you to *deſcend to any ſuch Rules* as the Scriptures, (tho' even there you acknowledge the Severities ſpoken againſt, are ſuch as are uſed to make Men Chriſtians) becauſe there (by an *Art* proper to your ſelf) you were to *ſpeak of true Religion under a Generality,* which had nothing to do with the Duty of Chriſtians, in reference to Toleration. Yet when here in your ſecond Book, where you condeſcend all along to ſpeak of the *CHRISTIAN RELIGION,* and tell us, that the *Magiſtrates have Authority to make Laws for promoting the Chriſtian Religion*; and do by *their Laws deſign to contribute what in them lies to make Men good CHRISTIANS*; and complain of Toleration as the very Bane of *the Life and Spirit of CHRISTIANITY,* &c. and have vouchſafed particularly to mention the *Goſpel*; why here, having been call'd upon for it, you could not ſend Men to the Scriptures, and tell them directly, that thoſe they were to *ſtudy* diligently, thoſe they were *impartially and carefully to examine,* to bring them to the True Religion, and into the Way of Salvation: rather than talk to them as you do, of *receiving Inſtruction,* and *conſidering Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince them*; rather than propoſe, as you do all along, ſuch Objects of Examination and Enquiry in general Terms, as are as hard to be A. p. 13.

be found, as the Thing it ſelf for which they are to be examined: Why, I ſay, you have here again avoided ſending Men to examine the Scriptures, is juſt Matter of Enquiry. And for this you muſt apply your ſelf again to your *Men of Art*, to furniſh you with ſome other Reaſon.

If you will but caſt your Eyes back to your next Page, you will there find that you build upon this, that *the Subject of* your and the Author's Inquiry is *only what Method is to be uſed to bring Men to the True Religion.* If this be ſo, your *Men of Art*, who cannot allow you to *deſcend to any ſuch Rule* as the Scriptures, becauſe you ſpeak of the True Religion *in general*, i. e. *not as limited to any particular Diſpenſation, or to the Times of the Scriptures*, muſt allow, that you deſerve to be Head of their College; ſince you are ſo ſtrict an Obſerver of their Rules, that tho' your Enquiry be, *What Method is to be uſed to bring Men to the True Religion* (now under the particular *Diſpenſation* of the Goſpel, and *under Scripture-times*) you think it an unpardonable Fault to recede ſo far from your *Generality*, as to admit the Study and Examination of the Scripture into your Method; for fear, 'tis like, your Method would be too *particular*, if it would not now ſerve to bring Men to the True Religion, who lived before the Flood. But had you had as good a Memory, as is generally thought needful to a *Man of Art*, it is believed you would have ſpared this Reaſon, for your being ſo backward in putting Men upon Examination of the Scripture. And any one, but *a Man*
Pag. 31. *of Art*, who ſhall read what you tell us the Magiſtrate's Duty is; and will but conſider how convenient it would be, that Men ſhould receive no Inſtruction but from the *Miniſtry*, that you there tell us, *the Magiſtrate aſſiſts*; examine no *Arguments*, hear nothing of the Goſpel, receive no other Senſe of the Scripture, but what that *Miniſtry* propoſes; who if they had but the coactive Power (you think them as capable of as other Men) might *aſſiſt* themſelves; he, I ſay, who reflects but on theſe Things, may perhaps find a Reaſon that may better ſatisfy the Ignorant and Unlearned, who have not had the good Luck to arrive at being of the Number of theſe *Men of Art*, why you cannot deſcend to propoſe to Men the Studying of the Scripture.

Let me for once ſuppoſe you in Holy Orders, (for we that are not of the *Adepti*, may be allow'd to be ignorant of the Punctilio's in Writing obſerved by *the Men of Art*:) And let me then ask what *Art* is this, whoſe Rules are of that Authority; that One, who has received Commiſſion from Heaven to preach the Goſpel in Seaſon and out of Seaſon, for the Salvation of Souls, may not allow himſelf to propoſe the *Reading, Studying, Examining* of the Scripture, which has for at leaſt theſe ſixteen hundred Years contained the only true Religion in the World: for fear ſuch a Propoſal ſhould offend againſt the Rules of this *Art*, by being too *particular*, and confined to the *Goſpel-Diſpenſation*; and therefore could not paſs muſter, nor find Admittance, in a Treatiſe wherein the Author profeſſes it his only Buſineſs to *enquire what Method is to be uſed to bring Men to the True Religion?* Do you expect any other *Diſpenſation*; that you are ſo afraid of being too particular, if you ſhould recommend the Uſe and Study of the Scripture, to bring Men to the true Religion now in the Times of the Goſpel? Why might you not as well ſend them to the Scriptures, as to the *Miniſters and Teachers of the True Religion?* Have thoſe Miniſters any other Religion to teach, than what is contained in the Scriptures? But perhaps you do this out of Kindneſs and Care, becauſe poſſibly the Scriptures could not be found; but who were the *Miniſters of the true Religion*, Men could not poſſibly miſs. Indeed you have *allowed* your ſelf to *deſcend to what belongs only to ſome particular Times and Diſpenſations*, for their ſakes, when you ſpeak of the *Miniſters of the Goſpel.* But whether it be as fully agreed on amongſt Chriſtians, who are the *Miniſters of the Goſpel* that Men muſt hearken to, and be guided by; as which are the Writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, that (if ſtudied) will inſtruct them in the Way to Heaven; is more than you or your *Men of Art* can be poſitive in. Where are the Canons of this over-ruling *Art* to be found, to which you pay ſuch Reverence? May a Man of no diſtinguiſhing Character be admitted to the Privilege of them? For I ſee it may be of notable Uſe at a dead-lift, and bring a Man off with flying Colours, when Truth and Reaſon can do him but little Service. The ſtrong Guard you have in the Powers you write for; and when you have engaged a little too far, the ſafe Retreat you have always at hand in an Appeal to theſe *Men of Art*, made me almoſt at a Stand, whether I were not beſt make a Truce with one who had ſuch Auxiliaries. A Friend of mine finding me talk thus, replied briskly; 'tis a Matter of Religion, which requires not *Men of Art*, and the Aſſiſtance of ſuch *Art* as ſavours ſo little of the Simplicity of the Goſpel, both

ſhews

ſhews and makes the Cauſe the weaker. And ſo I went on to your two next Paragraphs.

In them, to vindicate a pretty ſtrange Argument for the Mrgiſtrate's Uſe of Force, you think it convenient to repeat it out of your *A.* p. 26. And ſo, in Compliance with you, ſhall I do here again. There you tell us, *The Power you aſcribe to the Magiſtrate is given him to bring Men, not to his* own, *but to the* true *Religion: And tho' (as our Author puts us in mind) the Religion of every Prince is Orthodox to himſelf; yet if this Power keep within its Bounds, it can ſerve the Intereſt of no other Religion but the true, among ſuch as have any Concern for their Eternal Salvation; (and thoſe that have none, deſerve not to be conſidered) becauſe the Penalties it enables him that has it to inflict, are not ſuch as may tempt ſuch Perſons either to renounce a Religion which they believe to be true, or to profeſs one which they do not believe to be ſo; but only ſuch as are apt to put them upon a ſerious and impartial Examination of the Controverſy between the Magiſtrate and them, which is the Way for them to come to the Knowledge of the Truth. And if, upon ſuch Examination of the Matter, they chance to find that the Truth does not lie on the Magiſtrate's Side, they have gained thus much however, even by the Magiſtrate's miſapplying his Power, that they know better than they did before, where the Truth doth lie: And all the hurt that comes to them by it, is only the ſuffering ſome tolerable Inconveniences for their following the Light of their own Reaſon, and the Dictates of their own Conſciences; which, certainly, is no ſuch Miſchief to Mankind as to make it more eligible that there ſhould be no ſuch Power veſted in the Magiſtrate, but the Care of every Man's Soul ſhould be left to himſelf alone, (as this Author demands it ſhould be.)*

To this I tell you, "That here, out of abundant Kindneſs, when Diſſenters L. 2. p. 290.
"have their Heads (without any Cauſe) broken, you provide them a Plaiſter. For, ſay you, *if upon ſuch Examination of the Matter (i. e.* brought to it by the Magiſtrate's Pag. 70.
Puniſhment) *they chance to find that the Truth doth not lie on the Magiſtrate's Side; they have gain'd thus much however, even by the Magiſtrate's miſapplying his Power, that they know better than they did before, where the Truth does lie.* "Which is as true as if you "ſhould ſay; Upon Examination I find ſuch an one is out of the Way to *York*, "therefore I know better than I did before that I am in the right. For neither of "you may be in the right. This were true indeed, if there were but two Ways "in all, a right and a wrong. To this you reply here; That *whoever ſhall conſider the Penalties*, will, you *perſuade* your *ſelf, find no Heads* broken, and ſo but little need of a Plaiſter. *The Penalties*, as you ſay, *are to be ſuch* as will *not tempt ſuch as have any Concern for their Eternal Salvation, either to renounce a Religion which they believe to be true, or profeſs one which they believe not to be ſo, but only ſuch as* (being weigh'd in Gold Scales) are juſt enough, or as you expreſs it, *are apt to put them upon a ſerious and impartial Examination of the Controverſy between the Magiſtrate and them.* If you had been pleaſed to have told us what Penalties thoſe were, we might have been able to gueſs whether there would have been *broken Heads* or no. But ſince you have not vouchſafed to do it, and if I miſtake not, will again *appeal to your Men of Art* for another Diſpenſation rather than ever do it; I fear no body can be ſure theſe Penalties will not reach to ſomething worſe than a *broken Head:* Eſpecially if the Magi- Pag. 7.
ſtrate ſhall obſerve that you impute the Riſe and Growth of *falſe Religions* (which it is the Magiſtrate's Duty to hinder) to the *Pravity of human Nature, unbridled by Authority*; which, by what follows, he may have Reaſon to think is to uſe Force ſuf- Pag. 8.
ficient to counter-ballance the *Folly, Perverſeneſs and Wickedneſs* of Men: And whether then he may not lay on Penalties ſufficient, if not to *break* Mens *Heads*, yet to ruin them in their Eſtates and Liberties, will be more than you can undertake. And ſince you acknowledge here, that the Magiſtrate may err ſo far in the Uſe of this his Power, as to miſtake the Perſons that he lays his Penalties on; will you be Security that he ſhall not alſo miſtake in the Proportion of them, and not lay on ſuch as Men would willingly exchange for a broken Head? All the Aſſurance you give us of this, is; *If this Power keep within its Bounds*, i. e. as you here explain it, *If the Penalties the Magiſtrate makes uſe of to promote a falſe Religion, do not exceed the Meaſure of thoſe which he may warrantably uſe for the promoting the true.* The Magiſtrate may, notwithſtanding any Thing you have ſaid, or can ſay, uſe any Sort of Penalties, any Degree of Puniſhment; you having neither ſhew'd the Meaſure of them, nor will be ever able to ſhew the utmoſt Meaſure which may not be exceeded, if any may be uſed.

But

But what is this I find here? *If the Penalties the Magiſtrate makes uſe of to promote a FALSE RELIGION.* Is it poſſible that the Magiſtrate can make uſe of Penalties to promote a *falſe Religion*; of whom you told us but three Pages back, That *it may always be ſaid of him, (what St.* Paul *ſaid of himſelf) That he can do nothing againſt the Truth, but for the Truth?* By that one would have thought you had undertaken to tell us, that the Magiſtrate could no more uſe Force to promote a *falſe Religion*, than St. *Paul* could preach to promote a *falſe Religion.* If you ſay, the Magiſtrate has no Commiſſion to promote a falſe Religion, and therefore *it may always be ſaid of him, what St.* Paul *ſaid of himſelf*, &c. I ſay, No Miniſter was ever commiſſioned to preach Falſhood; and therefore *it may always be ſaid of every Miniſter, (what St.* Paul *ſaid of himſelf) that he can do nothing againſt the Truth, but for the Truth:* Whereby we ſhall very commodiouſly have an infallible Guide in every Pariſh, as well as one in every Common-wealth. But if you thus uſe Scripture, I imagine you will have Reaſon to appeal to your *Men of Art*; whether, though you may not be allowed to recommend to others the Examination and Uſe of Scripture, to find the true Religion, yet you your ſelf may not uſe the Scripture to what Purpoſe, and in what Senſe you pleaſe, for the Defenſe of your Cauſe.

To the Remainder of what I ſaid in that Paragraph, your Anſwer is nothing but an Exception to an Inference I made. The Argument you were upon, was to juſtify the Magiſtrate's inflicting Penalties to bring Men to a falſe Religion, by the Gain thoſe that ſuffered them would receive.

L. 2. p. 290. Their Gain was this; That *they would know better than they did before, where the Truth does lie.* To which I replied, " Which is as true, as if you ſhould ſay, upon Exami- " nation I find ſuch an one is out of the Way to *York*; therefore I know better than I " did before, that I am in the right. This Conſequence you find fault with, and ſay Pag. 70. it ſhould be thus; *Therefore I know better than I did before, where the right Way lies.* This, you tell me, *would have been true; which was not for* my *Purpoſe.* Theſe Conſequences, one or t'other, are much-what alike *true.* For he that of an hundred Ways, amongſt which there is but one right, ſhuts out one that he diſcovers certainly to be wrong, knows as much better than he did before, that he is in the right, as he knows better than before, *where the right Way lies.* For before 'twas 99 to one he was not in the right; and now he knows 'tis but 98 to one that he is not in the right; and therefore knows ſo much better than before, that he is in the right, juſt as much as he knows better than he did before, *where the right Way lies.* For let him, upon your Suppoſition, proceed on; and every Day, upon Examination of a Controverſy with ſome one in one of the remaining Ways, diſcover him to be in the wrong; he will every Day know better than he did before, equally, *where the right Ways lies,* and that he is in it; till at laſt he will come to diſcover the right Way it ſelf, and himſelf in it. And therefore your Inference, whatever you think, is as much as the other for my Purpoſe; which was to ſhew what a notable *Gain* a Man made in the Variety of falſe Opinions and Religions in the World, by diſcovering that the Magiſtrate had not the Truth *on his ſide*; and what Thanks he owed the Magiſtrate, for inflicting Penalties upon him ſo much for his Improvement, and for affording him ſo much Knowledge at ſo cheap a Rate. And ſhould not a Man have Reaſon to boaſt of his Purchaſe, if he ſhould by Penalties be driven to hear and examine all the Arguments can be propoſed by thoſe in Power for all their fooliſh and falſe Religions? And yet this *Gain* is what you propoſe, as a Juſtification of Magiſtrates inflicting Penal- Pag. 70. ties for the promoting their falſe Religions. And *an impartial Examination of the Controverſy between them and the Magiſtrate,* you tell us here, *is the Way for ſuch as have any Concern for their eternal Salvation, to come to the Knowledge of the Truth.*

To my ſaying, " He that is puniſhed may have examined before, and then I am Pag. 71. " ſure he *gains* nothing: You reply, *But neither does he loſe much, if it be true, which you there add, that all the Hurt that befalls him, is only the ſuffering ſome tolerable Inconvenience for his following the Light of his own Reaſon, and the Dictates of his Conſcience.* So it is therefore you would have a Man rewarded for being an honeſt Man; (for ſo is he who *follows the Light of his own Reaſon, and the Dictates of his Conſcience;*) *only with the ſuffering ſome tolerable Inconveniences.* And yet thoſe *tolerable Inconveniences* are ſuch as are to counterballance Mens *Luſts*, and *the Corruption of depraved Nature*; which you know any ſlight Penalty is ſufficient to maſter. But that the Magiſtrate's Diſcipline ſhall ſtop at thoſe your tolerable Inconveniences, is what you are loth to be Gaurantee for: For all the Security you dare give of it, is, *If it* be

be true which you there add. But if it ſhould be otherwiſe, the Hurt may be more I ſee than you are willing to anſwer for.

L. 2. p. 290. " However, you think " you do well to encourage the Magi- " ſtrate in puniſhing, and comfort the " Man who has ſuffer'd unjuſtly, by " ſhewing what he ſhall *gain by it.* " Whereas, on the contrary, in a Diſ- " courſe of this Nature, where the " Bounds of Right and Wrong are " enquired into, and ſhould be eſta- " bliſh'd, the Magiſtrate was to be " ſhew'd the Bounds of his Autho- " rity, and warn'd of the Injury he " did when he *miſapply'd his Power*, and " puniſh'd any Man who deſerv'd it " not; and not be ſooth'd into In- " juſtice, by Conſideration of *Gain* that " might thence accrue to the Suf- " ferer. *Shall we do Evil, that Good may* " *come of it?* There are a ſort of Peo- " ple who are very wary of touching " upon the Magiſtrate's Duty, and ten- " der of ſhewing the Bounds of his " Power, and the Injuſtice and ill Con- " ſequences of his *miſapplying it*; at " leaſt, ſo long as it is *miſapply'd* in " favour of them, and their Party. I " know not whether you are of their " number; But this I am ſure, you " have the Misfortune here to fall in- " to their Miſtake. The Magiſtrate, " you confeſs, may in this Caſe *miſ-* " *apply his Power:* And inſtead of re- " preſenting to him the Injuſtice of " it, and the Account he muſt give to " his Sovereign one Day of this great " Truſt put into his Hands, for the " equal Protection of all his Subjects, " you pretend Advantages which the " Sufferer may receive from it: And " ſo inſtead of diſheartning from, you " give Encouragement to the Miſchief. " Which, upon your Principle, join'd " to the natural Thirſt in Man after " Arbitrary Power, may be carried to " all manner of Exorbitancy, with ſome " Pretence of Right.

L. 3. p. 71. *As to what you ſay here of the* nature *of my* Diſcourſe, *I ſhall only put you in mind that the Queſtion there debated is; Whether the Magiſtrate has any Right or Authority to uſe Force for the promoting the* true *Religion. Which plainly* ſuppoſes *the Unlawfulneſs and Injuſtice of uſing Force to promote a falſe Religion, as granted on both ſides. So that I could no way be obliged to take notice of it in my* Diſcourſe, *but only as Occaſion ſhould be offer'd.*

And whether I have not ſhew'd the Bounds of the Magiſtrate's Authority, *as far as I was any way obliged to do it, let any indifferent Perſon judge. But to talk here of a* ſort of People who are very wary of touching upon the Magiſtrate's Duty, and tender of ſhewing the Bounds of his Power, *where I tell the Magiſtrate that the Power I aſcribe to him in reference to Religion, is given him to bring Men,* not to his own, but to the true Religion; *and that he* miſapplies *it, when he endeavours to promote a falſe Religion by it, is, methinks, at leaſt a little unſeaſonable.*

Nor am I any more concern'd in what you ſay of the Magiſtrate's miſapplying his Power in favour of a Party. *For as you have not yet proved that his applying his Power to the promoting the true Religion, (which is all that I contend for) is* miſapplying *it; ſo much leſs can you prove it to be* miſapplying it in favour of a Party.

But that I encourage the Magiſtrate in puniſhing Men to bring them to a *falſe Religion, (for that is the* puniſhing *we here ſpeak of) and* ſooth him into Injuſtice, by ſhewing what thoſe who ſuffer unjuſtly ſhall gain by it, *when in the very ſame Breath I tell him that by ſo puniſhing, he* miſapplies his Power, *is a Diſcovery which I believe none but your ſelf could have made. When I ſay that the Magiſtrate* miſapplies his Power *by ſo puniſhing; I ſuppoſe all other Men underſtand me to ſay, that he* ſins *in doing it, and lays himſelf open to Divine Vengeance by it. And can he be* encouraged *to this, by hearing what others may* gain *by what (without Repentance) muſt coſt him ſo dear?*

Here your *Men of Art* will do well to be at hand again. For it may be ſeaſonable for you to appeal to them, whether the Nature of your Diſcourſe will allow you to *deſcend* to ſhew " the Magiſtrate the Bounds of his Authority, and warn him of the " Injury he does, if he miſapplies his Power.

You ſay, *the Queſtion there debated, is Whether the Majeſtrate has any Right or Authority to uſe Force for promoting the true Religion; which plainly ſuppoſes the Unlawfulneſs and Injuſtice of uſing Force to promote a falſe Religion, as granted on both ſides.* Neither is that the Queſtion in debate; nor if it were, does it ſuppoſe what you pretend. But the Queſtion in debate is, as you put it, Whether any body *has a Right to uſe Force in Matters of Religion?* You ſay indeed, *The Magiſtrate has, to bring* Pag. 78.

Men

Men to the true Religion. If thereupon, you think the Magiſtrate has none to bring Men to a falſe Religion, whatever your *Men of Art* may think, 'tis probable other Men would not have thought it to have been beſides the nature of your Diſcourſe, to have warn'd the Magiſtrate, that he ſhould conſider well, and impartially examine the Grounds of his Religion before he uſe any Force to bring Men to it. This is of ſuch Moment to Mens temporal and eternal *Intereſts*, that it might well deſerve ſome particular Caution addreſſed to the Magiſtrate; who might as much need to be put in mind of *Impartial Examination* as other People. And it might, whatever your *Men of Art* may allow, be juſtly expected from you; who think it no Deviation from the Rules *of Art*, to tell the Subjects that they muſt ſubmit to the Penalties laid on them, or elſe *fall under the Sword* of the Magiſtrate; which how true ſoever, will hardly by any body be found to be much more to your Purpoſe in this Diſcourſe, than it would have been to have told the Magiſtrate of what ill Conſequence it would be to him and his People, if he miſuſed his Power, and warn'd him to be cautious in the Uſe of it. But not a word that way. Nay even where you mention the Account he ſhall give for ſo doing, it is ſtill to ſatisfy the Subjects that they are well provided for, and not left unfurniſh'd of the Means of Salvation, by the Right God has put into the Magiſtrate's Hands to uſe his Power to bring them to the True Religion; and therefore, they ought to be well content, becauſe if the Magiſtrate miſapply it, the *Great Judge* will puniſh him for it. Look, Sir, and ſee whether what you ſay, any where, of the Magiſtrate's miſuſe of his Power, have any other Tendency: And then I appeal to the ſober Reader, whether if you had been as much concern'd for the Bounding, as for the Exerciſe of Force in the Magiſtrate's Hands, you would not have ſpoke of it after another manner.

The next thing you ſay, is, that *the Queſtion (being, Whether the Magiſtrate has any Right to uſe Force to bring Men to the True Religion,) ſuppoſes the Unlawfulneſs of uſing Force to promote a Falſe Religion as granted on both ſides*; which is ſo far from true, that I ſuppoſe quite the contrary, *viz.* That if the Magiſtrate has a Right to uſe Force to promote the True, he muſt have a Right to uſe Force to promote his own Religion; and that for Reaſons I have given you elſewhere. But the Suppoſition of a Suppoſition ſerves to excuſe you from ſpeaking any thing directly of ſetting Bounds to the Magiſtrate's Power, or telling him his Duty in that Point; though you are very frequent in mentioning the Obligation he is under, that Men ſhould not want the Aſſiſtance of his Force; and how anſwerable he is if any body miſcarry for want of it; though there be not the leaſt Whiſper of any Care to be taken, that no body be miſled by it. And now I recollect my ſelf, I think your Method would not allow it: For if you ſhould have put the Magiſtrate upon Examining, it would have ſuppos'd him as liable to Error as other Men; whereas, to ſecure the Magiſtrate's acting right, upon your Foundation of never uſing Force but for the True Religion, I ſee no help for it, but either he or you (who are to Licenſe him) muſt be got paſt the State of Examination, into that of certain Knowledge and Infallibility.

Indeed, as you ſay, you *tell the Magiſtrate that the Power you aſcribe to him in reference to Religion, is given him to bring Men not to his own, but to the True Religion.* But you do put upon him a *ſevere and impartial Examination* which, amongſt the many Falſe, is the only True Religion he muſt uſe Force to bring his Subjects to; that he may not miſtake and miſapply his Power in a Buſineſs of that Conſequence? Not a Syllable of this. Do you then tell him which it is he muſt take, without Examination, and promote with Force; whether that of *England*, *France* or *Denmark*? This, methinks, is as much as the Pope, with all his Infallibility, could require of Princes. And yet what is it leſs than this you do; when you ſuppoſe the Religion of the Church of *England* to be the only True; and upon this your Suppoſition, tell the Magiſtrate it is his Duty, by Force, to bring Men to it; without ever putting him upon Examining, or ſuffering him or any body elſe to queſtion, whether it be the only true Religion or no? For if you will ſtick to what you in another Place ſay; *That it is enough to ſuppoſe that there is one true Religion, and but one, and that that Religion may be known by thoſe who profeſs it*; What Authority will this Knowableneſs of the true Religion, give to the King of *England* more than to the King of *France*, to *uſe Force*, if he does not actually know the Religion he profeſſes to be the true; or to the Magiſtrate more than the Subject, if he has not examin'd the Grounds of his Religion? But if he believe you when you tell him, your Religion is the true, all is well; he has Authority enough to uſe Force, and he need not examine any farther. If this were not the Caſe; why

why you ſhould not be careful to prepare a little Advice to make the Magiſtrate examine, as well as you are ſolicitous to provide Force to make the Subject examine, will require the Skill of a *Man of Art* to diſcover.

Whether you are not of the Number of thoſe Men I there mention'd, (for that there have been ſuch Men in the World, Inſtances might be given) one may doubt from your Principles. For if upon a Suppoſition that yours is the true Religion, you can give Authority to the Magiſtrate to inflict Penalties on all his Subjects that diſſent from the Communion of the National Church, without examining whether theirs too may not be that only true Religion which is neceſſary to Salvation; Is not this to demand, that the Magiſtrate's Power ſhould be applied only *in favour of a Party?* And can any one avoid being confirm'd in this Suſpicion, when he reads that broad Inſinuation of yours, *p.* 34. as if our Magiſtrates were not concern'd *for Truth or Piety*, becauſe they granted a *Relaxation* of thoſe Penalties, which you would have employed in favour of your Party: For ſo it muſt be call'd, and not the Church of God, excluſive of others; unleſs you will ſay Men cannot be ſaved out of the Communion of your particular Church, let it be National where you pleaſe.

You do not, you ſay, encourage the Magiſtrate to miſapply his Power; becauſe *in the very ſame Breath you tell him he miſapplies his Power.* I anſwer, Let *all Men underſtand you*, as much as you pleaſe, to ſay that *he ſins in doing it:* That will not excuſe you from encouraging him there; unleſs it be impoſſible that a Man may be encourag'd to ſin. If your telling the Magiſtrate that his Subjects *gain* by his *miſapplying of Force*, be not an Encouragement to him to miſapply it, the doing Good to others muſt ceaſe to be an Encouragement to any Action. And whether it be not a great Encouragement in this Caſe to the Magiſtrate, to go on in the Uſe of Force, without impartially examining whether his or his Subjects be the True Religion; when he is told that (be his Religion true or falſe) his Subjects, who ſuffer, will be ſure to be Gainers by it; let any one judge. For the Encouragement is not (as you put it) to the Magiſtrate to uſe Force to bring Men to what he thinks a falſe Religion; but it is an Encouragement to the Magiſtrate, who preſumes his to be the True Religion, to puniſh his diſſenting Subjects; without due and impartial Examination on which ſide the Truth lies. For having never told the Magiſtrate, that neglect of Examination is a *Sin* in him; if you ſhould tell him a thouſand times, that he who uſes his Power to bring Men to a falſe Religion miſapplies it; he would not underſtand by it that he ſinn'd, whilſt he thought his the true; and ſo it would be no reſtraint to the *miſapplying* his Power.

And thus we have ſome Proſpect of this admirable Machine you have ſet up for the Salvation of Souls.

The Magiſtrate is to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion. But what if he miſapplies it to bring Men to a falſe Religion? 'Tis well ſtill for his Subjects: They are Gainers by it. But this may encourage him to a miſapplication of it. No; You *tell him* that he that uſes it *to bring Men* to a falſe Religion, *miſapplies it*; and therefore he cannot but underſtand that you ſay *he ſins, and lays himſelf open to Divine Vengeance.* No; He believes himſelf in the right; and thinks as St. *Paul*, whilſt a Perſecuter, that he does God good Service. And you aſſure him here, he makes his ſuffering Subjects Gainers; and ſo he goes on as comfortably as St. *Paul* did. Is there no Remedy for this? Yes, a very ready one, and that is, that the *one only true Religion may be known by thoſe who profeſs it to be the only true Religion.*

To which, if we add how you moderate as well as direct the Magiſtrate's Hand in puniſhing; by making the laſt Regulation of your *convenient Penalties* to lie in the *Prudence and Experience* of Magiſtrates themſelves; we ſhall find the Advantages of your Method. For are not your neceſſary Means of Salvation, which lie in moderate Penalties uſed to bring Men to the true Religion, brought to an happy State; when that which is to guide the Magiſtrate in the Knowledge of the true Religion, is, that *the true Religion may be known by thoſe who profeſs it to be the only true Religion*; and the convenient Penalties to be uſed for the promoting of it, are ſuch as the Magiſtrate ſhall in his *Prudence* think fit; and that whether the Magiſtrate applies it right or wrong, the Subject will be a Gainer by it? If in either of your Diſcourſes, you have given the Magiſtrate any better Direction than this to know the true Religion by, which he is by Force to promote; or any other intelligible Meaſure to moderate his Penalties by; or any other Caution to reſtrain the Miſuſe of his Power; I deſire you to ſhew it me: And then I ſhall think I have reaſon to believe, that in this Debate you

you have had more Care of the true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, than to encourage the Magiſtrate to uſe the Power he has, by your Direction, and without Examination, and to what Degree he ſhall think fit, in favour of a Party. For the Matter thus ſtated, if I miſtake not, will ſerve any Magiſtrate, to uſe any Degree of Force, againſt any that diſſent from his National Religion.

Having recommended to the Subjects the Magiſtrate's Perſecution by a Shew of *Gain*, which will accrue to them by it, you do well to bring in the Example of *Julian*; who whatever he did to the Chriſtians, would (no more than you) own that it was Perſecution, but for their Advantage in the other World. But whether his pretending *Gain* to them, upon Grounds which he did not believe; or your pretending *Gain* to them, which no body can believe to be one, be a greater Mockery, you were beſt look. This ſeems reaſonable; That his *Talk of Philanthropy*, and yours of Moderation, ſhould be bound up together. For till you ſpeak and tell them plainly what they may truſt to, the Advantage the Perſecuted are to receive from your Clemency, may, I imagine, make a ſecond Part to what the Chriſtians of that Age received from his. But you are ſolicitous for the Salvation of Souls, and Diſſenters ſhall find the Benefit of it.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Uſefulneſs of Force in Matters of Religion.

Pag. 10. YOU having granted that in all Pleas for any Thing, becauſe of its Uſefulneſs, it is not enough to ſay that it may be ſerviceable; but it muſt be conſidered, not only what it may, but what it is likely to produce; and the greater Good or Harm likely to come from it, ought to determine the Uſe of it; I think there need nothing more to be ſaid to ſhew the Uſefulneſs of Force in the Magiſtrate's Hands for promoting the true Religion, after it has been proved that, if any, then all Magiſtrates who believe their Religion to be true, are under an Obligation to uſe it. But ſince the Uſefulneſs and Neceſſity of Force is the main Foundation on which you build your Hypotheſis, we will in the two remaining Chapters examine particularly what you ſay for them.

Pag. 10. To the Author's ſaying, "That Truth ſeldom hath received, and he fears never "will receive much Aſſiſtance from the Power of great Men, to whom ſhe is but "rarely known, and more rarely welcome; You anſwer, *And yet God himſelf foretold and promiſed that Kings ſhould be Nurſing Fathers, and Queens Nurſing Mothers to his Church.* If we may judge of this Prophecy by what is paſt or preſent, we ſhall have reaſon to think it concerns not our Days; or if it does, that God intended not that the Church ſhould have many ſuch Nurſing Fathers and Nurſing Mothers, that were to nurſe them up with moderate Penalties, if thoſe were to be the Swadling-Clouts of this Nurſery. Perhaps, if you read that Chapter, you will think you have little Reaſon to build much on this Promiſe, till the reſtoring of *Iſrael*: And when you ſee the *Gentiles* bring *Thy* (*i. e.* as the Stile of the Chapter ſeems to import the Sons of the *Iſraelites*) *Sons in their Arms, and thy Daughters be carried upon their Shoulders*, as is promiſed in the immediately preceding Words; you may conclude that then *Kings ſhall be thy* (i. e. *Iſrael's*) *Nurſing Fathers, and Queens thy Nurſing Mothers.* This ſeems to me to be the Time deſigned by that Prophecy, and I gueſs to a great many others, upon an attentive reading that Chapter in *Iſaiah*. And to all ſuch this Text will do you little Service, till you make out the Meaning of it better than by barely quoting of it; which will ſcarce ever prove, that God hath promiſed that ſo many Princes ſhall be Friends to the true Religion, that it will be better for the true Religion, that Princes ſhould uſe Force for the impoſing or propagating of their Religions, than not. For unleſs it prove that, it anſwers not the Author's Argument, as an indifferent Reader muſt needs ſee. For he ſays not *Truth* never, but *ſhe ſeldom hath received, and he fears never will receive* (not any, but) *much Aſſiſtance from the Power of Great Men, to whom ſhe is* BUT RARELY KNOWN, *and more* RARELY WELCOME. And therefore to this of *Iſaiah* pray join that of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, *Not many wiſe, not many mighty, not many noble.*

1 Cor. 1. 26.

But

But ſuppoſing many *Kings* were to be *Nurſing Fathers to the Church*, and that this Prophecy were to be fulfilled in this Age, and the *Church* were now to be their Nurſery; 'tis I think more proper to underſtand this figurative Promiſe, that their Pains and Diſcipline was to be employ'd on theſe in the Church, and that they ſhould feed and cheriſh them, rather than that theſe Words meant that they ſhould whip thoſe that were out of it. And therefore this Text will, I ſuppoſe, upon a juſt Conſideration of it, ſignify very little againſt the known Matter of Fact which the Author urges; unleſs you can find a Country where the Cudgel and the Scourge are more the Badges and Inſtruments of a good Nurſe, than the Breaſt and the Bib; and that ſhe is counted a good Nurſe of her own Child, who buſies her ſelf in whipping Children not hers, nor belonging to her Nurſery.

The Fruits which give you *no Encouragement to hope for any Advantage from the Author's Toleration, which almoſt all but the Church of* England *enjoy'd in the Times of the Bleſſed Reformation, as it was called*, you tell us, *were Sects and Hereſies*. Here your Zeal hangs a little in your Light. It is not *the Author's Toleration* which here you accuſe. That, you know, is univerſal: And the Univerſality of it is that which a little before you wondred at, and complained of. Had it been the *Author's Toleration*, it could not have been *almoſt all but the Church of* England; but it had been the Church of *England* and all others. But let us take it, that *Sects and Hereſies* were, or will be the Fruits of a free Toleration, *i. e.* Men are divided in their Opinions and Ways of Worſhip. Differences in the Ways of Worſhip, wherein there is nothing mixed inconſiſtent with the true Religion, will not hinder Men from Salvation, who ſincerely follow the beſt Light they have; which they are as likely to do under Toleration as Force. And as for difference of Opinions, ſpeculative Opinions in Religion, I think I may ſafely ſay, that there are ſcarce any where three conſidering Men (for 'tis want of Conſideration you would puniſh) who are in their Opinions throughout of the ſame Mind. Thus far then, if Charity be preſerved, (which it is likelier to be where there is Toleration, than where there is Perſecution) though without Uniformity, I ſee no great reaſon to complain of thoſe ill Fruits of Toleration. Pag. 12.

But Men will run, as they did in the late Times, into *dangerous and deſtructive Errors, and extravagant Ways of Worſhip*. As to Errors in Opinion; If Men upon Toleration be ſo apt to vary in Opinions, and run ſo wide one from another, 'tis evident they are not ſo averſe to thinking as you complain. For 'tis hard for Men, not under Force, to quit one Opinion and embrace another, without thinking of them. But if there be danger of that; It is moſt likely the National Religion ſhould ſweep and draw to it ſelf the looſe and unthinking Part of Men; who without Thought, as well as without any Conteſt with their corrupt Nature, may embrace the Profeſſion of the countenanced Religion, and joyn in outward Communion with the great and ruling Men of the Nation. For he that troubles not his Head at all about Religion, what other can ſo well ſuit him as the National; with which the Cry and Performents go; And where (it being, as you ſay, *preſumable* that he makes that his Profeſſion upon *Conviction*, and that he is in earneſt,) he is ſure to be Orthodox without the Pains of examining, and has the Law and Government on his ſide to make it good that he is in the right?

But *Seducers*, if they be tolerated, will be ready at hand, and diligent; and Men will hearken to them. *Seducers* ſurely have no Force on their Side, to make People hearken. And if this be ſo, there is a Remedy at hand, better than Force, if you and your Friends will uſe it, which cannot but prevail; and that is, let the Miniſters of Truth be as diligent; and they bringing Truth with them, Truth *obvious and eaſy to be underſtood* (as you ſay what is *neceſſary to Salvation* is) cannot but prevail. Pag. 29.

But *Seducers* are hearken'd to, becauſe they teach Opinions favourable to Mens Luſts. Let the Magiſtrate, as is his Duty, hinder the Practices which their Luſt would carry them to, and the Advantage will be ſtill on the Side of Truth.

After all, Sir, if as the Apoſtle tells the *Corinthians*, (*1 Cor. 11. 19.*) *There muſt be Hereſies amongſt you, that they which are approved may be made manifeſt*; which, I beſeech you, is beſt for the Salvation of Mens Souls; that they ſhould enquire, *hear, examine, conſider*, and then have the Liberty to profeſs what they are perſuaded of; or, that having conſider'd, they ſhould be forced not to own nor follow their Perſuaſions; or elſe, that being of the National Religion, they ſhould go ignorantly on without any Conſideration at all? In one Caſe, if your Penalties prevail, Men are forced

to act contrary to their Conſciences, which is not the Way to Salvation; and if the Penalties prevail not, you have the ſame Fruits, Sects and Hereſies, as under Toleration: In the other, 'tis true, thoſe ignorant, looſe, unthinking Conformiſts, do not break Company with thoſe who embrace the Truth that will ſave them; but I fear can no more be ſaid to have any Share in it, than thoſe who openly diſſent from it. For 'tis not being in the Company, but having on the Wedding-Garment, that keeps Men from being bound Hand and Foot, and caſt into the dreadful and eternal Priſon.

Pag. 16. You tell us, *Force has a proper Efficacy to procure the Enlightning of the Underſtanding, and the Production of Belief, viz.* by making Men conſider. But your aſcribing Mens Averſion to examine Matters of Religion, to the Corruption of their Nature; Force, your Way apply'd, (*i. e.* ſo that Men avoid the Penalties by an outward Conformity,) cannot have any *proper Efficacy* to procure Conſideration; ſince Men may outwardly conform, and retain their Corruption, and Averſion to Conſideration; and upon this Account, Force, your Way apply'd, is abſolutely impertinent.

But farther; If Force has ſuch a *proper Efficacy* to procure the *Production of Belief*, it will do more Harm then Good, employ'd by any but Orthodox Magiſtrates. But how to put it only into Orthodox Hands, is the Difficulty. For I think I have proved, that if Orthodox Magiſtrates may, and ought to uſe Force, for the promoting their Religion, all that think themſelves Orthodox are obliged to uſe it too. And this may ſerve for an Anſwer to all you have ſaid, *p.* 16.

I having ſaid, Whatever indirect Efficacy there be in Force apply'd by the Magi-
L. 2. p. 173. ſtrate your Way, it makes againſt you; *Force uſed by the Magiſtrate, to bring Men to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are proper and ſufficient to convince them, but which, without being forced, they would not conſider*; *may*, ſay you, be ſerviceable *indirectly and at a diſtance*, to make Men embrace the Truth which muſt ſave them. " And thus, I ſay, it may be *ſerviceable* to bring Men *to receive and embrace* Falſ-
Pag. 25. " hood, which will deſtroy them. To this you with great Triumph reply, *How, Sir, may Force be uſed by the Magiſtrate, to bring Men to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are proper and ſufficient to convince them, be ſerviceable to bring Men to embrace Falſhood, ſuch Falſhood as will deſtroy them? It ſeems then, there are Reaſons and Arguments which are proper and ſufficient to convince Men of the Truth of Falſhood, which will deſtroy them. Which is certainly a very extraordinary Diſcovery, though ſuch as no Man can have any Reaſon to thank you for.*

In the firſt Place, let me ask you, Where did you find, or from what Words of mine do you infer that notable Propoſition, That *there are Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince Men of the Truth of Falſhood?* If a Magiſtrate of the True Religion may uſe Force to make Men conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince Men of the Truth of his Religion, may not a Prince of a falſe Religion uſe Force to make Men conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince them of what he believes to be true? And may not Force thus be ſerviceable to bring Men to receive and embrace Falſhood?

In the next Place, Did you, who argue with ſo much School-Subtilty, as if you drank it in at the very Fountain, never hear of ſuch an ill Way of arguing as *a conjunctis ad diviſa?* There are no Arguments proper and ſufficient to bring a Man into the Belief of what is in itſelf falſe, whilſt he knows or believes it to be falſe; therefore there are no Arguments proper and ſufficient to bring a Man into the Belief of what is in itſelf falſe, which he neither knows nor believes to be ſo. A Senior Sophiſter would be laugh'd at for ſuch Logick. And yet this is all you ſay in that Sentence you erect for a Trophy, to *convince Men of the Truth of Falſhood*; which though not my Words, but ſuch as you in your Way ſupply from what I ſaid, you are exceedingly pleaſed with, and think their very repeating a Triumph. But though there are no Arguments proper and ſufficient *to convince Men of the Truth of Falſhood*, as Falſhood; yet I hope you will allow that there are *Arguments proper and ſufficient* to make Men receive Falſhoods for Truths; why elſe do you complain of *Seducers?* And thoſe who embrace Falſhoods for Truths, do it under the Appearance of Truth, miſled by thoſe Arguments which make it appear ſo, and ſo convince them. And that Magiſtrates, who take their Religion to be true, though it be not ſo, may with Force urge ſuch Arguments, you will, I think, grant.

But you talk as if no body could have *Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince another*, but he that was of your Way, or your Church. This indeed is a new and *re-*

ry extraordinary Diſcovery, and ſuch as your Brethren, if you can *convince* them of it, *will have Reaſon to thank you for.* For if any one was ever by Arguments and Reaſons brought off, or ſeduced from your Church, to be a Diſſenter, there were then, I think, *Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince* him. I will not name to you again Mr. *Reynolds*, becauſe you have Charity enough to queſtion his Sincerity. Though his leaving his Country, Friends, and Acquaintance, may be *preſum'd* as great a Mark of his being convinced and in earneſt, as it is for one to write for a National Religion in a Country where it is uppermoſt. I will not yet deny, but that, in you, it may be pure Zeal for the True Religion, which you would have aſſiſted with the Magiſtrate's Force. And ſince you ſeem ſo much concern'd for your Sincerity in the Argument, it muſt be granted you deſerve the Character of a well-meaning Man, who own your Sincerity in a Way ſo little advantageous to your Judgment.

But if Mr. *Reynolds*, in your Opinion, was miſled by corrupt Ends, or ſecular Intereſt; what do you think of a Prince now living? Will you doubt his Sincerity, or that he was convinced of the Truth of the Religion he profeſſed, who ventured Three Crowns for it? What do you think of Mr. *Chillingworth*, when he left the Church of *England* for the *Romiſh* Profeſſion? Did he do it without being *convinc'd* that that was the right? Or was he convinc'd with *Reaſons and Arguments*, not *proper or ſufficient to convince him?*

But certainly this could not be true, becauſe, as you ſay, *p.* 25. *the Scripture does not teach* any thing of it. Or perhaps thoſe that leave your Communion do it always without being convinc'd, and only think they are *convinc'd* when they are not; or are *convinc'd* with *Arguments* not *proper and ſufficient to convince them.* If no body can convince another, but he that has Truth on his ſide, you do more Honour to the *firſt and ſecond Letter concerning Toleration*, than is for the Advantage of your Cauſe, when you impute to them the Increaſe of *Sects and Hereſies* amongſt us. And there are ſome, even of the Church of *England*, have profeſſed themſelves ſo fully ſatisfied by the Reaſons and Arguments in the firſt of them, that though I dare not be poſitive to you, whoſe Privilege it is to *convince* Men that they are convinced; yet I may ſay, 'tis as *preſumable* they are *convinced*, having owned it, as it is *preſumable* that all that are Conformiſts *are made ſo upon Reaſon and Conviction.*

This, I ſuppoſe, may ſerve for an Anſwer to your next Words, *That God in his* Pag. 25. *juſt Judgment will ſend ſuch as receive not the Love of Truth, that they may be ſaved, but reject it for the Pleaſure they have in Unrighteouſneſs,* ἐνέργειαν πλάνης, *ſtrong Deluſion*, i. e. *ſuch Reaſons and Arguments as will prevail with Men, ſo diſpoſed, to believe a Lie, that they may be damn'd; this* you *confeſs the Scripture plainly teaches us. But that there are any ſuch Reaſons or Arguments as are proper and ſufficient to convince or ſatisfy any, but ſuch reſolute and obdurate Sinners, of the Truth of ſuch Falſhood as will deſtroy them, is a Poſition which you are ſure the Scripture doth not teach us; and which*, you tell me, *when* I *have better conſider'd it*, you *hope* I *will not undertake to maintain. And yet if it be not maintainable, what* I *ſay here is to no Purpoſe: For if there be no ſuch Reaſons or Arguments as here we ſpeak of, 'tis in vain to talk of the Magiſtrate's uſing Force to make Men conſider them.*

But if you are ſtill of the Mind, that no Magiſtrate but thoſe who are of the True Religion, can have Arguments back'd with Force, proper and ſufficient to convince; and that in *England* none but *reſolute obdurate Sinners* ever forſook or forbore the Communion of the Church of *England*, upon Reaſons and Arguments that *ſatisfy or convince* them; I ſhall leave you to enjoy ſo charitable an Opinion.

But as to the Uſefulneſs of Force, your Way applied, I ſhall lay you down again the ſame Argument I uſed before; though in Words leſs fitted for your Way of Reaſoning on them, now I know your Talent. If there be any Efficacy in Force to bring Men to any Perſuaſion, it will, your Way apply'd, bring more Men to Error than to Truth. Your Way of uſing it is only to puniſh Men for not being of the National Religion; which is the only Way you do or can apply Force, without a Toleration. Nonconformity is the Fault that is puniſh'd; which Fault, when it ceaſes, the Puniſhment ceaſes. But yet to make them conſider, is the End for which they are puniſh'd; but whether it be or be not intended to make Men conſider, it alters nothing in the Caſe. Now I ſay, that ſince all Magiſtrates who believe their Religion to be true, are as much obliged to uſe Force to bring their Subjects to it, as if it were true; and ſince moſt of the National Religions of the World are erroneous;

roneous; if Force made uſe of to bring Men to the National Religion, by puniſhing Diſſenters, have any Efficacy, let it be what it will, *indirect and at a diſtance*, if you pleaſe) it is like to do twenty times more harm than good; becauſe of the National Religions of the World, to ſpeak much within compaſs, there are above twenty wrong for one that is right.

Indeed could Force be directed to drive all Men indifferently, who are negligent and backward in it, to *ſtudy*, *examine*, and *conſider* ſeriouſly Matters of Religion, and ſearch out the Truth: And if Men were, upon their Study and Examination, permitted to follow what appears to them to be right; you might have ſome Pretence for Force, as ſerviceable to Truth in making Men conſider. But this is impoſſible, but under a Toleration. And I doubt whether, even there, Force can be ſo apply'd, as to make Men conſider and impartially examine what is true in the profeſſed Religions in the World, and to embrace it. This at leaſt is certain, that where Puniſhments purſue Men like outlying Deer, only to the Pale of the National Church; and when once they are within that, leaves them free there, and at eaſe; it can do no Service to the true Religion, even in a Country where the National is the true. For the Penalties ceaſing as ſoon as *Men* are got within the Pale and Communion of the Church, they help not Men at all againſt that which you aſſign as the great Hindrance to the true Religion, and which therefore, in your Opinion, makes Force neceſſary to aſſiſt it.

For there being no Neceſſity that Men ſhould leave either their Vices or Corruption, or ſo much as their Ignorance, to get within the Pale of the Church; Force, your Way apply'd, ſerves only to bring them (even in the few Chriſtian and Orthodox Countries) to the Profeſſion, not to the Knowledge, Belief or Practice, of the true Religion.

You ſay corrupt Nature inclines Men from the true Religion to falſe ones; and moderate Force is requiſite to make ſuch Men conſider. But ſuch Men as, out of corrupt Nature, and for their Eaſe and carnal Pleaſures, chuſe an erroneous Religion without conſidering, will again, as ſoon as they can find their Choice incommoded by thoſe Penalties, conſult the ſame corrupt Nature and carnal Appetites, and without conſidering any thing further, conform to that Religion where they can beſt enjoy themſelves. 'Tis only the conſcientious Part of Diſſenters, ſuch as diſſent not out of Indulgence to corrupt Nature, but out of Perſuaſion, who will not conform without conſidering as they ought. And therefore your Argument from corrupt Nature is out of doors. If moderate Penalties ſerve only to work on thoſe who are led by corrupt Nature, they are of no Uſe but to fill the Church with Hypocrites; that is, to make thoſe Men worſe Hypocrites than they were before, by a new Act of Hypocriſy, and to corrupt the Manners of the reſt of the Church, by their Converſe with theſe. And whether this be for the Salvation of Souls, as is pretended, or for ſome other End, that the Prieſts of all Religions have generally ſo earneſtly contended for it, I leave to be conſider'd. For as for thoſe who diſſent out of Perſuaſion, I ſuſpect your moderate Penalties will have little effect upon them. For ſuch Men being awed by the Fear of Hell-fire, if that Fear will not make them conſider better than they have done, moderate Penalties will be too weak to work upon them. 'Tis well if Dragooning and Martyring can do it.

Pag. 26. But you add, *May it not be true nevertheleſs, that Force* your way applied *may be ſerviceable indirectly, and at a diſtance, to bring Men to embrace the Truth which may ſave them? which is all you are concerned here to make good.* So that if it may poſſibly happen that it ſhould ever bring two Men to embrace the Truth, you have gain'd your Point, and overthrown Toleration, by the *Uſefulneſs* and *Neceſſity* there is of Force. For without being forced theſe two Men would never have *conſidered*: Which is more yet than you know, unleſs you are of his private Council, who only can tell when the Seaſon of Grace is paſt, and the Time that Preaching, Intreaty, Inſtruction and Perſuaſion ſhall never after prevail upon a Man. But whatever you are *here concerned to make good*, are you not alſo *concerned* to remember what you ſay; where declaring againſt the Magiſtrate's having a Power to uſe what may any way, at any Time, upon any Perſon, by any Accident, be uſeful towards the promoting the true Religion, you ſay, *Who ſees not that however ſuch Means might chance to hit right in ſome few Caſes, yet, upon the whole Matter, they would certainly do a great deal more harm than good; And in all Pleas* (making uſe of my Words) *for any Thing becauſe of its Uſefulneſs, it is not enough to ſay that it may be ſerviceable, but it muſt be conſidered, not only what it*

Pag. 18.

may,

may, but what it is likely to produce; and the greater Good or Harm like to come from it, ought to determine the Uſe of it?

You proceed and tell me, That I, *not content to ſay that* Force your Way applied (i. e. "*to bring Men to embrace the Truth which muſt ſave them*) may be ſerviceable to "bring Men to embrace Falſhood which will deſtroy them; *and ſo is* proper to do as much Harm as Good, (*which ſeems ſtrange enough;*) *I add (to increaſe the Wonder)* "*that* "*in your* indirect Way it is much more proper, and likely to make Men receive and "embrace Error, than the Truth: *And that*, 1. Becauſe Men out of the right Way "are as apt, and I think I may ſay apter, to uſe Force than others; *Which is, doubt-* "*leſs, an irrefragable Demonſtration, that Force uſed by the Magiſtrate to bring Men to* "*receive and embrace the Truth which muſt ſave them*, is much more proper and likely "to make Men receive Error than the Truth. And then you ask me, *How we come to talk here of what Men out of the right Way are apt to do, to bring others into their* (i. e. a wrong) Way; *where we are only enquiring, what may be done to bring Men to the right Way. For* you *muſt put* me *in Mind*, you ſay, that *this our Queſtion*, viz. *Whether the Magiſtrate has any Right to uſe Force, to bring Men to the* true Religion. Whether the Magiſtrate has a Right to uſe Force in Matters of Religion, as you more truly ſtate it, (*p.* 78.) is the main Queſtion between us, I confeſs. But the Queſtion here between us is about the Uſefulneſs of Force your Way apply'd; which being to puniſh Diſſenters as Diſſenters to make them conſider, I ſhew'd would do more harm than good. And to this you were here anſwering. Whereby, I ſuppoſe, it is plain that the Queſtion here is about the Uſefulneſs of Force, ſo apply'd. And I doubt not but my Readers, who are not concerned, when the Queſtion in Debate will not ſerve your Turn, to have another ſubſtituted, will take this for a regular and natural Way of arguing, *viz.* "That Force, your Way apply'd is more proper and likely to "make Men embrace Error than the Truth; becauſe Men out of the right Way "are as apt, I think I may ſay apter, to uſe Force than others. You need not then ask as you do, *How we come to talk of Men out of the right Way.* You ſee how. If you do not, I know not what Help there is for your Eyes. And I muſt content my ſelf that any other Reader that has Eyes, will not miſs it. And I wonder that you ſhould: ſince you know I have on ſeveral Occaſions argued againſt the Uſe of Force in Matters of Religion upon a Suppoſition, that if any one, then all Magiſtrates have a juſt Pretence and Right to uſe it; which has ſerved you in ſome Places for Matter of great Reproof, and in others of Sport and Diverſion. But becauſe ſo plain a thing as that was ſo ſtrange to you, that you thought it a ridiculous Paradox to ſay, "That for all Magiſtrates to ſuppoſe the Religion they believed to be true, was e- "qually juſt and reaſonable; And becauſe you took no notice of the Words adjoin'd that proved it, *viz.* "Unleſs we can imagine every where but in *England*, [or where "the National Religion is the true] Men believe what at the ſame time they think "to be a Lie, I have taken the Pains to prove it to you more at large in another Place, and therefore ſhall make bold to uſe it here as an Argument againſt Force, *viz.* That if it have any Efficacy, it will do more Harm than Good; "Becauſe "Men out of the right Way are as apt, or apter to uſe it: And I ſhall think it a good one till you have anſwered it.

Pag. 26.

It is a good and a ſure Way, and ſhews a Zeal to the Cauſe, ſtill to hold faſt the Concluſion, and whatever be in Debate, return ſtill to one's old Poſition. I arguing againſt what you ſay for the Uſe of Force, *viz.* That *Force uſed not to convince by its own proper Efficacy, but only to make Men conſider*, might *indirectly and at a diſtance do ſome Service towards the bringing Men to embrace the Truth*; After other Arguments againſt it, I ſay, that whatever Efficacy there is in Force, your Way apply'd, (*i. e.* "To puniſh all, and none but, Diſſenters from the National Church) makes againſt "you: And the firſt Reaſon I give for it, is in theſe Words; "Becauſe Men out of "the right Way are as apt or apter to uſe Force than others. Which is what you are here anſwering. And what can be done better to anſwer it, than to the Words I have above-cited, to ſubjoin theſe following? *Now whereas our Author ſays, that Penalties or Force is abſolutely impertinent in this Caſe, becauſe it is not proper to convince the Mind; To which*, you anſwer, *that though Force be not proper to convince the Mind, yet it is not abſolutely impertinent in this Caſe, becauſe it may however, do ſome Service towards the bringing Men to embrace the Truth which muſt ſave them, by bringing them to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are proper to convince the Mind; and which, without being forced, they would not conſider. Here* I *tell* you, "No, but it is much more pro-

A. p. 5.

L. 2. p. 264.

L. 2. p. 265.

Pag. 26.

"per

" per and likely to make Men receive and embrace Error than Truth; becauſe Men " out of the right Way are as apt, and perhaps apter, to uſe Force than others. Which you tell me, *is as good a Proof* you *believe as the thing would admit: For otherwiſe*, you *ſuppoſe I would* have *given you a better*. And thus you have certainly gain'd the Cauſe. For I having prov'd that Force, your way apply'd, whatever Efficacy it had, would do more Harm than Good, have not ſufficiently proved that it cannot *do ſome Service towards the bringing Men to embrace the Truth; And therefore it is not abſolutely impertinent*. But ſince you think this not enough to prove the Uſe of Force in Matters of Religion *impertinent*, I ſhall farther ſhew you that Force, apply'd your Way to *make* People *conſider*, and ſo to make them *embrace the Truth*, is *impertinent*.

Your Way is to lay Penalties on Men for Nonconformity, as you ſay, *to make Men conſider*: Now here let me ask any one but you, Whether it be not utterly *impertinent* ſo to lay Penalties on Men, to *make them conſider*, when they can avoid thoſe Penalties without conſidering? But becauſe it is not enough to prove Force, your Way apply'd, *utterly impertinent*, I ſhall ſhew you in the next place, that were a Law made to puniſh not barely Nonconformity, but Nonconſideration, thoſe Penalties laid on not conſidering, would be utterly impertinent; becauſe it would never be proved that a Man had not conſider'd the Arguments offer'd him. And therefore all Law-makers till you, in all their Penal Laws about Religion, laid all their Penalties upon not embracing; and 'twas againſt that, that our Author was arguing when he ſaid Penalties, in this Caſe are abſolutely *impertinent*; becauſe they are not proper to convince the Mind. For in that Caſe, when Penalties are laid on Men for not embracing, 'tis plain they are uſed as a Means to make Men embrace: Which, ſince thoſe who are careleſs in Matters of Religion can do without conſidering, and thoſe who are conſcientious cannot do without Conviction; and ſince Penalties can in no wiſe convince; this Uſe of them is abſolutely *impertinent*, and will always be ſo till you can ſhew a Way how they can be uſed in Religion, not as Motives to embrace, but as Motives barely to make Men conſider. For if you puniſh them on when they tell you they have conſidered your Arguments, but are not convinced by them, and you judge of their having not conſidered by nothing but their not embracing, 'tis plain you uſe Penalties inſtead of Arguments to convince them; ſince without Conviction, thoſe who our Author pleads for, cannot embrace; and thoſe who do embrace without Conviction, 'tis all one as if they did not embrace at all, they being not one Jot the more in the Way of Salvation; and ſo Penalties are abſolutely *impertinent*. But embracing in the Senſe of the Law, and yours too, when you ſay Men have not *conſidered as they ought* as long as they *reject*, is nothing but outward Conformity, or an outward Profeſſion of embracing, wherewith the Law is ſatisfied, and upon which the Penalties ceaſe. Now Penalties uſed to make Men in this Senſe embrace, are abſolutely *impertinent* to bring Men to embrace in Earneſt, or, as the Author calls it, believe: Becauſe an outward Profeſſion, which in this Caſe is the immediate End to which Penalties are directed, and beyond which they do not reach, is no proper Means to produce in Men Conſideration, Conviction, or Believing.

What can be more *impertinent* than to vex and diſeaſe People with the Uſe of Force, to no purpoſe? And that Force muſt needs be to no purpoſe, which is ſo apply'd as to leave the End for which it is pretended to be uſed, without the Means which is acknowledg'd neceſſary for its Attainment. That this is ſo in your way of uſing Force, will eaſily appear from your Hypotheſis. You tell us at large in your *Argument conſider'd*, that Mens Luſts hinder them from even impartial *Conſideration and Examination* of Matters in Religion: And therefore Force is neceſſary to remove this Hindrance. You tell us likewiſe at large in your *Letter*, that Mens corrupt Nature and beloved Luſts hinder them alſo from *embracing* the true Religion, and that Force is neceſſary likewiſe to remove this Obſtacle. Now in your Way of uſing Force, wherein Penalties are laid on Men till, and no longer than till, they are made outwardly to conform, Force is ſo apply'd, that notwithſtanding the Intention of the Law-maker (let it be what it will) neither the Obſtacle to impartial Examination, riſing from Mens *Luſts*, nor the Averſion to the embracing the true Religion, ariſing from Mens *corrupt Nature*, can be removed: unleſs they can be removed without that, which you ſuppoſe neceſſary to their Removal. For ſince a Man may conform, without being under the Neceſſity of *impartial Examining or Embracing* on the one Hand, or ſuffering the Penalties on the other; it is unavoidable, that he ſhould neither impartially examine nor embrace, if Penalties are neceſſary to make him do either; becauſe Penalties, which are

A. p. 6, — 12.

Pag. 6. 8.

the

the neceſſary Remedies to remove thoſe Hindrances, were never apply'd to them; and ſo thoſe Obſtacles not being removed for want of their neceſſary Remedy, muſt continue on to hinder both *Examining and Embracing*. For Penalties cannot be uſed as a Means to any End, or be apply'd to the procuring any Action to be done, which a Man from his Luſts or any other Cauſe, has an Averſion to, but by putting them as it were in one Scale as a Counter-balance to that Averſion, and the Action in the other Scale, and putting a Man under the Neceſſity of chuſing the one or the other: Where that is not done, the Penalty may be avoided, the Averſion or Obſtacle hath nothing to remove it, and ſo the Action muſt remain undone. So that if Penalties be neceſſary to make Men impartially *examine* and really *embrace*; if Penalties are not ſo laid on Men as to make the Alternative to be either ſuffering the Penalties or conforming, it is impoſſible that Men, who without Penalties would not impartially *examine* or really *embrace* the true Religion, ſhould ever do either; and then I beſeech you conſider whether Penalties, your Way apply'd, be *impertinent* or no.

The Neceſſity of Penalties is only where there is ſome Inclination or Biaſs in a Man, whenceſoever ariſing, that keeps him from doing ſomething in his Power, which he cannot be brought to without the Inconveniences of ſome Penal Infliction. The Efficacy of Penalties lies in this, that the Inconvenience to be ſuffer'd by the Penalties over-balance the Biaſs or Inclination which leans the Man the other way, and ſo removes the Obſtacle: And the Application of this Remedy lies only in putting a Man under the neceſſary Choice either of doing the Action, or ſuffering the Penalty: So that in whatever Caſe a Man has not been put under that Neceſſity, there Penalties have never been apply'd to the procuring that Action: For the Obſtacle or Averſion to it, has never had it its neceſſary Remedy.

Perhaps you will ſay it is not *abſolutely impertinent*, becauſe it may poſſibly *do ſome Service indirectly and at a diſtance*, and be the Occaſion that ſome may conſider and embrace. If whatever may by Accident contribute to any End, may be uſed not impertinently as a Means to that End, nothing that I know can be *impertinent*; and a Penalty of 12 *d.* a time laid on them for being drunk, may be ſaid, to be a pertinent Means, to make Men *Carteſians*, or Conformiſts: becauſe it may *indirectly and at a diſtance do ſome Service*, by being an Occaſion to make ſome conſider their miſpending their Time; whereby it may happen that one may betake himſelf to the Study of Philoſophy, where he may meet with *Arguments proper and fit to convince him* of the Truth of that Philoſophy; as another betaking himſelf to the Study of Divinity, may *conſider Arguments proper and fit to make* him (whether it be in *England*, *Holland* or *Denmark*) of the National Profeſſion, which he was not of before.

Juſt thus, and no otherwiſe, does 12 *d.* a Sunday, or any other Penalty laid on Nonconformity, make Men ſtudy and embrace the true Religion; and whatever you will call the Service it does, direct or *indirect*, near or *at a diſtance*, 'tis plain it produces that Effect, and conduces to that End merely by Accident; and therefore muſt be allow'd to be impertinent to be uſed to that Purpoſe.

That your Way of uſing Force in Matters of Religion, even in a Country where the Magiſtrate's is of the true Religion, is abſolutely *impertinent*; I ſhall farther ſhew you from your own Poſitions.

Here in the Entrance give me leave to obſerve to you, that you confound two Things very different, *viz.* your Way of applying Force, and the End for which you pretend you uſe it. And this perhaps may be it which contributes to caſt that Miſt about your Eyes, that you always return to the ſame Place, and ſtick to the ſame groſs Miſtake. For here you ſay, *Force*, your *Way applied*, i. e. *to bring Men to* Pag. 26. *embrace the Truth which muſt ſave them*: but, Sir, to *bring Men to embrace the Truth*, is not your *Way of applying* Force, but *the End* for which you pretend it is applied. Your *Way* is to puniſh Men (as you ſay) moderately for being Diſſenters from the National Religion; this is your Way of uſing Force. Now if in this Way of uſing it, Force does Service merely by Accident, you will then, I ſuppoſe, allow it to be abſolutely impertinent. For you ſay, *If by doing Service by Accident, I mean doing it but ſeldom, and be-* Pag. 17. *ſide the Intention of the Agent*, you *aſſure* me, *that it is not the Thing* you *mean when* you *ſay Force may indirectly, and at a diſtance, do ſome Service. For in that Uſe of Force, which* you *defend, the Effect is both intended by him that uſes it, and withal, you doubt not, ſo often attain'd, as abundantly to manifeſt the Uſefulneſs of it.* Whereby 'tis plain the two Marks, whereby you diſtinguiſh'd your *indirect and at a diſtance* Uſefulneſs, from that

which is *by Accident*, are that, *that by Accident* does Service but ſeldom, and beſides the Intention of the Agent, but yours the contrary.

Pag. 17. Firſt, as to the Intention, you tell us, *in the Uſe of Force*, which you *defend, the Effect is intended by him that uſes it*; that is, thoſe who made Laws to puniſh Nonconformiſts, deſigned thoſe Penalties to make all Men, under their Power, *conſider ſo as to be convinced of, and embrace the Truths that ſhould ſave them.* If one ſhould ask you how you know it to be their Intention, can you ſay, they ever told you ſo? If they did not, then ſo far you and I know their *Intentions* alike. Did they ever ſay ſo in thoſe Laws? Nor that neither. Thoſe vers'd then in the Interpretations of Laws, will tell you nothing can be known to be the *Intention* of the Law-makers in any Law, of which the Law is wholly ſilent: That Way then you cannot know it to have been their *Intention*, if the Law ſays nothing of it. Whatever was the *Intention* of former Law-makers, if you had read with Attention the laſt Act of Uniformity of *Car.* 2. printed before the Common-Prayer Book, I conclude you would have been better ſatisfied about the *Intention* of the then Law-makers in that Law: for I think nothing can be plainer to any one who will look into that Statute, than that their only End in that Law was, what they have expreſſed in theſe Words. *And to the End that Uniformity in the publick Worſhip of God (which is ſo much deſired) may be ſpeedily effected;* which was driven with ſuch Speed, that if all concern'd had Opportunity to get and peruſe the then eſtabliſh'd Liturgy, 'tis certain they had not over-much Time ſeriouſly and deliberately to conſider of all the Parts of it before the Day ſet for the Uſe of it.

But you think, they ought to have *intended*, and therefore they did: And I think they neither ought, nor could, in making thoſe Laws, intend ſo unpracticable a Thing; and therefore they did not. Which being as certain a Way of Knowledge as yours, if you know it by that Way; 'tis poſſible you and I may at the ſame Time know Contraries.

But you know it, by their *having provided ſufficient Means of Inſtruction for all under their Care in the True Religion*; (of this *ſufficient Means*, we have ſomething to ſay in another Place.) Penalties laid expreſly on one Fault, have no Evidence that they are deſigned to mend another, tho' there are ſufficient Means provided of mending it, if Men would make a ſufficient Uſe of them; unleſs thoſe two Faults are ſo connected, as one cannot be mended without the other. Now if Men cannot conform, without ſo *conſidering as to be convinced of, and embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, you may know that Penalties laid on Nonconformity, were *intended* to make Men ſo conſider: But if Men may conform, without ſo *conſidering*, one cannot know nor conclude thoſe Penalties were *intended* to make Men ſo *conſider*, whatever Proviſion there is made of *Means of Inſtruction.*

But you will ſay, it is evident that Penalties on Nonconformiſts, were *intended* to make them uſe theſe Means of Inſtruction, becauſe they are intended for the bringing Men to Church, the Place of Inſtruction. That they are *intended* to bring Men to Church, the Place of Preaching, that I grant; but that thoſe Penalties that are laid on Men, for not coming to Church, can be known thereby to be *intended* to make Men ſo *conſider*, as to be *convinced* and *embrace* the True Religion, that I deny: And it is utterly impoſſible it ſhould be ſo, if what you ſay be true, where you tell us,

Pag. 22. That *the Magiſtrates concern themſelves for Compliance or Conformity, only as the Fruit of their Conviction.* If therefore the *Magiſtrates are concerned for Mens Conformity, only as the Fruit of their Conviction*, and coming to Church be that Conformity; coming to Church cannot be *intended* as a Means of their Conviction: Unleſs it be *intended* they ſhould be convinc'd, before they are convinc'd.

But to ſhew you, that you cannot pretend the Penalty of Laws for Conformity, to proceed from a Care of the Souls of *all* under the Magiſtrate's Power, and ſo to be *intended* to make them *all* conſider, in any Senſe. Can you, or any one know, or ſuppoſe, that Penalties which are laid by the Law on Nonconformity, are *intended* to make *all* Men conſider; where 'tis known that a great Number, under the Magiſtrate's Power, are diſpenſed with, and privileged from thoſe Penalties? How many, omitting the *Jews*, are there; for Example, in the King of *England*'s Dominions, under his Care and Power, of the *Walloon*, and *French Church*; to whom Force is never apply'd, and they live in Security from it? How many *Pagans* are there in the

the Plantations, many whereof born in his Dominions, of whom there was never any Care taken, that they ſhould ſo much as come to Church, or be in the leaſt inſtructed in the Chriſtian Religion? And yet muſt we believe, or can you pretend, that the Magiſtrate's Uſe of Force, againſt Nonconformiſts, is to make *all* his Subjects conſider, *ſo as to be convinc'd of, and embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them?* If you ſay, in your Way you mean no ſuch Indulgence: I anſwer, the Queſtion is not of yours, but the Magiſtrate's Intention; though what your *Intention* is, who would have the want of Conſideration, or Knowledge, in Conformiſts, exempt from Force, is viſible enough.

Again, Thoſe Penalties cannot be ſuppoſed, to be *intended* to make Men *conſider*; which are laid on thoſe, who have, or may have already conſidered: And ſuch you muſt grant to be the Penalties laid in *England*, on Nonconformiſts; unleſs you will deny, that any Nonconformiſt has, or can *conſider*, ſo as to be convinced, or believe, and *embrace the Truth that muſt ſave him.* So that you cannot vouch the *Intention* of the Magiſtrate, where his Laws ſay nothing; much leſs affirm, that Force is *intended* to produce a certain End in *all* his Subjects, which is not applied to them *all*, and is applied to ſome who have attained that End already: Unleſs you have a Privilege to affirm, againſt all Appearance, whatſoever may ſerve your Cauſe. But to learn ſome Moderation in this, I ſhall ſend you to my *Pagans* and *Mahometans*. For whatever charitable Wiſhes Magiſtrates may ſometimes have in their Thoughts, (which I meddle not with;) no body can ſay, that in making the Laws, or in the Uſe of Force, we are ſpeaking of, they *intended* to make Men conſider and examine, ſo as to *be convinced of, and heartily to embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, but he that gives himſelf the Liberty to ſay any thing.

The Service that Force does, *indirectly, and at a diſtance*; you tell us in the following Page, is to make People *apply themſelves to the Uſe of thoſe Means, and Helps, which are proper to make them what they are deſigned to be.* In the Caſe before us, What are Men deſigned to be? Holy Believers of the Goſpel in this World, without which no Salvation, no ſeeing of God in the next. Let us ſee now, whether Force, your Way applied, can be ſuited to ſuch a Deſign, and ſo *intended* for that End. Pag. 18.

You hold, That all out of the National Church, where the Religion of the National Church is true, ſhould be puniſhed, and ought to have Force uſed to them: And again, you grant That thoſe who are in the Communion of the National Church, ought not to be puniſhed, or be under the Stroke of Force; nor indeed in your Way can they. If now *the Effect* be to prevail with Men, *to conſider as they ought*, ſo that they may become *what they are deſigned to be*: How can any one think, that you, and they who uſe Force thus, *intend*, in the Uſe of it, that Men ſhould really be Chriſtians, both in Perſuaſion and Practice, without which there is no Salvation; if they leave off Force before they have attained that *Effect*? Or how can it be imagined, that they *intend* any thing but Conformity by their Uſe of Force; if they leave off the Uſe of it as ſoon as Men conform? Unleſs you will ſay that an outward Conformity to the National Church, whoſe Religion is the True Religion, is ſuch an embracing of the Truth as is ſufficient to Salvation? Or that an outward Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion is the ſame with being really a Chriſtian; which poſſibly you will not be very forward to do, when you recollect what you meet with in the Sermons, and printed Diſcourſes, of Divines of the Church of *England*, concerning the Ignorance and Irreligion of Conformiſts themſelves. For Penalties can never be thought, by any one (but he that can think againſt common Senſe, and what he pleaſes) to be *intended* for any End; which by that Conſtitution, and Law whereby they are impoſed, are to ceaſe before that End be attained. And will you ſay, that all who are conformable, have ſo well *conſidered*, that they *believe*, and *heartily embrace* the Truths of the Goſpel, *that muſt ſave them:* When perhaps it will be found that a great many Conformiſts do not ſo much as underſtand them? But the Ignorance or Irreligiouſneſs to be found amongſt Conformiſts, which your Way of talking forces me in ſome Places to take notice of, let me here tell you once for all, I lay not the Blame of upon Conformity, but upon your Uſe of Force to make Men conform. For whatever the Religion be, true or falſe, it is natural for Force, and Penalty, ſo applied, to bring the Irreligious, and thoſe who are careleſs and unconcerned for the True, into the National Profeſſion: But whether it be fitter for ſuch to be kept out, rather than by Force to be driven into the Communion of any Church, Pag. 64.

and owned as Members of it, thoſe who have a due Care and Reſpect for truly religious and pious Conformiſts, were beſt conſider.

But farther, if, as you ſay, the Oppoſition to the True Religion lies only in Mens Luſts, it having *Light* and *Strength* enough (were it not for that) to prevail: And it is upon that Account only that Force is *neceſſary*, there is no Neceſſity at all to uſe Force on Men, only till they conform, and no farther: Since I think you will not deny, but that the *Corruption of Humane Nature* is as great in Conformiſts as in Nonconformiſts; in the Profeſſors of, as in the Diſſenters from, the National Religion. And therefore either Force was not neceſſary before, or elſe it is neceſſary ſtill, after Men are Conformiſts: Unleſs you will ſay, that it is harder for a Man to be a Profeſſor, than a Chriſtian indeed: And that the True Religion, by its own *Light* and *Strength*, can, without the Help of Force, prevail over a Man's Luſts, and the Corruption of his Nature; but it has need of the Help of Force, to make him a Conformiſt, and an outward Profeſſor. And ſo much for the *Effect*, which is *intended by him that uſes it in that Uſe of Force which you defend.*

The other Argument you bring to ſhew, that your *indirect, and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs* of Force your Way apply'd, is not by Accident, is the *frequent Succeſs* of it. Which I think is not the true Mark of what is not *by Accident*: For an Effect may not be *by Accident*, though it has never been produced but once; and is certainly as little *by Accident* the firſt time, as when it has been produced a thouſand times. That then, by which any thing is excuſed from being by Accident, is not the frequency of the Event, but that whereon the frequency of the Event depends, when frequent Trials are made; and that is the proper, natural, direct Efficacy of the Cauſe or Means, which produces the Effect. As in the Caſe before us, Penalties are the Cauſe or Means uſed to produce an End; the proper and immediate Effect of Penalties, is to produce ſome Pain or Inconvenience; and the natural Effect of that, is to make a Man, who naturally flies from all Pain or Inconvenience, to endeavour to avoid it; whereby it naturally and directly works upon the Will of Man, by propoſing to him this unavoidable Choice of doing ſome Action, or enduring the Pain or Inconvenience of the Penalty annexed to its Omiſſion. When the Pain of doing the Action is outweigh'd in the Senſe of him that lies under the Penalty, the Pain, that by the Law is annex'd to the Omiſſion, operates upon his Will, as naturally, as thirteen Ounces in one Scale, laid againſt twelve Ounces in the other, incline the Balance, and bring it down on that ſide. And this is by a direct and natural Efficacy, wherein there is nothing of Chance.

Let us ſee this, how far this will go in *your indirect, and at a diſtance, Uſefulneſs.* In your Method, the Action you propoſe to be done, is *Conſidering*, or a ſevere and *impartial Examining* Matters of Religion, which you tell us, Men by their great Negligence or Averſion are kept from doing. What now is a proper Means to produce this? *Penalties, without which*, you tell us, *it will not be done.* How now is it apply'd in your Method? Conformity, and Mens Neglect or Averſion to it, is laid in one Scale, and the Penalty joyn'd to the Omiſſion of it, laid in the other; and in this Caſe, if the Inconvenience of the Penalty overweighs the Pains of, or Averſion to Conformity, it does by a direct and natural Efficacy produce Conformity: But if it produces a ſevere and impartial Examination, that is merely by Accident; becauſe the Inconvenience of the Penalty is not laid againſt Mens Averſion or Backwardneſs to examine impartially, as a Counter-balance to that, but againſt their Averſion or Backwardneſs to conform; and ſo whatever it does, *indirectly, and at a diſtance*, 'tis certain its making Men *ſeverely and impartially examine* (if ever that happens) is as much by Accident, as it would be *by Accident*, if a Piece of Lead laid in one Scale as a Counterpoiſe to Feathers in the oppoſite Scale, ſhould move or weigh down Gold that was put in the Scale of another Pair of Balances, which had no Counterpoiſe laid againſt it. Unleſs you will ſay there is a neceſſary Connection between Conformity, and a ſevere and impartial Examination.

But you will ſay, perhaps, that though it be not poſſible that Penalties ſhould produce Examination but by mere Accident, becauſe Examination has no neceſſary Connection with Conformity, or the Profeſſion of any Religion; yet ſince there are ſome who will not take up any Profeſſion without a *ſevere and impartial Examination*, Penalties for Nonconformity will, by a direct and natural Efficacy, produce Examination in all ſuch. To which I anſwer, That thoſe are (if we may believe what you ſay) ſo very few, that this your Remedy, which you put into the Magiſtrate's

A. p. 6, &c.

Hands

Hands to bring *all* his Subjects to conſider and examine, will not work upon one in a thouſand: nay, it can work on none at all, to make them ſeverely and impartially examine, but merely by *Accident*. For if they are Men, whom a ſlight and partial Examination (which upon your Principles you muſt ſay) ſufficed to make Nonconformiſts, a ſlight and partial Examination will as well ſerve to make them Conformiſts; and ſo Penalties laid on them to make them conform, can only by Accident produce a *ſevere and impartial Examination*, in ſuch Men, who can take up the Profeſſion of any Religion without a *ſevere and impartial Examination*, no more than it can otherwiſe than by Accident, produce any Examination in thoſe who, without any Examination, can take up the Profeſſion of any Religion.

And in thoſe very few, who take not up the Profeſſion of any Religion without a *ſevere and impartial Examination*, that Penalties can do any Service, to bring them either *to the Truth that muſt ſave them*, or ſo much as to outward Conformity, but merely by *Accident*, that alſo is evident. Becauſe all ſuch in a Country, where they diſſent from the National Religion, muſt neceſſarily have ſeverely and impartially examin'd already, or elſe you deſtroy the Suppoſition this Argument is built on, *viz.* That they are Men who do ſeverely and impartially examine before they chuſe. And if you lay, or continue your Penalties on Men, that have ſo examin'd, 'tis plain you *uſe* them *inſtead of Reaſons and Arguments*; in which Uſe of them, you confeſs they have no *proper Efficacy*, and therefore if they do any Service, it is merely by Accident.

But now let us ſee the *Succeſs* you boaſt of, and for that you tell us, that you *doubt* Pag. 17.
not but it is *ſo often attain'd, as abundantly to manifeſt the Uſefulneſs of it*. You ſpeak here of it, as thing tried, and ſo known, that you doubt not. Pray tell us where your *moderate* (for great ones you acknowledge to do Harm, and to be uſeleſs) Penalties have been uſed, with ſuch Succeſs, that we may be paſt Doubt too. If you can ſhew no ſuch Place, do you not vouch Experience where you have none? And ſhew a Willingleſs not to doubt, where you have no Aſſurance? In all Countries, where any Force is uſed to bring Men to the Profeſſion of the National Religion, and to outward Conformity, it is not to be doubted, but that Force joining with their natural Corruption, in bringing them into the Way of Preferment, Countenance, Protection, Eaſe and Impunity, ſhould eaſily draw in all the Looſe and Careleſs in Matters of Religion, which are every where the far greater Number: But is it thoſe you count upon, and will you produce them as Examples of what Force has done to make Men *conſider, ſtudy*, and *embrace* the True Religion? Did the Penalties laid on Nonconformity make you *conſider, ſo as to ſtudy, be convinced*, and *embrace the True Religion?* Or can you give an Inſtance of any one, in whom it produced this Effect? If you cannot, you will have ſome reaſon to doubt of what you have ſaid, and not to be ſo confident that the Effect you talk of, is ſo often attain'd. Not that I deny, but that God may ſometimes have made theſe Puniſhments the Occaſions to Men of ſetting themſelves ſeriouſly on conſidering Religion, and thence they may have come into the National Religion upon a real Conviction: But the Inſtances of it I believe to be ſo few, that you will have reaſon to remember your own Words, where you ſpeak of ſuch things as, "Any Way, at any Time, upon any Perſon, by any Accident, Pag. 18.
"may be uſeful towards the promoting of True Religion: *If Men ſhould thence take Occaſion to apply ſuch things generally, who ſees not that, however they might chance to hit right in ſome few Caſes, yet upon the whole Matter, they would certainly do a great deal more Harm than Good.* You and I know a Country wherein, not long ſince, greater Severities were uſed than you pretend to approve of. Were there not, for all that, great Numbers of ſeveral Profeſſions ſtood out, who by your Rule, ought now to have your moderate Penalties tried upon them? And can you think leſs Degrees of Force can work, and often, as you ſay, prevail, where greater could not? But perhaps they might prevail on many of thoſe to return, who having been brought into the Communion of the Church by former penal Laws, have now upon the *Relaxation* left it again. A manifeſt Demonſtration, is it not? That *their Compliance was the Fruit of their Conviction*; and that the Magiſtrate was *concern'd for their Compliance only as the Fruit of their Conviction*: When they as ſoon as any Relaxation of thoſe Laws took off the Penalties, left again the Communion of the National Church? For *the leſſening the Number of Conformiſts*, is, I ſuppoſe, one of thoſe things which you ſay your *Eyes cannot but ſee at this Time*; and which you, with Concern, impute to the late *Relaxation*. A plain Evidence how *preſumable*

it

it is, even in your own Opinion, that thoſe who conform do it upon real *Conviction.*

To conclude, theſe Proofs, though I do not pretend to bring *as good as the Thing will admit*, will ſerve my Turn to ſhew, that Force is impertinent; ſince by your own Confeſſion it has no direct Efficacy to convince Men, and by its being *indirect and at a diſtance* uſeful, is not at all diſtinguiſh'd from being barely ſo *by accident*: Since you can neither prove it to be intended for that End, nor frequently to ſucceed, which are the two Marks whereby you put a Difference between *indirect, and at a diſtance, and by accident*: This, I ſay, is enough to ſhew what the Author ſaid, is true, that the Uſe of Force is wholly *impertinent*. Which, whatever others do, you upon another Reaſon, muſt be forced to allow.

You profeſs your ſelf of the Church of *England*, and if I may gueſs, are ſo far of it, as to have ſubſcrib'd the 39 Articles, which if you have done, and aſſented to what you ſubſcribed, you muſt neceſſarily allow that all Force, uſed for the bringing Men to the true Religion, is *abſolutely impertinent*; for that muſt be *abſolutely impertinent* to be uſed as a Means, which can contribute nothing at all to the End for which it is uſed. The End here, is to make a Man a true Chriſtian, that he may be ſaved; and he is then, and then only, a true Chriſtian, and in the Way of Salvation, when he believes, and with Sincerity obeys the Goſpel. By the 13*th* Article of the Church of *England*, you hold, that *WORKS DONE BEFORE THE GRACE OF CHRIST, AND THE INSPIRATION OF HIS SPIRIT, ARE NOT PLEASING TO GOD; FOR AS MUCH AS THEY SPRING NOT OF FAITH IN JESUS CHRIST, NEITHER DO THEY MAKE MEN MEET TO RECEIVE GRACE, (OR AS THE SCHOOL AUTHORS SAY) DESERVE GRACE OF CONGRUITY; YEA RATHER, FOR THAT THEY ARE NOT DONE AS GOD HAS WILLED AND COMMANDED THEM TO BE DONE, WE DOUBT NOT BUT THEY HAVE THE NATURE OF SIN.* Now if it be impertinent to uſe Force to make a Man do more than he can, and a Man can do nothing to procure Grace, unleſs *Sin* can procure it; and without Grace, a Man cannot believe, or live ſo as to be a true Chriſtian, it is certainly wholly *impertinent* to uſe Force to bring a Man to be truly a Chriſtian. To hear and conſider, is in Mens Power, you will ſay, and to that Force may be pertinent; I grant to make Men hear, but not to make them *conſider* in your Senſe, which you tell us, is to *conſider ſo as to embrace*; if you mean by *embracing* any thing but outward Conformity: And that according to your Article, contributes nothing to the attaining of Grace; becauſe without Grace, your Article ſays it is a Sin; and to conform to, and outwardly profeſs a Religion which a Man does not underſtand and heartily believe, every one, I think, judges to be a *Sin*, and no fit Means to procure the Grace of God.

Pag. 31. But you tell us, *That God denies his Grace to none who ſeriouſly ask it.* If that be ſo, methinks Force ſhould moſt properly and pertinently be uſed to make Men *ſeriouſly* pray to God *for Grace*. But how, I beſeech you, will this ſtand with your 13*th* Article? For if you mean by *ſeriouſly*; ſo as will make his Seeking acceptable to God, that cannot be, becauſe he is ſuppoſed yet to want Grace which alone can make it acceptable: And if his asking has the *Nature of Sin*, as in the Article you *do not doubt* but it has, can you expect that Sinning ſhould procure the Grace of God? You will I fear here, without ſome great Help in a very nice Diſtinction from the *School-Authors*, be forced either to renounce your Article in the plain Senſe of it, and ſo become a Diſſenter from the Church of *England*, or elſe acknowledge Force to be wholly *impertinent* to the Buſineſs of true Religion and Salvation.

Another Reaſon I gave againſt the *Uſefulneſs* of Force in Matters of Religion, was, "Becauſe the Magiſtrates of the World, bring few of them in the right Way, (not "one of ten, take which ſide you will) perhaps not one of an hundred, being of the "true Religion; 'Tis likely your indirect Way of uſing Force would do an hundred,

Pag. 27. or at leaſt ten times as much Harm as Good. To which you reply, *Which would have been to the Purpoſe, if* you *had aſſerted, that every Magiſtrate may uſe Force, your indirect Way (or any Way) to bring Men to his own Religion, whatever that be. But if* you *aſſert no ſuch thing, (as no Man you think but an Atheiſt will aſſert it) then this is quite beſide the Buſineſs.* I think I have proved, that if Magiſtrates of the True Religion may uſe Force to bring Men to their *Religion*, every Magiſtrate may uſe Force to bring Men to his own Religion, when he thinks it the true: And then do you look where the *Atheiſm* will light.

In

In the next Paragraph, having quoted theſe following Words of mine; where I ſay, " Under another Pretence, you put into the Magiſtrate's Hands as much Power " to force Men to his Religion, as any the openeſt Perſecutors can pretend to. I " ask what Difference is there between puniſhing them to bring them to Maſs, and " puniſhing them to bring them to conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments which are " proper and ſufficient to convince them that they ought to go to Maſs? You reply; *A Queſtion which you ſhall then think your ſelf obliged to anſwer, when* I *have produced thoſe* Reaſons and Arguments which are *proper and ſufficient to convince Men that they ought to go to Maſs.* But if you had not omitted the three or four immediately preceding Lines, (an Art to ſerve a good Cauſe, which puts me in mind of my *Pagans and Mahometans*) the Reader would have ſeen that your Reply was nothing at all to my Argument: My Words were theſe. Pag. 27.

" Eſpecially, if you conſider, that as the Magiſtrate will certainly uſe it [Force] " to force Men to hearken to the *proper Miniſters of his Religion*, let it be what it will; " ſo you having ſet no Time nor Bounds to this Conſideration of Arguments and " Reaſons ſhort of being convinced, you under another, *&c.* My Argument is to ſhew of what Advantage Force, your Way apply'd, is like to be to the true Religion, ſince it puts as much Force into the Magiſtrate's Hands as the openeſt Perſecutors can pretend to, which the Magiſtrates of wrong Perſuaſions may and will uſe as well as thoſe of the true; becauſe your Way ſets no other Bounds to conſidering ſhort of complying. And then I ask, " What Difference there is between " puniſhing you to bring you to Maſs, or puniſhing you to conſider thoſe *Reaſons* " and *Arguments* which are proper and ſufficient to convince you that you ought to go " to Maſs? To which you reply, That it is a *Queſtion* you *ſhall then think* your *ſelf oblig'd to anſwer, when* I *have produced thoſe Reaſons and Arguments that are proper and ſufficient to convince Men that they ought to go to Maſs.* Whereas the Objection is the ſame, Whether there be or be not, Reaſons and Arguments proper to convince Men, that they ought to go to Maſs; for Men muſt be puniſhed on till they have ſo conſidered as to comply: And what Difference is there then between puniſhing Men to bring them to Maſs, and puniſhing them to make them conſider ſo as to go to Maſs? But tho' I pretend not to produce any Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince you or all Men, that they ought to go to Maſs; yet do you think there are none proper and ſufficient to convince any Men? And that all the *Papiſts* in the World go to Maſs without believing it their Duty? And whoſoever believes it to be his Duty, does it upon Reaſons and Arguments, proper and ſufficient to convince him (tho' perhaps not to convince another) that it is ſo, or elſe I imagine he would never believe it at all. What think you of thoſe great Numbers of *Japaneſes*, that reſiſted all Sorts of Torments, even to Death it ſelf, for the *Romiſh* Religion? And had you been in *France* ſome Years ſince, who knows but the Arguments the King of *France produced* might have been *proper and ſufficient* to have *convinced* you *that* you *ought to go to Maſs?* I do not by this, think you leſs confident of the Truth of your Religion, than you profeſs to be. But Arguments ſet on with Force, have a ſtrange Efficacy upon human Frailty; and he muſt be well aſſured of his own Strength, who can peremptorily affirm, he is ſure he ſhould have ſtood, what above a Million of People ſunk under: Amongſt which, 'tis great Confidence to ſay, there was not one ſo well perſuaded of the Truth of his Religion, as you are of yours; tho' ſome of them gave great Proofs of their Perſuaſion in their Sufferings for it. But what the *neceſſary* Method of Force may be able to do, to bring any one, in your Senſe, to any Religion, *i. e.* to an outward Profeſſion of it, he that thinks himſelf ſecure againſt, muſt have a greater Aſſurance of himſelf, than the Weakneſs of decayed and depraved Nature will well allow. If you have any Spell againſt the Force of Arguments, driven with Penalties and Puniſhments, you will do well to teach it the World; for it is the hard Luck of well-meaning People to be often miſled by them, and even the confident themſelves have not ſeldom fallen under them, and betrayed their Weakneſs.

To my demanding, if you meant *Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince Men* of the Truth, why did you not ſay ſo? You reply, *As if it were poſſible for any Man that reads your Anſwer, to think otherwiſe.* Whoever reads that Paſſage in your *A. p.* 5. cannot poſſibly think you meant to ſpeak out, and poſſibly you found ſome Difficulty to add any Thing to your Words (which are theſe, *Force uſed to bring Men to conſider Reaſons and Arguments proper and ſufficient to convince them*) that might determine their Senſe. For if you had ſaid, *to convince them* of Truth; then the Pag. 27. A. p. 5.

Magiſtrate

Magiſtrate muſt have made Laws, and *uſed Force* to make Men ſearch after Truth in general, and that would not have ſerved your Turn: If you had ſaid to *convince them* of the Truth of the Magiſtrate's Religion, that would too manifeſtly have put the Power in every Magiſtrate's Hands, which you tell us, *none but an Atheiſt will ſay.* If you had ſaid, *to convince them* of the Truth of your Religion, that had looked too rediculous to be owned, tho' it were the Thing you meant; and therefore in this Strait, where nothing you could ſay, would well fit your Purpoſe, you wiſely chuſe to leave the Senſe imperfect, and name nothing they were to be convinced of, but leave it to be collected by your Reader out of your Diſcourſe, rather than add three Words to make it good Grammer, as well as intelligible Senſe.

To my ſaying, " That if you pretend it muſt be Arguments to convince Men of " the Truth, it would in this Caſe do you little Service; becauſe the Maſs in *France*
Pag. 28. " is as much ſuppos'd the Truth, as the Liturgy here. You reply, *So that it ſeems, that in my Opinion, whatſoever is ſuppos'd the Truth, is the Truth, for otherwiſe this Reaſon* of mine *is none at all.* If, in my Opinion, the Suppoſition of Truth authorizes the Magiſtrate to uſe the ſame Means to bring Men to it, as if it were true, my Argument will hold good, without taking all to be true which ſome Men ſuppoſe true. According to this Anſwer of yours, to ſuppoſe or believe his Religion the true, is not enough to authorize the Magiſtrate to uſe Force, he muſt know, *i. e.* be infallibly certain, that his is the true Religion. We will for once ſuppoſe you our Magiſtrate, with Force promoting our National Religion. I will not ask you, whether you know that all required of Conformiſts, is neceſſary to Salvation: But will ſuppoſe one of my *Pagans* asking you, whether you know Chriſtianity to be the true Religion? If you ſay, Yes, he will ask you how you know it? And no doubt, but you will give the Anſwer, whereby our Saviour proved his Miſſion, *John* 5. 36. that *the Works which* our Saviour *did bear Witneſs* of him, *that the Father ſent him.* The Miracles that Chriſt did, are a Proof of his being ſent from God, and ſo his Religion the true Religion. But then you will be asked again, Whether you know that he did thoſe Miracles, as well as thoſe who ſaw them done? If you anſwer, Yes; then it is plain that Miracles are not yet withdrawn, but do ſtill accompany the Chriſtian Religion with all the Efficacy and Evidence, that they had upon the Eye-witneſſes of them, and then upon your own Grounds, there will be no Neceſſity of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance, Miracles ſtill ſupplying the Want of it. If you anſwer, that Matter of Fact done out of your Sight, at ſuch a Diſtance of Time and Place, cannot be known to you as certainly, as it was to the Eye-witneſſes of it, but that you upon very good Grounds firmly believe it; you are then come to believing, that yours is the true Religion, and if that be ſufficient to authorize you to uſe Force, it will authorize any other Magiſtrate of any other Religion to uſe Force alſo. For whoever believes any thing, takes it to be true, and as he thinks upon good Grounds; and thoſe often who believe on the weakeſt Grounds, have the ſtrongeſt Confidence: And thus all Magiſtrates who believe their Religion to be true, will be obliged to uſe Force to promote it, as if it were the true.

To my ſaying that the Uſefulneſs of Force, your Way apply'd, amounts to no more
Pag. 28. but this, that it is not impoſſible but that it may be uſeful. You reply, *I leave it to be judg'd by what has been ſaid;* and I leave it to you your ſelf to judge: Only, that you may not forget, I ſhall here remind you in ſhort of ſome of the Reaſons I have to ſay ſo: 1. You grant that Force has no direct Efficacy to bring Men to embrace the Truth. 2. You diſtinguiſh the *indirect,* and *at diſtance Uſefulneſs* of your Force, from that which is barely *by Accident*; by theſe two Marks, *viz.* *1ſt.* That Puniſhment on Diſſenters for Nonconformity, is, *by thoſe that uſe it, intended* to make Men conſider: and *2d.* That your moderate Puniſhments, by Experience, are found *often ſucceſsful*; and yours having neither of theſe Marks, it muſt be concluded to be uſeful only by Accident:
L. 1. p. 266. and ſuch an Uſefulneſs, as I ſaid, " One cannot deny, to Auricular Confeſſion, do- " ing of Penance, going Pilgrimages to Saints, and what not? Yet our Church does not " think fit to uſe them; tho' it cannot be deny'd but they may have ſome of your " *indirect and at a diſtance Uſefulneſs*; that is, perhaps may *do ſome Service indirectly,* and " by Accident. If the Intention of thoſe that uſe them, and the *Succeſs* they will tell you they find the Uſe of them, be a Proof of doing Service more than by Accident; that cannot be deny'd to them more than to Penalties, your Way applied. To which, let me add, that Niceneſs and Difficulty there is, to hit that juſt Degree of Force; which according to your Hypotheſis, muſt be neither ſo much as to do harm, nor ſo little as to be ineffectual: for you your ſelf cannot determine it,

makes

makes it Uſefulneſs yet more uncertain and accidental. And after all, let its Efficacy to work upon Mens Minds be what it will, great or little, it being ſure to be employed ten, or poſſibly, an hundred Times to bring Men to Error, for once that it is employ'd to bring Men to the Truth; and where it chances to be employ'd, on the Side of Truth, it being liable to make an hundred, or perhaps a thouſand outward Conformiſts, for one true and ſincere Convert; I leave it alſo to be judg'd what Uſefulneſs it is like to be of.

To ſhew the Uſefulneſs of Force, your Way apply'd, I ſaid, " Where the Law " puniſh'd Diſſenters without telling them it is to make them conſider, they may thro' " Ignorance and Overſight neglect to do it. Your Anſwer is, *But where the Law pro-* Pag. 28. *vides ſufficient Means of Inſtruction for all, as well as Puniſhment for Diſſenters, it is ſo plain to all concern'd, that the Puniſhment is intended to make them conſider, that* you *ſee no Danger of Mens neglecting to do it, thro' Ignorance and Overſight.* I hope you mean by *conſider*, ſo to *conſider* as not only to embrace in an outward Profeſſion (for then all you ſay is but a poor Fallacy, for ſuch a Conſidering amounts to no more but bare outward Conformity;) but ſo to *conſider, ſtudy* and *examine* Matters of Religion, as really to embrace, what one is convinced to be true, with Faith and Obedience. If it be ſo plain and eaſy to underſtand, that a Law, that ſpeaks nothing of it, ſhould yet be intended to make Men *conſider*, ſearch and *ſtudy*, to find out the *Truth that muſt ſave them*; I wiſh you had ſhew'd us this Plainneſs. For I confeſs many of all Degrees, that I purpoſely ask'd about it, did not ever ſee, or ſo much as dream, that the Act of Uniformity, or againſt Conventicles, or the Penalties in either of them, were ever intended to make Men ſeriouſly ſtudy Religion, and make it their Buſineſs to find the *Truth which muſt ſave them*; but barely to make Men conform. But perhaps you have met with Handicrafts-men, and Country-Farmers, Maid-Servants, and Day-Labourers, who have quicker Underſtandings, and reaſon better about the Intention of the Law, for theſe as well others are *concern'd*. If you have not, 'tis to be fear'd, your ſaying *it is ſo plain, that you ſee no Danger of Mens neglecting to do it, thro' Ignorance or Overſight*, is more for its ſerving your Purpoſe, than from any Experience you have, that it is ſo.

When you will enquire into this Matter, you will, I gueſs, find the People ſo ignorant amidſt that great *Plainneſs* you ſpeak of, that not one of twenty of any Degree, amongſt Conformiſts or Nonconformiſts, ever underſtood the Penalty of 12 *d.* a *Sunday*, or any other of our Penal Laws againſt Nonconformity, to be intended to ſet Men upon ſtudying the true Religion, and impartially examine what is neceſſary to Salvation. And if you would come to *Hudibras*'s Deciſion, I believe he would have a good Wager of it, who ſhould give you a Guinea for each one who had thought ſo, and receive but a Shilling for every one who had not. Indeed you do not ſay, it is plain every-where, but only *where the Law provides ſufficient Means of Inſtruction for all, as well as Puniſhments for Diſſenters*. From whence, I think it will follow, that that contributes nothing to make it plain, or elſe that the Law has not provided ſufficient Means of Inſtruction in *England*, where ſo very few find this to be ſo plain. If by this *ſufficient Proviſion of Means of Inſtruction for all*; you mean, Perſons maintain'd at the publick Charge to preach, and officiate in the publick Exerciſe of the National Religion; I ſuppoſe you needed not this Reſtriction, there being few Places which have an eſtabliſh'd National Religion, where there is not ſuch *Means of Inſtruction provided*: If you intend any other *Means of Inſtruction*, I know none *the Law* has provided in *England* but the 39 Articles, the Liturgy, and the Scripture, and how either of them by it ſelf, or theſe altogether, with a National Clergy, make it plain, that Penalties laid on Nonconformity, are intended to make Men *conſider, ſtudy and impartially examine Matters of Religion*, you would do well to ſhew. For Magiſtrates uſually know (and therefore make their Laws accordingly) that the People ſeldom carry either their Interpretation or Practice beyond what the expreſs Letter of the Law requires of them. You would do well alſo to ſhew, that a ſufficient Proviſion of Means of Inſtruction, cannot but be underſtood to require an effectual Uſe of them, which the Law that makes that Proviſion ſays nothing of. But on the contrary, contents it ſelf with ſomething very ſhort of it: For Conformity or coming to Church, is at leaſt as far from *conſidering, ſtudying* and *impartially examining* Matters of Religion, ſo as to *embrace the Truth upon Conviction, and with an obedient Heart*, as being preſent at the Diſcourſe concerning Mathematicks, and ſtudying Mathematicks, ſo as to become a knowing Mathematician, are different one from the other.

People generally think they have done their Duties abundantly, if they have been at Church, whether they mind any Thing done there or no: This they call ſerving of God, as if it were their whole Duty; ſo backward are they to underſtand more, tho' it be plain the Law of God expreſly requires more. But that they have fully ſatisfied the Law of the Land, no body doubts; nor is it eaſy to anſwer what was replied to me on this Occaſion, *viz.* If the Magiſtrate *intended* any Thing more in thoſe Laws but Conformity, would he not have ſaid it? To which let me add, if the Magiſtrate *intended Conformity as the Fruit of Conviction*, would he not have taken ſome Care to have them inſtructed before they conformed, and examin'd when they did? But 'tis *preſumable* their Ignorance, Corruption and Luſts, all drop off in the Church-Porch, and that they become perfectly good Chriſtians as ſoon as they have taken their Seats in the Church.

If there be any whom your Example or Writing hath inſpir'd with Acuteneſs enough to find out this; I ſuſpect the Vulgar who have ſcarce Time and Thought enough to make Inferences from the Law, which ſcarce one of ten of them ever ſo much as reads, or perhaps underſtands when read, are ſtill, and will be ignorant of it: And thoſe who have the Time and Abilities to argue about it, will find Reaſon to think that thoſe Penalties were not *intended* to make Men examine the Doctrines and Ceremonies of Religion; ſince thoſe who ſhould examine, are prohibited by thoſe very Laws, to follow their own Judgments, (which is the very End and Uſe of Examination) if they at all differ from the Religion eſtabliſh'd by Law. Nor can it appear ſo *plain to all concern'd, that the Puniſhment is intended to make them conſider and examine*, when they ſee the Puniſhments you ſay are to make People *conſider*, ſpare thoſe who conſider and examine Matters of Religion, as little as any of the moſt ignorant and careleſs Diſſenters.

To my ſaying, "Some Diſſenters may have conſider'd already, and then Force
Pag. 28. "employ'd upon them muſt needs be uſeleſs; unleſs you can think it uſeful to pu-
"niſh a Man to make him do that which he has done already. You reply, *No Man who rejects Truth neceſſary to his Salvation, has conſider'd already as he ought to conſider.* The Words *as he ought*, are not, as I take it, in the Queſtion: And ſo your Anſwer is, *No Man who rejects the Truth neceſſary to his Salvation, hath conſider'd*, ſtudy'd or examin'd *Matters of Religion.* But we will let that go: and yet with that Allowance, your Anſwer will be nothing to the Purpoſe, unleſs you will dare to ſay, that all Diſſenters reject Truth neceſſary to Salvation. For without that Suppoſition, that all Diſſenters *reject Truth neceſſary to Salvation*, the Argument and Anſwer will ſtand thus. It may be uſeleſs to puniſh all Diſſenters to make them *conſider*, becauſe ſome of them may have *conſider'd* already. To which, the Anſwer is, Yes, ſome of them may have *conſider'd* already, but thoſe who reject Truth neceſſary to their Salvation, have not conſider'd as they ought.

L. 2. p. 267. I ſaid, "The greateſt Part of Mankind, being not able to diſcern betwixt Truth and
"Falſhood, that depends upon long and many Proofs, and remote Conſequences; nor
"having Ability enough to diſcover the falſe Grounds, and reſiſt the captious and fal-
"lacious Arguments of learned Men verſed in Controverſies, are ſo much more expos'd
"by the Force, which is uſed to make them hearken to the Information and Inſtruc-
"tion of Men appointed to it by the Magiſtrate, or thoſe of his Religion, to be led
"into Falſhood and Error, than they are likely this Way to be brought to embrace
"the Truth which muſt ſave them: by how much the National Religions of the World
Pag. 29. "are, beyond Compariſon, more of them falſe or erroneous, than ſuch as have God
"for their Author, and Truth for their Standard. You reply, *If the firſt Part of this be true, then an infallible Guide, and implicit Faith, are more neceſſary than ever you thought them.* Whether you conclude from thence or no, that then there will be a Neceſſity of an *infallible Guide*, and an *implicit Faith*, 'tis nevertheleſs true, that the greateſt Part of Men are unable to diſcern, as I ſaid, between Truth and Falſhood depending, upon long and many Proofs, *&c.* But whether that will make an infallible Guide neceſſary or no, Impoſition in Matters of Religion certainly will: ſince there can be nothing more abſurd imaginable, than that a Man ſhould take upon him to impoſe on others in Matters of their Eternal Concernment, without being, or ſo much as pretending to be *infallible*: For colour it with the Name of *conſidering* as much as you pleaſe, as long as it is to *make Men conſider as they ought, and conſidering as they ought, is* ſo to conſider, as to *embrace*; the uſing of Force to make Men *conſider*, and the uſing of Force to *make them embrace* any Doctrine or Opinion, is the ſame Thing: And to

ſhew

ſhew a Difference betwixt impoſing an Opinion, and uſing Force to make it be embrac'd, would require ſuch a piece of Subtilty, as I heard lately from a learned Man out of the Pulpit, who told us, that tho' two Things, he named, were all one, yet for Diſtinction's ſake he would divide them. Your Reaſon for the Neceſſity of an infallible Guide, is, *For if the greateſt Part of Mankind be not able to diſcern betwixt Truth and Falſhood, in Matters concerning their Salvation (as I muſt mean if I ſpeak to the Purpoſe) their Condition muſt needs be very hazardous, if they have not ſome Guide or Judge, to whoſe Determination and Direction they may ſecurely reſign themſelves.* And therefore they muſt reſign themſelves to the *Determination and Direction* of the Civil Magiſtrate, or be puniſhed. Here 'tis like you will have ſomething again to ſay to my *Modeſty and Conſcience*, for imputing to you what you no where ſay. I grant it, in direct Words; but in Effect as plainly as may be. The Magiſtrate may *impoſe ſound Creeds and decent Ceremonies*, i. e. ſuch as he thinks fit, for what is *ſound* and *decent* he I hope muſt be Judge; and if he be Judge of what is *ſound* and *decent*, it amounts to no more, but what he thinks fit: And if it be not what he thinks fit, why is one Ceremony prefer'd to another? Why one Doctrine of the Scripture put into the Creed and Articles, and another as ſound left out? They are *Truths neceſſary to Salvation.* We ſhall ſee that in good Time: Here only I ask, Does the Magiſtrate only believe them to be Truths and Ceremonies neceſſary to Salvation, or does he certainly know them to be ſo? If you ſay he only believes them to be ſo, and that that is enough to authorize him to *impoſe* them, you, by your own Confeſſion, authorize Magiſtrates *to impoſe* what they think neceſſary for the Salvation of their Subjects Souls; and ſo the King of *France* did what he was obliged to, when he ſaid he would have all his Subjects ſaved, and ſo fell to dragooning.

If you ſay the Magiſtrate certainly know them to be neceſſary to Salvation, we are luckily come to an *infallible Guide.* Well then, the *ſound Creeds* are agreed on; the Confeſſion and Liturgy are framed; the *Ceremonies* pitch'd on; and the Terms of Communion thus ſet up, you have Religion eſtabliſh'd by Law: And what now is the Subject to do? He is to conform. No; he muſt firſt *conſider.* Who bids him *conſider?* No body, he may if he pleaſes, but the Law ſays nothing to him of it: *conſider* or not *conſider*, if he conforms 'tis well, and he is approved of, and admitted. He does conſider the beſt he can, but finds ſome Things he does not underſtand, other Things he cannot believe, aſſent or conſent to. What now is to be done with him? He muſt either be puniſhed on, or reſign himſelf up to the Determination and Direction of the Civil Magiſtrate; which till you can find a better Name for it, we will call *implicit Faith.* And thus you have provided a Remedy for the *hazardous Condition* of weak Underſtandings, in that which you ſuppoſe neceſſary in the Caſe, *viz.* an *infallible Guide* and *implicit Faith*, in *Matters concerning Mens Salvation.*

But you ſay, *For* your *Part*, you *know of no ſuch Guide of God's appointing.* Let that Pag. 29.
be your Rule, and the *Magiſtrate* with his *coactive Power*, will be left out too. You *think there is no need of any ſuch: becauſe notwithſtanding* the long and many Proofs and remote Conſequences, the falſe Grounds, and the captious and fallacious Arguments of learned Men vers'd in Controverſies, *with which I (as well as thoſe of the* Roman *Communion) endeavour to amuſe* you; *thro' the Goodneſs of God, the Truth which is neceſſary to Salvation, lies ſo obvious and expoſed to all that ſincerely and diligently ſeek it, that no ſuch Perſon ſhall ever fail of attaining the Knowledge of it.* This then is your Anſwer, that *Truths neceſſary to Salvation are obvious*; ſo that thoſe who *ſeek them ſincerely and diligently*, are not in Danger to be miſled or expos'd in thoſe to Error, by the Weakneſs of their Underſtandings. This will be a good Anſwer to what I objected from the Danger moſt are in to be led into Error, by the Magiſtrate's adding Force to the Arguments for their National eſtabliſh'd Religions; when you have ſhewn that nothing is wont to be impos'd in National Religions, but what is neceſſary to Salvation; or which will a little better accommodate your Hypotheſis, when you can ſhew that nothing is impos'd, or requir'd for Communion with the Church of *England*, but what is *neceſſary to Salvation*; and conſequently, is very eaſy and *obvious* to be known, and diſtinguiſh'd from Falſhood. And indeed, beſides what you ſay here, upon your Hypotheſis, that Force is lawful only becauſe it is *neceſſary to bring Men to Salvation*, it cannot be lawful to uſe it, to bring Men to any Thing, but what is abſolutely neceſſary to *Salvation.* For if the Lawfulneſs of Force be only from the need Men have of it to bring them to *Salvation*, it cannot lawfully be uſed, to bring Men to that which they do not need, or is not neceſſary to

their *Salvation*; for in ſuch an Application of it; it is not needful to their *Salvation*. Can you therefore ſay, that there is nothing requir'd to be believ'd and profeſs'd in
Pag. 29. the Church of *England*, but what *lies ſo obvious and expos'd to all that ſincerely and diligently ſeek it, that no ſuch Perſon ſhall ever fail of attaining the Knowledge of it?* What think you of St. *Athanaſius*'s Creed? Is the Senſe of that ſo *obvious and expos'd* to every one who ſeeks it, which ſo many learned Men have explained ſo different Ways, and which yet a great many profeſs they cannot underſtand? Or is it neceſſary to your or my Salvation, that you or I ſhould believe or pronounce all thoſe damn'd who do not believe that Creed, *i. e.* every Propoſition in it? which I fear would extend to not a few of the Church of *England*, unleſs we can think that People believe, *i. e.* aſſent to the Truth of Propoſitions, they do not at all underſtand. If ever you were acquainted with a Country Pariſh, you muſt needs have a ſtrange Opinion of them, if you think all the Plowmen and Milkmaids at Church, underſtood all the Propoſitions in *Athanaſius*'s Creed; 'tis more, truly, than I ſhould be apt to think of any one of them, and yet I cannot hence believe my ſelf authoriz'd to judge or pronounce them all damn'd: 'Tis too bold an intrenching on the Prerogative of the Almighty, to their own Maſter they ſtand or fall.

The Doctrine of Original Sin, is that which is profeſs'd, and muſt be owned by the Members of the Church of *England*, as is evident from the Thirty Nine Articles, and ſeveral Paſſages in the Liturgy: And yet I ask you, whether this be *ſo obvious and expos'd to all that diligently and ſincerely ſeek the Truth*, that one who is in the Communion of the Church of *England*, ſincerely ſeeking the Truth, may not raiſe to himſelf ſuch Difficulties concerning the Doctrine of Original Sin as may puzzle him, tho' he be a Man of Study; and whether he may not puſh his Enquiries ſo far, as to be ſtagger'd in his Opinion.

If you grant me this, as I am apt to think you will, then I enquire whether it be not true (notwithſtanding what you ſay concerning the Plainneſs and Obviouſneſs of Truths neceſſary to Salvation) that a great Part of Mankind may not be able to diſcern between Truth, and Falſhood, in ſeveral Points, which are thought ſo far *to concern their Salvation*, as to be made neceſſary Parts of the National Religion.

If you ſay it may be ſo, then I have nothing farther to enquire; but ſhall only adviſe you not to be ſo ſevere hereafter in your Cenſure of Mr. *Reynolds*, as you are, where you tell me, that the *famous Inſtance* I *give of the two* Reynolds's *is not of any moment to prove the contrary; unleſs* I *can undertake, that he that erred was as ſincere in his Enquiry after that Truth, as I ſuppoſe him able to examine and judge.*

You will, I ſuppoſe, be more charitable another time, when you have conſider'd, that neither *Sincerity*, nor Freedom from Error, even in the eſtabliſh'd Doctrines of their own Church, is the Privilege of thoſe who join themſelves in outward Profeſſion to any National Church whatſoever. And it is not impoſſible, that one who has ſubſcribed the Thirty Nine Articles, may yet make it a Queſtion, *Whether it may be truly ſaid that God imputes the firſt Sin of* Adam *to his Poſterity?* &c. But we are apt to be ſo fond of our own Opinions, and almoſt *Infallibility*, that we will not allow them to be *ſincere*, who quit our Communion; whilſt at the ſame Time we tell the World, it is *preſumable*, that all who embrace it do it ſincerely, and upon Conviction; tho' we cannot but know many of them to be but looſe, inconſiderate, and ignorant People. This is all the Reaſon you have, when you ſpeak of the *Reynolds's*, to ſuſpect one of the Brothers more than the other: And to think that Mr. *Chillingworth* had not as much Sincerity when he quitted, as when he return'd to the Church of *England*, is a Partiality, which nothing can juſtify without pretending to *Infallibility*.

Pag. 34. To ſhew that you do not *fancy* your Force to be uſeful, but that you *judge ſo upon juſt and ſufficient Grounds*, you tell us, the *ſtrong Probability of its Succeſs* is *grounded upon the Conſideration of human Nature, and the general Temper of Mankind, apt to be wrought upon by the Method* you *ſpeak* of, *and upon the indiſputable Atteſtation of Experience.* The Conſideration of human Nature, and the general Temper of Mankind, will teach one this, That Men *are apt*, in Things within their Power, to be *wrought upon* by Force, and the more wrought upon, the greater the Force or Puniſhments are: So that where *moderate Penalties* will not work, *great Severities* will. Which Conſideration of human Nature, if it be a *juſt Ground to judge* any Force uſeful, will I fear neceſſarily carry you, in your Judgment, to Severities beyond the moderate

Penalties

Penalties, ſo often mentioned in your Syſtem, upon a *ſtrong Probability* of the Succeſs of greater Puniſhments, where leſs would not prevail.

But if to *conſider* ſo as you require, *i. e.* ſo as to *embrace*, and *believe*, be not in their Power, than no Force at all, great or little, is or can be *uſeful*. You muſt therefore (conſider it which Way you will) either renounce all Force as *uſeful*, or pull off your Mask, and own all the Severities of the cruelſt Perſecutors.

The other Reaſon of your judging Force to be uſeful, you ſay, *is grounded on the indiſputable Atteſtation of Experience.* Pray tell us where you have this *Atteſtation of Experience* for your *moderate*, which is the only uſeful *Force*: Name the Country where *true Religion or ſound Chriſtianity* has been *Nationally receiv'd*, and *eſtabliſh'd by moderate Penal Laws*, that the *obſerving Perſons* you *appeal to*, may know where to employ their Obſervation: Tell us how long it was tried, and what was the Succeſs of it? And where there has been the Relaxation of ſuch moderate Penal Laws, the Fruits whereof have *continually* been *Epicuriſm and Atheiſm?* Till you do this, I fear, that all the World will think, there is a more *indiſputable Atteſtation of Experience* for the Succeſs of dragooning, and the *Severities* you condem, than of your *moderate Method*; which we ſhall compare with the King of *France*'s, and ſee which is moſt ſucceſsful in making Proſelytes to Church-Conformity, (for yours as well as his reach no farther than that) when you produce your Examples: The confident Talk whereof, is good to countenance a Cauſe, tho' Experience there be none in the Caſe.

But you *appeal*, you ſay, *to all obſerving Perſons, Whether where-ever true Religion or* Pag. 34. *ſound Chriſtianity have been Nationally receiv'd and eſtabliſh'd by moderate Penal Laws, it has not always viſibly loſt Ground by the Relaxation of thoſe Laws?* True or falſe Religions, ſound or unſound Chriſtianity, where-ever eſtabliſh'd into National Religions by Penal Laws, always have loſt, and always will loſe Ground, *i. e.* loſe ſeveral of their conforming Profeſſors upon the Relaxation of thoſe Laws. But this concerns not the true, more than other Religions; nor is any Prejudice to it; but only ſhews, that many are, by the Penalties of the Law, kept in the Communion of the National Religion, who are not really convinced or perſuaded of it: And therefore, as ſoon as Liberty is given, they own the Diſlike they had many of them before, and out of Perſuaſion, Curioſity, *&c.* ſeek out and betake themſelves to ſome other Profeſſion. This need not ſtartle the Magiſtrates of any Religion, much leſs thoſe of the true, ſince they be ſure to retain thoſe, who more mind their ſecular Intereſt than the Truth of Religion, (who are every where the greater Number) by the Advantages of Countenance and Preferment: And if it be the true Religion, they will retain thoſe alſo, who are in earneſt of it, by the ſtronger Tie of Conſcience and Conviction.

You go on, *Whether Sects and Hereſies (even the wildeſt and moſt abſurd, and even Epi-* Ibid. *curiſm and Atheiſm) have not continually thereupon ſpread themſelves, and whether the very Life of Chriſtianity has not ſenſibly decay'd, as well as the Number of ſound Profeſſors of it been daily leſſen'd upon it?* As to *Atheiſm* and *Epicuriſm*, whether they more ſpread under Toleration, or National Religions, eſtabliſh'd by *moderate Penal Laws*, when you ſhew us the Countries where fair Trial hath been made of both, that we may compare them together, we ſhall better be able to judge.

Epicuriſm and Atheiſm, ſay you, are found *conſtantly to ſpread themſelves upon the Relaxation of moderate Penal Laws.* We will ſuppoſe your Hiſtory to be full of Inſtances of ſuch *Relaxations*, which you will in good Time communicate to the World, that wants this Aſſiſtance from your Obſervation. But were this to be juſtified out of Hiſtory, yet would it not be any Argument againſt Toleration; unleſs your Hiſtory can furniſh you with a new Sort of Religion founded in Atheiſm. However, you do well to charge the ſpreading of Atheiſm upon Toleration in Matters of Religion, as an Argument againſt thoſe who deny *Atheiſm* (which takes away all Religion) to have any Right to Toleration at all. But perhaps (as is uſual for thoſe who think all the World ſhould ſee with their Eyes, and receive their Syſtems for unqueſtionable Verities) Zeal for your own Way makes you call all *Atheiſm*, that agrees not with it. That which makes me doubt of this, are theſe following Words; *Not to ſpeak of* Pag. 35. *what at this Time our Eyes cannot but ſee for fear of giving Offence: Though I hope it will be none to any that have a juſt Concern for Truth and Piety, to take notice of the Books and Pamphlets which now fly ſo thick about this Kingdom, manifeſtly tending to the multiplying of Sects and Diviſions, and even to the promoting of* Scepticiſm *in Religion amongſt us. In which Number*, you ſay, you *ſhall not much need* my *Pardon, if* you *reckon the Firſt*

and

and Second Letter concerning Toleration. Wherein, by a broad Inſinuation, you impute the ſpreading of *Atheiſm* among us, to the late *Relaxation* made in Favour of Proteſtant Diſſenters: And yet all that you can take notice of as a Proof of this, is *the Books and Pamphlets which now fly ſo thick about this Kingdom, manifeſtly tending to the multiplying of Sects and Diviſions, and even to the promoting of Scepticiſm in Religion amongſt us*; and for Inſtance, you name *the Firſt and Second Letter concerning Toleration.* If one may gueſs at the others by theſe, The *Atheiſm* and *Scepticiſm* you accuſe them of will have but little more in it, than an Oppoſition to your Hypotheſis; on which, the whole Buſineſs of Religion muſt ſo turn, that whatever agrees not with your Syſtem, muſt preſently, by Interpretation, be concluded to *tend* to the promoting of *Atheiſm* or *Scepticiſm* in Religion. For I challenge you to ſhew in either of thoſe two Letters you mention, one Word tending to *Epicuriſm, Atheiſm, or Scepticiſm* in Religion.

But, Sir, againſt the next Time you are to give an Account of *Books and Pamphlets tending to the promoting Scepticiſm in Religion amongſt us*, I ſhall mind you of the *Third Letter concerning Toleration*, to be added to the Catalogue, which aſſerting and
Pag. 47. building upon this, that *True Religion, may be known by thoſe who profeſs it, to be the only True Religion*, does not a little towards betraying the Chriſtian Religion to Scepticks. For what greater Advantage can be given them, than to teach, that one may know the true Religion? thereby putting into their Hands a Right to demand it to be demonſtrated to them, that the Chriſtian Religion is true, and bringing on the Profeſſors of it to a Neceſſity of doing it. I have heard it complain'd of as one great Artifice of Scepticks, to require Demonſtrations where they neither could be had, nor were neceſſary. But if the true Religion may be known to Men to be ſo, a Sceptick may require, and you cannot blame him if he does not receive your Religion, upon the ſtrongeſt probale Arguments, without Demonſtration.

And if one ſhould demand of you Demonſtration of the Truths of your Religion, which I beſeech you, would you do, either renounce your Aſſertion, that it may be known to be true, or elſe undertake to demonſtrate it to him?

And as for *the Decay of the very Life and Spirit of Chriſtianity*, and the *ſpreading of Epicuriſm* amongſt us: I ask, what can more tend to the promoting of them than this Doctrine, which is to be found in the ſame Letter, *viz.* That it is *preſumable* that thoſe who *conform, do it upon Reaſon and Conviction?* When you can inſtance in any Thing ſo much tending to the promoting of *Scepticiſm in Religion*, and *Epicuriſm*, in *the firſt or ſecond Letter concerning Toleration*, we ſhall have Reaſon to think you have ſome Ground for what you ſay.

As to *Epicuriſm*, the ſpreading whereof you likewiſe impute to the *Relaxation* of your moderate Penal Laws; That ſo far as it is diſtinct from *Atheiſm*, I think regards Mens Lives more than their Religions, *i. e.* ſpeculative Opinions in Religion and Ways of Worſhip, which is what we mean by Religion, as concern'd in Toleration. And for the Toleration of corrupt Manners, and the Debaucheries of Life, neither our Author, nor I do plead for it; but ſay it is properly the Magiſtrate's Buſineſs, by Puniſhments to reſtrain and ſuppreſs them. I do not therefore blame your Zeal againſt *Atheiſm* and *Epicuriſm*; but you diſcover a great Zeal againſt ſomething elſe, in charging them on Toleration, when it is in the Magiſtrate's Power to reſtrain and ſuppreſs them by more effectual Laws than thoſe for Church-Conformity. For there are thoſe who will tell you, that an outward Profeſſion of the National Religion, even where it is the true Religion, is no more oppoſite to, or inconſiſtent with *Atheiſm* or *Epicuriſm*, than the owning of another Religion, eſpecially any Chriſtian Profeſſion, that differs from it. And therefore, you, in vain, impute *Atheiſm* or *Epicuriſm* to the Relaxation of Penal Laws, that require no more than an outward Conformity to the National Church.

As to the *Sects* and unchriſtian *Diviſions* (for other *Diviſions* there may be without Prejudice to Chriſtianity) at whoſe Door they chiefly ought to be laid, I have ſhew'd you elſewhere.

One Thing I cannot but take notice of here, that having named *Sects, Hereſies, Epicuriſm, Atheiſm, and a Decay of the Spirit and Life of Chriſtianity*, as the Fruits of *Relaxation*, for which you had the *Atteſtation* of former *Experience*, you add theſe
Pag. 34. Words, *Not to ſpeak of what our Eyes at this Time cannot but ſee, for fear of giving Offence.* Whom is it, I beſeech you, you are ſo afraid of offending, if you ſhould ſpeak of the *Epicuriſm, Atheiſm, and Decay of the Spirit, and Life of Chriſtianity*, amongſt us?

us? But I ſee, he that is ſo moderate in one Part of his Letter, that he will *not take upon him to teach Law-makers and Governors*, even what they cannot know without being taught by him, *i. e.* what he calls *moderate Penalties or Force*; may yet, in another Part of the ſame Letter, by broad Inſinuations, uſe Reproaches, wherein 'tis a hard Matter to think *Law-makers* and *Governors* are not meant. But whoever be meant, it is at leaſt adviſeable in Accuſations that are eaſier ſuggeſted than made out, to caſt abroad the Slander in general, and leave others to apply it, for fear thoſe who are named, and ſo juſtly offended with a falſe Imputation, ſhould be entitled to ask, as in this Caſe, how it appears *that Sects* and *Hereſies have multiply'd Epicuriſm and Atheiſm ſpread themſelves, and that the Life and Spirit of Chriſtianity is decay'd* more within theſe two Years, than it was before; and that all this Miſchief is owing to the late *Relaxation* of the Penal Laws againſt Proteſtant Diſſenters?

You go on, *And if theſe have always been the Fruits of the Relaxation of moderate Penal Laws, made for the preſerving and advancing true Religion*; you *think this Conſideration alone is abundantly ſufficient to ſhew the Uſefulneſs and Benefit of ſuch Laws. For if theſe Evils have conſtantly ſprung from the Relaxation of thoſe Laws, 'tis evident they were prevented before by thoſe Laws.* One would think by your ſaying, *always been the Fruits*, and *conſtantly ſprung*, that moderate Penal Laws, for preſerving the true Religion, had been the conſtant Practice of all Chriſtian Common-wealths; and that Relaxations of them, in Favour of a free Toleration, had frequently happen'd; and that there were Examples both of the one and the other, as common and known, as of Princes that have perſecuted for Religion, and learned Men who have employ'd their Skill to make it good. But till you ſhew us in what Ages or Countries your *moderate* Eſtabliſhments were in Faſhion, and where they were again removed to make way for our Author's Toleration, you to as little Purpoſe talk of the *Fruits* of them, as if you ſhould talk of the Fruit of a Tree which no body planted, or was no where ſuffered to grow till one might ſee what Fruit came from it. Pag. 35.

Having laid it down as one of the Conditions for a fair Debate of this Controverſy, "That it ſhould be without ſuppoſing all along your Church in the right, "your Religion the true; I add theſe Words: "Which can no more be allow'd to "you *IN THIS CASE*, whatever your Church or Religion be, than it can be "to a *Papiſt* or a *Lutheran*, a *Presbyterian* or an *Anabaptiſt*; nay, no more to you, "than it can be allow'd to a *Jew* or *Mahometan*. To which you reply, *No, Sir? Not* whatever your *Church or Religion be? That ſeems ſomewhat hard. And* you *think* I *might have given you ſome Reaſon for what* I *ſay: For certainly it is not ſo ſelf-evident as to need no Proof. But* you *think it is no hard Matter to gueſs at* my *Reaſon, tho'* I *did not think fit expreſly to own it. For 'tis obvious enough, there can be no other Reaſon for this Aſſertion of* mine, *but either the equal Truth, or at leaſt the equal Certainty (or Uncertainty) of all Religions. For whoever conſiders* my *Aſſertion, muſt ſee, that to make it good* I *ſhall be obliged to maintain one of theſe two Things: Either,* 1. *That no Religion is the true Religion, in Oppoſition to other Religions: Which makes all Religions true or falſe, and ſo either way indifferent. Or,* 2. *That though ſome one Religion be the true Religion, yet no Man can have any more Reaſon than another Man of another Religion may have, to believe his to be the true Religion. Which makes all Religions equally certain, (or uncertain, whether* I *pleaſe) and ſo renders it vain and idle to enquire after the true Religion, and only a Piece of good Luck if any Man be of it, and ſuch good Luck as he can never know that he has, till he come into the other World. Whether of theſe two Principles* I *will own,* you *know not. But certainly one or other of them lies at the bottom with* me, *and is the lurking Suppoſition upon which* I *build all that* I *ſay.* L. 2. p. 181. Pag. 47.

Certainly no, Sir, neither of theſe Reaſons you have ſo ingenuouſly and friendly found out for me, lies at the bottom; but this, That whatever Privilege or Power you claim, upon your ſuppoſing yours to be the true Religion, is equally due to another (who ſuppoſes his to be the true Religion) upon the ſame Claim: And therefore that is no more to be allow'd to you than to him. For whoſe is really the true Religion, yours or his, being the Matter in Conteſt betwixt you, your *ſuppoſing* can no more determine it on your Side, than his *ſuppoſing on his*; unleſs you can think you have a Right to judge in your own Cauſe. You believe yours to be the true Religion, ſo does he believe his: You ſay you are certain of it, ſo ſays he, he is: You think you have *Arguments proper and ſufficient* to convince him, if he would conſider them; the ſame thinks he of his. If this Claim which is equally on both Sides, be allow'd to either, without any Proof; 'tis plain

plain he, in whoſe Favour it is allow'd, is allow'd to be Judge in his own Cauſe, which no body can have a Right to be, who is not at leaſt infallible. If you come to Arguments and Proofs, which you muſt do, before it can be determin'd whoſe is the true Religion, 'tis plain your Suppoſition is not allow'd.

In our preſent Caſe, in uſing Puniſhments in Religion, your ſuppoſing yours to be the true Religion, gives you or your Magiſtrate no more Advantage over a *Papiſt*, *Preſbyterian*, or *Mahometan*, or more Reaſon to puniſh either of them for his Religion, than the ſame Suppoſition in a *Papiſt*, *Preſbyterian*, or *Mahometan*, gives any of them, or a Magiſtrate of their Religion, Advantage over you, or Reaſon to puniſh you for your Religion: And therefore this Suppoſition, to any Purpoſe or Privilege of uſing of Force, is no more to be allow'd to you, than to any one of any other Religion. This the Words, *IN THIS CASE*, which I there us'd, would have ſatisfied any other to have been my Meaning: But whether your Charity made you not to take notice of them, or the Joy of ſuch an Advantage as this, not to underſtand them, this is certain, you were reſolved not to loſe the Opportunity, ſuch a Place as this afforded you, of ſhewing your Gift, in commenting and gueſſing ſhrewdly at a Man's Reaſons, when he does not *think fit expreſly to own them* himſelf.

I muſt own you have a very lucky Hand at it; and as you do it here upon the ſame Ground, ſo it is juſt with the ſame Succeſs, as you in another Place have exercis'd your Logick on my ſaying ſomething to the ſame Purpoſe, as I do here. But, Sir, if you will add but one more to your plentiful Stock of Diſtinctions, and obſerve the Difference their is between the Ground of any one's ſuppoſing his Religion is true, and the Privilege he may pretend to by ſuppoſing it true, you will never ſtumble at this again; but you will find, that tho' upon the former of theſe Accounts, Men of all Religions cannot be equally allow'd to ſuppoſe their Religions true, yet in reference to the latter, the Suppoſition may and ought to be allow'd, or deny'd equally to all Men. And the Reaſon of it is plain, *viz.* Becauſe the Aſſurance wherewith one Man ſuppoſes his Religion to be true, being no more an Argument of its Truth to another, than *vice verſâ*; neither of them can claim by the Aſſurance, wherewith he ſuppoſes his Religion the true, any Prerogative or Power over the other, which the other has not by the ſame Title an equal Claim to, over him. If this will not ſerve to ſpare you the Pains another time of any more ſuch Reaſonings, as we have twice had on this Subject, I think I ſhall be forced to ſend you to my *Mahometans* or *Pagans*: And I doubt whether I am not leſs civil to your Parts than I ſhould be, that I do not ſend you to them now.

Pag. 47. You go on, and ſay, *But as unreaſonable as this Condition is*, you *ſee no need* you *have to decline it, nor any Occaſion* I *had to impoſe it upon* you. *For certainly the making what* I *call* your *new Method, conſiſtent and practicable, does no way oblige* you *to* ſuppoſe all *along* your *Religion the true, as* I *imagine*. And as I imagine it does: For without that Suppoſition, I would fain have you ſhew me, how it is in any one Country, practicable to puniſh Men to bring them to the true Religion. For if you will argue for Force, as neceſſary to bring Men to the true Religion, without ſuppoſing yours to be it, you will find your ſelf under ſome ſuch Difficulty as this, that then it muſt be firſt be determin'd, (and you will require it ſhould be) which is the true Religion, before any one can have a Right to uſe Force to bring Men to it; which, if every one did not determine for himſelf, by ſuppoſing his own the true, no body, I think, will deſire Toleration any longer than till that be ſettled.

Ibid. You go on: *No, Sir, it is enough for that Purpoſe, that there is one true Religion, and but one.* Suppoſe not the National Religion eſtabliſh'd by Law in *England* to be that, and then even upon your Principles of its being *uſeful*, and that the Magiſtrate has a Commiſſion to uſe Force for the promoting the true Religion; prove, if you pleaſe, that the Magiſtrate has a Power to uſe Force to bring Men to the National Religion in *England*. For then you muſt prove the National Religion, as eſtabliſh'd by Law in *England*, to be that *one true Religion*, and ſo the true Religion; that he rejects the true Religion who diſſents from any Paat of it; and ſo rejecting the true Religion, cannot be ſaved. But of this more in another Place.

Ibid. Your other two Suppoſitions, which you join to the foregoing, are, *That that Religion may be known by thoſe who profeſs it, to be the only true Religion; and may alſo be manifeſted to be ſuch by them to others, ſo far at leaſt, as to oblige them to receive it, and to leave them without Excuſe, if they do not.*

Thoſe,

Theſe, you ſay, are Suppoſitions, *enough for the making your Method conſiſtent and practicable.* They are, I gueſs, more than enough, for you, upon them, to prove any National Religion in the World *the only true Religion.* And till you have proved (for you profeſs here to have quitted the Suppoſition of any one's being true, as neceſſary to your Hypotheſis) ſome National Religion to be that *only true Religion*, I would gladly know how it is any where practicable to uſe Force to bring Men to the true Religion.

You ſuppoſe *there is one true Religion, and but one.* In this we are both agreed: And from hence, I think, it will follow, ſince whoever is of this true Religion ſhall be ſaved, and without being of it no Man ſhall be ſaved, that upon your ſecond and third Suppoſition, it will be hard to ſhew any National Religion to be this *only true Religion.* For who is it will ſay, he knows, or that it is knowable, that any National Religion (wherein muſt be comprehended all that, by the Penal Laws, he is requir'd to embrace) is that *only true Religion*; which if Men reject, they ſhall; and which, if they embrace, they ſhall not miſs Salvation? Or can you undertake that any National Religion in the World can be *manifeſted* to be ſuch, *i. e.* in ſhort, to contain all Things neceſſary to Salvation, and nothing but what is ſo? For that, and that alone, is the *one only true Religion*, without which no body can be ſaved; and which is enough for the Salvation of every one who embraces it. And therefore whatever is leſs or more than this, is not the *one only true Religion*, or that which there is a Neceſſity for their Salvation, Men ſhould be forced to embrace.

I do not hereby deny, that there is any National Religion which contains all that is neceſſary to Salvation, for ſo doth the *Romiſh* Religion, which is not for all that, ſo much as a true Religion. Nor do I deny, that there are National Religions that contain all Things neceſſary to Salvation, and nothing inconſiſtent with it, and ſo may be call'd *true Religions.* But ſince they all of them join with what is neceſſary to Salvation, a great deal that is not ſo, and make that as neceſſary to Communion, as what is neceſſary to Salvation, not ſuffering any one to be of their Communion, without taking all together; nor to live amongſt them free from Puniſhment, out of their Communion; will you affirm, that any of the National Religions of the World, which are impoſed by Penal Laws, and to which Men are driven with Force, can be ſaid to be, that *one only true Religion*, which if Men embrace, they ſhall be ſaved; and which, if they embrace not, they ſhall be damn'd? And therefore your two Suppoſitions, True or Falſe, are not enough to make it practicable, upon your Principles of Neceſſity, to uſe Force upon Diſſenters from the National Religion, tho' it contain in it nothing but Truth, unleſs that which is requir'd to Communion be all neceſſary to Salvation. For whatever is not neceſſary to Salvation, there is no Neceſſity any one ſhould embrace. So that whenever you ſpeak of the *true Religion*, to make it to your Purpoſe, you muſt ſpeak only of what is neceſſary to Salvation; unleſs you will ſay, that in order to the Salvation of Mens Souls, it is neceſſary to uſe Force to bring them to embrace ſomething, that is not neceſſary to their Salvation. I think that neither you, nor any body elſe, will affirm, that it is neceſſary to uſe Force to bring Men to receive all the Truths of the Chriſtian Religion, tho' they are Truths God has thought fit to reveal. For then, by your own Rule, you who profeſs the Chriſtian Religion, muſt know them all, and muſt be able to manifeſt them to others; for it is on that here you ground the Neceſſity and Reaſonableneſs of Penalties uſed to bring Men to embrace the Truth. But I ſuſpect 'tis the good Word *Religion* (as in other Places other Words) has miſled you, whilſt you content your ſelf with good Sounds, and ſome confuſed Notions, that uſually accompany them, without annexing to them any preciſe determin'd Signification. To convince you that 'tis not without Ground I ſay this, I ſhall deſire you but to ſet down what you mean here by *true Religion*, that we may know what in your Senſe is, and what is not contain'd in it. Would you but do thus fairly, and define your Words, or uſe them in one conſtant ſettled Senſe, I think the Controverſy between you and me would be at an end, without any farther Trouble.

Having ſhewed of what Advantage they are like to be to you for the making your Method practicable, in the next Place let us conſider your Suppoſitions themſelves. As to the firſt, *There is one true Religion, and but one*, we are agreed. But what you ſay in the next Place, That *that one true Religion may be known by thoſe who profeſs it*, will need a little Examination. As firſt, it will be neceſſary to enquire, what you mean by *known*; whether you mean by it Knowledge properly ſo call'd, as contra-diſtinguiſh'd

to Belief; or only the Aſſurance of a firm Belief? If the latter, I leave you your Suppoſition to make your Uſe of it, only with this Deſire, that to avoid Miſtakes, when you do make any Uſe of it, you would call it Believing. If you mean that the true Religion may be *known* with the Certainty of Knowledge properly ſo call'd; I ask you farther, Whether that true Religion be to be *known* by the Light of Nature, or needed a Divine Revelation to diſcover it? If you ſay (as I ſuppoſe you will) the latter; then I ask whether the making out of that to be a Divine Revelation, depends not upon particular Matters of Fact, whereof you were no Eye-witneſs; but were done many Ages before you were born? and if ſo, by what Principles of Science they can be *known* to any Man now living?

The Articles of my Religion, and of a great many other ſuch ſhort-ſighted People as I am, are Articles of Faith, which we think there are ſo good Grounds to believe, that we are perſuaded to venture our eternal Happineſs on that Belief: And hope to be of that Number of whom our Saviour ſaid, *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and yet have believed.* But we neither think that God requires, nor has given us Faculties capable of knowing in this World ſeveral of thoſe Truths which are to be believed to Salvation. If you have a Religion, all whoſe general Truths are either ſelf-evident, or capable of Demonſtration, (for Matters of Fact are not capable of being any way *known* but to the By-ſtanders) you will do well to let it be known, for the ending of Controverſies, and baniſhing of Error, concerning any of thoſe Points, out of the World. For whatever may be known, beſides Matter of Fact, is capable of Demonſtration; and when you have demonſtrated to any one any Point in Religion, you ſhall have my Conſent to puniſh him if he do not aſſent to it. But yet let me tell you, there are many Truths even in the Mathematicks, the Evidence whereof one Man ſeeing is able to demonſtrate to himſelf, and ſo may know them; which Evidence yet he not being able to make another ſee, (which is to demonſtrate to him) he cannot make known to him, tho' his Scholar be willing, and with all his Power applies himſelf to learn it.

But granting your Suppoſition, That *the one true Religion may be known by thoſe who profeſs it to be the only true Religion*; will it follow from hence, that becauſe it is knowable to be the true Religion, therefore the Magiſtrate who profeſſes it actually knows it to be ſo? Without which Knowledge, upon your Principles, he cannot uſe Force to bring Men to it. But if you are but at Hand to aſſure him which is the true Religion, for which he ought to uſe Force, he is bound to believe you; and that will do as well as if he examin'd and knew himſelf, or perhaps better. For you ſeem not well ſatisfied with what the Magiſtrates have lately done, without your Leave, concerning Religion in *England*. And I confeſs the eaſieſt Way to remove all Difficulties in the Caſe, is for you to be the Magiſtrates infallible Guide in Matters of Religion. And therefore you do well here alſo to keep to your ſafe Stile, leſt if your Senſe were clear and determin'd, it might be more expoſed to Exceptions; and therefore you tell us the true Religion may be known *by thoſe* who profeſs it. For not ſaying *by ſome of thoſe*, or *by all thoſe*, the Error of what you ſay is not ſo eaſily obſerved, and requires the more Trouble to come at: Which I ſhall ſpare my ſelf here, being ſatisfied that the Magiſtrate, who has ſo full an Employment of his Thoughts in the Cares of the Government, has not an Over-plus of Leiſure to attain that Knowledge which you require, and ſo uſually contents himſelf with believing.

Your next Suppoſition is, That *the one true Religion may alſo be manifeſted to be ſuch, by them, to others; ſo far, at leaſt, as to bring them to receive it, and leave them without Excuſe if they do not.* That it can be manifeſted to ſome, ſo as to *oblige*, i. e. cauſe *them to receive it*, is evident, becauſe it is received. But becauſe this ſeems to be ſpoken more in reference to thoſe who do not receive it, as appears by theſe following Words of yours: *Then 'tis altogether as plain, that it may be very reaſonable and neceſſary for ſome Men to change their Religion; and that it may be made appear to them to be ſo. And then, if ſuch Men will not conſider what is offer'd to convince them of the Reaſonableneſs and Neceſſity of doing it; it may be very fit and reaſonable,* you tell me, *for any Thing I have ſaid to the contrary, in order to the bringing them to the Conſideration, to require them, under convenient Penalties, to forſake their falſe Religions, and to embrace the true.* You ſuppoſe the true Religion may be ſo *manifeſted* by a Man *that is* of it, to all Men *ſo far as to leave them*, if they did not embrace it, *without Excuſe.* Without Excuſe, to whom I beſeech you? To God indeed, but

Pag. 84.

not

not to the Magiſtrate, who can never know whether it has been ſo *manifeſted* to any Man, that it has been through his *Fault* that he has not been convinc'd, and not through the *Fault* of him to whom the Magiſtrate committed the Care of convincing him: And 'tis a ſufficient *Excuſe* to the Magiſtrate, for any one to ſay to him, I have not neglected to conſider the Arguments that have been offered me, by thoſe whom you have employed to manifeſt it to me, but that yours is the only true Religion I am not convinced. Which is ſo direct and ſufficient an *Excuſe* to the Magiſtrate, that had he an expreſs Commiſſion from Heaven to puniſh all thoſe who did not conſider, he could not yet juſtly puniſh any one whom he could not convince had not conſider'd. But you endeavour to ovoid this, by what you infer from this your Suppoſition, *viz.* That *then it may be very fit and reaſonable, for any thing I have ſaid to the contrary,* Pag. 48. *to require Men under convenient Penalties to forſake their falſe Religions, to embrace the true, in order to the bringing them to Conſideration.* Whether I *have ſaid any thing to the contrary*, or no, the Readers muſt judge, and I need not repeat. But now, I ſay, it is neither *juſt* nor *reaſonable* to *require Men, under Penalties*, to attain one End, *in order* to bring them to uſe the Means not neceſſary to that, but to another End. For where is it you can ſay (unleſs you will return to your old Suppoſition, of yours being the true Religion; which you ſay is not neceſſary to your Method) that Men are by the Law *required to forſake their falſe Religions, and embrace the true?* Pag. 47. The Utmoſt is this, in all Countries, where the National Religion is impoſed by Law, Men are *required under the Penalties* of thoſe Laws outwardly to conform to it; which you ſay, is *in order* to make them conſider. So that your Puniſhments are for the attaining one End, *viz.* Conformity, *in order* to make Men uſe *Conſideration*, which is a Means not neceſſary to that, but another End, *viz.* finding out and embracing the one true Religion. For however *Conſideration* may be a neceſſary Means to find and embrace the one True Religion, it is not at all a neceſſary Means to outward Conformity in the Communion of any Religion.

To manifeſt the Conſiſtency and *Practicableneſs* of your *Method*, to the Queſtion, what Advantage would it be to the true Religion, if Magiſtrates did every where ſo puniſh? You anſwer, That *by the Magiſtrates puniſhing, if I ſpeak to the Purpoſe, I muſt mean their puniſhing Men for rejecting the true Religion, (ſo tender'd to them, as has been ſaid) in order to the bringing them to conſider and embrace it. Now before we can ſuppoſe Magiſtrates every where ſo to puniſh, we muſt ſuppoſe the True Religion to be every where the National Religion. And if this were the Caſe,* you *think it is evident enough, what Advantage to the True Religion it would be, if Magiſtrates every where did ſo puniſh. For then we might reaſonably hope that all falſe Religions would ſoon vaniſh, and the True become once more the only Religion in the World: Whereas if Magiſtrates ſhould not ſo puniſh, it were much to be fear'd (eſpecially conſidering what has already happen'd) that on the contrary falſe Religions, and Atheiſm, as more agreeable to the Soil, would daily take deeper Root, and propagate themſelves, till there were no room left for the True Religion (which is but a foreign Plant) in any Corner of the World.* Pag. 51.

If you can make it *practicable* that the Magiſtrate ſhould *puniſh Men for rejecting the True Religion*, without judging which is the True Religion: Or if true Religion could appear in Perſon, take the Magiſtrate's Seat, and there judge all that rejected her, ſomething might be done. But the Miſchief of it is, it is a Man that muſt condemn, Men muſt puniſh, and Men cannot do this but by judging who is guilty of the Crime which they puniſh. An Oracle, or an Interpreter of the Law of Nature, who ſpeaks as clearly, tells the Magiſtrate, he may and ought to puniſh thoſe, *who reject the True Religion, tender'd with ſufficient Evidence:* The Magiſtrate is ſatisfied of his Authority, and believes this Commiſſion to be good. Now I would know how poſſibly he can execute it, without making himſelf the Judge. 1. What is the True Religion? unleſs the Law of Nature at the ſame time deliver'd into his Hands the thirty nine Articles of the one only true Religion, and another Book wherein all the Ceremonies and outward Worſhip of it are contain'd. But it being certain, that the Law of Nature has not done this; and as certain, that the Articles, Ceremonies, and Diſcipline of this one only True Religion, have been often varied in ſeveral Ages and Countries, ſince the Magiſtrate's Commiſſion by the Law of Nature was firſt given: There is no Remedy left, but that the Magiſtrate muſt judge what is the True Religion, if he muſt puniſh them who reject it. Suppoſe the Magiſtrate be commiſſion'd to puniſh thoſe who depart from *right Reaſon*, the Magiſtrate can yet never

never punish any one, unless he be Judge what is right Reason; and then judging that Murder, Theft, Adultery, narrow Cart-Wheels, or want of Bows and Arrows in a Man's House, are against right Reason, he may make Laws to punish Men guilty of those, as rejecting right Reason.

So if the Magistrate in *England* or *France*, having a Commission to punish those who *reject the one only True Religion*, judges the Religion of his National Church to be it, 'tis possible for him to lay Penalties on those who reject it, pursuant to that Commission; otherwise, without judging that to be the *one only True Religion*, 'tis wholly impracticable for him to punish those who embrace it not, as Rejecters of the *one only True Religion*.

To provide as good a *Salvo* as the thing will bear, you say, in the following Words, *Before we can suppose Magistrates every where so to punish, we must suppose the True Religion to be every where the National*. That is true of actual Punishment, but not of laying on Penalties by Law; for that would be to suppose the National Religion makes or chuses the Magistrate, and not the Magistrate the National Religion. But we see the contrary; for let the National Religion be what it will before, the Magistrate doth not always fall into it and embrace that; but if he thinks not that, but some other the *True*, the first Opportunity he has, he changes the National Religion into that which he judges *the True*, and then punishes the Dissenters from it; where his Judgment, which is *the True Religion*, always necessarily precedes, and is that which ultimately does, and must determine who are Rejecters of the *True Religion*, and so, obnoxious to Punishment. This being so, I would gladly see how your Method can be any way practicable to the Advantage of the *True Religion*, whereof the Magistrate every where must be Judge, or else he can *punish* no body at all.

Pag. 54. You tell me that whereas I say, that to justify Punishment it is requisite that it be directly useful for the procuring some greater Good *than that which it* takes away; you *wish I had told* you *why it must needs be* directly *useful for that Purpose*. However exact you may be in demanding Reasons of what is said, I thought here you had no cause to complain; but you let slip out of your Memory the foregoing Words of this Pas-
L. 1. p. 281. sage, which together stands thus, "Punishment is some Evil, some Inconvenience, "some Suffering, by taking away or abridging some good thing, which he who is pu-"nish'd has otherwise a Right to. Now to justify the bringing any such Evil upon "any Man, two things are requisite; 1. That he that does it has a Commission so to "do. 2. That it be directly useful for the promoting some greater Good. 'Tis evident by these Words, that Punishment brings direct Evil upon a Man, and therefore it should not be used but where it is directly useful for the procuring some greater Good. In this Case, the Signification of the Word *directly*, carries a manifest Reason in it, to any one who understands what *directly* means. If the taking away any Good from a Man cannot be justified, but by making it a Means to procure a greater, is it not plain it must be so a Means as to have, in the Operation of Causes and Effects, a natural Tendency to that Effect; and then it is called *directly* useful to such an End: And this may give you a Reason, *why Punishment must be directly useful for that Purpose*. I know you are very tender of *your indirect and at a distance* Usefulness of Force, which I have in another Place shew'd to be, in your Way, only useful by Accident; nor
Pag. 54. will the Question you here subjoyn, excused it from being so, *viz. Why Penalties are not as directly* useful *for the bringing Men to the True Religion, as the Rod of Correction is to drive Foolishness from a Child, or to work Wisdom in him?* Because the Rod works on the Will of the Child, to obey the Reason of the Father, whilst under his Tuition, and thereby makes it supple to the Dictates of his own Reason afterwards, and disposes him to obey the Light of that, when being grown to be a Man, that is to be his Guide, and this is Wisdom. If your *Penalties* are so used, I have nothing to say to them.

Your Way is charg'd to be impracticable to those Ends you purpose, which you endeavour to clear, *p.* 63. That there may be fair play on both sides, the Reader shall have in the same View what we both say.

L. 2. *p.* 286. "It remains now to examine, whether "the Author's Argument will not hold good, even "against Punishments in your Way. For if *the Ma-"gistrate's Authority be*, as you here say, *only to procure all "his Subjects* (mark what you say, *ALL HIS SUB-"JECTS*

L. 3. p. 63. *But how little to the Purpose this Request of yours is, will quickly appear. For if the Magistrate provides sufficiently for*

" *JECTS*) *the Means of diſcovering the Way of Salvation,* " *and to procure withal, as much as in him lies, that NONE* " *remain ignorant of it, or refuſe to embrace it, either for* " *want of uſing thoſe Means, or by Reaſon of any ſuch Pre-* " *judices as may render them ineffectual.* If this be the " Magiſtrate's Buſineſs, in reference to *ALL HIS SUB-* " *JECTS*; I deſire you, or any Man elſe, to tell me " how this can be done, by the Application of Force " only to a part of them; unleſs you will ſtill vainly " ſuppoſe *Ignorance, Negligence, or Prejudice,* only a- " mongſt that Part which any where differs from the " Magiſtrate. If thoſe of the Magiſtrate's Church may " be *ignorant of the Way of Salvation*; If it be poſſible " there may be amongſt them, thoſe who *refuſe to embrace* " *it, either for want of uſing thoſe Means, or by reaſon of any* " *ſuch Prejudices as may render them ineffectual*; What, " in this Caſe, becomes of the *Magiſtrate's Authority to* " *procure all his Subjects the Means of diſcovering the Way* " *of Salvation?* Muſt theſe of his Subjects be neglected, " and left without the *Means he has Authority to procure* " *them?* Or muſt he uſe Force upon them too? And then, " pray ſhew me how this can be done. Shall the Magi- " ſtrate puniſh thoſe of his own Religion, *to procure them* " *the Means of diſcovering the Way of Salvation, and to pro-* " *cure, as much as in him lies, that they remain not ignorant* " *of it, or refuſe not to embrace it?* Theſe are ſuch Con- " tradictions in Practice, this is ſuch Condemnation " of a Man's own Religion, as no one can expect from " the Magiſtrate; and I dare ſay, you deſire not of him. " And yet this is that he muſt do, *If his Authority be to* " *procure ALL his Subjects the Means of diſcovering the Way* " *to Salvation.* And if it be ſo *needful*, as you ſay it " is, that he ſhould uſe it; I am ſure *Force* cannot do " that till it be apply'd wider, and Puniſhment be laid " upon more than you would have it. For if the *Magi-* " *ſtrate be by Force to procure, as much as in him lies, that* " *NONE remain ignorant of the Way of Salvation*; muſt " he not puniſh all thoſe who are *ignorant of the Way of* " *Salvation?* And pray tell me, how is this any way " practicable, but by ſuppoſing none in the National " Church ignorant, and all out of it ignorant of the " Way of Salvation? Which, what is it, but to puniſh " Men barely for not being of the Magiſtrate's Religion? " The very thing you deny he has Authority to do? So " that *the Magiſtrate having,* by your own Confeſſion, *no* " *Authority,* thus to uſe *Force*; and it being otherways " impracticable for the *procuring all his Subjects the Means* " *of diſcovering the Way of Salvation*; there is an End of " *Force.* And ſo *Force* being laid aſide, either as unlaw- " ful, or unpracticable, the Author's Argument holds " good againſt *Force,* even in your Way of applying it.

for the Inſtruction of all his Subjects in the true Religion; and then requires them all, under convenient Penalties, to hearken to the Teachers and Miniſters of it, and to profeſs and exerciſe it with one Accord, under their Direction, in Publick Aſſemblies: Is there any Pretence to ſay, that in ſo doing he applies Force only to a Part *of his Subjects; when the Law is general, and excepts none? 'Tis true, the Magiſtrate inflicts the Penalties in that Caſe, only upon them that break the Law. But is that the thing you mean by his* applying Force only to a Part of his Subjects? *Would you have him puniſh all indifferently? Them that obey the Law, as well as them that do not?*

As to Ignorance, Negligence *and* Prejudice, *I deſire you, or any Man elſe, to tell me what better Courſe can be taken to cure them, than that which I have mentioned. For if after all that God's Miniſters, and the Magiſtrate can do, ſome will ſtill remain* ignorant, negligent, *or* prejudiced; *I do not take that to be any Diſparagement to it: For certainly that is a very extraordinary Remedy, which infallibly cures all diſeas'd Perſons to whom it is applied.*

The Backwardneſs and Luſts that hinder an *impartial Examination,* as you deſcribe it, is general. The Corruption of Nature which hinders a *real embracing* the True Religion, that alſo you tell us here, is univerſal. I ask a Remedy for theſe in your Way. You ſay *the Law* for Conformity *is general, excepts none.* Very likely, *none* that do not conform; but puniſhes *none* who conforming, do neither *impartially examine* nor *really embrace* the true Religion. From whence I conclude there is no Corruption of Nature in thoſe, who are brought up or join in outward Communion with the Church of *England.* But *as to Ignorance, Negligence and Prejudice,* you ſay you *deſire* me, *or any Man elſe, to tell what better Courſe can be taken to cure them, than that* A. p. 6, — 12. Pag. 6, — 8.

which

which you *have mentioned.* If your Church can find no better Way to cure Ignorance and Prejudice, and the Negligence, that is in Men, to examine Matters of Religion and heartily embrace the true, than what is impracticable upon Conformists, then of all others, Conformists are in the most deplorable Estate. But, as I remember, you have been told of a better Way, which is, the discoursing with Men seriously and friendly about Matters in Religion, by those whose Profession is the Care of Souls; examining what they do understand, and where, either through Lazineſs, Prejudice or Difficulty, they do stick: and applying to their several Diseases proper Cures, which it is as impossible to do by a general Harangue, once or twice a Week out of the Pulpit, as to fit all Mens Feet with one Shoe, or cure all Mens Ails with one, though very wholsome, Diet-drink. To be thus *instant in Season and out of Season*, some Men have thought a better Way of Cure, than a Desire, only to have Men driven by the Whip, either in your, or the Magistrate's Hands, into the Sheepfold: Where when they are once, whether they understand or no, their Ministers Sermons; whether they are, or can be better for them or no; whether they are ignorant and hypocritical Conformists, and in that Way like to remain so, rather than to become knowing and sincere Converts, some Bishops have thought is not sufficiently enquired; but this no body is to mention, for whoever does so, *makes himself an Occasion to shew his good Will to the Clergy.*

This had not been said by me here, now I see how apt you are to be put out of Temper with any thing of this kind, (though it be in every serious Man's Mouth) had not you desired me to shew you a better Way than Force, your way apply'd. And to use your Way of arguing, since bare preaching, as now us'd, 'tis plain, will not do, there is no other Means left but this to deal with the corrupt Nature of Conformists; for Miracles are now ceased, and Penalties they are free from; therefore, by your Way of concluding, *no other being left*, this of visiting at home, conferring and instructing, and admonishing Men there, and the like Means, proposed by the reverend Author of the *Pastoral Care*, is necessary; and Men, whose Business is the Care of Souls, are *obliged* to use it: For you *cannot prove, that it cannot do some* Service (I think I need not say) *indirectly and at a distance.* And if this be proper and sufficient to bring Conformists (notwithstanding the Corruption of their Nature) to *examine impartially*, and *really embrace the Truth that must save them*, it will remain to shew, Why it may not do as well on Nonconformists (whose, I imagine, is the common Corruption of Nature) to bring them to examine and embrace the Truth, that must save them? And though it be not so extraordinary a *Remedy* as will *infallibly cure all diseased Persons, to whom it is apply'd*; yet since the Corruption of Nature, which is the same Disease, and hinders the *impartial Examination, and hearty embracing the Truth that must save them*, is equally in both, Conformists and Nonconformists, 'tis reasonable to think it should in both have the same Cure, let that be what it will.

CHAP. X.

Of the Necessity of Force in Matters of Religion.

Pag. 30. YOU tell us you *do not ground the Lawfulness of such Force, as* you *take to be useful for promoting the true Religion, upon the bare Usefulness of such Force, but upon the Necessity as well as Usefulness of it*; and therefore you declare it *to be no fit Means to be used, either for that Purpose or any other, where it is not necessary as well as useful.*

How useful Force in the Magistrate's Hand, for bringing Men to the true Religion, is like to be, we have shewn in the foregoing Chapter, in answer to what you have said for it. So that it being proved not useful, it is impossible it should be necessary.

A. p. 10. However we will examine what you say to prove the Necessity of it. The Foundation you build on for its Necessity we have in your *Argument considered*, where having at large dilated on Mens Inconsiderateness in the Choice of their Religions, and their persisting in those they have once chosen, without due Examination, you conclude thus; *Now if this be the Case, if Men are so averse to a due Consideration, if they usually take up their Religion, without examining it as they ought, what other Means is there left?* Wherein you suppose Force necessary, instead of proving it to be so; for preaching and

and Perſuaſion not prevailing upon all Men, you upon your own Authority think fit ſomething elſe ſhould be done; and that being reſolv'd, you readily pitch on Force, becauſe you ſay you can find nothing elſe, which in Effect is to tell us, if the Salvation of Mens Souls were only left to your Diſcretion, how you would order the Matter.

And in your Anſwer to me, you very confidently tell us, *the true Religion cannot prevail without the Aſſiſtance either of Miracles, or of Authority.* Pag. 7. I ſhall here only obſerve one or two Things, and then go on to examine how you make this good.

The firſt Thing I ſhall obſerve is, that in your *Argument conſidered, &c.* you ſuppoſe Force neceſſary only to maſter the Averſion there is in Men to *Conſidering* and *Examination:* And here in your Anſwer to me, you make Force neceſſary to conquer the Averſion there is in Men *to embrace* and *obey* the true Religion. Which are ſo very different, that the former juſtifies the Uſe of Force only to make Men *conſider*, the other juſtifies the Uſe of Force to make Men *embrace* Religion. If you meant the ſame Thing when you writ your firſt Treatiſe, it was not very ingenuous to expreſs your ſelf in ſuch Words as were not proper to give your Reader your true Meaning; it being a far different Thing to uſe Force to make Men *conſider*, which is an Action in their Power to do or omit; and to uſe Force to make them *embrace*, i. e. *believe* any Religion, which is not a Thing in any one's Power to do or forbear as he pleaſes. If you ſay you meant barely conſidering in your firſt Paper, as the whole Current of it would make one believe, then I ſee your Hypotheſis may mend, as we have ſeen in other Parts, and in Time, may grow to its full Stature.

Another Thing I ſhall remark to you, is, That in your firſt Paper, beſides Preaching and Perſuaſion, and the Grace of God, nothing but *Force* was neceſſary. Here in your ſecond, it is *either Miracles or Authority*, which how you make good, we will now conſider.

You having ſaid, you had *no Reaſon from any Experiment to expect that the true Religion ſhould be any way a Gainer by Toleration.* A. p. 2. L. 2. p. 260. I inſtanced in the prevailing of the Goſpel, by its own Beauty, Force, and Reaſonableneſs, in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity. You reply, that it has not the ſame Beauty, Force and Reaſonableneſs now, Pag. 5. that it had then, unleſs I *include Miracles* too, which are now ceaſed; and as you tell us, *were not withdrawn, till by their Help Chriſtianity had prevailed to be received for the Religion of the Empire*, and to be *encouraged and ſupported by the Laws of it.* Pag. 37.

If therefore we will believe you upon your own Word, Force being *neceſſary* (for prove it neceſſary you never can) you have enter'd into the Counſel of God, and tell us, when *Force* could not be had, *Miracles* were employ'd to ſupply its Want. *I cannot but think*, ſay you, *its highly probable (if we may be allowed to gueſs at the Counſels of infinite Wiſdom) that God was pleaſed to continue them till then*, i. e. till the Laws of the Empire ſupported Chriſtianity, *not ſo much for any Neceſſity there was of them all that Time, for the evincing the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, as to ſupply the Want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance.* Pag. 37. You allow your ſelf to gueſs very freely, when you will make God uſe *Miracles* to ſupply a Means he no where authorized or appointed. How long Miracles continued we ſhall ſee anon.

Say you, *If we may be allow'd to gueſs:* This Modeſty of yours where you confeſs you *gueſs*, is only concerning the Time of the continuing of Miracles; but as to their ſupplying the Want of coactive Force, that you are poſitive in, both here and where you tell us, *Why Penalties were not neceſſary at firſt, to make Men to give Ear to the Goſpel, has already been ſhewn*; and a little after, *the great and wonderful Things which were to be done for the evidencing the Truth of the Goſpel, were abundantly ſufficient to procure Attention, &c.* How you come to know ſo undoubtedly that Miracles were made uſe of to ſupply the Magiſtrate's Authority, ſince God no where tells you ſo, you would have done well to ſhew. Pag. 38.

But in your Opinion Force was *neceſſary*, and that could not then be had, and ſo God muſt uſe Miracles. For, ſay you, *Our Saviour was no Magiſtrate, and therefore could not inflict political Puniſhments upon any Man, ſo much leſs could he impower his Apoſtles to do it.* Could not our Saviour *impower his Apoſtles* to denounce or inflict Puniſhments on careleſs or obſtinate Unbelievers, to make them hear and conſider? You pronounce very boldly methinks of Chriſt's Power, and ſet very narrow Limits to what at another Time you would not deny to be infinite: But it was convenient here for your preſent Purpoſe, that it ſhould be ſo limited. But, they not being Magiſtrates, he *could not impower his Apoſtles* to inflict *political Puniſhments.* How is it Pag. 36.

of

of a ſudden, that they muſt be political Puniſhments? You tell us all that is *neceſſary*, is to *lay Briars and Thorns in Mens Ways, to trouble and diſeaſe them to make them conſider.* This I hope our Saviour had Power to do, if he had found it neceſſary, without the Aſſiſtance of the Magiſtrates; he could have always done by his Apoſtles and Miniſters, if he had ſo thought fit, what he did once by St. *Peter*, have *dropp'd Thorns and Briars* into their very Minds, that ſhould have pricked, *troubled and diſeaſed* them ſufficiently. But ſometimes it is *Briars and Thorns* only that you want, ſometimes it muſt be *Human Means*, and ſometimes, as here, nothing will ſerve your Turn but *political Puniſhments*; juſt as will beſt ſute your Occaſion, in the Argument you have then before you.

That the Apoſtles could lay on Puniſhments, as troubleſome and as great as any *political* ones when they were neceſſary, we ſee in *Ananias* and *Sapphira*: And he that had *all Power given him in Heaven and in Earth*, could, if he had thought fit, have *laid Briars and Thorns in the Way* of all that received not his Doctrine.

Pag. 36. You add, *But as he could not puniſh Men to make them hear him, ſo neither was there any need that he ſhould. He came as a Prophet ſent from God to reveal a new Doctrine to the World; and therefore to prove his Miſſion, he was to do ſuch Things as could only be done by a divine Power: And the Works which he did were abundantly ſufficient both to gain him a Hearing, and to oblige the World to receive his Doctrine.* Thus the Want of Force and Puniſhments are ſupplied. How far? ſo far as they are ſuppoſed neceſſary *to gain a Hearing*, and ſo far as to *oblige the World to receive Chriſt's Doctrine*; whereby, as I ſuppoſe, you mean *ſufficient* to lay an Obligation on them to receive his Doctrine, and render them inexcuſable if they did not: But that they were not *ſufficient* to make all that ſaw them effectually to receive and embrace the Goſpel, I think is evident, and you will not I imagine ſay, that all who ſaw Chriſt's Miracles believed on him. So that Miracles were not to ſupply the Want of ſuch Force, as was to be continued on Men to make them *conſider as they ought*, i. e. *till they embraced the Truth that muſt ſave them.* For we have little Reaſon to think that our Saviour, or his Apoſtles, contended with their Neglect or Refuſal by a conſtant Train of Miracles, continued on to thoſe who were not wrought upon by the Goſpel preached to them. St. *Matthew* tells us, 13. 57. that he did not many mighty Works in his own Country, becauſe of their Unbelief; much leſs were Miracles to ſupply the Want of Force in that Uſe you make of it, where you tell us it is to puniſh the Fault of not being of the true Religion: For we do not find any miraculouſly puniſhed to bring them in to the Goſpel. So that the Want of Force to either of theſe Purpoſes not being ſupplied by *Miracles*, the Goſpel 'tis plain ſubſiſted and ſpread it ſelf without Force ſo made uſe of, and without Miracles to ſupply the Want of it; and therefore it ſo far remains true, that the Goſpel having the ſame Beauty, Force and Reaſonableneſs now as it had at the Beginning, it wants not Force to ſupply the Defect of *Miracles*, to that for which *Miracles* were no where made uſe of. And ſo far, at leaſt, the Experiment is good, and this Aſſertion true, that the Goſpel is able to prevail by its own Light and Truth, without the Continuance of Force on the ſame Perſon, or puniſhing Men for not being of the true Religion.

Lightfoot *Harm. of the N. T. Sect.* 41, and 51.

Pag. 36. You ſay, *Our Saviour being no Magiſtrate, could not inflict political Puniſhments; much leſs could he empower his Apoſtles to do it.* I know not what need there is, that it ſhould be *political*; ſo there were ſo much Puniſhment uſed, as you ſay, is *ſufficient to make Men conſider*, it is not neceſſary it ſhould come from this or that Hand: Or if there be any odds in that, we ſhould be apt to think it would come beſt, and moſt effectually, from thoſe who preached the Goſpel, and could tell them it was to make them *conſider*, than from the Magiſtrate, who neither doth, nor according to your Scheme can, tell them it is to make them *conſider*. And this Power, you will not deny, but our Saviour could have given to the Apoſtles.

But if there were ſuch abſolute Need of *political Puniſhments*, *Titus* or *Trajan* might as well have been converted, as *Conſtantine*. For how true it is, that Miracles ſupplied the Want of Force from thoſe Days till *Conſtantine*'s, and then ceaſed, we ſhall ſee by and by. I ſay not this to enter boldly into the Counſels of God, or to take upon me to cenſure the Conduct of the Almighty, or to call his Providence to an Account; but to anſwer your ſaying, *Our Saviour was no Magiſtrate, and therefore could not inflict political Puniſhments.* For he could have had both *Magiſtrates* and *political Puniſhments* at his Service, if he had thought fit, and needed not to have continued Miracles longer, *than there was Neceſſity for evincing the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion,*

gion, as you imagine, *to ſupply the Want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance*, by *Force*, which is *neceſſary*. Pag. 37.

But how come you to know that Force is *neceſſary*? Has God revealed it in his Word? no where. Has it been revealed to you in particular? that you will not ſay. What Reaſon have you for it? none at all but this, That having ſet down the Grounds, upon which Men take up and perſiſt in their Religion, you conclude, *What Means is there left but Force?* Force therefore you conclude *neceſſary*, becauſe without any Authority, but from your own Imagination, you are peremptory, that other Means, beſides Preaching and Perſuaſion, is to be uſed; and therefore is it neceſſary, becauſe you can think of no other. A. p. 6, —12.

When I tell you there is other Means, and that by your own Confeſſion the Grace of God is another Means, and therefore Force is not neceſſary: You reply, *Tho' the Grace of God be* another Means, *and* you *thought fit to mention it, to prevent Cavils; yet it is none of the Means of which* you *were ſpeaking, in the Place* I *refer to; which any one who reads that Paragraph will find to be only human Means: and therefore tho' the Grace of God be both a proper and ſufficient Means, and ſuch as can work by itſelf, and without which neither Penalties nor any other Means can do any thing; yet it may be true however, that when Admonitions and Entreaties fail, there is no human Means left, but Penalties, to bring prejudiced Perſons to hear and conſider, what may convince them of their Errors, and diſcover the Truth to them. And then Penalties will be neceſſary in reſpect to that End as an human Means.* Pag. 39.

In which Words, if you mean any Anſwer to my Argument, it is this, that Force is neceſſary, becauſe *to bring Men into the right Way* there is other *human Means* neceſſary, beſides Admonitions and Perſuaſions. For elſe what have we to do with *Human* in the Caſe? But it is no ſmall Advantage one owes to Logick, that where Senſe and Reaſon fall ſhort, a Diſtinction ready at Hand may ech it out. Force, when Perſuaſions will not prevail, is *neceſſary*, ſay you, becauſe it is the *only Means left*. When you are told it is not *the only Means left*, and ſo cannot be neceſſary on that Account: You reply, That *when Admonitions and Entreaties fail, there is no human Means left, but Penalties, to bring prejudiced Perſons to hear and conſider what may convince them of their Errors, and diſcover the Truth to them: And then Penalties will be neceſſary in reſpect to that End, as an human Means.* Pag. 40.

Suppoſe it be urged to you, when your moderate lower Penalties fail, there is no human Means left but Dragooning and ſuch other Severities; which you ſay you *condemn* as much as I, *to bring prejudiced Perſons to hear and conſider what may convince them of their Errors, and diſcover the Truth to them.* And then Dragooning, Impriſonment, Scourging, Fining, *&c. will be neceſſary in reſpect to that End, as an human Means.* What can you ſay but this? that you are impower'd to judge what Degrees of *human Means* are *neceſſary*, but others are not. For without ſuch a Confidence in your own Judgment, where God has neither ſaid how much, nor that any Force is *neceſſary*, I think this is as good an Argument for the higheſt, as yours is for the lower *Penalties*. When *Admonitions and Entreaties will not prevail*, then *Penalties, lower Penalties, ſome Degrees of Force will be neceſſary*, ſay you, *as an human Means*. And when your *lower Penalties, your ſome Degrees* of Force will not prevail, then higher Degrees will be neceſſary, ſay I, as *an human Means*. And my Reaſon is the ſame with yours, becauſe *there is no others Means* (i. e. *human Means*) *left*. Shew me how your Argument concludes for lower Puniſhments being neceſſary, and mine not for higher, even to Dragooning, *& eris mihi magnus Apollo*. Pag. 9.

But let us apply this to your *Succedaneum* of Miracles, and then it will be much more admirable. You tell us, Admonitions and Entreaties not prevailing to bring Men into the right Way, *Force is neceſſary*, becauſe there is *no other Means left*. To that 'tis ſaid, Yes, there is other Means left, the Grace of God. Ah, but, ſay you, that will not do; becauſe you ſpeak *only of human Means*. So that according to your Way of arguing, ſome *other human Means* is neceſſary: For you your ſelf tell us, that the Means you were ſpeaking of, where you ſay, that when *Admonitions and Entreaties will not do, what other Means is there left but Force?* were *human Means*. Your Words are, *Which any one, who reads that Paragraph, will find to be only human Means*. By this Argument then *other human Means* are *neceſſary* beſides Preaching and Perſuaſion, and thoſe *human Means* you have found out to be either *Force*, or *Miracles*: The latter are certainly notable *human Means*. And your Diſtinction of *human Means* ſerves you to very good Purpoſe, having brought *Miracles*

to be one of your *human Means*. Preaching and Admonitions, ſay you, are not ſufficient to bring Men into the right Way, ſomething elſe is *neceſſary*; Yes, the Grace of God; no, ſay you, that will not do, it is not *human Means*: 'tis neceſſary to have other *human Means*, therefore in the three or four firſt Centuries after Chriſtianity, the Inſufficiency of Preaching and Admonitions was made up with *Miracles*, and thus the Neceſſity of other *human Means* is made good. But to conſider a little farther your *Miracles* as ſupplying the Want of Force.

The Queſtion between us here is, Whether the Chriſtian Religion did not prevail in the firſt Ages of the Church, by its own Beauty, Force and Reaſonableneſs, without the Aſſiſtance of *Force?* I ſay it did, and therefore external Force is not neceſſary.

Pag. 7. To this you reply, *that it cannot prevail by its own Light, and Strength, without the Aſſiſtance either of Miracles, or of Authority*; and therefore *the Chriſtian Religion not being ſtill accompanied with Miracles*, Force is now neceſſary. So that to make your equivalent *Miracles* correſpond with your *neceſſary Means* of Force, you ſeem to require an actual Application of *Miracles*, or of *Force*, to prevail with Men *to receive* the Goſpel, *i. e.* Men could not be prevailed with to receive the Goſpel without actually ſeeing

Pag. 6. of Miracles. For when you tell us, That you *are ſure* I *cannot ſay the Chriſtian Religion is ſtill accompanied with Miracles, as it was at its firſt planting*; I hope you do not mean that the Goſpel is not ſtill accompanied with an undoubted Teſtimony that Miracles were done by the firſt Publiſhers of it, which was as much of Miracles as I ſuppoſe the greateſt Part of thoſe had, with whom the Chriſtian Religion pre-

Pag. 27. vailed, till it was *ſupported and encouraged*, as you tell us, *by the Laws of the Empire*: For I think you will not ſay, or if you ſhould, you could not expect to be believed, that all, or the greateſt Part of thoſe, that embraced the Chriſtian Religion, before it was *ſupported by the Laws of the Empire*, which was not till the Fourth Century, had actually *Miracles* done before them, to work upon them. And all thoſe, who were not Eye-witneſſes of Miracles done in their Preſence, 'tis plain had no other Miracles than we have, that is upon Report; and 'tis probable not ſo many, nor ſo well atteſted as we have. The greateſt Part then, of thoſe who were converted, at leaſt, in ſome of thoſe Ages, before *Chriſtianity was ſupported by the Laws of the Empire*, I think you muſt allow, were wrought upon by bare Preaching, and ſuch Miracles as we ſtill have, Miracles at a diſtance, related Miracles. In others, and thoſe the greater Number, *Prejudice* was not ſo removed, that they were prevailed on *to conſider, to conſider as they ought*, i. e. in your Language, *to conſider ſo as to embrace*. If they had not ſo *conſidered* in our Days, what, according to your Scheme, muſt have been done to them, that did *not conſider as they ought?* Force muſt have been applied to them. What therefore in the Primitive Church was to be done to them? Why! your *ſuccedaneum* Miracles, actual Miracles, ſuch as you deny the *Chriſtian Religion to be ſtill accompanied with*, muſt have been done in their Preſence, to work upon them. Will you ſay this was ſo, and make a new Church-Hiſtory for us, and out-do thoſe Writers who have been thought pretty liberal of Miracles? If you do not, you muſt confeſs *Miracles* ſupplied not the Place of *Force*, and ſo let fall all your fine Contrivance about the Neceſſity either of *Force* or *Miracles*; and perhaps you will think it at laſt a more becoming Modeſty, not to ſet the Divine Power and Providence on work, by Rules, and for the Ends of your Hypotheſis, without having any Thing in Authentick Hiſtory, much leſs in Divine and unerring Revelation to juſtify you. But Force and Power deſerve ſomething more than ordinary and allowable Arts or Arguments, to get and keep them: *Si violandum eſt jus regnandi cauſa violandum eſt.*

If the Teſtimony, of Miracles having been done, were ſufficient to make the Goſpel prevail, without Force, on thoſe, who were not Eye-witneſſes of them, we have that ſtill, and ſo upon that Account need not *Force* to ſupply the Want of it: But if Truth muſt have either the Law of the Country, or actual *Miracles* to *ſupport* it, what became of it after the Reign of *Conſtantine* the Great, under all thoſe Emperors that were erroneous or heretical? It ſupported it ſelf in *Piedmont*, and *France*, and *Turkey*, many Ages without *Force* or *Miracles*: And it ſpread it ſelf in divers Nations and Kingdoms of the North and Eaſt, without any *Force*, or other *Miracles* than thoſe that were done many Ages before. So that I think you will, upon ſecond Thoughts, not deny, but that the true Religion is able to prevail now, as it did at firſt, and has done ſince in many Places, without Aſſiſtance from the Powers in Being,

ing, by its own Beauty, Force, and Reaſonableneſs, whereof well-atteſted Miracles is a part.

But the Account you give us of Miracles will deſerve to be a little examined; we have it in theſe Words, *Conſidering that thoſe extraordinary Means were not withdrawn, till by their Help Chriſtianity had prevail'd to be received for the Religion of the Empire, and to be ſupported and encouraged by the Laws of it*, you *cannot*, you ſay, *but think it highly probable, (if we may be allow'd to gueſs at the Counſels of infinite Wiſdom) that God was pleaſed to continue them till then, not ſo much for any Neceſſity there was of them all that while, for the evincing the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, as to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance.* Miracles then, if what you ſay be true, were continued till *Chriſtianity was received for the Religion of the Empire, not ſo much to evince the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, as to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance.* But in this the learned Author, whoſe Teſtimony you quote, fails you. For he tells you that the chief Uſe of Miracles, in the Church, after the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion had been ſufficiently confirm'd by them in the World, was to oppoſe the falſe and pretended Miracles of Hereticks and Heathens; and anſwerable hereunto Miracles ceaſed and returned again, as ſuch Oppoſitions made them more or leſs neceſſary. Accordingly Miracles which before had abated in *Trajan's* and *Hadrian's* time, which was in the latter end of the Firſt, or the beginning of the Second Century, did again *revive* to confound the magical Deluſions of the Hereticks of that time. And in the Third Century the Hereticks uſing no ſuch Tricks, and the Faith being confirm'd, they by Degrees ceaſed, of which there then, he ſays, could be no imaginable *Neceſſity*. His Words are, " Et quidem eo minus neceſſaria ſunt pro vete-
" rum Principiis, recentiora illa Miracula, quod Hæreticos (quos appellant) nullos
" adverſarios habeant, qui contraria illis dogmata aſtruant Miraculis. Sic enim vi-
" dimus, apud veteres, dum nulli Eccleſiam exercerent Adverſarii, ſeu Heretici, ſeu
" Gentiles; aut ſatis illi præteritis Miraculis fuiſſent refutati; aut nullas ipſi præſti-
" gias opponerent quæ veris eſſent Miraculis oppugnandæ; ſubductam deinde paula-
" tim eſſe mirificam illam ſpiritus virtutem. Ortus ſub Trajano Hadrianoque Hære-
" ticos eſtendimus præſtigiis Magicis ſuiſſe uſos, & proinde Miraculorum verorum in
" Eccleſia uſum una *REVIXISSE*. Ne dicam præſtigiatores etiam Gentiles eodem
" illo ſeculo ſane frequentiſſimos, Apuleium in Africa, in Aſia Alexandrum Pſeudo-
" mantim, multoſque alios quorum meminit Ariſtides. Tertio ſeculo orto, Hæretici
" Hermogenes, Praxeas, Noetus, Thoedotus, Sabellius, Novatianus, Artemas, Sa-
" moſatenus, nulla, ut videtur, Miracula ipſi venditabant, nullis propterea Miraculis
" oppugnandi. Inde vidimus, apud ipſos etiam Catholicos, ſenſim defeciſſe Miracu-
" la. Et quidem, Hæreticis nulla in contrarium Miracula obſtantibus, quæ tandem
" fingi poteſt miraculorum neceſſitas traditam ab intitio fidem, miraculiſque adeo jam-
" dudum confirmatam prædicantibus? Nulla certe prorſus pro primævo miraculo-
" rum exemplo. Nulla denique conſciis vere primævam eſſe fidem quam novis mira-
" culis ſuſcipiunt confirmandam.

Pag. 37.

Dodwell. Differtat. in Iran. Diſſ. 2.

Sect. LXV.

The Hiſtory therefore you have from him, *of Miracles*, ſerves for his Hypotheſis, but not at all for yours. For if they were continued to ſupply the want of Force, which was to deal with the Corruption of depraved Human Nature, that being without any great Variation in the World, conſtantly the ſame, there could be no reaſon why they ſhould abate and fail, and then return and revive again. So that there being then, as you ſuppoſe, no Neceſſity of Miracles for any other End, but *to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance*, they muſt, to ſute that End, be conſtant and regularly the ſame, as you would have Force to be, which is ſteddily and uninterruptedly to be applied, as a conſtantly neceſſary Remedy, to the corrupt Nature of Mankind.

If you allow the learned *Dodwell's* Reaſons, for the Continuation of Miracles, till the Fourth Century, your Hypotheſis, that they were continued to ſupply the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance, will be only precarious. For if there was need of Miracles till that time to other Purpoſes, the Continuation of them in the Church, though you could prove them to be as frequent and certain as thoſe of our Saviour and the Apoſtles, it would not advantage your Cauſe; ſince it would be no Evidence, that they were uſed for that End, which as long as there were other viſible Uſes of them, you could not, without Revelation, aſſure us were made uſe of by Divine Providence *to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance*. You muſt therefore confute his Hypotheſis, before you can make any Advantage of what he ſays, concerning the Continuation

tion of Miracles, for the eſtabliſhing of yours. For till you can ſhew, that that which he aſſigns was not the End, for which they were continued in the Church; the utmoſt you can ſay, is, that it may be imagined, that one Reaſon of their Continuation was *to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance:* But what you can without Proof imagine poſſible, I hope you do not expect ſhould be received as an unqueſtionable Proof, that it was ſo. I can imagine it poſſible they were not continued for that End, and one Imagination will be as good a Proof as another.

To do your Modeſty right therefore, I muſt allow, that you do faintly offer at ſome kind of Reaſon, to prove that Miracles were continued *to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance:* And ſince God has no where declared, that it was for that End, you would perſuade us in this Paragraph, that it was ſo, by two Reaſons. One is, that the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion being ſufficiently evinced by the Miracles done by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, and perhaps their immediate Succeſſors, there was no other need of Miracles to be continued till the Fourth Century; and therefore they were uſed by God *to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance.* This I take to be the Meaning of theſe Words of yours, *I cannot but think it highly probable that God was pleaſed to continue them till then, not ſo much for any Neceſſity there was of them all that while for the evincing the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, as to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance.* Whereby, I ſuppoſe, you do not barely intend to tell the World what is your Opinion in the Caſe, but uſe this as an Argument, to make it probable to others, that this was the End for which Miracles were continued, which at beſt will be but a very doubtful Probability to build ſuch a bold Aſſertion on, as this of yours is, *viz.* That *the Chriſtian Religion is not able to ſubſiſt and prevail in the World, by its own Light and Strength, without the Aſſiſtance either of Force, or* actual *Miracles.* And therefore you muſt either produce a Declaration from Heaven that authorizes you to ſay, that Miracles were uſed *to ſupply the want of Force,* or ſhew that there was no other Uſe of them but this. For if any other Uſe can be aſſigned of them, as long as they continued in the Church, one may ſafely deny, that they were *to ſupply the want of Force:* and it will lie upon you to prove it by ſome other Way than by ſaying you *think it highly probable.* For I ſuppoſe you do not expect that your *thinking* any thing *highly probable,* ſhould be a ſufficient Reaſon for others to acquieſce in. When perhaps, the Hiſtory of Miracles conſidered, no body could bring himſelf to ſay he thought it *probable,* but one whoſe Hypotheſis ſtood in need of ſuch a poor Support.

The other Reaſon you ſeem to build on is this, That when *Chriſtianity was received for the Religion of the Empire,* Miracles ceaſed; becauſe there was then no longer any
Pag. 37. need of them: which I take to be the Argument inſinuated in theſe Words, *Conſidering that thoſe extraordinary Means were not withdrawn, till by their help Chriſtianity had prevailed to be received for the Religion of the Empire.* If then you can make it appear that Miracles laſted *till Chriſtianity was received for the Religion of the Empire,* without any other Reaſon for the Continuation, *but to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance*; and that they ceaſed as ſoon as the Magiſtrates became Chriſtians; your Argument will have ſome kind of Probility, that within the Roman Empire this was the Method God uſed for the propagating the Chriſtian Religion. But it will not ſerve to make good your Poſition, That the Chriſtian Religion cannot ſubſiſt *and prevail by its own Strength and Light, without the Aſſiſtance of Miracles or Authority,* unleſs you can ſhew, that God made uſe of Miracles, to introduce and ſupport it in other Parts of the World, not ſubject to the Roman Empire, till the Magiſtrates there alſo became Chriſtians. For the Corruption of Nature being the ſame without, as within the Bounds of the Roman Empire; Miracles, upon your Hypotheſis, were as neceſſary to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrates Aſſiſtance in other Countries as in the Roman Empire. For I do not think you will find the *Civil Sovereigns* were the firſt converted in all thoſe Countries, where the Chriſtian Religion was planted after *Conſtantine's* Reign: And in all thoſe it will be neceſſary for you to ſhew us the Aſſiſtance of *Miracles.*

But let us ſee how much your Hypotheſis is favoured by Church-Hiſtory. If the Writings of the Fathers of greateſt Name and Credit are to be believed, Miracles were not withdrawn when *Chriſtianity had prevailed to be received for the Religion of the Empire. Athanaſius,* the great Defender of the Catholick Orthodox, writ the Life of his Contemporary St. *Anthony,* full of Miracles; which though ſome have queſtion'd, yet the learned *Dodwell* allows to be writ by *Athanaſius:* and the Stile evinces it to be his, which is alſo confirmed by other Eccleſiaſtical Writers.

Palladius

Palladius tell us, That *Ammon did many Miracles: But that particularly St.* Athanaſius *related in the Life of* Anthony, *That* Ammon *going with ſome Monks,* Anthony *had ſent to him; when they came to the River* Lycus, *which they were to paſs, was afraid to ſtrip for fear of ſeeing himſelf naked; and whilſt he was in diſpute of this Matter, he was taken up, and in Extaſy carry'd over by an Angel, the reſt of the Monks ſwimming the River. When he came to* Anthony, Anthony *told him he had ſent for him, becauſe God had revealed many Things to him concerning him, and particularly his Tranſlation. And when* Ammon *died, in his Retirement,* Anthony *ſaw his Soul carried into Heaven by Angels.* Palladius in vita Ammonis.

Socrates tells us, That *Anthony ſaw the Soul of* Ammon *taken up by Angels as* Athanaſius *writes in the Life of* Anthony. L. 4. c. 23.

And again, ſays he, *It ſeems ſuperfluous for me to relate the many Miracles* Anthony *did; how he fought openly with Devils, diſcovering all their Tricks and Cheats: For* Athanaſius *Biſhop of* Alexandria *has prevented me on that Subject, having writ a Book particularly of his Life.* Socrat. l. 1. c. 21.

Anthony *was thought worthy of the Viſion of God, and led a Life perfectly conformable to the Laws of Chriſt. This, whoever reads the Book, wherein is contain'd the Hiſtory of his Life, will eaſily know; wherein he will alſo ſee Prophecy ſhining out: For he propheſied very clearly of thoſe who were infected with the Arian Contagion, and foretold what Miſchief from them was threatned to the Churches, God truly revealing all theſe Things to him, which is certainly the principal Evidence of the Catholick Faith, no ſuch Man being to be found amongſt the Hereticks. But do not take this upon my Word, but read and ſtudy the Book it ſelf.*

This Account you have from St. *Chryſoſtom*, whom Mr. *Dodwell* calls the Contemner of Fables. Chryſoſt. Hom. 8. in Mat. 2.

St. *Hierom*, in his Treatiſe *De Viro Perfecto*, ſpeaks of the frequency of Miracles done in his time, as a thing paſt queſtion: Beſides thoſe, not a few, which he has left upon Record, in the Lives of *Hilarion* and *Paul*, two Monks, whoſe Lives he has writ. And he that has a mind to ſee the plenty of Miracles of this kind, need but read the Collection of the Lives of the Fathers, made by *Roſweydus*.

Ruffin tells us, That *Athanaſius* lodg'd the Bones of St. *John Baptiſt* in the Wall of the Church, knowing by the Spirit of Prophecy, the good they were to do to the next Generation: And of what Efficacy and Uſe they were, may be concluded from the Church with the golden Roof, built to them ſoon after, in the place of the Temple of *Serapis*.

Cæcum illuminatum fuiſſe jam noveram. Nec ea quæ cognoſcimus, enumerare poſſumus. *Aug. Retract.* l. c. 13. Quæ utiq; mecum ſciunt.

St. *Auſtin* tell us, That he *knew a blind Man reſtor'd to ſight by the Bodies of the* Milan Martyrs, *and ſome other ſuch things; of which kind, there were ſo many done in that time, that many ſcaped his Knowledge; and thoſe which he knew, were more than he could number.* More of this you may ſee *Epiſt.* 137.

He farther aſſures us, that by the ſingle Reliques of St. *Stephen, a blind Woman receiv'd her Sight.* Lucullus *was cured of an old Fiſtula*; Eucharius *of the Stone*; *Three Gouty Men recovered; A Lad kill'd with a Cart-wheel going over him, reſtor'd to Life ſafe and ſound, as if he had received no Hurt: A Nun lying at the point of Death, they ſent her Coat to the Shrine, but ſhe dying before it was brought back, was reſtor'd to Life by its being laid on her dead Body. The like happened at* Hippo *to the Daughter of* BASSUS; *and two others,* whoſe Names he ſets down, were by the ſame Reliques *raiſed from the dead.*

After theſe and other Particulars there ſet down, of Miracles done in his time by thoſe Reliques of St. *Stephen*, the holy Father goes on thus; *What ſhall I do? preſſed by my Promiſe of diſpatching this Work, I cannot here ſet down all: And without doubt many, when they ſhall read this, will be troubled that I have omitted ſo many Particulars, which they truly know as well as I.* For *if I ſhould, paſſing by the reſt, write only the miraculous Cures which have been wrought by this moſt glorious Martyr* Stephen, *in the Colony of* Calama, *and this of ours, I ſhould fill many Books, and yet ſhould not take in all of them: But only of thoſe of which there are Collections publiſhed, which are read to the People: For this I took care ſhould be done, when I ſaw that Signs of Divine Power, like thoſe of old, were FREQUENT alſo in our Times. It is not now two Years ſince that Shrine has been at* Hippo: *And many of the Books (which I certainly knew to be ſo) not being publiſhed, thoſe which are publiſhed concerning thoſe miraculous Operations, amount to near fifty when I writ this. But at* Calama, *where this Shrine was before, there are more*

Libelli dati ſunt. Cum videremus antiquis ſimilia divinarum ſignа virtutum etiam noſtris temporibus frequentari. Aug. de Civ. Dei. l. xxii. c. 8.

more publiſhed, and their Number is incomparably greater. At Uzal *alſo a Colony, and near* Utica, *we know many famous Things to have been done by the ſame Martyr.*

Two of thoſe Book he mentions, are printed in the *Appendix* of the Xth Tome of St. *Auſtin*'s Works of *Plantius Edit.* One of them contains two Miracles; the other, as I remember, about ſeventeen. So that at *Hippo* alone, in two Years time, we may count, beſides thoſe omitted, there were publiſhed above 600 Miracles, and, as he ſays, *incomparably more* at *Calama*: Beſides what were done by other Reliques of the ſame St. *Stephen*, in other Parts of the World, which cannot be ſuppos'd to have had leſs Virtue than thoſe ſent to this Part of *Africa*. For the Reliques of St. *Stephen*, diſcovered by the Dream of a Monk, were divided and ſent into diſtant Countries, and there diſtributed to ſeveral Churches.

Theſe may ſuffice to ſhew, that if the Fathers of the Church of greateſt Name and Authority are to be believed, Miracles were not withdrawn, but continued down to the latter end of the Fourth Century, long after *Chriſtianity had prevailed to be received for the Religion of the Empire.*

But if theſe Teſtimonies of *Athanaſius*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Palladius*, *Ruffin*, St. *Hierom*, and St. *Auſtin*, will not ſerve your turn, you may find much more to this Purpoſe in the ſame Authors; and, if you pleaſe, you may conſult alſo St. *Baſil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Hilary*, *Theodoret*, and others.

This being ſo, you muſt either deny the Authority of theſe Fathers, or grant that Miracles continued in the Church after *Chriſtianity was received for the Religion of the Empire*, and then they could not be *to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance*, unleſs they were to ſupply the want of what was not wanting; and therefore they were continued for ſome other End. Which End of the Continuation of Miracles, when you are ſo far inſtructed in as to be able to aſſure us, that it was different from that for which God made uſe of them in the 2*d* and 3*d* Centuries: when you are ſo far admitted into the Secrets of Divine Providence, as to be able to convince the World that the Miracles between the Apoſtles and *Conſtantine*'s Time, or any other Period you ſhall pitch on, were *to ſupply the want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance*, and thoſe after, for ſome other Purpoſe, what you ſay may deſerve to be conſidered. 'Till you do this, you will only ſhew the Liberty you take, to aſſert with great Confidence, though without any Ground, whatever will ſute your Syſtem; and that you do not ſtick to make bold with the Counſels of infinite Wiſdom, to make them ſubſervient to your Hypotheſis.

And ſo I leave you to diſpoſe of the Credit of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, as you ſhall think fit; and by your Authority to eſtabliſh, or invalidate theirs as you pleaſe. But this, I think, is evident, that he who will build his Faith or Reaſonings upon Miracles delivered by Church-Hiſtorians, will find cauſe to go no farther than the Apoſtles time, or elſe not to ſtop at *Conſtantine*'s: ſince the Writers after that Period, whoſe Word we readily take as unqueſtionable in other things, ſpeak of Miracles in their time with no leſs Aſſurance, than the Fathers before the 4*th* Century; and a great Part of the Miracles of the 2*d* and 3*d* Centuries ſtand upon the Credit of the Writers of the 4*th*. So that that ſort of Argument which takes and rejects the Teſtimony of the Ancients at pleaſure, as may beſt ſute with it, will not have much force with thoſe who are not diſpoſed to embrace the Hypotheſis, without any Argument at all.

Pag. 7. You grant, *That the true Religion has always Light and Strength of its own*, i. e. *without the Aſſiſtance of Force or Miracles, ſufficient to prevail with all that conſider it ſeriouſly, and without Prejudice*: That therefore, for which the Aſſiſtance of Force is wanting, is to make Men *conſider ſeriouſly, and without Prejudice*. Now whether the Miracles that we have ſtill, Miracles done by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, atteſted, as they are, by undeniable Hiſtory, be not fitter to deal with Mens *Prejudices*, than Force, and then Force which requires nothing but outward Conformity, I leave the World to judge. All the Aſſiſtance the true Religion needs from Authority, is only a Liberty for it, to be truly taught? but it has ſeldom had that, from the Powers in being, in its firſt Entry into their Dominions, ſince the withdrawing of Miracles: And yet I deſire you to tell me, into what Country the Goſpel, accompanied (as now it is) only with paſt Miracles, hath been brought by the preaching of Men, who have labour'd in it after the Example of the Apoſtles, where it did not ſo prevail over Mens Prejudices, that *as many as were ordain'd to eternal Life*, conſider'd *and believed* it. Which, as you may ſee, *Acts* 13. 48. was all the Advance it made, even when aſſiſted with

with the Gift of Miracles: For neither then were all, or the Majority wrought on to conſider, and embrace it.

But yet the Goſpel *cannot prevail by its own Light and Strength*; and therefore Miracles were to ſupply the Place of Force. How was Force uſed? A Law being made, there was a continued Application of Puniſhment to all thoſe, whom it brought not to embrace the Doctrine propoſed. Were Miracle ſo uſed till Force took Place? For this, we ſhall want more new Church-Hiſtory, and I think contrary to what we read in that Part of it which is unqueſtionable; I mean in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, where we ſhall find, that the then Promulgators of the Goſpel, when they had preached, and done what Miracles the Spirit of God directed, if they prevail'd not, they often left them: *Then* Paul *and* Barnabas *waxed bold, and ſaid it was neceſſary that the Word of God ſhould firſt have been ſpoken to you: but ſeeing you put it from you, and judge your ſelves unworthy, we turn to the Gentiles. They ſhook off the Duſt of their Feet againſt them, and came unto* Iconium. *But when divers were hardened, and believed not, but ſpake Evil of that Way, before the Multitude departed from them, and ſeperated the Diſciples.* Paul *was preſſed in Spirit, and teſtified to the Jews that Jeſus was Chriſt; and when they oppoſed themſelves, and blaſphemed, he ſhook his Raiment, and ſaid unto them, Your Blood be upon your own Heads, I am clean, from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.* Did the Chriſtian Magiſtrates ever do ſo, who thought it neceſſary to ſupport the Chriſtian Religion by Laws? Did they ever, when they had a while puniſh'd thoſe, whom Perſuaſions and Preaching had not prevail'd on, give off, and leave them to themſelves, and make Trial of their Puniſhment upon others? Or in this your Way of Force and Puniſhment? If it be not, yours is not what Miracle came to ſupply the room of, and ſo is not neceſſary. For you tell us, they are puniſh'd to *make them conſider*, and they can never be ſuppos'd to conſider *as they ought, whilſt they perſiſt in rejecting*; and therefore they are juſtly puniſhed to make them conſider: So that not ſo *conſidering*, being the *Fault* for which they are puniſh'd, and the Amendment of that Fault the End which is deſign'd to be attain'd by puniſhing, the Puniſhment muſt continue. But Men were not always beat upon with Miracles. To this, perhaps you will reply, that the ſeeing of a Miracle or two, or half a Dozen, was ſufficient *to procure a Hearing*; but that being puniſh'd once or twice, or half a Dozen Times, is not; for you tell us, the *Power of Miracles communicated to the Apoſtles, ſerved altogether, as well as Puniſhment, to procure them a Hearing*: Where, if you mean by *Hearing*, only Attention, who doubts but Puniſhment may alſo procure that? If you mean by *Hearing*, receiving and embracing, what is propos'd, that even Miracles themſelves did not effect upon all Eye-witneſſes. Why then, I beſeech you, if one be to ſupply the Place of the other, is one to be continued on thoſe who do *reject*, when the other was never long contined, nor, as I think we may ſafely ſay, often repeated to thoſe, who perſiſted in their former Perſuaſions?

Acts 13. 46. V. 51. Acts 19. 9. Acts 8. 6. Pag. 24, 25. Pag. 36.

After all therefore, may not one juſtly doubt, whether Miracles ſupplied the Place of Puniſhment; nay, whether you your ſelf, if you be true to your own Principles, can think ſo? You tell us, that not to join *themſelves to the Church, where ſufficient Evidence is offered to convince Men that it is ſo, is a Fault that it cannot be unjuſt to puniſh.* Let me ask you now; Did the Apoſtles by their Preaching and Miracles, offer *ſufficient Evidence* to convince Men that the Church of Chriſt was the *true Church*; or, which is, in this Caſe, the ſame Thing, that the Doctrine they preach'd was the *true Religion?* If they did, were not thoſe, who perſiſted in Unbelief, guilty of a *Fault?* And if ſome of the Miracles done in thoſe Days, ſhould now be repeated, and yet Men ſhould not embrace the Doctrince, or join themſelves to the Church which thoſe Miracles accompanied, would you not think them guilty of a *Fault*, which the Magiſtrate might juſtly, nay, ought to *puniſh?* If you would anſwer truly and ſincerely to this Queſtion, I doubt you would think your beloved Puniſhments neceſſary notwithſtanding Miracles, *there being no other human Means left.* I do not make this Judgment of you, from any ill Opinion I have of your good Nature, but it is conſonant to your Principles: For if not Profeſſing the true Religion, where ſufficient Evidence is offer'd by bare Preaching, be *a Fault*, and *a Fault juſtly to be puniſhed* by the Magiſtrate, you will certainly think it much more his Duty to puniſh a greater Fault, as you muſt allow it is, to *reject* Truth propos'd with Arguments and Miracles, than with bare Arguments: Since you tell us, that the Magiſtrate is *obliged to procure, as much as in him lies, that every Man take Care of his own Soul,*

Pag. 25. Pag. 77.

i. e. con-

i. e. *conſider as he ought*; which no Man can *be ſuppos'd* to do, *whilſt he perſiſts in rejecting*: as you tell us, *pag.* 24.

Miracles, ſay you, ſupplied the Want of Force, *till by their Help Chriſtianity had prevailed to be received for the Religion of the Empire.* Not that the Magiſtrates had not as much Commiſſion then, from the Law of Nature, to uſe Force, for promoting the true Religion, as ſince: But becauſe the Magiſtrates then, not being of the true Religion, did not afford it the Aſſiſtance of their political Power. If this be ſo, and there be a Neceſſity either of *Force or Miracles*, will there not be the ſame Reaſon for Miracles ever ſince, even to this Day, and ſo on to the End of the World, in all thoſe Countries where the Magiſtrate is not of the true Religion? *Unleſs* (as you urge it) you *will ſay (what without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer of all Things, has not furniſhed Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls.*

A. p. 16.

But to put an end to your Pretence to *Miracles*, as ſupplying the Place of Force. Let me ask you, Whether ſince the withdrawing of *Miracles*, your moderate Degree of Force has been made uſe of, for the Support of the Chriſtian Religion? If not, then Miracles were not made uſe of to ſupply the Want of Force, unleſs it were for the Supply of ſuch Force as Chriſtianity never had, which is for the Supply of juſt no Force at all; or elſe for the Supply of the Severities which have been in Uſe amongſt Chriſtians, which is worſe than none at all. Force, you ſay, is neceſſary: what Force? *not Fire and Sword, not Loſs of Eſtates, not maiming with corporal Puniſhments, not ſtarving and tormenting in noiſome Priſons*: thoſe you condemn. *Not Compulſion: Theſe Severities*, you ſay, *are apter to hinder, than promote the true Religion; but moderate lower Penalties, tolerable Inconveniences*, ſuch as ſhould *a little diſturb and diſeaſe Men.* This Aſſiſtance not being to be had from the Magiſtrates, in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, Miracles, ſay you, were continued till *Chriſtianity became the Religion of the Empire, not ſo much for any Neceſſity there was of them, all that while, for the evincing the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, as to ſupply the Want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance.* For the *true Religion not being able to ſupport it ſelf by its own Light, and Strength, without the Aſſiſtance either of Miracles, or of Authority*, there was a Neceſſity of the one or the other; and therefore, whilſt the Powers in being aſſiſted not with neceſſary Force, Miracles ſupplied that Want. Miracles then being to ſupply neceſſary Force, and neceſſary Force being only *lower moderate Penalties, ſome Inconveniences, ſuch as only diſturb and diſeaſe a little*; if you cannot ſhew that in all Countries, where the Magiſtrates have been Chriſtian, they have aſſiſted with ſuch Force, 'tis plain that Miracles ſuppli'd not the Want of *neceſſary Force*; unleſs to ſupply the Want of your neceſſary Force, for a Time, were to ſupply the Want of an Aſſiſtance, which true Religion had not upon the withdrawing of Miracles, and I think I may ſay, was never thought on by any Authority, in any Age or Country, till you now, above 1300 Years after, made this happy Diſcovery. Nay, Sir, ſince the true Religion, as you tell us, cannot prevail or ſubſiſt without *Miracles or Authority*, i. e. your moderate Force; it muſt neceſſarily follow, that the Chriſtian Religion has, in all Ages and Countries, been accompanied either with actual Miracles, or ſuch Force: which, whether it be ſo or no, I leave you and all ſober Men to conſider. When you can ſhew, that it has been ſo, we ſhall have Reaſon to be ſatisfied with your bold Aſſertion: That the Chriſtian *Religion*, as deliver'd in the *New Teſtament*, cannot *prevail by its own Light, and Strength, without the Aſſiſtance* of your moderate Penalties, or of actual *Miracles* accompanying it. But if ever ſince the withdrawing of Miracles in all Chriſtian Countries, where Force has been thought neceſſary by the Magiſtrate to ſupport the National, or (as every where it is called) the true Religion, thoſe Severities have been made uſe of, which you (for a good Reaſon) *condemn, as apter to hinder, than promote the true Religion*; 'tis plain that Miracles ſupplied the Want of ſuch an *Aſſiſtance* from the *Magiſtrate*, as was *apter to hinder, than promote the true Religion.* And your ſubſtituting of Miracles, to ſupply the Want of moderate Force, will ſhew nothing, for your Cauſe, but the Zeal of a Man ſo fond of Force, that he will without any Warrant from Scripture, enter into the Counſels of the Almighty; and without Authority from Hiſtory, talk of Miracles, and political Adminiſtrations, as may beſt ſute his Syſtem.

To my ſaying, a Religion that is from God, wants not the Aſſiſtance of human Authority to make it prevail; you anſwer, This *is not ſimply nor always true. Indeed*

pag. 8.

when

when God takes the Matter wholly into his own Hands, as he does at his first revealing any Religion, there can be no need of any Assistance of Human Authority: But when God has once sufficiently settled his Religion in the World, so that if Men from thenceforth will do what they may and ought, in their several Capacities, to preserve and propagate it, it may subsist and prevail without that extraordinary Assistance from him, which was necessary for its first Establishment. By this Rule of yours, how long was there need of Miracles to make Christianity subsist and prevail? If you will keep to it, you will find there was no need of Miracles, after the Promulgation of the Gospel by Christ and his Apostles; for I ask you, was it not then so *sufficiently settled in the World, that if Men would from thenceforth have done what they might and ought, in their several Capacities*, it would have subsisted and prevailed without that *extraordinary Assistance* of Miracles? Unless you will on this Occasion retract what you say in other Places, *viz.* that it is a Fault not to receive the *True Religion, where sufficient Evidence is offered to convince Men that it is so.* If then, from the Times of the Apostles, the Christian Religion has had sufficient Evidence that it is the True Religion, and *Men did their Duty*, i. e. receive it, it would certainly have subsisted and prevailed, even from the Apostles Times, without that extraordinary Assistance, and then Miracles after that were not necessary.

But perhaps you will say, that by *Men in their several Capacities*, you mean the Magistrates. A pretty way of speaking, proper to you alone: But even in that Sense, it will not serve your Turn. For then there will be need of Miracles, not only in the Time you propose, but in all Times after. For if the Magistrate, who is as much subject as other Men to that Corruption of Human Nature, by which you tell us false Religions prevail against the true, should not do *what he may and ought*, so as to be of the true Religion, as 'tis the odds he will not; what then will become of the True Religion, which according to you cannot subsist or prevail without either the *Assistance of Miracles or Authority?* Subjects cannot have the *Assistance of Authority*, where the Magistrate is not of the True Religion; and the Magistrate wanting the *Assistance of Authority* to bring him to the True Religion, that want must be still supplied with Miracles, or else, according to your Hypothesis, all must go to wrack; and *the True Religion*, that cannot subsist *by its own Strength and Light*, must be lost in the World. For, I presume, you are scarce yet such an Adorer of the Powers of the World, as to say, that Magistrates are privileged from that common Corruption of Mankind, whose Opposition to the true Religion you suppose cannot be overcome, without the *Assistance of Miracles or Force.* The Flock will stray, unless the Bell-weather conduct them right; the Bell-weather himself will stray, unless the Shepherd's Crook and Staff (which he has as much need of as any Sheep of the Flock) keep him right. *Ergo*, The whole Flock will stray, unless the Bell-weather have that Assistance which is necessary to conduct him right. The Case is the same here. So that by your own Rule, either there was no need of Miracles to supply the want of Force, after the Apostles time, or there is need of them still.

But your Answer, when looked into, has something in it more excellent. I say, a Religion that is of God, wants not the Assistance of *human Authority* to make it prevail. You answer, *True, when God takes the Matter into his own Hands. But when* Pag. 8. *once he has sufficiently settled Religion, so that if Men will but do what they may and ought, it may subsist without that extraordinary Assistance from Heaven; then he leaves it to their Care.* Where you suppose, if Men will do their Duties in their several Capacities, true Religion, being once establish'd, may subsist without Miracles. And is it not as true, that if they will, in *their several Capacities, do what they may and ought*, true Religion, will also subsist without Force? But you are sure Magistrates will do *what they may and ought to preserve and propagate the true Religion*, but Subjects will not. If you are not, you must bethink your self how to answer that old Question.

——— *Sed quis custodiet ipsos*
Custodes? ———

To my having said, that prevailing without the Assistance of Force, I thought was made use of as an Argument for the Truth of Christian Religion. You reply, that you hope *I am mistaken, for sure this is a very bad Argument, That the Christian Re-* Pag. 6. *ligion, so contrary in the Nature of it, as well to Flesh and Blood, as to the Powers of Dark-*

Darkneſs, ſhould prevail as it did, and that not only without any Aſſiſtance from Authority, but even in ſpight of all the Oppoſition which Authority and a wicked World, joyned with thoſe infernal Powers, could make againſt it. This, I acknowledge, has deſervedly been inſiſted upon by Chriſtians as a very good Proof of their Religion. But to argue the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, from its mere prevailing in the World, without any Aid from Force, or the Aſſiſtance of the Powers in being; as if whatever Religion ſhould ſo prevail, muſt needs be the true Religion, (whatever may be intended) is really not to defend the Chriſtian Religion, but to betray it. How you have mended the Argument by putting in *mere*, which is not any where uſed by me, I will not examine. The Queſtion is, whether the Chriſtian Religion, ſuch as it was then, (for I know not any other Chriſtian Religion) and is ſtill *contrary to the Fleſh and Blood, and to the Powers of Darkneſs*, prevail'd not without the Aſſiſtance of human Force, by thoſe Aids it has ſtill? This, I think, you will not deny to be an Argument uſed for its Truth by Chriſtians, and ſome of our Church. How far any one in the uſe of this Argument pleaſes or diſpleaſes you, I am not concern'd. All the uſe I made of it was to ſhew, that it is confeſſed that the Chriſtian Religion did prevail, without that *human Means* of the *coactive Power* of the *Magiſtrate*, which you affirmed to be *neceſſary*; and this, I think, makes good the Experiment I brought. Nor will your ſeeking your Way, a Refuge, in Miracles, help you to evade it; as I have already ſhewn.

Pag. 6. But you give a Reaſon for what you ſay, in theſe following Words; *For neither does the true Religion always prevail without the Aſſiſtance of the Powers in being; nor is that always the true Religion, which does ſo ſpread and prevail.* Thoſe who uſe the Argument of its prevailing without Force, for the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion, 'tis like will tell you, that, if it be true, as you ſay, that the Chriſtian Religion (which at other times does) ſometimes does not prevail without the Aſſiſtance of the Powers in being, it is becauſe when it fails, it wants the due Aſſiſtance and Diligence of the Miniſters of it. *How ſhall they hear without a Preacher?* How ſhall the Goſpel be ſpread and prevail, if thoſe who take on them to be the Miniſters and Preachers of it, either neglect to teach it others as they ought, or confirm it not by their Lives? If therefore you will make this Argument of any uſe to you, you muſt ſhew, where it was, that the Miniſters of the Goſpel, doing their Duty by the Purity of their Lives, and their uninterrupted Labour, in being inſtant in ſeaſon, and out of ſeaſon, have not been able to make it prevail. An Inſtance of this, 'tis believed you will ſcarce find: And if this be the Caſe, that it fails not to prevail where thoſe, whoſe Charge it is, neglect not to teach and ſpread it with that Care, Aſſiduity, and Application which they ought, you may hereafter know where to lay the Blame; Not on the want of ſufficient Light and Strength in the Goſpel to prevail, (wherein methinks, you make very bold with it) but on the want of what the Apoſtle requires in the Miniſters of it; ſome Part whereof you may read in theſe Words to *Timothy*; *But thou, O Man of God, follow after Righteouſneſs, Godlineſs, Faith, Love, Patience, Meekneſs: Give Attendance to Reading, to Exhortation, to Doctrine, Preach the Word, be inſtant in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all Long-ſuffering and Doctrine:* And more to this Purpoſe in his Epiſtles to *Timothy* and *Titus*.

That the Chriſtian Religion has prevail'd, and ſupported it ſelf in the World now above theſe 1600 Years, you muſt grant, and that it has not been by Force, is Demonſtration. For where-ever the Chriſtian Religion prevail'd, it did it, as far as we know any thing of the Means of its Propagation and Support, without the Help of that Force, *moderate* Force, which you ſay, is alone uſeful and neceſſary. So that if the Severities you condemn, be, as you confeſs, *apter to hinder than promote* the Goſpel, and it has no where had the Aſſiſtance of your *moderate* Penalties, it muſt follow, that it prevail'd without Force, only by its own Strength and Light, diſplay'd and brought home to the Underſtandings and Hearts of the People, by the Preaching, Entreaties, and Exhortations of its Miniſters. This at leaſt you muſt grant, that Force can be by no means neceſſary to make the Goſpel prevail any where, till the utmoſt has been tried that can be done by Argument and Exhortations, Prayers and Entreaties, and all the friendly Ways of Perſuaſion.

As to the other Part of your Aſſertion, *Nor is that always the true Religion that does ſo ſpread and prevail.* 'Tis like they will demand Inſtances of you, where falſe Religions ever prevail'd againſt the Goſpel, without the Aſſiſtance of Force on the one ſide, or the betraying of it by the Negligence and Careleſneſs of its Teachers,

on

on the other? So that if the Gospel any where wants the Magistrate's Assistance, it is only to make the Ministers of it do their Duty. I have heard of those, and possibly there are Instances of it now not wanting, who by their pious Lives, peaceable and friendly Carriage, and diligent Application to the several Conditions and Capacities of their Parishoners, and screening them as much as they could from the Penalties of the Law, have in a short Time scarce left a Dissenter in a Parish, where, notwithstanding the Force had been before used, they scarce found in any other. But how far this has recommended such Ministers to those who ought to encourage or follow the Example, I wish you would inform your self, and then tell me. But who sees not that a Justice of Peace's Warrant is a shorter, and much easier Way for the Minister, than all this ado of Instruction, Debates, and particular Application. Whether it be also more Christian, or more effectual to make real Converts, others may be apt to enquire. This, I am sure, it is not justifiable (even by your very Principles) to be used till the other has been throughly tried. *Vid.* Pastoral Care, *pag.* 202.

How far our Saviour is like to approve of this Method in those whom he sends: what Reward he is like to bestow on Ministers of his Word, who are forward to bring their Brethren under such Correction; those who call themselves Successors of the Apostles, will do well to consider from what he himself says to them, *Luke* 12. 42. For that That was spoken particularly to the Apostles and Preachers of the Gospel, is evident not only from the Words themselves, but from St. *Peter*'s Question. Our Saviour having in the foregoing Verses declared in a Parable, the Necessity of being watchful, St. *Peter*, ver. 41. asks him, *Lord, speakest thou this Parable unto us, or even to all?* To this Demand, our Saviour replies in these Words. *Who then is that faithful and wise Steward whom his Lord shall make Ruler over his Houshold, to give them their Portion of Meat in due Season? Blessed is that Servant whom the Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Of a Truth, I say unto you, he will make him Ruler over all that he hath. But, and if that Servant say in his Heart, my Lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to beat the Men-Servants, and Maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken. The Lord of that Servant will come in a Day when he looketh not for him, and at an Hour when he is not aware; and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his Portion with Unbelievers*, or *with Hypocrites*, as it is, Mat. 24. 51.

But if there be any thing in the Argument for the Truth of Christianity, (as God forbid there should not) that it has, and consequently can prevail without Force, I think it can scarce be true in Matter of Fact, that false Religions do also prevail against the Christian Religion, when they come upon equal Terms in Competition; and as much Diligence and Industry is used by the Teachers of it, as by Seducers to false Religions, the Magistrate using his Force on neither Side. For if in this Case, which is the fair Trial, Christianity can prevail, and false Religions too, 'tis possible Contrarieties may prevail against one another both together. To make good therefore your Assertion, you must shew us, where-ever any other Religion so spread and prevail'd, as to drive Christianity out of any Country without Force, where the Ministers of it did their Duty to teach, adorn and support it.

As to the following Words, *Nor is that always the true Religion which does so spread and prevail; as I doubt not but you will acknowledge with me, when you have but consider'd within how few Generations after the Flood, the Worship of false Gods prevail'd against that which* Noah *professed and taught his Children, which was undoubtedly the true Religion, almost to the utter Exclusion of it, (tho' that at first was the only Religion in the World) without any Aid from Force, or Assistance from the Powers in being.* This will need something more than a Negative Proof, as we shall see by and by. Pag. 6.

Where I say, "The Inventions of Men need the Force and Help of Men: A Religion that is from God, wants not the Assistance of human Authority. The first Part of those Words you take no notice of; neither grant nor deny it to be so, tho' perhaps it will prove a great Part of the Controversy between us. L. 1. p. 160.

To my Question, "Whether if such a Toleration as is propos'd by the Author of "the First Letter, were establish'd in *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, *Portugal*, &c. the true "Religion would not be a Gainer by it? You answer, That the *true Religion would be a Loser by it in those few Places where it is now establish'd as the National Religion*; and particularly, you name *England*. It is then, it seems, by your Way of *moderate Force, and lower Penalties*, that in all Countries where it is National, the true Religion hath prevail'd and subsists. For the Controversy is between the Author's universal Toleration, and your new Way of *Force*: for greater Degrees of Force, you condemn as hurtful. Pag. 8.

hurtful. Say then that in *England*, and where-ever the true Religion is National, it has been beholden to your Force for the Advantages and Support it has had, and I will yield you the Cauſe. But of National Religions, and particularly that of *England*, I have occaſion to ſpeak more in another Place.

Pag. 9. In the next Place you anſwer, That you *ſuppoſe* I *do not hope* I *ſhall perſuade the World to conſent to* my *Toleration*. I think by your Logick, a Propoſition is not leſs true or falſe, becauſe the World will or will not be perſuaded to conſent to it. And therefore, tho' it will not conſent to a general Toleration, it may nevertheleſs be true that it would be advantageous to the true Religion: and if no body muſt ſpeak Truth till he thinks all the World will be perſuaded by it, you muſt have a very good Opinion of your Oratory, or elſe you will have a very good Excuſe to turn your Parſonage, when you have one, into a fine Cure. But tho' I have not ſo good an Opinion of my Gift of Perſuaſion, as perhaps you have of yours; yet I think I may without any great Preſumption hope, that I may as ſoon perſuade *England*, the *World*, or any Government in it, to conſent to my Toleration, as you perſuade it to content it ſelf with *moderate Penalties*.

You farther anſwer, If ſuch a Toleration, eſtabliſh'd there, would permit the Doctrine of the Church of *England* to be truly preach'd, and its Worſhip ſet up in any *Popiſh*, *Mahometan* or *Pagan* Country, you think true Religion would be *a Gainer by*

Pag. 10. *it for a Time*; *but* you *think withal, that an univerſal Toleration would ruin it both there and every where elſe, in the End.* You grant it then poſſible, notwithſtanding the Corruption of human Nature, that the true Religion may gain ſome where, and for ſome Time, by Toleration: It will gain under a new Toleration you think, but decay under an old one; would you had told us the Reaſon why you think ſo. *But you*

Pag. 5. *think there is great Reaſon to fear, that without God's extraordinary Providence, it would in a much ſhorter Time, than any one, who does not well conſider the Matter, will imagine, be moſt effectually extirpated by it throughout the World.* If you have conſidered right, and the Matter be really ſo, it is Demonſtration, that the Chriſtian Religion, ſince *Conſtantine*'s Time, as well as the true Religion before *Moſes*'s Time, muſt needs have been totally extinguiſh'd out of the World, and have ſo continued, unleſs by Miracle and immediate Revelation reſtor'd. For thoſe Men, *i. e.* the Magiſtrates, upon whoſe being of the true Religion, the Preſervation of it, according to you, depends; living all of them under a free Toleration, muſt needs loſe the true Religion effectually and ſpeedily, from among them; and they quitting the true Religion, the Aſſiſtance of Force, which ſhould ſupport it againſt a general Defection, be utterly loſt.

The Princes of the World are, I ſuppoſe, as well infected with the *depraved Nature of Man*, as the reſt of their Brethren. Theſe, whether 100 or 1000, ſuppoſe they lived together in one Society, wherein, with the true Religion, there were a free Toleration, and no *Coactive Power* of the Magiſtrate employed about Matters of Religion, would the true Religion be ſoon extirpated amongſt them? If you ſay it would not, you muſt grant Toleration not to be ſo deſtructive of the true Religion, as you ſay; or you muſt think them of another Race, than the reſt of corrupt Men, and free from that general Taint. If you grant that the true Religion would be quickly extirpated amongſt them, by Toleration, living together in one Society, the ſame will happen to them, living as Princes, where they are free from all coactive Power of the Magiſtrate in Matters of Religion, and have as large a Toleration as can be imagin'd. Unleſs you will ſay, that *depraved human Nature* works leſs in a Prince than a Subject; and is moſt tame, moſt mortified, where it has moſt Liberty and Temptation. Muſt not then, if your Maxim be true, Toleration quickly deprive the few Orthodox Princes that are in the World (take it when you will) of the true Religion; and with them, take away the Aſſiſtance of Authority, which is neceſſary to ſupport it amongſt their Subjects? Toleration then does not, whatever your Fears are, make that woful Wrack on true Religion which you talk of.

I ſhall give you another Evidence of it, and then come to examine your great Reaſon taken from the Corruption of human Nature, and the Inſtance you ſo often repeat, and build ſo much on, the *Apoſtacy after the Flood*. Toleration, you ſay, would quickly, and *effectually extirpate the true Religion throughout the World*. What now is the Means to preſerve true Religion in the World? If you may be believed, 'tis Force, but not all Force, great Severities, Fire, Faggot, Impriſonment, Loſs of Eſtate, &c. Theſe will do more harm than good; 'tis only *lower and moderate Penalties*, *ſome tolerable Inconveniences*, can do the Buſineſs. If then *moderate* Force hath not been all along,

alone, no, nor any where, made uſe of for the Preſervation of the true Religion, the Maintenance and Support of the true Religion in the World, has not been owing to what you oppoſe to Toleration: And ſo your Argument againſt Toleration is out of Doors.

You give us in this and the foregoing Pages, the Grounds of your *Fear*, It is the *Corruption of human Nature* which oppoſes the true Religion. You expreſs it thus, *Idolatry prevailing againſt it* [the true Religion] *not by its own Light and Strength, for it could have nothing of either, but merely by the Advantage it had in the Corruption and Pravity of human Nature, finding out to it ſelf more agreeable Religions than the true. For*, ſay you, *whatever Hardſhips ſome falſe Religions may impoſe, it will however, always be eaſier to carnal and worldly-minded Men, to give even their Firſt-born for their Tranſgreſſions, than to mortify their Luſts from which they ſpring, which no Religion but the true, requires of them.* I wonder, ſaying this, how you could any longer miſtake the Magiſtrate's Duty, in reference to Religion, and not ſee wherein *Force* truly can and ought to be ſerviceable to it. What you have ſaid, plainly ſhews you, that the Aſſiſtance the Magiſtrate's Authority can give to the true Religion, is in the ſubduing of Luſts, and its being directed againſt Pride, Injuſtice, Rapine, Luxury and Debauchery, and thoſe other Immoralities which come properly under his Cogniſance, and may be corrected by Puniſhments; and not by the Impoſing of *Creeds* and *Ceremonies*, as you tell us. *Sound* and *Decent*, you might have left out, whereof their Fancies, and not the Law of God, will always be Judge, and conſequently the Rule. Pag. 7. Pag. 13.

The Caſe between the true and falſe Religions, as you have ſtated it, in ſhort, ſounds thus, *True Religion has always Light and Strength of its own, ſufficient to prevail with all that ſeriouſly conſider it, and without Prejudice. Idolatry*, or falſe Religions *have nothing of Light or Strength to prevail with.* Why then does not the true Religion prevail againſt the falſe, having ſo much the Advantage in Light and Strength? The Counter-balance of *Prejudice* hinders. And wherein does that conſiſt? The Drunkard muſt part with his Cups and Companions, and the voluptuous Man with his Pleaſures. The Proud and Vain muſt lay by all Exceſs in Apparel, Furniture and Attendance; and Money, the Support of all theſe, muſt be got only by the Ways of Juſtice, Honeſty, and fair Induſtry: And every one muſt live peaceably, uprightly, and friendly with his Neighbour. Here then the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance is wanting: Here they may and ought to interpoſe their Power, and by Severities, againſt Drunkenneſs, Laſciviouſneſs, and all Sorts of Debauchery; by a ſteady and unrelaxed Puniſhment of all the Ways of Fraud and Injuſtice; and by their Adminiſtration, Countenance, and Example, reduce the Irregularities of Mens Manners into Order, and bring Sobriety, Peaceableneſs, Induſtry and Honeſty into Faſhion. This is their proper Buſineſs every where; and for this they have a Commiſſion from God, both by the Light of Nature and Revelation; and by this, removing the great Counterpoiſe, which lies in Strictneſs of Life, and is ſo ſtrong a Biaſs, with the greateſt Part, againſt the true Religion, they would caſt the Balance on that Side. For if Men were forced by the Magiſtrate to live ſober, honeſt and ſtrict Lives, whatever their Religion were, would not the Advantage be on the Side of Truth, when the gratifying of their Luſts were not to be obtained by forſaking her? In Men's Lives lies the main Obſtacle to right Opinions in Religion: And if you will not believe me, yet what a very rational Man of the Church of *England* ſays in the Caſe, will deſerve to be remembred. *Did Religion beſtow Heaven, without any Forms and Conditions, indifferently upon all; If the Crown of Life was Hereditary, and free to good and bad, and not ſettled by Covenant upon the Elect of God only, ſuch as* live ſoberly, righteouſly and godly in this preſent World; *I believe there would be no ſuch Thing as an Infidel among us. And without Controverſy 'tis the Way and Means of attaining to Heaven, that makes profane Scoffers ſo willing to let go the Expectation of it. 'Tis not the Articles of the Creed, but their Duty to God and their Neighbour, that is ſuch an inconſiſtent incredible Legend. They will not practiſe the Rules of Religion, and therefore they cannot believe the* Doctrines *of it.* The ingenuous Author will pardon me the Change of one Word, which I doubt not but ſutes his Opinion, tho' it did not ſo well that Argument he was then on. Bentley's Sermon of the Folly of Atheiſm. Pag. 16.

You grant the true Religion has always *Light, and Strength to prevail*; falſe Religions *have neither*. Take away the Satisfaction of Mens Luſts, and which then, I pray, hath the Advantage? Will Men, againſt the Light of their Reaſon, do Violence to their Underſtandings, and forſake Truth, and Salvation too, *gratis*? You tell us here,

here, *No Religion but the true requires of Men* the difficult Task *of mortifying their Lusts.* This being granted you, what Service will this do you to prove a Neceſſity of Force to puniſh all Diſſenters in *England?* Do none of their Religions require the mortifying of Luſts as well as yours?

And now, let us conſider your Inſtance whereon you build ſo much, that we hear
Pag. 7. of it over and over again. For you tell us. *Idolatry prevail'd, but yet not by the Help*
Pag. 10. *of Force, as has been ſufficiently ſhewn.* And again, That *Truth left to ſhift for her ſelf, will not do well enough, has been ſufficiently ſhewn.* What you have done to ſhew this,
Pag. 6. is to be ſeen, where you tell us, *Within how few Generations after the Flood, the Worſhip of falſe Gods prevail'd againſt the Religion which* Noah *profeſſed, and taught his Children, (which was undoubtedly the true Religion) almoſt to the utter Excluſion of it, (tho' that at firſt was the only Religion in the World) without any Aid from Force, or the Aſſiſtance of the Powers in Being, for any thing we find in the Hiſtory of thoſe Times, as we may reaſonably believe, conſidering that it found an Entrance into the World, and Entertainment in it, when it could have no ſuch Aid, or Aſſiſtance. Of which (beſides the Corruption of human Nature)* you *ſuppoſe there can no other Cauſe be aſſigned, or none more probable than this, that the Powers then in Being, did not do what they might and ought to have done, towards the preventing or checking that horrible Apoſtacy.* Here you tell us, that the *Worſhip of falſe Gods, within a very few Generations after the Flood, prevail'd againſt the true Religion, almoſt to the utter Excluſion of it.* This you ſay indeed, but without any Proofs; and unleſs that be *ſhewing*, you have not, as you pretend, any way *ſhewn* it. Out of what Records, I beſeech you, have you it, that the true Religion was *almoſt wholly extirpated* out of the World, within a few Generations after the Flood? The Scripture, the largeſt Hiſtory we have of thoſe Times, ſays nothing of it; nor does, as I remember, mention any as guilty of Idolatry, within 2 or 300 Years after the Flood. In *Canaan* it ſelf, I do not think that you can out of any credible Hiſtory *ſhew*, that there was any Idolatry within ten or twelve Generations after *Noah*; much leſs that it had ſo overſpread the World, and extirpated the true Religion, out of that Part of it, where the Scene lay of thoſe Actions recorded in the Hiſtory of the Bible. In *Abraham*'s Time, *Melchiſedeck* who was King of *Salem*, was alſo the Prieſt of the moſt High God. We read that God, with an immediate Hand, puniſh'd miraculouſly, firſt Mankind, at the Confuſion of *Babel*, and afterward *Sodom*, and four other Cities; but in neither of theſe Places is there any the leaſt mention of Idolatry, by which they provoked God, and drew down Vengeance on themſelves. So that truly you have *ſhewn* nothing at all, and what the Scripture *ſhews* is againſt you: For beſides, that it is plain by *Melchiſedeck* the King of *Salem*, and Prieſt of the moſt
Pag. 6. High God, to whom *Abraham* paid Tithes, that all the Land of *Canaan* was not yet over-ſpread with Idolatry, tho' afterwards in the Time of *Joſhua*, by the Forfeiture was therefore made to the *Iſraelites*, one may have Reaſon to ſuſpect it were more defiled with it, than any Part of the World. Beſides *Salem*, I ſay, he that reads
Gen. 20. 21, 22. the Story of *Abimelech*, will have Reaſon to think, that he alſo and his Kingdom, tho' *Philiſtines*, were not then infected with Idolatry.

You think they, and almoſt all Mankind were Idolaters, but you may be miſtaken; and that which may ſerve to ſhew it, is the Example of *Elijah* the Prophet, who was at leaſt as infallible a Gueſſer as you, and was as well inſtructed in the State and Hiſtory of his own Country, and Time, as you can be in the State of the whole World three or four thouſand Years ago. *Elijah* thought Idolatry had wholly
1 Kings 19. 10. Ver. 14. *extirpated* the true Religion out of *Iſrael*, and complains thus to God. *The Children of* Iſrael *have forſaken thy Covenant, thrown down thy Altars, and ſlain thy Prophets with the Sword: and I, even I alone, am left, and they ſeek my Life to take it away.* And he is ſo fully perſuaded of it, that he repeats it again: And yet God tells him, that he had there yet 7000 Knees that had not bowed to *Baal*, 7000 that were not Idolaters: tho' this was in the Reign of *Ahab*, a King zealous for Idolatry; and in a Kingdom ſet up in an idolatrous Worſhip, which had continued the National Religion, eſtabliſhed and promoted by the continued Succeſſion of ſeveral idolatrous Princes. And though the National Religions ſoon after the Flood were falſe, which you are far enough from proving; how does it thence follow, that the true Religion was *near extirpated?* which it muſt needs quite have been, before
Pag. 9. St. *Peter*'s Time, if there were ſo *great Reaſon to fear*, as you tell us, That the true Religion, without the Aſſiſtance of Force, *would in a much ſhorter Time, than any one that does not well conſider the Matter would imagine, be moſt effectually extir-*

pated

pated throughout the World. For about 2000 Years after *Noah*'s time, St. *Peter* tells us, *That in every Nation, he that feareth God, and worketh Righteouſneſs, is accepted by him.* By which Words, and the Occaſion on which they were ſpoken, it is manifeſt, that in Countries where for 2000 Years together no Force had been uſed for the ſupport of *Noah*'s true Religion, it was not yet wholly extirpated. But that you may not think it was ſo near, that there was but one left, only *Cornelius*, if you will look into *Acts* 17. 4. you will find a great Mutlitude of them at *Theſſalonica*, *And of the devout Greeks a great Multitude believed, and conſorted with* Paul *and* Silas. And again more of them in *Athens*, a City wholly given to Idolatry. For that thoſe σεβόμενοι, which we tranſlate *devout*, and whereof many are mentioned in the *Acts*, were Gentiles, who worſhipped the true God, and kept the Precepts of *Noah*, Mr. *Mede* has abundantly proved. So that whatſoever you, *who have well conſidered the Matter*, may imagine of the ſhortneſs of time, wherein *Noah*'s Religion would be *effectually extirpated throughout the World*, without the Aſſiſtance of Force, we find it at *Athens*, at *Philippi*, at *Corinth*, amongſt the *Romans*, in *Antioch* of *Piſidia*, in *Theſſalonica*, above 2000 Years after, and that not ſo near being extinguiſh'd, but that in ſome of thoſe Places the Profeſſors of it were numerous: at *Theſſalonica* they are call'd a *great Multitude*: at *Antioch many*: and how many of them there were in other Parts of the World, whereof there was no occaſion to make mention in that ſhort Hiſtory of the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, who knows? If they anſwered, in other Places, to what were found in theſe, as what Reaſon is there to ſuppoſe they ſhould not? I think we may *imagine* them to be as many, as there were effectually of the true Religion, Chriſtians in *Europe*, a little before the Reformation, notwithſtanding the Aſſiſtance the Chriſtian Religion had from Authority, after the withdrawing of Miracles.

Acts 10. 35.

Ver. 4.

But you have a *Salvo*, for you write warily, and endeavour to ſave your ſelf on all Hands; you ſay, *There is great Reaſon to fear, that without God's* EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE, *it would in a much ſhorter time, than any one, who does not well conſider the Matter, would imagine, be moſt effectually extirpated by it, throughout the World.* 'Tis without doubt, the *Providence* of God which governs the Affairs both of the World and his Church; and to that, whether you call it Ordinary or *Extraordinary*, you may truſt the Preſervation of his Church, without the uſe of ſuch Means, as he has no where appointed or authorized. You fancy Force neceſſary to preſerve the true Religion, and hence you conclude the Magiſtrate authorized, without any farther Commiſſion from God, to uſe it, if *there be no other Means left*; and therefore that muſt be uſed: If Religion ſhould be preſerved without it, it is by the *Extraordinary Providence of God*; where *Extraordinary* ſignifies nothing, but begging the thing in queſtion. The true Religion has been preſerved many Ages, in the Church, without Force. Ay, ſay you, that was by the *Extraordinary Providence of God.* His Providence which over-rules all Events, we eaſily grant it: But why *Extraordinary Providence?* becauſe Force was *neceſſary* to preſerve it. And why was Force *neceſſary?* becauſe otherwiſe, without *Extraodinary Providence*, it cannot be preſerv'd. In ſuch Circles covered under good Words, but miſapplied, one might ſhew your taking many a Turn in your anſwer, if it were fit to waſte others Time to trace your Wanderings. God has appointed Preaching, Teaching, Perſuaſion, Inſtruction, as a Means to continue and propagate his true Religion in the World; and if it were any where preſerved and propagated without that, we might call it his *Extraordinary Providence?* but the Means he has appointed being uſed, we may conclude, that Men have done their Duties, and ſo may leave it to his Providence, however we will call it, to preſerve the little Flock (which he bids not to *fear*) to the end of the World.

Pag. 9.

But let us return again to what you ſay, to make good this Hypotheſis of yours, That Idolatry entred firſt into the World by the Contrivance, and ſpread it ſelf by the Endeavours of private Men, without the Aſſiſtance of the Magiſtrates, and thoſe in Power. To prove this, you tell us, *That it found Entrance into the World, and Entertainment in it, when it could have no ſuch Aid or Aſſiſtance.* When was this, I beſeech you, that Idolatry found this *Entrance into the World?* Under what King's Reign was it, that you are ſo poſitive it could have *no ſuch Aid or Aſſiſtance?* If you had named the Time, the Thing (though of no great Moment to you) had been ſure. But now we may very juſtly queſtion this bare Aſſertion of yours. For ſince we find, as far back as we have any Hiſtory of it, that the great Men of the World were always forward to ſet up and promote Idolatry and falſe Religions, you ought to have given us ſome Reaſon why, without Authority from Hiſtory, you affirm that Idolatry, at its Entrance into

Pag. 6.

the

the World, had not that Aſſiſtance from Men in Power, which it never fail'd of afterwards. Who they were that made *Iſrael* to ſin, the Scripture tells us. Their Kings were ſo zealous Promoters of Idolatry, that there is ſcarce any one of them, that has not that Brand left upon him in Holy Writ.

One of the firſt falſe Religions, whoſe riſe and way of propagating we have an account of in Sacred Hiſtory, was by an ambitious Uſurper, who, having rebell'd againſt his Maſter, with a falſe Title ſet up a falſe Religion, to ſecure his Power and Dominion. Why this might not have been done before *Jeroboam*'s Days, and Idols ſet up at other Places, as well as at *Dan* and *Bethel*, to ſerve politick Ends, will need ſome other Proof, than barely ſaying, it *could not* be ſo at firſt. The Devil, unleſs much more ignorant, was not leſs buſy in thoſe Days to engage Princes in his Favour, and to weave Religion into Affairs of State, the better to introduce his Worſhip, and ſupport Idolatry, by accommodating it to the Ambition, Vanity, or Superſtition, of Men in Power: and therefore, you may as well ſay, that the *Corruption of Human Nature*, as that the *Aſſiſtance of the Powers in being*, did not, in thoſe Days, help forward falſe Religions; becauſe your Reading has furniſh'd you with
Pag. 6. no particular mention of it out of Hiſtory. But you need but ſay, that the *Worſhip of falſe Gods prevail'd without any Aid from Force, or the Aſſiſtance of the Powers in being, for any thing we find in the Hiſtory of thoſe Times*, and then you have ſufficiently *ſhewn*, what? even that you have juſt nothing to *ſhew* for your Aſſertion.

But whatever that *any thing* is, which you *find in Hiſtory*, you may meet with Men (whoſe reading yet I will not compare with yours) who think they have found in Hiſtory, that Princes, and thoſe in Power, firſt corrupted the true Religion, by ſetting up the Images and Symbols of their Predeceſſors in their Temples: which, by their Influence, and the ready Obedience of the Prieſts they appointed, were in Succeſſion of Time propos'd to the People as Objects of their Worſhip. Thus they think they *find in Hiſtory that* Iſis, Queen of *Egypt*, with her Counſellor *Thoth*, inſtituted the Funeral-Rites of King *Oſiris*, by the Honour done to the Sacred Ox. They think they *find* alſo *in Hiſtory*, that the ſame *Thoth*, who was alſo King of *Egypt* in his Turn, invented the Figures of the firſt *Egyptian* Gods, *Saturn*, *Dagon*, *Jupiter Hammon*, and the reſt: that is, the Figures of their Statutes or Idols; and that he inſtituted the Worſhip and Sacrifices of theſe Gods: And his Inſtitutions were ſo well aſſiſted by thoſe in Authority, and obſerved by the Prieſts they ſet up, that the Worſhip of thoſe Gods ſoon became the Religion of that, and a Pattern to other Nations. And here we may perhaps, with good Reaſon, place the Riſe and Original of Idolatry after the Flood, there being nothing of this kind more ancient. So ready was the Ambition, Vanity, or Superſtition of Princes, to introduce their Predeceſſors into the Divine Worſhip of the People, to ſecure to themſelves the greater Veneration from their Subjects, as deſcended from the Gods; or to erect ſuch a Worſhip, and ſuch a Prieſthood, as might awe the blinded and ſeduced People into that Obedience they deſired. Thus *Ham*, by the Authority of his Succeſſors, the Rulers of *Egypt*, is firſt brought for the Honour of his Name and Memory into their Temples, and never left, till he is erected into a God, and made *Jupiter Hammon*, *&c.* which Faſhion took afterwards with the Princes of other Countries.

Was not the great God of the Eaſtern Nations, *Baal*, or *Jupiter Belus*, one of the firſt Kings of *Aſſyria*? And which, I pray, is the more likely, that Courts, by their Inſtruments the Prieſts, ſhould thus advance the Honour of Kings amongſt the People for the Ends of Ambition and Power; or the People find out theſe refined Ways of doing it, and introduce them into Courts for the enſlaving themſelves? What Idolatry does your Hiſtory tell you of among the Greeks, before *Phoroneus* and *Danaus*, Kings of the *Argives*, and *Cecrops* and *Theſeus* Kings of *Attica*, and *Cadmus* King of *Thebes* introduced it? An Art of Rule 'tis probable they borrowed from the *Egyptians*. So that if you had not vouch'd the Silence of Hiſtory, without conſulting it, you would poſſibly have found, that in the firſt Ages, Princes, by their Influence and Aid, by the Help and Artifice of the Prieſts they employ'd, their Fables of their Gods, their Myſteries and Oracles, and all the Aſſiſtance they could give it by their Authority, did ſo much againſt the Truth, before direct Force was grown into Faſhion, and appear'd openly, that there would be little reaſon of putting the Guard and Propagation of the true Religion into their Hands now, and arming them with Force to promote it.

That

That this was the Original of Idolatry in the World, and that it was borrowed by other Magiſtrates from the *Egyptians*, is farther evident in that this Worſhip was ſettled in *Egypt*, and grown the National Religion there, before the Gods of *Greece*, and ſeveral other idolatrous Countries were born. For though they took their Pattern of deifying their deceaſed Princes, from the *Egyptians*, and kept, as near as they could, to the Number and Genealogies of the *Egyptian* Gods; yet they took the Names ſtill of ſome great Men of their own, which they accommodated to the Mythology of the *Egyptians*. Thus, by the aſſiſtance of *the Powers in being*, Idolatry entred into the World after the Flood. Whereof, if there were not ſo clear Footſteps in Hiſtory, why yet ſhould you not imagine Princes and Magiſtrates, engaged in falſe Religions, as ready to employ their Power for the maintaining and promoting their falſe Religions in thoſe Days, as we find them now? And therefore, what you ſay in the next Words, of the Entrance of Idolatry *into the World, and the Entertainment* it found *in it*, will not paſs for ſo very evident, without Proof, though you tell us never ſo confidently, that you *ſuppoſe, beſides the Corruption of human Nature, there can no other Cauſe be aſſigned of it, or none more probable than this, That the Powers then in being, did not what they might and ought to have done, (i. e.* if you mean it to your Purpoſe, uſe Force your Way, to make Men *conſider*, or to *impoſe Creeds and Ways of Worſhip) towards the preventing or checking that horrible Apoſtacy.* Pag. 6.

I grant that the entrance and growth of Idolatry, might be owning to the Negligence of the *Powers in being*, in that they *did not do what they might and ought to have done*, in uſing their Authority to ſuppreſs the Enormities of Mens Manners, and correct the Irregularity of their Lives. But this was not all the aſſiſtance they gave to that *horrible Apoſtacy:* They were, as far as Hiſtory gives us any Light, the Promoters of it, and Leaders in it, and did what they ought not have done, by ſetting up falſe Religions, and uſing their Authority to eſtabliſh them, to ſerve their corrupt and ambitious Deſigns.

National Religions, eſtabliſh'd by Authority, and enforced by the Powers in being we hear of every where, as far back as we have any account of the riſe and growth of the Religions of the World. Shew me any Place, within thoſe few Generations, wherein you ſay the Apoſtacy prevail'd after the Flood, where the Magiſtrates, being of the true Religion, the Subjects by the Liberty of a Toleration, were led into falſe Religions, and then you will produce ſomething againſt Liberty of Conſcience. But to talk of that great Apoſtacy, as wholly owing to Toleration, when you cannot produce one Inſtance of Toleration then in the World, is to ſay what you pleaſe.

That the Majority of Mankind were then, and always have been, by the *Corruption and Prävity of human Nature*, led away, and kept from embracing the true Religion, is paſt doubt. But whether this be owing to Toleration, in Matters of Religion, is the Queſtion. *David* deſcribes an horrible Corruption and Apoſtacy in his time, ſo as to ſay, *There is none that doth Good, no not one*; and yet I do not think you will ſay, a Toleration then in that Kingdom was the Cauſe of it. If the greateſt Part cannot be ill without a Toleration, I am afraid you muſt be fain to find out a Toleration in every Country, and in all Ages of the World. For I think it is true, of all Times and Places, that the *broad Way, that leadeth to Deſtruction*, has had moſt Travellers. I would be glad to know where it was that Force, your Way apply'd, *i. e.* with Puniſhments only upon Nonconformiſts, ever prevail'd to bring the greater Number into the *narrow Way, that leads unto Life*; which our Saviour tells us, there are *few* that *find*. Pſal. 14.

The *Corruption of humane Nature*, you ſay, oppoſes the true Religion. I grant it you. There was alſo, ſay you, an *horrible Apoſtacy* after the Flood; let this alſo be granted you: and yet from hence it will not follow, that the true Religion cannot ſubſiſt and prevail in the World without the aſſiſtance of Force, your Way apply'd, till you have ſhewn, that the falſe Religions, which were the Inventions of Men, grew up under Toleration, and not by the Encouragement and Aſſiſtance of the Powers in being.

How near ſoever therefore, the *true Religion* was to be *extinguiſhed within a few Generations* after the Flood, (which whether more in Danger then, than in moſt Ages ſince, is more than you can ſhew.) This will be ſtill the Queſtion, whether the Liberty of Toleration, or the Authority of the Powers in being, contributed moſt to it? And whether *there can be no other, nor more probable Cauſe* aſſigned, than the want

want of Force, your Way apply'd, I ſhall leave the Reader to judge. This I am ſure, whatever Cauſes any one elſe ſhall *aſſign*, are as well proved as yours, if they offer them only as their Conjectures.

Not but that I think Men could run into falſe and fooliſh Ways of Worſhip, without the Inſtigation or Aſſiſtance of human Authority; but the Powers of the World, as far as we have any Hiſtory, having been always forward enough (*true Religion* as little ſerving Princes as private Mens *Luſts*) to take up wrong Religions, and as forward to employ their Authority to impoſe the Religion, good or bad, which they had once taken up; I can ſee no reaſon why the not uſing of Force, by the Princes of the World, ſhould be aſſigned as the ſole, or ſo much as the moſt *probable Cauſe* of propagating the falſe Religions of the World, or extirpating the true; or how you can ſo poſitively ſay, Idolatry *prevail'd without any Aſſiſtance from the Powers in being*.

Since therefore Hiſtory leads us to the Magiſtrates, as the Authors and Promoters of Idolatry in the World, to which we may ſuppoſe their not ſuppreſſing of Vice, joined as another Cauſe of the Spreading of falſe Religions, you were beſt conſider, whether you can ſtill *ſuppoſe there can no other Cauſe be aſſigned*, of the Prevailing of the Worſhip of falſe Gods, but the Magiſtrate's not interpoſing his Authority in Matters of Religion. For that that cannot with any Probability at all be aſſigned as any Cauſe, I ſhall give you this farther Reaſon. You impute the Prevailing of falſe Religions to *the Corruption and Pravity of human Nature, left to it ſelf, unbridled by Authority*. Now if *Force*, your Way applied, does not at all *bridle the Corruption and Pravity of human Nature*, the Magiſtrate's not ſo interpoſing his Authority, cannot be *aſſigned* as any *Cauſe* at all of that Apoſtacy. So that let that Apoſtacy have what riſe, and ſpread as far as you pleaſe, it will not make one jot for Force, your Way applied, or ſhew that that can receive any Aſſiſtance your Way from Authority. For your uſe of Authority and Force, being only to bring Men to an outward Conformity to the National Religion, it leaves the *Corruption and Pravity of human Nature* as *unbridled* as before; as I have ſhewn elſewhere.

Pag. 7. You tell us, *That it is not true, that the true Religion will prevail by its own Light and Strength, without Miracles, or the Aſſiſtance of the Powers in being*, becauſe of the *Corruption of human Nature*. And for this you give us an Inſtance in the *Apoſtacy* preſently after the Flood. And you tell us, That without the Aſſiſtance of Force it would preſently be *extirpated* out of the World. If the Corruption of human Nature be ſo univerſal, and ſo ſtrong, that, without the Help of Force, the true Religion is too weak to ſtand it, and cannot at all prevail, without *Miracles or Force*; How come Men ever to be converted, in Countries where the National Religion is falſe? If you ſay by *extraordinary Providence*, what that amounts to, has been ſhewn. If you ſay this Corruption is ſo potent in all Men, as to oppoſe and prevail againſt the Goſpel, not aſſiſted by *Force or Miracles*, that is not true. If in moſt Men, ſo it is ſtill, even where Force is uſed. For I deſire you to name me a Country, where the greateſt Part are really and truly Chriſtians, ſuch as you confidently believe Chriſt, at the laſt Day, will own to be ſo. In *England* having, as you do, excluded all the Diſſenters, (or elſe why would you have them puniſh'd, to bring them to embrace the true Religion?) you muſt, I fear, allow your ſelf a great Latitude in thinking, if you think that the Corruption of human Nature, does not ſo far prevail, even amongſt Conformiſts, as to make the Ignorance, and Lives, of great Numbers amongſt them, ſuch as ſutes not at all with *the Spirit of true Chriſtianity*. How great their Ignorance may be, in the more ſpiritual and elevated Parts of the Chriſtian Religion, may be gueſſed, by what the Reverend Biſhop, before cited, ſays of it, in reference to a Rite of the Church; the moſt eaſy and obvious to be inſtructed in, and underſtood. His Words are, *In the common Management of that Holy Rite* [Confirmation] *it is but too viſible, that of thoſe Multitudes that croud to it, the far greater Part come merely as if they were to receive the Biſhop's Bleſſing, without any Senſe of the Vow made by them, and of their renewing their baptiſmal Engagements in it.* And if *Origen* were now alive, might he not find many in our Church, to whom theſe Words of his might be apply'd, *Whoſe Faith ſignifies only thus much, and goes no farther than this*, viz. *that they come duly to the Church, and bow their Heads to the Prieſts*, &c. For it ſeems it was then the Faſhion to bow to the Prieſt as it is now to the Altar. If therefore you ſay Force is neceſſary, becauſe without it no Men will ſo conſider as to embrace the true Religion, for the Salvation of their Souls, that I think is manifeſtly falſe.

Paſtoral Care Pag. 189.

Orig. Hom. in Joſ. IX.

falſe. If you ſay it is *neceſſary* to uſe ſuch Means as will make the greateſt Part ſo embrace it, you muſt uſe ſome other Means than Force, your Way applied, for that does not ſo far work on the Majority. If you ſay it is *neceſſary*, becauſe poſſibly it may work on ſome, which bare Preaching, and Perſuaſion, will not; I anſwer, If poſſibly your *moderate Puniſhments* may work on ſome, and therefore *they* are *neceſſary*, 'tis as poſſible, that greater Puniſhments may work on others, and therefore they are neceſſary, and ſo on to the utmoſt Severities.

That the Corruption of human Nature is every where ſpread, and that it works, Pag. 25.
powerfully in the Children of Diſobedience, who *received not the Love of the Truth, but had Pleaſure in Unrighteouſneſs*; and therefore God gives them up *to believe a Lie*, no body, I think, will deny. But that this Corruption of human Nature works equally in all Men, or in all Ages; and ſo, that God will, or ever did, give up all Men, not reſtrained by Force, your Way modified and applied, to believe a Lie, (as all falſe Religions are) that I yet ſee no Reaſon to grant. Nor will this Inſtance of *Noah*'s Religion, you ſo much rely on, ever perſuade, till you have proved, that from thoſe eight Men which brought *the true Religion* with them into the new World there were not eight thouſand, or eighty thouſand, which retain'd it in the World, in the worſt Times of the Apoſtacy. And Secondly, till you have proved, that the falſe Religions of the World prevail'd, without any Aid from Force, or the Aſſiſtance of the Powers in Being. And Thirdly, That the Decay of the true Religion was for want of Force, your *moderate Force*, neither of which you have at all proved, as, I think it manifeſt.

One Conſideration more touching *Noah*, and his Religion, give me leave to ſuggeſt, and that is; If Force were ſo neceſſary for the Support of the true Religion, as you make it, 'tis ſtrange, God, who gave him Precepts about other Things, ſhould never reveal this to him, nor any body elſe, that I know. To this, you, who have confeſſed the *Scripture not to have given the Magiſtrate this Commiſſion*, muſt ſay, that it is plain enough in Commiſſion that he has from the *Law of Nature*, and ſo needed not any Revelation, to inſtruct the Magiſtrate in the Right he has to uſe Force. I confeſs the Magiſtrates have uſed Force in Matters of Religion, and have been as confidently and conſtantly put upon it by their Prieſts, as if they had as clear a Commiſſion from Heaven, as St. *Peter* had to preach the Goſpel to the *Gentiles*. But yet 'tis plain, notwithſtanding that Commiſſion from the *Law of Nature*, there needs ſome farther Inſtruction from Revelation, ſince it does not appear, that they have found out the right Uſe of Force, ſuch as the true Religion requires for its Preſervation; and tho' you have after ſeveral thouſands of Years, at laſt, diſcovered it, yet it is very imperfectly, you not being able to tell, if a Law were now to be made againſt thoſe who have not *conſider'd as they ought*, what are thoſe *moderate* Penalties which are to be employ'd againſt them, tho' yet without that all the reſt ſignifies nothing. But however doubtful you are in this, I am glad to find you ſo direct, in putting Mens rejecting the true Religion, upon the Difficulty they have to *mortify* Pag. 7.
their Luſts, which the true Religion requires of them, and I deſire you to remember it in other Places, where I have occaſion to mind you of it.

To conclude, That we may ſee the great Advantage your Cauſe will receive from that Inſtance, you ſo much rely on, of the *Apoſtacy* after the Flood; I ſhall oppoſe another to it. You ſay, That *Idolatry prevail'd in the World, in a few Generations, al-* Pag. 6.
moſt to the utter Excluſion of the true Religion, without any Aid from Force, or Aſſiſtance of the Powers in Being, by reaſon of Toleration. And therefore, *you think there is great* Pag. 9.
reaſon to fear, that the true Religion would, by Toleration, quickly be moſt effectually extirpated throughout the World. And I ſay, that after *Chriſtianity was received for the Religion of the Empire*, and whilſt political Laws, and Force, interpoſed in it, an horrible Apo- Mede Diſc.
ſtacy prevail'd, *to almoſt the utter Excluſion* of true Religion, and a general introdu- 30. p. 194.
cing of Idolatry. And therefore I think there is great reaſon to fear more harm than *& Apoſt. of the late Times.*
good, from the Uſe of Force in Religion.

This I think as good an Argument againſt, as yours for Force, and ſomething better; ſince what you build on is only preſum'd by you, not prov'd from Hiſtory: whereas the Matter of Fact here is well known, nor will you deny it, when you conſider the State of Religion in Chriſtendom under the Aſſiſtance of that Force, which you tell us, ſucceeded and ſupplied the Place of withdrawn Miracles, which in your Opinion, are ſo neceſſary in the Abſence of Force, that you make that the Reaſon of their Continuance; and tell us, they *were continued till Force* could be had; *not ſo* Pag. 37.
much for evincing the Truth of Chriſtian Religion, as to ſupply the Want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance.

Assistance. So that whenever Force fail'd, there, according to your Hypothesis, are Miracles to supply its Want; for without one of them, the true Religion (if we may believe you) will soon *be utterly extirpated*; and what Force, in the Absence of Miracles, produced in Christendom several Ages before the Reformation, is so well known, that it will be hard to find what Service your Way of arguing will do any but the Romish Religion.

But to take your Argument in its full Latitude, you say, but you say it without Book, that there was once a Toleration in the World to the *almost utter Extirpation* of the true Religion; and I say to you, that as far as Records authorize either Opinion, we may say Force has been always used in Matters of Religion, to the great Prejudice of the true Religion, and the Professors of it. And there not being an Age wherein you can shew me, upon a fair Trial of an establish'd National Toleration, that the true Religion was *extirpated*, or endangered, so much as you pretend by it: Whereas there is no Age (whereof we have sufficient History to judge of this Matter) wherein it will not be easy to find that the true Religion, and its Followers, suffered by Force, you will in vain endeavour, by Instances, to prove the ill Effects, or Uselesness of Toleration, such as the Author proposed, which I challenge you to shew me was ever set up in the World, or that the true Religion suffer'd by it; and 'tis to the Want of it, the Restraints and Disadvantages the true Religion has laboured under, and its so little spreading in the World will justly be imputed; until, from better Experiments, you have something to say against it.

Our Saviour has promised that he will build his Church on this fundamental Truth, That he is *Christ the Son of God*; so that *the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*: And this I believe, tho' you tell us the true Religion is not able to subsist without the Assistance of Force, when Miracles cease. I do not remember that our Saviour any where promises any other Assistance but that of his Spirit, or gives his little Flock any Encouragement to expect much Countenance or Help from the great Men of the World, or the Coercive Power of the Magistrates, nor any where authorizes them to use it for the Support of his Church; *Not many wise Men after the Flesh; not many mighty, not many noble,* is the Stile of the Gospel; and I believe will be found to belong to all Ages of the Church Militant, past and to come, as well as to the first: For God, as St. *Paul* tells us, has chosen the *foolish Things of the World to confound the wise, and the weak Things of the World to confound the Mighty*; and this not only till Miracles ceased, but ever since. To be *hated for Christ's Name Sake,* and by *much Tribulation to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven,* has been the general and constant Lot of the People of God, as well as it seems to be the current Strain of the *New Testament*; which promises nothing of secular Power or Greatness; says nothing of *Kings being nursing Fathers, and Queens nursing Mothers*: which Prophecy, whatever Meaning it have, 'tis like our Saviour would not have omitted to support his Church with some Hopes and Assurance of such Assistance, if it were to have any Accomplishment before his second Coming; when *Israel* shall come in again, and with the *Gentiles* make up the Fulness of his glorious Kingdom. But the Tenor of the *New Testament* is, *All that will live Godly in Jesus Christ, shall suffer Persecution,* 2 Tim 3.

1 Cor. 1. 26.

A. p. 7. In your *Argument consider'd*, you tell us, *That no Man can fail of finding the Way of Salvation that seeks it as he ought.* In my Answer, I take notice to you, that the Places of Scripture you cite to prove it, point out this Way of *seeking as we ought*, to be a good Life; as particularly that of St. *John*, *If any one will do his Will, he shall know of the Doctrine whether it be of God*: Upon which I use these Words. "So that these "Places, if they prove what you cite them for, That *no Man can fail of finding the Way "of Salvation, who seeks as he ought*; they do also prove, that a good Life is the on- "ly Way to seek as we ought; and that therefore, the Magistrates, if they would "put Men upon *seeking* the Way of Salvation *as they ought*, should by their Laws "and Penalties force them to a good Life; a good Conversation being the surest and "readiest Way to a right Understanding. And that if Magistrates will severely and "impartially set themselves against Vice, in whomsoever it is found, True Religion "will be spread wider — than ever hitherto it has been by the Imposition of *Creeds* "and *Ceremonies*. To this you reply, *Whether the Magistrates setting themselves se- verely and impartially against what* you *suppose* I *call Vice, or the Imposition of sound Creeds and decent Ceremonies, does more conduce to the spreading the true Religion, and rendring it fruitful in the Lives of its Professors, we need not examine*; you *confess*, you *think, both together do best*; *and this*, you *think, is as much as needs be said to* that *Paragraph*. If

L. 2. p. 261.

P. g. 13.

it

it had been put to you, Whether a good Living, or a good Prebend would more conduce to the enlarging your Fortune, I think it would be allow'd you as no improper or unlikely Anſwer, what you ſay here, *I think both together would be beſt*; but here the Caſe is otherwiſe, your Thinking determines not the Point: and other People of equal Authority, may, and I will anſwer for it, do think otherwiſe: but becauſe I pretend to no Authority, I will give you a Reaſon, why your Thinking is inſufficient. You tell us, That *Force is not a fit Means, where it is not neceſſary as well as useful*; and you prove it to be *neceſſary*, becauſe there is *no other Means left*. Now if the Severity of the Magiſtrate, againſt what I call *Vice*, will, as you will not deny, promote a good Life, and that be the right Way to ſeek the Truths of Religion, here is another Means beſides impoſing of *Creeds* and *Ceremonies*, to promote true Religion; and therefore your Argument for its Neceſſity, becauſe of *no other Means left*, being gone, you cannot ſay *both together* are *beſt*, when one of them being not neceſſary, is therefore, by your own Confeſſion, not to be uſed. Pag. 30.

I having ſaid, That if ſuch an *indirect* and *at a diſtance* Uſefulneſs were ſufficient to juſtify the Uſe of Force, the Magiſtrate might make his Subjects Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven: You reply, That you *ſuppoſe* I *will not ſay Caſtration is neceſſary, becauſe* you *hope* I *acknowledge, that Marriage, and that Grace which God denies to none, who ſeriouſly ask it, are ſufficient for that Purpoſe.* And I hope you *acknowledge*, that Preaching, Admonitions and Inſtructions, and *that Grace which God denies to none who ſeriouſly ask it, are ſufficient* for Salvation. So that by this Anſwer of yours, there being no more Neceſſity of Force to make Men of the true Religion, than there is of Caſtration to make Men chaſte, it will ſtill remain that the Magiſtrate, when he thinks fit, may, upon your Principles, as well caſtrate Men to make them chaſte, as uſe Force to make them *embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them.* Pag. 31.

If Caſtration be not neceſſary, *becauſe Marriage and the Grace of God is ſufficient*, without it; nor will Force be neceſſary, becauſe Preaching, and the Grace of God is ſufficient without it; and this I think, by your own Rule, where you tell us, *Where there are many uſeful Means, and ſome of them are ſufficient without the reſt, there is no Neceſſity of uſing them all.* So that you muſt either quit your Neceſſity of Force, or take in Caſtration too; which however, it might not go down with the untractable and *deſperately perverſe and obſtinate* People in theſe Weſtern Countries, yet is a Doctrine, you may hope, may meet with a better Reception in the *Ottoman* Empire, and recommend you to ſome of my *Mahometans.* Pag. 34.

To my ſaying, "If what we are apt to think uſeful, were thence to be concluded "ſo, we might be in danger to be obliged to believe the pretended Miracles of the "Church of *Rome*, by your Way of Reaſoning; *Unleſs we will ſay (that which without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things, does not uſe all uſeful Means for promoting his own Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls.*" This, I think, will conclude as much for Miracles as for Force: You reply, You *think it will not*; *For in the Place* I *intend*, you *ſpeak not of uſeful, but of competent*, i. e. *ſufficient Means. Now competent, or ſufficient Means are neceſſary; but* you *think no Man will ſay that all* uſeful *Means are ſo: And therefore though, as* you *affirm, it cannot be ſaid without Impeity, that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things has not furniſh'd Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls; yet it is very agreeable with Piety, and with Truth too, to ſay that he does not uſe all uſeful Means: Becauſe as none of his Attributes obliges him to uſe more than ſufficient Means; ſo he may uſe ſufficient Means, without uſing all uſeful Means. For where there are many uſeful Means, and ſome of them are ſufficient without the reſt, there is no Neceſſity of uſing them all. So that from God's not uſing Miracles now, to promote the true Religion, I cannot conclude that he does not think them uſeful now, but only that he does not think them neceſſary. And therefore, though what we are apt to think uſeful, were thence to be concluded ſo; yet if whatever is uſeful, be not likewiſe to be concluded neceſſary, there is no reaſon to fear that we ſhould be obliged to believe the Miracles pretended to by the Church of* Rome. *For if Miracles be not now neceſſary, there is no Inconvenience in thinking the Miracles pretended to by the Church of* Rome, *to be but pretended Miracles.* To which I anſwer, Put it how you will, for *competent* Means, or *uſeful* Means, it will conclude for Miracles ſtill as much as for Force. Your Words are theſe, *If ſuch a Degree of outward Force, as has been mentioned, be really of great and neceſſary Uſe for the advancing theſe Ends, as taking the World as we find it*, you ſay, you *think it appears to be; then it muſt be acknowledg'd there is a Right ſomewhere to uſe it* L. 2. p. 168. A. p. 16.

for

for the advancing thoſe Ends; unleſs we will ſay (what without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer of all Things, has not furniſhed Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls. What, I beſeech you, now is the Sum of this Argument, but this, *Force is of great and neceſſary Uſe*; therefore, *the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer of all Things, who will not leave Mankind unfurniſh'd (which it would be Impiety to ſay) of competent Means for the promoting his Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls,* has *given ſomewhere a Right to uſe it?*

Let us try it now, whether it will not do as well for Miracles. Miracles *are of great and neceſſary Uſe,* (as great and neceſſary at leaſt as Force) therefore, *the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer of all Things, who will not leave Mankind unfurniſh'd (which it would be Impiety to ſay) of competent Means for the promoting his Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls,* has given ſomewhere a Power of Miracles. I ask you, when I in the *Second Letter* uſed your own Words, applied to Miracles inſtead of Force, would they not conclude then as well for *Miracles* as for *Force.* For you muſt remember there was not then in all your Scheme one Word of *Miracles* to ſupply the Place of *Force. Force* alone was mention'd, *Force* alone was neceſſary, all was laid on *Force.* Nor was it eaſy to divine, that *Miracles* ſhould be taken in, to mend the Defects of your Hypotheſis, which in your Anſwer to me, you now have done, and I eaſily allow it, without holding you to any Thing you have ſaid, and ſhall always do ſo. For ſeeking Truth, and not Triumph, as you frequently ſuggeſt, I ſhall always take your Hypotheſis as you pleaſe to reform it, and either embrace it, or ſhew you why I do not.

Let us ſee therefore, whether this Argument will do any better now your Scheme is mended, and you make *Force* or *Miracles neceſſary.* If Force or Miracles are *of great and neceſſary Uſe for the promoting true Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, then it muſt be acknowledg'd, that there is ſomewhere a Right to uſe* the one, or a Power to do the other, *for the advancing thoſe Ends; unleſs we will ſay (what without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things has not furniſh'd Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour, and the Good of Souls.* From whence it will follow, if your Argument be good, that where Men have not a Right to uſe Force, there ſtill we are to expect Miracles, *unleſs we will ſay,* &c. Now where the Magiſtrates are not of the true Religion, there by this Part of your Scheme, there is a *Right in no body to uſe Force*; for if there were, what need of Miracles (as you tell us there was) in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, to ſupply that Want? Since the Magiſtrates, who were of falſe Religions then, were furniſh'd with as much Right, if that were enough, as they are now. So that where the Magiſtrates are of falſe Religions, there you muſt, upon your Principles, affirm Miracles are ſtill to ſupply the Want of Force; *unleſs you will ſay (what without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things, hath not furniſh'd Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour in the World, and the Good of Souls.* Now how far this will favour the Pretences of the Church of *Rome* to Miracles in the *Eaſt* and *Weſt-Indies,* and other Parts not under Popiſh Governments, you were beſt conſider. This is evident, that in all Countries where the true Religion is *not received for the Religion of* the State, *and ſupported and encouraged by the Laws of it,* you muſt allow Miracles to be as neceſſary now, as ever they were any where in the World, for the Supply of the Want of Force, before the Magiſtrates were Chriſtians. And then what Advantage your Doctrine gives to the Church of *Rome,* is very viſible. For they, like you, ſuppoſing theirs *the one only true Religion,* are ſupplied
Pag. 7. by you with this Argument for it, *viz.* That the *true Religion will not prevail by its own Light and Strength, without the Aſſiſtance of Miracles or Authority.* Which are the *competent Means,* which, *without Impiety, it cannot be ſaid, that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things, has not furniſh'd Mankind with.* From whence they will not think it hard to draw this Conſequence; that therefore the *wiſe and benign Governor of all Things,* has continued in their Church the Power of Miracles (which yours does not ſo much as pretend to) *to ſupply the Want of the Magiſtrate's Aſſiſtance,* where that cannot be had to make the true Religion prevail. And if a *Papiſt* ſhould preſs you with this Argument, I would gladly know what you would reply to him.

Though this be enough to make good what I ſaid, yet ſince I ſeek Truth, more than my own Juſtification, let us examine a little, what 'tis you here ſay of *competent*

tent Means. Competent Means, you ſay, *are neceſſary; but* you *think no Man will ſay, all uſeful Means are ſo.* If you think you ſpeak plain, clear determin'd Senſe, when you uſed this good *Engliſh* Word *competent*, I pity you: If you did it with Skill, I ſend you to my *Pagans* and *Mahometans*. But this ſafe Way of Talking, though it be not altogether ſo clear, yet it ſo often occurs in you, that 'tis hard to judge, whether it be Art or Nature. Now pray what do you mean by *Mankind's being furniſh'd with competent Means?* If it be ſuch Means as any are prevail'd on by to *embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*, Preaching is a *competent Means*; for by Preaching alone, without Force, many are prevail'd on, and become truly Chriſtians; and then your *Force*, by your own Confeſſion, is not *neceſſary*. If by *competent*, you underſtand ſuch Means by which all Men are prevail'd on, or the Majority, to become *truly Chriſtians*, I fear your Force is no *competent* Means. Pag. 25.

Which way ever you put it, you muſt acknowledge Mankind to be deſtitute of *competent Means*, or your *moderate Force* not to be that *neceſſary competent Means*: Since whatever *Right* the *Magiſtrates* may have had any where to uſe it, where-ever it has not been uſed, (let the Cauſe be what it will that kept this Means from being uſed) there the People have been deſtitute of that Means.

But you will think there is little reaſon to complain of Obſcurity, you having abundantly explain'd what you mean by *competent*, in ſaying, *competent*, i. e. *ſufficient* Means. So that we have nothing to do but to find out what you mean by *ſufficient*: and the Meaning of that Word, in your Uſe of it, you happily give us in theſe following, *What does any Man mean by ſufficient Evidence, but ſuch as will certainly win Aſſent where-ever it is duly conſider'd?* Apply this to your *Means*, and then tell me, whether your *Force* be ſuch *competent*, i. e. *ſufficient Means*, that it certainly produced *embracing the Truth*, where-ever it was *duly*, i. e. your Way apply'd; if it did not, 'tis plain it is not your *competent ſufficient Means*, and ſo the World, without any ſuch Imputation to the Divine *Wiſdom* and *Benignity*, might be without it. If you will ſay it was *ſufficient*, and did produce that End where-ever it was apply'd, I deſire you then to tell me whether Mankind hath been always furniſh'd with *competent Means*. You have it now in your Choice, either to talk *impiouſly*, or renounce Force, and diſown it to be *competent Means*; one of the two I do not ſee how, by your own Argument, you can avoid. Pag. 51.

But to lay by your *competent and ſufficient Means*, and to eaſe you of the Uncertainty and Difficulty you will be in to determine what is ſo, in reſpect of Mankind; I ſuppoſe it will be little leſs *impious to ſay, that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor hath not furniſh'd Mankind with* neceſſary *Means*, as to ſay he hath not *furniſh'd* them *with competent Means*. Now, Sir, if your *moderate Penalties*, and nothing elſe, be, ſince the withdrawing of Miracles, this *neceſſary Means*, what will be left you to ſay, by your Argument, of the *Wiſdom* and *Benignity* of God in all thoſe Countries, where moderate Penalties are not made uſe of? where Men are not furniſh'd with this Means to bring them to the true Religion? For unleſs you ſay, that your *moderate Penalties* have been conſtantly made uſe of in the World for the Support and Encouragement of the true Religion, and to bring Men to it, ever ſince the withdrawing of Miracles, you muſt confeſs, that not only ſome Countries, (which yet were enough againſt you) but Mankind in general, have been unfurniſh'd of the *neceſſary Means for the promoting the Honour of God in the World, and the Salvation of Mens Souls.* This Argument out of your own Mouth (were there no other) is ſufficient to ſhew the Weakneſs and Unreaſonableneſs of your Scheme; and I hope the due Conſideration of it will make you cautious another time, how you entitle the *Wiſdom* and *Benignity* of God to the Support of what you once fancy to be of great and neceſſary Uſe.

" I having thereupon ſaid, " Let us not therefore be more wiſe than our Maker in " that ſtupendous and ſupernatural Work of our Salvation, the Scripture, &c. L. 2. p. 168.

You reply, *Though the* Work of our Salvation be, *as I juſtly call it*, ſtupendous and ſupernatural; *yet you ſuppoſe no ſober Man doubts, but it both admits, and ordinarily requires the Uſe of natural and human Means, in Subordination to that* Grace *which works it.* Pag. 35.

" If you had taken notice of theſe immediately following Words of mine, " The " Scripture that reveals it to us, contains all that we can know or do, in order " to it; and where that is ſilent, 'tis Preſumption in us to direct; You would not have thought what you here ſay a ſufficient Anſwer: For though God does make uſe

of

of *natural* and *human Means* in *Subordination to Grace*, yet it is not for Man to make uſe of any Means, in *Subordination to his Grace*, which God has not appointed, out of a Conceit it may do *ſome Service indirectly and at a diſtance*.

The whole Covenant and Work of Grace, is the Contrivance of God's infinite Wiſdom. What it is, and by what Means he will diſpenſe his Grace, is known to us by Revelation only; which is ſo little ſuted to human *Wiſdom*, that the Apoſtle calls it the *Fooliſhneſs of Preaching*. In the Scripture, is contain'd all that Revelation, and all things neceſſary for that Work, all the Means of *Grace*: There God has declared all what he would have done for the Salvation of Souls; and if he had thought Force neceſſary to be join'd with the *Fooliſhneſs of Preaching*, no doubt but he would ſomewhere or other have reveal'd it, and not left it to the *Wiſdom* of Man: which how diſproportion'd and oppoſite it is to the Ways and Wiſdom of God in the Goſpel, and how unfit to be truſted in the Buſineſs of Salvation, you may ſee, 1 *Cor.* i. from *v.* 17, to the end.

The Work of Grace admits, and ordinarily requires the uſe of natural and human Means.

Pag. 35. I deny it not: Let us now hear your Inference; *Therefore till* I *have ſhewn that no Penal Laws, that can be made, can do any Service towards the Salvation of Mens Souls in Subordination to God's Grace, or that God has forbidden the Magiſtrate* to uſe Force, (for ſo you ought to put it) but you rather chuſe (according to your ordinary Way) to uſe general and doubtful Words; and therefore you ſay, *To ſerve him in that great Work with the Authority which he has given him, there will be no occaſion for the Caution* I *have given*, not to be wiſer than our Maker in that ſtupendous Work of our Salvation. By which Way of arguing, any thing that I cannot ſhew, cannot poſſibly, cannot *indirectly and at a diſtance*, or by Accident, do *any Service*, or *God has not forbidden*, may be made uſe of for the Salvation of Souls. I ſuppoſe you mean expreſly *forbidden*, for elſe I might think theſe Words, [*Who has required this at your Hands?*] a ſufficient Prohibition of it. The Sum of your Argument is, what cannot *be ſhew'd not* to do *any Service*, may be uſed *as an human Means in Subordination to Grace*, in the Work of Salvation. To which I reply, That what may, through the Grace of God, ſometimes do ſome Service, cannot, without a farther warrant from Revelation, than Uſefulneſs, be *requir'd*, or made uſe of as a ſubordinate Means to Grace. For if ſo, then auricular Confeſſion, Penance, Pilgrimages, Proceſſions, *&c.* which no body can ſhew do not ever do *any Service*, at leaſt, *indirectly and at a diſtance*, towards the Salvation of Souls, may all be juſtify'd.

'Tis not enough that it cannot be ſhewn that it cannot do any Service to juſtify its Uſefulneſs; For what is there that may not, *indirectly and at a diſtance*, or by Accident, do ſome Service? To ſhew that it is an *human Means*, that God has no where appointed, *in Subordination to Grace*, in the ſupernatural Work of Salvation, is enough to prove it an unwarrantable Boldneſs to uſe it: And much more ſo in the preſent Caſe of *Force*, which, if put into the Magiſtrate's Hands with Power to uſe it in Matters of Religion, will do more harm than good; as I think I have ſufficiently ſhewn.

And therefore, ſince according to you, the Magiſtrate's Commiſſion, to uſe Force for the Salvation of Souls, is from the Law of Nature; which Commiſſion reaches to none, ſince the Revelation of the Goſpel, but Chriſtian Magiſtrates; 'tis more natural to conclude, (were there nothing elſe in the Caſe but the Silence of Scripture) that the Chriſtian Magiſtrate has no ſuch Power, becauſe he has no ſuch Commiſſion any where in the Goſpel, wherein all things are appointed neceſſary to Salvation; than that there was ſo clear a Commiſſion given to all Magiſtrates by the Law of Nature, that it is neceſſary to *ſhew* a Prohibition from Revelation, if one will deny Chriſtian Magiſtrates to have that Power. Since the Commiſſion of the Law of Nature to Magiſtrates, being only that general one, of doing Good according to the beſt of their Judgments: if that extends to the uſe of Force in Matters of Religion, it will abundantly more oppoſe than promote the true Religion, if Force in the Caſe has any Efficacy at all, and ſo do more harm than good: Which though it ſhews not, (what you here demand) that it cannot *do any Service towards the Salvation of Mens Souls*, for that cannot be ſhewn of any thing; yet it ſhews the Diſſervice it does, is ſo much more, than any *Service* can be expected from it, that it can never be proved, that God has given Power to Magiſtrates to uſe it by the Commiſſion they have of doing Good, from the Law of Nature.

But whilſt you tell me, *Till I have ſhewn that* Force and Penalties *cannot do any Service towards the Salvation of Souls, there will be no occaſion for the Caution* I *gave* you,

not

not to be wiſer than our Maker in that ſtupendous and ſupernatural Work, you have forgot your own Confeſſion, That it is not enough to authorize the uſe of Force, that it may be *uſeful*, if it be not alſo *neceſſary*. And when you can prove ſuch Means neceſſary, which though it cannot be ſhewn, never upon any occaſion, to do any Service; yet may be, and is abundantly ſhewn to do ſo little Service, and ſo uncertainly, that if it be uſed, it will, if it has any Efficacy, do more Harm than Good: If you can, I ſay, prove ſuch a Means as that *neceſſary*, I think I may yield you the Cauſe. But the uſe of it has ſo much certain Harm, and ſo little and uncertain Good in it, that it can never be ſuppos'd included or intended in the general Commiſſion to the Magiſtrates, of doing good: Which may ſerve for an Anſwer to your next Paragraph. Pag. 30.

Only let me take notice, that you here make this Commiſſion of the Law of Nature true to extend the *Uſe of Force*, only to *induce thoſe, who would not otherwiſe, to hear what may and ought to move them to embrace the Truth.* They have heard all that is offered *to move them to embrace*, i. e. *believe*, but are not moved: Is the Magiſtrate by the Law of Nature commiſſion'd to puniſh them for what is not in their Power? for Faith is the Gift of God, and not in a Man's Power: Or is the Magiſtrate commiſſion'd by the Law of Nature, which impowers him in general, only to do them good? Is he, I ſay, commiſſion'd to make them lie, and profeſs that which they do not believe? And is this for their good? If he puniſh them till they *embrace*, *i. e.* believe, he puniſhes them for what is not in their Power; if till they *embrace*, *i. e.* barely profeſs, he puniſhes them for what is not for their good: To neither of which, can he be commiſſion'd by the Law of Nature. Pag. 35.

To my ſaying, Till you can ſhew us a Commiſſion in Scripture, it will be fit for us to obey that Precept of the Goſpel, *Mark* 4. 24. which bids us *take heed what* we *hear*. You reply, That this you *ſuppoſe is only intended for the vulgar Reader; For it ought to be render'd, Attend to what you hear*; which you prove out of *Grotius*. What if I or my Readers are not ſo learned, as to underſtand either the Greek Original, or *Grotius*'s Latin Comment? Or if we did, are we to be blamed for underſtanding the Scripture in that Senſe, which the National, *i. e.* (as you ſay) the true Religion authorizes, and which you tell us, would be a *Fault* in us if we did not believe? Pag. 36.

For if, as you ſuppoſe, there be ſufficient Proviſion made in *England* for inſtructing all Men in the Truth, we cannot then but take the Words in this Senſe, it being that which the Publick Authority has given them; for if we are not to follow the Senſe as it is given us in the Tranſlation authorized by our Governors, and uſed by our Worſhip eſtabliſh'd by Law, but muſt ſeek it elſewhere, 'twill be hard to find, how there is any other Proviſion made for inſtructing Men in the Senſe of the Scripture, which is *the Truth that muſt ſave them*, but to leave them to their own Enquiry and Judgment, and to themſelves, to take whom they think beſt for Interpreters and Expounders of Scripture, and to quit that of the true Church, which ſhe has given in her Tranſlation. This is the Liberty you take to differ from the true Church, when you think fit, and it will ſerve your Purpoſe. *She ſays, Take heed what you hear*; but you ſay, *the true Senſe is, Attend to what you hear*. Methinks you ſhould not be at ſuch Variance with Diſſenters; for after all, nothing is ſo like a Nonconformiſt as a Conformiſt. Though it be certainly every one's Right to underſtand the Scripture in that Senſe which appears trueſt to him, yet I do not ſee how you, upon your Principles, can depart from that which the Church of *England* has given it: But you, I find, when you think fit, take that Liberty; and ſo much Liberty as that, would, I think, ſatisfy all the Diſſenters in *England*. Pag. 20.

As to your other place Scripture; if St. *Paul*, as it ſeems to me in that 10*th* to the *Romans*, were ſhewing that the Gentiles were provided with all things neceſſary to Salvation, as well as the Jews; and that by having Men ſent to them to Preach the Goſpel, that Proviſion was made, what you ſay in the two next Paragraphs will ſhew us, that you underſtand, that the Greek Word ἀκοὴ, ſignifies both *Hearing* and *Report*, but does no more anſwer the Force of thoſe two Verſes, againſt you, than if you had ſpared all you ſaid with your Greek Criticiſm. The Words of St. *Paul* are theſe; *How then ſhall they call on him on whom they have not believed? And how ſhall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how ſhall they hear without a Preacher? And how ſhall they Preach, except they be ſent? So then Faith cometh by Hearing, and Hearing by the Word of God.* In this Deduction of the Means of propagating the Goſpel, we may well ſuppoſe St. *Paul* would have put in *Miracles* or *Penalties*, if, as you ſay, one of them had been neceſſary. But whether or no every Pag. 37. Rom. 10. 14. 17.

Reader will think St. *Paul* ſet down in that Place all neceſſary Means, I know not; but this, I am confident, he will think, that the New Teſtament does; and then I ask, Whether there be in it one Word of Force to be uſed to bring Men to be Chriſtians, or to hearken to the good Tidings of Salvation, offer'd in the Goſpel?

To my asking, "What if God, for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf, would not have
Pag. 38. "Men compell'd? You anſwer, *If he would not have them compell'd now Miracles are ceaſed, as far as moderate Penalties compel, (otherwiſe* you *are not concern'd in the Demand) he would have told us ſo.* Concerning *Miracles* ſupplying the want of Force I ſhall need to ſay nothing more here but to your Anſwer, That *God would have told us ſo.* I ſhall in few Words ſtate the Matter to you. You firſt ſuppoſe Force *neceſſary* to compel Men to *hear*, and thereupon ſuppoſe the Magiſtrate inveſted with a Power to compel them *to hear*, and from thence peremptorily declare, that if God would not have Force uſed, *he would have told us ſo.* You ſuppoſe alſo, that it muſt be only *moderate* Force. Now may we not ask one, that is ſo far of the Council of the Almighty, that he can poſitively ſay what he would or would not have, to tell us, whether it be not as probable that God, who knows the Temper of Man that he has made, who knows how apt he is not to ſpare any Degree of Force when he believes he has a Commiſſion to compel Men to do any think in their Power, and who knows alſo how prone Man is to think it reaſonable to do ſo: whether, I ſay, it is not as probable that God, if he would have the Magiſtrate to uſe none but *moderate* Force to *compel Men to hear, would* alſo *have told us ſo?* Fathers are not more apt than Magiſtrates to ſtrain their Power beyond what is convenient for the Education of their Children; and yet it has pleaſed God to tell them in the New-Teſtament, of this Moderation, by a Precept more than once repeated.

To my demanding, "What if God would have Men left to their Freedom in this
"Point; if they will hear, or if they will forbear, will you conſtrain them? Thus we
Pag. 38. "are ſure he did with his own People, *&c.* You anſwer, *But thoſe Words,* whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear, *which we find thrice uſed in the Prophet* Ezekiel, *are nothing at all to* my *Purpoſe. For by* Hearing *there, no Man underſtands the bare giving an Ear to what was to be preach'd, nor yet the conſidering it only; but the complying with it, and obeying it, according to the Paraphraſe which* Grotius *gives of the Words.* Methinks, for this once, you might have allow'd me to have hit upon ſomething *to the Purpoſe*, you have deny'd me it in ſo many other Places: If it were but for Pity, and one other Reaſon; which is, that all you have to ſay againſt it, is, that *by Hearing there, no Man underſtands the bare giving an Ear to what was to be preach'd, nor yet the conſidering it, but the complying with it, and obeying it.* If I miſremember not, your Hypotheſis pretends the uſe of Force to be not barely to make Men *give an Ear*, nor yet *to conſider*, but to make them *conſider as they ought*, i. e. *ſo as not to reject*; and therefore, though this Text out of *Ezekiel*, be *nothing to the Purpoſe* againſt *bare giving an Ear*, yet if you pleaſe, let it ſtand as if it were *to the Purpoſe* againſt your Hypotheſis, till you can find ſome other Anſwer to it.

If you will give your ſelf the Pains to turn to *Acts* 28. 24,—28. you will read theſe Words, *And ſome believed the Things that were ſpoken, and ſome believed not. And when they agreed not among themſelves they departed, after that* Paul *had ſpoken one Word; Well ſpake the Holy Ghoſt by* Eſaias *the Prophet, unto our Fathers, ſaying, Go unto this People, and ſay, Hearing, ye ſhall hear, and ſhall not underſtand; and Seeing, ye ſhall ſee, and not perceive. For the Heart of this People is waxed groſs, and their Ears are dull of hearing, and their Eyes have they cloſed; leſt they ſhould ſee with their Eyes, and hear with their Ears, and underſtand with their Heart, and ſhould be converted, and I ſhould heal them. Be it known therefore unto you, that the Salvation of God is ſent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.*

A. p. 7, *&c.* If one ſhould come now, and out of your Treatiſe, call'd *The Argument of the Letter concerning Toleration conſider'd and anſwer'd*, reaſon thus, *It is evident that* theſe Jews *have not ſought the Truth in this Matter, with that Application of Mind, and Freedom of Judgment which was requiſite, whilſt they ſuffer'd their Luſts and Paſſions to ſit in Judgment, and manage the Enquiry. The Impreſſions of Education, the Reverence and Admiration of Perſons, worldly Reſpects, and the like incompetent Motives, have determin'd them. Now if this be the Caſe; if theſe Men are averſe to a due Conſideration of Things, where they are moſt concern'd to uſe it, WHAT MEANS IS THERE LEFT (beſides the Grace of God) to reduce* them out of *the wrong Way they are in, but to lay Thorns and Briars in it?* Would you not think this a good Argument to

ſhew

ſhew the Neceſſity of uſing Force and Penalties upon theſe Men in the *Acts*, who refuſed to be brought to embrace the true Religion upon the Preaching of St. *Paul*? For *what* other *Means was left, what human Method could be uſed to bring them to make a wiſer and more rational Choice, but laying ſuch Penalties upon them as might balance the Weight of ſuch Prejudices, which inclin'd them to prefer a falſe Way before the true?* Tell me, I beſeech you, would you not (had you been a Chriſtian Magiſtrate in thoſe Days) have thought your ſelf obliged to try, by Force, *to over-balance the Weight of* Pag. 11. *thoſe Prejudices which inclin'd them to prefer a falſe Way to the true?* For there was *no other human Means left*; and if that be not enough to prove the Neceſſity of uſing it, you have no Proof of any Neceſſity of Force at all.

If you would have laid Penalties upon them, I ask you, what if God, for Reaſons beſt known to himſelf, thought it not neceſſary to uſe any other *human Means* but Preaching and Perſuaſion? You have a ready Anſwer, There is no other *human Means* but Force, and ſome other *human Means* beſides Preaching, is neceſſary, *i. e.* in your Opinion: And is it not fit your Authority ſhould carry it? For as to Miracles, whether you think fit to rank them among *human Means* or no; or whether or no there were any ſhew'd to theſe unbelieving *Jews*, to ſupply the Want of Force, I gueſs, in this Caſe, you will not be much help'd, which ever you ſuppoſe: Though to one unbiaſs'd, who reads that Chapter, it will, I imagine, appear moſt probable, that St. *Paul*, when he thus parted with them, had done no Miracles amongſt them.

But you have, at the Cloſe of the Paragraph before us, provided a *Salvo* for all, in telling us, *However the Penalties* you *defend, are not ſuch as can any way be pretended* Pag. 38. *to take away Mens Freedom in this Point.* The Queſtion is, Whether there be a Neceſſity of uſing other *human Means* but Preaching, for the bringing Men to *embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them*; and whether Force be it? God himſelf ſeems, in the Places quoted, and others, to teach us that he would have Men left to their Freedom from any Conſtraint of Force in that Point; and you anſwer, *The Penalties* you *defend are not ſuch as can any ways be pretended to take away Mens Freedom in this Point.* Tell us what you mean by theſe Words of yours, *take away Mens Freedom in this Point*; and then apply it. I think it pretty hard to uſe *Penalties* and *Force* to any Man, without *taking away his Freedom from Penalties and Force.* Farther, the Penalties you think neceſſary, if we may believe you your ſelf, are to *be ſuch as may balance* A. p. 11. *the Weight of thoſe Prejudices, which incline Men to prefer a falſe Way before a true:* Whether theſe be *ſuch* as you will *defend*, is another Queſtion. This, I think, is to be made plain, that you muſt go beyond the lower Degrees of Force, and moderate Penalties, *to balance theſe Prejudices.*

To my ſaying, "That the Method of the Goſpel is to pray and beſeech, and L. 2. p. 269. "that if God had thought it neceſſary to have Men puniſh'd to make them give ear, "he could have called Magiſtrates to be Spreaders of the Goſpel, as well as poor Fiſh-"ermen, or *Paul* a Perſecutor, who yet wanted not Power to puniſh *Ananias* and "*Saphira*, and the inceſtuous *Corinthian.* You reply, *Though it be* the Method of the Pag. 38. Goſpel, *for the Miniſters of it to pray and beſeech Men; yet it appears from* my *own Words here, both that Puniſhments may be ſometimes neceſſary; and that Puniſhing, and that even by thoſe who are to pray and beſeech, is conſiſtent with that Method.* I fear, Sir, you ſo greedily lay hold upon any Examples of Puniſhment, when on any Account they come in your way, that you give your ſelf not Liberty to conſider whether they are for your Purpoſe or no; or elſe you would ſcarce infer, as you do from my Words, that, in your Caſe, *Puniſhments may be ſometimes neceſſary. Ananias* and *Saphira* were L. 2. p. 268. puniſhed; therefore *it appears*, ſay you, *that Puniſhments may be ſometimes neceſſary.* For what, I beſeech you? For the only End, you ſay, Puniſhments are uſeful in Religion, *i. e.* to make Men *conſider.* So that *Ananias* and *Saphira* were ſtruck dead: For what End? To make them *conſider.* If you had given your ſelf the Leiſure to have reflected on this, and the other Inſtance of the inceſtuous *Corinthian*, 'tis poſſible you would have found neither of them to have ſerved very well to ſhew *Puniſhment neceſſary* to bring Men to embrace the true Religion; for both theſe were Puniſhments laid on thoſe who had already embraced the true Religion, and were in the Communion of the true Church, and ſo can only ſhew (if you will infer any thing concerning the Neceſſity of Puniſhments from them) that Puniſhments may be ſometimes neceſſary for thoſe who are in the Communion of the true Church. And of that you may make your Advantage.

As to your other Inferences from my Words, *viz. That Puniſhing, and that even by thoſe who are,* as Ambaſſadors, *to pray and beſeech, is conſiſtent with that Method:* When they can do it as the Apoſtles did, by the immediate Direction and Aſſiſtance of the Spirit of God, I ſhall eaſily allow it to be *conſiſtent with* the Method of the Goſpel. If that will not content you, 'tis plain you have an Itch to be handling the ſecular Sword; and ſince Chriſt has not given you the Power you deſire, you would be executing the Magiſtrate's pretended *Commiſſion* from the *Law of Nature.* One Thing more let me mind you of, and that is, that if, from the Puniſhments of *Ananias* and *Saphira,* and the inceſtuous *Corinthian,* you can infer a *Neceſſity* of Puniſhment to make Men *conſider,* it will follow that there was a Neceſſity of Puniſhment to make Men conſider, notwithſtanding Miracles; which cannot therefore be ſuppos'd, to ſupply the Want of Puniſhments.

L. 2. p. 269. To my asking, " What if God, foreſeeing this Force would be in the Hands of " Men, as paſſionate, as humourſome, as liable to Prejudice and Error, as the reſt " of their Brethren, did not think it a proper Means to bring Men into the right

Pag. 39. " Way? You reply, *But if there be any thing of an Argument in this, it proves that there ought to be no Civil Government in the World; and ſo proving too much, proves nothing at all.* This you ſay; but you being one of thoſe Mortals which is liable to Error as well as your Brethren, you cannot expect it ſhould be received for infallible Truth, till you have proved it; and that you will never do, till you can ſhew, that there is as abſolute a Neceſſity of Force in the Magiſtrate's Hand for the Salvation of Souls, as there is of Force in the Magiſtrate's Hands for the Preſervation of Civil Society; and next, till you have proved that Force, in the Hands of Men, as paſſionate, and humourſome, or liable to Prejudice and Error as their Brethren, would contribute as much to the bringing Men, and keeping them in the right Way to Salvation, as it does to the Support of Civil Society, and the keeping Men at Peace in it.

Where Men cannot live together without mutual Injuries, not to be avoided without Force, Reaſon has taught them to ſeek a Remedy in Government, which always places Power ſomewhere in the Society to reſtrain and puniſh ſuch Injuries; which Power, whether placed in the Community it ſelf, or ſome choſen by the Community to govern it, muſt ſtill be in the Hands of Men; and where (as in the Societies of civiliz'd and ſettled Nations) the Form of the Government places this Power out of the Community it ſelf, it is unavoidable, that out of Men (ſuch as they are) ſome ſhould be made Magiſtrates, and have coerſive Power or Force put into their Hands, to govern and direct the Society for the Publick Good; without which Force, ſo placed in the Hands of Men, there could be no Civil Society, nor the Ends for which it is inſtituted, to any Degree attain'd. And thus Government is the Will of God.

'Tis the Will of God alſo, that Men ſhould be ſaved; but to this, it is not neceſſary that Force or *coactive Power* ſhould be put into Mens Hands; becauſe God can, and hath provided other Means to bring Men to Salvation: To which, you indeed ſuppoſe, but can never prove Force neceſſary.

The *Paſſions, Humours,* Liableneſs to *Prejudices* and *Errors,* common to Magiſtrates with other Men, do not render Force in their Hands ſo dangerous and unuſeful, to the Ends of Society, which is the Publick Peace, as to the Ends of Religion, which is the Salvation of Mens Souls. For tho' Men of all Ranks could be content to have their own *Humours, Paſſions* and *Prejudices* ſatisfied, yet when they come to make Laws, which are to direct their Force in Civil Matters, they are driven to oppoſe their Laws to the *Humours, Paſſions* and *Prejudices* of Men in general, whereby their own come to be reſtrain'd: For if Law-makers, in making of Laws, did not direct them againſt the irregular *Humours, Prejudices* and *Paſſions* of Men, which are apt to miſlead them: If they did not endeavour with their beſt Judgment, to bring Men from their *Humours* and *Paſſions,* to the Obedience and Practice of right Reaſon, the Society could not ſubſiſt, and ſo they themſelves would be in Danger to loſe their Station in it, and be expos'd to the unreſtrain'd *Humours, Paſſions,* and Violence of others. And hence it comes, that be Men as humourſome, paſſionate, and prejudiced as they will, they are ſtill by their own Intereſt obliged to make uſe of their beſt Skill, and with their moſt unprejudiced and ſedateſt Thoughts, take Care of the Government, and endeavour to preſerve the Commonwealth; and therefore, notwithſtanding their *Humours and Paſſions,* their Liableneſs to *Error and Prejudice,* they do pro-

provide pretty well for the Support of Society, and the Power in their Hands is of Uſe to the Maintenance of it.

But in Matters of Religion it is quite otherwiſe; you had told us, about the latter End of your *Argument C.* how liable Men were in *chuſing their Religion*, to be miſled by *Humour*, *Paſſion* and *Prejudice*; and therefore, it was not fit that in a Buſineſs of ſuch Concernment they ſhould be left to themſelves: And hence, in this Matter of Religion, you would have them ſubjected to the *coactive Power* of the Magiſtrate. But this Contrivance is viſibly of no Advantage to the true Religion, nor can ſerve at all to ſecure Men from a wrong Choice. For the Magiſtrates, by their *Humours*, *Prejudices* and *Paſſions*, (which they are born to like other Men) being as liable, and likely to be miſled in the Choice of their Religion, as any of their Brethren, as conſtant Experience hath always ſhewn, what Advantage could it be to Mankind, for the Salvation of their Souls, that the Magiſtrates of the World ſhould have Power to uſe Force to bring Men to that Religion which they, each of them, by whatſoever *Humour*, *Paſſion* or *Prejudice* influenc'd, had choſen to themſelves as the true? For whatſoever you did, I think with Reverence we may ſay, that God foreſaw, that whatever Commiſſion one Magiſtrate had by the Law of Nature, all Magiſtrates had: And that Commiſſion, if there were any ſuch, could be only to uſe their *coactive Power* to bring Men to the Religion they believ'd to be true, whether it were really the true or no: And therefore I ſhall, without taking away Government out of the World, or ſo much as queſtion it, ſtill think this a reaſonable Queſtion; "What if God, "foreſeeing this Force would be in the Hands of Men, as *paſſionate*, as *humourſome*, "as liable to *Prejudice* and *Error*, as the reſt of their Brethren, did not think it a "proper Means, in ſuch Hands, to bring Men into the right Way? And that it needs a better Anſwer than you have given to it: And therefore, you might have ſpared the Pains you have taken in this Paragraph, to prove that the Magiſtrates, being liable as much as other Men to *Humour*, *Prejudice*, *Paſſion* and *Error*, makes not Force, in his Hand, wholly unſerviceable to the Adminiſtration of Civil Government. Which is what no body denies: And you would have better employ'd it to prove, that if the Magiſtrate's being as liable to *Paſſion*, *Humour*, *Prejudice* and *Error*, as other Men, made Force, in his Hands, improper to bring Men to the true Religion, this would take away Government out of the World: which is a Conſequence, I think, I may deny.

To which let me now add, What if God foreſaw, that if Force, of any Kind or Degree whatſoever, where allow'd in Behalf of Truth, it would be us'd by *erring*, *paſſionate*, *prejudiced* Men, to the Reſtraint and Ruin of Truth, as conſtant Experience in all Ages has ſhewn, and therefore commanded that the Tares ſhould be ſuffer'd to grow with the Wheat till the Harveſt, when the infallible Judge ſhall ſever them. That Parable of our Saviour's plainly tells us, If Force were once permitted, even in Favour of the true Religion, what Miſchief it was like to do in the Miſapplication of it, by forward buſy miſtaken Men, and therefore he wholly forbid it; and yet, I hope, this does not take away Civil Government out of the World?

To my demanding, "What if there be no other Means? and ſaying, "Then yours "ceaſes to be neceſſary upon that Account, that *there is no other Means left*; for the "Grace of God is another Means. You anſwer, That *tho'* the Grace of God be an- Pag. 39.
other Means, *yet it is none of the Means of which* you *were ſpeaking in the Place* I *refer to, which any one, who reads that Paragraph, will find to be only human Means.* In that Place, you were endeavouring to prove Force neceſſary to bring Men to the true Religion, as appears; and there having dilated for four or five Pages together upon the *Careleſneſs*, *Prejudices*, *Paſſions*, *Luſts*, *Impreſſions of Education*, *worldly Reſpects*, and other the A. p. 6.
like Cauſes, which you think miſlead and keep Men from the true Religion, you at laſt, conclude Force neceſſary to bring Men to it, becauſe *Admonitions* and *Intreaties* not prevailing, there is no *other Means left*. To this, Grace being inſtanced in as another Means, you tell us here you mean *no other human Means left*. So that to prove Force neceſſary, you muſt prove that God would have other *human Means* uſed beſides Praying, Preaching, Perſuaſion and Inſtruction; and for this, you will need to bring a plain Direction from Revelation for your moderate Puniſhments; unleſs you will pretend to know, by your own natural Wiſdom, what Means God has made *neceſſary*; without which, thoſe whom he hath *foreknown* and Rom. 8. 29.
predeſtinated, and will in his good Time *call* by ſuch Means as he thinks fit, according to his Purpoſe, cannot be brought *into the Way of Salvation*. Perhaps you have ſome

Warrant

Warrant we know not of, to enter thus boldly into the Counſel of God; without which, in another Man, a modeſt Chriſtian would be apt to think it Preſumption.

You ſay, there are many who are not prevail'd on by Prayers, Entreaties and Exhortations to embrace the true Religion. What then is to be done? *Some Degrees of Force* are *neceſſary* to be uſed. Why? Becauſe there is no other *human Means left*. Many are not prevail'd on by your moderate Force; What then is to be done? Greater Degrees of Force are neceſſary, becauſe *there is no other human Means left*. No, ſay you, God has made moderate Force neceſſary, becauſe *there is no other human Means left*, where Preaching and Entreaties will not prevail: But he has not made greater Degrees of Force neceſſary, becauſe *there is no other human Means left* where moderate Force will not prevail. So that your Rule changing, where the Reaſon continues the ſame, we muſt conclude you have ſome Way of Judging concerning the Purpoſes and Ways of the Almighty in the Work of Salvation, which every one underſtands not. You would not elſe, upon ſo ſlight Ground as you have yet produced for it, which is nothing but your own Imagination, make Force, your *moderate* Force ſo neA. p. 16. ceſſary, that you bring in queſtion the Wiſdom and Bounty of the *Diſpoſer and Governor of* all Things, as if he *had not furniſh'd Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour in the World, and the good of Souls*, if your *moderate* Force were wanting to bring them to the true Religion; whereas you know, that moſt of the Nations of the World always were deſtitute of this *human Means* to bring them to the true Religion. And I imagine you would be put to it, to name one now that is furniſh'd with it.

Pag. 39. Beſides, if you pleaſe to remember what you ſay in the next Words. *And therefore, tho' the Grace of God be both a proper and ſufficient Means, and ſuch as can work by it ſelf, and without which, neither Penalties nor any other Means can do any thing*; and by Conſequence, can make any Means effectual: How can you ſay any *human Means*, in this ſupernatural Work, unleſs what God has declar'd to be ſo, is neceſſary? Preaching and Inſtruction, and Exhortation, are *human Means* that he has appointed: Theſe, therefore, Men may and ought to uſe; they have a Commiſſion from God, and may expect his Bleſſing and the Aſſiſtance of his Grace; but to ſuppoſe, when they are uſed and prevail not, that Force is neceſſary, becauſe theſe are not ſufficient, is to exclude Grace, and aſcribe this Work to *human Means*; as in effect you do, when you call Force *competent* and *ſufficient Means*, as you have done. For if bare Preaching by the Aſſiſtance of Grace, can and will certainly prevail; and *moderate Penalties*, as you confeſs, or any kind of Force, without the Aſſiſtance of Grace, *can do nothing*, How can you ſay, that Force is in any Caſe a more *neceſſary*, or a more *competent*, or *ſufficient* Means, than bare Preaching and Inſtruction? Unleſs you can ſhew us, that God hath promiſed the Co-operation and Aſſiſtance of his *Grace* to Force, and not to Preaching? The contrary whereof, has more of Appearance. Preaching and Perſuaſion are not *competent Means*, you ſay; Why? becauſe, without the Co-operation of Grace, they can do nothing: But by the Aſſiſtance of Grace, they can prevail even without Force. Force too, without Grace, you acknowledge can do nothing; but join'd with Preaching and Grace, it can prevail. Why then, I pray, is it a more *competent Means* than Preaching, or why *neceſſary*, where Preaching prevails not? ſince it can do nothing without that, which, if joined to Preaching, can make Preaching effectual without it.

Pag. 40. You go on, *Yet it may be true however, that when Admonitions and Entreaties fail, there is no HUMAN Means left but Penalties, to bring prejudiced Perſons to hear and conſider what may convince them of their Errors, and diſcover the Truth to them: And then* Penalties *will be* neceſſary *in reſpect to that End, as an HUMAN Means.* Let it be true or not true, that when *Entreaties*, &c. *fail, there is no HUMAN Means left but Penalties:* Your Inference I deny, that *then Penalties will be* neceſſary as an *HUMAN Means.* For I ask you, ſince you lay ſo much Streſs to ſo little Purpoſe on *HUMAN Means, is ſome human Means neceſſary?* If that be your Meaning, you have *human* Means in the Caſe, *viz. Admonitions, Entreaties, being inſtant in Seaſon and out of Seaſon.* I ask you again, Are Penalties neceſſary becauſe the *End* could not be obtain'd by Preaching, without them? that you cannot ſay, for Grace co-operating with Preaching will prevail: Are *Penalties then neceſſary* as ſure to produce that *End?* Nor ſo are they neceſſary; for without the Aſſiſtance of Grace, you confeſs, they can *do nothing.* So that Penalties, neither as *human Means*, nor as any Means, are at all neceſſary. And now you may underſtand what I *intend, by ſaying* that the Grace of God

God is the only Means; which is the Enquiry of your next Paragraph, *viz.* this I in- Pag. 40.
tend, that it is the only efficacious Means, without which all *human Means* is ineffe-
ctual. You tell me, If by it I *intend that it does either always, or ordinarily exclude all other* Ibid.
Means: you see no ground I *have to say it.* And I see no ground you have to think I *intended, that it excludes* any *other Means* that God in his Goodness will be pleased to make use of: But this I intend by it, and this, I think, I have ground to say, that it excludes all the *human Means* of Force from being *necessary*, or so much as lawful to be used, unless God hath required it by some more authentick Declaration than your bare saying or imagining it is necessary. And you must have more than *human* Confidence, if you continue to mix this poor and *human* Contrivance of yours, with the Wisdom and Counsel of God in the Work of Salvation; since he having declar'd the Means and Methods to be used for the saving Mens Souls, has in the Revelation of the Gospel, by your own Confession, prescribed no such *human Means.*

To my saying, God alone can open the Ear that it may hear, and open the Heart Ibid.
that it may understand. You reply, *But by your Favour, this does not prove that he makes use of no Means in doing of it.* Nor needs it: it is enough for me, if it proves, that if Preaching and Instruction do not open the Ear, or the Heart, 'tis not *necessary* any one should try his Strength with an Hammer or an Auger. Man is not in this Business, (where no Means can be effectual, without the Assistance and Co-operation of his Grace) to make use of any Means which God hath not prescribed. You here set up a Way of propagating Christianity according to your Fancy, and tell us how you would have the Work of the Gospel carried on: You commission the Magistrate by Arguments of Congruity; you shall find an Efficacy in Punishment towards the converting of Men: you limit the Force, to be used to *low* and *moderate* Degrees; and to Countries where *sufficient Means of Instruction are provided* by the Law. And where the *Magistrate's* Religion is the *true, i. e.* where it pleases you; and all this without any Direction from God, or any Authority so much as pretended from the Gospel; and without its being truly for the Propagation Christianity, but only so much of it as you think fit, and what else are you pleas'd to join to it. Why else, in the Religion you are content to have establish'd by Law, and promoted by Penalties, is any thing more or less requir'd, than is expressly contain'd in the New Testament.

This indeed is well suited to any one, who would have a Power of punishing those who differ from his Opinion, and would have Men compell'd to Conformity in *England.* But in this your fair Contrivance, what becomes of the rest of Mankind, left to wander in Darkness out of this *Goshen*, who neither have, nor (according to your Scheme) can have your necessary Means of *Force* and *Penalties* to bring them to embrace the Truth that must save them: For if that be necessary, they cannot without a Miracle, either Prince or People, be wrought on without it. If a Papist at *Rome*, a Lutheran at *Stockholm*, or a Calvinist at *Geneva*, should argue thus for his Church, would you not say, that such as these look'd like the Thoughts of a poor prejudiced narrow Mind? But they may mistake, and you cannot; they may be prejudiced, but you cannot. Say too, if you please, you are confident you are in the right, but they cannot be confidenr that they are so. This I am sure, God's Thoughts are not as Man's Thoughts, nor his Ways as Man's Ways, *Isa.* 55. 8. And it may abate any one's Confidence of the Necessity or Use of Punishments, for not receiving our Saviour, or his Religion, when those who had the Power of Miracles were told, that they *knew not what manner of Spirit* they *were of*, when they would have *commanded down Fire from Heaven.* Joh. 9. 55.
But you do well to take care to have the Church you are of, supported by Force and Penalties, whatever becomes of the Propagation of the Gospel, or the Salvation of Mens Souls, in other Parts of the World, as not coming within your Hypothesis.

In your next Paragraph, to prove that God does bless the use of Force, you say you Pag. 40.
suppose I *mean*, by the Words you there cite, that the *Magistrate has no ground to hope that God will bless any Penalties that he may use to bring Men to hear and consider the Doctrine of Salvation; or (which is the same thing) that God does not (at least not ordinarily) afford his Grace and Assistance to them who are brought by such Penalties to hear and consider that Doctrine, to enable them to hear and consider it as they ought,* i. e. *so as to be moved heartily to embrace it.* You tell me, *If this be my Meaning; then to let* me *see that it is not true,* you *shall only desire* me *to tell* you, *whether they that are so brought to hear and consider, are bound to believe the Gospel or not? If* I *say they are; (and* you *suppose* I *dare not say otherwise;) then it evidently follows, that God does afford them that Grace which is requisite to enable them to believe the Gospel. Because, without that*

Grace,

Grace, it is impoſſible for them to believe it ; *and they cannot be bound to believe what it is impoſſible for them to believe.* To which, I ſhall only anſwer, That by this irrefragable Argument, it is evident, that where-ever due Penalties have been uſed (for thoſe you tell us are *ſufficient* and *competent Means)* to make Men *hear and conſider as they ought*, there all Men were brought to believe the Goſpel; which, whether you will reſolve with your ſelf to be true or falſe, will be to me indifferent, and on either hand equally advantage your Cauſe. Had you appeal'd to Experience for the Succeſs of the Uſe of Force by the Magiſtrate, your Argument had not ſhewn half ſo much depth of Theological Learning: But the Miſchief is, that if you will not make it all of a piece Scholaſtick, and by arguing that all whom the Magiſtrates uſe Force upon, *are brought to conſider as they ought*, and to all that are ſo *wrought upon, God does afford that Grace which is requiſite*; and ſo roundly conclude for a greater Succeſs of Force, to make Men believe the Goſpel, than ever our Saviour and the Apoſtles had by their Preaching and *Miracles*, (for that wrought not on all) your unanſwerable Argument comes to nothing. And in truth, as you have in this Paragraph ordered the matter, by being too ſparing of your abſtract Metaphyſical Reaſoning, and employing it but by halves, we are fain, after all, to come to the dull way of Experience; and muſt be force to count, as the Parſon does his Communicants, by his Eaſter-Book, how many thoſe are *that are ſo brought to hear and conſider*, to know how far God *bleſſes Penalties.* Indeed, were it to be meaſur'd by conforming, the Eaſter-Book would be a good Regiſter to determine it. But ſince you put it upon *Believing*, that will be of ſomewhat a harder Diſquiſition.

To my ſaying, (upon that place out of *Iſaiah 6.* 10. *Make the Heart of this People fat, leſt they underſtand, and convert, and be healed)* " Will all the Force you can uſe " be a Means to make ſuch People hear and underſtand, and be converted? You re-
Pag. 41. ply, *No, Sir, it will not. But what then? What if God declares that he will not heal thoſe who have long reſiſted all his ordinary Methods, and made themſelves, morally ſpeaking, incurable by them? (Which is the utmoſt*, you ſay, I *can make of the Words* I *quote.) Will it follow from thence, that no Good can be done by Penalties upon others, who are not ſo far gone in Wickedneſs and Obſtinacy? If it will not, as it is evident it will not, to what purpoſe is this ſaid?* It is ſaid to this purpoſe, *viz.* to ſhew that Force ought not to be uſed at all. Thoſe *ordinary Methods* which, reſiſted, are puniſhed with a Reprobate Senſe, are the ordinary Methods of Inſtruction, without Force; as is evident by this place and many others, particularly *Rom.* 1. From whence I argue; That what State ſoever you will ſuppoſe Men in, either as paſt, or not yet come to the Day of Grace, no Body can be juſtified in uſing Force to work upon them. For till the *ordinary Methods* of Inſtruction and Perſuaſion can do no more, Force is not *neceſſary*, (for you cannot ſay *what other Means is there left)* and ſo by your own Rule not lawful. For till God hath pronounced this Sentence here, on any one, *Make his Heart fat, &c.* the ordinary Means of Inſtruction and Perſuaſion, may, by the Aſſiſtance of God's Grace prevail. And when this Sentence is once paſſed upon them, and *God will not afford them his Grace to heal them*; (I take it, you confeſs in this place) I am ſure you muſt confeſs your Force to be wholly *uſeleſs*, and ſo utterly *impertinent*, unleſs that can be pertinent to be uſed, which you own can do nothing. So that whether it *will follow*, or no, from Mens being given up to a Reprobate Mind, for having reſiſted the Preaching of Salvation, *That no good can be done by Penalties upon others*; this will follow, that not knowing whether Preaching may not, by the Grace of God, yet work upon them; or whether the Day of Grace be paſt with them; neither you nor any body elſe can ſay that Force is *neceſſary*; and if it be not *neceſſary*, you your ſelf tell us it is not to be uſed.

Ibid. In your next Paragraph, you complain of me, as *repreſenting your* Argument, as you ſay, *I commonly do, as if* you *allow'd any Magiſtrate, of what Religion ſoever, to lay Penalties upon all that diſſent from him.* Unhappy Magiſtrates that have not your Allowance! But to conſole them, I imagine they will find that they are all under the ſame Obligation, one as another, to propagate the Religion they believe to be the true, whether you allow it them or no. For to go no farther than the firſt Words of your Argument, which you complain I have miſrepreſented, and which you tell me run thus, *When Men fly from the Means of right Information*; I ask you here, who ſhall be Judge of thoſe *Means of right Information*, the Magiſtrate who joins Force with them to make them be hearkned to, or no? When you have anſwer'd that, you will have reſolv'd a great Part of the Queſtion, What Magiſtrates are to uſe Force.

But

But that you may not complain again of my misrepresenting, I must beg my Reader's Leave to set down your Argument at large in your own Words, and all you say upon it. *When Men fly from the Means of a right Information, and will not so much as consider how reasonable it is, throughly and impartially to examine a Religion, which they embraced upon such Inducements, as ought to have no Sway at all in the Matter, and therefore with little or no Examination of the proper Grounds of it; What human Method can be used to bring them to act like Men, in an Affair of such Consequence, and to make a wiser and more rational Choice, but that of laying such Penalties upon them, as may balance the Weight of those Prejudices, which inclined them to prefer a false Way before the true, &c.* A. p. 18. *Now this Argument*, you tell me, I *pretend to retort in this Manner:* "And, I say, I "see no other Means left (taking the World as we now find it, wherein the Magi- "strate never lays Penalties, for Matters of Religion, upon those of his own Church, "nor is it to be expected they ever should) to make Men of the National Church, "any where, throughly and impartially examine a Religion, which they embraced "upon such Inducements as ought to have no Sway at all in the Matter, and there- "fore with little or no Examination of the proper Grounds of it: And therefore, I "conclude the Use of Force by Dissenters upon Conformists necessary. I appeal to "all the World, whether this be not as just and natural a Conclusion as yours? Pag. 41. *And* you say, you are *well content the World should judge. And when it determines, that there is the same Reason to say, That to bring those who conform to the National Church, to examine their Religion, it is necessary for Dissenters (who cannot possibly have the coactive Power, because the National Church has that on its Side, and cannot be National without it) to use Force upon Conformists, As there is to say, That where the National Church is the true Church, there to bring Dissenters (as I call them) to examine their Religion, it is necessary for the Magistrate (who has the coactive Power) to lay moderate Penalties upon them for* dissenting: You *say, when the World determines thus,* you *will never pretend any more to judge what is reasonable, in any Case whatsoever. For* you *doubt not but* you *may safely presume, that the* World *will easily admit these two Things.* 1. *That though it be very fit and desirable, that all that are of the true Religion, should understand the true Grounds of it; that so they may be the better able, both to defend themselves against the Assaults of Seducers, and to reduce such as are out of the Way; yet this is not strictly necessary to their Salvation: Because Experience shews (as far as Men are capable to judge of such Matters) that many do heartily believe and profess the true Religion, and conscientiously practise the Duties of it, who yet do not understand the true Grounds upon which it challenges their Belief: And no Man doubts, but whosoever does so believe, profess, and practise the true Religion, if he perseveres to the End, shall certainly attain Salvation by it.* 2. *That how much soever it concerns those who reject the true Religion (whom* I *may call* Dissenters *if* I *please) to examine and* Pag. 39. *consider why they do so; and how needful soever Penalties may be to bring them to this; it is, however, utterly unreasonable, that such as have not the coactive Power, should take upon them to inflict Penalties for that Purpose: Because, as that is not consistent with Order and* A. p. 6. *Government, which cannot stand, where private Persons are permitted to usurp the coactive Power; So there is nothing more manifest, than that the Prejudice which is done to Religion, and to the Interest of Mens Souls, by destroying Government, does infinitely outweigh any good that can possibly be done by that which destroys it. And whoever admits and considers these Things,* you say, you are *very secure will be far enough from admitting, that there is any Parity of Reason in the Cases we here speak of, or that* mine is as just and natural a Conclusion as yours.

The Sum of what you say, amounts to thus much. Men being apt to take up their Religion, upon *Inducements that ought to have no Sway at all in the Matter*, and so, *with little or no Examination of the Grounds of it*; therefore Penalties are necessary to be laid on them, to make them *throughly* and *impartially examine*. But yet Penalties need not be laid on Conformists, in *England*, to make them examine; because they, and you, believe yours to be the true Religion: Tho' it must be laid on *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, &c. to make them examine, tho' they believe theirs to be the true Religion; because you believe it not to be so. But you give another very substantial Reason, why Penalties cannot be laid on Conformists, to make them examine; and that is, *because the National Church has the coactive Power on its Side*, and therefore they have no need of Penalties to make them examine. The National Church of *France* too, has *the coactive Power on its Side*; and therefore, they who are of it have no need of Penalties, any of them, to make them examine.

If

A. p. 11. If your Argument be good, that Men take up their Religions upon wrong Inducements, and *without* due *Examination of the proper Grounds of it*; and that therefore they have need of Penalties to be laid on them to make them *examine, as they ought*, the Grounds of their Religion; You muſt confeſs there are ſome in the Church of *England*, to whom Penalties are neceſſary: Unleſs you will affirm, that all, who are in the Communion of the Church of *England*, have ſo *examin'd*: But that I think you will not do, however you endeavour to palliate their Ignorance and Negligence in this Matter. There being therefore a need of Penalties, I ſay, 'tis as neceſſary that *Presbyterians* ſhould lay Penalties on the Conformiſts of the Church of *England*, to make them examine, as for the Church of *England* to lay Penalties on the *Presbyterians* to make them do ſo: For they each equally believe their Religion to be true; and we ſuppoſe, on both Sides, there are thoſe who have not duly *examin'd*. But here you think you have a ſure Advantage, by ſaying *it is not conſiſtent with the Order of Government*, and ſo is *impracticable*. I eaſily grant it. But is yours more practicable? When you can make your Way practicable, for the End for which you pretend it neceſſary, *(viz.)* to make *all*, who have taken *up their Religion upon ſuch Inducements, as ought to have no Sway at all in the Matter, to examine throughly and impartially the proper Grounds of it*; When, I ſay, you can ſhew your Way practicable, to this End, you will have clear'd it of one main Objection, and convinc'd the World that yours is a more juſt and natural Concluſion than mine.

If your Cauſe were capable of any other Defence, I ſuppoſe we ſhould not have had ſo long and elaborate an Anſwer as you have given us in this Paragraph, which at laſt bottoms only on theſe two Things: 1. That there is in you, or thoſe of your Church, ſome Approaches towards Infallibility, in your Belief that your Religion is true, which is not to be allow'd thoſe of other Churches, in the Belief of theirs. 2. That it is enough if any one does but conform to it, and remain in the Communion of your Church: Or elſe one would think there ſhould be as much need for Conformiſts too of your Church, to *examine the Grounds of their Religion*, as for any others.

Pag. 42. *To underſtand the true Grounds of the true Religion, is not*, you ſay, *ſtrictly neceſſary to Salvation*. Yet, I think, you will not deny, but it is as *ſtrictly neceſſary to Salvation*, as it is to conform to a National Church in all thoſe Things it impoſes: Some whereof, are not neceſſary to Salvation; ſome whereof, are acknowledg'd by all to be indifferent; and ſome whereof, to ſome conſcientious Men, who thereupon decline Communion, appear unſound or unlawful. If not being *ſtrictly neceſſary to Salvation*, will excuſe from Penalties in the one Caſe, why will it not in the other? And now I ſhall excuſe the World from determining my Concluſion to be as natural as yours: For 'tis pity ſo reaſonable a Diſputant as you are, ſhould take ſo deſperate a Reſolution as *never to pretend any more to judge what is reaſonable in any Caſe whatſoever*.

Whether you have proved that Force, uſed by the Magiſtrate, be a Means preſcrib'd by God to procure the Gift of Faith from him, (which is all you ſay in the next Paragraph,) others muſt judge.

In that following; you quote theſe Words of mine. "If all the Means God has "appointed to make Men hear and conſider, be Exhortation in Seaſon and out of "Seaſon, &c. together with Prayer for them, and the Example of Meekneſs, and a
Pag. 43. "good Life; this is all ought to be done, whether they will hear, or whether they "will forbear. To which you thus reply, *But if theſe be not all the Means God has appointed, then theſe Things are not all that ought to be done.* But if I ask you, How do you know that this is not all God has appointed; you have nothing to anſwer (to bring it to your preſent Purpoſe) but that you know it by the Light of Nature. For all you ſay is but this; That by the Light of Nature you know Force to be uſeful and neceſſary to bring Men into the Way of Salvation; by the Light of Nature you know the Magiſtrate has a Commiſſion to uſe Force to that Purpoſe; and by the ſame Light of Nature, you know that Miracles were appointed to ſupply the Want of Force till the Magiſtrates were Chriſtians. I imagine, Sir, you would ſcarce have thought this a reaſonable Anſwer, if you had taken notice of my Words in the ſame Paragraph immediately preceding thoſe you have cited; which (that you may ſee the Scope of my Argument) I will here trouble you with again; and
L. 2. p. 269. they are theſe: "It is not for you and me, out of an Imagination that they may "be uſeful, or are neceſſary, to preſcribe Means in the great myſterious Work of Sal-

"vation,

" vation, other than what God himſelf has directed. God has appointed Force as " uſeful and neceſſary, and therefore it is to be uſed, is a Way of Arguing becom- " ing the Ignorance and Humility of poor Creatures. But I think Force uſeful or " neceſſary, and therefore it is to be uſed, has methinks a little too much Preſump- " tion in it. You ask what Means is there left? none, ſay I, to be uſed by Man, " but what God himſelf has directed in the Scriptures, wherein are contained all the " Means and Methods of Salvation. Faith is the Gift of God. And we are not " to uſe any other Means to procure this Gift to any one, but what God himſelf " has preſcribed. If he has there appointed, that any ſhould be forced to hear thoſe " *who tell them they have miſtaken their Way, and offer to ſhew them the right*; and that " they ſhould be puniſh'd by the Magiſtrate, if they did not; 'twill be paſt doubt, " it is to be made uſe of. But till that can be done, 'twill be in vain to ſay, *what* " *other Means is there left.*

My Argument here lies plainly in this; That all the Means and Methods of Salvation are contain'd in the Scripture: which either you were to have deny'd, or elſe have ſhewn where it was, in Scripture, that Force was appointed. But inſtead of that, you tell us, that God appointed Miracles in the Beginning of the Goſpel. And though, when theſe ceaſed, the Means I mention were all the Miniſters had left, yet this proves not that the Magiſtrate was not to uſe Force. Your Words are, *As* Pag. 43. *to the firſt* Spreaders *of the Goſpel, it has already been ſhewn, that God appointed other Means beſides theſe for them to uſe, to induce Men to hear and conſider: And though, when thoſe extraordinary Means ceaſed, theſe Means which I mention (viz.* Preaching, *&c.) were the only Means left to the Miniſters of the Goſpel; yet that is no Proof that the Magiſtrate, when he became Chriſtian, could not lawfully uſe ſuch Means as his Station enabled him to uſe, when they became needful.* I ſaid, in expreſs Words, " No Means was to be uſed by *Man*, " but what God himſelf has directed in the Scripture. And you anſwer, This is *no Proof that the Chriſtian Magiſtrate* may not uſe Force. Perhaps when they ſo peremptorily interpoſe their deciſive Decrees in the Buſineſs of Salvation, eſtabliſh Religions by Laws and Penalties, with what Articles, Creeds, Ceremonies and Diſcipline they think fit; (for this we ſee done almoſt in all Countries) when they force Men *to hear* thoſe, and thoſe only, who by their Authority are choſen and allow'd *to tell Men they have miſtaken their Way, and offer to ſhew them the right*; it may be thought neceſſary to prove Magiſtrates to be *Men*. If that needs no Proof, what I ſaid needs ſome other Anſwer.

But let us examine a little the Parts of what you here ſay. *As to the firſt Spreaders of the Goſpel*, ſay you, *it has already been ſhewn, that God appointed other Means beſides* Exhortation in Seaſon and out of Seaſon, Prayer and the Example of a good Life, *for them to uſe to induce Men to hear and conſider*. What were thoſe other Means? To that you anſwer readily, *Miracles*. *Ergo*, Men are directed now by Scripture to uſe Miracles. Or elſe what Anſwer do you make to my Argument, which I gave you in theſe Words, " No Means is to be uſed by Man, but what God himſelf has " directed in the Scriptures, wherein are contain'd all the Means and Methods of " Salvation. No, they cannot uſe Miracles now as a Means, ſay you, for they have not. What then? Therefore the Magiſtrate, who has it, muſt uſe Force to ſupply the Want of thoſe *extraordinary Means which are now ceaſed*. This indeed is an Inference of yours, but not of the Scripture's. Does the Scripture ſay any Thing of this? Not a Word? not ſo much as the leaſt Intimation towards it in all the *New Teſtament*. Be it then true or falſe, that Force is a Means to be uſed by Men in the Abſence of Miracles, this is yet no Anſwer to my Argument; this is no Proof that 'tis appointed in Scripture; which is the Thing my Argument turns on.

Revelation then fails you. Let us ſee now how Reaſon and common Senſe, that common Light of Nature, will help you out.

You then reaſon thus: Bare Preaching, *&c.* will not prevail on Men *to hear and conſider*; and therefore ſome *other Means* is *neceſſary* to make them do ſo. Pray what do you mean by *Men*, or any other of thoſe indefinite Terms, you have always uſed in this Caſe? Is it that bare Preaching will prevail on *no Men*? Does Reaſon (under which I comprehend Experience too, and all the Ways of Knowledge, contrardiſtinguiſh'd to Revelation) diſcover any ſuch Thing to you? I imagine you will not ſay that; or pretend that no body was ever brought, by Preaching and Perſuaſion, to *hear* and *conſider* the Truths of the Goſpel, (mean by *conſidering* what you will) without

without other Means uſed by thoſe who applied themſelves to the Care of converting them. To ſuch therefore as may be brought to *hear* and *conſider*, without other Means, you will not ſay that other Means are neceſſary.

In the next Place, therefore, When you ſay bare Preaching will not prevail on Men, do you mean that 'twill not prevail on all Men, and therefore 'tis neceſſary that Men ſhould uſe other Means? Neither, I think, will Reaſon authorize you to draw ſuch a Conſequence: Becauſe neither will Preaching alone, nor Preaching aſſiſted with Force, or any other Means Man can uſe, prevail on all Men. And therefore no other Means can be pretended to be neceſſary to be uſed by Man, to do what Men by thoſe Means never did, nor never can do.

That ſome Men ſhall be ſaved, and not all, is, I think, paſt queſtion to all that are Chriſtians: And thoſe that ſhall be ſaved, 'tis plain, are the *Elect*. If you think not this plain enough in Scripture, I deſire you to turn to the ſeventeenth of the 29 Articles of the Church of *England*, where you will read theſe Words: *Predeſtination to Life is the everlaſting Purpoſe of God, whereby (before the Foundations of the World were laid) he hath conſtantly decreed by his Counſel ſecret to us, to deliver from Curſe and Damnation thoſe whom he has Choſen in Chriſt out of Mankind, and to bring them by Chriſt to everlaſting Salvation, as Veſſels made to Honour. Wherefore they which be endued with ſo excellent a Benefit of God, be called according to God's Purpoſe by his Spirit working in due Seaſon: They thro' Grace obey the Calling; they be juſtified freely; they be made Sons of God by Adoption; they be made like the Image of his only begotten Son Jeſus Chriſt; they walk religiouſly in good Works; and at length, by God's Mercy, they attain to everlaſting Felicity.* Now pray tell me whether bare Preaching will not prevail on all the *Elect* to *hear* and *conſider*, without other Means to be uſed by Men. If you ſay it will; the Neceſſity of your other Means, I think, is out of Doors. If you ſay it will not; I deſire you to tell me how you do know it without Revelation? And whether by your own Reaſon you can tell us, whether any, and what Means God has made neceſſary, beſides what he has appointed in Scripture for the calling his *Elect*? When you can do this, we ſhall think you no ordinary Divine, nor a Stranger to the ſecret Counſels of the infinite wiſe God. But till then, your mixing your Opinion with the Divine Wiſdom in the great Work of Salvation, and from Arguments of Congruity, taking upon you to declare the Neceſſity or Uſefulneſs of Means, which God has not expreſly directed, for the gathering in of his *Elect*, will ſcarce authorize the Magiſtrate to uſe his *coactive Power* for the edifying and compleating the Body of Chriſt, which is his Church. *Thoſe whom God hath choſen in Chriſt out of Mankind, before the Foundation of the World, are called, according to God's Purpoſe, by his Spirit, working in due Seaſon, and through Grace obey the Calling*; ſay you in your Article. The outward Means that God has appointed for this, is Preaching. Ay, but Preaching is not enough; that is not ſufficient Means, ſay you. And I ask you how you know it; ſince the Scripture, which declares all that we can know in this Matter, ſays nothing of the Inſufficiency of it, or of the Neceſſity of any other? Nor can there be a Neceſſity of any other Means than what God expreſly appoints, in a Matter wherein no Means can operate effectually, without the Aſſiſtance of his Grace; and where the Aſſiſtance of his Grace can make any outward Means, he appoints, effectual.

I muſt deſire you here to take notice, that by Preaching, which I uſe for Shortneſs, I mean Exhortation, Inſtruction, Entreaty, Praying for, and in fine, any outward Means of Perſuaſion in the Power of Man, ſeperate from Force.

Pag. 43. You tell us here, *As to the firſt Spreaders of the Goſpel, God appointed other Means*, viz. Miracles, *for them to uſe to induce Men to hear and conſider.* If by the *firſt Spreaders of the Goſpel*, you mean the twelve Apoſtles and ſeventy Diſciples, whom Chriſt himſelf ſent to preach the Goſpel; they indeed were appointed by his immediate Command, to ſhew Miracles by the Power which he had beſtowed upon them. But will you ſay, all the Miniſters and Preachers of the Goſpel had ſuch a Commiſſion, and ſuch a Power, all along from the Apoſtles Time; and that they, every one, did actually ſhew Miracles to induce Men *to hear and conſider*, quite down, till *Chriſtianity was ſupported by the Law of the Empire?* Unleſs you could ſhew this, though you could produce ſome well-atteſted Miracles, done by ſome Men in every Age till that Time, yet it would not be ſufficient to prove that Miracles were *appointed* to be conſtantly uſed to *induce Men to hear and conſider*; and ſo by your Reaſoning, to ſupply the Want of Force, till that neceſſary Aſſiſtance could be had from the Authority of the

he Magiſtrate become Chriſtian. For ſince it is what you build upon, that Men will not *hear and conſider* upon bare Preaching, (and I think you will forwardly enough agree, that till *Chriſtianity was made the Religion of the Empire*, there were thoſe every-where that *heard* the Preachers of it ſo little, or ſo little *conſider'd* what they ſaid, that they rejected the Goſpel;) and that therefore Miracles or Force are neceſſary Means to make Men *hear and conſider*; you muſt own that thoſe who preach'd without the Power of Miracles, or the coactive Power of the Magiſtrate accompanying them, were unfurniſh'd of *competent and ſufficient Means to make Men hear and conſider*; and ſo to bring them to the true Religion, If you will ſay the Miracles done by others were enough to accompany their Preaching, to make it be *heard* and *conſider'd*; the Preaching of the Miniſters at this Day is ſo accompanied, and ſo will need no Aſſiſtance of Force from the Magiſtrate. If the Report of Miracles done by one Miniſter of the Goſpel ſome time before, and in another Place, were ſufficient to make the Preaching of ten or a thouſand others, be *heard* and *conſider'd*, why is it not ſo now? For the Credibility and Atteſtation of the Report is all that is of moment; when Miracles done by others, in other Places, are the Argument that prevails. But this, I fear, will not ſerve your Turn in the Buſineſs of Penalties; and whatever might ſatisfy you in the Caſe of Miracles, I doubt you would not think the Salvation of Souls ſufficiently provided for, if the Report of the Force of Penalties, uſed ſome time ſince on one Side of the *Tweed*, were all that ſhould aſſiſt the Preachers of the true Religion on the other, to make Men *hear and conſider*.

St. *Paul*, in his Epiſtle to *Titus*, inſtructs him what he, and the *Preſbyterians* he ſhould ordain in the Cities of *Crete*, were to do for the propagating of the Goſpel, and bringing Men heartily to embrace it. His Directions are, that they ſhould be *blameleſs*, not Rioters, *not ſelf-willed, not ſoon angry, not given to Wine or filthy Lucre, not Strikers, not unruly; Lovers of Hoſpitality, and of good Men; ſober, juſt, holy, temperate; To be able by ſound Doctrine, both to exhort and convince Gain-ſayers; In all Things to be a Pattern of good Works; In Doctrine, ſhewing Uncorruptedneſs, Gravity, Sincerity, ſound Speech that cannot be condemned, that he that is of the contrary Part may be aſhamed, having no Evil to ſay of you. Theſe Things ſpeak, and exhort, and rebuke with all Authority. Avoid fooliſh Queſtions, and Genealogies, and Contentions. A Man that is an Heretick, after the firſt and ſecond Admonition, reject.* To repay you the Favour of your *Greek*, it is παραίτου; which, if I may take your Liberty of receding from our Tranſlation, I would read *avoid*.

The *Cretans*, by the Account St. *Paul* gives of them, were a People that would require all the Means that were needful to prevail with any Strangers to the Goſpel, to *hear* and *conſider*. But yet we find nothing directed for the Support and Propagation of the Goſpel in this Iſland, but Preaching, Exhortation, Reproof, &c. with the Example of a good Life. In all this Epiſtle, writ on pupoſe to inſtruct the Preachers of the Goſpel, in the Means they were to uſe among the *Cretans*, for their Converſion, not a Word about Miracles, their Power or Uſe: Which one would think ſtrange, if they were the Means appointed, and neceſſary to make Men *hear* and *conſider*, and without which they would not do it. Preaching, Admonition, Exhortation, Entreaties, Inſtruction, by the common Light of Reaſon, were known, and natural to be uſed, to perſuade Men. There needed not be much ſaid to convince Men of it. But if Miracles were a neceſſary Means, it was a Means wholly new, unexpected, and out of the Power of other Treachers. And therefore one would think, if they were appointed for the Ends you propoſe, one ſhould hear ſomething of that Appointment: Since that they were to be uſed; or how; and when; was farther from common Apprehenſion, and ſeems to need ſome particular Direction.

If you ſay the ſame Spirit that gave them the Power of Miracles, would alſo give them the Knowledge both that they had it, and how to uſe it; I am far enough from limiting the Operations of that infinitely wiſe Spirit, who will not fail to bring all the Elect of God into the Obedience of Truth, by thoſe Means, and in that Manner he ſhall think neceſſary. But yet our Saviour, when he ſent abroad his Diſciples, with the Power of Miracles, not only put it in their Commiſſion, whereby they were informed that they had that extraordinary Gift, but added Inſtructions to them in the Uſe of it. *Freely you have received, freely give*; a Caution as neceſſary to the *Cretan* Elders, in the Uſe of Miracles, if they had that Power; there being nothing more liable to be turn'd to the Advantage of *filthy Lucre*.

I do not queſtion but the Spirit of God might give the Power, and ſtir up the Mind of the firſt Spreaders of the Goſpel to do *Miracles* on ſome extraordinary Occaſion. But if they were a neceſſary Means to make Men hear and conſider what was preached to them, till Force ſupplied their Place, and ſo were ordinarily to accompany the Preaching of the Goſpel, (unleſs it ſhould be preached without the Means appointed and neceſſary to make it prevail) I think, in that Caſe, we may expect it ſhould expreſly have made a Part of the Preacher's Commiſſion; it making a neceſſary Part of the effectual Execution of his Function.

But the Apoſtle, it ſeems, thought fit to lay the Streſs upon inſtructing others, and living well themſelves; upon being *inſtant in Seaſon, and out of Seaſon*; and therefore directs all his Advices for the ordering the *Cretan* Church, and propagating the Goſpel there, to make them attend to thoſe neceſſary Things of Life and Doctrine, without ſo much as mentioning the Appointment, Need, or Uſe of *Miracles*.

L. 1. p. 270. I ſaid, "But whatever Neglect or Averſion there is in ſome Men, impartially and "throughly to be inſtructed; there will, upon a due Examination (I fear) be found "no leſs a Neglect and Averſion in others, impartially and throughly to inſtruct "them. 'Tis not the talking even general Truths in plain and clear Language; much "leſs a Man's own Fancies in Scholaſtical or uncommon Ways of ſpeaking, an Hour "or two, once a Week, in publick; that is enough to inſtruct even willing Hear-"ers in the Way of Salvation, and the Grounds of their Religion: And that poli-tick Diſcourſes and Invectives from the Pulpit, inſtead of friendly and Chriſtian Debates with People at their Houſes, were not the proper Means to inform Men in the Foundations of Religion; and that if there were not a Neglect in this Part, I thought, there would be little need of any other Means. To this you tell me, in Pag. 43. the next Paragraph, You *do not ſee how pertinent* my *Diſcourſe, about this Matter, is to the preſent Queſtion.* If the ſhewing the Neglects, obſervable in the Uſe of what is agreed to be *neceſſary* Means, will not be allow'd by you to be pertinent, in a Debate about *neceſſary* Means; when poſſibly thoſe very Neglects may ſerve to make other Means ſeem requiſite, which really are not ſo: Yet if you are not of thoſe who will never think any ſuch Diſcourſe *pertinent*, you will allow me to mind you of it again, as not impertinent in anſwer to your laſt Letter, wherein you ſo often tell us of *the ſufficient Proviſion made for Inſtruction.* For where-ever the Neglect be, it can ſcarce be ſaid there is *ſufficient Proviſion* made for Inſtruction in a Chriſtian Country, where great Numbers of thoſe, who are in the Communion of the National Church, are groſly ignorant of the *Grounds of the* Chriſtian Religion. And I ask you whether it be in reſpect Ibid. of ſuch Conformiſts you ſay, as you do in the ſame Paragraph, That *when the beſt Proviſion* is *made* that *can* be, *for the Inſtruction of the People*, you *fear a great Part of them will ſtill need ſome moderate Penalties to bring them to hear and receive Inſtruction?*

But what if all the Means that can, be not uſed for their Inſtruction; That there are Neglects of this Kind, you will, I ſuppoſe, take the Word of a Reverend Pre-Paſtoral late of our Church, who thought he could not better *ſhew his good Will to the Clergy,* Care, *pag.* than by a ſeaſonable *Diſcourſe of the Paſtoral Care*, to cure that Neglect for the future. 115, 118. There he tells you, that *Miniſters ſhould watch over and feed their Flock, and not enjoy their Benefices as Farms*, &c. *Which Reproach*, ſays he, *(whatever we may be) our Church is free of*; which he proves by the *Stipulation* and *Covenant* they make with Chriſt, that they will *never ceaſe their Labour, Care and Diligence, till they have done all that lieth in them, according to their bounden Duty, towards all ſuch as are, or ſhould be committed to their Care, to bring them to a Ripeneſs of Age in Chriſt.* And a Page or two after, having repeated Part of the Promiſe made by thoſe who take Orders, he adds, *In this is expreſſed the ſo much* NEGLECTED, *but ſo neceſſary Duty, which Incumbents owe their Flock in a private Way; viſiting, inſtructing, and admoniſhing; which is one of the moſt uſeful and important Parts of their Duty, how generally ſoever it may be diſuſed or forgotten.* P. 178. He ſays, *Every Prieſt that minds his Duty will find, that no Part of it is ſo uſeful as Chatechiſtical Diſcourſes; by means whereof, his People will underſtand all his Sermons the better, when they had once a clear Notion of all thoſe Terms that muſt run through* Paſt. Care, *them; for thoſe not being underſtood, renders them all unintelligible. Another Part of the* pag. 201. *Prieſt's Duty*, he tells you, *is with Relation to them that are* without, *who are of the Side of the Church of* Rome, *or among the Diſſenters. Other Churches and Bodies are noted for their* Zeal *in making Proſelytes; for their reſtleſs Endeavours, as well as their unlawful Methods in it: They reckoning perhaps that all will be ſanctified by the increaſing their* PARTY; *which is the true Name of making Converts, except they become at the ſame*

time

time good Men, as well as Votaries to a Side or Cauſe. We are certainly very REMISS *in this of both Hands. Little Pains is taken to gain either upon Papiſts or Nonconformiſts: The* LAW HAS BEEN SO MUCH TRUSTED TO, *that that Method only was thought ſure; it was much valued, and others at the ſame Time as much* NEGLECTED. And whereas, *at firſt,* WITHOUT FORCE OR VIOLENCE, *in forty Years Time,* Popery, *from being the prevailing Religion, was reduced to a Handful, we have now in above twice that Number of Years, made very little Progreſs,* &c.

Perhaps here again you will tell me, you *do not ſee how this is pertinent to the preſent Queſtion;* Which, that you may ſee, give me leave to put you in mind, that neither you, nor any body elſe, can pretend Force *neceſſary,* till all the Means of Perſuaſion have been uſed, nothing *neglected* that can be done by all the ſofter Ways of Application. And ſince it is your own Doctrine, that Force is not lawful, unleſs where it is *neceſſary;* the Magiſtrate, upon your Principles, can neither lawfully uſe Force, nor the Miniſters of any National Church plead for it any where, but where they themſelves have firſt done their Duties: A Draught whereof, adapted to our preſent Circumſtances, we have in the newly publiſh'd *Diſcourſe of the Paſtoral Care.* And he that ſhall preſs the Uſe of Force as neceſſary, before he can anſwer it to himſelf and the World, that thoſe who have taken on them the Care of Souls have performed their Duties, were beſt conſider, whether he does not draw up an Accuſation againſt the Men of that Holy Order, or againſt the Magiſtrate who ſuffers them to neglect any Part of their Duty. For whilſt what that learned Biſhop, in the Paſſages above-cited, and in other Places, mentions, is *neglected,* it cannot be ſaid, that no *other Means but Force* is *left*; thoſe, who are on all hands acknowledg'd neceſſary and uſeful Means, not having yet been made uſe of.

To vindicate your Method from Novelty, you tell me, 'tis *as old as St.* Auſtin. Pag. 43.
Whatever he ſay in the Place you quote, it ſhews only his Opinion, but not that it was ever uſed. Therefore, to ſhew it not to be new in Practice, you add, that you *think it has been made uſe of by all thoſe Magiſtrates, who having made all requiſite Proviſions for the inſtructing their People in the Truth, have likewiſe requir'd them under convenient Penalties to embrace it.* Which is as much as to ſay, that thoſe Magiſtrates who uſed your Method, did uſe your Method. And that certainly you may *think* ſafely, and without fear of being gain-ſaid.

But now I will tell you what I think, in my Turn: And that is, if you could have found any Magiſtrates who had made uſe of your Method, as well as you think you have found a Divine that approves of it, you would have named thoſe Magiſtrates as forwardly as you do St. *Auſtin.* If I think amiſs, pray correct me yet, and name them.

That which makes me imagine you will hardly find any Examples of it, is what I there ſaid in theſe Words: "All other Law-makers have conſtantly taken this Me- La. p. 270.
"thod; that where any Thing was to be amended, the Fault was firſt declared, and
"then Penalties denounced againſt all thoſe, who after a Time ſet, ſhould be found
"guilty of it. This the common Senſe of Mankind, and the very Reaſon of Laws
"(which are intended not for Puniſhment, but Correction) has made ſo plain, that
"the ſubtileſt and moſt refined Law-makers have not gone out of this Courſe, nor
"have the moſt ignorant and barbarous Nations miſs'd it. But you have out-done
"*Solon* and *Lycurgus, Moſes* and our *Saviour*, and are reſolved to be a Law-maker of
"a Way by your ſelf. 'Tis an old and obſolete Way, and will not ſerve your Turn,
"to begin with Warnings and Threats of Penalties, to be inflicted on thoſe who do
"not reform, but continue to do that which you think they fail in. To allow of
"Impunity to the Innocent, or the Opportunity of Amendment to thoſe who would
"avoid the Penalties, are Formalities not worth your Notice. You are for a ſhorter
"and ſurer Way. Take a whole Tribe, and puniſh them at all Adventures, whe-
"ther guilty or no of the Miſcarriage which you would have amended; or without
"ſo much as telling them what it is you would have them do, but leaving them to
"find it out if they can. All theſe Abſurdities are contained in your Way of Pro-
"ceeding, and are impoſſible to be avoided by any one, who will puniſh Diſſenters,
"and only Diſſenters, to make them *conſider and weigh the Grounds of their Religion,*
"and *impartially examine whether it be true or no, and* upon *what Grounds they took it up;*
"that ſo they may *find* and *embrace the Truth that muſt ſave them.* Theſe Abſurdities,
"I fear, muſt be remov'd, before any Magiſtrates will find your Method practicable.

I ima-

I having ſaid, " Your Method is not altogether unlike the Plea made uſe of to " excuſe the late barbarous Uſage of the Proteſtants in *France*, from being a Perſe- " cution for Religion, *viz.* That it was not a Puniſhment for Religion but for diſo- " beying the King's Laws, which requir'd them to come to Maſs: So by your Rule, " Diſſenters muſt be puniſh'd, not for the Religion they have embraced, and the Reli-
Pag. 44. " gion, they have rejected. In anſwer to this, in the next Paragraph, you take abundance of Pains to prove, that the King of *France*'s Laws, that require going to Maſs, are no Laws. You were beſt to ſay ſo on the other ſide of the Water. 'Tis ſure the Puniſhments were Puniſhments, and the Dragooning was Dragooning. And if you think that Plea excus'd them not, I am of your Mind. But nevertheleſs am
Ibid. of Opinion, as I was, that it will prove as good a Plea as yours. Which is what you argue againſt in your next Paragraph, in the Words following, wherein you examine *the Likeneſs of* your *new Method to this Plea.* You tell me, I *ſay, by your Rule, the Diſſenters (from the true Religion, for* you *ſpeak of no other) muſt be puniſh'd (or if* I *pleaſe, ſubjected to moderate Penalties, ſuch as ſhall make them uneaſy, but neither deſtroy or undo them:) For what?* Indeed I thought by your firſt Book, you meant not for their Religion, but to make them conſider; but here you ask me *where* it is you *ſay that Diſſenters from the true Religion, are not to be puniſh'd for their Religion?* " So then it ſeems, in your Opinion now, *Diſſenters from the true Religion are to be puniſh'd*, or (as you are pleaſed to mollify the Expreſſion, for the Thing is the ſame) *ſubjected to moderate Penalties for their Religion.* I think I ſhall not need to prove, to any one but one of your nice Stile, that the Execution of Penal Laws, let the Penalties be great or ſmall, are Puniſhments.

If therefore *the Religion of Diſſenters from the true*, be a Fault to be *puniſh'd* by the Magiſtrate; Who is to judge who are guilty of that Fault? Muſt it be the Magiſtrate every where, or the Magiſtrate in ſome Countries, and not in others, or the Magiſtrate no where? If the *Magiſtrate* no where is to be Judge who are Diſſenters from the true Religion, he can no where puniſh them. If he be to be every where Judge, then the King of *France*, or the Great *Turk*, muſt puniſh thoſe whom they judge Diſſenters from the true Religion, as well as other Potentates. If ſome Magiſtrates have a Right to judge, and others not; That yet, I fear, (how abſurd ſoever it be) ſhould I grant it, will not do your Buſineſs. For beſides that, they will hardly agree to make you their infallible Umpire in the Caſe, to determine who of them have, and who have not this Right to judge which is the *true Religion*: or if they ſhould, and you ſhould declare the King of *England* had that Right, *(viz.* whilſt he complied to ſupport the Orthodoxy, Eccleſiaſtical Polity, and thoſe Ceremonies which you approve of;) But that the King of *France*, and the Great *Turk*, had it not, and ſo could have no Right to uſe Force on thoſe they judg'd *Diſſenters from the true Religion*; You ought to bethink your ſelf what you will reply to one that
A. p. 16. ſhould uſe your own Words; *If ſuch a Degree of outward Force, as has been mentioned, be really of great and even neceſſary Uſe, for the advancing of the true Religion, and Salvation of Souls, then it muſt be acknowledg'd, that in* France *and* Turky, *&c. there is a Right ſomewhere to uſe it, for the advancing thoſe Ends; unleſs we will ſay (what without Impiety cannot be ſaid) that the wiſe and benign Diſpoſer and Governor of all Things, has not in* France *and* Turky *furniſh'd Mankind with competent Means for the promoting his own Honour, and the Good of Souls.*

Pag. 44. You go on, and tell us, they are to be puniſh'd, not for following the Light of their own Reaſon, nor for obeying the Dictates of their own Conſciences, *but rather for the contrary. For the Light of their own Reaſon, and the Dictates of their own Conſcience (if their Reaſon and their Conſciences were not perverted and abuſed) would undoubtedly lead them to the ſame Thing, to which the Method* you *ſpeak of is deſigned to bring them*; i. e. to the ſame Thing to which your *Reaſon* and your *Conſcience* leads you. For if you were to argue with a *Papiſt*, or a *Presbyterian*, in the Caſe, What Privilege have you to tell him, that his *Reaſon* and *Conſcience* is *perverted*, more than he has to tell you that yours is ſo? Unleſs it be this inſupportable Preſumption, that your *Reaſon* and *Conſcience* ought to be the Meaſure of all *Reaſon* and *Conſcience* in all others, which how you can claim, without pretending to Infallibility, is not eaſy to diſcern.

The Diverſion you give your ſelf about the Likeneſs and Unlikeneſs of thoſe two Pleas, I ſhall not trouble my ſelf with; ſince, when your Fit of Mirth was over, you
Pag. 45. were forced to confeſs, That as I *have made your Plea for* you, you *think there is no conſiderable Defference, as to the* Fairneſs *of them, excepting what ariſes from the different* Degrees

Degrees of Puniſhment, in the French *Diſcipline, and* your *Method. But if the* French *Plea be not true; and that which* I *make to be* yours, *be not* yours; —— I muſt beg your Pardon, Sir, I did not think it was your Opinion, (nor do I yet remember that you any where ſaid in your *A. &c.*) that Men were to be puniſh'd for their Religion; but that it was purely to make Men *examine the Religion they had embraced, and the Religion that they had rejected.* And if that were of moment, I ſhould think my ſelf ſufficiently juſtified for this my Miſtake, by what you ſay in your *Argument, &c.* from *p.* 6. to 12. But ſince you explain your ſelf otherwiſe here, I am not unwilling to take your Hypotheſis, as you from time to time ſhall pleaſe to reform it. You anſwer then, That to *make them examine, is indeed the next End for* Pag. 451. *which they are to be puniſh'd. But what is that to* my *Queſtion? Which, if it be pertinent, demands for what Fault, not for what End, they are to be puniſh'd: As appears even by* my *next Words.* " So that they are puniſh'd, not for having offended againſt a Law, " *(i. e. not for any Fault;)* for there is no Law in *England* that requires them to examine. This, I muſt confeſs, was to ſhew, that here, as in *France*, whatever was pretended, yet the true Reaſon why People were puniſh'd, was their Religion. And it was for this Agreement, that in both Places Religion was meant, though ſomething elſe was talked of, that I ſaid your Plea was like that made uſe of in *France*. But I ſee I might have ſpared my Pains to prove that you puniſh Diſſenters for their Religion, ſince you here own it.

You tell me, in the ſame Place, I was impertinent in my Queſtion, (which was this, *For what then are they to be puniſh'd?*) that I demanded for what *End*, and not for what *Fault* they are to be puniſh'd. In good earneſt, Sir, I was not ſo ſubtile as to diſtinguiſh them. I always thought that the *End* of all Laws was to amend thoſe Faults which were forbidden; and that when any one was puniſh'd, the *Fault* for which he was puniſh'd, was the Tranſgreſſion of the Law, in that Particular which was by the Law commanded or forbidden; and the End of the Puniſhment, was the Amendment of that *Fault* for the future. For Example; if the Law commanded to *hear*, not *Hearing* was the Fault puniſh'd; and the End of that Puniſhment, was to make the Offenders *hear*. If the Law commanded to *examine*, the *Fault* puniſh'd, when that Law was put in Execution, was not *Examining*; and the *End* of the Puniſhment, to make the Offenders *examine*. If the Law commanded Conformity, the *Fault* was Nonconformity, and the *End* of it to make Men conform.

This was my Apprehenſion concerning Laws, and Ends of Puniſhment. And I muſt own my ſelf ſtill ſo dull as not to diſtinguiſh otherwiſe between the *Fault for which* Men *are to be puniſh'd, and the End for which they are to be puniſh'd*; but only as the one is paſt, the other future. The Tranſgreſſion, or Fault, is an Omiſſion or Action that a Man is already guilty of; the *End* of the Puniſhment, that it be not again repeated. So that if a Man be puniſh'd for the Religion he profeſſes, I can ſee no other *End* for which he is puniſh'd, but to make him quit that Religion. No other immediate *End* I mean; for other remote *Ends*, to which this is ſubordinate, it may have. So that if *not examining* the Religion which Men have embraced, and the Religion they have rejected, be not the Fault for which Men are puniſh'd; I would be glad you would ſhew me how it can be the *next End*, as you ſay it is, of their being puniſh'd. And that you may not think my Dullneſs gives you a Labour without Ground, I will tell you the Reaſon why I cannot find any other *next End* of Puniſhment, but the Amendment of the Fault forbidden; and that is, Becauſe that ſeems to me to be the *End*, the *next End*, of any Action; which, when obtain'd, the Action is to ceaſe, and not ceaſe till it be attain'd. And thus, I think, it is, in Puniſhments ordain'd by the Law. When the Fault forbiddon is amended, the Puniſhment is to ceaſe, and not till then. This is the only Way I have to know the *End*, or final Cauſe for which any Action is done. If you have any other, you will do me a Kindneſs to inſtruct me. This 'tis which makes me conclude, (and I think with me all thoſe who have not had the Leiſure and Happineſs to attain the utmoſt refining of the Schools) that if their Religion be the Fault for which Diſſenters are puniſh'd, Examining is not the End for which they are puniſh'd, but the Change of their Religion: Though Examining may, perhaps, in ſome Men, precede their Change, and help to it. But that is not neceſſary. A Man may change his Religion without it: And when he has chang'd, let the Motive be what it will, the *End* the Law aims at, is obtain'd, and the Puniſhment ceaſes. So on the other ſide, If *not Hearing, not Examining*, be the *Fault* for which Men are puniſh'd, Conformity is not the *next End*

End for which they are puniſh'd, though it may perhaps, in ſome, be a Conſequence of it; but *Hearing* and *Examining* muſt be underſtood to be the *Ends* for which they are puniſh'd. If they are not the *Ends*, why does the Puniſhment ceaſe, when thoſe *Ends* are attain'd? And thus you have my Thoughts concerning this Matter, which perhaps will not be very pertinent (as mine have not the good Luck always to be to you) to a Man of nicer Diſtinctions.

But let us conſider your Hypotheſis as it now ſtands, and ſee what Advantage you have got to your Cauſe by this new Explication. *Diſſenters from the true Religion are to be puniſh'd*, ſay you, *for their Religion.* Why? Becauſe 'tis a *Fault.* Againſt whom? Againſt God. Thence it follows indeed, that God, if he pleaſes, may puniſh it. But how will you prove that God has given the Magiſtrates of the Earth a Power to puniſh all Faults againſt himſelf? Covetouſneſs, or not loving our Neighbour as our ſelves, are Faults or Sins againſt God. Ought the Magiſtrate to puniſh theſe? But I ſhall not need to trouble you much with that Queſtion. This Matter, I think, will be decided between us without going ſo far.

If the Magiſtrate may puniſh any one for not being of the true Religion, muſt the Magiſtrate judge what is that true Religion, or no? If he muſt not, what muſt guide him in the puniſhing of ſome, and not of others? For ſo it is in all Places where there is a National Religion eſtabliſh'd by Penal Laws. If the Magiſtrate be commiſſion'd by the ſame Law of Nature (for that is all the Commiſſion you pretend to) to judge what is the true Religion, by which he is authorized to puniſh thoſe who diſſent from it; Muſt not all Magiſtrates judge, and accordingly puniſh thoſe who diſſent from that, which they judge the true Religion, *i. e.* in effect, thoſe who diſſent from theirs? And if all Magiſtrates have a Power to puniſh thoſe who are not of their Religion, I ask you, Whether it be of more Uſe or Diſadvantage to the promoting *true Religion*, and *Salvation of Souls?* And when you have reſolved that Queſtion, you will then be able to tell me, whether the Uſefulneſs of it (which muſt be determin'd by the greater Good or Harm it is like to do) is ſuch as to juſtify your Doctrine about it, or the Magiſtrate's Uſe of it.

Beſides, your making the Diſſenting from the true Religion a *Fault* to be puniſh'd by the Magiſtrate, puts an End to your Pretence to *moderate* Puniſhments; which, in this Place, you make uſe of to diſtinguiſh yours from the *French* Method; ſaying, That your *Method puniſhes Men with Puniſhments which do not deſerve to be called ſo, when compared with thoſe of the* French *Diſcipline.* But if the Diſſenting from the true Religion, be a *Fault* that the Magiſtrate is to puniſh, and a *Fault* of that Conſequence, that it draws with it the Loſs of a Man's Soul; I do not ſee how other Magiſtrates, whoſe Duty it is to puniſh Faults under their Cognizance, and by puniſhing to amend them, can be more remiſs than the King of *France* has been, and forbear declaring that they will have all their People ſaved, and endeavour by
Pag. 8. ſuch Ways as he has done to effect it: Eſpecially ſince you tell us, That *God* now *leaves Religion to the Care of Men, under his ordinary Providence, to try whether they will do their Duties in their ſeveral Capacities or not, leaving them anſwerable for all that may follow from their Neglect.* In the Correcting of Faults, *malo nodo malus cuneus*, is not only what is juſtifiable, but what is requiſite. But of this more fully in another Place.

In the next Place; I do not ſee how, by your Method, as you explain it here, the Magiſtrate can puniſh any one for not being of the true Religion, (though we ſhould
Pag. 45. grant him to have a Power to do it) whilſt you tell us, That your *Method puniſhes Men for rejecting the true Religion, propoſed to them with ſufficient Evidence, which certainly is a Fault.* By this Part of your Scheme it is plain, that you allow the Magiſtrate to puniſh none but thoſe to *whom the true Religion is propos'd with ſufficient*
Pag. 53. *Evidence*; and ſufficient Evidence, you tell us, *is ſuch as will certainly win Aſſent where-ever it is duly conſider'd.* Now by this Rule, there will be very few that the Magiſtrate will have Right to puniſh; ſince he cannot know whether thoſe who diſſent, do it for want of *due Conſideration* in them, or want of *ſufficient Evidence* in what is propoſed; unleſs you mean by *due Conſideration*, ſuch *Conſideration* that always does bring Men actually to aſſent; which is in effect to ſay nothing at all. For then your Rule amounts to thus much, *That ſufficient Evidence is ſuch as will certainly win Aſſent where-ever it is conſider'd duly*, i. e. ſo as to win Aſſent. This being like ſome of thoſe other Rules we have met with, and ending in a Circle, which after you have traced, you at laſt find your ſelf juſt where you were at ſetting out;

I leave

I leave it to you to own as you think fit: And tell you, if by *duly conſidering*, you mean conſidering to his utmoſt; that then, that which is propos'd to one with *ſufficient Evidence to win Aſſent*, may not be ſo to another.

There are Propoſitions extant in Geometry, with their Demonſtrations annexed, and that with ſuch ſufficient Evidence to ſome Men of deep Thought and Penetration, as to make them ſee the Demonſtration, and give Aſſent to the Truth: Whilſt there are many others, and thoſe no Novices in Mathematicks, who with all the Conſideration and Attention they can uſe, are never able to attain unto it. 'Tis ſo in other Parts of Truth. That which hath Evidence enough to make one Man certain, has not enough to make another ſo much as gueſs it to be true, tho' he has ſpared no Endeavour or Application in examining it. And therefore, if the Magiſtrate be to puniſh none but thoſe who *reject the true Religion*, when it has been offer'd *with ſufficient Evidence*, I imagine he will not have many to puniſh, if he will, as he ought, diſtinguiſh between the Innocent and the Guilty.

Upon your Forwardneſs to encourage the Magiſtrate's uſe of Force in Matters of Religion, by its Uſefulneſs, even ſo far as to pretend Advantages from what your ſelf acknowledge the Miſapplication of it, I ſay that "So inſtead of diſheartning L. 2. p. 171.
"from, you give Encouragement to the Miſchief; which, upon your Principle, join-
"ed to the natural Thirſt in Man after arbitrary Power, may be carried to all Man-
"ner of Exorbitancy, with ſome Pretence of Right. To which your Reply is, That Pag. 73.
you *ſpeak* no where *but of the Uſe and Neceſſity of Force*. What think you in the Place mention'd, of the *Gain* that you tell the Sufferers they ſhall make by the Magiſtrate's puniſhing them to bring them to a wrong Religion? You do not, as I remember, there ſay, that Force is *neceſſary* in that Caſe; tho' they *gaining*, as you ſay, by it this Advantage, that *they know better than they did before, where the Truth does lie*, you cannot but allow, that ſuch a Miſapplication of Force *may do ſome Service indirectly and at a diſtance, towards the Salvation of Souls*.

But that you may not think, whilſt I had under Conſideration the dangerous Encouragement you gave to Men in Power, to be very buſy with their Force in Matters of Religion, by all the Sorts of Uſefulneſs you could imagine of it, however apply'd, right or wrong, that I declin'd mentioning the *Neceſſity* you pretend of Force, becauſe it would not as well ſerve to the Purpoſe for which I mention its Uſefulneſs; I ſhall here take it ſo, that the Reader may ſee what Reaſon you had to complain of my not doing it before.

Thus then ſtands your Syſtem. *The procuring and advancing any way of the ſpiritual and eternal Intereſts of Men, is one of the Ends of Civil Society*. And Force is put into the Magiſtrate's Hands, as neceſſary for the attaining thoſe Ends, where *no other Means are left*, "Who then upon your Grounds may quickly find Reaſon, where it ſutes his Incli-
"nation, or ſerves his Turn, to puniſh Men directly to bring them to his Religion. For if he may uſe Force becauſe it is *neceſſary*, as being the only Means left to make Men conſider thoſe Reaſons and Arguments, which otherwiſe they would not conſider, Why may he not by the ſame Rule of Force, as the only Means left to procure Men Degrees of Glory, which otherwiſe they would not attain, and ſo to advance their eternal Intereſts? For St. *Paul* aſſures us, that *the Afflictions of this Life work for us a far more exceeding Weight of Glory*. So that whether the Magiſtrate may not, when it may ſerve his Turn, argu'd thus from your Principles, judge you: Diſſenters from my Religion muſt be puniſh'd, if in the wrong, to bring them into the right Way; if in the right, to make them by their Sufferings *Gainers* of a far more exceeding Weight of Glory. Ibid.

But you ſay, *Unleſs it be as neceſſary for Men to attain any greater Degree of Glory, as it is to attain Glory, it will not follow, that if the Magiſtrate may uſe Force, becauſe it may be indirectly, &c. uſeful towards the procuring* any Degree *of Glory, he may by the ſame Rule uſe it where it may be in that Manner uſeful towards the procuring a greater Degree of Glory. But that there is the ſame Neceſſity of Mens attaining a greater Degree of Glory, as there is of their attaining Glory, no Man will affirm. For without attaining* Glory, *they cannot eſcape the Damnation of Hell, which yet they may eſcape, without any* greater Degree *of Glory*. One of the *Ends* of a Common-wealth is, ſay you, the *advancing Mens eternal Intereſts*. The procuring of greater Degrees of Glory, is the advancing a Man's eternal Intereſt. The Uſe of Force to make Men ſuffer for the Truth, what otherwiſe they would not ſuffer, is as *neceſſary* for the attaining an higher Degree of Glory, as uſing Force to make Men conſider, what otherwiſe they would not conſider, is *neceſſary* for the attaining any Degree of Glory. But you will ſay, *Attaining* Ibid.

Glory is abſolutely neceſſary, but the attaining any greater Degree of Glory, however deſirable, is not ſo neceſſary. Now if there be not the ſame Neceſſity of the one of theſe, as there is of the other, there can be no Pretence to ſay, that whatever is lawful in reſpect of one of them, is likewiſe ſo in reſpect of the other. But there will always be a juſt Pretence to ſay, if *advancing the eternal Intereſts* of Men be one of the Ends of a Common-wealth, and that the Force in the Magiſtrate's Hands be neceſſary to the attaining that End; that then the Magiſtrate is obliged to uſe it; whether you will think that End *abſolutely neceſſary*, or as *neceſſary* as another, or no, I ſhall not here trouble you again with your Miſtake about what is *abſolutely neceſſary*, having taken notice of it in another Place. Only I ſhall deſire you to ſhew me, that the *attaining of Glory is abſolutely neceſſary*, when next Time you have Occaſion to affirm it. *Attaining of Glory* is neceſſary in order to Happineſs: And atttaining a greater Degree of Glory, is neceſſary in order to greater Happineſs: But neither of them is *abſolutely neceſſary*, but in order to their reſpective Ends.

And now, though, as you ſay, you *do not think* your *ſelf bound to take notice of all that may be done with ſome Pretence of Right*: Yet, I ſuppoſe, upon cooler Thoughts, when you have conſider'd of what dangerous Conſequence an Argument, manag'd as yours is, may be to the true Religion, and the ſincere Profeſſors of it; and what Occaſion or Encouragement it may give to Men in Power warm'd with Zeal, and excited by the *proper Miniſters* of their own Religion, to make a wrong and exorbitant Uſe of Force in Matters of Religion, you will another Time think your ſelf bound not to let it go abroad again without ſome Caution to the Magiſtrate in the Uſe of it; without one Word of Advice at leaſt, that ſince it is given him, as you ſay, only for *promoting the true Religion*, he ſhould take Care, and examine impartially whether what he employs it for, be the one only true Religion. It being your Opinion, whenever he makes uſe of Force in Matters of Religion, for the promoting any Thing but that, he goes beyond his Commiſſion, injures his Subjects, and endangers his own Soul.

By this time, Sir, I ſuppoſe you ſee upon what Grounds I think you have not clear'd thoſe Difficulties which were charg'd by me on your Method: And my Reader will ſee what Reaſon there was for thoſe Imputations, which, with ſo loud an Outcry, you laid upon me of unfair Dealing; ſince there is not one of them which cannot be made good to be contain'd either in your Book, or in your Hypotheſis; and that ſo clearly, that I could not imagine that a Man who had ſo far conſider'd Government, as to engage in Print, in ſuch a Controverſy as this, could miſs ſeeing it as ſoon as mention'd to him. One of them which very much offends you, and makes you ſo often tell me what I ſay is *impertinent*, and *nothing to the Purpoſe*; and ſometimes to uſe warmer Expreſſions, is, that I argue againſt a Power in the Magiſtrate to bring Men to his own Religion: For I could not imagine that, to a Man of any Thought, it could need proving; that if there were a Commiſſion given to all *Magiſtrates* by *the Law of Nature*, which obliged them to uſe Force to bring Men to *the true Religion*, it was not poſſible for them to put this Commiſſion in Execution, without being Judges *what was the true Religion*; and then there needed no great Quickneſs to perceive, that every *Magiſtrate*, when your Commiſſion came to be put in Execution, would, one as well as another, find himſelf obliged to uſe Force to bring Men to that which he believed to be the true Religion. But ſince this was ſo hard for you to ſee, I now have been at the Pains to prove it, and thereby to clear all thoſe Imputations. I ſhall not inſtance in any other: They are all of a like Kind. Only where you complain I have not cited your Words fairly, if you can ſhew that I have done it any where in this or the *Second Letter*, to the Advantage of my Cauſe; or to avoid any Argument in them, not anſwer'd; if you pleaſe to ſhew it me, I ſhall either let you ſee your Miſtake, or acknowledge mine.

And now whether you ſhall think what I have ſaid worth that Conſideration you
Pag. 78. promiſe, to take it all for *Cavils and Impertinencies*, to me is very indifferent. Enjoy, if you pleaſe, that ſhort and eaſy Way of anſwering. But if the *Party you write for*, be, as you ſay, *God, and the Souls of Men*, it will require you ſeriouſly to weigh your Scheme, examine and put together the Parts of it, obſerve its Tendency and Conſequences; and in a Word, conſider Things, and not Words. For the *Party of God and Souls* needs not any Help from Obſcurity or Uncertainty of general and equivocal Terms, but may be ſpoke out clearly and diſtinctly; needs no Retreat in the Round of equivalent, or the Uncertainty of miſapply'd Expreſſions, that may ſerve to amuſe

and

and deceive the Unwary, but inſtruct no body; and laſtly, needs no Leave nor Allowance from *Men of Art*, to direct both Subjects and Magiſtrates to the Examination of the *Scriptures*, wherein God has reveal'd to the World the Ways and Means of Salvation. In doing of this, in a Treatiſe where you profeſs *the Subject of your Enquiry is only what Method is to be uſed to bring Men to the true Religion*; the *Party* you profeſs to write for, would have juſtified you againſt the Rules of any lawful *Art*; and no Chriſtian Man, of what *Art* ſoever, would have denied you that Liberty: And if I miſtake not, the *Party*, you ſay you write for, demands it of you. Pag. 68.

If you find upon a Review of the Whole, that you have manag'd your Cauſe for *God and the Souls of Men*, with that Sincerity and Clearneſs that ſatisfies your own Reaſon, and you think may ſatisfy that of other Men, I ſhall congratulate to you ſo happy a Conſtitution. But if all your magnified and *neceſſary* Means of Force, in the Way you contend for, reaches no farther than to bring Men to a bare outward Conformity to the Church of *England*, wherein you can ſedately affirm, that it is *preſumable* that all that are of it are ſo upon Reaſon and Conviction; I ſuppoſe there needs no more to be ſaid to convince the World what *Party* you write for.

The *Party* you *write* for is *God*, you ſay. But if all you have ſaid aims or amounts to nothing more, than that the Church of *England*, as now eſtabliſh'd by Law, in its Doctrines, Ceremonies and Diſcipline, ſhould be ſupported by the Power of the *Magiſtrate*, and Men by Force be driven into it; I fear the World will think you have very narrow Thoughts of God; or that that is not the *Party* you write for. 'Tis true, you all along ſpeak of bringing Men *to the true Religion*. But to evidence to you, that by *the only true Religion*, you mean only that of the Church of *England*, I tell you, that upon your Principles, you cannot name any other Church now in the World, (and I again demand of you to do it) for the promoting whereof, or puniſhing Diſſenters from it, the *Magiſtrate* has the ſame Right to uſe Force, as you pretend he has here in *England*. Till you therefore name ſome ſuch other true Church and true Religion, beſides that of *England*, your ſaying, that *God is the Party you write for*, will rather ſhew that you made bold with his Name, than that you do not write for another *Party*.

You ſay too, you write not *for any Party, but the Souls of Men*. You write indeed, and contend earneſtly, that Men ſhould be brought into an outward Conformity to the Church of *England*. But that they embrace that Profeſſion upon Reaſon and Conviction, you are content to have it *preſumable*, without any farther Enquiry or Examination. And thoſe who are once in the outward Communion of the National Church, however ignorant or irreligious they are, you leave there unaſſiſted by your only *competent Means, Force*; without which, you tell us, the *true Religion, by its own Light and Strength, is not able to prevail* againſt Mens Luſts, and the Corruption of Nature, ſo as to be conſider'd as it ought, and heartily embraced. And this dropped not from your Pen by chance; but you profeſſedly make Excuſes for thoſe of the National Religion, who are ignorant of the *Grounds* of it, and give us Reaſons why Force cannot be uſed to thoſe who outwardly conform, to make them conſider ſo as ſincerely to embrace, believe and obey the Truth that muſt ſave them. But the Reverend Author of the *Paſtoral Care* tells you, *PAKTY is the true Name of making Converts, except they become at the ſame Time good Men.* Pag. 201.

If the Uſe of Force be neceſſary for the Salvation of Souls, and Mens Souls be the *Party* you write for; you will be ſuſpected to have betrayed your *Party*, if your Method and neceſſary Means of Salvation reach no farther, than to bring Men to outward Conformity, tho' to the true Church; and after that abandons them to their *Luſts* and *depraved Natures*, deſtitute of the Help of Force, your *neceſſary* and *competent Means* of Salvation.

This Way of managing the Matter, whatever you intend, ſeems rather, in the Fitneſs of it, to be for another *Party*. But ſince you aſſure us, you write for nothing but *God and Mens Souls*, it can only be ſaid you had a good Intention, but ill Luck; ſince your Scheme, put into the Language of the Country, will fit any National Church and Clergy in the World, that can but ſuppoſe it ſelf the true; and that I preſume none of them will fail to do.

You were more than ordinary reſerv'd and gracious, when you tell me, That *what Party* I *write for*, you *will not undertake to ſay*. But having told me, that my Letter tends *to the promoting of Scepticiſm in Religion*, you thought ('tis like) that was ſufficient to ſhew the *Party* I write for; and ſo you might ſafely end your Pag. 79.

Letter

Letter with Words that looked like civil. But that you may another time be a little better informed what *Party* I write for, I will tell you. They are thoſe who in every Nation *fear God, work Righteouſneſs, and are accepted with him*; and not thoſe who in every Nation are zealous for human Conſtitutions, cry up nothing ſo much as outward Conformity to the National Religion, and are accepted by thoſe who are the Promoters of it. Thoſe that I write for are thoſe, who, according to the Light of their own Conſciences, are every where in earneſt in Matters of their own Salvation, without any Deſire to impoſe on others; a *Party* ſo ſeldom favour'd by any of the Powers or Sects of the World; a *Party* that has ſo few Preferments to beſtow; ſo few Benefices to reward the Endeavour of any one who appears for it, that I conclude I ſhall eaſily be believ'd when I ſay, that neither Hopes of Preferment, nor a Deſign to recommend my ſelf to thoſe I live amongſt, has biaſſed my Underſtanding, or miſled me in my Undertaking. So much Truth as ſerves the Turn of any particular Church, and can be accommodated to the narrow Intereſt of ſome human Conſtitution, is indeed often receiv'd with Applauſe, and the Publiſher finds his Account in it. But I think I may ſay, Truth (in its full Latitude of thoſe generous Principles of the Goſpel, which ſo much recommend and inculcate univerſal Charity, and a Freedom from the Inventions and Impoſitions of Men in the Things of God,) has ſo ſeldom had a fair and favourable Hearing any where, that he muſt be very ignorant of the Hiſtory and Nature of Man, however dignify'd and diſtinguiſhed, who propoſes to himſelf any ſecular Advantage by writing for her at that rate.

As to your Requeſt in the Cloſe of your Letter, I hope this will ſatisfy you, that you might have ſpar'd it; and you, with the reſt of the World, will ſee that all I writ in my former was ſo *true*, that you need not have given me any Caution for the future. As to the *Pertinence* of what I ſay, I doubt whether I ſhall pleaſe you: Becauſe I find by your laſt Letter, that what is brought by me to ſhew the Weakneſs, Abſurdities, or Inſignificancy of what you write, you are very apt to call *impertinent*, and *nothing to the Purpoſe*. You muſt pardon me therefore, if I have endeavour'd more to pleaſe other Readers than you in that Point. I hope they will find, in what I have ſaid, not much beſides the Matter. But to a Man who, ſuppoſing himſelf in the right, builds all upon that Suppoſition, and takes it for an Injury to have that Privilege deny'd him; to a Man who would ſovereignly decide for all the World, what is the *true Religion*, and thereby impower what Magiſtrates he thinks fit, and what not, to uſe Force; to ſuch a Man, not to ſeem *impertinent*, would be really to be ſo. This makes me pleas'd with your Reply to ſo many Paſſages of my Letter, that they were *nothing to the Purpoſe*: And 'tis in your Choice whether in your Opinion any Thing in this ſhall be ſo.

But ſince this depends upon your keeping ſteadily to clear and ſettled Notions of Things, ſeparate from Words and Expreſſions uſed in a doubtful and undetermin'd
Pag. 78. Signification, wherewith *Men of Art* often amuſe themſelves and others; I ſhall not be ſo unreaſonable as to expect, whatever you promiſe, that you ſhould lay by your Learning to embrace Truth, and own what will not perhaps ſute very well with your Circumſtances and Intereſt.

I ſee, my Deſign, not to omit any Thing that you might think looks like an Argument in yours, has made mine grow beyond the Size of a Letter. But an Anſwer to any one being very little different from a Letter, I ſhall let it go under that Title. I have in it alſo endeavour'd to bring the ſcatter'd Parts of your Scheme into ſome Method, under diſtinct Heads, to give a fuller and more diſtinct View of them. Wherein, if any of the Arguments, which gives Support to your Hypotheſis, have eſcaped me unawares, be pleaſed to ſhew them me; and I ſhall either acknowledge their Force, or endeavour to ſhew their Weakneſs. I am,

SIR,

Your moſt Humble Servant,

June 20, 1692.

PHILANTHROPUS.

THE

THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY,

As deliver'd in the

SCRIPTURES.

THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY, As delivered in the SCRIPTURES.

THE

PREFACE.

THE little Satisfaction and Conſiſtency is to be found in moſt of the Syſtems of Divinity I have met with, made me betake myſelf to the ſole reading of the Scripture (to which they all appeal) for the underſtanding the Chriſtian Religion. What from thence by an attentive and unbiaſſed Search I have received, Reader, I here deliver to thee. If by this my Labour thou receiveſt any Light or Confirmation in the Truth, join with me in Thanks to the Father of Lights for his Condeſcenſion to our Underſtandings. If upon a fair and unprejudiced Examination, thou findeſt I have miſtaken the Senſe and Tenor of the Goſpel, I beſeech thee, as a true Chriſtian, in the Spirit of the Goſpel (which is that of Charity) and in the Words of Sobriety, ſet me right in the Doctrine of Salvation.

THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY,

As deliver'd in the

SCRIPTURES.

THIS obvious to any one who reads the New-Teſtament, that the Doctrine of Redemption, and conſequently of the Goſpel, is founded upon the Suppoſition of *Adam*'s Fall. To underſtand therefore what we are reſtored to by Jeſus Chriſt, we muſt conſider what the Scripture ſhews we loſt by *Adam*. This I thought worthy of a diligent and unbiaſſed Search: Since I found the two Extremes, that Men run into on this Point, either on the one hand ſhook the Foundations of all Religion, or on the other made Chriſtianity almoſt nothing. For whilſt ſome Men would have all *Adam*'s Poſterity doomed to eternal infinite Puniſhment for the Tranſgreſſion of *Adam*, whom Millions had never heard of, and no one had authorized to tranſact for him, or be his Repreſentative; this ſeemed to others ſo little conſiſtent with the Juſtice or Goodneſs of the Great and Infinite God, that they thought there was no Redemption neceſſary, and conſequently that there was none, rather than admit of it upon a Suppoſition ſo derogatory to the Honour and Attributes of that infinite Being; and ſo made Jeſus Chriſt nothing but the Reſtorer and Preacher of pure Natural Religion; thereby doing Violence to the whole Tenor of the New Teſtament. And, indeed, both ſides will be ſuſpected to have treſpaſſed this way, againſt the written Word of God, by any one, who does but take it to be a Collection of Writings deſigned by God for the Inſtruction of the illiterate bulk of Mankind in the Way to Salvation; and therefore generally and in neceſſary Points to be underſtood in the plain direct Meaning of the Words and Phraſes, ſuch as they may be ſuppoſed to have had in the Mouths of the Speakers, who uſed them according to the Language of that Time and Country wherein they lived, without ſuch learned, artificial, and forced Senſes of them, as are ſought out, and put upon them in moſt of the Syſtems of Divinity, according to the Notions, that each one has been bred up in.

To one that thus unbiaſſed reads the Scriptures, what *Adam* fell from, is viſible, was the State of perfect Obedience, which is called *Juſtice* in the New Teſtament, though the Word which in the Original ſignifies *Juſtice*, be tranſlated *Righteouſneſs*: And by this Fall he loſt Paradiſe, wherein was Tranquillity and the Tree of Life, *e. i.* he loſt Bliſs and Immortality. The Penalty annexed to the Breach of the Law, with the Sentence pronounced by God upon it, ſhew this. The Penalty ſtands thus, *Gen.* ii. 17.

In

In the Day that thou eateſt thereof thou ſhalt ſurely die. How was this executed? He did eat, but in the Day he did eat, he did not actually die, but was turned out of Paradiſe from the Tree of Life, and ſhut out for ever from it, *leſt he ſhould take thereof and live for ever.* This ſhews that the State of Paradiſe was a State of Immortality, of Life without End, which he loſt that very Day that he eat: His Life began from thence to ſhorten, and waſte, and to have an End; and from thence to his actual Death, was but like the Time of a Priſoner between the Sentence paſt and the Execution, which was in view and certain. Death then enter'd and ſhewed his Face, which before was ſhut out, and not known. So that St. *Paul*, Rom. v. 12. *By one Man Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin*; i. e. a State of Death and Mortality: And, 1 *Cor.* xv. 22. *In Adam all die*; i. e. by reaſon of his Tranſgreſſion all Men are mortal, and come to die.

This is ſo clear in theſe cited Places, and ſo much the Current of the *New Teſtament*, that no body can deny, but that the Doctrine of the Goſpel is, that Death came on all Men by *Adam*'s Sin; only they differ about the Signification of the Word *Death*. For ſome will have it to be a State of Guilt, wherein not only he, but all his Poſterity was ſo involved, that every one deſcended of him deſerved endleſs Torment in Hell-fire. I ſhall ſay nothing more here how far, in the Apprehenſions of Men, this conſiſts with the Juſtice and Goodneſs of God, having mentioned it above: But it ſeems a ſtrange Way of underſtanding a Law, which requires the plaineſt and directeſt Words, that by *Death* ſhould be meant eternal Life in Miſery. Could any one be ſuppoſed by a Law, that ſays, *For Felony you ſhall die*, not that he ſhould loſe his Life, but be kept alive in perpetual exquiſite Torments? And would any one think himſelf fairly dealt with, that was ſo uſed?

To this they would have it be alſo a State of neceſſary ſinning, and provoking God in every Action that Men do: A yet harder Senſe of the Word *Death* than the other, God ſays, *That in the Day thou eateſt of* the forbidden Fruit, *thou ſhalt die*; *i. e.* thou and thy Poſterity ſhall be ever after uncapable of doing any thing, but what ſhall be ſinful and provoking to me, and ſhall juſtly deſerve my Wrath and Indignation. Could a worthy Man be ſuppoſed to put ſuch Terms upon the Obedience of his Subjects, much leſs can the righteous God be ſuppoſed, as a Puniſhment of one Sin wherewith he is diſpleaſed, to put Man under a Neceſſity of ſinning continually, and ſo multiplying the Provocation? The Reaſon of this ſtrange Interpretation we ſhall perhaps find in ſome miſtaken Places of the *New Teſtament*. I muſt confeſs by *Death* here I underſtand nothing but a ceaſing to be, the loſing of all Actions of Life and Senſe. Such a Death came on *Adam*, and all his Poſterity by his firſt Diſobedience in Paradiſe, under which *Death* they ſhould have lain for ever, had it not been for the Redemption by Jeſus Chriſt. If by *Death* threatned to *Adam* were meant the Corruption of human Nature in his Poſterity, 'tis ſtrange that the *New Teſtament* ſhould not any where take notice of it, and tell us, that Corruption ſeized on all, becauſe of *Adam*'s Tranſgreſſion, as well as it tells us ſo of *Death*. But, as I remember, every one's Sin is charged upon himſelf only.

Another Part of the Sentence was, *Curſed is the Ground for thy ſake; in Sorrow ſhalt thou eat of it all the Days of thy Life, in the Sweat of thy Face ſhalt thou eat Bread, till thou return unto the Ground: For out of it waſt thou taken; Duſt thou art, and to Duſt ſhalt thou return*, Gen. iii. 17—19. This ſhews that Paradiſe was a Place of Bliſs as well as Immortality, without Drudgery, and without Sorrow. But when Man was turned out, he was expoſed to the Toil, Anxiety and Frailties of this mortal Life, which ſhould end in the *Duſt*, out of which he was made, and to which he ſhould return, and then have no more Life or Senſe than the *Duſt* had, out of which he was made.

As *Adam* was turned out of *Paradiſe*, ſo all his Poſterity were born out of it, out of the Reach of the Tree of Life, All like their Father *Adam* in a State of Mortality, void of the Tranquillity and Bliſs of *Paradiſe*. Rom. v. 12. *By one Man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin.* But here will occur the common Objection, that ſo many ſtumble at: How doth it conſiſt with the Juſtice and Goodneſs of God, that the Poſterity of *Adam* ſhould ſuffer for his Sin; the Innocent he puniſhed for the Guilty? Very well, if keeping one from what he has no Right to, be called a *Puniſhment*; the State of Immortality in Paradiſe is not due to the Poſterity of *Adam* more than to any other Creature. Nay, if God afford them a temporary mortal Life, 'tis his Gift, they owe to his Bounty, they could not claim it as their Right, nor does he injure them when he takes it from them. Had he taken from Mankind any Thing that

was their Right; or did he put Men in a State of Miſery worſe than not being, without any Fault or Demerit of their own; this, indeed, would be hard to reconcile with the Notion we have of Juſtice, and much more with the Goodneſs, and other Attributes of the ſupreme Being, which he has declared of himſelf, and Reaſon as well as Revelation muſt acknowledge to be in him; unleſs we will confound Good and Evil, God and Satan. That ſuch a State of extreme irremediable Torment is worſe than no Being at all, if every ones own Senſe did not determine againſt the vain Philoſophy, and fooliſh Metaphyſicks of ſome Men; yet our Saviour's peremptory Deciſion, *Mat.* xxiv. 24. has put it paſt Doubt, that one may be in ſuch an Eſtate, that it had been *better for him not have been born.* But that ſuch a temporary Life as we now have, with all its Frailties and ordinary Miſeries, is better than no Being, is evident by the high Value we put upon it our ſelves. And therefore tho' *all die in Adam*, yet none are truly *puniſh'd* but for their own Deeds. *Rom.* ii. 6. *God will render to every one*, how? *according to his Deeds. To thoſe that obey Unrighteouſneſs, Indignation and Wrath, Tribulation and Anguiſh upon every Soul of Man that doth Evil*, v. 9. 2 Cor. v. 10. *We muſt appear before the Judgment-ſeat of Chriſt, that every one may receive the Things done in his Body, according to that he has done, whether it be good or bad.* And Chriſt himſelf, who knew for what he ſhould condemn Men at the laſt Day, aſſures us in the two Places where he deſcribes his Proceeding at the great Judgment, that the Sentence of Condemnation paſſes only upon the *Workers of Iniquity*, ſuch as neglected to fulfil the Law in Acts of Charity, *Mat.* vii. 23. *Luke* xiii. 27. *Mat.* xxv. 42. And again, *John* v. 29. our Saviour tells the *Jews*, that *All ſhall come forth of their Graves, They that have done Good to the Reſurrection of Life, and they that have done Evil unto the Reſurrection of Damnation.* But here is no Condemnation of any one, for what his Fore-father *Adam* had done, which 'tis not likely ſhould have been omitted, if that ſhould have been a Cauſe, why any one was adjudged to the *Fire* with the *Devil and his Angels.* And he tells his Diſciples, that when he comes again with his Angels in the Glory of his Father, *that then he will render to every one according to his Works*, Mat. xvi. 27.

Adam being thus turned out of Paraiſe, and all his Poſterity born out of it, the Conſequence of it was, that all Men ſhould die, and remain under Death for ever, and ſo be utterly loſt.

From this Eſtate of Death Jeſus Chriſt reſtores all Mankind to Life; 1 *Cor.* xv. 22. *As in* Adam *all die, ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.* How this ſhall be, the ſame Apoſtle tells us in the foregoing *v.* 21. *By Man Death came, by Man alſo came the Reſurrection from the Dead.* Whereby it appears, that the Life, which Jeſus Chriſt reſtores to all Men, is that Life, which they receive again at the Reſurrection. Then they recovered from Death, which otherwiſe all Mankind ſhould have continued under, loſt for ever, as appears by St. *Paul*'s Arguing, 1 *Cor.* xv. concerning the Reſurrection.

And thus Men are by the Second *Adam* reſtored to Life again: That ſo by *Adam*'s Sin they may none of them loſe any thing, which by their own Righteouſneſs they might have a Title to. For Righteouſneſs, or an exact Obedience to the Law, ſeems by the Scripture to have a Claim of Right to Eternal Life, *Rom.* iv. 4. *To him that worketh, i. e.* does the Works of the Law, *is the Reward not reckoned of Grace, but OF DEBT.* And *Rev.* xxii. 14. *Bleſſed are they who do his Commandments, that they may HAVE RIGHT to the Tree of Life, which is in the Paradiſe of God.* If any of the Poſterity of *Adam* were juſt, they ſhall not loſe the Reward of it, eternal Life and Bliſs, by being his mortal Iſſue: Chriſt will bring them all to Life again; and then they ſhall be put every one upon his own Trial, and receive Judgment, as he is found to be righteous or not. And *the Righteous*, as our Saviour ſays, *Mat.* xxv. 46. *ſhall go into eternal Life.* Nor ſhall any one miſs it, who has done what our Saviour directed the Lawyer, who asked, *Luke* x. 25. *What he ſhould do to inherit eternal Life? Do this. i. e.* what is required by the Law, *and thou ſhalt live.*

On the other ſide, it ſeems the unalterable Purpoſe of the Divine Juſtice, that no unrighteous Perſon, no one that is guilty of any Breach of the Law, ſhould be in Paradiſe; but that the Wages of Sin ſhould be to every Man, as it was to *Adam*, an Excluſion of him out of that happy State of Immortality, and bring Death upon him. And this is ſo conformable to the etetnal and eſtabliſh'd Law of Right and Wrong, that it is ſpoke of too as it could not be otherwiſe. St. *James* ſays, *Chap.* i. 15. *Sin when it is finiſhed bringeth forth Death*, as it were by a natural and neceſſary Production. *Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin*, ſays St. *Paul*, Rom. v. 12. and vi. 23. *The Wages of Sin is Death.* Death is the Purchaſe of any, of every Sin. *Gal.* iii. 10. *Curſed*

is

is every one who continued not in all Things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them. And of this St. *James* gives a Reaſon, *Chap.* ii. 10, 11. *Whoſoever ſhall keep the whole Law, and yet offend in one Point, he is guilty of all: For he that ſaid, Do not commit Adultery, ſaid alſo, Do not Kill: i. e.* He that offends in any one Point, ſins againſt the Authority which eſtabliſhed the Law.

Here then we have the Standing and fixed Meaſures of Life and Death. Immortality and Bliſs belong to the Righteous; Thoſe who have lived in an exact Conformity to the Law of God, are out of the Reach of Death: But an Excluſion from Paradiſe, and Loſs of Immortality, is the Portion of Sinners, of all thoſe who have any way broke that Law, and failed of a compleat Obedience to it by the Guilt of any one Tranſgreſſion. And thus Mankind by the Law are put upon the Iſſues of Life or Death; As they are *Righteous* or *Unrighteous*; *Juſt* or *Unjuſt*; *i. e.* Exact Performers, or Tranſgreſſors of the Law.

But yet *all having ſinned*, Rom. iii. 23. *and come ſhort of the Glory of God, i. e.* the Kingdom of God in Heaven, which is often called his Glory, *both Jews and Gentiles*, v. 22. So that *by the Deeds of the Law no one could be juſtified*, v. 20. it follows, that no one could then have eternal Life and Bliſs.

Perhaps it will be demanded, Why did God give ſo hard a Law to Mankind, that to the Apoſtles Time no one of *Adam*'s Iſſue had kept it? As appears by *Rom.* iii. and *Gal.* iii. 21, 21.

Anſw. It was ſuch a Law as the Purity of God's Nature requir'd, and muſt be the Law of ſuch a Creature as Man, unleſs God would have made him a rational Creature, and not required him to have lived by the Law of Reaſon, but would have countenanced in him Irregularity and Diſobedience to that Light which he had, and that Rule which was ſuitable to his Nature: Which would have been, to have authorized Diſorder, Confuſion and Wickedneſs in his Creatures. For that this Law was the *Law of Reaſon*, or as it is called, *of Nature*, we ſhall ſee by and by: And if rational Creatures will not live up to the Rule of their Reaſon, who ſhall excuſe them? If you will admit them to forſake Reaſon in one Point, why not in another? Where will you ſtop? To diſobey God in any Part of his Commands (and 'tis he that commands what Reaſon does) is direct Rebellion; which if diſpenſed with in any Point, Government and Order are at an end; and there can be no Bounds ſet to the lawleſs Exorbitancy of unconfined Men. *The Law therefore was*, as St. *Paul* tells us, *Rom.* vii. 21. *holy, juſt and good*, and ſuch as it ought, and could not otherwiſe be.

This then being the Caſe, that whoever is guilty of any Sin, ſhould certainly die, and ceaſe to be, the Benefit of Life reſtored by Chriſt at the Reſurrection would have been no great Advantage, (for as much as here again Death muſt have ſeized upon all Mankind, becauſe all had ſinned; for the Wages of Sin is every where Death, as well after as before the Reſurrection) if God had not found out a Way to juſtify ſome, *i. e.* ſo many, as obeyed another Law, which God gave, which in the *New Teſtament* is called *the Law of Faith*, Rom. iii. 27. and is oppoſed to *the Law of Works*. And therefore the Puniſhment of thoſe who would not follow him was to loſe their Souls, *i. e.* their Lives, *Mark* viii. 35—38. as is plain, conſidering the Occaſion it was ſpoke on.

The better to underſtand *the Law of Faith*, it will be convenient in the firſt Place to conſider *the Law of Works*. *The Law of Works* then, in ſhort, is that Law, which requires perfect Obedience, without any Remiſſion or Abatement; So that by that Law a Man cannot be juſt, or juſtified without an exact Performance of every Tittle. Such a perfect Obedience in the *New Teſtament* is termed δικαιοσύνη, which we tranſlate *Righteouſneſs*.

The Language of this Law is, Do this and live, tranſgreſs and die. *Lev.* xviii. 5. *Ye ſhall keep my Statutes and my Judgments, which if a Man do he ſhall live in them.* Ezek. xx. 11. *I gave them my Statutes, and ſhewed them my Judgments, which if a Man do he ſhall even live in them. Moſes*, ſays St. *Paul*, Rom. x. 5. *deſcribeth the Righteouſneſs which is of the Law, that the Man which doth thoſe Things ſhall live in them.* Gal. iii. 12. *The Law is not of Faith, but that Man that doth them ſhall live in them.* On the other ſide, tranſgreſs and die; no Diſpenſation, no Atonement. *V.* 10. *Curſed is every one that continueth not in all Things which are written in the Book of the Law to do them.*

Where

Where this Law of Works was to be found, the *New Teſtament* tells us, (*viz.*) in the Law delivered by *Moſes*. *John* i. 17. *The Law was given by Moſes, but Faith and Truth came by Jeſus Chriſt.* Chap. vii. 19. *Did not Moſes give you the Law,* ſays our Saviour, *and yet none of you keep the Law.* And this is the Law which he ſpeaks of, where he asks the Lawyer, *Luke* x. 26. *What is written in the Law? How readeſt thou?* V. 28. *This do and thou ſhalt live.* This is that which St. *Paul* ſo often ſtiles the *Law,* without any other Diſtinction, *Rom.* ii. 13. *Not the Hearers of the Law are juſt before God, but the Doers of the Law are juſtified.* 'Tis needleſs to quote any more Places, his Epiſtles are all full of it, eſpecially this to the *Romans.*

But the Law given by *Moſes* being not given to all Mankind, how are all Men Sinners, ſince without a Law there is no Tranſgreſſion? To this the Apoſtle, v. 14. anſwers, *For when the Gentiles which have not the Law, do* (*i. e.* find it reaſonable to do) *by Nature the Things contained in the Law; theſe having not the Law, are a Law unto themſelves: Which ſhew the Work of the Law written in their Hearts, their Conſciences alſo bearing witneſs, and amongſt one another their Thoughts accuſing or excuſing.* By which, and other Places in the following Chapter, 'tis plain, that under the Law of Works is comprehended alſo the Law of Nature, knowable by Reaſon as well as the Law given by *Moſes*. *For,* ſays St. *Paul,* Rom. iii. 9. 23. *We have proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under Sin: For all have ſinned, and come ſhort of the Glory of God:* Which they could not do without a Law.

Nay, whatever God requires any where to be done without making any Allowance for Faith, that is a Part of the Law of Works. So that forbidding *Adam* to eat of the Tree of Knowledge was Part of the Law of Works. Only we muſt take notice here, That ſome of God's poſitive Commands being for peculiar Ends, and ſuited to particular Circumſtances of Times, Places and Perſons, have a limited and only temporary Obligation by vertue of God's poſitive Injunction; ſuch as was that Part of *Moſes*'s Law which concerned the outward Worſhip, or political Conſtitution of the *Jews,* and is called the Ceremonial and Judaical Law, in Contradiſtinction to the Moral Part of it; Which being conformable to the eternal Law of Right, is of eternal Obligation, and therefore remains in force ſtill under the Goſpel; nor is abrogated by the *Law of Faith,* as St. *Paul* found ſome ready to infer, *Rom.* iii. 31. *Do we then make void the Law through Faith? God forbid; yea, we eſtabliſh the Law.*

Nor can it be otherwiſe: For were there no *Law of Works,* there could be no *Law of Faith.* For there could be no need of Faith, which ſhould be counted to Men for Righteouſneſs, if there were no Law to be the Rule and Meaſure of Righteouſneſs, which Men failed in their Obedience to, Where there is no Law, there is no Sin; all are righteous equally with or without Faith.

The Rule therefore of Right is the ſame that ever it was, the Obligation to obſerve it is alſo the ſame: The Difference between the *Law of Works,* and the *Law of Faith* is only this; that the *Law of Works* makes no Allowance for failing on any Occaſion. Thoſe that obey are righteous, thoſe that in any Part diſobey are unrigteous, and muſt not expect Life, the Reward of Righteouſneſs. But by the *Law of Faith,* Faith is allowed to ſupply the Defect of full Obedience; and ſo the Believers are admitted to Life and Immortality as if they were righteous. Only here we muſt take notice, that when St. *Paul* ſays, that the Goſpel eſtabliſhes the Law, he means the Moral Part of the Law of *Moſes*: For that he could not mean the Ceremonial or Political Part of it, is evident by what I quoted out of him juſt now, where he ſays, *The Gentiles that do by Nature the Things contained in the Law, their Conſciences bearing witneſs.* For the *Gentiles* neither did nor thought of the Judaical and Ceremonial Inſtitutions of *Moſes,* 'twas only the Moral Part their Conſciences were concerned in. As for the reſt, St. *Paul* tells the *Galatians,* Chap. iv. they are not under that Part of the Law, which *v.* 3. he calls *Elements of the World*; and *v.* 9. *weak and beggerly Elements.* And our Saviour himſef in his Goſpel-Sermon on the Mount, tells them, *Mat.* v. 17. That whatever they might think, he was not come *to diſſolve the Law,* but to make it more full and ſtrict: For that that is meant by πληρῶσαι, is evident from the following Part of that Chapter, where he gives the Precepts in a ſtricter Senſe than they were received in before. But they are all Precepts of the Moral Law which he reinforces. What ſhould become of the Ritual Law he tells the Woman of *Samaria* in theſe Words, *John* iv. 21, 23. *The Hour cometh when you ſhall neither in this Mountain, nor yet at* Jeruſalem *worſhip the Father. But the true Worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father in Spirit and in Truth, for the Father ſeeketh ſuch to worſhip him.*

Thus

Thus then as to the Law in ſhort. The Civil and Ritual part of the Law delivered by *Moſes* obliges not Chriſtians, though to the Jews it were a Part of the Law of Works; it being a part of the Law of Nature, that Man ought to obey every poſitive Law of God, whenever he ſhall pleaſe to make any ſuch addition to the Law of his Nature. But the Moral Part of *Moſes*'s Law, or the Moral Law, (which is every where the ſame, the eternal Rule of Right) obliges Chriſtians and all Men every where, and is to all Men the ſtanding Law of Works. But Chriſtian Believers have the Privilege to be under the *Law of Faith* too; which is that Law whereby God juſtifies a Man for believing, though by his Works he be not juſt or righteous, *i. e.* though he came ſhort of Perfect Obedience to the Law of Works. God alone does, or can, juſtify or make juſt thoſe who by their Works are not ſo: Which he doth by counting their Faith for Righteouſneſs, *i. e.* for a compleat Performance of the Law. *Rom.* iv. 3. *Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for Righteouſneſs.* v. 5. *To him that believeth on him that juſtifieth the Ungodly, his Faith is counted for Righteouſneſs.* v. 6. *Even as David alſo deſcribeth the Bleſſedneſs of the Man unto whom God imputeth Righteouſneſs without Works*; *i. e.* without a full Meaſure of Works, which is exact Obedience. v. 7. Saying, *Bleſſed are they whoſe Iniquities are forgiven, and whoſe Sins are covered.* v. 8. *Bleſſed is the Man to whom the Lord will not impute Sin.*

This Faith for which God juſtified *Abraham*, what was it? It was the believing God when he engaged his Promiſe in the Covenant he made with him. This will be plain to any one who conſiders theſe Places together, *Gen.* xv. 6. *He believed in the Lord*, or *believed the Lord.* For that the *Hebrew* Phraſe *believing in*, ſignifies no more but *believing*, is plain from St. *Paul*'s Citation of this Place, *Rom.* iv. 3. where he repeats it thus: *Abraham believed God*, which he thus explains, v. 18—22. *who againſt Hope believed in Hope, that he might become the Father of many Nations: According to that which was ſpoken, ſo ſhall thy Seed be. And being not weak in Faith, he conſidered not his own Body now dead, when he was about an hundred Years old, nor yet the Deadneſs of Sarah's Womb. He ſtaggered not at the Promiſe of God through Unbelief; but was ſtrong in Faith, giving Glory to God. And being fully perſuaded, that what he had promiſed, he was alſo able to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs.* By which it is clear, that the Faith which God counted to *Abraham* for Righteouſneſs, was nothing but a firm Belief of what God declared to him, and a ſtedfaſt relying on him for the Accompliſhment of what he had promiſed.

Now this, ſays St. *Paul*, v. 23, 24. *was not writ for his* [Abraham's] *ſake alone, But for us alſo*; teaching us, that as *Abraham* was juſtified for his Faith ſo alſo ours ſhall be accounted to us for Righteouſneſs, if we believe God as *Abraham* believed him. Whereby 'tis plain is meant the firmneſs of our Faith without *ſtaggering*, and not the believing the ſame Propoſitions that *Abraham* believed; *viz.* that though he and *Sarah* were old, and paſt the time and hopes of Children, yet he ſhould have a Son by her, and by him become the Father of a great People, which ſhould poſſeſs the Land of *Canaan*. This was what *Abraham* believed, and was counted to him for Righteouſneſs. But no body, I think, will ſay, that any one's believing this now ſhall be imputed to him for Righteouſneſs. The Law of Faith then, in ſhort, is for every one to believe what God requires him to believe, as a Condition of the Covenant he makes with him; and not to doubt of the Performance of his Promiſes. This the Apoſtle intimates in the cloſe here, v. 24. *But for us alſo, to whom it ſhall be imputed, if we believe on him that raiſed up Jeſus our Lord from the dead.* We muſt therefore examine and ſee what God requires us to believe now under the Revelation of the Goſpel: For the Belief of one Inviſible, Eternal, Omnipotent God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, &c. was required before, as well as now.

What we are now required to believe to obtain eternal Life, is plainly ſet down in the Goſpel. St. *John* tells us, *John* iii. 36. *He that believeth on the Son, hath eternal Life; and he that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee Life.* What this *believing on him* is, we are alſo told in the next Chapter. *The Woman ſaith unto him, I know that the Meſſiah cometh: When he is come, he will tell us all Things. Jeſus ſaid unto her, I that ſpeak unto thee am he. The Woman then went into the City, and ſaith to the Men, come ſee a Man that hath told me all Things that ever I did. Is not this the Meſſiah? And many of the Samaritans believed on him for the ſaying of the Woman, who teſtified, he told me all that ever I did. So when the Samaritans were come unto him, many more believed becauſe of his Words, and ſaid to the Woman; We believe not any longer, be-*

cauſe

cauſe of thy ſaying, for we have heard our ſelves, and we know that this Man is truly the Saviour of the World, the Meſſiah, John 25, 26, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42.

By which Place it is plain, that *believing on the Son*, is the *believing that Jeſus was the Meſſiah*; giving credit to the Miracles he did, and that the Profeſſion he made of himſelf. For thoſe who were ſaid to BELIEVE ON HIM for the ſaying of the Woman, *v.* 39. tell the Woman, that they now believed not any longer becauſe of her ſaying; but that having heard him themſelves, they knew, *i. e.* BELIEVED paſt doubt THAT HE WAS THE MESSIAH.

This was the great Propoſition that was then controverted concerning Jeſus of *Nazareth*, whether he was the *Meſſiah* or no; and the Aſſent to that, was that which diſtinguiſhed Believers from Unbelievers. When many of his Diſciples had forſaken him, upon his declaring that he was the Bread of Life which came down from Heaven, *He ſaid to the Apoſtles, Will ye alſo go away? Then Simon Peter anſwered him; Lord, to whom ſhall we go? Thou haſt the Words of eternal Life. And we believe, and are ſure thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God*, John iv. 69. This was the Faith which diſtinguiſhed them from Apoſtates and Unbelievers, and was ſufficient to continue them in the Rank of Apoſtles: And it was upon the ſame Propoſition, *That Jeſus was the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God*, owned by St. *Peter*, that our Saviour ſaid, he would build his Church, *Mat.* xvi. 16—18.

To convince Men of this, he did his Miracles: And their aſſent to, or not aſſenting to this, made them to be, or not to be of his Church; Believers, or not Believers. *The Jews came round about him, and ſaid unto him, How long doſt thou make us doubt? If thou be the Meſſiah tell us plainly. Jeſus anſwered them; I told you, and ye believed not: The Works that I do in my Fathers Name, they bear witneſs of me. But ye believe not, becauſe ye are not of my ſheep*, John x. 24—26. Conformable hereunto, St. *John* tells us, *That many Deceivers are entred into the World, who confeſs not that Jeſus, the Meſſiah, is come in the Fleſh. This is a Deceiver, and an Antichriſt, whoſoever abideth not in the Doctrine of the Meſſiah has not God. He that abideth in the Doctrine of the Meſſiah, i. e.* that Jeſus is he, *hath both the Father and the Son*, 2 John 7. 9, 10. That this is the Meaning of the Place, is plain from what he ſays in his foregoing Epiſtle, *Whoſoever believeth that Jeſus is the Meſſiah, is born of God*, 1 John v. 1. And therefore drawing to a cloſe of his Goſpel, and ſhewing the End for which he writ it, he has theſe Words: *Many other Signs truly did Jeſus in the preſence of his Diſciples, which are not written in this Book; but theſe are written, that ye may believe that Jeſus is the Meſſiah, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have Life through his Name*, John xx. 30, 31. Whereby it is plain that the Goſpel was writ to induce Men into a Belief of this Propoſition, *That Jeſus of Nazareth was the Meſſiah*; which if they believed, they ſhould *have Life*.

Accordingly the great Queſtion amongſt the Jews was, whether he were the *Meſſiah*, or no: And the great Point inſiſted on and promulgated in the Goſpel was, that he was the *Meſſiah*. The firſt glad Tidings of his Birth, brought to the Shepherds by an Angel, was in theſe Words: *Fear not, for behold I bring you good Tidings of great Joy, which ſhall be to all People; For to you is born this Day in the City of David a Saviour, who is the Meſſiah, the Lord*, Luke ii. 11. Our Saviour diſcourſing with *Martha* about the Means of attaining eternal Life, ſaith to her, *John* xi. 27. *Whoſoever believeth in me ſhall never die. Believeſt thou this? She ſaith unto him, Yea, Lord. I believe that thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World.* This Anſwer of hers ſheweth what it is to believe in Jeſus Chriſt, ſo as to have eternal Life, *viz.* to believe that he is the *Meſſiah* the Son of God, whoſe coming was foretold by the Prophets. And thus *Andrew* and *Philip* expreſs it: *Andrew ſays to his Brother Simon, we have found the Meſſiah, which is, being interpreted, the Chriſt. Philip ſaith to Nathaniel, we have found him of whom Moſes in the Law, and the Prophets did write, Jeſus of Nazareth, the Son of Joſeph*, John i. 41. 45. According to what the Evangeliſt ſays in this place, I have, for the clearer underſtanding of the Scripture, all along, put *Meſſiah* for *Chriſt*. *Chriſt* being but the Greek Name for the Hebrew *Meſſiah*, and both ſignifying, *The Anointed*.

And that he was the *Meſſiah*, was the great Truth he took pains to convince his Diſciples and Apoſtles of; appearing to them after his Reſurrection: As may be ſeen, *Luke* xxiv. which we ſhall more particularly conſider in another place. There we read what Goſpel our Saviour preach'd to his Diſciples and Apoſtles; and, That, as ſoon as he was riſen from the Dead, twice the very Day of his Reſurrection.

And

And if we may gather what was to be believed by all Nations, from what was preached unto them; we may certainly know what they were commanded, *Mat. ult.* to teach all Nations, by what they actually did teach all Nations; we may obſerve that the Preaching of the Apoſtles every where in the *Acts* tended to this one Point, to prove that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah*. Indeed, now after his Death, his Reſurrection was alſo commonly required to be believed as a neceſſary Article, and ſometimes ſolely inſiſted on: It being a Mark and undoubted Evidence of his being the *Meſſiah*, and neceſſary now to be believed by thoſe who would receive him as the *Meſſiah*. For ſince the *Meſſiah* was to be a Saviour and a King, and to give Life and a Kingdom to thoſe who received him, as we ſhall ſee by and by, there could have been no Pretence to have given him out for the *Meſſiah*, and to require Men to believe him to be ſo, who thought him under the Power of Death, and Corruption of the Grave. And therefore thoſe who believed him to be the *Meſſiah*, muſt believe that he was riſen from the Dead: And thoſe who believed him to be riſen from the Dead, could not doubt of his being the *Meſſiah*. But of this more in another place.

Let us ſee therefore how the Apoſtles preached Chriſt, and what they propoſed to their Hearers to believe, St. *Peter* at *Jeruſalem*, *Acts* ii. by his firſt Sermon, converted three thouſand Souls. What *was his Word*, which, as we are told, *v.* 41. *they gladly received, and thereupon were baptized?* That may be ſeen from *v.* 22. to *v.* 36. In ſhort, this; which is the Concluſion drawn from all that he had ſaid, and which he preſſes on them as the thing they were to believe, *viz. Therefore let all the Houſe of Iſrael know aſſuredly, that God hath made that ſame Jeſus, whom ye have crucified, Lord and Meſſiah*, v. 36.

To the ſame Purpoſe was his Diſcourſe to the *Jews* in the Temple, *Acts* iii. the Deſign whereof you have, *v.* 18. *But thoſe Things that God before had ſhewed by the Mouth of all his Prophets, that the Meſſiah ſhould ſuffer, he hath ſo fulfilled.*

In the next Chapter, *Acts* iv. *Peter* and *John* being examined about the Miracle on the lame Man, profeſs it to have been done in the Name of *Jeſus* of *Nazareth*, who was the *Meſſiah*, in whom alone there was Salvation, *v.* 10—12. The ſame thing they confirm to them again, *Acts* v. 29—32. *And daily in the Temple, and in every Houſe they ceaſed not to teach and preach Jeſus the Meſſiah*, v. 42.

What was *Stephen*'s Speech to the Council, *Acts* vii. but a Reprehenſion to them, that they were the Betrayers and Murderers of the *Juſt One?* Which is the Title by which he plainly deſigns the *Meſſiah*, whoſe coming was foreſhewn by the Prophets, *v.* 51,52. And that the *Meſſiah* was to be without Sin (which is the Import of the Word *Juſt*) was the Opinion of the *Jews*, appears from *John* ix. *v.* 22. compared with 24.

Acts viii. *Philip* carries the Goſpel to *Samaria*. *Then Philip went down to Samaria, and preached to them.* What was it he preached? You have an account of it in this one Word, *The Meſſiah*, *v.* 5. This being that alone which was required of them, to believe that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*; which, when they believed, they were baptized. *And when they believed Philip's preaching the Goſpel of the Kingdom of God, And the Name of Jeſus the Meſſiah, they were baptized both Men and Women*, *v.* 12.

Philip being ſent from thence, by a ſpecial Call of the Spirit, to make an eminent Convert, out of *Iſaiah* preaches to him *Jeſus*, *v.* 35. And what it was he preached concerning *Jeſus*, we may know by the Profeſſion of Faith the Eunuch made, upon which he was admitted to Baptiſm. *V.* 37. *I believe that Jeſus Chriſt, is the Son of God:* Which is as much as to ſay, I believe that he whom you call Jeſus Chriſt, is really and truly the *Meſſiah* that was promiſed. For that believing him to be the *Son of God*, and to be the *Meſſiah*, was the ſame thing, may appear by comparing *John* i. 45. with *v.* 49. where *Nathaniel* owns Jeſus to be the *Meſſiah* in theſe Terms: *Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Iſrael.* So the *Jews*, *Luke* xxii. 70. asking Chriſt, whether he were the *Son of God*, plainly demand of him, whether he were the *Meſſiah?* Which is evident by comparing that with the three preceding Verſes. They ask him, *v.* 67. whether he were the *Meſſiah?* He anſwers, *If I tell you, you will not believe?* but withal tells them, that from thenceforth he ſhould be in Poſſeſſion of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, expreſſed in theſe Words, *v.* 69. *Hereafter ſhall the Son of Man ſit on the right Hand of the Power of God:* Which made them all cry out, *Art thou then the Son of God? i.e.* Doſt thou then own thy ſelf to be the *Meſſiah?* To which he replies, *Ye ſay that I am.* That the *Son of God* was the known Title of the *Meſſiah* at that time amongſt the *Jews*, we may ſee alſo from what the *Jews* ſay to *Pilate*, John xix. 7. *we have a*

Law, and by our Law he ought to die, becauſe he made himſelf THE SON OF GOD; *i. e.* by making himſelf the *Meſſiah*, the Prophet which was to come, but falſely; and therefore he deſerves to die by the Law, *Deut.* xviii. 20. That this was the common Signification of *the Son of God*, is farther evident from what the Chief Prieſt mocking him, ſaid, when he was on the Croſs, *Mat.* xxvii. 42. *He ſaved others, himſelf he cannot ſave: If he be the King of Iſrael, let him now come down from the Croſs, and we will believe him. He truſted in God, let him deliver him now, if he will have him; for he ſaid, I am the* SON OF GOD; *i. e.* he ſaid, he was the *Meſſiah*: But 'tis plainly falſe; for if he were, God would deliver him: For the *Meſſiah* is to be King of *Iſrael*, the Saviour of others; but this Man cannot ſave himſelf. The Chief Prieſts mention here the two Titles then in uſe whereby the *Jews* commonly deſigned the *Meſſiah*, *viz. Son of God*, and *King of Iſrael*. That of *Son of God*, was ſo familiar a Compellation of the *Meſſiah*, who was then ſo much expected and talked of, that the *Romans* it ſeems, who lived amongſt them, had learned it, as appears from *v.* 54. *Now when the Centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jeſus, ſaw the Earthquake, and thoſe Things that were done, they feared greatly, ſaying, Truly this was the* SON OF GOD; this was that extraordinary Perſon that was looked for.

Acts ix. St. *Paul* exerciſing the Commiſſion to preach the Goſpel, which he had received in a miraculous way, *v.* 20. *Straitway preached Chriſt in the Synagogues, that he is the Son of God*; *i. e.* that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah*: *For Chriſt* in this Place is evidently a proper Name. And that this was it which *Paul* preached, appears from *v.* 22. *Saul encreaſed the more in Strength, and confounded the Jews who dwelt in Damaſcus, proving that this is the very Chriſt, i. e. the Meſſiah.*

Peter, when he came to *Cornelius* at *Ceſarea*; who, by a Viſion, was ordered to ſend for him, as St. *Peter*, on the other ſide, was by a Viſion commanded to go to him; what does he teach him? His whole Diſcourſe, *Acts* x. tends to ſhew what he ſays God commanded the Apoſtles, *To Preach unto the People, and to teſtify, that it is he* [Jeſus] *which was ordained of God to be the Judge of the Quick and the Dead.* And that it was *to him that all the Prophets give witneſs, that through his Name whoſoever believeth in him ſhall have Remiſſion of Sins*, v. 42,43. This is *the Word which God ſent to the Children of Iſrael; that WORD which was publiſhed throughout all Judea, and began from Gallilee, after the Baptiſm which John preached*, v. 36, 37. And theſe are the *Words* which had been promiſed to *Cornelius*, Act xi. 14. *Whereby he and all his Houſe ſhould be ſaved:* Which *Words* amount only to thus much, That *Jeſus was the Meſſiah*, the Saviour that was promiſed. Upon their receiving of this (for this was all was taught them) the Holy Ghoſt fell on them, and they were baptized. 'Tis obſervable here, that the Holy Ghoſt fell on them before they were baptized, which in other Places Converts received not till after Baptiſm. The Reaſon whereof ſeems to be this; That God by beſtowing on them the Holy Ghoſt, did thus declare from Heaven, that the *Gentiles*, upon believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, ought to be admitted into the Church by Baptiſm, as well as the *Jews*. Whoever reads St. *Peter's* Defence, *Acts* xi. when he was accuſed by thoſe of the Circumciſion, that he had not kept that Diſtance which he ought with the Uncircumciſed, will be of this Opinion, and ſee by what he ſays, *v.* 15,16,17. That this was the Ground, and an irreſiſtible Authority to him for doing ſo ſtrange a thing, as it appeared to the *Jews* (who alone yet were Members of the Chriſtian Church) to admit *Gentiles* into their Communion, upon their believing. And therefore St. *Peter*, in the foregoing Chapter, *Acts* x. before he would baptize them, propoſes this Queſtion *to thoſe of the Circumciſion, which came with him, and were aſtoniſhed, becauſe that on the Gentiles alſo was poured out the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt: Can any one forbid Water, that theſe ſhould not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghoſt as well as we?* v. 47. And when ſome of the Sect of the *Phariſees*, who believed, thought *it needful that the converted Gentiles ſhould be circumciſed, and keep the Law of Moſes*, Acts xv. *Peter roſe up and ſaid unto them, Men and Brethren, you know that a good while ago God made choice amongſt us, that the Gentiles*, viz. *Cornelius*, and thoſe here converted with him, *by my Mouth ſhould hear the Goſpel, and believe. And God, who knoweth the Hearts, bear them witneſs, giving them the Holy Ghoſt, even as he did unto us, and put no difference between us and them, purifying their Hearts by Faith*, v. 7—9. So that both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, who believed Jeſus to be the *Meſſiah*, received thereupon the Seal of Baptiſm; whereby they were owned to be his, and diſtinguiſhed from Unbelievers. From what is above ſaid, we may obſerve, That this preaching Jeſus to be the *Meſſiah*, is called *the Word*,

and

and *the Word of God*; and believing it, *receiving the Word of God. Vid.* Acts x. 36, 37. and xi. 1, 19, 20. and *the Word of the Goſpel*, Acts xv. 7. And ſo likewiſe in the Hiſtory of the Goſpel, what *Mark*, Chap. iv. 14, 15. calls ſimply the *Word*, St. *Luke* calls *the Word of God*, *Luke* viii. 11. And St. *Matth. Chap.* xiii. 19. *the Word of the Kingdom*; which were it ſeems, in the Goſpel-writers ſynonymous Terms, and are ſo to be underſtood by us.

But to go on: *Acts* xiii. *Paul* preaches in the Synagogue at *Antioch*, where he makes it his Buſineſs to convince the Jews, that *God, according to his Promiſe, had of the Seed of David raiſed to Iſrael a Saviour, Jeſus*, v. 24. That he was *He* of whom the Prophets writ, v. 25 — 22. *i. e.* the *Meſſiah*: And that as a Demonſtration of his being ſo, God had raiſed him from the Dead, v. 30. From whence he argues thus, v. 32, 33. *We Evangelize to you*, or bring you this Goſpel, *how that the Promiſe which was made to our Fathers, God hath fulfilled the ſame unto us, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again; as it is alſo written in the ſecond Pſalm, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee.* And having gone on to prove him to be the *Meſſiah*, by his Reſurrection from the Dead, he makes this Concluſion; v. 38, 39. *Be it known unto you therefore, Men and Brethren, that through this Man is preached unto you Forgiveneſs of Sins; and by him all who believe are juſtified from all things, from which they could not be juſtified by the Law of Moſes.* This is in this Chapter called, *the Word of God*, over and over again: Compare v. 42. with 44, 46, 48, 49. And *Chap.* xii. v. 24.

Acts xvii. 2—4. At *Theſſalonica, Paul, as his Manner was, went into the Synagogue, and three Sabbath-days reaſoned with the Jews out of the Scriptures; opening and alledging, that the Meſſiah muſt needs have ſuffered, and riſen again from the Dead: And that this Jeſus, whom I preach unto you, is the Meſſiah. And ſome of them believed, and conſorted with Paul and Silas: But the Jews which believed not, ſet the City in an Uproar.* Can there be any thing plainer, than that the aſſenting to this Propoſition, that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah*, was that which diſtinguiſhed the Believers from the Unbelievers? For this was that alone which, three Sabbaths, *Paul* endeavoured to convince them of, as the Text tells us in direct Words.

From thence he went to *Berea*, and preached the ſame thing: And the *Bereans* are commended, v. 11. for ſearching the Scriptures, whether thoſe things, *i. e.* which he had ſaid, v. 2, 3. concerning Jeſus his being the *Meſſiah*, were true or no.

The ſame Doctrine we find him preaching at *Corinth*, *Acts* xviii. 4—6. *And he reaſoned in the Synagogue every Sabbath, and perſuaded the Jews and the Greeks. And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was preſſed in Spirit, and teſtified to the Jews, that Jeſus was the Meſſiah. And when they oppoſed themſelves, and blaſphemed, he ſhook his Raiment, and ſaid unto them, your Blood be upon your own Heads, I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Greeks.*

Upon the like Occaſion he tells the Jews at *Antioch*, *Acts* xiii. 46. *It was neceſſary that the Word of God ſhould firſt have been ſpoken to you: But ſeeing you put it off from you, we turn to the Gentiles.* 'Tis plain here, St. *Paul*'s charging their Blood on their own Heads, is for oppoſing this ſingle Truth, that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*; that Salvation or Perdition depends upon believing or rejecting this one Propoſition. I mean, this is all is required to be believed by thoſe who acknowledge but one eternal and inviſible God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth, as the Jews did. For that there is ſomething more required to Salvation, beſides believing, we ſhall ſee hereafter. In the mean time, it is fit here on this Occaſion to take notice, that though the Apoſtles in their Preaching to the Jews, and the *Devout*, (as we tranſlate the Word σεβόμενοι, who were Proſolytes of the Gate, and the Worſhippers of one eternal and inviſible God,) ſaid nothing of the believing in this one true God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth; becauſe it was needleſs to preſs this to thoſe who believed and profeſſed it already (for to ſuch, 'tis plain, were moſt of their Diſcourſes hitherto). Yet when they had to do with idolatrous Heathens, who were not yet come to the Knowledge of the one only true God; they began with that, as neceſſary to be believed; it being the Foundation on which the other was built, and without which it could ſignify nothing.

Thus *Paul* ſpeaking to the idolatrous *Lyſtrians*, who would have ſacrificed to him and *Barnabas*, ſays, *Acts* xiv. 15. *We preach unto you, that you ſhould turn from theſe Vanities unto the living God, who made Heaven, and Earth, and the Sea, and all things that are therein. Who in times paſt ſuffered all Nations to walk in their own ways.*

Nevertheleſs he left not himſelf without Witneſs in that he did good, and gave us Rain from Heaven, and fruitful Seaſons, filling our Hearts with Food and Gladneſs.

Thus alſo he proceeded with the Idolatrous *Athenians*, *Acts* xvii. Telling them, upon occaſion of the Altar dedicated to the unknown God, *Whom ye ignorantly worſhip, him declare I unto you; God who made the World, and all things therein: Seeing that he is Lord of Heaven and Earth, dwelleth not in Temples made with Hands.* —— *Foraſmuch then as we are the Off-ſpring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto Gold, or Silver, or Stone, graven by Art, and Man's Device. And the Times of this Ignorance God winked at; But now commandeth all Men every where to repent: Becauſe he hath appointed a Day in which he will judge the World in Righteouſneſs, by that Man whom he hath ordained: Whereof he hath given Aſſurance unto all Men, in that he hath raiſed him from the Dead.* So that we ſee, where any thing more was neceſſary to be propoſed to be believed, as there was to the Heathen Idolaters, there the Apoſtles were careful not to omit it.

Acts xviii. 4. *Paul at Corinth reaſoned in the Synagogue every Sabbath-day, and teſtified to the Jews, that Jeſus was the Meſſiah.* Ver. 11. *And he continued there a Year and ſix Months, teaching the Word of God amongſt them*; *i. e.* The good News, that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah*; as we have already ſhewn is meant by the *Word of God.*

Apollos, another Preacher of the Goſpel, when he was inſtructed in the way of God more perfectly, what did he teach but this ſame Doctrine? As we may ſee in this Account of him, *Acts* xviii. 27. That *when he was come into Achaia, he helped the Brethren much, who had believed through Grace. For he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publickly, ſhewing by the Scriptures that Jeſus was the Meſſiah.*

St. *Paul*, in the Account he gives of himſelf before *Feſtus* and *Agrippa*, profeſſes this alone to be the Doctrine he taught after his Converſion: For, ſays he, *Acts* xxvi. 22. *Having obtained Help of God, I continue unto this Day, witneſſing both to ſmall and great, ſaying none other things than thoſe which the Prophets and Moſes did ſay ſhould come: That the Meſſias ſhould ſuffer, and that he ſhould be the firſt that ſhould riſe from the Dead, and ſhould ſhew Light unto the People, and to the Gentiles.* Which was no more than to prove that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah.* This is that, which, as we have above obſerved, is called, *The Word of God*; *Acts* xi. 1. compared with the foregoing Chapter, from *v.* 34. to the end. And xiii. 42. compared with 44, 46, 48, 49. and xvii. 13. compared with *v.* 11, 3. It is alſo called, *The Word of the Goſpel*, *Acts* xv. 7. And this is that *Word of God*, and that *Goſpel*, which, where-ever their Diſcourſes are ſet down, we find the Apoſtles preached; and was that Faith, which made both Jews and Gentiles Believers and Members of the Church of Chriſt; purifying the Hearts, *Acts* xv. 9. and carrying with it Remiſſion of Sins, *Acts* x. 43. So that all that was to be believed for Juſtification, was no more but this ſingle Propoſition; that *Jeſus of Nazareth was the Chriſt, or the Meſſiah.* All, I ſay, that was to be believed for Juſtification: For that it was not all that was required to be done for Juſtification, we ſhall ſee hereafter.

Though we have ſeen above from what our Saviour has pronounced himſelf, *John* iii. 36. *That he that believeth on the Son, hath everlaſting Life; and he that believeth not the Son, ſhall not ſee Life, but the Wrath of God abideth on him*; and are taught from *John* iv. 39. compared with *v.* 42. *That believeth on him, is believing that he is the Meſſiah, the Saviour of the World*; and the Confeſſion made by St. *Peter*, Mat. xvi. 16. That he is *the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God*, being the Rock, on which our Saviour has promiſed to build his Church; though this, I ſay, and what elſe we have already taken notice of, be enough to convince us what it is we are in the Goſpel required to believe to eternal Life, without adding what we have obſerved from the preaching of the Apoſtles; yet it may not be amiſs, for the farther clearing this Matter, to obſerve what the Evangeliſts deliver concerning the ſame thing, though in different Words; which, therefore, perhaps, are not ſo generally taken notice of to this Purpoſe.

We have above obſerved, from the Words of *Andrew* and *Philip* compared, That the *Meſſiah*, and *him of whom Moſes in the Law and the Prophets did write*, ſignify the ſame thing. We ſhall now conſider that place, *John* i. a little farther. *Ver.* 41. *Andrew* ſays to *Simeon*, *We have found the Meſſiah. Philip*, on the ſame occaſion, *v.* 45. ſays to *Nathaniel*, *We have found him, of whom Moſes in the Law and the Prophets did write, Jeſus of Nazareth, the Son of Joſeph. Nathaniel*, who disbelieved this, when upon Chriſt's ſpeaking to him, he was convinced of it, declares his aſſent to it in

theſe

theſe Words; *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Iſrael.* From which it is evident, that to believe him to be *Him of whom Moſes and the Prophets did write*, or to be the *Son of God*, or to be the *King of Iſrael*, was in effect the ſame as to believe him to be the *Meſſiah:* And an Aſſent to that, was what our Saviour received for believing. For upon *Nathaniel*'s making a Confeſſion in theſe Words, *Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Iſrael; Jeſus anſwered and ſaid to him, Becauſe I ſaid to thee, I ſaw thee under the Fig-tree, doſt thou BELIEVE? Thou ſhalt ſee greater things than theſe*, v. 51. I deſire any one to read the latter Part of the firſt of *John*, from v. 25. with Attention, and tell me, whether it be not plain, that this Phraſe, *The Son of God*, is an Expreſſion uſed for the *Meſſiah*. To which let him add, *Martha*'s Declaration of her Faith, *John* xi. 27. in theſe Words; *I believe that thou art the Meſſiah, THE SON OF GOD, who ſhould come into the World*; and that Paſſage of St. *John* xx. 31. *That ye might believe that Jeſus is the Meſſiah, THE SON OF GOD; and that believing, ye might have Life through his Name:* And then tell me whether he can doubt that *Meſſiah* and *Son of God* were ſynonymous Terms, at that Time amongſt the Jews.

The Prophecy of *Daniel, Chap.* ix. where he is called *Meſſiah the Prince*; and the mention of his Government and Kingdom, and the Deliverance by him, in *Iſaiah*, *Daniel*, and other Propheſies, underſtood of the *Meſſiah*; were ſo well known to the Jews, and had ſo raiſed their Hopes of him about this time, which by their Account was to be the Time of his coming to reſtore the Kingdom to *Iſrael*, That *Herod* no ſooner heard of the *Magi*'s enquiry after *him that was born King of the Jews*, *Mat.* ii. but he forthwith *demanded of the chief Prieſts and Scribes, where the Meſſiah ſhould be born*, v. 4. Not doubting, but if there were any King born to the Jews, it was the *Meſſiah:* Whoſe Coming was now the general Expectation, as appears, *Luke* iii. 15. *The People being in Expectation, and all Men muſing in their Hearts of John, whether he were the Meſſiah or not.* And when the Prieſts and Levites ſent to ask him who he was; he underſtanding their Meaning, anſwers, *John* i. 20. That he was *not the Meſſiah:* But he bears witneſs that Jeſus *is the Son of God, i. e.* the *Meſſiah*, v. 34.

This looking for the *Meſſiah* at this time, we ſee alſo in *Simeon*; who is ſaid to be *waiting for the Conſolation of Iſrael*, *Luke* ii. 21. And having the Child Jeſus in his Arms, he ſays he had *ſeen the Salvation of the Lord*, v. 30. And *Anna coming at the ſame inſtant into the Temple, ſhe gave thanks alſo unto the Lord, and ſpake of him to all them that looked for Redemption in Iſrael*, v. 38. And of *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, it is ſaid, *Mark* xv. 43. That *he alſo expected the Kingdom of God:* By all which was meant the coming of the *Meſſiah*; and *Luke* xix. 11. it's ſaid, *They thought that the Kingdom of God ſhould immediately appear.*

This being premiſed, let us ſee what it was that *John the Baptiſt* preached, when he firſt entred upon his Miniſtry. That St. *Matthew* tells us, *Chap.* iii. 1, 2. *In thoſe Days came John the Baptiſt preaching in the Wilderneſs of Judea, ſaying, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* This was a Declaration of the coming of the *Meſſiah*; the *Kingdom of Heaven* and the *Kingdom of God* being the ſame, as is clear out of ſeveral Places of the Evangeliſts; and both ſignifying the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*. The Profeſſion which *John the Baptiſt* made, when ſent to the Jews, *John* i. 19. was, That *he was not the Meſſiah*; but that Jeſus was. This will appear to any one, who will compare v. 26—34. with *John* iii. 27, 30. The Jews being very inquiſitive to know whether *John* were the *Meſſiah*; he poſitively denies it, but tells them, he was only his Fore-runner; and that there ſtood one amongſt them, who would follow him, whoſe Shoe-latchet he was not worthy to untie. The next Day ſeeing Jeſus, he ſays, he was the Man; and that his own baptizing in Water, was only that *Jeſus* might be manifeſted to the World; and that he knew him not, till he ſaw the Holy Ghoſt deſcend upon him. He that ſent him to baptize having told him, that he on whom he ſhould ſee the Spirit deſcend, and reſt upon, he it was that ſhould baptize with the Holy Ghoſt; and that therefore he witneſſed, that *this was the Son of God*, v. 34. *i. e.* the *Meſſiah*; and, *Chap.* iii. 26, *&c.* They came to *John the Baptiſt*, and tell him, that *Jeſus* baptized and that all Men went to him. *John* anſwers, He has his Authority from Heaven; You know I never ſaid, I was the *Meſſiah*, but that I was ſent before him; He muſt increaſe, but I muſt decreaſe; for God hath ſent him, and he ſpeaks the Words of God; and God hath given all things into the Hands of his Son, *And he that believes on the Son, hath eternal Life*; The ſame Doctrine, and nothing elſe but what was preached by the Apoſtles afterwards: As we have ſeen all through the

Acts

Acts, *v.g.* that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah*. And thus it was that *John* bears Witneſs of our Saviour, as Jeſus himſelf ſays, *John* v. 33.

This alſo was the Declaration was given of him at his Baptiſm, by a Voice from Heaven; *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleaſed*, Mat. iii. 17. Which was a Declaration of him to be the *Meſſiah*, *the Son of God* being (as we have ſhewed) underſtood to ſignify the *Meſſiah*. To which we may add the firſt mention of him after his Conception, in the Words of the Angel to *Joſeph*; Mat. i. 21. *Thou ſhalt call his Name Jeſus*, or Saviour; *for he ſhall ſave his People from their Sins*. It was a received Doctrine in the Jewiſh Nation, that at the coming of the *Meſſiah*, all their Sins ſhould be forgiven them. Theſe Words therefore of the Angel we may look on as a Declaration, that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah*; whereof theſe Words, *his People*, are a farther Mark; which ſuppoſe him to have a People, and conſequently to be a King.

After his Baptiſm, Jeſus himſelf enters upon his Miniſtry. But before we examine what it was he propoſed to be believed, we muſt obſerve, that there is a threefold Declaration of the *Meſſiah*.

1. By Miracles. The Spirit of Propheſy had now for many Ages forſaken the Jews: And though their Common-wealth were not quite diſſolved, but that they lived under their own Laws, yet they were, under a foreign Dominion, ſubject to the *Romans*. In this State their Account of the Time being up, they were in Expectation of the *Meſſiah*; and of Deliverance by him in a Kingdom, he was to ſet up, according to their ancient Propheſies of him: Which gave them Hopes of an extraordinary Man yet to come from God, who with an extraordinary and Divine Power, and Miracles, ſhould evidence his Miſſion, and work their Deliverance. And of any ſuch extraordinary Perſon who ſhall have the Power of doing Miracles, they had no other Expectation but only of their *Meſſiah* One great Prophet and Worker of Miracles, and only one more, they expected; who was to be the *Meſſiah*. And therefore, we ſee the People juſtified their *believing in him*, *i.e.* their believing him to be the *Meſſiah*, becauſe of the Miracles he did; *John* vii. 31. *And many of the People believed in him, and ſaid, when the Meſſiah cometh, will he do more Miracles than this Man hath done?* And when the Jews, at the Feaſt of Dedication, *John* x. 24, 25. coming about him, ſaid unto him, *How long doſt thou make us doubt? If thou be the Meſſiah, tell us plainly. Jeſus anſwered them, I told you, and ye believed not; the Works that I do in my Father's Name bear Witneſs of me.* And, *John* v. 36. he ſays, *I have a greater Witneſs than that of John; for the Works which the Father hath given me to do, the ſame Works that I do, bear Witneſs of me, that the Father hath ſent me.* Where, by the way, we may obſerve, that his being *ſent by the Father*, is but another way of expreſſing the *Meſſiah*; which is evident from this Place here, *John* v. compared with that of *John* x. laſt quoted. For there he ſays, that his Works bear Witneſs of him: And what was that Witneſs? *viz.* That he was the *Meſſiah*. Here again he ſays, that his Works bear Witneſs of him: And what is that Witneſs? *viz.* *That the Father ſent him.* By which we are taught, that to be ſent by the Father, and to be the *Meſſiah*, was the ſame thing, in his way of declaring himſelf. And accordingly we find, *John* iv. 53. and xi. 45. and elſewhere, many hearkned and aſſented to his Teſtimony, and believed on him, ſeeing the things that he did.

2. Another way of declaring the coming of the *Meſſiah*, was by Phraſes and Circumlocutions that did ſignify or intimate his coming; though not in direct Words pointing out the Perſon. The moſt uſual of theſe were, *The Kingdom of God, and of Heaven*; becauſe it was that which was often ſpoken of the *Meſſiah*, in the Old Teſtament, in very plain Words: And a Kingdom was that which the Jews moſt looked after, and wiſhed for. In that known Place, *Iſa.* ix. *The GOVERNMENT ſhall be upon his Shoulders; he ſhall be called the PRINCE of Peace: Of the Increaſe of his GOVERNMENT and Peace there ſhall be no End: Upon the THRONE of David, and upon his KINGDOM, to order it, and to eſtabliſh it with Judgment, and with Juſtice, from henceforth even for ever.* Micha v. 2. *But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thouſands of Judah, yet out of thee ſhall he come forth unto me, that is to be the RULER in Iſrael.* And *Daniel*, beſides that he calls him *Meſſiah the PRINCE*, *Chap.* ix. 25. In the Account of his Viſion *of the Son of Man*, *Chap.* vii. 13, 14. ſays, *There was given him Dominion, Glory, and a KINGDOM, that all People, Nations, and Languages ſhould ſerve him: His Dominion is an everlaſting Dominion, which ſhall not paſs away; and his KINGDOM that which ſhall not be deſtroyed.* So that the Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom of Heaven, were common Phraſes

among

amongſt the *Jews* to ſignify the Times of the *Meſſiah*. Luke xiv. 15. *One of the Jews that ſat at meat with him, ſaid unto him, Bleſſed is he that ſhall eat bread in the Kingdom of God. Chap.* xvii. 20. The Phariſees demanded, *when the Kingdom of God ſhould come?* And St. *John Baptiſt came, ſaying, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand:* A Phraſe he would not have uſed in preachiug, had it not been underſtood.

There are other Expreſſions that ſignified the *Meſſiah*, and his Coming, which we ſhall take notice of as they come in our way.

3. By plain and direct Words, declaring the Doctrine of the *Meſſiah*, ſpeaking out that Jeſus was He: As we ſee the Apoſtles did, when they went about preaching the Goſpel, after our Saviour's Reſurrection. This was the open clear Way, and that which one would think the *Meſſiah* himſelf, when he came, ſhould have taken; eſpecially if it were of that Moment, that upon Mens believing him to be the *Meſſiah*, depended the Forgiveneſs of their Sins. And yet we ſee that our Saviour did not: But on the contrary, for the moſt part, made no other Diſcovery of himſelf, at leaſt in *Judea*, and at the beginning of his Miniſtry, but in the two former Ways, which were more obſcure; not declaring himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, any otherwiſe than as it might be gathered from the Miracles he did, and the Conformity of his Life and Actions, with the Propheſies of the Old Teſtament concerning him; and from ſome general Diſcourſes of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* being come, under the name of the *Kingdom of God*, and *of Heaven*. Nay, ſo far was he from publickly owning himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, that he forbid the doing of it: *Mark* viii. 27-30. *He asked his Diſciples, whom do Men ſay that I am? And they anſwered, John the Baptiſt; but ſome ſay Elias; and others, one of the Prophets.* (So that it is evident, that even thoſe who believed him an extraordinary Perſon, knew not yet who he was, or that he gave himſelf out for the *Meſſiah*; though this was in the third Year of his Miniſtry, and not a Year before his Death.) *And he ſaith unto them, but whom ſay ye that I am? And Peter anſwered, and ſaid unto him, Thou art the* Meſſiah. *And he charged them that they ſhould tell no Man of him. Luke* iv. 41. *And Devils came out of many, crying, Thou art the* Meſſiah, *the Son of God: And he rebuking them, ſuffered them not to ſpeak, that they knew him to be the* Meſſiah. Mark iii. 11,12. *Unclean Spirits, when they ſaw him, fell down before him, and cryed, ſaying, Thou art the Son of God: And he ſtraitly charged them that they ſhould not make him known.* Here again we may obſerve from the comparing of the two Texts, that, *Thou art the Son of God*; or, *Thou art the Meſſiah*, were indifferently uſed for the ſame thing. But to return to the Matter in Hand.

This Concealment of himſelf will ſeem ſtrange, in one who was come to bring Light into the world, and was to ſuffer Death for the Teſtimony of the Truth. This Reſervedneſs will be thought to look as if he had a mind to conceal himſelf, and not to be known to the World for the *Meſſiah*, nor to be believ'd on as ſuch. But we ſhall be of another mind, and conclude this Proceeding of his according to divine Wiſdom, and ſuited to a fuller Manifeſtation and Evidence of his being the *Meſſiah*; when we conſider that he was to fill out the time foretold of his Miniſtry; and, after a Life illuſtrious in Miracles and good Works, attended with Humility, Meekneſs, Patience, and Sufferings, and every way conformable to the Propheſies of him, ſhould be led as a Sheep to the ſlaughter, and with all quiet and ſubmiſſion be brought to the Croſs, though there were no guilt nor fault found in him. This could not have been, if as ſoon as he appeared in publick, and began to preach, he had preſently profeſſed himſelf to have been the *Meſſiah*; the King that owned that Kingdom he publiſhed to be at Hand. For the *Sanhedrim* would then have laid hold on it, to have got him into their Power, and thereby have taken away his Life; at leaſt, they would have diſturbed his Miniſtry, and hindred the Work he was about. That this made him cautious, and avoid, as much as he could, the Occaſions of provoking them, and falling into their Hands, is plain from *John* vii. 1. *After theſe things Jeſus walked in Galilee*; out of the way of the Chief Prieſts and Rulers; *for he would not walk in Jewry, becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him.* Thus, making good what he foretold them at *Jeruſalem*, when at the firſt Paſſover after his beginning to preach the Goſpel, upon his curing the Man at the Pool of *Bethſaida*, they ſought to kill him, *John* v. 16. *Ye have not*, ſays he, *v.* 38. *his Word abiding amongſt you: For whom he hath ſent, him ye believe not.* This was ſpoken more particularly to the *Jews* of *Jeruſalem*, who were the forward Men, zealous to take away his Life: And it imports, that becauſe of their Unbelief and Oppoſition to him, the *Word of God, i. e.* the preaching of the Kingdom of the

Meſſiah,

Meſſiah, which is often called the Word of God, did not ſtay amongſt them: He could not ſtay amongſt them, preach and explain to them the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*.

That the Word of God, here, ſignifies *the word of God* that ſhould make Jeſus known to them to be the *Meſſiah*, is evident from the Context: And this meaning of this Place is made good by the Event. For after this, we here no more of Jeſus at *Jeruſalem*, till the Pentecoſt come twelve-month, though 'tis not to be doubted but that he was there the next Paſſover, and other Feaſts between, but privately. And now at *Jeruſalem*, at the Feaſt of *Pentecoſt*, near fifteen Months after, he ſays little of any thing and not a word of the Kingdom of Heaven being come, nor at hand; or did he any Miracle there. And returning to *Jeruſalem* at the Feaſt of Tabernacles, it is plain, that from this time till then, which was a Year and a half, he had not taught them at *Jeruſalem*.

For, 1. It is ſaid, *John* vii. 2, 15. That he teaching in the Temple at the Feaſt of Tabernacles, *The Jews marvelled, ſaying, How knoweth this Man Letters, having never learned?* A ſign they had not been uſed to his preaching: For if they had, they would not now have marvelled.

2. *Ver.* 19. He ſays thus to them: *Did not Moſes give you the Law, and yet none of you keep the Law? Why go you about to kill me? One work*, or Miracle, *I did* here amongſt you, *and ye all marvel. Moſes therefore gave unto you Circumciſion, and ye on the Sabbath-day circumciſe a Man? If a Man on the Sabbath-day receive Circumciſion, that the Law of Moſes ſhould not be broken, are ye angry with me becauſe I have made a Man every way whole on the Sabbath-day?* Which is a direct Defence of what he did at *Jeruſalem* a Year and a half before; the Work he here ſpeaks of, we find he had not preached to them there, from that time till this, but had made good what he then told them, *v.* 38. *Ye have not the Word of God remaining among you, becauſe whom he hath ſent ye believe not.* Whereby, I think, he ſignifies his not ſtaying and being frequent amongſt them at *Jeruſalem*, preaching the Goſpel of the Kingdom: becauſe their great Unbelief, Oppoſition, and Malice to him would not permit it.

This was manifeſtly ſo in fact. For the firſt Miracle he did at *Jeruſalem*, which was at the ſecond Paſſover after his Baptiſm, brought him in danger of his Life. Hereupon we find he forbore preaching again there till the Feaſt of Tabernacles, immediately preceding his laſt Paſſover: So that till half a Year before his Paſſion, he did but one Miracle, and preached but once publickly at *Jeruſalem*. Theſe Trials he made there: But found their Unbelief ſuch, that if he had ſtaid and perſiſted to preach the good Tidings of the Kingdom, and to ſhew himſelf by Miracles among them, he could not have had Time and Freedom to do thoſe Works which his Father had given him to finiſh, as he ſays *v.* 36. of this fifth of St. *John*.

When upon the curing of the withered Hand on the Sabbath-day, *The Phariſees took counſel with the Herodians, how they might deſtroy him, Jeſus withdrew himſelf with his Diſciples to the Sea: And a great Multitude from Galilee followed him, and from Judea, and from Jeruſalem, and from Idumea, and from beyond Jordan, and they about Tyre and Sidon, a great Multitude; when they had heard what great Things he did, came unto him, and he healed them all, and* CHARGED THEM THAT THEY SHOULD NOT MAKE HIM KNOWN: *That it might be fulfilled what was ſpoken by the Prophet Iſaiah, ſaying: Behold my Servant whom I have choſen; my Beloved, in whom my Soul is well pleaſed: I will put my Spirit upon him, and he ſhall ſhew Judgment to the Gentiles. He ſhall not ſtrive, nor cry, neither ſhall any Man hear his Voice in the Streets*, Mat. xii, and Mark iii.

And *John* xi. 47. Upon the News of our Saviour's raiſing *Lazarus* from the Dead, *The Chief Prieſts and Phariſees convened the Sanhedrim, and ſaid, what do we? For this Man does many Miracles. V.* 53. *Then from that Day forth, they took counſel together for to put him to death. V.* 54. *Jeſus therefore walked no more openly amongſt the Jews.* His Miracles had now ſo much declared him to be the *Meſſiah*, that the *Jews* could no longer bear him, nor he truſt himſelf amongſt them; *But went thence unto a Country near to the Wilderneſs, into a City called Ephraim, and there continued with his Diſciples.* This was but a little before his laſt Paſſover, as appears by the following Words, *v.* 55. *And the Jews Paſſover was nigh at hand:* And he could not, now his Miracles had made him ſo well known, have been ſecure the little time that remained till his hour was fully come, if he had not with his wonted and neceſſary Caution withdrawn, *And walked no more openly amongſt the Jews*, till his time (at the next Paſſover) was fully come; and then again he appeared amongſt them openly. Nor

Nor would the *Romans* have ſuffered him, if he had gone about Preaching that he was the King whom the *Jews* expected. Such an Accuſation would have been forwardly brought againſt him by the *Jews*, if they could have heard it out of his own Mouth; and that had been his publick Doctrine to his Followers, which was openly preached by his Apoſtles after his Death, when he appeared no more. And of this they were accuſed, *Acts* 17. 5—9. *But the Jews which believed not, moved with Envy, took unto them certain lewd Fellows of the baſer Sort, and gathered a Company, and ſet all the City in an Uproar; and aſſualted the Houſe of Jaſon, and ſought to bring them out to the People. And when they found them* [Paul *and* Silas] *not, they drew Jaſon and certain Brethren unto the Rulers of the City, crying, theſe that have turned the World upſide down, are come hither alſo, whom Jaſon hath received: And theſe all do contrary to the Decrees of Cæſar, ſaying, that there is another King, one Jeſus. And they troubled the People, and the Rulers of the City, when they heard theſe Things: And when they had taken Security of Jaſon and the other, they let them go.*

Tho' the Magiſtrates of the World had no great Regard to the Talk of a King, who had ſuffered Death, and appeared no longet any where; yet if our Savour had openly declared this of himſelf in his Life-time, with a Train of Diſciples and Followers every where owning and crying him up for their King, the *Roman* Governour of *Judea* could not have forborn to have taken notice of it, and have made uſe of their Force againſt him. This the *Jews* were not miſtaken in; and therefore made uſe of it as the ſtrongeſt Accuſation, and likelieſt to prevail with *Pilate* againſt him for the taking away his Life; it being Treaſon, and an unpardonable Offence, which could 'ſcape Death from a *Roman* Deputy, without the Forfeiture of his own Life. Thus then they accuſe him to *Pilate*, Luke xxiii. 2. *We found this Fellow perverting the Nation, and forbidding to give Tribute to Cæſar, ſaying, that he himſelf is a King*, or rather, *the Meſſiah, the King.*

Our Saviour indeed, now that his Time was come, (and he in Cuſtody, and forſaken of all the World, and ſo out of all Danger of raiſing any Sedition or Diſturance,) owns himſelf to *Pilate*, to be a King; after having firſt told *Pilate*, John xviii. 36. *That his Kingdom was not of this World:* And for a Kingdom in another World, *Pilate* knew that his Maſter at *Rome* concerned not himſelf. But had there been any the leaſt Appearance of Truth in the Allegations of the *Jews*, that he had perverted the Nation; forbidding to pay Tribute to *Cæſar*, or drawing the People after him, as their King; *Pilate* would not ſo readily have pronouced him Innocent. But we ſee what he ſaid to his Accuſers, *Luke* xxiii. 13, 14. *Pilate, when he had called together the Chief Prieſts and the Rulers of the People, ſaid unto them, You have brought this Man unto me, as one that perverteth the People; and behold, I having examined him before you, have found no Fault in this Man, touching theſe Things whereof you accuſe him: No, nor yet Herod, for I ſent you to him; and lo, nothing worthy of Death is done by him.* And therefore, finding a Man of that mean Condition, and innocent Life, (no Mover of Seditions, or Diſturber of the Publick Peace,) without a Friend or a Follower, he would have diſmiſſed him, as a King of no Conſequence; as an innocent Man, falſely and maliciouſly accuſed by the *Jews*.

How neceſſary this Caution was in our Saviour, to ſay or do nothing that might juſtly offend, or render him ſuſpected to the *Roman* Governor; and how glad the *Jews* would have been to have any ſuch Thing againſt him; we may ſee, *Luke* xx. 20. The chief Prieſts and the Scribes *watched him, and ſent forth Spies, who ſhould feign themſelves juſt Men, that might take hold of his Words, that ſo they might deliver him unto the Power and Authority of the Governor.* And the very Thing wherein they hoped to entrap him in this Place, was paying Tribute to *Cæſar*, which they afterwards falſly accuſed him of. And what would they have done, if he had before them profeſſed himſelf to have been the *Meſſiah*, their King and Deliverer?

And here we may obſerve the wonderful Providence of God, who had ſo ordered the State of the *Jews* at the Time when his Son was to come into the World; that though neither their Civil Conſtitution, nor religious Worſhip were diſſolved, yet the Power of Life and Death was taken from them; whereby he had an Opportunity to publiſh the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*; that is, his own Royalty, under the Name of the *Kingdom of God*, and *of Heaven*: Which the *Jews* well enough underſtood, and would certainly have put him to Death for, had the Power been in their own Hands. But this being no Matter of Accuſation to the *Romans*, hindred him not from ſpeaking of the *Kingdom of Heaven*, as he did: Some-

times in Reference to his Appearing in the World, and being believ'd on by particular Perſons; ſometimes in reference to the Power ſhould be given him by the Father at the Reſurrection; and ſometimes in reference to his coming to judge the World at the laſt Day in the full Glory and Completion of his Kingdom. Theſe were Ways of declaring himſelf, which the Jews could lay no hold on, to bring him in danger with *Pontius Pilate*, and get him ſeized and put to Death.

Another Reaſon there was, that hindred him as much as the former from profeſſing himſelf in expreſs Words to be the *Meſſiah*; and that was, that the whole Nation of the Jews expecting at this Time their *Meſſiah*, and Deliverance by him from the Subjection they were in to a foreign Yoke, the Body of the People, would certainly, upon his declaring himſelf to be the *Meſſiah* their King, have roſe up in Rebellion, and ſet him at the Head of them. And indeed, the Miracles that he did, ſo much diſpoſed them to think him to be the *Meſſiah*, that tho' ſhrouded under the Obſcurity of a mean Condition, and a very private ſimple Life; tho' he paſſed for a *Galilean*, (his Birth an *Bethlehem* being then concealed) and aſſumed not to himſelf any Power or Authority, or ſo much as the Name of the *Meſſiah*, yet he could hardly avoid being ſet up by a Tumult, and proclaimed their King. So *John* tells us, *Chap.* vi. 14, 15. *Then thoſe Men, when they had ſeen the Miracles that Jeſus did, ſaid, this is of a Truth that Prophet that ſhould come into the World. When therefore Jeſus perceived that they would come to take him by Force to make him King, he departed again into a Mountain himſelf alone.* This was upon his feeding of Five Thouſand with five Barley Loaves and two Fiſhes. So hard was it for him, doing thoſe Miracles which were neceſſary to teſtify his Miſſion, and which often drew great Multitudes after him, *Mat.* iv. 25. to keep the heady and haſty Multitude from ſuch Diſorder, as would have involved him in it; and have diſturbed the Courſe, and cut ſhort the Time of his Miniſtry; and drawn on him the Reputation and Death of a turbulent ſeditious Malefactor: Contrary to the Deſign of his Coming, which was to be offered up a Lamb blameleſs, and void of Offence; his Innocence appearing to all the World, even to him that delivered him up to be crucified. This it would have been impoſſible to have avoided, if in his Preaching every where, he had openly aſſumed to himſelf the Title of their *Meſſiah*; which was all was wanting to ſet the People in a Flame; who, drawn by his Miracles, and the Hopes of finding a Deliverer in ſo extraordinary a Man, followed him in great Numbers. We read every where of Multitudes: and in *Luke* xii. 1. of *Myriads* that were gathered about him. This Conflux of People, thus diſpoſed, would not have failed, upon his declaring himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, to have made a Commotion, and with Force ſet him up for their King. It is plain therefore from theſe two Reaſons, why, (tho' he came to preach the Goſpel, and convert the World to a Belief of his being the *Meſſiah*, and tho' he ſays ſo much of his Kingdom, under the Title of the Kingdom of God, and the Kingdom of Heaven,) he yet makes it not his Buſineſs to perſuade them that he himſelf is the *Meſſiah*, nor does in his publick Preaching declare himſelf to be him. He inculcates to the People, on all Occaſions, that the Kingdom of God is come: He ſhews the Way of Admittance into this Kingdom, *viz.* Repentance and Baptiſm; and teaches the Laws of it, *viz.* Good Life, according to the ſtricteſt Rules of Vertue and Morality. But who the King was of this Kingdom, he leaves to his Miracles to point out to thoſe who would conſider what he did, and make the right Uſe of it, now; or to witneſs to thoſe who ſhould hearken to the Apoſtles hereafter, when they preached it in plain Words, and called upon them to believe it, after his Reſurrection, when there ſhould be no longer room to fear that it ſhould cauſe any Diſturbance in Civil Societies, and the Governments of the World. But he could not declare himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, without manifeſt Danger of Tumult and Sedition: And the Miracles he did, declared it ſo much, that he was fain often to hide himſelf, and withdraw from the Concourſe of the People. The Leper that he cured, *Mark* i. tho' forbid to ſay any thing, yet *blazed it ſo abroad, that Jeſus could no more openly enter into the City, but was without in deſart Places*, living in Retirement, as appears from *Luke* v. 16. and there *they came to him from every Quarter*. And thus he did more than once.

This being premiſed, let us take a View of the Promulgation of the Goſpel by our Saviour himſelf, and ſee what it was he taught the World, and required Men to believe.

The firſt Beginning of his Miniſtry, whereby he ſhewed himſelf, ſeems to be at *Cana* in *Galilee*, ſoon after his Baptiſm; where he turned Water into Wine: Of which

St. *John*,

St. *John*, *Chap.* ii. 11. ſays thus, *This Beginning of Miracles Jeſus made, and manifeſted his Glory, and his Diſciples believed in him.* His Diſciples here believed in him, but we hear not of any other Preaching to them, but by this Miracle, whereby he *manifeſted his Glory*, *i. e.* of being the *Meſſiah* the Prince. So *Nathanael*, without any other Preaching, but only our Saviour's diſcovering to him that he knew him after an extraordinary Manner, preſently acknowledges him to be the *Meſſiah*; crying, *Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Iſrael.*

From hence, ſtaying a few Days at *Capernaum*, he goes to *Jeruſalem* to the Paſſover; and there he drives the Traders out of the Temple, *John* ii. 12—15. ſaying, *Make not my Father's Houſe a Houſe of Merchandiſe.* Where we ſee he uſes a Phraſe which by Interpretaoion ſignifies that he was the *Son of God*, though at that Time unregarded. *v.* 16. Hereupon the Jews demand, *What Sign doſt thou ſhew us, ſince thou doeſt theſe Things? Jeſus anſwered, Deſtroy ye this Temple, and in three Days I will raiſe it again.* This is an Inſtance of what Way Jeſus took to declare himſelf: For 'tis plain by their Reply, the Jews underſtood him not, nor his Diſciples neither; for 'tis ſaid, *v.* 22. *When therefore he was riſen from the Dead, his Diſciples remembred that he ſaid this to them: And they believed the Scripture, and the ſaying of Jeſus to them.*

This therefore we may look on, in the beginning, as a Pattern of Chriſt's Preaching, and ſhewing himſelf to the Jews; which he generally followed afterwards, *viz.* ſuch a Manifeſtation of himſelf, as every one at preſent could not underſtand; but yet carried ſuch an Evidence with it to thoſe who were well diſpoſed now, or would reflect on it when the whole Courſe of his Miniſtry was over, as was ſufficient clearly to convince them that he was the *Meſſiah.*

The Reaſon of this Method uſed by our Saviour, the Scripture gives us here, at this his firſt Appearing in publick; after his Entrance upon his Miniſtry, to be a Rule and Light to us in the whole Courſe of it. For the next Verſe taking notice that many believed on him, *becauſe of his Miracles*, (which was all the Preaching they had.) 'Tis ſaid, *v.* 24. *But Jeſus did not commit himſelf unto them, becauſe he knew all Men*; *i.e.* He declared not himſelf ſo openly to be the *Meſſiah*, their King, as to put himſelf into the Power of the Jews, by laying himſelf open to their Malice whom he knew would be ſo ready to lay hold on it to accuſe him. For, as the next Verſe 25. ſhews, he knew well enough what was in them. We may here farther obſerve, That *believing in his Name*, ſignifies believing him to be the *Meſſiah*. *v.* 22. tells us, That *many at the Paſſover believed in his Name, when they ſaw the Miracles that he did.* What other Faith could theſe Miracles produce in them, who ſaw them, but that this was He of whom the Scripture ſpoke, who was to be their Deliverer.

Whilſt he was now at *Jeruſalem*, *Nicodemus*, a Ruler of the Jews, comes to him, *John* iii. 1—21. to whom he preaches eternal Life by Faith in the *Meſſiah*, *v.* 15. and 17. But in general Terms, without naming himſelf to be that *Meſſiah*; though his whole Diſcourſe tends to it. This is all we hear of our Saviour the firſt Year of his Miniſtry; but only his Baptiſm, Faſting and Temptation in the Beginning of it, and ſpending the reſt of it after the Paſſover in *Judea* with his Diſciples baptizing there. But *when he knew that the* Phariſees *reported that he made and baptized more Diſciples than* John, *he left* Judea, and got out of their way again into *Galilee*, John iv. 1, 3.

In his way back, by the Well of *Sichar*, he diſcourſes with the *Samaritan* Woman; and after having opened to her the true and ſpiritual Worſhip which was at hand, which the Woman preſently underſtands of the Times of the *Meſſiah*, who was then looked for; Thus ſhe anſwers, *v.* 25. *I know that the Meſſiah cometh: When he is come, he will tell us all Things.* Whereupon our Saviour, though we hear no ſuch thing from him in *Jeruſalem* or *Judea*, or to *Nicodemus*, yet here to this *Samaritan* Woman, he in plain and direct Words owns and declares, that he himſelf, who talk'd with her, was the *Meſſiah*, *v.* 26.

This would ſeem very ſtrange, that he ſhould be more free and open to a *Samaritan*, than he was to the *Jews*; were not the Reaſon plain from what we have obſerved above. He was now out of *Judea*, amongſt a People with whom the *Jews* had no Commerce; *v.* 9. Who were not diſpoſed out of Envy, as the *Jews* were, to ſeek his Life, or to accuſe him to the *Roman* Governor, or to make an Inſurrection to ſet a Jew up for their King. What the Conſequence was of his Diſcourſe with this *Samaritan* Woman, we have an Account,

v. 28. 39—42. *She left her Water-pot, and went her way into the City, and ſaith to the Men, Come, ſee a Man who told me all Things that ever I did: Is not this the Meſſiah? And many of the* Samaritans *of that City* BELIEVED ON HIM *for the ſaying of the Woman, which teſtified, He told me all that ever I did. So when the* Samaritans *were come unto him, they beſought him that he would tarry with them: And he abode there two Days. And many more believed becauſe of his own Word: And ſaid unto the Woman, Now we believe not becauſe of thy ſaying; for we have heard him our ſelves; and we know,* (i. e. are fully perſuaded,) *that it is indeed the Meſſiah, the Saviour of the World.* By comparing *v.* 39. with 41 and 42. it is plain, that *believing on him* ſignifies no more than believing him to be the *Meſſiah.*

From *Sichar* Jeſus goes to *Nazareth*, the Place he was bred up in; and there reading in the Synagogue a Prophecy concerning the *Meſſiah* out of the lxi. of *Iſaiah*, he tells them, *Luke* iv. 21. *This Day is this Scripture fulfilled in your Ears.*

But being in Danger of his Life at *Nazareth*, he leaves it for *Capernaum*: And then, as St. *Matthew* informs us, *Chap.* iv. 17. *He began to preach, and ſay, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*, Or, as St. *Mark* has it, *Chap.* i. 14, 15. *Preaching the Goſpel of the Kingdom of God; and ſaying, The Time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand, repent ye, and believe in the Goſpel*; *i. e.* believe this good News. This removing to *Capernaum*, and ſeating himſelf there in the Borders of *Zabulon* and *Naphtali*, was, as St. *Matthew* obſerves, *Chap.* iv. 13—16. That a Prophecy of *Iſaiah* might be fulfilled. Thus the Actions and Circumſtances of his Life anſwered the Prophecies, and declared him to be the *Meſſiah.* And by what St. *Mark* ſays in this Place, it is manifeſt, that the Goſpel which he preached and required them to believe, was no other but the good Tidings of the Coming of the *Meſſiah*, and of his Kingdom; the Time being now fulfilled.

In his way to *Capernaum*, being come to *Cana*, a Nobleman of *Capernaum* came to him, *v.* 47. *And beſought him that he would come down and heal his Son, for he was at the point of Death.* V. 48. *Then ſaid Jeſus unto him, except ye ſee Signs and Wonders ye will not believe.* Then he returning homewards, and finding that his Son began to *mend at the ſame Hour in which Jeſus ſaid unto him, thy Son liveth; he himſelf believed, and his whole Houſe*, v. 53.

Here this Noblemen is by the Apoſtle pronounced to be a *Believer.* And what does he *believe?* Even that which Jeſus complains, *v.* 48. *They would not* BELIEVE, except they ſaw Signs and Wonders: Which could be nothing but what thoſe of *Samaria*, in the ſame Chapter, believed, *viz.* that he was that *Meſſiah.* For we no where in the Goſpel hear of any thing elſe had been propoſed to be believed by them.

Having done Miracles, and cured all their Sick at *Capernaum*, he ſays, *Let us go to the adjoining Towns, that I may preach there alſo, for therefore came I forth*, Mark i. 38. Or, as St. *Luke* has it, *Chap.* iv. 43. He tells the Multitude, who would have kept him that he might not go from them, *I muſt Evangelize*, or tell the good Tidings of the *Kingdom of God*, to other Cities alſo, for therefore am I ſent. And St. *Matthew*, *Chap.* iv. 23. tells us how he executed this Commiſſion he was ſent on. *And Jeſus went about all* Galilee, *teaching in their Synagogues, and preaching the Goſpel of the Kingdom, and curing all Diſeaſes.* This then was what he was ſent to preach every where, *viz.* the Goſpel of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*; and by the Miracles and Good he did, let them know who was the *Meſſiah.*

Hence he goes up to *Jeruſalem*, to the ſecond Paſſover ſince the Beginning of his Miniſtry. And here diſcourſing to the Jews, who ſought to kill him, upon occaſion of the Man, whom he had cured, carrying his Bed on the Sabbath-day; and for making God his Father, he tells them, that he wrought theſe Things by the Power of God; and that he ſhall do greater Things: For that the Dead ſhall, at his Summons, be raiſed; and that he, by a Power committed to him from his Father, ſhall judge them; and that he is ſent by his Father, and that whoever ſhall hear his Word, and believe in him that ſent him, has eternal Life. This, though a clear Deſcription of the *Meſſiah*, yet we may obſerve, that here to the angry Jews, who ſought to kill him, he ſays not a Word of his Kingdom, nor ſo much as names the *Meſſiah*; but yet that he is the Son of God, and ſent from God, he refers them to the Teſtimony of *John* the *Baptiſt*, to the Teſtimony of his own Miracles, and of God himſelf in the Voice from Heaven, and of the Scriptures, and of *Moſes.*

He

He leaves them to learn from theſe the Truth they were to believe, *viz.* that he was the *Meſſiah* ſent from God. This you may read more at large, *John* v. 1.—47.

The next Place where we find him Preaching, was on the Mount, *Mat.* v. and *Luke* vi. This is by much the longeſt Sermon we have of his any where; and, in all likelihood, to the greateſt Auditory. For it appears to have been to the People gathered to him from *Galilee*, and *Judea*, and *Jeruſalem*, and from beyond *Jordan*; and that came out of *Idumea*, and from *Tyre* and *Sidon*, mentioned *Mark* iii. 7, 8. and *Luke* vi. 17. But in this whole Sermon of his we do not find one Word of Believing, and therefore no mention of the *Meſſiah*, or any Intimation to the People who himſelf was. The Reaſon whereof we may gather from *Mat.* xii. 16. where Chriſt *forbids them to make him known*, which ſuppoſes them to know already who he was. For that this xiith Chapter of *Matthew* ought to precede the Sermon in the Mount, is plain, by comparing it with *Mark* ii. beginning at *v.* 13. to *Mark* iii. 8. And comparing thoſe Chapters of St. *Mark* with *Luke* vi. And I deſire my Reader once for all here to take notice, that I have all along obſerved the Order of Time in our Saviour's Preaching; and have not, as I think, paſſed by any of his Diſcourſes. In this Sermon our Saviour only teaches them what were the Laws of his Kingdom, and what they muſt do who were admitted into it, of which I ſhall have Occaſion to ſpeak more at large in another Place; being at preſent only enquiring what our Saviour propoſed as Matter of Faith to be believed.

After this *John* the *Baptiſt* ſends to him this Meſſage, *Luke* vii. 19. asking, *Art thou he that ſhould come, or do we expect another?* That is, in ſhort, Art thou the *Meſſiah?* And if thou art, why doſt thou let me, thy Fore-runner, languiſh in Priſon? Muſt I expect Deliverance from any other? To which Jeſus returns this Anſwer, *v.* 22, 23. *Tell* John *what you have ſeen and heard: The Blind ſee, the Lame walk, the Lepers are cleanſed, the Deaf hear, the Dead are raiſed, to the Poor the Goſpel is preached; and bleſſed is he who is not offended in me.* What it is to be *offended* or *ſcandalized in him*, we may ſee by comparing *Mat.* xiii. 28. and *Mark* iv. 17. with *Luke* viii. 13. For what the two firſt call *ſcandalized*, the laſt calls *ſtanding off from*, or *forſaking*, *i. e.* not receiving him as the *Meſſiah*, (*Vid. Mark* vi. 1—6.) or revolting from him. Here Jeſus refers *John* as he did the Jews before, to the Teſtimony of his Miracles, to know who he was; and this was generally his Preaching, whereby he declared himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*: Who was the only Prophet to come, whom the Jews had any Expectation of; nor did they look for any other Perſon to be ſent to them with the Power of Miracles, but only the *Meſſiah*. His Miracles, we ſee by his Anſwer to *John* the *Baptiſt*, he thought a ſufficient Declaration amongſt them, that he was the *Meſſiah*. And therefore upon his curing the Poſſeſſed of the Devil, the Dumb and Blind, *Mat.* xii. the People, who ſaw the Miracle, ſaid, *v.* 23. *Is not this the Son of David?* As much as to ſay, Is not this the *Meſſiah?* Whereat the *Phariſees* being offended, ſaid, He caſt out Devils by *Beelzebub*. Jeſus ſhewing the Falſhood and Vanity of their Blaſphemy, juſtifies the Concluſion the People made from this Miracle; ſaying, *v.* 28. That his caſting out Devils by the Spirit of God was an Evidence that the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* was come.

One Thing more there was in the Miracles done by his Diſciples, which ſhewed him to be the *Meſſiah*; that they were done in his Name. *In the Name of Jeſus of* Nazareth, *riſe up and walk*, ſays St. *Peter* to the lame Man whom he cured in the Temple, *Acts* iii. 6. And how far the Power of that Name reached, they themſelves ſeem to wonder, *Luke* x. 17. *And the ſeventy returned with Joy, ſaying, Lord, even the Devils are ſubject to us in thy Name.*

From this Meſſage from *John* the *Baptiſt*, he takes Occaſion to tell the People, that *John* was the Fore-runner of the *Meſſiah*; that from the Time of *John* the *Baptiſt* the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* began, to which Time all the Prophets and the Law pointed, *Luke* vii. and *Math.* xi.

Luke viii. 1. *Afterwards he went through every City and Village, preaching and ſhewing the good Tidings of the Kingdom of God.* Here we ſee, as every where, what his Preaching was, and conſequently what was to be believed.

Soon after he preaches from a Boat to the People on the Shoar. His Sermon at large we may read, *Mat.* xiii. *Mark* iv. and *Luke* viii. But this is very obſervable, that this ſecond Sermon of his here, is quite different from his former in the Mount. For that was all ſo plain and intelligible, that nothing could be more ſo: Whereas this is all ſo involved in Parables, that even the Apoſtles themſelves did not underſtand

it,

it. If we enquire into the Reaſon of this, we ſhall poſſibly have ſome Light from the different Subjects of theſe two Sermons. There he preach'd to the People only Morality, clearing the Precepts of the Law from the falſe Gloſſes which were receiv'd in thoſe Days; and ſetting forth the Duties of a good Life in their full Obligation and Extent, beyond what the Judiciary Laws of the *Iſraelites* did, or the Civil Laws of any Country could preſcribe or take notice of. But here in this Sermon by the Sea-ſide, he ſpeaks of nothing but the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, which he does all in Parables. One Reaſon whereof St. *Matthew* gives us, *Chap.* xiii. 35. *That it might be fulfilled which was ſpoken by the Prophet, ſaying, I will open my Mouth in Parables, I will utter Things that have been kept ſecret from the Foundations of the World.* Another Reaſon our Saviour himſelf gives of it, *v.* 11, 12. *Becauſe to you is given to know the Myſteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given. For whoſoever hath, to him ſhall be given, and he ſhall have more abundantly: But whoſoever hath not, i. e.* improves not the Talents that he hath, *from him ſhall be taken away, even that that he hath.*

One thing it may not be amiſs to obſerve; That our Saviour here in the Explication of the firſt of theſe Parables to his Apoſtles, calls the Preaching of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, ſimply *the Word*; and *Luke* viii. 21. *The Word of God:* From whence St. *Luke*, in the *Acts*, often mentions it under the Name of the *Word*, and the *Word of God*, as we have elſewhere obſerved. To which I ſhall here add that of *Acts* viii. 4. *Therefore they that were ſcattered abroad, went every where preaching the Word:* Which Word, as we have found by examining what they preached all through their Hiſtory, was nothing but this, That *Jeſus was the Meſſiah:* I mean, this was all the Doctrine they propoſed to be believed. For what they taught, as well as our Saviour, contained a great deal more; but that concerned Practice, and not Belief. And therefore our Saviour ſays, in the Place before quoted, *Luke* viii. 21. *They are my Mother, and my Brethren, who hear the Word of God, and do it:* Obeying the Law of the *Meſſiah* their King, being no leſs required than their believing that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah*, the King and Deliverer that was promiſed them.

Mat. ix. 13. We have an Account again of this Preaching, what it was, and how. *And Jeſus went about all the Cities and Villages, teaching in their Synagogues, and preaching the Goſpel of the Kingdom; and healing every Sickneſs, and every Diſeaſe amongſt the People.* He acquainted them that the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* was come, and left it to his Miracles to inſtruct and convince them that he was the *Meſſiah.*

Mat. x. When he ſent his Apoſtles abroad, their Commiſſion to preach we have, *v.* 7, 8. in theſe Words: *As ye go, preach, ſaying, the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand; Heal the Sick,* &c. All that they had to preach, was, that the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* was come. Whoſoever ſhould not receive them, the Meſſengers of this good Tidings, nor hearken to their Meſſage, incurred a heavier Doom than *Sodom* and *Gomorrah* at the Day of Judgment, *v.* 14, 15. But, *v.* 32. *Whoſoever ſhall confeſs me before Men, I will confeſs him before my Father who is in Heaven.* What this Confeſſing of Chriſt is, we may ſee, by comparing *John* xii. 4. with ix. 22. *Nevertheleſs among the chief Rulers alſo many believed in him; but becauſe of the Phariſees they did not* CONFESS HIM, *leſt they ſhould be put out of the Synagogue.* And *Chap.* ix. 22. *Theſe Words ſpake his Parents, becauſe they feared the Jews: For the Jews had agreed already, that if any Man did* CONFESS THAT HE WAS THE MESSIAH, *he ſhould be put out of the Synagogue.* By which Places it is evident, that to *confeſs* him, was to *confeſs* that he was the *Meſſiah.* From which give me leave to obſerve alſo (what I have cleared from other Places, but cannot be too often remark'd, becauſe of the different Senſe has been put upon that Phraſe;) *viz.* That *believing on* or *in him* (for εἰς αὐτὸν is rendred either way by the Engliſh Tranſlation) ſignifies believing that he was the *Meſſiah.* For many of *the Rulers* (the Text ſays) *believed on him*; but they durſt not confeſs what they believed, *for fear they ſhould be put out of the Synagogue.* Now the Offence for which it was agreed that any one ſhould be put out of the Synagogue, was, if he *did confeſs that Jeſus was the Meſſiah.* Hence we may have a clear Underſtanding of that Paſſage of St. *Paul* to the *Romans*, where he tells them poſitively, what is the Faith he preaches, *Rom.* x. 8, 9. *That is the Word of Faith which we preach; That if thou ſhalt confeſs with thy Mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe in thine Heart that God hath raiſed him from the Dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved:* And that alſo of St. *John*, 1 *Ep.* iv. 14, 15. *We have ſeen, and do teſtify, that the Father ſent the Son to be the Saviour of the World: Whoſoever ſhall confeſs that Jeſus is the Son of God,*

God, God dwelleth in him, and he in God. Where confeſſing Jeſus to be the Son of God, is the ſame with confeſſing him to be the *Meſſiah*: Thoſe two Expreſſions being underſtood amongſt the Jews to ſignify the ſame Thing, as we have ſhewn already.

How calling him the Son of God came to ſignify that he was the *Meſſiah*, would not be hard to ſhew. But it is enough that it appears plainly that it was ſo uſed, and had that Import amongſt the Jews at that Time; which if any one deſires to have further evidenc'd to him, he may add *Mat.* xxvi. 63. *John* vi. 69. and xi. 27. and xx. 31. to thoſe Places before occaſionally taken notice of.

As was the Apoſtles Commiſſion, ſuch was their Performance; as we read, *Luke* ix. 6. *They departed and went through the Towns, preaching the Goſpel and healing every where.* Jeſus bids them preach, *ſaying, The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* And St. *Luke* tells us, they went through the Towns Preaching the *Goſpel*; a Word which in *Saxon* anſwers well the *Greek* εὐαγγέλιον, and ſignifies as that does, *Good News.* So that what the inſpired Writers call the *Goſpel*, is nothing but the good Tidings that the *Meſſiah* and his Kingdom was come; and ſo it is to be underſtood in the *New Teſtament*, and ſo the Angel calls it *Good Tidings of great Joy*, Luke ii. 10. bringing the firſt News of our Saviour's Birth. And this ſeems to be all that his Diſciples were at that Time ſent to preach.

So *Luke* ix. 59, 60. To him that would have excus'd his preſent Attendance, becauſe of burying his Father; *Jeſus ſaid unto him, let the Dead bury their Dead, but go thou and preach the Kingdom of God.* When, I ſay, this was all they were to preach, I muſt be underſtood, that this was the Faith they preach'd; but with it they joined Obedience to the *Meſſiah*, whom they received for their King. So likewiſe when he ſent out the Seventy, *Luke* x. their Commiſſion was in theſe Words, *v. 9. Heal the Sick, and ſay unto them, the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.*

After the Return of his Apoſtles to him, he ſits down with them in a Mountain; and a great Multitude being gathered about them, St. *Luke* tells us, *Chap.* ix. 11. *The People followed him, and he received them, and ſpake unto them of the Kingdom of God; and healed them that had need of healing.* This was his Preaching to this Aſſembly, which conſiſted of five Thouſand Men, beſides Women and Children: All which great Multitude he fed with five Loaves and two Fiſhes, *Mat.* xiv. 21. And what this Miracle wrought upon them, St. *John* tells us, *Chap.* vi. 14, 15. *Then theſe Men, when they had ſeen the Miracles that Jeſus did, ſaid, This is of a Truth that Prophet that ſhould come into the World, i. e.* the *Meſſiah.* For the *Meſſiah* was the only Perſon that they expected from God, and this the Time they looked for him. And hence *John the Baptiſt*, Mat. xi. 3. ſtiles him, *He that ſhould come*; as in other Places, *Come from God*, or *Sent from God*, are Phraſes uſed for the *Meſſiah.*

Here we ſee our Saviour keeps to his uſual Method of Preaching: He ſpeaks to them of the Kingdom of God, and does Miracles; by which they might underſtand him to be the *Meſſiah*, whoſe Kingdom he ſpake of. And here we have the Reaſon alſo, why he ſo much concealed himſelf, and forbore to own his being the *Meſſiah.* For what the Conſequence was, of the Multitude's but thinking him ſo, when they were got together, St. *John* tells us in the very next Words, *When Jeſus then perceived that they would come and take him by Force to make him a King, he departed again into a Mountain himſelf alone.* If they were ſo ready to ſet him up for their King, only becauſe they gathered from his Miracles that he was the *Meſſiah*, whilſt he himſelf ſaid nothing of it; what would not the People have done, and what would not the Scribes and Phariſees have had an Opportunity to accuſe him of, if he had openly profeſſed himſelf to have been the *Meſſiah*, that King they looked for? But this we have taken notice of already.

From hence going to *Capernaum*, whither he was followed by a great Part of the People, whom he had the Day before ſo miraculouſly fed; he, upon the Occaſion of their following him for the Loaves, bids them ſeek for the Meat that endureth to eternal Life: And thereupon, *John* vi. 22--69. declares to them his being ſent from the Father; and that thoſe who believed in him, ſhould be raiſed to eternal Life: But all this very much involved in a Mixture of Allegorical Terms of eating, and of Bread, Bread of Life, which came down from Heaven, *&c.* Which is all comprehended and expounded in theſe ſhort and plain Words, *v.* 47. and 54. *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, he that believeth on me, hath everlaſting Life, and I will raiſe him up at the laſt Day.* The Sum of all which Diſcourſe is, that he was the *Meſſiah* ſent from God;

God; and that thoſe who believed him to be ſo, ſhould be raiſed from the Dead at the laſt Day to eternal Life. Theſe who he ſpoke to here, were of thoſe who the Day before would by Force have made him King; and therefore it is no Wonder he ſhould ſpeak to them of himſelf, and his Kingdom and Subjects, in obſcure and myſtical Terms; and ſuch as ſhould offend thoſe who looked for nothing but the Grandeur of a Temporal Kingdom in this World, and the Protection and Proſperity they had promiſed themſelves under it. The Hopes of ſuch a Kingdom, now that they had found a Man that did Miracles, and therefore concluded to be the Deliverer they expected, had the Day before almoſt drawn them into an open Inſurrection, and involved our Saviour in it. This he thought fit to put a Stop to; they ſtill following him, 'tis like, with the ſame Deſign. And therefore, tho' he here ſpeaks to them of his Kingdom, it was in a Way that ſo plainly baulk'd their Expection, and ſhock'd them; that when they found themſelves diſappointed of thoſe vain Hopes, and that he talked of their eating his Fleſh, and drinking his Blood, that they might have Life; the *Jews* ſaid, *v.* 52. *How can this Man give us his Fleſh to eat? And many, even of his Diſciples, ſaid, It was an hard Saying, who can bear it?* And ſo were ſcandalized in him, and forſook him, *v.* 60, 66. But what the true Meaning of this Diſcourſe of our Saviour was, the Confeſſion of St. *Peter*, who underſtood it better and anſwered for the reſt of the Apoſtles, ſhews: When Jeſus asked him, *v.* 67. *Will you alſo go away? Then Simon Peter anſwered him, Lord, to whom ſhall we go, thou haſt the Words of eternal Life*; i. e. Thou teacheſt us the Way to eternal Life; and accordingly *We believe, and are ſure that thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God.* This was the eating his Fleſh, and drinking his Blood, whereby thoſe who did ſo, had eternal Life.

Sometime after this, he enquires of his Diſciples, *Mark* viii. 27. who the People took him for? They telling him, for *John the Baptiſt*, or one of the old Prophets riſen from the Dead; he asked, What they themſelves thought? And here again, *Peter* anſwers in theſe Words, *Mark* viii. 29. *Thou art the Meſſiah.* Luke ix. 20. *The Meſſiah of God.* And, *Mat.* xvi. 16. *Thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God:* Which Expreſſions, we may hence gather, amount to the ſame Thing. Whereupon our Saviour tells *Peter*, Mat. xvi. 17, 18. That this was ſuch a Truth *as Fleſh and Blood could not reveal to him, but only his Father who was in Heaven*; and that this was the Foundation on which he was *to build his Church.* By all the Parts of which Paſſage it is more than probable, that he had never yet told his Apoſtles in direct Words, that he was the *Meſſiah*; but that they had gathered it from his Life and Miracles. For which we may may imagine to our ſelves this probable Reaſon; becauſe that if he had familiarly, and in direct Terms, talked to his Apoſtles in private that he was the *Meſſiah* the Prince, of whoſe Kingdom he preached ſo much in Publick every where; *Judas*, whom he knew falſe and treacheous, would have been readily made uſe of to teſtify againſt him, in a Matter that would have been really Criminal to the *Roman* Governor. This perhaps may help to clear to us that ſeemingly abrupt Reply of our Saviour to his Apoſtles, *John* vi. 70. when they confeſſed him to be the *Meſſiah*, I will, for the better explaining of it, ſet down the Paſſage at large. *Peter* having ſaid, *We believe, and are ſure that thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God. Jeſus anſwered them, Have not I choſen you Twelve, and one of you is διάβολος?* This is a Reply ſeeming at firſt Sight nothing to the Purpoſe; when yet it is ſure all our Saviour's Diſcourſes were wiſe and pertinent. It ſeems therefore to me to carry this Senſe, to be underſtood afterwards by the Eleven (as that of deſtroying the Temple, and raiſing it again in three Days was) when they ſhould reflect on it after his being betray'd by *Judas*: You have confeſſed, and believe the Truth concerning me; I am the *Meſſiah* your King: But do not wonder at it, that I have never openly declared it to you: For amongſt you Twelve, whom I have choſen to be with me, there is one who is an Informer, or falſe Accuſer, (for ſo the *Greek* Word ſignifies, and may poſſibly here be ſo tranſlated, rather than *Devil*) who, if I had owned my ſelf in plain Words to have been the *Meſſiah, the King of Iſrael*, would have betrayed me, and informed againſt me.

That he was yet cautious of owning himſelf to his Apoſtles poſitively to be the *Meſſiah*, appears farther from the Manner wherein he tells *Peter*, v. 18. that he will build his Church upon that Confeſſion of his, that he was the *Meſſiah.* I ſay unto thee, *Thou art Cephas*, or a Rock, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it.* Words too doubtful to be laid hold on againſt him,

as

as a Teſtimony that he profeſſed himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, eſpecially if we join them the following Words, *v.* 19. *And I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and what thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; and what thou ſhalt looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven.* Which being ſaid perſonally to *Peter*, render the foregoing Words of our Saviour, (wherein he declares the fundamental Article of his Church to be the believing him to be the *Meſſiah*) the more obſcure and doubtful, and leſs liable to be made uſe of againſt him; but yet ſuch as might afterwards be underſtood. And for the ſame Reaſon he yet here again forbids the Apoſtles to ſay that he was the *Meſſiah*, *v.* 20.

From this Time (ſay the Evangeliſts) Jeſus *began to ſhew to his Diſciples* (*i. e.*) his Apoſtles, (who are often called Diſciples) *that he muſt go to Jeruſalem, and ſuffer many Things from the Elders, Chief Prieſts, and Scribes; and be killed, and be raiſed again the third Day*,, Mat. xvi. 21. Theſe, tho' all Marks of the *Meſſiah*, yet how little underſtood by the Apoſtles, or ſuited to their Expectation of the *Meſſiah*, appears from *Peter*'s rebuking him for it in the following Words, *Mat.* xvi. 22. *Peter* had twice before owned him to be the *Meſſiah*, and yet he cannot here bear that he ſhould ſuffer, and be put to Death, and be raiſed again. Whereby we may perceive, how little yet Jeſus had explained to the Apoſtles what perſonally concerned himſelf. They had been a good while Witneſſes of his Life and Miracles; and thereby being grown into a Belief that he was the *Meſſiah*, were in ſome degree prepared to receive the Particulars that were to fill up the Character, and anſwer the Propheſies concerning him. This from *henceforth* he began to open to them, (tho' in a Way which the *Jews* could not form an Acuſation out of) the Time of the Accompliſhment of all, in his Sufferings, Death, and Reſurrection, now drawing on. For this was in the laſt Year of his Life; he being to meet the *Jews* at *Jeruſalem* but once more at the Paſſover, and then they ſhould have their Will upon him; and therefore he might now begin to be a little more open concerning himſelf: Tho' yet ſo, as to keep himſelf out of the reach of any Accuſation that might appear juſt or weighty to the *Roman* Deputy.

After his Reprimand to *Peter*, telling him that he *ſavoured not the Things of God, but of Man*; *Mark* viii. 34. He calls the People to him, and prepares thoſe, who would be his Diſciples, for Suffering; telling them, *v.* 38. *Whoever ſhall be aſhamed of me and my Words in this adulterous and ſinful Generation, of him alſo ſhall the Son of Man be aſhamed when he cometh in the Glory of his Father with the holy Angels*: And then ſubjoins, *Mat.* xvi. 27, 28. two great and ſolemn Acts, wherein he would ſhew himſelf to be the *Meſſiah* the King: *For the Son of Man ſhall come in the Glory of his Father, with his Angels; and then he ſhall render every Man according to his Works.* This is evidently meant of the glorious Appearance of his Kingdom, when he ſhall come to judge the World at the laſt Day; deſcribed more at large, *Mat.* xxv. *When the Son of Man ſhall come in his Glory, and all the holy Angels with him, then ſhall he ſit upon the* THRONE *of his Glory. Then ſhall the* KING *ſay to them on his right Hand*, &c.

But what follows in the Place above quoted, *Mat.* xvi. 28. *Verily, verily, there be ſome ſtanding here, who ſhall not taſte of Death, till they ſee the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom*; importing that Dominion, which ſome there ſhould ſee him exerciſe over the Nation of the *Jews*, was ſo covered, by being annexed to the Preaching *v.* 27. (where he ſpoke of the Manifeſtation and Glory of his Kingdom at the Day of Judgment) That tho' his plain Meaning here in *v.* 28. be, that the Appearance and viſible exerciſe of his kingly Power in his Kingdom was ſo near, that ſome there ſhould live to ſee it: Yet if the foregoing Words had not caſt a Sadow over theſe latter, but they had been left plainly to be underſtood, as they plainly ſignified, that he ſhould be a King, and that it was ſo near, that ſome there ſhould ſee him in his Kingdom, this might have been laid hold on, and made the Matter of a plauſible and ſeemingly juſt Accuſation againſt him, by the *Jews* before *Pilate*. This ſeems to be the Reaſon of our Saviour's inverting here the Order of the two ſolemn Manifeſtations to the World of his Rule and Power; thereby perplexing at preſent his Meaning, and ſecuring himſelf, as was neceſſary, from the Malice of the *Jews*, which always lay at catch to intrap him, and accuſe him to the *Roman* Governor; and would, no doubt, have been ready to have alledged theſe Words, *Some here ſhall not taſte of Death, till they ſee the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom*, againſt him, as criminal, had not their Meaning been, by the former Verſe, perplexed, and the Senſe at that Time rendred unintelligible, and not applicable by any of his Auditors to a Senſe that might have been

been prejudicial to him before *Pontious Pilate.* For how well the chief of the *Jews* were diſpoſed towards him, St. *Luke* tells us, *Chap.* xi. 54. *Laying wait for him, and ſeeking to catch ſomething out of his Mouth, that they might accuſe him:* Which may be a Reaſon to ſatisfy us of the ſeemingly doubtful and obſcure way of ſpeaking uſed by our Saviour in other Places; his Circumſtances being ſuch, that without ſuch a prudent Carriage and Reſervedneſs, he could not have gone through the Work which he came to do; nor have performed all the Parts of it, in a way correſpondent to the Deſcriptions given of the *Meſſiah,* and which ſhould be afterwards fully underſtood to belong to him, when he had left the World.

After this, *Mat.* xvii. 10, *&c.* he, without ſaying it in direct Words, begins, as it were, to own himſelf to his Apoſtles to be the *Meſſiah*; by aſſuring them, that as the Scribes, according to the Prophecy of *Malachy, Chap.* iv. 5. rightly ſaid, that *Elias* was to uſher in the *Meſſiah*; ſo indeed *Elias* was already come, tho' the *Jews* knew him not, and treated him ill: Whereby *they underſtood that he ſpoke to them of John the Baptiſt, v.* 13. And a little after he ſomewhat more plainly intimates that he is the *Meſſiah,* Mark ix. 41. in theſe Words: *Whoſoever ſhall give you a Cup of Water to drink in my Name, becauſe ye belong to the Meſſiah.* This, as I remember, is the firſt Place where our Saviour ever mentioned the Name of *Meſſiah*; and the firſt time that he went ſo far towards the owning, to any of the *Jewiſh* Nation, himſelf to be him.

In his way to *Jeruſalem,* bidding one follow him, *Luke* ix. 59. who would firſt bury his Father, *v.* 60. *Jeſus ſaid unto him, let the Dead bury their Dead; but go thou and preach the Kingdom of God.* And *Luke* x. 1. Sending out the Seventy Diſciples, he ſays to them, *v.* 9. *Heal the Sick, and ſay, the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.* He had nothing elſe for theſe, or for his Apoſtles, or any one, it ſemes, to preach, but the good News of the coming of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah.* And if any City would not receive them, he bids them, *v.* 10. *Go into the Streets of the ſame, and ſay, Even the very Duſt of your City, which cleaveth on us, do we wipe off againſt you: Notwithſtanding, be ye ſure of this, that the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.* This they were to take notice of, as that which they ſhould dearly anſwer for; *viz.* That they had not with Faith received the good Tidings of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah.*

After this, his Brethren ſay unto him, *John* vii. 2, 3, 4. (the Feaſt of Tabernacles being near) *Depart hence, and go into Judea, that thy Diſciples may ſee the Works that thou doeſt: For there is no Man that does any thing in ſecret, and he himſelf ſeeketh to be known openly. If thou do theſe Things, ſhew thy ſelf to the World.* Here his Brethren, which the next Verſe tells us, *did not believe him,* ſeem to upbraid him with the Inconſiſtency of his Carriage; as if he deſign'd to be receiv'd for the *Meſſiah,* and yet was afraid to ſhew himſelf: To whom he juſtified his Conduct, (mentioned, *v.* 1.) in the following Verſes, by telling them, *That the World* (meaning the *Jews* eſpecially) *hated him, becauſe he teſtified of it, that the Works thereof are Evil; and that his Time was not yet fully come,* wherein to quit his Reſerve, and abandon himſelf freely to their Malice and Fury. Therefore, though he *went up unto the Feaſt,* it was *not openly, but as it were in ſecret, v.* 10. And here coming into the Temple about the middle of the Feaſt, he juſtifies his being ſent from God; and that he had not done any thing againſt the Law, in curing the Man at the Pool of *Bethſaida, John* v. 1—16. on the Sabbath-day; which, tho' done above a Year and a half before, they made uſe of as a Pretence to deſtroy him. But what was the true Reaſon of ſeeking his Life, appears from what we have in this vii. *Chapter, v.* 25—34. *Then ſaid ſome of them at Jeruſalem, Is not this he whom they ſeek to kill? But lo, he ſpeaketh boldly, and they ſay nothing unto him. Do the Rulers know indeed that this is the very* MESSIAH? *Howbeit, we know this Man whence he is; but when the Meſſiah cometh, no Man knoweth whence he is. Then cry'd Jeſus in the Temple, as he taught, ye both know me, and ye know whence I am: And I am not come of my ſelf, but he that ſent me is true, whom ye know not. But I know him, for I am from him, and he hath ſent me. Then they ſought* [an Occaſion] *to take him, but no Man lays Hands on him, becauſe his Hour was not yet come. And many of the People believed on him, and ſaid, when the Meſſiah cometh, will he do more Miracles than theſe which this Man hath done? The Phariſees heard that the People murmured ſuch things concerning him; and the Phariſees and Chief Prieſts ſent Officers to take him. Then ſaid Jeſus unto them, Yet a little while am I with you, and then I go to him that ſent me: Ye ſhall ſeek me, and not find me; and where I am, there you cannot come. Then ſaid the* Jews *among themſelves, Whither will he go, that we ſhall not find him?* Here we find that the great Fault in our Saviour, and the great Provocation to the *Jews,* was his being taken for the

Meſſiah;

Meſſiah; and doing ſuch Things as made the People *believe in him*; i. e. believe that he was the *Meſſiah*. Here alſo our Saviour declares, in words very eaſy to be underſtood, at leaſt after his Reſurrection, that he was the *Meſſiah*: For if he were *ſent from God*, and did his Miracles by the Spirit of God, there could be no doubt but he was the *Meſſiah*. But yet this Declaration was in a Way that the Phariſees and Prieſts could not lay hold on to make an Accuſation of to the diſturbance to his Miniſtry, or the ſeizure of his Perſon, how much ſoever they deſired it: For his Time was not yet come. The Officers they had ſent to apprehend him, charmed with his Diſcourſe, returned without laying Hands on him, *v.* 45, 46. And when the Chief Prieſts asked them, *Why they brought him not?* They anſwer'd, *Never Man ſpake like this Man.* Whereupon the Phariſees reply, *Are ye alſo deceiv'd? Have any of the Rulers of the Phariſees believed on him? But this People, who know not the Law, are curſed.* This ſhews what was meant by *believing on him*, viz. believing that he was the *Meſſiah*. For, ſay they, have any of the Rulers who are skill'd in the Law, or of the devout and learned Phariſees, acknowledg'd him to be the *Meſſiah?* For as for thoſe who in the Diviſion among the People concerning him, ſay, *That he is the Meſſiah*, they are ignorant and vile Wretches, knowing nothing of the Scripture, and being accurſed, are given by God to be deceived by this Impoſtor, and to take him for the *Meſſiah*. Therefore, notwithſtanding their deſire to lay hold on him, he goes on; and *v.* 37, 38. *In the laſt and great Day of the Feaſt, Jeſus ſtood and cryed, ſaying, if any Man Thirſt, let him come unto me and drink: He that believeth on me as the Scripture hath ſaid, out of his Belly ſhall flow Rivers of living Water.* And thus he here again declares himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*; but in the Prophetick Stile; as we ſee by the next Verſe of this Chapter, and thoſe Places in the Old Teſtament that theſe Words of our Saviour refer to.

In the next Chapter, *John* viii. all that he ſays concerning himſelf, and what they were to believe, tends to this, *viz.* That he was ſent from God his Father, and that if they did not believe that he was the *Meſſiah*, they ſhould die in their Sins: But this in a way, as St. *John* obſerves, *v.* 27. that they did not well underſtand. But our Saviour himſelf tells them, *v.* 28. *When ye have lift up the Son of Man, then ſhall ye know that I am he.*

Going from them he cures the Man born blind, whom meeting with again, after the *Jews* had queſtioned him, and caſt him out, *John* ix. 35—38. Jeſus *ſaid to him, Doſt thou believe on the Son of God? He anſwered, Who is he, Lord, that I might believe on him? And Jeſus ſaid unto him, Thou haſt both ſeen him, and it is he that talketh with thee. And he ſaid, Lord, I believe.* Here we ſee this Man is pronounced a Believer, when all that was propoſed to him to believe, was, that Jeſus was *the Son of God*; which was, as we have already ſhewn, to believe that he was the *Meſſiah*.

In the next Chapter, *John* x. 1—21. he declares the laying down of his Life for both *Jews* and *Gentiles*; but in a Parable which they underſtood not, *v.* 6, 20.

As he was Going to the Feaſt of the Dedication, the Phariſees ask him, *Luke* xvii. 20. *When the Kingdom of God*, i. e. of the *Meſſiah*, *ſhould come?* He anſwers, that it ſhall not come with Pomp and Obſervation, and great Concourſe; but that it was already begun amongſt them. If he had ſtopt here, the Senſe had been ſo plain, that they could hardly have miſtaken him; or have doubted, but that he meant, that the *Meſſiah* was already come, and amongſt them; and ſo might have been prone to infer, that Jeſus took upon him to be him. But here, as in the Place before taken notice of, ſubjoining to this future Revelation of himſelf, both in his coming to execute Vengeance on the *Jews*, and in his coming to Judgment mixed together, he ſo involved his Senſe, that it was not eaſy to underſtand him. And therefore the *Jews* came to him again in the Temple, *John* x. 23. and ſaid, *How long doſt thou make us doubt? If thou be Chriſt tell us plainly. Jeſus anſwered, I told you, and ye* BELIEVED *not: The Works that I do in my Father's Name, they bear witneſs of me. But ye* BELIEVED *not, becauſe ye are not of my Sheep, as I told you.* The BELIEVING here, which he accuſes them of not doing, is plainly their not BELIEVING him to be the *Meſſiah*, as the foregoing Words evince, and in the ſame Senſe it is evidently meant in the following Verſes of this Chapter.

From hence *Jeſus* going to *Barbara*, and thence returning into *Bethany*; upon *Lazarus*'s Death, *John* xi. 25—27. Jeſus ſaid to *Martha, I am the Reſurrection and the Life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet he ſhall live; and whoſoever liveth*

liveth and believeth in me ſhall not die for ever. So I underſtand ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; anſwerable to ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα of the *Septuagint*, *Gen.* iii. 22. or *John* vi. 51. which we read right in our *Engliſh* Tranſlation, *Live for ever*; but whether this Saying of our Saviour here can with truth be tranſlated, *He that liveth and believeth in me, ſhall never die*, will be apt to be queſtioned. But to go on, *Believeſt thou this? She ſaid unto him, Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World.* This ſhe gives as a full Anſwer to our Saviour's Demands; This being that Faith, which whoever had, wanted no more to make them Believers.

We may obſerve farther, in this ſame Story of the raiſing of *Lazarus*, what Faith it was our Saviour expected, by what he ſays, *v.* 41. 42. *Father, I thank thee that thou haſt heard me; and I know that thou hearеſt me always. But becauſe of the People who ſtand by, I ſaid it, that they may believe that thou haſt ſent me.* And what the Conſequence of it was, we may ſee, *v.* 45. *Then many of the Jews who came to Mary, and had ſeen the Things which Jeſus did, believed on him:* Which Belief was, that he was *ſent from the Father*; which, in other Words, was that he was the *Meſſiah*. That this is the meaning, in the Evangeliſts, of the Phraſe of *believing on him*, we have a Demonſtration in the following Words, *v.* 47, 48. *Then gathered the chief Prieſts and Phariſees a Council, and ſaid, What do we? For this Man does many Miracles; And if we let him alone, all Men will* BELIEVE ON HIM. Thoſe who here ſay, all Men would BELIEVE ON HIM, were the Chief Prieſts and Phariſees, his Enemies, who ſought his Life; and therefore could have no other Senſe nor Thought of this Faith in him, which they ſpake of, but only the believing him to be the *Meſſiah*: And that that was their meaning the adjoining Words ſhew; *If we let him alone, all the World will believe on him*; *i. e.* believe him to be the *Meſſiah*. *And the Romans will come and take away both our Place and Nation.* Which reaſoning of theirs was thus grounded. If we ſtand ſtill, and let the People *Believe on him*, *i.e.* receive him for the *Meſſiah*; they will thereby take him and ſet him up for their King, and expect Deliverance by him; which will draw the *Roman* Arms upon us, to the Deſtruction of us and our Country. The *Romans* could not be thought to be at all concerned in any other Belief whatſoever that the People might have on him. It is therefore plain, that *believeing on him*, was by the Writers of the Goſpel, underſtood to mean, *the believing him to be the Meſſiah*, *The Sanhedrim therefore*, *v.* 53, 54. *from that Day forth conſulted to put him to Death. Jeſus therefore walked not yet* (for ſo the Word ἔτι ſignifies, and ſo I think it ought here to be tranſlated) *boldly*, or openfac'd *among the Jews*; *i.e.* of *Jeruſalem*. Οὐκέτι cannot well here be tranſlated *no more*, becauſe within a very ſhort Time after, he appeared openly at the Paſſover, and by his Miracles and Speech declared himſelf more freely than ever he had done; and all the Week before his Paſſion taught daily in the Temple, *Mat.* xx. 17. *Mark* x. 32. *Luke* xviii. 31, *&c.* The Meaning of this Place ſeems therefore to be this: That his time being not yet come, he durſt not yet ſhew himſelf openly, and confidently, before the Scribes and Phariſees, and thoſe of the *Sanhedrim* at *Jeruſalem*, who were full of Malice againſt him, and reſolved his Death: *But went thence into a Country near the Wilderneſs, into a City called Ephraim, and there continued with his Diſciples*, to keep himſelf out of the Way till the Paſſover, *which was nigh at Hand*, *v.* 55. In his Return thither, he takes the Twelve aſide, and tells them beforehand what ſhould happen to him at *Jeruſalem*, whither they were now going; and that all Things that are written by the Prophets concerning the Son of Man, ſhould be accompliſhed; that he ſhould be betray'd to the chief Prieſts and Scribes; and that they ſhould condemn him to Death, and deliver him to the Gentiles; that he ſhould be mocked, and ſpit on, and ſcourg'd, and put to Death; and the third Day he ſhould riſe again. But St. *Luke* tells us, *Chap.* xviii. 34. That the Apoſtles *underſtood none of theſe Things, and this ſaying was hid from them; neither knew they the Things which were ſpoken.* They believed him to be the Son of God, the *Meſſiah* ſent from the Father; but their Notion of the *Meſſiah* was the ſame with the reſt of the Jews; that he ſhould be a Temporal Prince and Deliverer, accordingly we ſee, *Mark* x. 35. That even in this their laſt Journey with him to *Jeruſalem*, two of them, *James* and *John*, coming to him, and falling at his Feet, ſaid, *Grant unto us, that we may ſit, one on thy right Hand, and the other on thy left Hand, in thy Glory*; or, as St. *Matthew* has it, *Chap.* xx. 21. *in thy Kingdom.* That which diſtinguiſhed them from the unbelieving Jews, was, That they believed Jeſus to be the very *Meſſiah*, and ſo received him as their King and Lord.

And

And now the Hour being come that the Son of Man ſhould be glorified, he without his uſual Reſerve, makes his publick Entry into *Jeruſalem, riding on a young Aſs! As it is written, Fear not, Daughter of Sion, behold, thy King cometh, ſitting on an Aſs's Colt.* But *theſe things*, ſays St. *John*, *Chap.* xii. 16. *his Diſciples underſtood not at the firſt; But when Jeſus was glorified, then remembred they that theſe things were written of him, and that they had done theſe things unto him.* Though the Apoſtles believed him to be the *Meſſiah*, yet there were many Occurrences of his Life which they underſtood not, (at the time when they happened) to be foretold of the *Meſſiah*; which after his Aſcenſion they found exactly to quadrate. Thus, according to what was foretold of him, he rode into the City, *all the People crying Hoſanna, Bleſſed is the King of Iſrael, that cometh in the Name of the Lord.* This was ſo open a Declaration of his being the *Meſſiah*, that *Luke* xix. 39. *Some of the Phariſees from among the Multitude ſaid unto him, Maſter rebuke thy Diſciples.* But he was ſo far now from ſtopping them, or diſowning this their Acknowledgment of his being the *Meſſiah*, that he *ſaid unto them, I tell you, that if theſe ſhould hold their Peace, the Stones would immediately cry out.* And again, upon the like occaſion of their crying *Hoſanna to the Son of David*, in the Temple, *Matt.* xxi. 15, 16. When *the Chief Prieſts and Scribes were ſore diſpleaſed, and ſaid unto him, Heareſt thou what they ſay? Jeſus ſaid unto them, yea; Have ye never read, Out of the mouths of Babes and Sucklings thou haſt perfected Praiſe?* And now, *v.* 14, 15. *He cures the Blind and the Lame* openly *in the Temple. And when the Chief Prieſts and Scribes ſaw the wonderful things that he did, and the Children crying in the Temple Hoſanna, they were enraged.* One would not think, that after the multitude of Miracles that our Saviour had now been doing for above three Years together, that the curing the Lame and Blind ſhould ſo much move them. But we muſt remember, that though his Miniſtry had abounded with Miracles, yet the moſt of them had been done about *Galilee*, and in Parts remote from *Jeruſalem*. There is but one left upon Record hitherto done in that City; and that had ſo ill a Reception, that they ſought his Life for it; as we may read, *John* v. 16. And therefore we hear not of his being at the next Paſſover, becauſe he was there only privately, as an ordinary *Jew*: The Reaſon whereof we may read, *John* vii. 1. *After theſe things, Jeſus walked in Galilee, for he would not walk in Jewry, becauſe the Jews ſought to kill him.*

Hence we may gueſs the Reaſon why St. *John* omitted the Mention of his being at *Jeruſalem* at the third Paſſover after his Baptiſm; probably becauſe he did nothing memorable there. Indeed, when he was at the Feaſt of Tabernacles, immediately preceding this laſt Paſſover, he cured the Man born blind: But it appears not to have been done in *Jeruſalem* it ſelf, but in the way as he retired to the Mount of *Olives*; for there ſeems to have been no body by, when he did it, but his Apoſtles. Compare *v.* 2. with *v.* 8, 10. of *John* ix. This, at leaſt, is remarkable; that neither the Cure of this blind Man, nor that of the other infirm Man, at the Paſſover above a Twelvemonth before at *Jeruſalem*, was done in the ſight of the Scribes, Phariſees, Chief Prieſts, or Rulers. Nor was it without Reaſon, that in the former part of his Miniſtry he was cautious of ſhewing himſelf to them to be the *Meſſiah*. But now that he was come to the laſt Scene of his Life, and that the Paſſover was come, the appointed Time wherein he was to compleat the Work he came for, in his Death and Reſurrection, he does many things in *Jeruſalem* it ſelf, before the Face of the Scribes, Phariſees, and whole Body of the *Jewiſh* Nation, to manifeſt himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*. And, as St. *Luke* ſays, *Ch.* xix. 47, 48. *He taught daily in the Temple: But the Chief Prieſts, and the Scribes, and the chief of the People ſought to deſtroy him; And could not find what they might do, for all the People were very attentive to hear him.* What he taught we are not left to gueſs, by what we have found him conſtantly preaching elſewhere. But St. *Luke* tells us, *Chap.* xx. 1. *He taught in the Temple, and Evangelized*; Or, as we tranſlate it, *preached the Goſpel:* Which, as we have ſhewed, was the making known to them the good News of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*. And this we ſhall find he did, in what now remains of his Hiſtory.

In the firſt Diſcourſe of his which we find upon Record, after this, *John* xii. 20, &c. he foretells his Crucifixion, and the Belief of all ſorts, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, on him after that. Whereupon the People ſay to him, *v.* 34. *We have heard out of the Law, that the Meſſiah abideth for ever; And how ſayeſt thou, that the Son of Man muſt be lifted up? Who is this Son of Man?* In his Anſwer he plainly deſigns himſelf under the Name of *Light*; which was what he had declared himſelf to them to be, the laſt time that they had ſeen him in *Jeruſalem*. For then at the Feaſt of Tabernacles, but

six Months before, he tells them in the very place where he now is, *viz.* in the Temple, *I am the Light of the World; whosoever follows me, shall not walk in Darkness, but shall have the Light of Life*; as we may read, *John* viii. 12. and ix. 5. He says, *As long as I am in the World, I am the LIGHT of the World.* But neither here, nor any where else, does he, even in these four or five last Days of his Life (tho' he knew his Hour was come, and was prepared to his Death, *v.* 27. and scrupled not to manifest himself to the Rulers of the *Jews* to be the *Messiah*, by doing Miracles before them in the Temple) ever once in direct Words own himself to the *Jews* to be the *Messiah*; tho' by Miracles and other ways, he did every where make it known unto them, so that it might be understood. This could not be without some Reason: And the preservation of his Life, which he came now to *Jerusalem* on purpose to lay down, could not be it. What other could it then be, but the same which had made him use Caution in the former part of his Ministry; so to conduct himself, that he might do the Work which he came for, and in all Parts answer the Character given of the *Messiah* in the Law and the Prophets? He had fulfilled the time of his Ministry; and now taught, and did Miracles openly in the Temple, before the Rulers and the People, not fearing to be seized. But he would not be seized for any thing that might make him a Criminal to the Government: And therefore he avoided giving those, who in the Division that was about him inclined towards him, occasion of Tumult for his sake; or to the *Jews* his Enemies, matter of just Accusation against him out of his own Mouth, by professing himself to be the *Messiah*, the King of *Israel* in direct Words. It was enough that in Words and Deeds he declared it so to them, that they could not but understand him; which 'tis plain they did, *Luke* xx. 16, 19. *Mat.* xxi. 45. But yet neither his Actions, which were only doing of Good; nor Words, which were mystical and parabolical; (as we may see, *Mat.* xxi. and xxii. and the parallel Places of *Matthew* and *Luke*;) nor any of his ways of making himself known to be the *Messiah*, could be brought in Testimony, or urg'd against him, as opposite or dangerous to the Government. This preserv'd him from being condemned as a Malefactor; and procured him a Testimony from the *Roman* Governor his Judge, that he was an innocent Man, sacrificed to the Envy of the *Jewish* Nation. So that he avoided saying, that he was the *Messiah*, that to those who could call to mind his Life and Death after his Resurrection, he might the more clearly appear to be so. It is farther to be remarked, that tho' he often appeals to the Testimonies of his Miracles who he is, yet he never tells the *Jews* that he was born at *Bethlehem*, to remove the Prejudice that lay against him, whilst he passed for a *Galilean*, and which was urged as a Proof that he was not the *Messiah*, *John* vii. 41, 42. The healing of the Sick, and doing of Good miraculously, could be no Crime in him, nor Accusation against him. But the naming of *Bethlehem* for his Birth-place, might have wrought as much upon the Mind of *Pilate*, as it did on *Herod*'s; and having raised a Suspicion in *Pilate* as prejudicial to our Saviour's Innocence, as *Herod*'s was to the Children born there. His pretending to be born at *Bethlehem*, as it was liable to be explained by the *Jews*, could not have failed to have met with a sinister Interpretation in the *Roman* Governor, and have rendred *Jesus* suspected of some criminal Design against the Government. And hence we see, that when *Pilate* asked him, *John* xix. 9. *Whence art thou? Jesus gave him no answer.*

Whether our Saviour had not an Eye to this straitness, this narrow room that was left to his Conduct, between the new Converts and the captious *Jews*, when he says, *Luke* xii. 50. *I have a Baptism to be baptized with, and* τῶς συνέχομαι *how am I straitned till it be accomplished*, I leave to be considered. *I am come to send Fire on the Earth*, says our Saviour, *and what if it be already kindled? i. e.* There begin already to be Divisions about me, *John* vii. 12, 43. and ix. 16. and x. 19. And I have not the Freedom, the Latitude to declare my self openly to be the *Messiah*; tho' I am he that must not be spoken on till after my Death. My way to my Throne is closely hedged in on every side, and much straitned, within which I must keep, till it bring me to my Cross in its due Time and Manner; so that it do not cut short the Time, nor cross the End of my Ministry.

And therefore to keep up this inoffensive Character, and not let it come within the reach of Accident or Calumny, he withdrew with his Apostles out of the Town every Evening; and kept himself retired out of the way, *Luke* xxi. 37. *And in the Day-time he was teaching in the Temple, and every Night he went out and abode in the Mount that is called the Mount of Olives*, that he might avoid all Concourse to him

in

in the Night, and give no Occaſion of Diſturbance, or Suſpicion of himſelf, in that great Conflux of the whole Nation of the *Jews*, now aſſembled in *Jeruſalem* at the Paſſover.

But to return to his preaching in the Temple. He bids them, *John* xii. 36. *To believe in the Light whilſt they have it.* And he tells them, *v.* 46. *I am the Light come into the World, that every one who believes in me, ſhould not remain in Darkneſs*; which believing in him, was the believing him to be the *Meſſiah*, as I have elſewhere ſhewed.

The next Day, *Mat.* xxi. he rebukes them for not having believed *John* the *Baptiſt*, who had teſtified that he was the *Meſſiah*. And then, in a Parable, declares himſelf to be the *Son of God*, whom they ſhould deſtroy; and that for it God would take away the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* from them, and give it to the *Gentiles*. That they underſtood him thus, is plain from *Luke* xx. 16. *And when they heard it, they ſaid, God forbid.* And, *v.* 19. *For they knew that he had ſpoken this Parable againſt them.*

Much to the ſame Purpoſe was his next Parable concerning *the Kingdom of Heaven*, *Mat.* xxii. 1—10. That the *Jews* not accepting of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, to whom it was firſt offered, others ſhould be brought in.

The Scribes and Phariſees, and Chief Prieſts, not able to bear the Declaration he made of himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*; (by his Diſcourſes and Miracles *before* them, ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, *John* xii. 37. which he had never done before) impatient of his Preaching and Miracles; and being not able otherwiſe to ſtop the Increaſe of his Followers; (For, *ſaid the Phariſees among themſelves, perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? Behold, the World is gone after him*, John xii. 19. So that *the Chief Prieſts, and the Scribes, and the chief of the People*) *ſought to deſtroy him*, the firſt Day of his Entrance into *Jeruſalem*, *Luke* xix. 47. The next Day again they were intent upon the ſame thing, *Mark* xi. 17, 18. *And he taught in the Temple; and the Scribes, and the Chief Prieſts heard it, and ſought how they might deſtroy him; for they feared him, becauſe all the People were aſtoniſhed at his Doctrine.*

The next Day but one, upon his telling them the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* ſhould be taken from them, *The Chief Prieſts and Scribes ſought to lay Hands on him the ſame Hour, and they feared the People*, Luke xx. 10. If they had ſo great a Deſire to lay hold on him, why did they not? They were the Chief Prieſts and the Rulers, the Men of Power. The Reaſon St. *Luke* plainly tell us, in the next Verſe: *And they watched him, and ſent forth Spies, which ſhould feign themſelves juſt Men, that they might take hold of his Words; that ſo they might deliver him into the Power and Authority of the Governor.* They wanted Matter of Accuſation againſt him, to the Power they were under. That they watched for, and that they would have been glad of, if they could have *entangled him in his Talk*; as St. *Matthew* expreſſes it, *Chap.* xxii. 15. If they could have laid hold of any Word that had dropt from him, that might have rendered him guilty or ſuſpected to the *Roman* Governor; that would have ſerved their Turn, to have laid hold upon him, with Hopes to deſtroy him. For their Power not anſwering their Malice, they could not put him to Death by their own Authority, without the Permiſſion and Aſſiſtance of the Governor; as they confeſs, *John* xviii. 31. *It is not lawful for us to put any Man to Death.* This made them ſo earneſt for a Declaration in direct Words, from his own Mouth, that he was the *Meſſiah*. 'Twas not that would more have believed inhim, for ſuch a Declaration of himſelf, than they did for his Miracles, or other ways of making himſelf known, which it appears they underſtood well enough. But they Wanted plain direct Words, ſuch as might ſupport an Accuſation, and be of Weight before an Heathen Judge. This was the Reaſon why they preſſed him to ſpeak out, *John.* x. 24. *Then came the Jews round about him, and ſaid unto him, How long doſt thou hold us in Suſpence? If thou be the Meſſiah, tell us* PLAINLY, παῤῥησία; *i.e.* in direct Words: For that St. *John* uſes it in that Senſe, we may ſee, *Chap.* xi. 11—14. Jeſus ſaith to them, *Lazarus ſleepeth.* His Diſciples ſaid, *If he ſleeps, he ſhall do well. Howbeit, Jeſus ſpake of his Death; but they thought he had ſpoken of taking reſt in Sleep. Then ſaid Jeſus to them plainly*, παῤῥησία, *Lazarus is Dead.* Here we ſee what is Meant by παῤῥησία, PLAIN direct Words, ſuch as expreſs the Thing without a Figure; and ſo they would have had Jeſus pronounce himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*. And the ſame Thing they preſs again, *Mat.* xvi. 63. The High-Prieſt adjuring him by the Living God, to tell them whether he were the *Meſſiah*, the Son of God; as we ſhall have Occaſion to take Notice by and by.

This

This we may obſerve in the whole Management of their Deſign againſt his Life. It turned upon this, that they wanted and wiſhed for a Declaration from him, in direct Words, that he was the *Meſſiah:* ſomething from his own Mouth, that might offend the *Roman* Power, and render him Criminal to *Pilate.* In the 21ſt Verſe of this xxth of *Luke, They asked him, ſaying, Maſter, we know that thou ſayeſt and teacheſt rightly; neither accepteſt thou the Perſon of any, but teacheſt the way of God truly. Is it lawful to give Tribute to Cæſar or no?* By this captious Queſtion they hoped to to catch him, which way ſoever he anſwered. For if he had ſaid, they ought to pay Tribute to *Cæſar,* 'twould be plain he allowed their Subjection to the *Romans*; and ſo in effect diſown himſelf to be their King and Deliverer: Whereby he would have contradicted what his Carriage and Doctrine ſeemed to aim at, the Opinion that was ſpread amongſt the People, that he was the *Meſſiah.* This would have quaſh'd the Hopes, and deſtroy'd the Faith of thoſe who believed on him; and have turned the Ears and Hearts of the People from him. If on the other ſide, he anſwered *No,* it is not lawful to pay Tribute to *Cæſar*; they had had out of his own Mouth wherewithal to condemn him before *Pontius Pilate.* But St. *Luke* tells us, *v.* 23. *He perceived their Craftineſs, and ſaid unto them, Why tempt ye me? i. e.* Why do ye lay Snares for me? *Ye Hypocrites, ſhew me the Tribute-money*; ſo it is, *Mat.* xxii. 19. *Whoſe Image and Inſcription has it? They ſaid, Cæſar's. He ſaid unto them, Render therefore to Cæſar The things that are Cæſar's, and to God the Things that are God's.* By the Wiſdom and Caution of which unexpected Anſwer, he defeated their whole Deſign. *And they could not take hold of his Words before the People; and they marvelled at his anſwer, and held their Peace,* Luke xx. 26. *And leaving him, they departed. Mat.* xxii. 22.

He having by this Reply, and (what he anſwered to the *Sadduces* concerning the Reſurrection, and to the *Lawyer,* about the firſt Commandment, *Mark* xii.) anſwered ſo little to their Satisfaction or Advantage, they durſt ask him no more Queſtions, any of them. And now their Mouths being ſtopp'd, he himſelf begins to queſtion them about the *Meſſiah*; asking the *Phariſees,* Mat. xxii. 41. *What think ye of the Meſſiah, whoſe Son is he? They ſay unto him, The Son of David.* Wherein tho' they anſwered right, yet he ſhews them in the following Words, that however they pretended to be Studiers and Teachers of the Law, yet they underſtood not clearly the Scriptures concerning the *Meſſiah*; and thereupon he ſharply rebukes their Hypocriſy, Vanity, Pride, Malice, Covetouſneſs, and Ignorance; and particularly tells them, *v.* 13. *Ye ſhut up the Kingdom of Heaven againſt Men: For ye neither go in your ſelves, nor ſuffer ye them that are entring, to go in.* Whereby he plainly declares to them, that the *Meſſiah* was come, and his Kingdom began; but that they refuſed to believe in him themſelves, and did all they could to hinder others from believing in him; as is manifeſt throughout the New Teſtament: The Hiſtory whereof ſufficiently explains what is meant here by *The Kingdom of Heaven,* which the Scribes and Phariſees would neither go into themſelves, nor ſuffer others to enter into. And they could not chuſe but underſtand him, tho' he named not himſelf in the Caſe.

Provoked anew by his Rebukes, they get preſently to Council, *Mat.* xxvi. *Then aſſembled together the Chief Prieſts, and the Scribes, and the Elders of the People, unto the Palace of the High-Prieſt, who was called* Caiphas, *and conſulted that they might take Jeſus by Subtilty, and kill him. But they ſaid, Not on the Feaſt-Day, leſt there be an Uproar among the People. For they feared the People,* ſays St. *Luke, Chap.* xxii. 2.

Having in the Night got Jeſus into their Hands, by the Treachery of *Judas,* they preſently led him away bound to *Annas,* the Father-in-Law of *Caiaphas,* the High-Prieſt, probably having examined him, and getting nothing out of him for his Purpoſe, ſends him away to *Caiaphas, v.* 24. where the Chief Prieſts, the Scribes and the Elders were aſſembled, *Mat.* xvi. 57. *John* xviii. 13. 19. *The High-Prieſt then asked Jeſus of his Diſciples, and of his Doctrine. Jeſus anſwered him, I ſpake openly to the World: I ever taught in the Synagogue, and in the Temple, whither the Jews always reſort, and in Secret have I ſaid nothing.* A Proof that he had not in private to his Diſciples declared himſelf in expreſs Words to be the *Meſſiah,* the Prince. But he goes on. *Why askeſt thou me?* Ask *Judas* who has been always with me. *Ask them who heard me, what I have ſaid unto them; behold, they know what I ſaid.* Our Saviour we ſee here warily declines, for the Reaſons above-mention'd, all Diſcourſe of his Doctrine. The *Sanhedrim, Mat.* xxvi. 59. *Sought falſe Witneſs againſt him:* But when

when *they found none that were ſufficient*, or came up to the Point they deſired; which was to have ſomething againſt him to take away his Life, (For ſo I think the Words ἵνα and ὅτε mean, *Mark* xiv. 56. 59.) They try again what they can get out of him himſelf, concerning his being the *Meſſiah*; which if he owned in expreſs Words, they thought they ſhould have enough againſt him at the Tribunal of the *Roman* Governour, to make him *Læſæ Majeſtatis reum*, and ſo to take away his Life. They therefore ſay to him, *Luke* xxii. 67. *If thou be the Meſſiah, tell us.* Nay, as St. *Matthew* hath it, the High-Prieſt adjures him by the living God to tell them whether he were the *Meſſiah*. To which our Saviour replies, *If I tell you, ye will not believe; and if I ask you, ye will not anſwer me, nor let me go.* If I tell you, and prove to you, by the Teſtimony given me from Heaven, and by the Works that I have done among you, you will not believe in me, that I am the *Meſſiah*. Or if you ſhould ask where the *Meſſiah* is to be born, and what State he ſhould come in; how he ſhould appear, and other Things that you think in me are not reconcileable with the *Meſſiah*; you will not anſwer me, and let me go, as one that has no Pretence to be the *Meſſiah*, and you are not afraid ſhould be received for ſuch. But yet I tell you, *Hereafter ſhall the Son of Man ſit on the right Hand of the Power of God*, v. 70. *Then ſaid they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he ſaid unto them, ye ſay that I am.* By which Diſcourſe with them, related at large here by St. *Luke*, it is plain, that the Anſwer of our Saviour, ſet down by St. *Matthew*, *Chap.* xxvi. 64. in theſe Words, *Thou haſt ſaid*; and by St. *Mark*, *Chap.* xiv. 62. in theſe, *I am*; is an Anſwer only to this Queſtion, *Art thou then the Son of God?* And not to that other, *Art thou the Meſſiah?* which preceded, and he had anſwered to before: Though *Matthew* and *Mark*, contracting the Story, ſet them down together, as if making but one Queſtion, omitting all the intervening Diſcourſe; whereas 'tis plain of St. *Luke*, that they were two diſtinct Queſtions, to which *Jeſus* gave two diſtinct Anſwers. In the firſt whereof, he, according to his uſual Caution, declined ſaying in plain expreſs Words, that he was the *Meſſiah*; though in the latter he owned himſelf to be *the Son of God*. Which though they being Jews, underſtood to ſignify the *Meſſiah*; yet he knew could be no legal or weighty Accuſation againſt him before a Heathen; and ſo it proved. For upon his anſwering to their Queſtion, *Art thou then the Son of God? Ye ſay that I am*; they cry out, *Luke* xxii. 71. *What need we any further Witneſſes? For we our ſelves have heard out of his own Mouth:* And ſo thinking they had enough againſt him, they hurry him away to *Pilate*. *Pilate* asking them, *John* xviii. 29—32. *What Accuſation bring you againſt this Man? They anſwered, and ſaid, if he were not a Malefactor we would not have diliver'd him up unto thee.* Then ſaid *Pilate* unto them, *Take ye him, and judge him according to your Law.* But this would not ſerve their Turn, who aimed at his Life, and would be ſatisfied with nothing elſe. *The Jews therefore ſaid unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any Man to Death.* And this was alſo, *That the ſaying of Jeſus might be fulfilled which he ſpake, ſignifying what Death he ſhould die.* Purſuing therefore their Deſign of making him appear to *Pontius Pilate* guilty of Treaſon againſt *Cæſar*, *Luke* xxiii. 2. *They began to accuſe him, ſaying, We found this Fellow perverting the Nation, and forbidding to give Tribute to Cæſar; ſaying, that he himſelf is the Meſſiah the King:* All which were Inferences of theirs, from his ſaying, he was *the Son of God*: Which *Pontius Pilate* finding, (for 'tis conſonant that he examined them to the preciſe Words he had ſaid) their Accuſation had no Weight with him. However, the Name of King being ſuggeſted againſt Jeſus, he thought himſelf concerned to ſearch it to the bottom, *John* xviii. 33—37. *Then* Pilate *entred again into the Judgment-Hall, and called Jeſus, and ſaid unto him, Art thou the King of the Jews? Jeſus anſwered him, Sayeſt thou this of thy ſelf, or did others tell it thee of me?* Pilate *anſwered, am I a Jew? Thine own Nation and the Chief Prieſt have delivered thee unto me: What haſt thou done? Jeſus anſwered, My Kingdom is not of this World: If my Kingdom were of this World, then would my Servants fight, that I ſhould not be delivered to the Jews; But my Kingdom is not from hence.* Pilate *therefore ſaid unto him, Art thou a King then? Jeſus anſwered, Thou ſayeſt that I am King. For this End was I born, and for this Cauſe came I into the World, that I ſhould bear witneſs to the Truth: Every one that is of the Truth heareth my Voice.* In this Dialogue between our Saviour and *Pilate*, we may obſerve, 1. That being asked, Whether he were *the King of the Jews?* He anſwers ſo, that though he deny it not, yet he avoided giving the leaſt Umbrage, that he had any Deſign upon the Government. For though he allows himſelf to be a King, yet to obviate

obviate any Suſpicion, he tells *Pilate*, *His Kingdom is not of this World*; and evidences it by this, that if he had pretended to any Title to that Country, his Followers, which were not a few, and were forward enough be believe him their King, would have fought for him; if he had had a Mind to ſet himſelf up by Force, or his Kingdom were ſo to be erected. *But my Kingdom*, ſays he, *is not from hence*, is not of this Faſhion, or of this Place.

2. *Pilate*, being by his Words and Circumſtances ſatisfied that he laid no Claim to his Province, or meant any Diſturbance of the Government, was yet a little ſurprized to hear a Man, in that poor Garb, without Retinue, or ſo much as a Servant or a Friend, own himſelf to be a King; and therefore asks him, with ſome kind of wonder, *Art thou a King then?*

3. That our Saviour declares, that his great Buſineſs into the World was, to teſtify and make good this great Truth, that he was a King; *i. e.* in other Words, that he was the *Meſſiah*.

4. That whoever were Followers of the Truth, and got into the Way of Truth and Happineſs, received this Doctrine concerning him, *viz.* That he was the *Meſſiah* their King.

Pilate being thus ſatisfied, that he neither meant, nor could there ariſe any harm from his Pretence, whatever it was to be a King, tells the Jews, *v.* 38. *I find no fault in this Man.* But the Jews were the more fierce, *Luke* xxiii. 5. ſaying, *He ſtirreth up the People* to Sedition, by *his preaching through all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this Place.* And then *Pilate*, learning that he was of *Galilee*, *Herod*'s Juriſdiction, ſent him to *Herod*; to whom alſo *the chief Prieſts and Scribes*, *v.* 10. *vehemently accuſed him. Herod* finding all their Accuſations either falſe or frivolous, thought our Saviour a bare Object of Contempt; and ſo turning him only into Ridicule, ſent him back to *Pilate*: Who calling unto him the chief Prieſts, and the Rulers, and the People, *v.* 14. *Said unto them, Ye have brought this Man unto me, as one that perverteth the People; And behold, I have examined him before you, have found no Fault in this Man, touching theſe Things whereof ye accuſe him; No, nor yet Herod; for I ſent you to him: And ſo nothing worthy of Death is done by him:* And therefore he would have releaſed him. *For he knew the chief Prieſts had delivered him through Envy*, *Mark* xv. 10. And when they demanded *Barrabas* to be releaſed, but as for Jeſus, cried, Crucify him; *Luke* xxiii. 22. *Pilate ſaid unto them the third time, Why? What Evil hath he done? I have found no cauſe of Death in him; I will therefore chaſtiſe him, and let him go.*

We may obſerve in all this whole Proſecution of the Jews, that they would fain have got it out of *Jeſus*'s own Mouth, in expreſs Words, that he was the *Meſſiah*: Which not being able to do with all their Art and Endeavour; all the reſt that they could alledge againſt him, not amounting to a Proof before *Pilate*, that he claimed to be King of the Jews; or that he had cauſed or done any thing towards a Mutiny or Inſurrection among the People; (for upon theſe two, as we ſee, their whole Charge turned) *Pilate* again and again pronounced him innocent: For ſo he did a fourth, and a fifth time; bringing him out to them, after he had whipt him, *John* xix. 4, 6. And after all, *When Pilate ſaw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a Tumult was made, he took Water, and waſhed his Hands before the Multitude, ſaying, I am innocent of the Blood of this juſt Man; ſee you to it*, Mat. xxvii. 24. Which gives us a clear Reaſon of the cautious and wary Conduct of our Saviour, in not declaring himſelf, in the whole courſe of his Miniſtry, ſo much as to his Diſciples, much leſs to the Multitude or the Rulers of the Jews, in expreſs Words, to be the *Meſſiah* the King: And why he kept himſelf always in prophetical or parabolical Terms: (He and his Diſciples preaching only the Kingdom of God, *i. e.* of the *Meſſiah*, to be come) And left to his Miracles to declare who he was; though this was the Truth, which he came into the World, as he ſays himſelf, *John* xviii. 37. to teſtify, and which his Diſciples were to believe.

When *Pilate*, ſatisfied of his Innocence, would have releaſed him; and the Jews perſiſted to cry out, *Crucify him, Crucify him*, *John* xix. 6. *Pilate ſays to them, Take ye him your ſelves, and crucify him: For I do not find any Fault in him.* The Jews then, ſince they could not make him a State-Criminal, by alledging his ſaying that he was *the Son of God:* ſay, by their Law it was a capital Crime, *v.* 7. *The Jews anſwered to Pilate, We have a Law, and by our Law he ought to die; becauſe he made himſelf the Son of God, i. e.* becauſe, by ſaying he is the *Son of God*, he has made himſelf the *Meſſiah* the Prophet, which was to come. For we find no other Law but that againſt falſe Prophets,

Prophets, *Deut.* xviii. 20. whereby *making himſelf the Son of God*, deſerved Death. After this, *Pilate* was the more deſirous to releaſe him, *v.* 12, 13. *But the Jews cried out, ſaying, If thou let this Man go, thou art not Cæſar's Friend: Whoſoever maketh himſelf a King, ſpeaketh againſt Cæſar.* Here we ſee the Streſs of their Charge againſt Jeſus; whereby they hoped to take away his Life; *viz.* That he *made himſelf King*. We ſee alſo upon what they grounded this Accuſation, *viz.* Becauſe he had owned himſelf to be *the Son of God*. For he had in their Hearing, never made or profeſſed himſelf to be a King. We ſee here likewiſe the Reaſon why they were ſo deſirous to draw, from his own Mouth, a Confeſſion in expreſs Words that he was the *Meſſiah*; viz. That they might have what might be a clear Proof that he did ſo. And laſt of all, we ſee the Reaſon why, though in Expreſſions, which they underſtood, he owned himſelf to them to be the *Meſſiah*; yet he avoided declaring it to them, in ſuch Words as might look Criminal at *Pilate*'s Tribunal. He owned himſelf to be the *Meſſiah* plainly, to the Underſtanding of the *Jews*; but in Ways that could not, to the Underſtanding of *Pilate*, make it appear that he had laid Claim to the Kingdom of *Judea*, or went about to make himſelf King of that Country. But whether his ſaying, that he was *the Son of God*, was Criminal by their Law, that *Pilate* troubled not himſelf about.

He that conſiders what *Tacitus*, *Suetonius*, *Seneca de benef.* l. 3. c. 26. ſay of *Tiberius* and his Reign, will find how neceſſary it was for our Saviour, if he would not die as a Criminal and a Traitor, to take great heed to his Words and Actions; that he did, or ſaid not any thing that might be offenſive, or give the leaſt Umbrage to the *Roman* Government. It behoved an innocent Man, who was taken notice of for ſomething extraordinary in him, to be very wary under a jealous and cruel Prince, who encouraged Informations, and filled his Reign with Executions for Treaſon; under whom Words ſpoken innocently, or in jeſt, if they could be miſconſtrued, were made Treaſon, and proſecuted with a Rigor, that made it always the ſame Thing to be accuſed and condemned. And therefore we ſee, that when the *Jews* told *Pilate*, John xix. 12. that he ſhould not be a Friend to *Cæſar*, if he let *Jeſus* go; (for that whoever made himſelf King was a Rebel againſt *Cæſar*;) he asks them no more, whether they would take *Barrabas*, and ſpare *Jeſus*; but (though againſt his Conſcience) gives him up to Death, to ſecure his own Head.

One Thing more there is, that gives us Light into this wiſe and neceſſarily cautious Management of himſelf, which manifeſtly agrees with it, and makes a Part of it: And that is, the Choice of his Apoſtles; exactly ſuited to the Deſign and Foreſight of the Neceſſity of keeping the Declaration of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, which was now expected, within certain general Terms during his Miniſtry: It was not fit to open himſelf too plainly or forwardly, to the heady *Jews*, that he himſelf was the *Meſſiah*: That was to be left to the Obſervation of thoſe who would attend to the Purity of his Life, the Teſtimony of his Miracles, and the Conformity of all, with the Predictions concerning him; by theſe Marks, thoſe he lived amongſt were to find it out, without an expreſs Promulgation that he was the *Meſſiah*, till after his Death. His Kingdom was to be open'd to them by Degrees, as well to prepare them to receive it, as to enable him to be long enough amongſt them; to perform what was the Work of the *Meſſiah* to be done; and fulfil all thoſe ſeveral Parts of what was foretold of him in the *Old Teſtament*, and we ſee applied to him in the *New*.

The *Jews* had no other Thoughts of their *Meſſiah*, but of a mighty temporal Prince, that ſhould raiſe their Nation into an higher Degree of Power, Dominion and Proſperity than ever it had enjoyed. They were filled with the Expectation of a glorious earthly Kingdom. It was not therefore for a poor Man, the Son of a Carpenter, and (as they thought) born in *Galilee*, to pretend to it. None of the *Jews*, no not his Diſciples, could have born this; if he had expreſly avowed this at firſt, and began his Preaching, and the opening of his Kingdom this Way; eſpecially if he had added to it, that in a Year or two he ſhould die an ignominious Death upon the Croſs. They are therefore prepared for the Truth by Degrees. Firſt, *John the Baptiſt* tells them, *The Kingdom of God* (a Name by which the *Jews* called the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*) *is at hand*. Then our Saviour comes, and he tells them *of the Kingdom of God*; ſometimes that it is at hand, and upon ſome Occaſions, that it is come; but ſays in his publick Preaching little or nothing of himſelf. Then come the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts after his Death, and they in expreſs Words teach what his Birth,

Life, and Doctrine had done before, and had prepared the well-diſpoſed to receive; *viz.* That *Jeſus is the Meſſiah.*

To this Deſign and Method of publiſhing the Goſpel, was the Choice of the Apoſtles exactly adjuſted; a Company of poor, ignorant, illiterate Men; who, as Chriſt himſelf tells us, *Mat.* xi. 25. and *Luke* x. 21. were not of the *wiſe and prudent* Men of the World: They were, in that Reſpect, but mere Children. Theſe, convinced by the Miracles they ſaw him daily do, and the unblameable Life he led, might be diſpoſed to believe him to be the *Meſſiah*: And tho' they, with others, expected a temporal Kingdom on Earth, might yet reſt ſatisfied in the Truth of their Maſter (who had honoured them with being near his Perſon) that it would come, without being too inquiſitive after the Time, Manner, or Seat of his Kingdom, as Men of Letters, more ſtudied in their Rabins, or Men of Buſineſs, more verſed in the World, would have been forward to have been. Men great, or wiſe, in Knowledge or Ways of the World, would hardly have been kept from prying more narrowly into his Deſign and Conduct; or from queſtioning him about the Ways and Meaſures he would take for aſcending the Throne; and what Means were to be uſed towards it, and when they ſhould in earneſt ſet about it. Abler Men, of higher Births or Thoughts, would hardly have been hindred from whiſpering, at leaſt, to their Friends and Relations, that their Maſter was the *Meſſiah*; and that tho' he concealed himſelf to a fit Opportunity, and till Things were ripe for it, yet they ſhould e're long ſee him break out of his Obſcurity, caſt off the Cloud, and declare himſelf, as he was, King of *Iſrael*. But the Ignorance and Lowneſs of theſe good poor Men, made them of another Temper. They went along in an implicit Truſt on him, punctually keeping to his Commands, and not exceeding his Commiſſion. When he ſent them to preach the Goſpel, he bid them preach *The Kingdom of God* to be at hand; and that they did, without being more particular than he had order'd, or mixing their own Prudence with his Commands, to promote the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*. They preached it, without giving, or ſo much as intimating that their Maſter was he: Which Men of another Condition, and an higher Education, would ſcarce have forborn to have done. When he asked them, who they thought him to be; and *Peter* anſwer'd, *The Meſſiah, the Son of God*, Mat. xvi. 16. He plainly ſhews, by the following Words, that he himſelf had not told them ſo; and at the ſame Time, *v.* 20. forbids them to tell this their Opinion of him to any Body. How obedient they were to him in this, we may not only conclude from the Silence of the Evangeliſts concerning any ſuch Thing, publiſhed by them any where before his Death; but from the exact Obedience three of them paid to a like Command of his. He takes *Peter*, *James* and *John* into a Mountain, and there *Moſes* and *Elias* coming to him, he is transfigured before them, *Mat.* xvii. 9. He charges them, ſaying, *See that ye tell no Man what ye have ſeen, till the Son of Man ſhall be riſen from the Dead.* And St. *Luke* tells us, what punctual Obſervers they were of his Orders in this caſe, *Ch.* ix. 36. *They kept it cloſe, and told no Man, in thoſe Days, any of thoſe Things which they had ſeen.*

Whether twelve other Men, of quicker Parts, and of a Station or Breeding which might have given them any Opinion of themſelves, or their own Abilities, would have been ſo eaſily kept from medling beyond juſt what was preſcribed them, in a Matter they had ſo much Intereſt in; and have ſaid nothing of what they might in human Prudence have thought would have contributed to their Maſter's Reputation, and made way for his Advancement to his Kingdom, I leave to be conſidered. And it may ſuggeſt Matter of Meditation, whether St. *Paul* was not for this Reaſon, by his Learning, Parts, and warmer Temper, better fitted for an Apoſtle after, than during our Saviour's Miniſtry: And therefore, tho' a choſen Veſſel, was not by the Divine Wiſdom called till after Chriſt's Reſurrection.

I offer this only as a Subject of magnifying the admirable Contrivance of the divine Wiſdom, in the whole Work of our Redemption, as far as we are able to trace it by the Footſteps which God hath made viſible to human Reaſon. For tho' it be as eaſy to omnipotent Power to do all Things by an immediate over-ruling Will, and ſo to make any Inſtruments work, even contrary to their Nature, in Subſerviency to his Ends; yet his Wiſdom is not uſually at the Expence of Miracles (if I may ſo ſay) but only in Caſes that require them, for the evidencing of ſome Revelation or Miſſion to be from him. He does conſtantly (unleſs where the Confirmation of ſome Truth requires it otherwiſe) bring about his Purpoſes by Means operating according their Natures.

If

If it were not ſo, the Courſe and Evidence of Things would be confounded, Miracles would loſe their Name and Force; and there could be no Diſtinction between Natural and Supernatural.

There had been no room left to ſee and admire the Wiſdom, as well as Innocence of our Saviour, if he had raſhly every where expoſed himſelf to the Fury of the *Jews*, and had always been preſerved by a miraculous Suſpenſion of their Malice, or a miraculous Reſcuing him out of their Hands. It was enough for him once to eſcape from the Men of *Nazareth*, who were going to throw him down a Precipice, for him never to preach to them again. Our Saviour had Multitudes that followed him for the Loaves; who barely ſeeing the Miracles that he did, would have made him King. If to the Miracles he did, he had openly added in expreſs Words, that he was the *Meſſiah*, and the King they expected to deliver them, he would have had more Followers, and warmer in the Cauſe, and readier to ſet him up at the Head of a Tumult. Theſe, indeed, God, by a miraculous Influence, might have hindred from any ſuch Attempt: But then Poſterity could not have believed that the Nation of the *Jews* did at that Time expect the *Meſſiah* their King and Deliverer; or that *Jeſus*, who declared himſelf to be that King and Deliverer, ſhewed any Miracles amongſt them, to convince them of it; or did any Thing worthy to make him be credited or received. If he had gone about preaching to the Multitude which he drew after him, that he was the *Meſſiah, the King of Iſrael*; and this had been evidenced to *Pilate*; God could, indeed, by a ſupernatural Influence upon his Mind, have made *Pilate* pronounce him innocent, and not condemn him as a Malefactor, who had openly, for three Years together, preached Sedition to the People, and endeavoured to perſuade them that he was the *Meſſiah their King*, of the Blood-Royal of *David*, come to deliver them. But then I ask, whether Poſterity would not either have ſuſpected the Story, or that ſome Art had been uſed to gain that Teſtimony from *Pilate?* Becauſe he could not (for nothing) have been ſo favourable to *Jeſus*, as to be willing to releaſe ſo turbulent and ſeditious a Man; to declare him innocent, and to caſt the Blame and Guilt of his Death, as unjuſt, upon the Envy of the *Jews*.

But now the Malice of the Chief Prieſts, Scribes and Phariſees; the Headineſs of the Mob, animated with Hopes, and raiſed with Miracles; *Judas*'s Treachery, and *Pilate*'s Care of his Government, and of the Peace of his Province, all working naturally as they ſhould; *Jeſus*, by the admirable Warineſs of his Carriage, and an extraordinary Wiſdom viſible in his whole Conduct, weathers all theſe Difficulties; does the Work he comes for, uninterruptedly goes about preaching his full appointed Time, ſufficiently manifeſts himſelf to be the *Meſſiah* in all the Particulars the Scriptures had foretold of him; and when his Hour is come, ſuffers Death: But is acknowledged both by *Judas* that betrayed, and *Pilate* that condemned him, to die innocent. For, to uſe his own Words, *Luke* xxiv. 46. *Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Meſſiah to ſuffer.* And of his whole Conduct, we have a Reaſon and clear Reſolution in thoſe Words to St. *Peter*, Mat. xxvi. 53. *Thinkeſt thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he ſhall preſently give me more than twelve Legions of Angels? But how then ſhall the Scripture be fulfilled, that thus it muſt be?*

Having this Clew to guide us, let us now obſerve how our Saviour's Preaching and Conduct comported with it, in the laſt Scene of his Life. How cautious he had been in the former Part of his Miniſtry, we have already obſerved. We never find him to uſe the Name of the *Meſſiah* but once, till he now came to *Jeruſalem* this laſt Paſſover. Before this, his Preaching and Miracles were leſs at *Jeruſalem* (where he uſed to make but very ſhort Stays) than any where elſe. But now he comes ſix Days before the Feaſt, and is every Day in the Temple teaching; and there publickly heals the Blind and the Lame, in the Preſence of the *Scribes*, *Phariſees*, and *Chief Prieſts*. The Time of his Miniſtry drawing to an End, and his Hour coming, he cared not how much the Chief Prieſts, Elders, Rulers, and the Sanhedrim were provoked againſt him by his Doctrine and Miracles: He was as open and bold in his Preaching and doing the Works of the *Meſſiah* now at *Jeruſalem*, and in the Sight of the Rulers, and of all the People, as he had been before cautious and reſerved there, and careful to be little taken notice of in that Place, and not to come in their Way more than needs. All that he now took Care of, was not what they ſhould think of him, or deſign againſt him, (for he knew they would ſeize him) but to ſay or do nothing that might be a juſt Matter of Accuſation againſt him, or render him criminal to the Governor. But as for the Grandees of the *Jewiſh* Nation, he ſpares them not, but ſharply now

reprehends

reprehends their Miſcarriages publickly in the Temple; where he calls them, more than once, Hypocrites; as is to be ſeen *Mat.* xxiii. And concludes all with no ſofter a Compellation, than *Serpents* and *Generation of Vipers.*

After this ſevere Reproof of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, being retired with his Diſciples into the *Mount of Olives*, over againſt the Temple, and there foretelling the Deſtruction of it; his Diſciples ask him, *Mat.* xxiv. 3, &c. *When it ſhould be, and what ſhould be the Signs of his Coming?* He ſays to them, *Take heed that no Man deceive you: For many ſhall come in my Name, i. e.* taking on them the Name and Dignity of the *Meſſiah*, which is only mine, ſaying, *I am the Meſſiah, and ſhall deceive many.* But be not you by them miſled, nor by Perſecution driven away from this fundamental Truth, that I am the *Meſſiah*; *for many ſhall be ſcandalized*, and apoſtatize, *but he that endures to the End, the ſame ſhall be ſaved: And this Goſpel of the Kingdom ſhall be preached in all the World: i. e.* The good News of me, the *Meſſiah*, and my Kingdom, ſhall be ſpread through the World. This was the great and only Point of Belief they were warned to ſtick to; and this is inculcated again, *v.* 23—26. and *Mark* xiii. 21—23. with this emphatical Application to them in both theſe Evangeliſts, *Behold, I have told you before-hand*; remember ye are fore-warned.

This was in his Anſwer to the Apoſtles Enquiry concerning his *Coming, and the End of the World, v.* 3. For ſo we tranſlate τ συντελείας τ αἰῶνος; we muſt underſtand the Diſciples here to put their Queſtion, according to the Notion and Way of ſpeaking of the *Jews*. For they had two *Worlds*, as we tranſlate it, ὁ νῦν αἰὼν & ὁ μέλλων αἰών; the *preſent World*, and the *World to come*. The Kingdom of God, as they called it, or the Time of the *Meſſiah*, they called ὁ μέλλων αἰών, *the World to come*, which they believed was to put an end to *this World*: And that then the Juſt ſhould be raiſed from the Dead, to enjoy, in that *new World*, a happy Eternity, with thoſe of the Jewiſh Nation who ſhould be then living.

Theſe two Things, *viz.* the viſible and powerful Appearance of his Kingdom, and the End of the World, being confounded in the Apoſtles Queſtion, our Saviour does not ſeparate them, nor diſtinctly reply to them apart; but leaving the Enquirers in the common Opinion, anſwers at once concerning his coming to take Vengeance of the Jewiſh Nation, and put an end to their Church, Worſhip and Common-wealth; which was their ὁ νῦν αἰών, *preſent World*, which they counted ſhould laſt till the *Meſſiah* came: and ſo it did, and then had an End put to it. And to this he joins his laſt Coming to Judgment, in the Glory of his Father, to put a final End to this World, and all the Diſpenſation belonging to the Poſterity of *Adam* upon Earth. This joining them together, made his Anſwer obſcure, and hard to be underſtood by them then; nor was it ſafe for him to ſpeak plainer of his Kingdom, and the Deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, unleſs he had a mind to be accuſed for having Deſigns againſt the Government. For *Judas* was amongſt them: And whether no other but his Apoſtles were comprehended under the Name of *his Diſciples*, who were with him at this Time, one cannot determine. Our Saviour therefore ſpeaks of his Kingdom in no other Stile but that which he had all along hitherto uſed, *viz. The Kingdom of God*, Luke xxi. 31. *When you ſee theſe Things come to paſs, know ye that the Kingdom of God is nigh at hand.* And continuing on his Diſcourſe with them, he has the ſame Expreſſion, *Mat.* xxv. 1. *Then the Kingdom of Heaven ſhall be like unto ten Virgins.* At the End of the following Parable of the Talents, he adds, *v.* 31. *When the Son of Man ſhall come in his Glory, and all the Holy Angels with him, then ſhall he ſit upon the Throne of his Glory, and before him ſhall be gathered all the Nations. And he ſhall ſet the Sheep on his right Hand, and the Goats on his left. Then ſhall the* KING *ſay, &c.* Here he deſcribes to his Diſciples the Appearance of his Kingdom, wherein he will ſhew himſelf *a King* in Glory upon his Throne; but this in ſuch a Way, and ſo remote, and ſo unintelligible to a Heathen Magiſtrate; that if it had been alledg'd againſt him, it would have ſeemed rather the Dream of a crazy Brain, than the Contrivance of an ambitious or dangerous Man deſigning againſt the Government: The Way of expreſſing what he meant, being in the prophetick Stile, which is ſeldom ſo plain, as to be underſtood, till accompliſh'd. 'Tis plain, that his Diſciples themſelves comprehended not what Kingdom he here ſpoke of, from their Queſtion to him after his Reſurrection, *Wilt thou at this Time reſtore again the Kingdom to Iſrael?*

Having finiſhed theſe Diſcourſes, he takes order for the Paſſover, and eats it with his Diſciples; and at Supper tells them, that one of them ſhould betray him: And adds

adds, *John* xiii. 19. *I tell it you now, before it come, that when it is come to paſs, you may know that I am.* He does not ſay out, *the Meſſiah*; *Judas* ſhould not have that to ſay againſt him if he would; though that be the Senſe in which he uſes this Expreſſion, ἐγώ εἰμι, *I am*, more than once. And that this is the Meaning of it, is clear from *Mark* xii. 6. *Luke* xxi. 8. In both which Evangeliſts the Words are, *For many ſhall come in my Name, ſaying,* ἐγώ εἰμι, *I am:* The Meaning whereof we ſhall find explained in the parallel Place of St. *Matthew Chap.* xxiv. 5. For many ſhall come in my Name, ſaying, ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ χριστὸς, *I am* the *Meſſiah.* Here in this place of *John* xii. *Jeſus* foretels what ſhould happen to him, *viz.* that he ſhould be betrayed by *Judas*; adding this Prediction to the many other Particulars of his Death and Suffering, which he had at other times foretold to them. And here he tells them the Reaſon of theſe his Prediction, *viz.* that afterwards they might be a Confirmation to their Faith. And what was it that he would have them believe, and be confirmed in the Belief of? Nothing but this, ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, that *he was the Meſſiah.* The ſame Reaſon he gives, *John* xiii. 28. *You have heard, how I ſaid unto you, I go away, and come again unto you: And now I have told you before it come to paſs, that when it is come to paſs, ye might believe.*

When *Judas* had left them, and was gone out, he talks a little freer to them of his Glory, and his Kingdom, than ever he had done before. For now he ſpeaks plainly of himſelf and of his Kingdom, *John* xiii. 31. *Therefore when he* [Judas] *was gone out, Jeſus ſaid, Now is the Son of Man glorified, and God is alſo glorified in him. And if God be glorified in him, God ſhall alſo glorify him in himſelf, and ſhall ſtraitway glorify him.* And *Luke* xxii. 29. *And I will appoint unto you a Kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink with me at my Table in my Kingdom.* Though he has every where all along through his Miniſtry preached the *Goſpel of the Kingdom*; and nothing elſe but that and Repentance, and the Duties of a good Life; yet it has been always *the Kingdom of God*, and *the Kingdom of Heaven:* And I do not remember, that any where, till now, he uſes any ſuch Expreſſion, as *My Kingdom.* But here now he ſpeaks in the firſt Perſon, *I will appoint you a Kingdom*; and *in my Kingdom:* And this we ſee is only to the Eleven, now *Judas* was gone from them.

With theſe Eleven, whom he was now juſt leaving, he has a long Diſcourſe to comfort them for the Loſs of him; and to prepare them for the Perſecution of the World; and to exhort them to keep his Commandments, and to love one another. And here one may expect all the Articles of Faith ſhould be laid down plainly; if any thing elſe were required of them to believe, but what he had taught them, and they believed already, *viz. That he was the Meſſiah,* John xiv. 1. *Ye believe in God, believe alſo in me,* v. 29. *I have told you before it come to paſs, that when it is come to paſs ye may believe.* It is believing on him, without any thing elſe, *John* xvi. 31. *Jeſus anſwered them, Do ye now believe?* This was in anſwer to their Profeſſion, *v.* 30. *Now are we ſure that thou knoweſt all Things, and needeſt not that any Man ſhould ask thee: By this we believe that thou comeſt forth from God.*

John xvii. 20. *Neither pray I for theſe alone, but for them alſo which ſhall believe on me through their Word.* All that is ſpoke of *Believing*, in this his laſt Sermon to them, is only *believing on him*, or believing that *He came from God*; which was no other than believing him to be the *Meſſiah.*

Indeed, *John* xiv. 9. our Saviour tells *Philip, He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father.* And adds, *v.* 10. *Believeſt thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? The Words that I ſpeak unto you, I ſpeak not of my ſelf: But the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the Works.* Which being in anſwer to *Philip*'s Words. *v.* 9. *Shew us the Father*, ſeem to import thus much: *No Man hath ſeen God at any time*, he is known only by his Works. And that he is my Father, and the Son of God, *i. e.* the *Meſſiah*, you may know by the Works I have done; which it is impoſſible I could do of my ſelf, but by the Union I have with God my Father. For that by being *in God*, and *God in him*, he ſignifies ſuch an Union with God, that God operates in and by him, appears not only by the Words above-cited out of *v.* 10. (which can ſcarce otherwiſe be made coherent Senſe) but alſo from the ſame Phraſe uſed again by our Saviour preſently after, *v.* 20. *At that Day, viz.* after his Reſurrection, when they ſhould ſee him again, *ye ſhall know that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you*; *i. e.* by the Works I ſhall enable you to do, through a Power I have received from the Father: Which whoſoever ſees me do, muſt acknowledge

the

the Father to be in me; and whoever ſees you do, muſt acknowledge me to be in you. And therefore he ſays, *v.* 12. *Verily, verily I ſay unto you, He that believeth on me, the Works that I do ſhall he alſo do, becauſe I go unto my Father.* Though I go away, yet I ſhall be in you, who believe in me; and ye ſhall be enabled to do Miracles alſo for the carrying on of my Kingdom, as I have done: That it may be manifeſted to others, that you are ſent by me, as I have evidenced to you, that I am ſent by the Father. And hence it is that he ſays, in the immediately preceding *v.* 11. *Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; if not, believe me for the ſake of the Works themſelves.* Let the Works that I have done convince you that I am ſent by the Father; that he is with me, and that I do nothing but by his Will, and by vertue of the Union I have with him; and that conſequently I am the *Meſſiah*, who am anointed, ſanctified, and ſeparate by the Father to the Work for which he ſent me.

To confirm them in this Faith, and to enable them to do ſuch Works as he had done, he promiſes them the Holy Ghoſt, *John* xiv. 25, 26. *Theſe Things I have ſaid unto you, being yet preſent with you.* But when I am gone, *the Holy Ghoſt, the Paraclet* (which may ſignify Monitor as well as Comforter, or Advocate) *which the Father ſhall ſend you in my Name, he ſhall ſhew you all Things, and bring to your Remembrance all Things which I have ſaid.* So that conſidering all that I have ſaid, and laying it together, and comparing it with what you ſhall ſee come to paſs, you may be more abundantly aſſured, that I am the *Meſſiah*, and fully comprehend, that I have done and ſuffered all Things foretold of the *Meſſiah*; and that were to be accompliſhed and fulfilled by him, according to Scriptures. But be not filled with Grief that I leave you, *John* xvi. 7. *It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away, the Paraclet will not come unto you.* One Reaſon why, if he went not away, the Holy Ghoſt could not come, we may gather from what has been obſerved concerning the prudent and wary Carriage of our Saviour all through his Miniſtry, that he might not incur Death with the leaſt ſuſpicion of a Malefactor. And therefore though his Diſciples believed him to be the *Meſſiah*, yet they neither underſtood it ſo well, nor were ſo well confirmed in the Belief of it, as after that he being crucified and riſen again, they had received the Holy Ghoſt; and with the Gifts of the Holy Spirit, a fuller and clearer Evidence and Knowledge that he was the *Meſſiah*. They then were enlightned to ſee how his Kingdom was ſuch, as the Scriptures foretold, though not ſuch as they, till then, had expected. And now this Knowledge and Aſſurance received from the Holy Ghoſt, was of uſe to him after his Reſurrection; when they could now boldly go about, and openly preach, as they did, that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*; confirming that Doctrine by the Miracle which the Holy Ghoſt empowered them to do. But till he was dead and gone, they could not do this. Their going about openly Preaching, as they did after his Reſurrection, that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*; and doing Miracles every where, to make it good, would not have conſiſted with that Character of Humility, Peace and Innocence, which the *Meſſiah* was to ſuſtain, if they had done it before his Crucifixion. For this would have drawn upon him the Condemnation of a Malefactor, either as a Stirrer of Sedition againſt the publick Peace, or as a Pretender to the Kingdom of *Iſrael*. Hence we ſee, that they who before his Death preached only the *Goſpel of the Kingdom*; that *the Kindom of God was at hand*; as ſoon as they had received the Holy Ghoſt after his Reſurrection, changed their Stile, and every where in expreſs Words declare, that *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*, that *King* which was to come. This, the following Words here in St. *John* xvi. 8—14. confirm; where he goes on to tell them, *And when he is come, he will convince the World of Sin: Becauſe they believed not on me.* Your Preaching then, accompanied with Miracles, by the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, ſhall be a Conviction to the World, that the Jews ſinned in not believing me to be the *Meſſiah*. *Of Righteouſneſs*, or Juſtice: *Becauſe I go to my Father, and ye ſee me no more.* By the ſame Preaching and Miracles you ſhall confirm the Doctrine of my Aſcenſion; and thereby convince the World that I was that *Juſt One*, who am therefore aſcended to the Father into Heaven, where no unjuſt Perſon ſhall enter. *Of Judgment: Becauſe the Prince of this World is Judged.* And by the ſame Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt ye ſhall convince the World, that the Devil is judged or condemned, by your caſting of him out, and deſtroying his Kingdom, and his Worſhip where-ever you preach. Our Saviour adds, *I have yet many Things to ſay unto you, but you cannot bear them now.* They were yet ſo full of a Temporal Kingdom, that they could not bear the diſcovery

very of what kind of Kingdom his was, nor what a King he was to be: And therefore he leaves them to the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, for a farther and fuller diſcovery of himſelf, and the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*; for fear they ſhould be ſcandalized in him, and give up the Hopes they had now in him; and forſake him. This he tells them, *v.* 1. of this xvi. Chapter: *Theſe things I have ſaid unto you, that you may not be ſcandalized.* The laſt thing he had told them before his ſaying this to them, we find in the laſt Verſes of the precedent Chapter: *When the Paraclet is come, the Spirit of Truth, he ſhall witneſs concerning me.* He ſhall ſhew you who I am, and witneſs it to the World; and then, *Ye alſo ſhall bear witneſs, becauſe ye have been with me from the Beginning.* He ſhall call to your Mind, what I have ſaid and done, that ye may underſtand it, and know, and bear Witneſs concerning me. And again here, *John* xvi. after he had told them, they could not bear what he had more to ſay, he adds, *v.* 13. *Howbeit, when the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all Truth; and he will ſhew you things to come: He ſhall glorify me.* By the Spirit, when he comes, ye ſhall be fully inſtructed concerning me; though you cannot yet, from what I have ſaid to you, clearly comprehend my Kingdom and Glory, yet he ſhall make it known to you wherein it conſiſts: And tho' I am now in a mean State, and ready to be given up to Contempt, Torment, and Death, ſo that ye know not what to think of it; yet the Spirit when he comes, *ſhall glorify me*, and fully ſatisfy you of my Power and Kingdom; and that I ſit on the right Hand of God, to order all things for the Good and Increaſe of it, till I come again at the laſt Day in the Fulneſs of Glory.

Accordingly, the Apoſtles had a full and clear Sight and Perſwaſion of this, after they had receiv'd the Holy Ghoſt; and they preach'd it every where boldly and openly, without the leaſt remainder of Doubt or Uncertainty. But that even ſo late as this, they underſtood not his Death and Reſurrection, is evident from *v.* 17, 18. *Then ſaid ſome of the Diſciples among themſelves, What is this that he ſaith unto us; A little while, and ye ſhall not ſee me; And again, a little while, and ye ſhall ſee me; and becauſe I go to the Father? They ſaid therefore, what is this that he ſaith, a little while? We know not what he ſaith.* Upon which he goes on to diſcourſe to them of his Death and Reſurrection, and of the Power they ſhould have of doing Miracles. But all this he declares to them in a myſtical and involved way of ſpeaking: As he tells them himſelf, *v.* 25. *Theſe things have I ſpoken to you in Proverbs*; *i. e.* in general, obſcure, enigmatical, or figurative Terms. (All which, as well as alluſive Apologues, the *Jews* called Proverbs or Parables) hitherto my declaring of my ſelf to you hath been obſcure, and with reſerve; and I have not ſpoken of my ſelf to you in plain and direct Words, becauſe ye *could not bear it.* A *Meſſiah*, and not a King, you could not underſtand: And a King living in Poverty and Perſecution, and dying the Death of a Slave and Malefactor upon a Croſs, you could not put together. And had I told you in plain Words, that I was the *Meſſiah*, and given you a direct Commiſſion to preach to others, that I profeſſedly own'd my ſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, you and they would have been ready to have made a Commotion, to have ſet me upon the Throne of my Father *David*, and fight for me, and that your *Meſſiah*, your King, in whom are your Hopes of a Kingdom, ſhould not be deliver'd up into the Hands of his Enemies to be put to Death; and of this *Peter* will inſtantly give you a Proof. But *the Time cometh when I ſhall no more ſpeak unto you in Parables; but I ſhall ſhew unto you plainly of the Father.* My Death and Reſurrection, and the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, will ſpeedily enlighten you, and then I ſhall make you know the Will and Deſign of the Father; what a Kingdom I am to have, and by what Means, and to what End, *v.* 27. And this the Father himſelf will ſhew unto you; *For he loveth you, becauſe ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from the Father.* Becauſe ye have believed that I am the *Son of God, the Meſſiah*; that he hath anointed and ſent me; though it hath not been yet fully diſcovered to you, what kind of Kingdom it ſhall be, nor by what Means brought about. And then our Saviour, without being asked, explaining to them, what he ſaid, and making them underſtand better, what before they ſtuck at, and complained ſecretly among themſelves that they underſtood not; they thereupon declare, *v.* 30. *Now are we ſure that thou knoweſt all things, and needeſt not that any Man ſhould ask thee.* 'Tis plain, thou knoweſt Mens Thoughts and Doubts before they ask. *By this we believe that thou cameſt forth from God. Jeſus anſwer'd, do ye now believe?* Notwithſtanding that you now believe, that I came from God, and am the *Meſſiah*, ſent by him; *Behold, the Hour cometh, yea is now come*

come, that ye ſhall be ſcattered; and as it is, *Mat.* xxvi. 31. and *ſhall all be ſcandalized in me.* What it is to be ſcandalized in him, we may ſee by what followed hereupon, if that which he ſays to St. *Peter*, *Mark* xiv. did not ſufficiently explain it.

This I have been the more particular in; that it may be ſeen, that in his laſt Diſcourſe to his Diſciples (where he opened himſelf more than he had hitherto done; and where, if any thing more was requir'd to make them Believers, than what they already believed, we might have expected they ſhould have heard of it;) there were no new Articles propoſed to them, but what they believed before, *viz.* That he was the *Meſſiah*, the Son of God, ſent from the Father: Tho' of his Manner of Proceeding, and his ſudden leaving of the World, and ſome few Particulars, he made them underſtand ſomething more than they did before. But as to the main Deſign of the Goſpel, *viz.* That he had a Kingdom, that he ſhould be put to Death, and riſe again, and aſcend into Heaven to his Father, and come again in Glory to judge the World; this he had told them: And ſo had acquainted them with the great Counſel of God; in ſending him the *Meſſiah*, and omitted nothing that was neceſſary to be known or believed in it. And ſo he tells them himſelf, *John* xv. 15. *Henceforth I call ye not Servants; for the Servant knoweth not what his Lord does: But I have called ye Friends; for* ALL THINGS *I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you*; tho' perhaps ye do not ſo fully comprehend them, as you will ſhortly, when I am riſen and aſcended.

To conclude all, in his Prayer, which ſhuts up this Diſcourſe, he tells the Father what he had made known to his Apoſtles; the Reſult whereof we have, *John* xvii. 8. *I have given unto them the Words which thou gaveſt me, and they have received them, and* THEY HAVE BELIEVED THAT THOU DIDST SEND ME. Which is, in effect, that he was the *Meſſiah* promiſed and ſent by God. And then he prays for them, and adds, *v.* 20, 21. *Neither pray I for theſe alone, but for them alſo, who ſhall believe on me through their Word.* What that Word was, through which others ſhould believe in him, we have ſeen in the preaching of the Apoſtles all through the Hiſtory of the *Acts*, *viz.* This one great Point, that Jeſus was the *Meſſiah*. The Apoſtles, he ſays, *v.* 25. *know that thou haſt ſent me*; *i. e.* are aſſured that I am the *Meſſiah*. And in *v.* 21, and 23. he prays, *That the World may believe* (which *v.* 23. is called knowing) *that thou haſt ſent me*. So that what Chriſt would have believed by his Diſciples, we may ſee by this his laſt Prayer for them, when he was leaving the World, as well as by what he preached whilſt he was in it.

And as a Teſtimony of this, one of his laſt Actions, even when he was upon the Croſs, was to confirm his Doctrine, by giving Salvation to one of the Thieves that was crucified with him, upon his Declaration that he believed him to be the *Meſſiah*: For ſo much the Words of his Requeſt imported, when he ſaid, *Remember me, Lord, when thou comeſt into thy Kingdom*, *Luke* xxiii. 42. To which Jeſus reply'd, *v.* 43. *Verily I ſay unto thee, to Day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.* An Expreſſion very remarkable: For as *Adam*, by Sin, loſt *Paradiſe*; *i. e.* a State of happy Immortality; here the believing Thief, through his Faith in *Jeſus* the *Meſſiah*, is promiſed to be put in Paradiſe, and ſo reinſtated in an happy Immortality.

Thus our Saviour ended his Life. And what he did after his Reſurrection, St. *Luke* tells us, *Acts* i. 3. That he ſhewed himſelf to the Apoſtles *forty Days*, *ſpeaking* Things *concerning the Kingdom of God.* This was what our Saviour preached in the whole Courſe of his Miniſtry, before his Paſſion: And no other Myſteries of Faith does he now diſcover to them after his Reſurrection. All he ſays, is concerning the Kingdom of God; and what it was he ſaid concerning that, we ſhall ſee preſently out of the other Evangeliſts; having firſt only taken Notice, that when now they ask'd him, *v.* 6. *Lord, wilt thou at this time reſtore again the Kingdom to Iſrael? He ſaid unto them, v.* 7. *It is not for you to no know the Times and the Seaſons, which the Father hath put into his own Power: But ye ſhall receive Power after that the Holy Ghoſt is come upon you; and ye ſhall be Witneſſes unto me unto the utmoſt Parts of the Earth.* Their great Buſineſs was to be Witneſſes to *Jeſus* of his Life, Death, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion; which put together, were undeniable Proofs of his being the *Meſſiah*. This was what they were to preach, and what he ſaid to them concerning the Kingdom of God, as will appear by what is recorded of it in the other Evangeliſts.

When on the Day of his Reſurrection, he appeared to the two going to *Emmaus*, *Luke* xxiv. they declare, *v.* 21. what his Diſciples Faith in him was: *But we truſted that it had been he that ſhould have redeemed Iſrael*; *i. e.* we believed that he was the *Meſſiah*,

Meſſiah, come to deliver the Nation of the *Jews*. Upon this, *Jeſus* tells them, they ought to believe him to be the *Meſſiah*, notwithſtanding what had happened; nay, they ought by his Suffering and Death to be confirmed in that Faith, that he was the *Meſſiah*. And *v.* 26, 27. *Beginning at Moſes and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures, the Things concerning himſelf*; how *that the Meſſiah ought to have ſuffered theſe Things, and to have entred into his Glory*. Now he applies the Propheſies of the *Meſſiah* to himſelf, which we read not that he did ever do before his Paſſion. And afterwards appearing to the Eleven, *Luke* xxiv. 36. he ſaid unto them, *v.* 44—47. *The Words, which I ſpoke unto you while I was yet with you, that all Things muſt be fulfilled which are written in the Law of Moſes, and in the Prophets, and in the Pſalms concerning me. Then opened he their Underſtandings, that they might underſtand the Scripture, and ſaid unto them; Thus it is written, and thus it behoved the Meſſiah to ſuffer, and to riſe from the Dead the third Day; and that Repentance, and Remiſſion of Sins ſhould be preached in his Name among all Nations, beginning at Jeruſalem.* Here we ſee what it was he had preached to them, though not in ſo plain open Words, before his Crucifixion; and what it is he now makes them underſtand; and what it was that was to be preached to all Nations, *viz.* That he was the *Meſſiah*, that had ſuffered, and roſe from the Dead the third Day, and fulfill'd all Things that were written in the Old Teſtament concerning the *Meſſiah*; and that thoſe who believed this, and repented, ſhould receive Remiſſion of their Sins, through this Faith in him. Or, as St. *Mark* has it, *Chap.* xvi. 15. *Go into all the World, and preach the Goſpel to every Creature; he that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved; but he that believeth not ſhall be damned*, v. 20. What the *Goſpel*, or *Good News* was, we have ſhewed already, *viz.* The happy Tidings of the *Meſſiah* being come. *V.* 20. And *they went forth and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the Word with Signs following.* What the *Word* was which they preached, and the Lord confirmed with Miracles, we have ſeen already out of the Hiſtory of their Acts; I have already given an Account of their Preaching every where, as it is recorded in the *Acts*, except ſome few Places, where the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* is mentioned under the Name of *the Kingdom of God*; which I forbore to ſet down, till I had made it plain out of the Evangeliſts, that that was no other but the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*.

It may be ſeaſonable therefore now, to add to thoſe Sermons we have formerly ſeen of St. *Paul* (wherein he preached no other Article of Faith, but that *Jeſus was the Meſſiah*, the King, who being riſen from the Dead, now reigneth, and ſhall more publickly manifeſt his Kingdom, in judging the World at the laſt Day) what farther is left upon Record of his Preaching. *Acts* xix. 8. At *Epheſus*, *Paul went into the Synagogues, and ſpake boldly for the ſpace of three Months; diſputing and perſuading concerning the Kingdom of God*. And, *Acts* xx. 25. at *Miletus* he thus takes leave of the Elders of *Epheſus*: *And now behold, I know that ye all among whom I have gone preaching the Kingdom of God, ſhall ſee my Face no more.* What this Preaching the Kingdom of God was, he tells you, *v.* 20, 21. *I have kept nothing back from you, which was profitable unto you, but have ſhewed you, and have taught you publickly, and from Houſe to Houſe; teſtifying both to the Jews, and to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And ſo again, *Acts* xxviii 23, 24. *When they* [the *Jews* at *Rome*] *had appointed him* [Paul] *a Day, there came many to him into his Lodging; to whom he expounded and teſtified the Kingdom of God; perſuading them concerning Jeſus, both out of the Law of Moſes, and out of the Prophets, from Morning to Evening. And ſome believed the Things which were ſpoken, and ſome believed not.* And the Hiſtory of the *Acts* is concluded with this Account of St. *Paul*'s Preaching: *And Paul dwelt two whole Years in his own hired Houſe, and received all that came in unto him, preaching the Kingdom of God, and teaching thoſe Things which concern the Lord Jeſus the Meſſiah.* We may therefore here apply the ſame Concluſion to the Hiſtory of our Saviour writ by the Evangeliſts, and to the Hiſtory of the Apoſtles writ in the *Acts*, which St. *John* does to his own Goſpel, *Chap.* xx. 30, 31. *Many other Signs did Jeſus before his Diſciples*; and in many other Places the Apoſtles preached the ſame Doctrine, *which are not written* in theſe Books; *but theſe are written, that you may believe that Jeſus is the Meſſiah, the Son of God; and that believing, you may have Life in his Name.*

What St. *John* thought neceſſary and ſufficient to be *believed*, for the attaining eternal Life, he here tells us. And this, not in the firſt dawning of the Goſpel; when, perhaps, ſome will be apt to think leſs was required to be believed, than after the Doctrine of Faith, and Myſtery of Salvation, was more fully explained, in the Epiſtles writ

writ by the Apoſtles. For it is to be remembred, that St. *John* ſays this not as ſoon as Chriſt was aſcended; for theſe Words, with the reſt of St. *John*'s Goſpel, were not written till many Years after, not only the other Goſpels, and St. *Luke*'s Hiſtory of the *Acts*; but in all Appearance, after all the Epiſtles writ by the other Apoſtles. So that above threeſcore Years after our Saviour's Paſſion; (for ſo long after, both *Epiphanius* and St. *Jerom* aſſure us this Goſpel was written) St. *John* knew nothing elſe required to be believed for the attaining of Life, but that *Jeſus is the Meſſiah, the Son of God.*

To this, 'tis likely, it will be objected by ſome, that to believe only that *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* is the *Meſſiah*, is but an *Hiſtorical*, and not a juſtifying, or ſaving Faith.

To which I anſwer, that I allow to the Makers of Syſtems and their Followers, to invent and uſe what Diſtinctions they pleaſe; and to call Things by what Names they think fit. But I cannot allow to them, or to any Man, an Authority to make a Religion for me, or to alter that which God hath revealed. And if they pleaſe to call the Believing that which our Saviour and his Apoſtles preached and propoſed alone to be believed, an *Hiſtorical* Faith; they have their Liberty. But they muſt have a Care how they deny it to be a juſtifying or ſaving Faith, when our Saviour and his Apoſtles have declared it ſo to be, and taught no other which Men ſhould receive, and whereby they ſhould be made Believers unto eternal Life; unleſs they can ſo far make bold with our Saviour, for the ſake of their beloved Syſtems, as to ſay, that he forgot what he came into the World for; and that he and his Apoſtles did not inſtruct People right in the Way and Myſteries of Salvation. For that this is the ſole Doctrine preſſed and required to be believed in the whole Tenour of our Saviour's and his Apoſtles Preaching, we have ſhewed through the whole Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts and the *Acts*. And I challenge them to ſhew that there was any other Doctrine, upon their Aſſent to which, or Diſbelief of it, Men were pronounced *Believers*, or Unbelievers; and accordingly received into the Church of Chriſt, as Members of his Body, as far as mere believing could make them ſo, or elſe kept out of it. This was the only Goſpel-Article of Faith which was preached to them. And if nothing elſe was preached every where, the Apoſtles Argument will hold againſt any other Articles of Faith to be believed under the Goſpel, *Rom.* x. 14. *How ſhall they believe that whereof they have not heard?* For to preach any other Doctrines neceſſary to be believed, we do not find that any Body was ſent.

Perhaps it will farther be urged, that this is not a *ſaving Faith*; becauſe ſuch a *Faith* as this the Devils may have, and 'twas plain they had; for they believed and declared *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*. And St. *James*, *Chap.* ii. 19. tells us, *The Devils believe, and tremble*; and yet they ſhall not be ſaved. To which I anſwer, 1. That they could not be ſaved by any *Faith*, to whom it was not propoſed as a Means of Salvation, nor ever promiſed to be counted for Righteouſneſs. This was an Act of Grace ſhewn only to Mankind. God dealt ſo favourably with the Poſterity of *Adam*, that if they would believe *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, the promiſed King and Saviour, and perform what other Conditions were required of them by the Covenant of Grace; God would juſtify them, becauſe of this Belief. He would account this Faith to them for Righteouſneſs, and look on it as making up the Defects of their Obedience; which being thus ſupplied by what was taken inſtead of it, they were looked on as Juſt or Righteous, and ſo inherited eternal Life. But this Favour ſhewn to Mankind, was never offered to the fallen Angels. They had no ſuch Propoſals made to them: And therefore whatever of this kind was propoſed to Men, it availed not Devils, whatever they performed of it. This Covenant of Grace was never offered to them.

2. I anſwer; that though the Devils believed, yet they could not be ſaved by the Covenant of Grace; becauſe they performed not the other Condition required in it, altogether as neceſſary to be performed as this of Believing, and that is *Repentance*. Repentance is as abſolute a Condition of the Covenant of Grace, as Faith; and as neceſſary to be performed as that. *John the Baptiſt*, who was to prepare the Way for the *Meſſiah*, *Preached the Baptiſm of Repentance for the Remiſſion of Sins*, Mark i. 4.

As *John* began his Preaching with *Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*, Mat. iii. 2. So did our Saviour begin his, *Mat.* iv. 17. *From that Time began Jeſus to Preach, and to ſay, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* Or, as St. *Mark* has it in that parallel Place, *Mark* i. 14, 15. *Now after that* John *was put in Priſon, Jeſus*

Jesus came into Galilee, *Preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, and saying, The Time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: Repent ye, and believe the Gospel.* This was not only the Beginning of his Preaching, but the Sum of all that he did preach, *viz.* that Men should *Repent*, and believe the good Tidings which he brought them; that *the Time was fulfilled* for the coming of the *Messiah*. And this was what his Apostles preached, when he sent them out, *Mark* vi. 12. *And they going out, preached that Men should repent.* Believing Jesus to be the *Messiah*, and repenting, were so necessary and fundamental Parts of the Covenant of Grace, that one of them alone is often put for both. For here St. *Mark* mentions nothing but their preaching *Repentance*: as St. *Luke*, in the parallel Place, *Chap.* ix. 6. mentions nothing but their *Evangelizing*, or Preaching the good News of the Kingdom of the *Messiah*: And St. *Paul* often in his Epistles puts *Faith* for the whole Duty of a Christian. But yet the Tenour of the Gospel is what Christ declares, *Luke* xii. 3. 5. *Unless ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.* And in the Parable of the rich Man in Hell, delivered by our Saviour, *Luke* xvi. *Repentance* alone is the Means proposed of avoiding that Place of Torment, *v.* 30, 31. And what the Tenour of the Doctrine, which should be preached to the World, should be, he tells his Apostles after his Resurrection, *Luke* xxiv. 27. *viz. That Repentance and Remission of Sins should be preached in his Name*, who was the *Messiah*. And accordingly, believing *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, and repenting, was what the Apostles preached. So *Peter* began, *Acts* ii. 38. *Repent, and be baptized.* These two Things were required for the Remission of Sins, *viz.* entring themselves in the Kingdom of God; and owning and professing themselves the Subjects of *Jesus*, whom they believed to be the *Messiah*, and received for their Lord and King; for that was to be *baptized in his Name*: Baptism being an initiating Ceremony known to the Jews, whereby those, who leaving Heathenism, and professing a Submission to the Law of *Moses*, were received into the Commonwealth of *Israel*. And so it was made use of by our Saviour, to be that solemn visible Act, whereby those who believed him to be the *Messiah*, received him as their King, and professed Obedience to him, were admitted as Subjects into his Kingdom: Which in the Gospels is called the *Kingdom of God*; and in the *Acts* and Epistles, often by another Name, *viz.* the *Church*.

The same St. *Peter* preaches again to the *Jews*, *Acts* iii. 19. *Repent, and be converted, that your Sins may be blotted out.*

What this Repentance was, which the new Covenant required as one of the Conditions to be performed by all those who should receive the Benefits of that Covenant, is plain in the Scripture, to be not only a Sorrow for Sins past, but (what is a natural Consequence of such Sorrow, if it be real) a turning from them into a new and contrary Life. And so they are joined together, *Acts* iii. 19. *Repent and turn about*; or, as we render it, be converted. And *Acts* xxvii. *Repent and turn to God.*

And sometimes *turning about* is put alone, to signify Repentance, *Mat.* xiii. 15. *Luke* xxii. 32. which in other Words is well expressed by *Newness of Life*. For it being certain that he who is really sorry for his Sins, and abhors them, will turn from them, and forsake them; either of these Acts, which have so natural a Connexion one with the other, may be, and is often put for both together. Repentance is an hearty Sorrow for our past Misdeeds, and a sincere Resolution and Endeavour, to the utmost of our Power, to conform all our Actions to the Law of God. So that Repentance does not consist in one single Act for Sorrow (though that being the first and leading Act, gives Denomination to the whole) but in *doing Works meet for Repentance*, in a sincere Obedience to the Law of Christ, the remainder of our Lives. This was called for by *John the Baptist*, the Preacher of Repentance, *Mat.* iii. 8. *Bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance.* And by St. *Paul* here, *Acts* xxvi. 20. *Repent and turn to God, and do Works meet for Repentance.* There are Works to follow belonging to Repentance, as well as Sorrow for what is past.

These two, Faith and Repentance, *i. e.* believing Jesus to be the *Messiah*, and a good Life, are the indispensible Conditions of the new Covenant to be performed by all those who would obtain eternal Life. The Reasonableness, or rather Necessity of which, that we may the better comprehend, we must a little look back to what was said in the beginning.

Adam being the Son of God, and so St. *Luke* calls him, *Chap.* iii. 38. had this Part also of the *Likeness* and *Image* of his Father, *viz.* that he was Immortal. But *Adam* transgressing the Command given him by his heavenly Father, incurred the Penalty, forfeited

forfeited that State of Immortality, and became Mortal. After this, *Adam* begot Children: But they were *in his own Likeneſs, after his own Image*; Mortal, like their Father.

God nevertheleſs, out of his infinite Mercy, willing to beſtow eternal Life on mortal Men, ſends Jeſus Chriſt into the World; who being conceived in the Womb of a Virgin (that had not known Man) by the immediate Power of God, was properly the Son of God; according to what the Angel declared to his Mother, *Luke* i. 30—35. *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the Power of the Higheſt ſhall overſhadow thee: Therefore alſo that Holy Thing which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called THE SON OF GOD.* So that being the Son of God, he was, like his Father, *Immortal.* As he tells us, *John* v. 26. *As the Father hath Life in himſelf, ſo hath he given to the Son to have Life in himſelf.*

And that Immortality is a Part of that *Image*, wherein theſe (who were the immediate Sons of God, ſo as to have no other Father) were made like their Father, appears probable, not only from the Places in *Geneſis* concerning *Adam*, above taken notice of, but ſeems to me alſo to be intimated in ſome Expreſſions concerning *Jeſus* the Son of God, in the New Teſtament, *Col.* i. 15. He is called *the Image of the inviſible God. Inviſible* ſeems put in, to obviate any groſs Imagination, that he (as Images uſe to do) repreſented God in any corporeal or viſible Reſemblance. And there is farther ſubjoined, to lead us into the Meaning of it, *The Firſt-born of every Creature*; which is farther explained, *v.* 18. where he is termed, *The Firſt-born from the Dead*: Thereby making out, and ſhewing himſelf to be the *Image* of the Inviſible; that Death hath no Power over him: But being the Son of God, and not having forfeited that Sonſhip by a Tranſgreſſion, was the Heir of eternal Life, as *Adam* ſhould have been, had he continued in his filial Duty. In the ſame Senſe the Apoſtle ſeems to uſe the Word *Image* in other Places, *viz. Rom.* viii. 29. *Whom he did foreknow, he alſo did predeſtinate to be conformed to the Image of his Son, that he might be the Firſt-born among many Brethren.* This *Image*, to which they were conformed, ſeems to be *Immortality* and Eternal Life. For 'tis remarkable, that in both theſe Places St. *Paul* ſpeaks of the Reſurrection; and that Chriſt was *The Firſt-born among many Brethren*; he being by Birth the Son of God, and the others only by Adoption, as we ſee in this ſame Chapter, *v.* 15 —— 17. *Ye have received the Spirit of Adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father: The Spirit it ſelf bearing Witneſs with our Spirits, that we are the Children of God. And if Children, then Heirs, and Joynt-Heirs with Chriſt: If ſo be that we ſuffer with him, that we may alſo be glorified together.* And hence we ſee that our Saviour vouchſafes to call thoſe, who at the Day of Judgment are through him entring into eternal Life, his *Brethren*; *Mat.* xxv. 40. *In as much as ye have done it unto one of the leaſt of theſe my Brethren.* May we not in this find a Reaſon why God ſo frequently in the New Teſtament, and ſo ſeldom, if at all, in the Old, is mentioned under the ſingle Title of THE FATHER? And therefore our Saviour ſays, *Mat.* xi. *No Man knoweth the Father ſave the Son, and he to whomſoever the Son will reveal him.* God has now a Son again in the World, the Firſt-born of many Brethren, who all now, by the Spirit of Adoption, can ſay, *Abba*, Father. And we by Adoption, being for his ſake made his Brethren, and the Sons of God, come to ſhare in that Inheritance, which was his natural Right; he being by Birth the Son of God: Which Inheritance is eternal Life. And again, *v.* 23. *We groan within our ſelves, waiting for the Adoption, to wit, the Redemption of our Body*; whereby is plainly meant the Change of theſe frail mortal Bodies, into the Spiritual immortal Bodies at the Reſurrection; *When this Mortal ſhall have put on Immortality*, 1 *Cor.* xv. 54. which in that Chapter, *v.* 42—44. he farther expreſſes thus: *So alſo is the Reſurrection of the Dead. It is ſown in Corruption, it is raiſed in Incorruption: It is ſown in Diſhonour, it is raiſed in Glory: It is ſown in Weakneſs, it is raiſed in Power: It is ſown a Natural Body, it is raiſed a Spiritual Body, &c.* To which he ſubjoins, *v.* 49. *As we have born the Image of the earthy, (i. e.* As we have been Mortal, like earthy *Adam* our Father, from whom we are deſcended, when he was turned out of Paradiſe) *We ſhall alſo bear the Image of the Heavenly*; into whoſe Sonſhip and Inheritance being adopted, we ſhall, at the Reſurrection, receive that *Adoption* we expect, *Even the Redemption of our Bodies*; and after his *Image*, which is the *Image* of the Father, become immor tal. Hear what he ſays himſelf, *Luke* xx. 35, 36. *They who ſhall be accounted worthy to obtain that World, and the Reſurrection from the Dead, neither marry, nor are given in Marriage. Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the Angels,*

Angels, and are the SONS OF GOD, being the Sons of the Reſurrection. And he that ſhall read St. *Paul*'s arguing, *Acts* xiii. 32, 33. will find that the great Evidence that Jeſus was the *Son of God*, was his Reſurrection. Then the Image of his Father appeared in him, when he viſibly entered into the State of Immortality. For thus the Apoſtle reaſons, *We preach to you, how that the Promiſe which was made to our Fathers, God hath fulfilled the ſame unto us, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again; as it is alſo written in the ſecond Pſalm, Thou art my Son, this Day have I begotten thee.*

This may ſerve a little to explain the *Immortality* of the Sons of God, who are in this like their Father, made after his *Image* and Likeneſs. But that our Saviour was ſo, he himſelf farther declares, *John* x. 18. where ſpeaking of his Life, he ſays, *No one taketh it from me, but I lay it down my ſelf: I have Power to lay it down, and I have Power to take it up again.* Which he could not have had, if he had been a mortal Man, the Son of a Man, of the Seed of *Adam*; or elſe had by any Tranſgreſſion forfeited his Life. For *the Wages of Sin is Death*: And he that hath incurred Death for his own Tranſgreſſion, cannot lay down his Life for another, as our Saviour profeſſes he did. For he was the juſt One, *Acts* vii. 57. and xii. 14. *Who knew no Sin,* 2 *Cor.* v. 21. *Who did no Sin, neither was Guile found in his Mouth.* And thus, *As by Man came Death, ſo by Man came the Reſurrection of the Dead. For as in* Adam *all die, ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive.*

For this laying down his Life for others, our Saviour tells us, *John* x. 17. *Therefore does my Father Love me, becauſe I lay down my Life, that I might take it again.* And this his Obedience and Suffering was rewarded with a Kingdom; which, he tells us, *Luke* xxii. *His Father had appointed unto him*; and which, 'tis evident out of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, *Chap.* xii. 2. he had a Regard to in his Sufferings: *Who for the Joy that was ſet down before him, endured the Croſs, deſpiſing the Shame, and is ſet down at the Right Hand of the Throne of God.* Which Kingdom given him upon this account of his Obedience, Suffering and Death, he himſelf takes notice of, in theſe Words, *John* xvii. 1—4. *Jeſus lift up his Eyes to Heaven, and ſaid, Father, the Hour is come, glorify thy Son, that thy Son alſo may glorify thee. As thou haſt given him Power over all Fleſh, that he ſhould give eternal Life to as many as thou haſt given him. And this is Life eternal, that they may know thee the only true God, and Jeſus the Meſſiah, whom thou haſt ſent. I have glorified thee on Earth: I have finiſhed the Work which thou gaveſt me to do.* And St. *Paul*, in his Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, *Chap.* ii. 8—11. *He humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Croſs. Wherefore God alſo hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name that is above every Name: That at the Name of Jeſus every Knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth; and that every Tongue ſhould confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord.*

Thus God, we ſee, deſign'd his Son *Chriſt Jeſus* a Kingdom, an everlaſting Kingdom in Heaven. But *though as in Adam all die, ſo in Chriſt ſhall all be made alive*; and all Men ſhall return to Life again at the laſt Day; yet all Men having ſinned, and thereby *come ſhort of the Glory of God*, as St. *Paul* aſſures us, *Rom.* iii. 23. (*i. e.* Not attaining to the heavenly Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, which is often called the Glory of God; as may be ſeen, *Rom.* v. 2. and xv. 7. and ii. 7. *Mat.* xvi. 27. *Mark* viii. 38. For no one who is unrighteous, *i. e.* comes ſhort of perfect Righteouſneſs, ſhall be admitted into the eternal Life of that Kingdom; as is declared, 1 *Cor.* vi. 9. *The Unrighteous ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God*;) and Death, the Wages of Sin, being the Portion of all thoſe who had tranſgreſſed the righteous Law of God; the Son of God would in vain have come into the World, to lay the Foundations of a Kingdom, and gather together a ſelect People out of the World, if, (they being found guilty at their Appearance before the Judgment-ſeat of the righteous Judge of all Men at the laſt Day) inſtead of Entrance into eternal Life in the Kingdom he had prepared for them, they ſhould receive Death, the juſt Reward of Sin, which every one of them was guilty of. This ſecond Death would have left him no Subjects; and inſtead of thoſe ten thouſand times ten thouſand, and thouſands of thouſands, there would not have been one left him to ſing Praiſes unto his Name, ſaying, *Bleſſing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto him that ſitteth on the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* God therefore, out of his Mercy to Mankind, and for the erecting of the Kingdom of his Son, and furniſhing it with Subjects out of every Kindred and Tongue, and People, and Nation, propoſed to the Children of Men, that as many of them as

would

would believe *Jeſus* his Son (whom he ſent into the World) to be the *Meſſiah*, the promiſed Deliverer; and would receive him for their King and Ruler; ſhould have all their paſt Sins, Diſobedience, and Rebellion forgiven them: And if for the future they liv'd in a ſincere Obedience to his Law, to the utmoſt of their Power; the Sins of human Frailty for the Time to come, as well as all thoſe of their paſt Lives, ſhould, for his Son's ſake, becauſe they gave themſelves up to him to be his Subjects, be forgiven them: and ſo their Faith, which made them be baptized into his Name; (*i. e.* enrol themſelves in the Kingdom of *Jeſus* the *Meſſiah*, and profeſs themſelves his Subjects, and conſequently live by the Laws of his Kingdom) ſhould be accounted to them for Righteouſneſs; *i. e.* ſhould ſupply the Defects of a ſcanty Obedience in the Sight of God; who counting this Faith to them for Righteouſneſs, or compleat Obedience, did thus juſtify, or make them juſt, and thereby capable of Eternal Life.

Now, that this is the Faith for which God of his free Grace juſtifies ſinful Man; (for *'tis God alone that juſtifieth*, Rom. viii. 33. Rom. iii. 26.) We have already ſhewed, by obſerving through all the Hiſtory of our Saviour and the Apoſtles, recorded in the Evangeliſts, and in the *Acts*, what he and his Apoſtles preached and propoſed to be believed. We ſhall ſhew now, that beſides believing him to be the *Meſſiah* their King, it was farther required, that thoſe who would have the Privilege, Advantage and Deliverance of his Kingdom, ſhould enter themſelves into it; and by Baptiſm being made Denizons, and ſolemnly incorporated into that Kingdom, live as became Subjects obedient to the Laws of it. For if they believed him to be the *Meſſiah*, their King, but would not obey his Laws, and would not have him to reign over them, they were but the greater Rebels; and God would not juſtify them for a Faith that did but encreaſe their Guilt, and oppoſe diametrically the Kingdom and Deſign of the *Meſſiah*; *Who gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all Iniquity, and purify unto himſelf a peculiar People, zealous of good Works*, Titus ii. 14. And therefore St. *Paul* tells the *Galatians*, That that which availeth is *Faith*; but *Faith working by Love*. And that *Faith* without *Works*, *i. e.* the Works of ſincere Obedience to the Law and Will of Chriſt, is not ſufficient for our Juſtification, St. *James* ſhews at large, *Chap.* ii.

Neither, indeed, could it be otherwiſe, for Life, eternal Life being the Reward of Juſtice or Righteouſneſs only, appointed by the righteous God (who is of purer Eyes than to behold Iniquity) to thoſe only who had no Taint or Infection of Sin upon them, it is impoſſible that he ſhould juſtify thoſe who had no regard to Juſtice at all, whatever they believed. This would have been to encourage Iniquity, contrary to the Purity of his Nature; and to have condemned that eternal Law of Right, which is Holy, Juſt, and Good; of which no one Precept or Rule is abrogated or repealed; nor indeed can be, whilſt God is an holy, juſt, and righteous God, and Man a rational Creature. The Duties of that Law ariſing from the Conſtitution of his very Nature, are of eternal Obligation; nor can it be taken away or diſpenſed with, without changing the Nature of Things, overturning the Meaſures of Right and Wrong, and thereby introducing and authorizing Irregularity, Confuſion, and Diſorder in the World; Chriſt's coming into the World was not for ſuch an End as that. But on the Contrary, to reform the corrupt State of degenerate Man; and out of thoſe who would mend their Lives, and bring forth Fruit meet for Repentance, erect a new Kingdom.

This is the Law of that Kingdom, as well as of all Mankind; and that Law by which all Men ſhall be judg'd at the laſt Day. Only thoſe who have believ'd *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, and have taken him to be their King, with a ſincere endeavour after Righteouſneſs, in obeying his Law, ſhall have their paſt Sins not imputed to them; and ſhall have that Faith taken inſtead of Obedience; where Frailty and Weakneſs made them tranſgreſs, and Sin prevailed after Converſion in thoſe who hunger and thirſt after Righteouſneſs (or perfect Obedience) and do not allow themſelves in Acts of Diſobedience and Rebellion, againſt the Laws of that Kingdom they are entered into.

He did not expect, 'tis true, a perfect Obedience void of Slips and Falls: He knew our Make, and the Weakneſs of our Conſtitutions too well, and was ſent with a Supply for that Defect. Beſides, perfect Obedience was the Righteouſneſs of the Law of Works; and then the Reward would be of Debt, and not of Grace; and to ſuch there was no need of Faith to be imputed to them for Righteouſneſs. They

ſtood

ſtood upon their own Legs, were Juſt already, and needed no Allowance to be made them for believing Jeſus to be the *Meſſiah*, taking him for their King, and becoming his Subjects. But that Chriſt does require Obedience, ſincere Obedience, is evident from the Laws he himſelf delivers (unleſs he can be ſuppoſed to give and inculcate Laws only to have them diſobey'd) and from the Sentence he will paſs when he comes to judge.

The Faith required was, to believe *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, the Anointed; who had been promiſed by God to the World. Amongſt the *Jews* (to whom the Promiſes and Propheſies of the *Meſſiah* were more immediately delivered) anointing was uſed to three ſorts of Perſons, at their Inauguration; whereby they were ſet apart to three great Offices, *viz.* Of Prieſts, Prophets, and Kings. Though theſe three Offices be in holy Writ attributed to our Saviour, yet I do not remember that he any where aſſumes to himſelf the Title of a Prieſt, or mentions any thing relating to his Prieſthood: Nor does he ſpeak of his being a Prophet but very ſparingly, and once or twice, as it were, by the by: But the Goſpel, or the good News of the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, is what he preaches every where, and makes it his great Buſineſs to publiſh to the World. This he did, not only as moſt agreeable to the Expectation of the *Jews*, who look'd for their *Meſſiah*, chiefly as coming in Power to be their King and Deliverer; but as it beſt anſwered the chief End of his Coming, which was to be a King, and as ſuch to be received by thoſe who would be his Subjects in the Kingdom which he came to erect. And though he took not directly on himſelf the Title of King till he was in Cuſtody, and in the Hands of *Pilate*; yet 'tis plain *King*, and *King of Iſrael*, were the familiar and received Titles of the *Meſſiah*. See *John* i. 50. *Luke* xix. 38. compared with *Mat.* xxi. 9. and *Mark* xi. 9. *John* xii. 13. *Mat.* xxi. 5. *Luke* xxiii. 2. compared with *Mat.* xxvii. 11. and *John* xviii. 33——37. *Mark* xv. 12. compared with *Mat.* xxvii. 22. *Mat.* xxvii. 42.

What thoſe were to do, who believed him to be the *Meſſiah*, and received him for their King, that they might be admitted to be Partakers with him of this Kingdom in Glory, we ſhall beſt know by the Laws he gives them, and requires them to obey; and by the Sentence which he himſelf will give, when, ſitting on his Throne, they ſhall all appear at his Tribunal, to receive every one his Doom from the Mouth of this righteous Judge of all Men.

What he propoſed to his Followers to be believed, we have already ſeen; by examining his, and his Apoſtles Preaching, ſtep by ſtep, all through the Hiſtory of the four Evangeliſts, and the *Acts of the Apoſtles*. The ſame Method will beſt and plaineſt ſhew us, whether he required of thoſe who believed him to be the *Meſſiah*, any thing beſides that Faith, and what it was. For he being a King, we ſhall ſee by his Commands what he expects from his Subjects: For if he did not expect Obedience to them, his Commands would be but mere Mockery; and if there were no Puniſhment for the Tranſgreſſors of them, his Laws would not be the Laws of a King, that had Authority to Command, and Power to Chaſtiſe the Diſobedient; but empty Talk without Force, and without Influence.

We ſhall therefore from his Injunctions (if any ſuch there be) ſee what he has made neceſſary to be performed, by all thoſe who ſhall be received into eternal Life in his Kingdom prepared in the Heavens. And in this we cannot be deceived. What we have from his own Mouth, eſpecially if repeated over and over again, in different Places and Expreſſions, will be paſt Doubt and Controverſy. I ſhall paſs by all that is ſaid by St. *John Baptiſt*, or any other, before our Saviour's entry upon his Miniſtry and publick Promulgation of the Laws of his Kingdom.

He began his Preaching with a command to Repent, as St. *Mat.* tells us, iv. 17. *From that time Jeſus began to Preach; ſaying, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* And *Luke* v. 32. he tells the Scribes and Phariſees, *I come not to call the Righteous*; thoſe who were truly ſo, needed no Help, they had a Right to the Tree of Life, *but Sinners to Repentance.*

In his Sermon, as 'tis called, in the Mount, *Luke* vi. and *Mat.* v, *&c.* he commands they ſhould be Exemplary in good Works. *Let your Light ſo ſhine amongſt Men, that they may ſee your good Works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven, Mat.* v. 15. And that they might know what he came for, and what he expected of them, he tells them, *v.* 17——20. *Think not that I am come to diſſolve* or looſen *the Law, or the Prophets: I am not come to diſſolve*, or looſen, but to *make it full*, or compleat; by giving it you in its true and ſtrict Senſe. Here we ſee he confirms, and

at once reinforces all the Moral Precepts in the Old Teſtament. *For verily I ſay to you, Till Heaven and Earth paſs, one Jot or one Tittle, ſhall in no wiſe paſs from the Law, till all be done. Whoſoever therefore ſhall break one of theſe leaſt Commandments, and ſhall teach Men ſo, he ſhall be called the leaſt, (i. e.* as it is interpreted) ſhall not be at all, *in the Kingdom of Heaven. V.* 21. *I ſay unto you, That except your Righteouſneſs, i. e.* your Performance of the eternal Law of Right, *ſhall exceed the Righteouſneſs of the Scribes and Phariſees, ye ſhall in no caſe enter into the Kingdom of Heaven:* And then he goes on to make good what he ſaid, *v.* 17. *viz. That he was come to compleat the Law, viz.* By giving its full and clear Senſe, free from the corrupt and looſening Gloſſes of the Scribes and Phariſees, *v.* 22—26. He tells them, That not only Murder, but cauſeleſs Anger, and ſo much as Words of Contempt, were forbidden. He Commands them to be reconciled and kind towards their Adverſaries; and that upon pain of Condemnation. In the following part of his Sermon, which is to be read *Luke* vi. and more at large, *Matt.* v. vi, vii. He not only forbids actual Uncleanneſs, but all irregular Deſires, upon pain of Hell-fire; cauſeleſs Divorces; ſwearing in Converſation, as well as forſwearing in Judgment, Revenge, Retaliation, Oſtentation of Charity, of Devotion, and of Faſting, Repetitions in Prayer, Covetouſneſs, worldly Care, Cenſoriouſneſs: And on the other ſide, commands loving our Enemies, doing good to thoſe that Hate us, bleſſing thoſe that Curſe us, praying for thoſe that deſpightfully uſe us; Patience and Meekneſs under Injuries, Forgiveneſs, Liberality, Compaſſion: And cloſes all his particular Injunctions, with this general Golden Rule, *Mat.* vii. 12. *All Things whatſoever ye would have that Men ſhould do to you, do ye even ſo to them: For this is the Law and the Prophets.* And to ſhew how much he is in earneſt, and expects Obedience to the Laws; he tells them *Luke* vi. 35. That if they obey, *Great ſhall be their REWARD*; they *ſhall be called, The Sons of the Higheſt.* And to all this, in the Concluſion, he adds the Solemn Sanction; *Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the Things that I ſay?* 'Tis in vain for you to take me for the *Meſſiah* your King, unleſs you obey me. *Not every one who calls me Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven,* or be the Sons of God; *But he that does the Will of my Father which is in Heaven.* To ſuch diſobedient Subjects, though they have propheſied and done Miracles in my Name, I ſhall ſay at the Day of Judgment; *Depart from me ye Workers of Iniquity, I know you not.*

When *Mat.* xii. he was told, That his Mother and Brethren ſought to ſpeak with him, *v.* 49. *Stretching out his Hands to his Diſciples, he ſaid, Behold my Mother and my Brethren; For whoſoever ſhall do the Will of my Father, who is in Heaven, he is my Brother, and Siſter, and Mother.* They could not be Children of the Adoption, and fellow Heirs with him of eternal Life, who did not do the Will of his heavenly Father.

Mat. xv. and *Mark.* vi. The Phariſees finding fault, that his Diſciples eat with unclean Hands, he makes this Declaration to his Apoſtles: *Do ye not perceive, that whatſoever from without entreth into a Man, cannot defile him, becauſe it enters not into his Heart, but his Belly. That which cometh out of the Man, that defileth the Man: For from within, out of the Heart of Men, proceed evil Thoughts, Adulteries, Fornications, Murders, Theſts, falſe Witneſſes, Covetouſneſs, Wickedneſs, Deceit, Laſciviouſneſs, an evil Eye, Blaſphemy, Pride, Fooliſhneſs. All theſe ill Things come from within, and defile a Man.*

He commands Self-denial, and the expoſing our ſelves to Suffering and Danger, rather than to deny or diſown him: And this upon pain of loſing our Souls; which are of more worth than all the World. This we may read, *Mat.* xvi. 24—27. and the parallel Places, *Mat.* viii. and *Luke* ix.

The Apoſtles diſputing amongſt them, who ſhould be greateſt in the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah*, *Mat.* xviii. 1. He thus determines the Controverſy: *Mark* ix. 35. *If any one will be firſt, let him be laſt of all, and Servant of all*; and ſetting a Child before them adds, *Mat.* xviii. 3. *Verily I ſay unto you, Unleſs ye turn, and become as Children, ye ſhall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Mat. xviii. 15. *If thy Brother ſhall treſpaſs againſt thee, go tell him his Fault betweeen thee and him alone: If he ſhall hear thee, thou haſt gained thy Brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the Mouth of two or three Witneſſes every Word may be eſtabliſhed. And if he ſhall neglect to hear them, tell it to the Church: But if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen and Publican. V.* 28. Peter *ſaid, Lord, how often ſhall my Brother ſin againſt me, and I*

forgive

forgive him? Till ſeven times? Jeſus ſaid unto him, I ſay not unto thee, till ſeven times; but until ſeventy times ſeven. And then ends the Parable of the Servant, who being himſelf forgiven, was rigorous to his Fellow-Servant, with theſe Words; *v.* 34. *And his Lord was wrath, and delivered him to the Tormentors, till he ſhould pay all that was due unto him. So likewiſe ſhall my heavenly Father do alſo unto you, if you from your Hearts forgive not every one his Brother their Treſpaſſes.*

Luke x. 25. To the Lawyer, asking him, *What ſhall I do to inherit Eternal Life? He ſaid, What is written in the Law? How readeſt thou?* He anſwered, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart, and with all thy Soul, and with all thy Strength, and with all thy Mind; And thy Neighbour as thy ſelf.* Jeſus ſaid, *This do, and thou ſhalt live.* And when the Lawyer, upon our Saviour's Parable of the good *Samaritan*, was forced to confeſs, that he that ſhewed Mercy, was his Neighbour; Jeſus diſmiſſed him with this Charge, *v.* 37. *Go, and do thou likewiſe.*

Luke xi. 41. *Give Alms of ſuch Things as ye have: Behold, all Things are clean unto you.*

Luke xii. 15. *Take Heed, and beware of Covetouſneſs.* V. 22. *Be not ſolicitous what ye ſhall eat, or what ye ſhall drink, nor what ye ſhall put on;* Be not fearful, or apprehenſive of Want, *For it is your Father's Pleaſure to give you a Kingdom. Sell that you have, and give Alms: And provide your ſelves Bags that wax not old, and Treaſure in the Heavens that faileth not: For where your Treaſure is, there will your Heart be alſo. Let your Loyns be girded, and your Lights burning; And ye your ſelves like unto Men that wait for the Lord, when he will return. Bleſſed are thoſe Servants, whom the Lord when he cometh, ſhall find watching. Bleſſed is that Servant, whom the Lord having made Ruler of his Houſhould, to give them their Portion of Meat in due Seaſon, the Lord, when he cometh, ſhall find ſo doing. Of a Truth I ſay unto you, that he will make him a Ruler over all that he hath. But if that Servant ſay in his Heart, my Lord delayeth his coming; And ſhall begin to beat the Men-ſervants, and Maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken: The Lord of that Servant will come in a Day, when he looketh not for him, and at an Hour when he is not aware, and will cut him in ſunder, and will appoint him his Portion with Unbelievers. And that Servant who knew his Lord's Will, and prepared not himſelf, neither did according to his Will, ſhall be beaten with many Stripes. For he that knew not, and did commit Things worthy of Stripes, ſhall be beaten with few Stripes. For unto whomſoever much is given, of him ſhall be much required: And to whom Men have committed much, of him they will ask the more.*

Luke xiv. 11. *Whoſoever exalteth himſelf, ſhall be abaſed: And he that humbleth himſelf, ſhall be exalted.*

V. 12. *When thou makeſt a Dinner or Supper, call not thy Friends, or thy Brethren, neither thy Kinſmen, nor thy Neighbours; leſt they alſo bid thee again, and a Recompence be made thee. But when thou makeſt a Feaſt, call the Poor and Maimed, the Lame, and the Blind; and thou ſhalt be bleſſed: For they cannot recompence thee: For thou ſhalt be recompenced at the Reſurrection of the Juſt.*

V. 33. *So likewiſe, whoſoever he be of you, that is not ready to forego all that he hath, he cannot be my Diſciple.*

Luke xvi. 9. *I ſay unto you, make to your ſelves Friends of the Mammon of Unrighteouſneſs; That when ye fail, they may receive you into everlaſting Habitation. If ye have not been faitful in the unrighteous Mammon, who will commit to your Truſt the true Riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another Man's, who ſhall give you that which is your own?*

Luke xvii. 3. *If thy Brother treſpaſs againſt thee, rebuke him; And if he repent, forgive him. And if he treſpaſs againſt thee ſeven times in a Day, and ſeven times in a Day turn again to thee, ſaying, I repent; Thou ſhalt forgive him.*

Luke xviii. 1. *He ſpoke a Parable to them, to this End, that Men ought always to pray, and not to faint.*

V. 18. *One comes to him, and asks him, ſaying, Maſter, what ſhall I do to inherit eternal Life? Jeſus ſaid to him, If thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments. He ſays, Which? Jeſus ſaid, Thou knoweſt the Commandments: Thou ſhalt not kill; Thou ſhalt not commit Adultery; Thou ſhalt not Steal; Thou ſhalt not bear falſe Witneſs; Defraud not; Honour thy Father, and thy Mother; And thou ſhalt love thy Neighbour as thy ſelf. He ſaid, All theſe have I obſerved from my Youth. Jeſus hearing this, loved him; and ſaid unto him, Yet lackeſt thou one Thing: Sell all that thou haſt, and give it to the Poor, and thou ſhalt have Treaſure in Heaven; And come follow me.* To under-

you publickly, and from Houſe to Houſe; teſtifying both to the Jews and to the Greeks: And then gives an Account what his Preaching had been, *viz.* *REPENTANCE towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus the Meſſiah.* This was the Sum and Subſtance of the Goſpel which St. *Paul* preached; and was all that he knew neceſſary to Salvation, *viz. Repentance, and believing Jeſus to be the Meſſiah:* And ſo takes his laſt Farewel of them, whom he ſhould never ſee again, *v.* 32. in theſe Words, *And now Brethren, I commend you to God, and to the Word of his Grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an Inheritance among all them that are ſanctified.* There is an Inheritance conveyed by the Word and Covenant of Grace; but it is only to thoſe who are *ſanctified.*

Acts xxiv. 24. *When Felix ſent for Paul,* that he and his Wife *Druſille* might hear him, *concerning the Faith in Chriſt; Paul* reaſoned of *Righteouſneſs,* or Juſtice, and *Temperance*; the Duties we owe to others, and to our ſelves; and of the Judgment to come; till he made *Felix* to tremble. Whereby it appears, that *Temperance and Juſtice* were fundamental Parts of the Religion that *Paul* profeſſed, and were contained in the Faith which he preached. And if we find the Duties of the Moral Law not preſſed by him every where; we muſt remember, that moſt of his Sermons left upon Record, were preached in their Synagogues to the Jews, who acknowledged their Obedience due to all the Precepts of the Law: And would have taken it amiſs to have been ſuſpected, not to have been more zealous for the Law than he. And therefore it was with Reaſon that his Diſcourſes were directed chiefly to what they yet wanted, and were averſe to; the Knowledge and Embracing of Jeſus their promiſed *Meſſiah.* But what his Preaching generally was, if we will believe him himſelf, we may ſee *Acts* xxvi. where giving an Account to King *Agrippa* of his Life and Doctrine, he tells him, *v.* 20. *I ſhewed unto them of Damaſcus, and at Jeruſalem, and throughout all the Coaſts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they ſhould repent and turn to God, and do Works meet for Repentance.*

Thus we ſee, by the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, that he required of thoſe who believed him to be the *Meſſiah,* and received him for their Lord and Deliverer, that they ſhould live by his Laws: And that (though in Conſideration of their becoming his Subjects, by Faith in him, whereby they believed and took him to be the *Meſſiah,* their former Sins ſhould be forgiven) yet he would own none to be his, nor receive them as true Denizons of the new *Jeruſalem,* into the Inheritance of eternal Life; but leave them to the Condemnation of the Unrighteous; who renounced not their former Miſcarriages, and lived in a ſincere Obedience to his Commands. What he expects from his Followers, he has ſufficiently declared as a Legiſlator. And that they may not be deceived, by miſtaking the Doctrine of Faith, Grace, Free-Grace, and the Pardon and Forgiveneſs of Sins and Salvation by him, (which was the great End of his Coming) he more than once declares to them; for what Omiſſions and Miſcarriages he ſhall judge and condemn to Death, even thoſe who have owned him, and done Miracles in his Name; when he comes at laſt to render to every one according to what he hath DONE in the Fleſh; ſitting upon his great and glorious Tribunal, at the End of the World.

The firſt Place where we find our Saviour to have mentioned the Day of Judgment, is *John* v. 28, 29. in theſe Words; *The Hour is coming, in which all that are in their Graves ſhall hear his* [*i. e.* the Son of God's] *Voice, and ſhall come forth; they that have* *DONE GOOD* *unto the Reſurrection of Life; and they that have* *DONE EVIL, unto the Reſurrection of Damnation.* That which puts the Diſtinction, if we will believe our Saviour, is the having *done Good or Evil.* And he gives a Reaſon of the Neceſſity of his judging or condemning thoſe *who have done Evil,* in the following Words, *v.* 30. *I can of my own ſelf do nothing. As I hear I judge; And my Judgment is juſt: Becauſe I ſeek not my own Will, but the Will of my Father who hath ſent me.* He could not judge of himſelf; he had but a delegated Power of judging from the Father, whoſe Will he obeyed in it, and who was of purer Eyes than to admit any unjuſt Perſon into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Matt. vii. 22, 23. ſpeaking again of that Day, he tells what his Sentence will be, *Depart from me ye* *WORKERS* *of Iniquity.* Faith in the Penitent and ſincerely Obedient, ſupplies the Defect of their Performances; and ſo by Grace they are made juſt. But we may obſerve; none are ſentenced or puniſhed for Unbelief; but only for their Miſdeeds. *They are Workers of Iniquity* on whom the Sentence is pronounced.

Matt.

Matt. xiii. 14. *At the end of the World, the Son of Man ſhall ſend forth his Angels; And they ſhall gather out of his Kingdom all Scandals, and them which* DO INIQUITY; *And caſt them into a Furnace of Fire; There ſhall be wailing and gnaſhing of Teeth.* And again, *v.* 49. *The Angels ſhall ſever the* WICKED *from among the* JUST; *and ſhall caſt them into the Furnace of Fire.*

Matt. xvi. 24. *For the Son of Man ſhall come in the Glory of his Father, with his Angels: And then he ſhall Reward every Man according to his* WORKS.

Luke xiii. 26. *Then ſhall ye begin to ſay: We have eaten and drunk in thy Preſence, and thou haſt taught in our Streets. But he ſhall ſay, I tell you, I know you not; Depart from me, ye* WORKERS *of Iniquity.*

Matt. xxv. 24——26. *When the Son of Man ſhall come in his Glory; and before him ſhall be gathered all Nations; He ſhall ſet the Sheep on his right Hand, and the Goats on his left: Then ſhall the King ſay to them on his right Hand, Come ye bleſſed of my Father, inherit the Kingdom prepared for you, from the Foundation of the World; for, I was an hungred, and ye gave me Meat; I was thirſty, and ye gave me Drink; I was a Stranger, and ye took me in; Naked, and ye cloathed me; I was Sick, and ye viſited me; I was in Priſon, and ye came unto me. Then ſhall the Righteous anſwer him, ſaying, Lord, when ſaw we thee an hungred, and fed thee?* &c. *And the King ſhall anſwer, and ſay unto them, Verily, I ſay unto you, In as much as ye have done it unto one of the leaſt of theſe my Brethren, ye have done it unto me. Then ſhall he ſay unto them on the left Hand, Depart from me, ye Curſed, into everlaſting Fire, prepared for the Devil and his Angels. For I was an hungred and ye gave me no Meat; I was thirſty, and ye gave me no Drink; I was a Stranger, and ye took me not in; Naked, and ye cloathed me not; Sick and in Priſon, and ye viſited me not. In ſo much that ye did it not to one of theſe, ye did it not to me. And theſe ſhall go into everlaſting Puniſhment: But the Righteous into Life eternal.*

Theſe, I think, are all the Places where our Saviour mentions the laſt Judgment; or deſcribes his way of Proceeding in that great Day; Wherein, as we have obſerved, it is remarkable, that every where the Sentence follows, doing or not doing; without any mention of believing, or not believing. Not that any to whom the Goſpel hath been preached, ſhall be ſaved, without believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*: For all being Sinners, and Tranſgreſſors of the Law, and ſo unjuſt; are all liable to Condemnation; unleſs they believe, and ſo through Grace are juſtified by God for this Faith, which ſhall be accounted to them for Righteouſneſs. But the reſt wanting this Cover, this Allowance for their Tranſgreſſions, muſt anſwer for all their Actions: And being found Tranſgreſſors of the Law, ſhall by the Letter, and Sanction of that Law, be condemned, for not having paid a full Obedience to that Law: And not for want of Faith. That is not the Guilt, on which the Puniſhment is laid; though it be the want of Faith, which lays open their Guilt uncovered; and expoſes them to the Sentence of the Law, againſt all that are Unrighteous.

The common Objection here, is; if all Sinners ſhall be condemned, but ſuch as have a gracious Allowance made them; and ſo are juſtified by God, for believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, and ſo taking him for their King, whom they are reſolved to obey, to the utmoſt of their Power; what ſhall become of all Mankind, who lived before our Saviour's time; who never heard of his Name; and conſequently could not believe in him? To this, the Anſwer is ſo obvious and natural, that one would wonder how any reaſonable Man ſhould think it worth the urging. No Body was, or can be, required to believe, what was never propoſed to him, to believe. Before the fulneſs of Time which God from the Council of his own Wiſdom had appointed to ſend his Son in, he had at ſeveral Times, and in different Manners, promiſed to the People of *Iſrael*, an extraordinary Perſon to come; who raiſed from amongſt themſelves, ſhould be their Ruler and Deliverer. The Time, and other Circumſtances of his Birth, Life, and Perſon, he had in ſundry Propheſies ſo particularly deſcribed, and ſo plainly foretold, that he was well known, and expected by the *Jews*, under the Name of the *Meſſiah*, or anointed, given him in ſome of theſe Propheſies. All then that was required before his appearing in the World, was to believe what God had revealed; and to rely with a full Aſſurance on God for the Performance of his Promiſe; and believe, that in due time he would ſend them the *Meſſiah*, this anointed King, this promiſed Saviour and Deliverer, according to his Word. This Faith in the Promiſes of God; this relying and acquieſcing in his Word and Faithfulneſs, the Almighty takes well at our Hands, as a great Mark of Homage paid by us

poor

poor frail Creatures, to his *Goodneſs* and *Truth*, as well as to his *Power* and *Wiſdom*; and accepts it as an Acknowledgment of his peculiar Providence, and Benignity to us. And therefore our Saviour tells us, *John* xii. 44. *He that believes on me, believes not on me; But on him that ſent me.* The Works of Nature ſhew his Wiſdom and Power: But 'tis his peculiar Care of Mankind, moſt eminently diſcovered in his Promiſes to them, that ſhews his Bounty and Goodneſs; and conſequently engages their Hearts in Love and Affection to him. This Oblation of an Heart, fixed with Dependance on, and Affection to him, is the moſt acceptable Tribute we can pay him; the Foundation of true Devotion; and Life of all Religion. What a Value he puts on this Depending on his Word, and reſting ſatisfied in his Promiſes, we have an Example in *Abraham*; whoſe Faith *was counted to him for Righteouſneſs*; as we have before remarked out of *Rom.* iv. And his relying firmly on the Promiſe of God, without any doubt of its Performance, gave him the Name of the Father of the Faithful; and gained him ſo much Favour with the Almighty, that he was called the *Friend of God*: The higheſt and moſt glorious Title can be beſtowed on a Creature. The Thing promiſed was no more, but a Son by his Wife *Sarah*; and a numerous Poſterity by him, which ſhould poſſeſs the Land of *Canaan*. Theſe were but temporal Bleſſings; and (except the Birth of a Son) very remote; Such as he ſhould never live to ſee, nor in his own Perſon have the Benefit of. But becauſe he queſtioned not the Performance of it; but reſted fully ſatisfied in the Goodneſs, Truth, and Faithfulneſs of God who had promiſed; it was counted to him for Righteouſneſs. Let us ſee how St. *Paul* expreſſes it; *Rom.* iv. 18--22. *Who, againſt Hope, believed in Hope, that he might become the Father of many Nations; According to that which was ſpoken, ſo ſhall thy Seed be. And being not weak in his Faith, he conſidered not his own Body now dead, when he was above an hundred Years old; neither yet the deadneſs of* Sarah's *Womb. He ſtaggered not at the Promiſe of God through Unbelief, but was ſtrong in Faith, giving Glory to God; And being fully perſuaded, that what he had promiſed, he was able to perform. And* THEREFORE, *it was imputed to him for Righteouſneſs.* St. *Paul* having here emphatically deſcribed the ſtrength and firmneſs of *Abraham*'s Faith, informs us, that he thereby *gave glory to God*; and therefore it was *accounted to him for Righteouſneſs.* This is the way that God deals with poor frail Mortals. He is graciouſly pleaſed to take it well of them; and give it the Place of Righteouſneſs, and a kind of Merit in his ſight: If they believe his Promiſes, and have a ſteadfaſt Relying on his Veracity and Goodneſs. St. *Paul*, *Heb.* xi. 6. tells us; *Without Faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*: But at the ſame time tells us what Faith that is. *For*, ſays he, *He that cometh to God, muſt believe that he is; And that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently ſeek him.* He muſt be perſuaded of God's Mercy and good Will to thoſe who ſeek to obey him; and reſt aſſured of his rewarding thoſe who rely on him, for whatever, either by the Light of Nature, or particular Promiſes, he has revealed to them of his tender Mercies; and taught them to expect from his Bounty. This Deſcription of *Faith* (that we might not miſtake what he means by that *Faith*, without which we cannot pleaſe God, and which recommended the Saints of Old) St. *Paul* places in the middle of the Liſt of thoſe, who were Eminent for their *Faith*; And whom he ſets as Patterns to the converted *Hebrews*, under Perſecution, to encourage them to perſiſt in their Confidence of Deliverance by the Coming of *Jeſus Chriſt*; And in their Belief of the Promiſes they now had under the Goſpel. By thoſe Examples he exhorts them not to *draw back*, from the Hope, that was ſet before them; nor apoſtatize from the Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion. This is plain from *v.* 35-38. of the precedent Chapter: *Caſt not away therefore your Confidence, which hath great recompence of Reward. For ye have great need of Perſiſting or Perſeverance*; (for ſo the *Greek* Words ſignifies here, which our Tranſlation renders *Patience*. *Vid. Luke* viii. 15.) *That after ye have done the Will of God, ye might receive the Promiſe. For yet a little while, and he that ſhall come will come, and will not tarry. Now the Juſt ſhall live by Faith. But if any Man draw back, my Soul ſhall have no Pleaſure in him.*

The Examples of *Faith*, which St. *Paul* enumerates and propoſes in the following Words, *Chap.* xi. plainly ſhew, that the *Faith* whereby thoſe Believers of old pleaſed God, was nothing but a ſteadfaſt Reliance on the Goodneſs and Faithfulneſs of God, for thoſe good Things, which either the light of Nature, or particular Promiſes, had given them Grounds to hope for. Of what avail this *Faith* was with God, we may ſee, *v.* 4. *By Faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent Sacrifice than Cain; by which he obtained witneſs that he was Righteous. V.* 5. *By Faith Enoch was tranſlated, that he*

he ſhould not ſee Death: For before his Tranſlation he had this Teſtimony, that he pleaſed God. V. 7. Noah, being warned of God of Things not ſeen as yet; being wary, *by Faith prepared an Ark, to the ſaving of his Houſe; By the which he condemned the World, and became Heir of the Righteouſneſs which is by Faith.* And what it was that God ſo graciouſly accepted and rewarded, we are told, *v.* 11. *Through Faith alſo Sarah herſelf received Strength to conceive Seed, and was delivered of a Child, when ſhe was paſt Age.* How ſhe came to obtain this Grace from God, the Apoſtle tells us; *Becauſe ſhe judged him faithful who had promiſed.* Thoſe therefore who pleaſed God, and were accepted by him before the Coming of *Chriſt*, did it only by believing the Promiſes, and relying on the Goodneſs of God, as far as he had revealed it to them. For the Apoſtle, in the following Word, tells us, *v.* 13. *Theſe all died in Faith, not having received* (the Accompliſhment of) *the Promiſes; but having ſeen them afar off: And were perſuaded of them, and embraced them.* This was all that was required of them; to be perſuaded of, and embrace the Promiſes which they had. They could be *perſuaded of* no more than was propoſed to them; *Embrace* no more than was revealed, according to the Promiſes they had received, and the Diſpenſations they were under. And if the Faith of Things *ſeen afar off*; if their truſting in God for the Promiſes he then gave them; if a Belief of the *Meſſiah* to come, were ſufficient to render thoſe who lived in the Ages before *Chriſt*, acceptable to God, and righteous before him: I deſire thoſe, who tell us, that God will not, (nay, ſome go ſo far as to ſay) cannot accept any, who do not believe every Article of their particular Creeds and Syſtems, to conſider, why God, out of his infinite Mercy, cannot as well juſtify Man now, for believing *Jeſus of Nazareth* to be the promiſed *Meſſiah*, the King and Deliverer; as thoſe heretofore, who believed only that God would, according to his Promiſe, in due time ſend the *Meſſiah*, to be a King and Deliverer.

There is another Difficulty often to be met with, which ſeems to have ſomething of more Weight in it: And that is, that though the *Faith* of thoſe before *Chriſt*; (believing that God would ſend the *Meſſiah*, to be a Prince, and a Saviour to his People, as he had promiſed;) and the *Faith* of thoſe ſince his time, (believing *Jeſus* to be that *Meſſiah*, promiſed and ſent by God) ſhall be accounted to them for Righteouſneſs, Yet what ſhall become of all the reſt of Mankind, who having never heard of the Promiſe or News of a Saviour; not a Word of a *Meſſiah* to be ſent, or that was come, have had no Thought or Belief concerning him?

To this I anſwer; That God will require of every Men, *According to what a Man hath, and not according to what he hath not.* He will not expect the Improvement of Ten Talents, where he gave but One; nor require any one ſhould believe a Promiſe, of which he has never heard. The Apoſtle's Reaſoning, *Rom.* x. 14. is very juſt: *How ſhall they believe in him, of whom they have not heard?* But though there be many, who being Strangers to the Common-Wealth of *Iſrael*, were alſo Strangers to the Oracles of God committed to that People; many, to whom the Promiſe of the *Meſſiah* never came, and ſo were never in a Capacity to believe or reject that Revelation: Yet God had, by the Light of Reaſon, revealed to all Mankind, who would make uſe of that Light, that he was good and merciful. The ſame Spark of the Divine Nature and Knowledge in Man, which making him a Man, ſhewed him the Law he was under as a Man; ſhewed him alſo the Way of attoning the merciful, kind, compaſſionate Author and Father of him and his Being, when he had tranſgreſſed that Law. He that made uſe of this Candle of the Lord, ſo far as to find what was his Duty, could not miſs to find alſo the Way to Reconciliation and Forgiveneſs, when he had failed of his Duty: Though if he uſed not his Reaſon this Way; if he put out, or neglected this Light, he might, perhaps, ſee neither.

The Law is the eternal, immutable Standard of Right. And a Part of that Law is, that a Man ſhould forgive, not only his Children but his Enemies, upon their Repentance, asking Pardon, and Amendment. And therefore he could not doubt that the Author of this Law, and God of Patience and Conſolation, who is rich in Mercy, would forgive his frail Off-ſpring; if they acknowledged their Faults, diſapproved the Iniquity of their Tranſgreſſions, beg'd his Pardon, and reſolved in earneſt for the future to conform their Actions to this Rule, which they owned to be juſt and right. This Way of Reconciliation, this Hope of Attonement, the Light of Nature revealed to them: And the Revelation of the Goſpel having ſaid nothing to the contrary, leaves them to ſtand and fall to their own Father and Maſter, whoſe Goodneſs and Mercy is over all his Works.

I know ſome are forward to urge that Place of the *Acts*, *Chap.* iv. as contrary to this. The Words, *v.* 10. and 12. ſtand thus: *Be it known unto you all, and to all the People of Iſrael, that by the Name of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raiſed from the Dead, even by him doth this Man,* [*i. e.* The lame Man reſtored by *Peter*] *ſtand here before you whole. This is the Stone which is ſet at nought by you Builders, which is become the Head of the Corner. Neither is there Salvation in any other; For there is none other Name under Heaven given among Men, in which we muſt be ſaved.* Which, in ſhort, is, that *Jeſus* is the only true *Meſſiah*; neither is there any other Perſon, but he, given to be a Mediator between God and Man, in whoſe Name we may ask, and hope for Salvation.

It will here poſſibly be asked, *Quorſum perditio hæc?* What need was there of a Saviour? What Advantage have we by *Jeſus Chriſt?*

It is enough to juſtify the Fitneſs of any thing to be done, by reſolving it into the *Wiſdom of God*, who has done it; though our ſhort Views, and narrow Underſtandings, may utterly incapacitate us to ſee that Wiſdom, and to judge rightly of it. We know little of this viſible, and nothing at all of the State of that intellectual World, wherein are infinite Numbers and Degrees of Spirits out of the Reach of our Ken or Gueſs: And therefore know not what Tranſactions there were between God and our Saviour, in reference to his Kingdom. We know not what Need there was to ſet up a Head and a Chieftain, in Oppoſition to *the Prince of this World, the Prince of the Power of the Air*, &c. Whereof there are more than obſcure Intimations in Scripture. And we ſhall take too much upon us, if we ſhall call God's Wiſdom or Providence to Account, and pertly condemn for needleſs, all that our weak, and perhaps biaſſed *Underſtandings*, cannot account for.

Though this general Anſwer be Reply enough to the forementioned Demand, and ſuch as a rational Man, or fair Searcher after Truth, will acquieſce in; yet in this particular Caſe, the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God has ſhewn himſelf ſo viſiby to common Apprehenſions, that it hath furniſhed us abundantly wherewithal to ſatisfy the Curious and Inquiſitive, who will not take a Bleſſing, unleſs they be inſtructed what Need they had of it, and why it was beſtowed upon them. The great and many Advantages we receive by the coming of *Jeſus* the *Meſſiah*, will ſhew, that it was not without Need, that he was ſent into the World.

The Evidence of our Saviour's Miſſion from Heaven is ſo great, in the Multitude of Miracles he did before all ſorts of People, that what he delivered cannot but be received as the Oracles of God, and unqueſtionable Verity. For the Miracles he did were ſo ordered by the Divine Providence and Wiſdom, that they never were, nor could be denied by any of the Enemies or Oppoſers of Chriſtianity.

Though the Works of Nature, in every Part of them, ſufficiently evidence a Deity; yet the World made ſo little Uſe of their Reaſon, that they ſaw him not, where even by the Impreſſions of himſelf he was eaſy to be found. Senſe and Luſt blinded their Minds in ſome, and a careleſs Inadvertency in others, and fearful Apprehenſions in moſt (who either believed there were, or could not but ſuſpect there might be, ſuperior unknown Beings) gave them up into the Hands of their Prieſts, to fill their Heads with falſe Notions of the Deity, and their Worſhip with fooliſh Rites, as they pleaſed: And what Dread or Craft once began, Devotion ſoon made ſacred, and Religion immutable. In this State of Darkneſs and Ignorance of the true God, Vice and Superſtition held the World. Nor could any Help be had, or hoped for from *Reaſon*; which could not be heard, and was judged to have nothing to do in the Caſe: The Prieſts, every where, to ſecure their Empire, having excluded *Reaſon* from having any thing to do in Religion. And in the Crowd of wrong Notions, and invented Rites, the World had almoſt loſt the Sight of the one only true God. The rational and thinking Part of Mankind, 'tis true, when they ſought after him, found the one Supreme, inviſible God: But if they acknowledged and worſhipped him, it was only in their own Minds. They kept this Truth locked up in their own Breaſts as a Secret, nor ever durſt venture it amongſt the People, much leſs amongſt the Prieſts, thoſe wary Guardians of their own Creeds and profitable Inventions. Hence we ſee that *Reaſon*, ſpeaking never ſo clearly to the Wiſe and Virtuous, had never Authority enough to prevail on the Multitude, and to perſuade the Societies of Men, that there was but one God, that alone was to be owned and worſhipped. The Belief and Worſhip of one God, was the National Religion of the *Iſraelites* alone: And if we will conſider it, it was introduced and ſupported amongſt the People by *Revelation*. They were

were in *Goſhen*, and had Light, whilſt the reſt of the World were in almoſt *Egyptian* Darkneſs, *without God in the World*. There was no part of Mankind, who had quicker Parts, or improved them more; that had a greater light of Reaſon, or followed it farther in all ſorts of Speculations than the *Athenians*: And yet we find but one *Socrates* amongſt them, that oppoſed and laughed at their Polytheiſm, and wrong Opinions of the Deity; and we ſee how they rewarded him for it. Whatſoever *Plato*, and the ſobereſt of the Philoſophers thought of the Nature and Being of the One God, they were fain, in their outward Profeſſions and Worſhip, to go with the Herd, and keep to the Religion eſtabliſhed by Law: Which what it was, and how it had diſpoſed the Minds of theſe knowing, and quick-ſighted *Grecians*, St. *Paul* tells us, *Acts* xvii. 22---29. *Ye Men of Athens*, ſays he, *I perceive that in all Things ye are too ſuperſtitious. For as I paſſed by, and beheld your Devotions, I found an Altar with this Inſcription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD. Whom therefore ye ignorantly worſhip, him declare I unto you. God that made the World, and all Things therein, ſeeing that he is Lord of Heaven and Earth, dwelleth not in Temples made with Hands: Neither is worſhipped with Mens Hands, as though he needed any thing, ſeeing he giveth unto all Life, and Breath, and all Things; and hath made of one Blood all the Nations of Men, for to dwell on the face of the Earth; and hath determined the Times before appointed, and the Bounds of their Habitations; That they ſhould ſeek the Lord, if haply they might feel him out, and find him, though he be not far from every one of us.* Here he tells the *Athenians*, that they, and the reſt of the World (given up to Superſtition) whatever Light there was in the Works of Creation and Providence, to lead them to the true God, yet they few of them found him. He was every where near them; yet they were but like People groping and feeling for ſomething in the dark, and did not ſee him with a full clear Day-light; *But thought the Godhead like to Gold and Silver, and Stone, graven by Art and Man's Device.*

In this State of Darkneſs and Error, in reference to the *True God*, our Saviour found the World. But the clear Revelation he brought with him, diſſipated this Darkneſs; made the *One Inviſible True God* known to the World: And that with ſuch Evidence and Energy, that *Polytheiſm* and *Idolatry* hath no where been able to withſtand it: But where-ever the Preaching of the Truth he delivered, and the Light of the Goſpel hath come, thoſe Miſts have been diſpelled. And in effect we ſee that ſince our Saviour's Time, the *Belief of one God* has prevailed and ſpread it ſelf over the Face of the Earth. For even to the Light that the *Meſſiah* brought into the World with him, we muſt aſcribe the owning, and Profeſſion of *one God*, which the *Mahometan* Religion had derived and borrowed from it. So that in this Senſe it is certainly and manifeſtly true of our Saviour, what St. *John* ſays of him; 1 *John* iii. 8. *For this Purpoſe the Son of God was manifeſted, that he might deſtroy the Works of the Devil.* This Light the World needed, and this Light it received from him: That there is but *One God*, and the *Eternal, Inviſible*; not like to any viſible Objects, nor to be repreſented by them.

If it be aſked, whether the Revelation to the *Patriarchs* by *Moſes*, did not teach this, and why that was not enough? The Anſwer is obvious; that however clearly the Knowledge of one inviſible God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, was revealed to them; yet that Revelation was ſhut up in a little Corner of the World; amongſt a People by that very Law, which they received with it, excluded from a Commerce and Communication with the reſt of Mankind. The Gentile World in our Saviour's Time, and ſeveral Ages before, could have no Atteſtation of the Miracles, on which the *Hebrews* built their Faith, but from the *Jews* themſelves; a People not known to the greateſt Part of Mankind; contemned and thought vilely of by thoſe Nations that did know them; and therefore very unfit and unable to propagate the Doctrine of *one God* in the World, and diffuſe it through the Nations of the Earth, by the Strength and Force of that ancient Revelation, upon which they had received it. But our Saviour, when he came, threw down this Wall of Partition; and did not confine his Miracles or Meſſage to the Land of *Canaan*, or the Worſhippers at *Jeruſalem*. But he himſelf preached at *Samaria*, and did Miracles in the Borders of *Tyre* and *Sydon*, and before Multitudes of People gathered from all Quarters. And after his Reſurrection, ſent his Apoſtles amongſt the Nations, accompanied with Miracles; which were done in all Parts ſo frequently, and before ſo many Witneſſes of all ſorts, in broad Day-light, that, as I have before obſerved, the Enemies of Chriſtianity have never dared to deny them; no, not *Julian* himſelf: Who neither wanted Skill nor Power

Power to enquire into the Truth; nor would have failed to have proclaimed and expoſed it, if he could have detected any Falſhood in the Hiſtory of the Goſpel; or found the leaſt Ground to queſtion the Matter of Fact publiſhed of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles. The Number and Evidence of the Miracles done by our Saviour and his Followers, by the Power and Force of Truth, bore down this mighty and accompliſhed Emperor, and all his Parts, in his own Dominions. He durſt not deny ſo plain Matter of Fact; which being granted, the Truth of our Saviour's Doctrine and Miſſion unavoidably follows; notwithſtanding whatſoever artful Suggeſtions his Wit could invent, or Malice ſhould offer, to the contrary.

2. Next to the Knowledge of one God; Maker of all Things; a clear *Knowledge of their Duty* was wanting to Mankind. This Part of Knowledge, though cultivated with ſome Care, by ſome of the Heathen Philoſophers; yet got little footing among the People. All Men indeed, under Pain of diſpleaſing the Gods, were to frequent the Temples: Every one went to their Sacrifices and Services: But the Prieſts made it not their Buſineſs to teach them *Virtue*. If they were diligent in their Obſervations and Ceremonies; punctual in their Feaſts and Solemnities, and the Tricks of Religion; the holy Tribe aſſured them, the Gods were pleaſed; and they looked no farther. Few went to the Schools of the Philoſophers, to be inſtructed in their Duties; and to know what was Good and Evil in their Action. The Prieſts ſold the better Pennyworths, and therefore had all the Cuſtom. Luſtrations and Proceſſions were much eaſier than a clean Conſcience, and a ſteady Courſe of Virtue; and an expiatory Sacrifice, that attoned for the want of it, was much more convenient, than a ſtrict and holy Life. No wonder then, that Religion was every where diſtinguiſhed from, and preferred to *Virtue*; and that it was dangerous Hereſy and Profaneneſs to think the contrary. So much *Vertue* as was neceſſary to hold Societies together; and to contribute to the quiet of Governments, the Civil Laws of Common-wealths taught, and forced upon Men that lived under Magiſtrates. But theſe Laws, being for the moſt part made by ſuch, who had no other Aims by their own Power, reached no farther than thoſe things, that would ſerve to tie Men together in Subjection; or at moſt, were directly to conduce to the Proſperity and temporal Happineſs of any People. But *Natural Religion* in its full Extent, was no where, that I know, taken Care of by the Force of Natural Reaſon. It ſhould ſeem by the little that has hitherto been done in it, that 'tis too hard a Task for unaſſiſted Reaſon, to eſtabliſh Morality in all its Parts upon its true Foundation, with a clear and convincing Light. And 'tis at leaſt a ſurer and ſhorter Way, to the Apprehenſions of the Vulgar, and Maſs of Mankind, that one manifeſtly ſent from God, and coming with viſible Authority from him, ſhould, as a King and Law-maker, tell them their Duties; and require their Obedience; than leave it to the long, and ſometimes intricate Deductions of Reaſon, to be made out to them. Such Trains of Reaſonings the greateſt Part of Mankind have neither Leiſure to weigh; nor, for want of Education and Uſe, Skill to judge of. We ſee how unſucceſsful in this, the Attempts of Philoſophers were before our Saviour's Time. How ſhort their ſeveral Syſtems came of the Perfection of a true and compleat *Morality* is very viſible. And if, ſince that, the Chriſtian Philoſophers have much outdone them; yet we may obſerve, that the firſt Knowledge of the Truths they have added, are owing to Revelation: Though as ſoon as they are heard and conſidered, they are found to be agreeable to Reaſon; and ſuch as can by no Mean be contradicted. Every one may obſerve a great many Truths, which he receives at firſt from others, and readily aſſents to, as conſonant to Reaſon, which he would have found it hard, and perhaps beyond his Strength to have diſcovered himſelf. Native and original Truth, is not ſo eaſily wrought out of the Mine, as we, who have it delivered, ready dug and faſhioned into our Hands, are apt to imagine. And how often at fifty or threeſcore Years old are thinking Men told, what they wonder how they could miſs thinking of? Which yet their own Contemplations did not, and poſſibly never would have helped them to. Experience ſhews that the Knowledge of Morality, by mere natural Light, (how agreeable ſoever it be to it) makes but a ſlow Progreſs, and little Advance in the World. And the Reaſon of it is not hard to be found in Men's Neceſſities, Paſſions, Vices, and miſtaken Intereſts, which turn their Thoughts another Way: And the deſigning Leaders, as well as following Herd, find it not to their Purpoſe to employ much of their Meditations this Way. Or whatever elſe was the Cauſe, 'tis plain in Fact, that Human Reaſon unaſſiſted, failed Men in its great and proper Buſineſs of *Morality*. It never from unqueſtionable

queſtionable Principles, by clear Deductions, made out an entire Body of the *Law of Nature*. And he that ſhall collect all the Moral Rules of the Philoſophers, and compare them with thoſe contained in the New Teſtament, will find them to come ſhort of the *Morality* delivered by our Saviour, and taught by his Apoſtles; a College made up for the moſt part of ignorant, but inſpired Fiſhermen.

Though yet, if any one ſhould think, that out of the Sayings of the wiſe Heathens, before our Saviour's Time, there might be a Collection made of all thoſe Rules of *Morality*, which are to be found in the Chriſtian Religion; yet this would not at all hinder, but that the World nevertheleſs ſtood as much in Need of our Saviour, and the *Morality* delivered by him. Let it be granted (though not true) that all the *Moral Precepts* of the Goſpel were known by ſome Body or other, amongſt Mankind, before. But where, or how, or of what Uſe, is not conſidered. Suppoſe they may be picked up here and there; ſome from *Solon* and *Bias* in *Greece*; others from *Tully* in *Italy*: And to compleat the Work, let *Confutius*, as far as *China*, be conſulted; and *Anacarſis* the *Scythian* contribute his Share. What will all this do, to give the World a *compleat Morality*, that may be to Mankind, the unqueſtionable Rule of Life and Manners? I will not here urge the Impoſſibility of collecting from Men, ſo far diſtant from one another, in Time, and Place, and Languages. I will ſuppoſe there was a *Stobeus* in thoſe Times, who had gathered the *Moral Sayings* from all the Sages of the World. What would this amount to, towards being a ſteady Rule; a certain Tranſcript of a Law that we are under? Did the Saying of *Ariſtippus*, or *Confutius*, give it an Authority? Was *Zeno* a Law-giver to Mankind? If not, what he or any other Philoſopher delivered, was but a Saying of his. Mankind might hearken to it, or reject it, as they pleaſed; or as it ſuited their Intereſt, Paſſions, Principles or Humours. They were under no Obligation: The Opinion of this or that Philoſopher, was of no Authority. And if it were, you muſt take all he ſaid under the ſame Character. All his Dictates muſt go for Law, certain and true; or none of them. And then, If you will take any of the Moral Sayings of *Epicurus* (many whereof *Seneca* quotes with Eſteem and Approbation) for Precepts of the *Law of Nature*; you muſt take all the reſt of his Doctrine for ſuch too; or elſe his Authority ceaſes: And ſo no more is to be received from him, or any of the Sages of old, for Parts of the *Law of Nature*, as carrying with it an Obligation to be obeyed, but what they prove to be ſo. But ſuch a Body of *Ethicks*, proved to be the Law of Nature, from Principles of Reaſon, and reaching all the Duties of Life; I think no Body will ſay the World had before our Saviour's Time. 'Tis not enough, that there were up and down ſcattered Sayings of wiſe Men, conformable to right Reaſon. The Law of Nature, is the Law Convenience too: And 'tis no wonder, that thoſe Men of Parts, and ſtudious of Virtue; (who had occaſion to think on any particular part of it,) ſhould by Meditation light on the right, even from the obſervable Convenience and Beauty of it; without making out its Obligation from the true Principles of the Law of Nature, and Foundations of *Morality*. But theſe incoherent Apophthegms of Philoſophers, and wiſe Men: however excellent in themſelves, and well intended by them, could never make a Morality, whereof the World could be convinced, could never riſe to the force of a Law that Mankind could with certainty depend on. Whatſoever ſhould thus be univerſally uſeful, as a Standard to which Men ſhould conform their Manners, muſt have its Authority either from Reaſon or Revelation. 'Tis not every Writer of Morals, or Compiler of it from others, that can thereby be erected into a Law-giver to Mankind; and a Dictator of Rules, which are therefore valid, becauſe they are to be found in his Books; under the authority of this or that Philoſopher. He that any one will pretend to ſet up in this kind, and have his Rules paſs for authentick Directions, muſt ſhew, that either he builds his Doctrine upon Principles of Reaſon, ſelf-evident in themſelves; and that he deduces all the Parts of it from thence, by clear and evident Demonſtration: Or muſt ſhew his Commiſſion from Heaven, that he comes with Authority from God, to deliver his Will and Commands to the World. In the former way, no body that I know before our Saviour's time, ever did, or went about to give us a *Morality*. 'Tis true there is a *Law of Nature*: but who is there that ever did, or undertook to give it us all entire, as a Law; no more, nor no leſs, than what was contained in, and had the Obligation of that Law? Who ever made out all the Parts of it, put them together, and ſhewed the World their Obligation? Where was there any ſuch Code, that Mankind might have recourſe to, as their unerring Rule, before our Saviour's

Saviour's Time? If there was not, 'tis plain, there was Need of one to give us ſuch a *Morality*; ſuch a Law, which might be the ſure Guide of thoſe who had a Deſire to go right; and if they had a Mind, need not miſtake their Duty, but might be certain when they had performed, when failed in it. Such a *Law of Morality* Jeſus Chriſt hath given us in the New Teſtament; but by the latter of theſe Ways, by Revelation. We have from him a full and ſufficient Rule for our Direction, and conformable to that of Reaſon. But the Truth and Obligation of its Precepts have their Force, and are put paſt Doubt to us, by the Evidence of his Miſſion. He was ſent by God: His Miracles ſhew it; and the Authority of God in his Precepts cannot be queſtioned. Here *Morality* has a ſure Standard, that Revelation vouches, and Reaſon cannot gainſay, nor queſtion; but both together Witneſs to come from God the great Law-maker. And ſuch an one as this out of the New Teſtament, I think the World never had, nor can any one ſay is any where elſe to be found. Let me ask any one, who is forward to think that the Doctrine of *Morality* was full and clear in the World, at our Saviour's Birth; whether would he have directed *Brutus* and *Caſſius*, (both Men of Parts and Virtue, the one whereof believed, and the other diſbelieved a future Being) to be ſatisfied in the Rules and Obligations of all the Parts of their Duties; if they ſhould have asked him where they might find the Law they were to live by, and by which they ſhould be charged or acquitted as guilty or innocent? If to the Sayings of the Wiſe, and the Declarations of Philoſophers, he ſends them into a wild Wood of Uncertainty, to an endleſs Maze, from which they ſhould never get out: If to the Religions of the World, yet worſe: And if to their own Reaſon, he refers them to that which had ſome Light and Certainty; but yet had hitherto failed all Mankind in a perfect Rule; and we ſee, reſolved not the Doubts that had riſen amongſt the ſtudious and thinking Philoſophers; nor had yet been able to convince the civilized Parts of the World, that they had not given, nor could, without a Crime, take away the Lives of their Children, by expoſing them.

If any one ſhall think to excuſe Human Nature, by laying Blame on Men's *Negligence*, that they did not carry Morality to an higher Pitch; and made it out entire in every Part, with that Clearneſs of Demonſtration which ſome think it capable of; he helps not the Matter. Be the Cauſe what it will, our Saviour found Mankind under a Corruption of Manners and Principles, which Ages after Ages had prevailed, and muſt be confeſſed was not in a Way or Tendency to be mended. The Rules of Morality were in different Countries and Sects, different. And natural Reaſon no where had, nor was like to cure the Defects and Errors in them. Thoſe juſt Meaſures of Right and Wrong, which Neceſſity had any where introduced, the Civil Laws preſcribed, or Philoſophy recommended, ſtood not on their true Foundations. They were looked on as Bonds of Society, and Conveniencies of common Life, and laudable Practiſes. But where was it that their Obligation was throughly known and allowed, and they received as Precepts of a Law; of the higheſt Law, the Law of Nature? That could not be, without a clear Knowledge and Acknowledgment of the Law-maker, and the great Rewards and Puniſhments, for thoſe that would or would not obey him. But the Religion of the Heathens, as was before obſerved, little concerned itſelf in their Morals. The Prieſts, that delivered the Oracles of Heaven, and pretended to ſpeak from the Gods, ſpoke little of Virtue and a good Life. And on the other Side, the Philoſophers, who ſpoke from Reaſon, made not much Mention of the Deity in their *Ethicks*. They depended on Reaſon and her Oracles; which contain nothing but Truth: But yet ſome Parts of that Truth lie too deep for our Natural Powers eaſily to reach, and make plain and viſible to Mankind, without ſome Light from above to direct them. When Truths are once known to us, though by Tradition, we are apt to be favourable to our own Parts; and aſcribe to our own Underſtandings the Diſcovery of what, in reality, we borrowed from others: Or, at leaſt, finding we can prove, what at firſt we learnt from others, we are forward to conclude it an obvious Truth, which, if we had ſought, we could not have miſſed. Nothing ſeems hard to our Underſtanding, that is once known: And becauſe what we ſee we ſee with our own Eyes, we are apt to over-look or forget the Help we had from others, who ſhewed it us, and firſt made us ſee it, as if we were not at all beholden to them for thoſe Truths they opened the Way to, and lead us into. For Knowledge being only of Truths that are perceived to be ſo, we are favourable enough to our own Faculties; to conclude, that they of their own Strength would have attain'd

thoſe

thoſe Diſcoveries, without any foreign Aſſiſtance: and that we know thoſe Truths, by the Strength and native Light of our own Minds, as they did from whom we received them by theirs, only they had the Luck to be before us. Thus the whole Stock of Human Knowledge is claimed by every one, as his private Poſſeſſion, as ſoon as he (profiting by others Diſcoveries) has got it into his own Mind: And ſo it is; but not properly by his own ſingle Induſtry, nor of his own Acquiſition. He ſtudies, 'tis true, and takes Pains to make a Progreſs in what others have delivered: But their Pains were of another ſort, who firſt brought thoſe Truths to Light, which he afterwards derives from them. He that travels the Roads now, applauds his own Strength and Legs, that have carried him ſo far in ſuch a ſcantling of Time; and aſcribes all to his own Vigor, little conſidering how much he owes to their Pains, who cleared the Woods, drained the Bogs, built the Bridges, and made the Ways paſſable; without which he might have toiled much with little Progreſs. A great many Things which we have been bred up in the Belief of from our Cradles, (and are Notions grown familiar, and as it were natural to us, under the Goſpel,) we take for unqueſtionable obvious Truths, and eaſily demonſtrable; without conſidering how long we might have been in Doubt or Ignorance of them, had Revelation been ſilent. And many are beholden to Revelation, who do not acknowledge it. 'Tis no diminiſhing to Revelation, that Reaſon gives its Suffrage too to the Truths Revelation has diſcovered. But 'tis our Miſtake to think, that becauſe Reaſon confirms them to us, we had the firſt certain Knowledge of them from thence, and in that clear Evidence we now poſſeſs them. The contrary is manifeſt, in the *defective Morality of the Gentiles*, before our Saviour's Time; and the want of Reformation in the Principles and Meaſures of it, as well as Practice. Philoſophy ſeemed to have ſpent its Strength, and done its utmoſt: Or if it ſhould have gone farther, as we ſee it did not; and from undeniable Principles given us *Ethicks* in a Science like Mathematicks, in every Part demonſtrable, this yet would not have been ſo effectual to Man in this imperfect State, nor proper for the Cure. The greateſt Part of Mankind want Leiſure or Capacity for Demonſtration; nor can carry a Train of Proofs, which in that way they muſt always depend upon for Conviction, and cannot be required to aſſent to till they ſee the Demonſtration. Where-ever they ſtick, the Teachers are always put upon Proof, and muſt clear the Doubt by a Thread of coherent Deductions from the firſt Principle, how long, or how intricate ſoever that be. And you may as ſoon hope to have all the Day-Labourers and Tradeſmen, the Spinſters and Dairy Maids perfect Mathematicians, as to have them perfect in *Ethicks* this way. Hearing plain Commands, is the ſure and only Courſe to bring them to Obedience and Practice. The greateſt Part cannot know, and therefore they muſt believe. And I ask, whether one coming from Heaven in the Power of God, in full and clear Evidence and Demonſtration of Miracles, giving plain and direct Rules of *Morality* and Obedience, be not likelier to enlighten the Bulk of Mankind, and ſet them right in their Duties, and bring them to do them, than by reaſoning with them from general Notions and Principles of Human Reaſon? And were all the Duties of Human Life clearly demonſtrated; yet I conclude, when well conſidered, that Method of teaching Men their Duties, would be thought proper only for a few, who had much Leiſure, improved Underſtandings, and were uſed to abſtract Reaſonings. But the Inſtruction of the People were beſt ſtill to be left to the Precepts and Principles of the Goſpel. The Healing of the Sick, the reſtoring Sight to the Blind by a Word, the Raiſing, and being raiſed from the Dead, are Matters of Fact, which they can without Difficulty conceive, and that he who does ſuch Things, muſt do them by the Aſſiſtance of a Divine Power. Theſe Things lie level to the ordinarieſt Apprehenſion: He that can diſtinguiſh between ſick and well, lame and ſound, dead and alive, is capable of this Doctrine. To one who is once perſuaded that Jeſus Chriſt was ſent by God to be a King, and a Saviour of thoſe who do believe in him, all his Commands become Principles; there needs no other Proof for the Truth of what he ſays, but that he ſaid it. And then there needs no more but to read the inſpired Books, to be inſtructed: All the Duties of Morality lie there clear, and plain, and eaſy to be underſtood. And here I appeal, whether this be not the ſureſt, the ſafeſt, and moſt effectual Way of teaching: Eſpecially if we add this farther Conſideration; that as it ſuits the loweſt Capacities of reaſonable Creatures, ſo it reaches and ſatisfies, nay, enlightens the Higheſt. The moſt elevated Underſtandings cannot but ſubmit to the Authority of this Doctrine as Divine; which coming from the Mouths of a Company of illiterate Men, hath not only the Atteſtation

of

of Miracles, but Reaſon to confirm it: Since they delivered no Precepts but ſuch, as though Reaſon of itſelf had not clearly made out, yet it could not but aſſent to when thus diſcovered, and think itſelf indebted for the Diſcovery. The Credit and Authority our Saviour and his Apoſtles had over the Minds of Men, by the Miracles they did, tempted them not to mix (as we find in that of all the Sects and Philoſophers, and other Religions) any Conceits, any wrong Rules, any thing tending to their own By-Intereſt, or that of a Party, in their Morality. No Tang of Prepoſſeſſion or Fanſy; no Footſteps of Pride or Vanity; no Touch of Oſtentation or Ambition, appears to have a Hand in it. It is all pure, all ſincere; nothing too much, nothing wanting; but ſuch a compleat Rule of Life, as the wiſeſt Men muſt acknowledge, tends entirely to the Good of Mankind, and that all would be happy, if all would practiſe it.

3. The outward Forms of *worſhipping the Deity*, wanted a Reformation. Stately Buildings, coſtly Ornaments, peculiar and uncouth Habits, and a numerous huddle of pompous, fantaſtical, cumberſome Ceremonies, every where attended Divine Worſhip. This, as it had the peculiar Name, ſo it was thought the principal Part, if not the whole of Religion. Nor could this poſſibly be amended whilſt the Jewiſh Ritual ſtood; and there was ſo much of it mixed with the Worſhip of the true God. To this alſo our Saviour, with the Knowledge of the infinite, inviſible, ſupreme Spirit, brought a Remedy, in a plain, ſpiritual, and ſuitable Worſhip. *Jeſus* ſays to the Woman of *Samaria*, *The Hour cometh, when ye ſhall neither in this Mountain, nor yet at Jeruſalem, worſhip the Father. But the true Worſhippers, ſhall worſhip the Father, both in Spirit and in Truth; for the Father ſeeketh ſuch to worſhip.* To be worſhipped in Spirit and in Truth, with Application of Mind, and Sincerity of Heart, was what God henceforth only required. Magnificent Temples, and Confinement to certain Places, were now no longer neceſſary for his Worſhip, which by a pure Heart might be performed any where. The Splendor and Diſtinction of Habits, and Pomp of Ceremonies, and all outſide Performances, might now be ſpared. God who was a Spirit, and made known to be ſo, required none of thoſe, but the Spirit only; and that in publick Aſſemblies, (where ſome Actions muſt lie open to the View of the World) all that could appear and be ſeen, ſhould be done decently, and in order, and to Edification. Decency, Order, and Edification, were to regulate all their publick Acts of Worſhip, and beyond what theſe required, the outward Appearance, (which was of little Value in the Eyes of God) was not to go. Having ſhut out Indecency and Confuſion out of their Aſſemblies, they need not be ſolicitous about uſeleſs Ceremonies. Praiſes and Prayer, humbly offered up to the Deity, was the Worſhip he now demanded; and in theſe every one was to look after his own Heart, and know that it was that alone which God had Regard to, and accepted.

4. Another great Advantage received by our Saviour, is the great Encouragement he brought to a virtuous and pious Life: Great enough to ſurmount the Difficulties and Obſtacles that lie in the way to it, and reward the Pains and Hardſhips of thoſe who ſtuck firm to their Duties, and ſuffered for the Teſtimony of a good Conſcience. The Portion of the Righteous has been in all Ages taken notice of, to be pretty ſcanty in this World. Virtue and Proſperity do not often accompany one another; and therefore Virtue ſeldom had many Followers. And 'tis no wonder ſhe prevailed not much in a State, where the Inconveniencies that attend her were viſible, and at hand, and the Rewards doubtful and at a Diſtance. Mankind, who are and muſt be allowed to purſue their Happineſs, nay, cannot be hindred, could not but think themſelves excuſed from a ſtrict Obſervation of Rules, which appeared ſo little to conſiſt with their chief End, Happineſs, whilſt they kept them from the Enjoyments of this Life; and they had little Evidence and Security of another. 'Tis true, they might have argued the other way, and concluded, That, becauſe the Good were moſt of them ill treated here, there was another Place where they ſhould meet with better Uſage; but 'tis plain they did not. Their Thoughts of another Life were at beſt obſcure, and their Expectations uncertain. Of *Manes*, and Ghoſts, and the Shades of departed Men, there was ſome Talk; but little certain, and leſs minded. They had the Names of *Styx* and *Acheron*, of Eliſian Fields, and Seats of the Bleſſed: But they had them generally from their Poets, mixed with their Fables. And ſo they looked more like the Inventions of Wit, and Ornaments of Poetry, than the ſerious Perſuaſions of the grave and the ſober. They came to them bundled up amongſt their Tales, and for Tales they took them. And that which rendred them more ſuſpected, and leſs uſeful

ful to Virtue, was, that the Philoſophers ſeldom ſet on their Rules on Mens Minds and Practiſes, by Conſideration of another Life. The chief of their Arguments were from the Excellency of Virtue; and the higheſt they generally went, was the exalting of human Nature, whoſe Perfection lay in Virtue. And if the Prieſt at any time talked of the Ghoſts below, and a Life after this, it was only to keep Men to their ſuperſtitious and idolatrous Rites, whereby the uſe of this Doctrine was loſt to the credulous Multitude, and its Belief to the quicker-ſighted, who ſuſpected it preſently of Prieſtcraft. Before our Saviour's time, the Doctrine of a future State, though it were not wholly hid, yet it was not clearly known in the World. 'Twas an imperfect View of Reaſon, or, perhaps, the decay'd Remains of an ancient Tradition, which rather ſeemed to float on Mens Fanſies, than ſink deep into their Hearts. It was ſomething, they knew not what, between being and not being. Something in Man they imagined might ſcape the Grave; but a perfect complete Life of an eternal Duration, after this, was what entred little into their Thought, and leſs into their Perſuaſions. And they were ſo far from being clear herein, that we ſee no Nation of the World publickly profeſſed it, and built upon it: No Religion taught it, and 'twas no where made an Article of Faith, and Principle of Religion till Jeſus Chriſt came; of whom it is truly ſaid, that he, at his appearing, *brought Life and Immortality to Light*. And that not only in the clear Revelation of it, and in Inſtances ſhewn of Men raiſed from the Dead; but he has given us an unqueſtionable Aſſurance and Pledge of it, in his own Reſurrection and Aſcenſion into Heaven. How hath this one Truth changed the Nature of Things in the World, and given the Advantage to Piety over all that could tempt or deter Men from it? The Philoſophers, indeed, ſhewed the Beauty of Virtue; they ſet her off ſo as drew Mens Eyes and Approbation to her: But leaving her unendowed, very few were willing to eſpouſe her. The Generality could not refuſe her their Eſteem and Commendation, but ſtill turned their Backs on her, and forſook her, as a Match not for their Turn. But now there being put into the Scales, on her ſide, *an exceeding and immortal Weight of Glory*; Intereſt is come about to her, and Virtue now is viſible, to moſt enriching Purchaſe, and by much the beſt Bargain. That ſhe is the Perfection and Excellency of our Nature; that ſhe is herſelf a Reward, and will recommend our Names to future Ages, is not all that can now be ſaid for her. 'Tis not ſtrange that the learned Heathens ſatisfied not many with ſuch airy Commendation. It has another Reliſh and Efficacy, to perſuade Men that if they live well here, they ſhall be happy hereafter. Open their Eyes upon the endleſs, unſpeakable Joys of another Life, and their Hearts will find ſomething ſolid and powerful to move them. The view of Heaven and Hell will caſt a Slight upon the ſhort Pleaſures and Pains of this preſent State, and give Attractions and Encouragements to Virtue, which Reaſon and Intereſt, and the Care of our ſelves, cannot but allow and prefer. Upon this Foundation, and upon this only, Morality ſtands firm, and may defy all Competition. This makes it more than a Name, a ſubſtantial Good, worth all our Aims and Endeavours; and thus the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt has delivered it to us.

5. To theſe I muſt add one Advantage more by Jeſus Chriſt, and that is the Promiſe of Aſſiſtance. If we do what we can, he will give us his Spirit to help us to do what, and how we ſhould. 'Twill be idle for us, who know not how our own Spirits move and act us, to ask in what manner the Spirit of God ſhall work upon us. The Wiſdom that accompanies that Spirit, knows better than we, how we are made, and how to work upon us. If a wiſe Man knows how to prevail on his Child, to bring him to what he deſires, can we ſuſpect, that the Spirit and Wiſdom of God ſhould fail in it, though we perceive or comprehend not the Ways of his Operation? Chriſt has promiſed it, who is faithful and juſt, and we cannot doubt of the Performance. 'Tis not requiſite on this Occaſion, for the inhancing of this Benefit, to enlarge on the Frailty of our Minds, and Weakneſs of our Conſtitutions; how liable to Miſtakes, how apt to go Aſtray, and how eaſily to be turned out of the Paths of Virtue. If anyone needs go beyond himſelf, and the Teſtimony of his own Conſcience in this Point; if he feels not his own Errors and Paſſions always tempting, and often prevailing, againſt the ſtrict Rules of his Duty, he need but look abroad into any Age of the World to be convinced. To a Man under the Difficulties of his Nature, beſet with Temptations, and hedged in with prevailing Cuſtom; 'tis no ſmall Encouragement to ſet himſelf ſeriouſly on the Courſes of Virtue, and Pra-

ſtice of true Religion, that he is from a ſure Hand, and an almighty Arm, promiſed Aſſiſtance to ſupport and carry him through.

There remains yet ſomething to be ſaid to thoſe who will be ready to object, If the belief of Jeſus of *Nazareth* to be the *Meſſiah*, together with thoſe concomitant Articles of his Reſurrection, Rule, and coming again to judge the World, be all the Faith required as neceſſary to Juſtification, to what purpoſe were the Epiſtles written; I ſay, if the Belief of thoſe many Doctrines contained them, be not alſo neceſſary to Salvation? And if what is there delivered, a Chriſtian may believe or disbelieve, and yet nevertheleſs be a Member of Chriſt's Church, and one of the Faithful?

To this, I anſwer, That the Epiſtles were written upon ſeveral Occaſions: And he that will read them as he ought, muſt obſerve what 'tis in them is principally aimed at; find what is the Argument in hand, and how managed; if he will underſtand them right, and profit by them. The obſerving of this will beſt help us to the true Meaning and Mind of the Writer: For that is the Truth which is to be received and believed; and not ſcattered Sentences in Scripture-Language, accommodated to our Notions and Prejudices. We muſt look into the Drift of the Diſcourſe, obſerve the coherence and connexion of the Parts, and ſee how it is conſiſtent with it ſelf, and other Parts of Scripture; if we will conceive it right. We muſt not cull out, as beſt ſuits our Syſtem, here and there a Period or a Verſe: as if they were all diſtinct and independent Aphoriſms; and make theſe the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, and neceſſary to Salvation, unleſs God has made them ſo. There be many Truths in the Bible, which a good Chriſtian may be wholly ignorant of, and ſo not believe; which, perhaps, ſome lay great ſtreſs on, and call fundamental Articles, becauſe they are the diſtinguiſhing Points of their Communion. The Epiſtles, moſt of them, carry on a Thread of Argument, which in the Stile they are writ, cannot every where be obſerved without great Attention. And to conſider the Texts, as they ſtand and bear a part in that, is to view them in their due light, and the way to get the true ſence of them. They were writ to thoſe who were in the Faith, and true Chriſtians already: And ſo could not be deſigned to teach them the Fudamental Articles and Points neceſſary to Salvation. The Epiſtle to the *Romans* was writ to all *that were at* Rome, *beloved of God, called to be the Saints, whoſe Faith was ſpoken of through the World*, Chap. i. 7, 8. To whom St. *Paul*'s firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* was, he ſhews, *Chap.* i. 2, 4. *&c. Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus, called to be Saints; with all them that in every place call upon the Name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, both theirs and ours. I thank my God always on your behalf, for the Grace of God which is given you by Jeſus Chriſt; That in every thing ye are enriched by him in all Utterance, and and in all Knowledge: Even as the Teſtimony of Chriſt was confirmed in you. So that ye came behind in no Gift; waiting for the coming of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And ſo likewiſe the ſecond was, *To the Church of God at Corinth, with all the Saints in Achaia*, Chap. i. 1. His next is to the Churches of *Galatia*. That to the *Epheſians* was *To the Saints* that were *at* Epheſus, *and to the Faithful in Chriſt Jeſus.* So likewiſe, *To the Saints and Faithful Brethren in Chriſt at* Coloſſe, *who had Faith in Chriſt Jeſus, and love to the Saints. To the Church of the* Theſſalonians. *To* Timothy *his Son in the Faith. To* Titus *his own Son, after the common Faith. To* Philemon *his dearly beloved, and Fellow-labourer.* And the Author to the *Hebrews* calls thoſe he writes to, *Holy Brethren, partakers of the heavenly Calling*, Chap. iii. 1. From whence it is evident, that all thoſe whom St. *Paul* writ to, were *Brethren, Saints, Faithful* in the *Church*, and ſo *Chriſtians* already; and therefore wanted not the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Religion; without a Belief of which they could not be ſaved: Nor can it be ſuppoſed, that the ſending of ſuch Fundamentals was the reaſon of the Apoſtle's Writing to any of them. To ſuch alſo St. *Peter* writes, as is plain from the firſt Chapter of each of his Epiſtles. Nor is it hard to obſerve the like in St. *James* and St. *John*'s Epiſtles. And St. *Jude* directs his thus: *To them that are ſanctified by God the Father, and preſerved in Jeſus Chriſt, and called.* The Epiſtles therefore being all written to thoſe who were already Believers and Chriſtians, the Occaſion and End of writing them, could not be to inſtruct them in that which was neceſſary to make the Chriſtians. This 'tis plain they knew and delieved already; or elſe they could not have been Chriſtians and Believers. And they were writ upon particular Occaſions; and without thoſe Occaſions, had not been writ; and ſo cannot be thought neceſſary to Salvation: Though they

they reſolving Doubts, and reforming Miſtakes, are of great Advantage to our Knowledge and Practice. I do not deny, but the great Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith are dropt here and there, and ſcattered up and down in moſt of them. But 'tis not in the Epiſtles we are to learn what are the fundamental Articles of Faith, where they are promiſcuouſly, and without Diſtinction mixed with other Truths in Diſcourſes that were (though for Edification indeed, yet) only occaſional. We ſhall find and diſcern thoſe great and neceſſary Points beſt in the Preaching of our Saviour and the Apoſtles, to thoſe who were yet Strangers, and ignorant of the Faith, to bring them in, and convert them to it. And what that was, we have ſeen already out of the Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts, and the *Acts*; where they are plainly laid down, ſo that no body can miſtake them. The Epiſtles to particular Churches, beſides the main Argument of each of them, (which was ſome preſent Concernment of that particular Church to which they ſeverally were addreſs'd) do in many Places explain the Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Religion, and that wiſely; by proper Accommodations to the Apprehenſions of thoſe they were writ to, the better to make them imbibe the Chriſtian Doctrine, and the more eaſily to comprehend the Method, Reaſons, and Grounds of the great Work of Salvation. Thus we ſee in the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, Adoption (a Cuſtom well known amongſt thoſe of *Rome*) is much made uſe of, to explain to them the Grace and Favour of God, in giving them eternal Life; to help them to conceive how they became the Children of God, and to aſſure them of a Share in the Kingdom of Heaven, as Heirs to an Inheritance. Whereas the ſetting out, and confirming the Chriſtian Faith to the *Hebrews*, in the Epiſtle to them, is by Alluſions and Arguments, from the Ceremonies, Sacrifices, and Oeconomy of the *Jews*, and References to the Records of the *Old Teſtament*. And as for the general Epiſtles, they, we may ſee, regard the State and Exigencies, and ſome Peculiarities of thoſe Times. Theſe holy Writers, inſpired from above, writ nothing but Truth; and in moſt Places very weighty Truths to us now; for the expounding, clearing, and confirming of the Chriſtian Doctrine, and eſtabliſhing thoſe in it who had embraced it. But yet every Sentence of theirs muſt not be taken up, and looked on as a fundamental Article neceſſary to Salvation; without an explicit Belief whereof, no body could be a Member of Chriſt's Church here, nor be admitted into his eternal Kingdom hereafter. If all, or moſt of the Truths declared in the Epiſtles, were to be received and believed as fundamental Articles, what then became of thoſe Chriſtians who were fallen aſleep? (as St. *Paul* witneſſes in his firſt to the *Corinthians*, many were) before theſe Things in the Epiſtles were revealed to them? Moſt of the Epiſtles not being written till above twenty Years after our Saviour's Aſcenſion, and ſome after thirty.

But farther, therefore, to thoſe who will be ready to ſay, May thoſe Truths delivered in the Epiſtles, which are not contained in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, and are therefore by this Account not neceſſary to Salvation, be believed or disbelieved without any Danger? May a Chriſtian ſafely queſtion or doubt of them?

To this I anſwer, That the Law of Faith, being a Covenant of free Grace, God alone can appoint what ſhall be neceſſarily believed by every one whom he will juſtify. What is the Faith which he will accept and account for Righteouſneſs, depends wholly on his good Pleaſure. For 'tis of Grace, and not of Right, that this Faith is accepted. And therefore he alone can ſet the Meaſures of it: And what he has ſo appointed and declared, is alone neceſſary. No body can add to theſe fundamental Articles of Faith; nor make any other neceſſary, but what God himſelf hath made and declared to be ſo. And what theſe are which God requires of thoſe who will enter into, and receive the Benefits of the New Covenant, has already been ſhewn. An explicite Belief of theſe is abſolutely required of all thoſe to whom the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt is preached, and Salvation through his Name propoſed.

The other Parts of Divine Revelation are Objects of Faith, and are ſo to be received. They are Truths whereof no one can be rejected; none that is once known to be ſuch, may or ought to be disbelieved. For to acknowledge any Propoſition to be of Divine Revelation and Authority, and yet to deny or disbelieve it, is to offend againſt this fundamental Article and Ground of Faith, that God is true. But yet a great many of the Truths revealed in the Goſpel, every one does, and muſt confeſs, a Man may be ignorant of; nay, disbelieve, without Danger to his Salva-

tion: As is evident in thoſe, who, allowing the Authority, differ in the Interpretation and Meaning of ſeveral Texts of Scripture, not thought Fundamental: In all which 'tis plain the contending Parties, on one Side or t'other, are ignorant of, nay, disbelieve the Truths delivered in Holy Writ; unleſs Contrarieties and Contradictions can be contained in the ſame Words, and Divine Revelation can mean contrary to it ſelf.

Tho' all Divine Revelation requires the Obedience of Faith; yet every Truth of inſpired Scriptures is not one of thoſe, that by the Law of Faith is required to be explicitly believed to Juſtification. What thoſe are, we have ſeen by what our Saviour and his Apoſtles propoſed to, and required in thoſe whom they converted to the Faith. Thoſe are Fundamentals, which 'tis not enough not to disbelieve: Every one is required actually to aſſent to them. But any other Propoſition contained in the Scripture, which God has not thus made a neceſſary Part of the Law of Faith, (without an actual Aſſent to which he will not allow any one to be a Believer) a Man may be ignorant of, without hazarding his Salvation by a Defect in his Faith. He believes all that God has made neceſſary for him to believe, and aſſent to: And as for the reſt of divine Truths, there is nothing more required of him, but that he receive all the Parts of Divine Revelation, with a Docility and Diſpoſition prepared to embrace, and aſſent to all Truths coming from God; and ſubmit his Mind to whatſoever ſhall appear to him to bear that Character. Where he, upon fair Endeavours, underſtands it not; how can he avoid being ignorant? And where he cannot put ſeveral Texts, and make them conſiſt together; what Remedy? He muſt either intrepret one by the other, or ſuſpend his Opinion. He that thinks that more is, or can be required, of poor frail Man in Matters of Faith, will do well to conſider what Abſurdities he will run into. God out of the Infiniteneſs of his Mercy, has dealt with Man as a compaſſionate and tender Father. He gave him Reaſon, and with it a Law: That could not be otherwiſe than what Reaſon ſhould dictate; unleſs we ſhould think, that a reaſonable Creature ſhould have an unreaſonable Law. But conſidering the Frailty of Man, apt to run into Corruption and Miſery, he promiſed a Deliverer, whom in his good Time he ſent; and then declared to all Mankind, that whoever would believe him to be the Saviour promiſed, and take him now raiſed from the Dead, and conſtituted the Lord, and Judge of all Men, to be their King and Ruler, ſhould be ſaved. This is a plain intelligible Propoſition; and the all-merciful God ſeems herein to have conſulted the Poor of this World, and the Bulk of Mankind. Theſe are Articles that the labouring and illiterate Man may comprehend. This is a Religion ſuited to vulgar Capacities; and the State of Mankind in this World, deſtined to Labour and Travel. The Writers and Wranglers in Religion fill it with Niceties, and dreſs it up with Notions, which they make neceſſary and fundamental Parts of it; as if there were no Way into the Church, but through the Academy or Lyceum. The greateſt Part of Mankind have not Leiſure for Learning and Logick, and ſuperfine Diſtinctions of the Schools. Where the Hand is uſed to the Plough and the Spade, the Head is ſeldom elevated to ſublime Notions, or exerciſed in myſterious Reaſoning. 'Tis well if Men of that Rank (to ſay nothing of the other Sex) can comprehend plain Propoſitions, and a ſhort Reaſoning about Things familiar to their Minds, and nearly allied to their daily Experience. Go beyond this, and you amaze the greateſt Part of Mankind: And may as well talk *Arabick* to a poor Day-Labourer, as the Notions and Language that the Books and Diſputes of Religion are filled with; and as ſoon you will be underſtood. The diſſenting Congregations are ſuppoſed by their Teachers to be more accurately inſtructed in Matters of Faith, and better to underſtand the Chriſtian Religion, than the vulgar Conformiſts, who are charged with great Ignorance; how truly I will not here determine. But I ask them to tell me ſeriouſly, Whether Half their People have Leiſure to ſtudy? Nay, Whether one in ten of thoſe who come to their Meetings in the Country, if they had Time to ſtudy them, do or can underſtand, the Controverſies at this Time ſo warmly managed amongſt them, about Juſtification, the Subject of this preſent Treatiſe. I have talked with ſome of their Teachers, who confeſs themſelves not to underſtand the Difference in debate between them. And yet the Points they ſtood on, are reckon'd of ſo great Weight, ſo material, ſo fundamental in Religion, that they divide Commmunion, and ſeparate upon them. Had God intended that none but the learned Scribe, the Diſputer

puter or Wiſe of this World, ſhould be Chriſtians, or be ſaved, thus Religion ſhould have been prepared for them, filled with Speculations and Niceties, obſcure Terms, and abſtract Notions. But Men of that Expectation, Men furniſhed with ſuch Acquiſitions, the Apoſtles tells us, 1 *Cor.* i. are rather ſhut out from the Simplicity of the Goſpel; to make Way for thoſe Poor, Ignorant, Illiterate, who heard and believed Promiſes of a Deliverer, and believed Jeſus to be him; who could conceive a Man dead and made alive again, and believe that he ſhould, at the End of the World, come again and paſs Sentence on all Men, according to their Deeds. That the Poor had the Goſpel preached to them; Chriſt makes a Mark, as well as Buſineſs of his Miſſion, *Mat.* xi. 5. And if the Poor had the Goſpel preached to them, it was, without Doubt, ſuch a Goſpel as the Poor could underſtand, plain and intellible: And ſo it was, as we have ſeen, in the Preachings of Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

A VIN-

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

REASONABLENESS

OF

CHRISTIANITY, &c.

From Mr. *Edwards*'s

REFLECTIONS.

A VINDICATION OF THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY, &c.

From Mr. Locke's

REFLECTIONS.

A VINDICATION OF THE REASONABLENESS OF CHRISTIANITY, &c.

MY Book had not been long out, before it fell under the Correction of the Author of a Treatiſe, Entituled, *Some Thoughts concerning the ſeveral Cauſes and Occaſions of Atheiſm, eſpecially in the preſent Age.* No contemptible Adverſary I'll aſſure you; ſince, as it ſeems, he has got the Faculty to heighten every thing that diſpleaſes him into the capital Crime of Atheiſm; and breaths againſt thoſe who come in his Way a Peſtilential Air, whereby every the leaſt Diſtemper is turned into the Plague, and becomes mortal. For whoever does not juſt ſay after Mr. *Edwards*, cannot, 'tis evident, eſcape being an Atheiſt, or a Promoter of Atheiſm. I cannot but approve of any ones Zeal to guard and ſecure that great and fundamental Article of all Religion and Morality, That there is a God: But Atheiſm being a Crime, which for its Madneſs as well as Guilt, ought to ſhut a Man out of all ſober and civil Society, ſhould be very warily charged on any one by Deductions and Conſequences which he himſelf does not own, or at leaſt do not manifeſtly and unavoidably flow from what he aſſerts. This Caution, Charity, I think, obliges us to: And our Author would poſſibly think himſelf hardly dealt with, if, for neglecting ſome of thoſe Rules he himſelf gives, *p.* 31, and 34. againſt Atheiſm, he ſhould be pronounced a Promoter of it: As rational a Charge, I imagine, as ſome of thoſe he makes; and as fitly put together, as *the Treatiſe of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. brought in among the Cauſes of Atheiſm. However, I ſhall not much complain of him, ſince he joyns me, *p.* 104. with no worſe Company that two eminently Pious and Learned * Prelates of our Church, whom he makes Favourers of the ſame *Conceit*, as he calls it. But what has that *Conceit* to do with Atheiſm? Very much. That *Conceit* is of Kin to *Socinianiſm*, and *Socinianiſm* to *Atheiſm*. Let us hear Mr. *Edwards* himſelf. He ſays, *p.* 113. I am *all over Socinianized*: And therefore my Book, fit to be placed among the Cauſes of Atheiſm. For in the 64. and following Pages, he endeavours to ſhew, That *a Socinian is an Atheiſt, or leaſt that ſhould ſeem harſh, one that favours the Cauſe of Atheiſm*, *p.* 75. For ſo he has been pleaſed to mollify, now it is publiſhed as a Treatiſe, what was much more harſh, and much more confident in it, when it was preached as a Sermon. In this Abatement he ſeems a little to comply with his own Advice againſt his fourth Cauſe of Atheiſm; which we have in theſe Words, *pag.* 34. *Wherefore that we may effectually prevent this Folly in our ſelves, let us baniſh Preſumption, Confidence, and Self-conceit; let us extirpate all Pride and Arrogance: Let us not liſt our ſelves in the Number of Capricious Opiniators.*

* Bp. *Taylor*, and the Author of *The Naked Truth.*

I ſhall leave the *Socinians* themſelves to anſwer his Charge againſt them, and ſhall examine his Proof of my being a *Socinian*. It ſtands thus, *pag.* 112. *When he* [the Author of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *&c.*] *proceeds to mention the Advantages and Benefits of Chriſt's coming into the World, and appearing in the Fleſh, he hath not one Syllable of his Satisfying for us, or by his Death purchaſing Life or Salvation, or any thing that ſounds like it. This and ſeveral other Things ſhew that he is all over Socinianized.* Which in effect is, that becauſe I have not ſet down all that this Author perhaps would have done, therefore I am a *Socinian*. But what if I ſhould ſay, I ſet down as much as my Argument required, and yet am no *Socinian?* Would he from my Silence and Omiſſion give me the Lye, and ſay, I am one? Surmizes that may be overturned by a ſingle Denial, are poor Arguments, and ſuch as ſome Men would be aſhamed of: At leaſt, if they are to be permitted to Men of this Gentlemen's Skill and Zeal, who knows how to make a good Uſe of Conjectures, Suſpicions, and uncharitable Cenſures in the Cauſe of God; yet even there too (if the Cauſe of God can need ſuch Arts) they require a good Memory to keep them from recoiling upon the Author. He might have taken notice of theſe Words in my Book, (*p.* 497. of this Vol.) "From this Eſtate of Death JESUS CHRIST RESTORES all Mankind to "Life". And a little lower, "The Life which Jeſus Chriſt reſtores to all Men. "And *p.* 519. He that hath incurred Death for his own Tranſgreſſion, cannot LAY "DOWN HIS LIFE FOR ANOTHER, as our Saviour promiſes he did". This methinks SOUNDS SOMETHING LIKE *Chriſt's purchaſing Life for us by his Death.* But this Reverend Gentleman has an Anſwer ready, it was not in the Place he would have had it in, it was not where I *mention* the Advantages and Benefits of Chriſt's Coming. And therefore, I not having one Syllable of Chriſt's purchaſing Life and Salvation for us by his Death, or any thing that ſounds like it: This, and ſeveral other Things that might be offered, ſhew that I am *all over Socinianized.* A very clear and ingenuous Proof, and let him enjoy it.

But what will become of me, that I have not mentioned *Satisfaction!*

Poſſibly this Reverend Gentleman would have had Charity enough for a known Writer of the Brotherhood, to have found it by an *Inuendo* in thoſe Words above quoted, of laying down his Life for another. But every thing is to be ſtrained here the other Way. For the Author of *The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, &c.* is of Neceſſity to be repreſented as a *Socinian*; or elſe his Book may be read, and the Truths in it, which Mr. *Edwards* likes not, be received, and People put upon examining. Thus one, as full of happy Conjectures and Suſpicions as this Gentlemen, might be apt to argue. But what if the Author deſigned his Treatiſe, as the Title ſhews, chiefly for thoſe who were not yet throughly or firmly Chriſtians, propoſing to work on thoſe who either wholly disbelieved, or doubted of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion? Would any one blame his Prudence, if he mentioned only thoſe Advantages which all Chriſtians are agreed in? Might he not remember and obſerve that Command of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* xiv. 1. *Him that is weak in the Faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful Diſputations*, without being a *Socinian?* Did he amiſs, that he offered to the Belief of thoſe who ſtood off, that, and only that, which our Saviour and his Apoſtles preached for the reducing the unconverted World: And would any one think he in earneſt went about to perſuade Men to be Chriſtians, who ſhould uſe that as an Argument to recommend the Goſpel, which he has obſerv'd Men to lay hold on as an Objection againſt it? To urge ſuch Points of Controverſy as neceſſary Articles of Faith, when we ſee our Saviour and the Apoſtles in their Preaching urged them not as neceſſary to be believed, to make Men Chriſtians, is (by our own Authority) to add Prejudices to Prejudices, and to block up our own Way to thoſe Men whom we would have Acceſs to, and prevail upon. But ſome Men had rather you ſhould write Booty, and croſs your own Deſign of removing Mens Prejudices to Chriſtianity, than leave out one Tittle of what they put into their Syſtems. To ſuch, I ſay, convince but Men of the Miſſion of Jeſus Chriſt, make them but ſee the Truth, Simplicity and Reaſonableneſs of what he himſelf taught, and required to be believed by his Followers: and you need not doubt, but, being once fully perſuaded of his Doctrine, and the Advantages which all Chriſtians agree are received by him, ſuch Converts will not lay by the Scriptures, but by a conſtant Reading and Study of them, get all the Light they can from this Divine Revelation, and nouriſh themſelves up in the Words of Faith, and of good Doctrine, as St. *Paul* ſpeaks to *Timothy*. But ſome Men will not bear it, that any one ſhould ſpeak of Religion, but according to the Model that they

they themſelves have made of it. Nay, though he propoſes it upon the very Terms, and in the very Words which our Saviour and his Apoſtles preached it in, yet he ſhall not eſcape Cenſures, and the ſeveral Inſinuations. To deviate in the leaſt, or to omit any thing contained in their Articles, is Hereſy under the moſt invidious Names in Faſhion, and 'tis well if he eſcapes being a downright Atheiſt. Whether this be the Way for Teachers to make themſelves hearkened to, as Men in Earneſt in Religion, and really concerned for the Salvation of Mens Souls, I leave them to conſider. What Succeſs it has had towards perſuading Men of the Truth of Chriſtianity, their own Complaints of the Prevalency of Atheiſm on the one hand, and the Number of Deiſts on the other, ſufficiently ſhew.

Another Thing laid to my Charge, *p.*105, and 107. is my *Forgetting, or rather wilful Omitting ſome plain and obvious Paſſages*, and ſome *famous Teſtimonies in the Evangeliſts*; namely, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. *Go teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* And *John* i. 1. *In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* And Verſe 14. *And the Word was made Fleſh.* Mine it ſeems in this Book, are all Sins of Omiſſion. And yet when it came out, the Buz, and Flutter, and Noiſe which was made, and the Reports which were raiſed, would have perſuaded the World that it ſubverted all Morality, and was deſigned againſt the Chriſtian Religion. I muſt confeſs Diſcourſes of this kind, which I met with ſpread up and down, at firſt amazed me; knowing the Sincerity of thoſe Thoughts which perſuaded me to publiſh it, (not without ſome Hope of doing ſome Servic to decaying Piety, and miſtaken and ſlandered Chriſtianity.) I ſatisfied my ſelf againſt thoſe Heats with this Aſſurance, that if there was any thing in my Book, againſt what any one called Religion, it was not againſt the Religion contained in the Goſpel. And for that I appeal to all Mankind.

But to return to Mr. *Edwards* in particular, I muſt take Leave to tell him, that if omitting *plain and obvious Paſſages, and famous Teſtimonies in the Evangeliſts*, be a Fault in me, I wonder why he, among ſo many of this Kind that I am guilty of, mentions ſo few. For I muſt acknowledge I have omitted more, nay, many more, that are *plain and obvious Paſſages, and famous Teſtimonies in the Evangeliſts*, than thoſe he takes Notice of. But if I have left out none of thoſe *Pages or Teſtimonies* which contain what our Saviour and his Apoſtles preached, and required aſſent to, to make Men Believers, I ſhall think my Omiſſions (let them be what they will) no Faults in the preſent Caſe. Whatever Doctrines Mr. *Edwards* would have to be believed, if they are ſuch as our Saviour and his Apoſtles required to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, he will be ſure to find them in thoſe Preachings and *famous Teſtimonies* of our Saviour and his Apoſtles that I have quoted. And if they are not there, he may reſt ſatisfied, that they were not propoſed by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, as neceſſary to be believed, to make Men Chriſt's Diſciples.

If the Omiſſion of other Texts in the Evangeliſts (which are all true alſo, and no one of them to be disbelieved) be a Fault, it might have been expected that Mr. *Edwards* ſhould have accuſed me for leaving out *Mat.* i. 18, to 23. and *Mat.* xvii. 24, 35, 50, 60. for theſe are *plain and obvious Paſſages, and famous Teſtimonies in the Evangeliſts*; and ſuch whereon theſe Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, *viz. born of the Virgin* Mary, *ſuffered under* Pontius Pilate, *was crucified, dead, and buried*, are founded. Theſe being Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, are look'd upon as *fundamental Doctrines*: And one would wonder why Mr. *Edwards* ſo quietly paſſes by their Omiſſion; did it not appear that he was ſo intent on fixing his Imputation of *Socinianiſm* upon me, that rather than miſs that, he was content to drop the other Articles of his Creed. For I muſt obſerve to him, that if he had blamed me for the Omiſſion of the Places laſt quoted out of St. *Matthew* (as he had as much Reaſon as for any other) it would plainly have appeared how idle and ill-grounded his charging *Socinianiſm* on me was. But at any Rate he was to give the Book an ill Name; not becauſe it was *Socinian*; for he has no more Reaſon to charge it with *Socinianiſm* for the Omiſſions he mentions, than the Apoſtles Creed. 'Tis therefore well for the Compilers of that Creed, that they lived not in Mr. *Edwards*'s Days: For he would, no doubt, have found them *all over Socinianized*, for omitting the Texts he quotes, and the Doctrines he collects out of *John* i. and *John* xiv. *p.* 107, 108. *Socinianiſm* then is not the Fault of the Book, whatever elſe it be. For I repeat it again, there is not one Word of *Socinianiſm* in it. I that am not ſo good at Conjectures as Mr. *Edwards*, ſhall leave it

it to him to ſay, or to thoſe who can bear the Plainneſs and Simplicity of the Goſpel, to gueſs what its Fault is.

Some Men are ſhrewd Gueſſers, and others would be thought to be ſo: But he muſt be carried far by his forward Inclination, who does not take notice, that the World is apt to think him a Diviner, for any thing rather than for the ſake of Truth, who ſets up his own Suſpicions againſt the direct Evidence of Things; and pretends to know other Mens Thoughts and Reaſons better than they themſelves. I had ſaid, that the Epiſtles being writ to thoſe who were already Believers, could not be ſuppoſed to be writ to them to teach them Fundamentals, without which they could not be Believers.

And the Reaſon I gave why I had not gone through the Writings in the Epiſtles, to collect the Fundamental Articles of Faith, as I had through the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, was, becauſe thoſe fundamental Articles were in thoſe Epiſtles promiſcuouſly, and without Diſtinction, mixed with other Truths. And therefore we ſhall find and diſcern thoſe great and neceſſary Points beſt in the Preachings of our Saviour and the Apoſtles, to thoſe who were yet ignorant of the Faith, and unconverted. This, as far as I know my own Thoughts, was the Reaſon why I did (as Mr. *Edwards* complains, *p.* 109.) *not proceed to the Epiſtles, and not give an Account of them, as I had done of the Goſpels and Acts.* This I imagined I had in the cloſe of my Book ſo fully and clearly expreſſed, particularly *p.* 502. of this Vol. that I ſuppoſed no body, how willing ſoever, could have miſtaken me. But this Gentleman is ſo much better acquainted with me than I am with my ſelf; ſees ſo deeply into my Heart, and knows ſo perfectly every thing that paſſes there; that he with Aſſurance tells the World, *p.* 109. *That I purpoſely omitted the Epiſtolary Writings of the Apoſtles, becauſe they are fraught with other fundamental Doctrines beſides that one which I mention.* And then he goes on to enumerate thoſe fundamental Articles, *p.* 110, 111. *viz. The Corruption and Degeneracy of Human Nature, with the true Original of it (the Defection of our firſt Parents) the Propagation of Sin and Mortality, our Reſtoration and Reconciliation by Chriſt's Blood, the Eminency and Excellency of his Prieſthood, the Efficacy of his Death, the full Satisfaction made thereby to Divine Juſtice, and his being made an All-ſufficient Sacrifice for Sin. Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, our Juſtification by it, Election, Adoption, Sanctification, ſaving Faith, the Nature of the Goſpel, the new Covenant, the Riches of God's Mercy in the way of Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt, the Certainty of the Reſurrection of Human Bodies, and of the future Glory.*

Give me leave now to ask you ſeriouſly whether theſe, which you have here ſet down under the Title of *fundamental Doctrines*, are ſuch (when reduced to Propoſitions) that every one of them is required to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, and ſuch, as without the actual Belief therof, he cannot be ſaved. If they are not ſo every one of them, you may call them *fundamental Doctrines* as much as you pleaſe, they are not of thoſe Doctrines of Faith I was ſpeaking of, which are only ſuch as are required to be actually believed to make a Man a Chriſtian. If you ſay, ſome of them are ſuch neceſſary Points of Faith, and others not, you by this ſpecious Liſt of well-ſounding, but unexplained Terms arbitrarily collected, only make good what I have ſaid, *viz.* that the neceſſary Articles of Faith are in the Epiſtles promiſcouſly delivered with other Truths, and therefore they cannot be diſtinguiſhed but by ſome other Mark than being barely found in the Epiſtles. If you ſay, that they are all of them neceſſary Articles of Faith, I ſhall then deſire you to reduce them to ſo many plain Doctrines, and then prove them to be every one of them required to be believed by every Chriſtian Man to make him a Member of the Chriſtian Church. For to begin with the firſt, 'tis not enough to tell us, as you do, that *the Corruption and Degeneracy of Human Nature, with the true Original of it, (the Defection of our firſt Parents) the Propagation of Sin and Mortality is one of the great Heads of Chriſtian Divinity.* But you are to tell us what are the Propoſitions we are required to believe concerning this Matter: For nothing can be an Article of Faith, but ſome Propoſition; and then it will remain to be proved, that theſe Articles are neceſſary to be believed to Salvation. The Apoſtles Creed was taken, in the firſt Ages of the Church, to contain all Things neceſſary to Salvation; I mean, neceſſary to be believed: But you have now better thought on it, and are pleaſed to enlarge it, and we, no doubt, are bound to ſubmit to your Orthodoxy.

The Liſt of Materials for his Creed (for the Articles are not yet formed) Mr. *Edwards* cloſes, *p.* 111. with theſe Words, *Theſe are the Matters of Faith contained in the*

the Epiſtles, and they are Eſſential and Integral Parts of the Goſpel it ſelf. What, juſt theſe? Neither more nor leſs? If you are ſure of it, pray let us have them ſpeedily, for the Reconciling of Differences in the Chriſtian Church, which has been ſo cruelly torn about the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, to the great Reproach of Chriſtian Charity, and Scandal of our true Religion.

Mr. *Edwards* having thus, with two learned Terms of *Eſſential* and *Integral* Parts, ſufficiently proved the Matter in Queſtion, *viz.* That all thoſe, he has ſet down, are Articles of Faith neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, he grows warm at my Omiſſion of them. This I cannot complain of as unnatural: The Spirit of Creed-making always ariſing from an Heat of Zeal for our own Opinions, and warm Endeavours, by all ways poſſible to decry and bear down thoſe who differ in a Title from us. What then could I expect more gentle and candid, than what Mr. *Edwards* has ſubjoined in theſe Words? *And therefore it is no wonder, that our Author, being ſenſible of this (viz.* That the Points he has named were *Eſſential and Integral Parts of the Goſpel) would not vouchſafe to give us an Abſtract of thoſe inſpired Writings [the Epiſtles] but paſſes them by with ſome Contempt.* Sir, when your angry Fit is over, and the Abatement of your Paſſion has given way to the Return of your Sincerity, I ſhall beg you to read this Paſſage in 539 *pag.* of this Vol. "Theſe Holy Writers (*viz.* the Pen-"men of the Scriptures) INSPIRED from above, writ nothing but Truth, and in "moſt Places very weighty Truths to us now, for the Expounding, Clearing, and Con-"firming of the Chriſtian Doctrine; and eſtabliſhing thoſe in it who had embraced it." And again, *pag.* 539. "The other Parts of DIVINE REVELATION are Objects "of Faith, and are ſo to be received. They are Truths, of which none that is once "known to be ſuch, *i. e.* revealed, may or ought to be disbelieved." And if this does not ſatisfy you that I have as high a Veneration for the Epiſtles, as you or any one can have, I require you to publiſh to the World thoſe Paſſages which ſhew my *Contempt* of them. In the mean time I ſhall deſire my Reader to examine what I have writ concerning the Epiſtles, which is all contained between *p.* 537. and 540. of this Vol. and then to judge, whether I have made bold with the Epiſtles in what I have ſaid of them, or this Gentleman made bold with Truth in what he has writ of me. Human Frailty will not, I ſee, eaſily quit his Hold; what it loſes in one Part, it will be ready to regain in another; and not be hindred from taking Reprizals, even on the moſt privileged Sort of Men. Mr. *Edwards* who is entrenched in Orthodoxy, and ſo is as ſafe in Matters of Faith almoſt as Infallibility it ſelf, is yet as apt to err as others in Matter of Fact.

But he has not yet done with me about the Epiſtles: All his fine Draught of my ſlighting that Part of the Scripture will be loſt, unleſs the laſt Strokes compleat it into *Socinianiſm.* In his following Words you have the Concluſion of the whole Matter. His Words are theſe. *And more eſpecially, if I may conjecture,* (by all means, Sir; Conjecturing is your proper Talent; you have hitherto done nothing elſe; and I will ſay that for you, you have a lucky Hand at it.) *He doth this, (i. e. paſs by the Epiſtles with Contempt) becauſe he knew that there are ſo many and frequent, and thoſe ſo illuſtrious and eminent Atteſtations to the Doctrine of the ever to be adored Trinity, in theſe Epiſtles.* Truly, Sir, if you will permit me to know what I know, as well as you do allow your ſelf to conjecture what you pleaſe, you are out for this once. The Reaſon why I went not through the Epiſtles, as I did the Goſpels and the *Acts*, was that very Reaſon I printed, and that will be found ſo ſufficient a one to all conſiderate Readers, that I believe they will think you need not ſtrain your Conjectures for another. And if you think it be ſo eaſy to diſtinguiſh Fundamentals from not Fundamentals in the Epiſtles, I deſire you to try your Skill again, in giving the World a perfect Collection of Propoſitions out of the Epiſtles, that contain all that is required, and no more than what is abſolutely required to be believed by all Chriſtians, without which Faith they cannot be of Chriſt's Church. For I tell you, notwithſtanding the Shew you have made, you have not yet done it, nor will you affirm that you have.

His next Page, *viz.* 112. is made up of the ſame, which he calls, not uncharitable Conjectures. *I expound,* he ſays, *John* xiv. 9, &c. *after the Antitrinitarian Mode:* And I make Chriſt *and Adam to be Sons of God, in the ſame Senſe, and by their Birth, as the Racovians generally do.* I know not but it may be true, that the *Antitrinitarians* and *Racovians* underſtand thoſe Places as I do: But 'tis more than I know that they do ſo. I took not my Senſe of thoſe Texts from thoſe Writers, but from the Scripture it ſelf, giving Light to its own Meaning, by one Place compared with another:

ther: What in this way appears to me its true Meaning, I ſhall not decline, becauſe I am told, that it is ſo underſtood by the *Racovians*, whom I never yet read; nor embrace the contrary, though *the generality of Divines* I more converſe with, ſhould declare for it. If the Senſe wherein I underſtand thoſe Texts be a Miſtake, I ſhall be beholden to you if you will ſet me right. But they are not popular Authorities, or frightful Names, whereby I judge of Truth or Falſhood. You will now, no doubt, applaud your Conjectures; the Point is gained, and I am openly a *Socinian*, ſince I will not diſown that I think the *Son of God* was a Phraſe that among the *Jews* in our Saviour's Time was uſed for the *Meſſiah*, though the *Socinians* underſtand it in the ſame Senſe; and therefore I muſt certainly be of their Perſuaſion in every thing elſe. I admire the Acuteneſs, Force, and Fairneſs of your Reaſoning, and ſo I leave you to triumph in your *Conjectures*. Only I muſt deſire you to take notice, that that Ornament of our Church, and every way eminent Prelate, the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, underſtood that Phraſe in the ſame Sence that I do, without being a *Socinian*. You may read what he ſays concerning *Nathanael*, in his firſt *Sermon of Sincerity*, publiſhed this Year. His Words are theſe, *p.* 4. *And being ſatisfied that he* [our Saviour] *was the Meſſiah, he preſently owned him for ſuch, calling him the* SON OF GOD, *and the King of Iſrael.*

Though this Gentleman know my Thoughts as perfectly as if he had for ſeveral Years paſt lain in my Boſom, yet he is mightily at a Loſs about my Perſon: As if it at all concerned the Truth contained in my Book, what Hand it came from. However, the Gentleman is mightily perplexed about the Author. Why, Sir? What if it were writ by a Scribler of *Bartholomew* Fair Drolls, with all that flouriſh of Declamatory Rhetorick, and all that Smartneſs of Wit and Jeſt about *Capt. Tom. Unitarians, Units, and Cyphers*, &c. Which are to be found between 115 and 123 Pages of a Book that came out during the merry Time of Rope-Dancing, and Puppet-Plays? What is Truth, would, I hope, nevertheleſs be Truth in it, however oddly ſpruced up by ſuch an Author: Though perhaps 'tis likely ſome would be apt to ſay, ſuch Merriment became not the Gravity of my Subject, and that I writ not in the Stile of a Graduate in Divinity. I confeſs, (as Mr. *Edwards* rightly ſays) my Fault lies on the other Side, in a want of *Vivacity and Elevation*: And I cannot wonder that one of his Character and Palate, ſhould find out and complain of my *Flatneſs*, which has ſo overcharged my Book with plain and direct Texts of Scripture in a Matter capable of no other Proofs. But yet I muſt acknowledge his Exceſs of Civility to me; he ſhews me more Kindneſs than I could expect or wiſh, ſince he prefers what I ſay to him myſelf, to what is offered to him from the Word of God; and makes me this Compliment, that I begin to mend, about the Cloſe; *i. e.* when I leave off quoting of Scripture: And the dull Work was done, of *going through the Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts and Acts*, which he computes, *p.* 105. to take up three Quarters of my Book. Does not all this deſerve at leaſt that I ſhould in Return take ſome Care of his Credit? Which I know not how better to do, than by entreating him, that when he takes next in hand ſuch a Subject as this is, wherein the Salvation of Souls is concerned, he would treat it a little more ſeriouſly, and with a little more Candor; leſt Men ſhould find in his Writings another Cauſe of Atheiſm, which in this Treatiſe he has not thought fit to mention. *Oſtentation of Wit* in general he has made a *Cauſe of Atheiſm*, *p.* 28. But the World will tell him, That frothy light Diſcourſes concerning the ſerious Matters of Religion; and *Oſtentation* of trifling and misbecoming *Wit* in thoſe who come as Ambaſſadors from God, under the Title of Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, in the great Commiſſion of the Goſpel is none of the leaſt Cauſes of Atheiſm.

Some Men have ſo peculiar a Way of arguing, that one may ſee it influences them in the repeating another Man's Reaſoning, and ſeldom fails to make it their own. In the next Paragraph I find theſe Words: *What makes him contend for one ſingle Article, with the Excluſion of all the reſt? He pretends it is this, That all Men ought to underſtand their Religion.* This, I confeſs, is a Reaſoning I did not think of; nor would it hardly, I fear, have been uſed but by one, who had firſt took up his Opinion from the Recommendation of Faſhion or Intereſt, and then ſought Topicks to make it good. Perhaps the Deference due to your Character excuſed you from the Trouble of quoting the Page where *I pretend*, as you ſay; and it is ſo little like my Way of Reaſoning, that I ſhall not look for it in a Book where I remember nothing of it, and where, without your Direction, I fear the Reader will ſcarce find it. Though I have not *that Vivacity of Thought, that Elevation of Mind*, which Mr. *Edwards* demands,

mands, yet common Senſe would have kept me from contending that there is but one Article, becauſe all Men ought to underſtand their Religion. Numbers of Propoſitions may be harder to be remembred, but 'tis the Abſtruceneſs of the Notions, or Obſcurity, Inconſiſtency, or Doubtfulneſs of the Terms or Expreſſions that makes them hard to be underſtood: And one ſingle Propoſition may more perplex the Underſtanding than twenty other. But where did you find *I contend for one ſingle Article*, ſo as to *exclude all the reſt?* You might have remembred, that I ſay, *p.* 483. That the Article of the one only true God, was alſo neceſſary to be believed. This might have ſatisfied you, that I did not ſo *contend for one* Article of Faith, as to be *at Defiance* with more than one. However you inſiſt on the Word *one* with great Vigour, from *p.* 108, to 121. And you did well, you had elſe loſt all the Force of that killing Stroke, reſerved for the Cloſe, in that ſharp Jeſt of *Unitarians*, and a Clinch or two more of great Moment.

Having found by a careful Peruſal of the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, that the Religion they propoſed, conſiſted in that ſhort, plain, eaſy, and intelligible Summary which I ſet down, *p.* 540. in theſe Words: "Believing Jeſus to be the "Saviour promiſed, and taking him now raiſed from the Dead, and conſtituted "the Lord and Judge of Men, to be their King and Ruler". I could not forbear magnifying the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God (which infinitely exceeds the Thoughts of ignorant, vain, and narrow-minded Man) in theſe following Words. "The "All-merciful God ſeems herein to have conſulted the Poor of this World, and the "Bulk of Mankind: THESE ARE ARTICLES that the labouring and illiterate "Men may comprehend". Having thus plainly mentioned more than one Article, I might have taken it amiſs, that Mr. *Edwards* ſhould be at ſo much Pains as he is, to blame me for *contending for one* Article; becauſe I thought more than *one* could not be underſtood; had he not had many fine Things to ſay in his Declamation upon *one* Article, which affords him ſo much Matter, that leſs than ſeven Pages could not hold it. Only here and there, as Men of Oratory often do, he miſtakes the Buſineſs, as *p.* 115. where he ſays, *I urge, that there muſt be nothing in Chriſtianity that is not plain and exactly levelled to all Mens Mother Wit.* I deſire to know where I ſaid ſo, or that *the very Manner of every Thing in Chriſtianity muſt be clear and intelligible, every Thing muſt be preſently comprehended by the weakeſt Noddle, or elſe it's no Part of Religion, eſpecially of Chriſtianity*; as he has it, *p.* 119. I am ſure it is not in *pag.* 530, 537, 538. of my Book: Theſe, therefore to convince him that I am of another Opinion, I ſhall deſire ſome body to read to Mr. *Edwards*: For he himſelf reads my Book with ſuch Spectacles, as make him find Meanings and Words in it, neither of which I put there. He ſhould have remembred, that I ſpeak not of all the Doctrines of Chriſtianity, nor all that is publiſhed to the World in it; but of thoſe Truths only, which are abſolutely required to be believed to make any one a Chriſtian. And theſe I find are ſo plain and eaſy, that I ſee no Reaſon why every body, with me, ſhould not magnify the Goodneſs and Condeſcenſion of the Almighty; who having out of his free Grace propoſed a new Law of Faith to ſinful and loſt Man, hath by that Law required no harder Terms, nothing as abſolutely neceſſary to be believed, but what is ſuited to vulgar Capacities, and the Comprehenſion of illiterate Men.

You are a little out again, *p.* 118. where you ironically ſay, as if it were my Senſe, *Let us have but one Article, though it be with Defiance to all the reſt.* Jeſting apart, Sir, This is a ſerious Truth, That what our Saviour and his Apoſtles preached, and admitted Men into the Church for believing, is all that is abſolutely required to make a Man a Chriſtian. But this is without any *Defiance of all the reſt*, taught in the Word of God. This excludes not the Belief of any of thoſe many other Truths contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtaments, which it is the Duty of every Chriſtian to ſtudy, and thereby build himſelf up on our moſt Holy Faith; receiving with ſtedfaſt Belief, and ready Obedience all thoſe Things which the Spirit of Truth hath therein revealed. But that *all the reſt* of the inſpired Writings, or, if you pleaſe, *Articles, are of equal Neceſſity* to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, with what was preached by our Saviour and his Apoſtles; that I deny. A Man, as I have ſhewn, may be a Chriſtian and a Believer without actually believing them; becauſe thoſe whom our Saviour and his Apoſtles, by their Preaching and Diſcourſes, converted to the Faith, were made Chriſtians and Believers barely upon the receiving what they preached to them.

I hope

I hope it is no Derogation to the Christian Religion, to say, that the Fundamentals of it, *i. e.* all that is necessary to be believed in it by all Men, is easy to be understood by all Men. This I thought my self authorized to say by the very easy, and very intelligible Articles insisted on by our Saviour and his Apostles, which contain nothing but what could be understood by the *Bulk of Mankind*; a Term which, I know not why, Mr. *Edwards* p. 117. is offended at, and thereupon is, after his Fashion, sharp upon me about Captain *Tom* and his *Myrmidons*, for whom he tells me I am *going to make a Religion*. The making of Religions and Creeds I leave to others. I only set down the Christian Religion, as I find our Saviour and his Apostles preached it, and preached it to, and left it for the *ignorant and unlearned Multitude*. For I hope you do not think, how contemptibly soever you speak of the *venerable Mob*, as you are pleased to dignify them, *p.* 117. that the Bulk of Mankind, or in your Phrase, the *Rabble*, are not concerned in Religion, or ought to understand it, in order to their Salvation. Nor are you, I hope, acquainted with any, who are of that *Muscovite* Divine's Mind, who, to one that was talking to him about Religion, and the other World, replied, That for the *Czar* indeed, and *Bojars*, they might be permitted to raise their Hopes to Heaven, but that for such poor Wretches as he, they were not to think of Salvation.

I remember the *Pharisees* treated the common People with Contempt, and said, *Have any of the Rulers, or of the Pharisees believed in him? But this People, who knoweth not the Law, are cursed.* But yet these, who, in the Censure of the *Pharisees*, were cursed, were some of the *Poor*, or if you please to have it so, the *Mob*, to whom the *Gospel was preached* by our Saviour, as he tells *John*'s Disciples, *Matt.* xi. 5.

Pardon me, Sir, that I have here laid these Examples and Considerations before you; a little to prevail with you, not to let loose such a Torrent of Wit and Eloquence against the *Bulk of Mankind* another time, and that for a mere Fancy of your own: For I do not see how they here came in your Way; but that you were resolved to set up something to have a fling at, and shew your Parts, in what you call *Preface.* your *different Strain*, though besides the Purpose. I know no body was going to *ask the Mob, what you must believe?* And as for me, I suppose you will take my Word for it, that I think no *Mob*, (no, not your *venerable Mob*) is to be asked, what I am to believe; nor that *Articles of Faith* are to be *received by the Vote of Club-men*, or any other Sort of Men you will name instead of them.

In the following Words, *p.* 115. you ask, *Whether a Man may not understand those Articles of Faith which you mentioned out of the Gospels and Epistles, if they be explained to him, as well as that one I speak of?* 'Tis as the Articles are, and as they are explained. There are Articles that have been some Hundreds of Years explaining; which, there are many, and those not of the most illiterate, who profess they do not yet understand. And to instance in no other but *He descended into Hell*, the Learned are not yet agreed in the Sense of it, tho' great Pains has been taken to explain it.

Next, I ask, Who are to explain your Articles? The Papists will explain some of them one way, and the Reformed another. The Remonstrants, and Anti-Remonstrants give them different Senses. And probably the *Trinitarians* and *Unitarians* will profess, that they understand not each others Explications. And at last, I think it may be doubted whether any Articles, which need Mens Explications, can be so clearly and certainly understood, as one which is made so very plain by the Scripture itself, as not to need any Explication at all. Such is this, that Jesus is the *Messiah*. For though you learnedly tell us, that *Messiah* is a Hebrew Word, and no better understood by the Vulgar than Arabick; yet I guess it is so fully explained in the New Testament, and in those Places I have quoted out of it, that no body, who can understand any ordinary Sentence in the Scripture, can be at Loss about it. And 'tis plain, it needs no other Explication, than what our Saviour and the Apostles gave it in their Preaching; for as they preached it, Men received it, and that sufficed to make them Believers.

To conclude, when I heard that this learned Gentleman, who had a Name for his Study of the Scriptures, and Writings on them, had done me the Honour to consider my Treatise, I promised my self, that his Degree, Calling, and Fame in the World, would have secured to me something of Weight in his Remarks, which might have convinced me of my Mistakes; and if he had found any in it, justified my quitting of them.

them. But having examined what in his concerns my Book, I, to my Wonder, find, that he has only taken Pains to give it an ill Name, without ſo much as attempting to refute any one Poſition in it, how much ſoever he is pleaſed to make a Noiſe againſt ſeveral Propoſitions, which he might be free with, becauſe they are his own: And I have no reaſon to take it amiſs, if he has ſhewn his Zeal and Skill againſt them. He has been ſo favourable to what is mine, as not to uſe any one Argument againſt any Paſſage in my Book. This, which I take for a publick Teſtimony of his Approbation, I ſhall return him my Thanks for, when I know whether I owe it to his Miſtake, Conviction, or Kindneſs. But if he writ only for his Book-ſeller's Sake, he alone ought to thank him.

AFTER the foregoing Papers were ſent to the Preſs, The *Witneſſes to Chriſtianity*, of the reverend and learned Dr. *Patrick*, now Lord Biſhop of *Ely*, fell into my Hands. I regretted the not having ſeen it before I writ my Treatiſe of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. I ſhould then poſſibly, by the Light given me by ſo good a Guide, and ſo great a Man, with more Confidence directy have fallen into the Knowledge of Chriſtianity; which in the Way I ſought it, in its Source, required the comparing of Texts with Texts, and the more than once reading over the *Evangeliſts* and *Acts*, beſides other Parts of Scripture. But I had the ill Luck not to ſee that Treatiſe till ſo few Hours ſince, that I have had Time only to read as far the End of the Introduction, or firſt Chapter: And there Mr. *Edwards* may find, that this pious Biſhop (whoſe Writings ſhew his Studies, as well as his Life, that he believes the Scriptures) owns what Mr. *Edwards* is pleaſed to call *a plauſible Conceit*, which, he ſays, *I give over and over again in theſe formal Words*, viz. *That nothing is required to be believed by any Chriſtian Man, but this, That Jeſus is the Meſſiah.*

The Liberty Mr. *Edwards* takes in other Places, deſerves not it ſhould be taken upon his Word, *That theſe formal Words* are to be found *over and over again* in my Book, unleſs he had quoted the Pages. But I will ſet him down the *formal Words* which are to be found in this Reverend Prelate's Book, *p.* 14. *To be the Son of God, and to be Chriſt, being but different Expreſſions of the ſame Thing.* And *p.* 10. *It is the very ſame Thing to believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, and to believe that Jeſus is the Son of God; expreſs it how you pleaſe. This ALONE is the Faith which can regenerate a Man, and put a Divine Spirit into him; that is, makes him a Conqueror over the World, as Jeſus was.* I have quoted only theſe few Words; but Mr. *Edwards*, if he pleaſes, or any body elſe, may, in this firſt Chapter, ſatisfy himſelf more fully, that the Deſign of it is to ſhew, That in our Saviour's Time, *Son of God* was a known and received Name or Appellation of the *Meſſiah*, and ſo uſed in the holy Writers. And that the Faith that was to make Men Chriſtians, was only the believing that *Jeſus is the Meſſiah.* 'Tis to the Truth of this Propoſition that he *examines his Witneſſes*, as he ſpeaks, *p.* 21. And this, if I miſtake not, in his *Epiſt. Dedicatory*, he calls *Chriſtianity. Fol. A.* 3. where he calls them *Witneſſes to Chriſtianity.* But theſe two Propoſitions, *viz.* That *SON of God* in the Goſpel ſtands for *Meſſiah*; and that the Faith which alone makes Men Chriſtians, is the believing *Jeſus to be the Meſſiah*, diſpleaſes Mr. *Edwards* ſo much in my Book, that he thinks himſelf authorized from them to charge me with *Socinianiſm*, and Want of Sincerity. How he will be pleaſed to treat this Reverend Prelate whilſt he is alive (for the Dead may with good Manners be made bold with) muſt be left to his deciſive Authority. This, I am ſure, which Way ſoever he determine, he muſt, for the future, either afford me more good Company, or fairer Quarter.

A SECOND

VINDICATION

OF THE

REASONABLENESS

OF

CHRISTIANITY, &c.

A SECOND

VINDICATION

OF THE

REASONABLENESS

OF

CHRISTIANITY, &c.

PREFACE
TO THE
READER.

IT hath pleaſed *Mr.* Edwards, *in anſwer to* The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *&c. and its* Vindication, *to turn one of the moſt weighty and important Points that can come into Queſtion (even no leſs than the very Fundamentals of the Chriſtian Religion) into a mere Quarrel againſt the Author; as every one, with Mr.* Bold, *may obſerve. In my Reply to him, I have endeavoured, as much as his Objections would allow me, to bring him to the Subject Matter of my Book, and the Merits of the Cauſe; though his peculiar way writing Controverſy has made it neceſſary for me in following him ſtep by ſtep, to wipe off the Dirt he has thrown on me, and clear my ſelf from thoſe Falſhoods he has filled his Book with. This I could not but do, in dealing with ſuch an Antagoniſt; that by the Untruths I have proved upon him, the Reader may judge of thoſe other Allegations of his, whereof the Proof lying on his ſide, the bare Denial is enough on mine, and indeed, are wholly nothing to the Truth or Falſhood of what is contain'd in my* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *&c. To which I ſhall deſire the Reader to add this farther Conſideration from his way Writing, not againſt my Book, but againſt me for writing it, that if he had had a real Concern for Truth and Religion in this Diſpute, he would have treated it after another Manner; and we ſhould have had from him more Argument, Reaſoning and Clearneſs, and leſs Boaſting, Declamation and Railing. It has been unavoidable for me to take notice of a great deal of this ſort of Stuff, in anſwering a Writer who has very little elſe to ſay in the Controverſy, and places his Strength in Things beſides the Queſtion: But yet I have been ſo careful to take all Occaſions to explain the Doctrine of my Book, that I hope the Reader will not think his Pains wholly loſt Labour in peruſing this Reply, wherein he will find ſome farther, and, I hope, ſatisfying, Account concerning the Writings of the* New Teſtament, *and the* Chriſtian Religion *contained in it.*

Mr. Edwards's *ill Language, which I thought perſonally to me (though I know not how I had provoked a Man whom I had never had to do with) I am now ſatisfied by his rude and ſcurrilous treating of Mr.* Bold, *is his Way and Strength in Management of Controverſy; and therefore requires a little more Conſideration in this Diſputant, than otherwiſe it would deſerve. Mr.* Bold, *with the Calmneſs of a Chriſtian, the Gravity of a Divine, the Clearneſs of a Man of Parts, and the Civility of a well-bred Man, made ſome* Animadverſions *on his* Socinianiſm Unmask'd; *which, with a Sermon preach'd on the ſame Subject with my* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *he Publiſh'd: And how he has been uſed by Mr.* Edwards, *let the World judge.*

I was extremely ſurprized with Mr. Bold's *Book, at a Time when there was ſo great an Outcry againſt mine on all Hands. But, it ſeems, he is a Man that does not take up Things upon Heavſay; nor is afraid to own Truth, whatever Clamour or Calumny it may lie under. Mr.* Edwards *confidently tells the World, that Mr.* Bold *has been drawn in to eſpouſe this Cauſe, upon baſe and mean Conſiderations. Whoſe Picture of the two, ſuch a Deſcription is moſt likely to give us, I ſhall leave to the Reader to judge, from what he will find in their Writings on this Subject. For as to the Perſons themſelves, I am equally a Stranger to them both: I know not the Face of either of them: And having hitherto never had any Communication with Mr.* Bold, *I ſhall begin with him, as I did with Mr.* Edwards *in Print; and here publickly return him this following Acknowledgment for what he has printed in this Controverſy.*

To

To Mr. BOLD.

SIR,

THough I do not think I ought to return Thanks to any one for being of my Opinion, any more than to fall out with him for differing from me; yet I cannot but own to all the World the Eſteem that I think is due to you, for that Proof you have given of a Mind and Temper becoming a true Miniſter of the Goſpel, in appearing as you have done, in the Defence of a Point, a great Point of Chriſtianity, which it is evident you could have no other Temptation to declare for, but the Love of Truth. It has fared with you herein no better than with me. For Mr. *Edwards*, not being able to anſwer your Arguments, has found out already that you are a *Mercenary*, defending a Cauſe againſt your *Perſuaſion* for *Hire*; and that you *are ſailing to* Racovia *by a ſide Wind*: Such Inconſiſtencies can one (whoſe Buſineſs it is to Rail for a Cauſe he cannot defend) put together to make a noiſe with: And he tells you plainly what you muſt expect, if you write any more on this Argument, *viz.* to be pronounced a downright *Apoſtate* and *Renegado*.

As ſoon as I ſaw your *Sermon* and *Animadverſions*, I wonder'd what Scare-Crow Mr. *Edwards* would ſet up, wherewith he might hope to deter Men of more Caution than Senſe from reading of them: Since *Socinianiſm*, from which you were known to be as remote as he, I concluded would not do. The unknown Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, he might make a *Socinian*, *Mahometan*, *Atheiſt*, or what ſort of *Raw-head* and *Bloody-bones* he pleaſed. But I imagined he had had more Senſe than to venture any ſuch Aſperſions on a Man whom, tho' I have not yet the Happineſs perſonally to know; yet I know hath juſtly a great and ſettled Reputation amongſt worthy Men: And I thought that that Coat which you had worn with ſo much Reputation, might have preſerved you from the Beſpatterings of Mr. *Edwards*'s Dunghil. But what is to be expected from a Warrier that hath no other Ammunition, and yet aſcribes to himſelf Victory from hence, and with this Artillery imagines he carries all before him? And ſo *Skimmington* rides in Triumph, driving all before him by the Ordures that he beſtows on thoſe that come in his Way. And were not Chriſtianity concerned in the Caſe, a Man would ſcarce excuſe to himſelf the Ridiculouſneſs of entring into the Liſt with ſuch a Combatant. I do not therefore wonder that this mighty Boaſter, having no other Way to anſwer the Books of his Opponents, but by popular Calumnies, is fain to have Recourſe to his only Refuge, and lay out his natural Talent in Vilifying and Slandering the Authors. But I ſee, by what you have already writ, how much you are above that; and as you take not up your Opinions from Faſhion or Intereſt, ſo you quit them not to avoid the malicious Reports of thoſe that do: Out of which Number, they can hardly be left, who (unprovoked) mix with the Management of their Cauſe, Injuries and ill Language to thoſe they differ from. This, at leaſt I am ſure, Zeal or Love for Truth, can never permit Falſhood to be uſed in the Defence of it.

Your Mind I ſee prepar'd for Truth, by Reſignation of itſelf not to the Traditions of Men, but the Doctrine of the Goſpel, has made you more readily entertain, and more eaſily enter into the Meaning of my Book, than moſt I have heard ſpeak of it. And ſince you ſeem to me to comprehend, what I have laid together, with the ſame Diſpoſition of Mind, and in the ſame Senſe that I received it, from the Holy Scriptures, I ſhall, as a Mark of my Reſpect to you, give you a particular Account of the Occaſion of it.

The beginning of the Year in which it was publiſhed, the Controverſy that made ſo much Noiſe and Heat amongſt ſome of the Diſſenters, coming one Day accidentally into my Mind, drew me by degrees into a ſtricter and more through Enquiry into the Queſtion about Juſtification. The Scripture was direct and plain; and 'twas Faith that juſtified; The next Queſtion then, was what Faith that was that juſtified; what it was which, if a Man believed, it ſhould be imputed to him for Righteouſneſs. To find out this, I thought the right way was to ſearch the Scriptures; and thereupon betook my ſelf ſeriouſly to the reading of the New Teſtrment, only to that Purpoſe. What that produced, you and the World have ſeen.

The firſt View I had of it ſeem'd mightily to ſatisfy my Mind, in the Reaſonableneſs and Plainneſs of this Doctrine; but yet the general Silence I had in my little reading

reading met with, concerning any ſuch thing, awed me with the Apprehenſion of Singularity: till going on in the Goſpel Hiſtory, the whole Tenor of it made it ſo clear and viſible, that I more wonder'd that every body did not ſee and embrace it; than that I ſhould aſſent to what was ſo plainly laid down, and ſo frequently inculcated in Holy Writ, tho' Syſtems of Divinity ſaid nothing of it. That which added to my Satisfaction, was, that it led me into a Diſcovery of the marvellous and divine Wiſdom of our Saviour's Conduct, in all the Circumſtances of his Promulgating this Doctrine; as well as of the Neceſſity that ſuch a Law-giver ſhould be ſent from God for the reforming the Morality of the World; two Points that I muſt confeſs, I had not found ſo fully and advantageouſly explain'd in the Books of Divinity I had met with, as the Hiſtory of the Goſpel ſeem'd to me, upon an attentive Peruſal, to give Occaſion and Matter for. But the Neceſſity and Wiſdom of our Saviour's opening the Doctrine (which he came to publiſh) as he did in Parables and figurative Ways of ſpeaking, carries ſuch a Thread of Evidence thro' the whole Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts, as I think is impoſſible to be reſiſted; and makes it a Demonſtration, that the Sacred Hiſtorians did not write by Concert as Advocates, for a bad Cauſe, or to give Colour and Credit to an Impoſture they would uſher into the World; ſince they, every one of them, in ſome Place or other, omit ſome Paſſages of our Saviour's Life, or Circumſtances of his Actions; which ſhew the Wiſdom and Warineſs of his Conduct; and which even thoſe of the Evangeliſts, who have recorded, do barely and tranſiently mention, without laying any Streſs on them, and making the leaſt Remark of what Conſequence they are to give us our Saviour's true Character, and to prove the Truth of their Hiſtory. Theſe are Evidences of Truth and Sincerity, which reſult alone from the Nature of Things, and cannot be produced by any Art or Contrivance.

How much I was pleas'd with the growing Diſcovery, every Day, whilſt I was employed in this Search, I need not ſay. The wonderful Harmony, that the farther I went, diſcloſed it ſelf, tending to the ſame Points, in all the Parts of the ſacred Hiſtory of the Goſpel, was of no ſmall Weight with me and another Perſon who every Day, from the Beginning to the End of my Search, ſaw the Progreſs of it, and knew at my firſt ſetting out, that I was ignorant whither it would lead me; and therefore, every Day, asked me, What more the Scripture had taught me? So far was I from the Thoughts of *Socinianiſm*, or an Intention to write for that or any other Party, or to publiſh any Thing at all. But when I had gone thro' the Whole, and ſaw what a plain, ſimple, reaſonable Thing Chriſtianity was, ſuited to all Conditions and Capacities; and in the Morality of it now, with divine Authority, eſtabliſhed into a legible Law, ſo far ſurpaſſing all that Philoſophy and human Reaſon had attained to, or could poſſibly make effectual to all Degrees of Mankind; I was flatter'd to think it might be of ſome Uſe in the World; eſpecially to thoſe who thought either that there was no need of Revelation at all, or that the Revelation of our Saviour required the Belief of ſuch Articles for Salvation, which the ſettled Notions and their Way of reaſoning in ſome, and Want of Underſtanding in others, made impoſſible to them. Upon theſe two Topicks the Objections ſeemed to turn, which were with moſt Aſſurance, made by *Deiſts* againſt *Chriſtianity*; but againſt *Chriſtianity* miſunderſtood. It ſeem'd to me, that there needed no more to ſhew them the Weakneſs of their Exceptions, but to lay plainly before them the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, as delivered in the Scriptures, and not as taught by the ſeveral Sects of Chriſtianity.

This tempted me to publiſh it, not thinking it deſerved an Oppoſition from any Miniſter of the Goſpel; and leaſt of all, from any one in the Communion of the Church of *England*. But ſo it is, that Mr. *Edwards*'s Zeal for he knows not what (for he does not yet know his own Creed, nor what is required to make him a Chriſtian) could not brook ſo plain, ſimple, and intelligible a Religion: But yet not knowing what to ſay againſt it, and the Evidence it has from the Word of God, he thought fit to let the Book alone, and fall upon the Author. What great Matter he has done in it I need not tell you, who have ſeen and ſhewed the Weakneſs of his Wranglings. You have here, Sir, the true Hiſtory of the Birth of my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, as delivered in the Scriptures*, and my Deſign in publiſhing it, &c. What it contains, and how much it tends to Peace and Union among Chriſtians, if they would receive Chriſtianity as it is, you have diſcovered. I am,

SIR,

Your moſt humble Servant,

A. B.

My

My Readers will pardon me, that in my Preface to them, I make this particular Addreſs to Mr. Bold. *He hath thought it worth his while to defend my Book: How well he has done it, I am too much a Party to ſay: I think it ſo ſufficient to Mr.* Edwards, *that I needed not have troubled my ſelf any farther about him on the Account of any Argument that remains in his Book to be anſwered. But a great Part of the World judging of Conteſts about Truth, as they do of popular Elections, that the Side carries it where the greateſt Noiſe is; 'twas neceſſary they ſhould be undeceived, and be let ſee, that ſometimes ſuch Writers may be let alone, not becauſe they cannot, but becauſe they deſerve not to be anſwer'd.*

This farther I ought to acknowledge to Mr. Bold, *and own to the World, that he hath entered into the true Senſe of my Treatiſe, and his Notions do ſo perfectly agree with mine, that I ſhall not be be afraid by Thoughts and Expreſſions very like his in this my Second Vindication, to give Mr.* Edwards *(who is exceedingly quick-ſighted, and poſitive in ſuch Matters) a handle to tell the World, that either I borrowed this my* Vindication *from Mr.* Bold, *or writ his* Animadverſions *for him. The former of theſe I ſhall count no Diſcredit, if Mr.* Edwards *think fit to charge me with it; and the latter Mr.* Bold's *Character, is Anſwer enough to. Though the impartial Reader, I doubt not, will find that the ſame uniform Truth conſider'd by us, ſuggeſted the ſame Thoughts to us both, without any other Communication.*

There is another Author, who, in a civiler Stile, hath made it neceſſary for me to vindicate my Book from a Reflection or two of his, wherein he ſeems to come ſhort of that Candor he profeſſes. All that I ſhall ſay on this Occaſion here, is, that it is a Wonder to me, that having publiſh'd what I thought the Scripture told me was the Faith that made a Chriſtian, and deſired that if I was miſtaken, any one that thought ſo, would have the Goodneſs to inform me better; ſo many with their Tongues, and ſome in Print, ſhould intemperately find fault with a poor Man out of his Way, who deſires to be ſet right; and no one who blames his Faith, as coming ſhort, will tell him what that Faith is, which is required to make him a Chriſtian. But, I hope, that amongſt ſo many Cenſurers, I ſhall at laſt find one, who knowing himſelf to be a Chriſtian upon other Grounds than I am, will have ſo much Chriſtian Charity, as to ſhew me what more is abſolutely neceſſary to be believed by me, and every Man, to make him a Chriſtian.

A SE-

A SECOND

VINDICATION

OF THE

REASONABLENESS

OF

CHRISTIANITY, &c.

A Cauſe that ſtands in need of Falſhoods to ſupport it, and an Adverſary that will make uſe of them, deſerve nothing but Contempt; which I doubt not but every conſiderate Reader thought Anſwer enough to Mr. *Edwards's Socinianiſm Unmask'd*. But ſince in his late *Socinian Creed*, he ſays, *I would* have anſwer'd him *if I could*, That the Intereſt of Chriſtianity may not ſuffer by my Silence, nor the Contemptibleneſs of his Treatiſe afford him Mater of Triumph amongſt thoſe who lay any Weight on ſuch Boaſting, 'tis fit it ſhould be ſhewn what an Arguer he is, and how well he deſerves for his Performance to be dubb'd by himſelf *Irrefragable*.

Thoſe, who like Mr. *Edwards*, dare to publiſh Inventions of their own for Matters of Fact, deſerve a Name ſo abhorr'd, that it finds not Room in civil Converſation. This ſecures him from the proper Anſwer due to his Imputations to me in Print of Matters of Fact utterly falſe, which without any Reply of mine, fix upon him that Name (which without a profligate Mind, a Man cannot expoſe himſelf to) till he hath proved them. Till then he muſt wear what he has put upon himſelf. This being a Rule which common Juſtice hath preſcribed to the private Judgments of Mankind, as well as to the publick Judicatures of Courts, That all Allegations of Fact brought by contending Parties ſhould be preſum'd to be falſe till they are proved.

There are two Ways of making a Book unanſwerable. The one is by the Clearneſs, Strength and Fairneſs of the Argumentation. Men who know how to write thus, are above Bragging what they have done, or Boaſting to the World that their Adverſaries are *baffled*. Another Way to make a Book unanſwerable, is to lay Streſs on Matters of Fact foreign to the Queſtion, as well as to Truth; and to ſtuff it with Scurrility and Fiction. This hath been always ſo evident to common Senſe, that no Man who had any Regard to Truth or Ingenuity, ever thought Matters of Fact beſides the Argument, and Stories made at Pleaſure, the Way of managing Controverſies. Which ſhewing only the Want of Senſe and Argument, could, if uſed on both Sides, end in nothing but downright railing: And he muſt always have the Better of the Cauſe, who has Lying and Impudence on his Side.

The *Unmasker*, in the Entrance of his Book, ſets a great Diſtance between his and my Way of Writing. I am not ſorry that mine differs ſo much as it does from his. If it were like his, I ſhould think, like his, it wanted the Author's Commendations. For, in his firſt Paragraph, which is all laid out in his own Teſtimony of his own Book, he ſo earneſtly beſpeaks an Opinion of Maſtery in Politeneſs, Order, Coherence, Pertinence, Strength, Seriouſneſs, Temper, and all the good Qualities requiſite

ſite in Controverſy, that I think, ſince he pleaſes himſelf ſo much with his own good Opinion, one in Pity ought not to go about to rob him of ſo conſiderable an Admirer. I ſhall not therefore conteſt any of thoſe Excellencies he aſcribes to himſelf, or Faults he blames in me in the Management of the Diſpute between us, any farther than as particular Paſſages of his Book, as I come to examine them, ſhall ſuggeſt unavoidable Remarks to me. I think the World does not ſo much concern itſelf about him or me, that it need be told, in that Inventory he has given of his own good Parts in his firſt Paragraph, which of us two has the better Hand at *Flouriſhes, Jeſting, and common Places*; if I am, as he ſays, *p.* 2. troubled with *angry Fits, and paſſionate Ferments, which, though I ſtrive to palliate, are eaſily diſcernable*, &c. and he be more laudably ingenuous in the Openneſs of that Temper, which he ſhews in every Leaf, I ſhall leave to him the entire Glory of boaſting of it. Whatever we brag of our Performances, they will be juſt as they are, however he may think to add to his by his own Encomiums of them. The Difference in Stile, Order, Coherence, good Breeding (for all thoſe amongſt others the *Unmasker* mentions) the Reader will obſerve, whatever I ſay of them; and at beſt they are nothing to the Queſtion in hand. For, though I am a *Tool, Pert, Childiſh, Starch'd, Impertinent, Incoherent, Trifling, Weak, Paſſionate*, &c. Commendations I meet with before I get to the 4th Page, beſides what follows, as *Upſtart Racovian*, p. 24. *Flouriſhing Scribler*, p. 41. *Diſſembler*, 106. *Pedantick*, 107. I ſay, although I am all this, and what elſe he liberally beſtows on me in the reſt of his Book, I may have Truth on my Side, and that in the preſent Caſe ſerves my Turn.

Having thus placed the Laurels upon his own Head, and ſung Applauſe to his own Performance, he, *p.* 4. enters, as he thinks, upon his Buſineſs, which ought to be, as he confeſſes, *p.* 3. *to make good his former Charges.* The firſt whereof he ſets down in theſe Words. That *I unwarrantably crouded all the neceſſary Articles of Faith into one, with a Deſign of favouring Socinianiſm.*

If it may be permitted to the ſubdued to be ſo bold with one, who is already Conqueror, I deſire to know where that Propoſition is laid down in theſe Terms as laid to my Charge. Whether it be true, or falſe, ſhall, if he pleaſes, be hereafter examined: But it is not at preſent the Matter in queſtion. There are certain Propoſitions, which he having affirmed, and I denied, are under Debate between us: And that the Diſpute may not run into an endleſs Ramble, by multiplying of new before the Points in conteſt are decided, thoſe ought firſt to be brought to an Iſſue.

To go on therefore in the Order of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd* (for *p.* 3. he has out of the Miſhna taught me good Breeding, *to anſwer the Firſt firſt, and ſo in order*) the next Thing he has againſt me, is *p.* 5. which, that the Reader may underſtand the Force of, I muſt inform him, that in the 105. *p.* of his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, he ſaid, that I *give this plauſible Conceit*, as he calls it, *over and over again in theſe formal Words*, viz. "*That nothing is required to be believed by any Chriſtian Man but* "*this, that Jeſus is the Meſſiah.*" This I denied. To make it good, *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, *p.* 5. he thus argues, Firſt, *It is obſervable, that this guilty Man would be ſhifting off the Indictment, by excepting againſt the Formality of Words, as if ſuch were not to be found in his Book: But when doth he do this? In the Cloſe of it, when his Matter was exhauſted, and he had nothing elſe to ſay*, Vind. *p.* 553. of this Vol. *then he bethinks himſelf of this Salvo*, &c. *Anſw.* As if a Falſhood were ever the leſs a Falſhood, becauſe it was not oppoſed, or would grow into a Truth if it were not taken Notice of, before the 38th Page of the Anſwer. I deſire him to ſhew me theſe *formal Words over and over again* in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*: Nor let him hope to evade by ſaying, I would be *ſhifting by excepting againſt the Formality of the Words.*

To ſay that *I have over and over again thoſe formal Words* in my Book, is an Aſſertion of a Matter of Fact, let them produce the Words, and juſtify his Allegation, or confeſs, that this is an Untruth publiſhed to the World: And ſince he makes ſo bold with Truth in a Matter viſible to every body, let the World be Judge, what Credit is to be given to his Allegations of Matters of Fact, in Things foreign to what I have printed; and that are not capable of a Negative Proof. A Sample whereof the Reader has at the Entrance in his *Introduction*, Page A 4. and the three or four following Pages. Where he affirms to the World not only what I know to be falſe; but what every one muſt ſee, he could not know to be true. For he pretends to know and deliver my Thoughts. And what the Character is of one that confidently affirms what he does not know, no body need be told.

But

But he adds, *I had before pleaded to the Indictment, and thereby owned it to be true.* This is to make good his Promiſe, *p.* 3. to keep at a diſtance from *my feeble Strugglings.* Here this ſtrong Arguer muſt prove, that what is not anſwer'd or deny'd in the very beginning of a Reply, or before the 38th Page, *is owned to be true.* In the mean time till he does that, I ſhall deſire ſuch of my Readers as think the *Unmasker*'s Veracity worth examining to ſee in my *Vindication*, from *p.* 550, 551. wherein is contain'd, what I have ſaid about *one Article*, whether I have *own'd* what he charged me with, on that Subject.

This Propoſition then remains upon him ſtill to be proved, *viz.*

I. *That I have over and over again theſe formal Words in my* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *viz. That nothing is required to be believed by any Chriſtian Man, but this, That Jeſus is the Meſſiah.*

He goes on *pag.* 5. *And indeed he could do no other, for it was the main Work he ſet himſelf about to find but one Article of Faith in all the Chapters of the four Evangliſts, and the Acts of the Apoſtles.* This is to make good his Promiſe, *pag.* 3. *To clear his Book from thoſe ſorry Objections and Cavils I had raiſed againſt it.* Several of my *ſorry Objections and Cavils* were to repreſent to the Reader, that a great part of what he ſaid was nothing but *Suſpicions* and *Conjectures*, and ſuch he could not but then own them to be. But now he has rid himſelf of all his *Conjectures*, and has raiſed them up into direct poſitive Affirmations, which being ſaid with Confidence without Proof, who can deny, but he has clear'd, throughly clear'd that Part from my *ſorry Objections and Cavils?* He ſays *it was the main Work I ſet my ſelf about to find but one Article of Faith.* This I muſt take the Liberty to deny: And I deſire him to prove it. A Man may *ſet himſelf to find two*, or as many as there be, and yet find but one: Or a Man may *ſet himſelf to find but one*, and yet find two or more. It is no Argument from what a Man has found, to prove what was his *main Work* to find, unleſs where his Aim was only to find what there was, whether more or leſs. For a Writer may find the Reputation of a poor contemptible Railer; nay, of a downright impudent Lyar, and yet no body will think it was his main Work to find that. Therefore Sir, if you will not find what 'tis like you did not ſeek, you muſt prove thoſe many confident Aſſertions, you have publiſhed, which I ſhall give you in tale, whereof this is the ſecond, *viz.*

II. That *the main Buſineſs I ſet my ſelf about, was to find but one Article of Faith.*

In the following part of this Sentence, he quotes my own Words, with the Pages where they are to be found; the firſt time, that, in either of his two Pages againſt me, he has vouchſafed to do ſo, concerning *one Article*, wherewith he has made ſo much noiſe. My Words in (*page.* 516. of this Vol. of) my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, ſtand thus: "*For that this is the ſole Doctrine preſſed and required to be believed in the whole tenor of our Saviour's and his Apoſtles preaching, we have ſhew'd through the whole Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts and Acts, and I challenge them to ſhew that there was any other Doctrine upon their Aſſent to which, or disbelief of it, Men were pronounced Believers or Unbelievers, and accordingly received into the Church of Chriſt, as Members of his Body, as far as mere believing could make them ſo; or elſe kept out. This was the only Goſpel Article of Faith which was preached to them.* Out of this Page, the *Unmasker* ſets down theſe Words, "*This is the SOLE Doctrine preſſed and required to be believed in the whole tenor of our Saviour's and his Apoſtles preaching*, p. 129. *this was the ONLY Goſpel Article of Faith which was preached to them.*

I ſhall paſs by all other Obſervations, that this way of citing theſe Words would ſuggeſt, and only remark, that if he brought theſe Words to prove the immediately preceding Aſſertion of his, *viz.* That *to find out but one Article of Faith was the main Work I ſet my ſelf about.* This Argument reduced into Form, will ſtand thus:

He who ſays, that this is the ſole Doctrine preſſed and required to be believed, in the whole Tenor of our Saviour's and his Apoſtles Preaching, upon their Aſſent to which, or disbelief of it, Men were pronounced Believers or Unbelievers, and accordingly received into the Church of Chriſt, as Members of his Body, as far as mere believing could make them ſo, or elſe kept out, ſets himſelf to find out but one Article of Faith, as his main Work. But the Vindicator did ſo: *Ergo.*

If this were the uſe he would make of thoſe Words of mine cited, I muſt deſire him to prove the *major*. But he talks ſo freely, and without Book, every where, that I ſuppoſe he thought himſelf, by the Privilege of a Declaimer, exempt from being called ſtrictly to an Account for what he ſo looſely ſays, and from proving what he ſhould be called to Account for. Rail luſtily, is a good Rule, ſomething of it will ſtick, true or falſe, proved or not proved.

If he alledges theſe Words of mine, to anſwer my Demand, *Vind. p.* 551. where he found that *I contended for one ſingle Article of Faith, with the Excluſion and Defiance of all the reſt* which he had charged me with. I ſay, it proves this as little as the former. For to ſay, " That I had ſhew'd through the whole Hiſtory of the *Evangeliſts*, " and the *Acts*, that this is the ſole Doctrine, or only Goſpel-Article preſſed and re- " quired to be believed in the whole Tenor of our Saviour and his Apoſtles Preaching; " upon their Aſſent to which, or disbelieving of it, Men were pronounced Believers or " Unbelievers, and accordingly received into the Church of Chriſt, or kept out; is the ſimple Aſſertion of a poſitive Matter of Fact, and ſo carries in it no *Defiance*, no, nor *Excluſion* of any other Doctrinal or Hiſtorical Truth contained in the Scripture: And therefore it remains ſtill on the *Unmasker* to ſhew where 'tis I expreſs any *Defiance* of any other Truth contained in the Word of God; or where I exclude any one Doctrine of the Scriptures. So that if it be true, that *I contend for one Article*, my Contention may be without any *Defiance*, or ſo much as *Excluſion* of any of the reſt, notwithſtanding any thing contained in theſe Words. Nay, if it ſhould happen that I am in a Miſtake, and that this was not the ſole Doctrine which our Saviour and his Apoſtles preached, and upon their Aſſent to which, Men were admitted into the Church; yet the *Unmasker's* Accuſation would be never the truer for that, unleſs it be neceſſary, that he that miſtakes in one Matter of Fact, ſhould be at *Defiance* with all other Truths; or, that he who erroneouſly ſays, that our Saviour and his Apoſtles admitted Men into the Church upon the believing him to be the *Meſſiah*, does thereby exclude all other Truths publiſhed to the Jews before, or to Chriſtian Believers afterwards.

If theſe Words be brought to prove, that I contended for *one Article*, barely *one Article*, without any *Defiance* or *Excluſion* annext to that Contention; I ſay, neither do they prove that, as is manifeſt from the Words themſelves, as well as from what I ſaid elſewhere concerning the Article of One God. For here, I ſay, this is the only Goſpel-Article, *&c.* upon which Men were pronounced Believers; which plainly intimates ſome other Article known and believed in the World before, and without the preaching of the Goſpel.

To this the *Unmasker* thinks he has provided a *Salvo* in theſe Words, *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, p. 6. *And when I told him of this one Article, he knew well enough that I did not exclude the Article of the Diety, for that is a Principle of Natural Religion.* If it be fit for an *Unmasker* to perceive what is in debate, he would know, that the Queſtion is not, what he *excluded* or *excluded not*, but what Articles he charged me to have *excluded*.

Taking it therefore to be his Meaning (which it muſt be, if he meant any thing to the purpoſe,) *viz.* That when he charged me ſo often and poſitively for conteſting for *one Article*, *viz.* that *Jeſus was the Meſſiah*, he did not intend to accuſe me for excluding *the Article of the Deity*. To prove that he did not ſo intend it, he tells me, that *I knew that he did not*.

Anſw. How ſhould I know it? he never told me ſo either in his Book, or otherwiſe. This I know, that he ſaid, *p.* 115. That *I contended for one Article, with the Excluſion of all the reſt*. If then the Belief of the Diety, be an Article of Faith, and be not the Article of *Jeſus* being the *Meſſiah*, it is one *of the reſt*; and if *all the reſt* were excluded, certainly that being one of *all the reſt*, muſt be excluded. How then he could ſay, *I knew that he excluded it not, i. e.* meant not that I *excluded* it, when he poſitively ſays, I did *exclude it*, I cannot tell, unleſs he thought that I knew him ſo well, that when he ſaid one thing, I knew that he meant another, and that the quite contrary.

He now, it ſeems, acknowledges that I affirmed, that the Belief of the Deity, as well as of *Jeſus* being the *Meſſiah*, was required to make a Man a Believer. The believing in *one God the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth*, is one Article; and in *Jeſus Chriſt his only Son our Lord*, is another Article. Theſe therefore being *two Articles*, and both aſſerted by me to be required to make a Man a Chriſtian, let us ſee with what Truth or Ingenuity the *Unmasker* could apply, beſides that above-mention'd, theſe following Expreſſions to me, as he does without any Exception. *Why then muſt*

muſt there be one *Article, and* no more? *p.* 115. *Going to make a Religion for his Mermidons, he contracts all into* one *Article, and will trouble them with* no more, *p.* 117. *Away with Syſtems, away with Creeds, let us have but* one Article, *though it be* with Diſiance of all the reſt, *p.* 118. *Thus we ſee why he reduces* all Belief *to that* one *Article before rehearſed*, p. 120. And all this without any the leaſt Exception of the *Article of a Deity*, as he now pretends. Nor could he indeed, as is evident from his own Words, *p.* 121, 122. *To conclude, this Gentleman and his Fellows are reſolved to be* Unitarians, *they are for* one *Article of Faith, as well as* one *Perſon in the Godhead*: — *But if theſe learned Men were not prejudiced* — *they would perceive, that when the* Catholick Faith *is thus brought down to* one ſingle Article, *it will ſoon be reduced to* none, *the* Unite *will dwindle into a* Cypher. By which the Reader may ſee, that his Intention was, to perſuade the World, that I reduced *ALL BELIEF*, the *CATHOLICK FAITH* (they are his own Words) *to one ſingle Article and no more.* For if he had given but the leaſt hint, that I allowed of *two*, all the Wit and Strength of Argument contained in *Unitarians*, *Unite* and *Cypher*, with which he winds up all, had been utterly loſt, and dwindled into palpable Nonſenſe.

To demonſtrate that this was the Senſe he would be underſtood in, we are but to obſerve what he ſays again, *p.* 50. of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, where he tells his Readers, That *I and my Friends, have new modell'd the Apoſtles Creed; yea indeed, have preſented them with ONE Article, inſtead of TWELVE.* And hence we may ſee what Sincerity there is in the Reaſon he brings to prove that he did not exclude the *Article of the Deity. For*, ſays he, *p. 6. that is a principle of Natural Religion.*

Anſw. Ergo, He did not in poſitive Words, without any Exception, ſay, I reduced *all Belief, the Catholick Faith, to one ſingle Article, and no more.* But to make good his Promiſe, *not to reſemble me in the little Artifices of Evading*, he wipes his Mouth, and ſays at the bottom of this Page, *But the Reader ſees his* [the Vindicator's] *ſhuffling.* Whilſt the Article of *One God* is a Part of *ALL Belief, a Part of the Catholick Faith*, ALL which he affirm'd I concluded, but the one Article concerning the *Meſſiah*, every one will ſee where the *ſhuffling* is: And if it be not clear enough from thoſe Words themſelves, let thoſe above quoted out of *p.* 50. of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, where he ſays, That *I have new-modell'd the Apoſtles Creed, and preſented the World with ONE Article inſtead of TWELVE*, be an Interpretation of them. For if the Article of *One Eternal God, Maker of Heaven and Earth*, be one of the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed, and the one Article I *preſented* them with be not that, 'tis plain, he did and would be underſtood to mean, that by my one Article, I excluded that of the One Eternal God, which Branch ſoever of Religion, either Natural or Revealed, it belongs to.

I do not endeavour to *perſuade the Reader*, as he ſays, *p. 6. that he miſunderſtood me*; but yet every body will ſee, that he miſrepreſented me. And I challenge him to ſay, that thoſe Expreſſions above quoted out of him, concerning *One Article*, in the obvious Senſe of the Words, as they ſtand in his Accuſation of me, were true?

This flies ſo directly in his Face, that he labours mightily to get it off, and therefore adds theſe Words, *My Diſcourſe did not treat (neither doth his Book run that Way) of Principles of Natural Religion, but of the Revealed, and particularly the Chriſtian: Accordingly this was it which I taxed him with, That of all the Principles and Articles of Chriſtianity, he choſe out but one as neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian.*

Anſw. His Book was of——*Atheiſm*, which one may think ſhould make his *Diſcourſe treat of Natural Religion.* But I paſs by that, and bid him tell me where he taxed me, *That of all the Principles and Articles of Chriſtianity, I choſe out but one*: Let him ſhew in all his Diſcourſe but ſuch a Word, or any thing ſaid like *one Article of Chriſtianity*, and I will grant that he meant particularly, but ſpoke generally; miſled his Reader, and left himſelf a Subterfuge. But if there be no Expreſſion to be in found in him tending that way, all this is but the covering of one Falſhood with another, which thereby only becomes the groſſer. Though if he had in expreſs Word, taxed me, *That of all the Principles and Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, I choſe out but one*, that would not at all help him, till he farther declares, that the Belief of One God is not an *Article of the Chriſtian Religion.* For of *ALL the Articles of the Chriſtian Religion*, he ſays, *I choſe but one*; which not being that of a Deity, his Words plainly import, that that was left out among the reſt, unleſs it be poſſible for a Man to chuſe but one

Article

Article of the Chriſtian Religion, *viz.* That *Jeſus is the Meſſiah*; and at the ſame time to chuſe Two Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, *viz.* That there is One Eternal God, and that *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*. If he had ſpoken clearly, and like a fair Man, he ſhould have ſaid, That he taxed me with chuſing but One Article of revealed Religion. This had been plain and direct to his Purpoſe: But then he knew the Falſhood of it would be too obvious: For in the ſeven Pages wherein he taxes me ſo much with *One Article*, Chriſtianity is ſeveral times named, though not once to the Purpoſe he here pretends. But Revelation is not ſo much as once mentioned in them, nor, as I remember, in any of the Pages he beſtows upon me.

To conclude, the ſeveral Paſſages above quoted out of him, concerning *one ſole Article*, are all in general Terms, without any the leaſt Limitation or Reſtriction; and as they ſtand in him, fit to perſuade the Reader that I excluded all other Articles whatſoever, but that one of *Jeſus the Meſſiah*: And if in that Senſe they are not true, they are ſo many Falſhoods of his repeated there, to miſlead others into a wrong Opinion of me. For if he had had a mind his Readers ſhould have been rightly informed, why was it not as eaſy once to explain himſelf, as ſo often to affirm it in general and unreſtrained Terms? This all the boaſted Strength of the *Unmasker* will not be able to get him out of. This very well becomes one who ſo loudly charges me with *Shuffling*, Having repeated the ſame thing over and over again, in as general Terms as was poſſible, without any the leaſt Limitation in the whole Diſcourſe, to have nothing elſe to plead when required to prove it, but that it was meant in a limited Senſe, in an *Unmasker*, is not *Shuffling*. For by this way he may have the Convenience to ſay and unſay what he pleaſes; to vent what Stuff he thinks for his Turn; and when he is called to an Account for it, reply, He meant no ſuch thing. Should any one publiſh, that the *Unmasker* had but *One Article of Faith and no more*, *viz.* That the Doctrines in faſhion, and likely to procure Preferment, are alone to be received; that *all his Belief* was compriſed in this *one ſingle Article*: And when ſuch a Talker was demanded to prove his Aſſertion, ſhould he ſay, he meant, to except his Belief of the Apoſtles Creed: Would he not, notwithſtanding ſuch a Plea, be thought a ſhuffling Lyar? And if the *Unmasker* can no otherwiſe prove thoſe univerſal Propoſitions above-cited, but by ſaying, he meant them with a tacit Reſtriction, (for none is expreſſed) they will ſtill and for ever remain to be accounted for by his Veracity.

What he ſays in the next Paragraph, *p.* 7. of my *ſplitting One Article into Two*, is juſt of the ſame Force, and with the ſame Ingenuity. I had ſaid, That the Belief of One God was neceſſary; which is not denied: I had alſo ſaid, "That the Belief of "*Jeſus* of *Nazareth* to be the *Meſſiah*, together with thoſe concomitant Articles of his "Reſurrection, Rule, and coming again to Judge the World, was neceſſary, *p.* 538. "And again, *p.* 540. That God had declared, whoever would believe *Jeſus* to be the "Saviour promiſed, and take him now raiſed from the Dead, and conſtituted the "Lord and Judge of all Men, to be their King and Ruler, ſhall be ſaved." This made me ſay *Theſe* and *Thoſe Articles* (in Words of the plural Number) more than once; evidence enough to any but a Caviller, that I *contended* not *for one ſingle Article and no more*. And to mind him of it, I in my *Vindication*, reprinted one of thoſe Places where I had done ſo; and that he might not, according to his manner, overlook what does not pleaſe him, the Words, THESE ARE ARTICLES, were printed in great Characters. Whereupon he makes this Remark, *p.* 7. *And though ſince he has tried to ſplit this One into Two*, p. 28. *yet he labours in vain: For to believe Jeſus to be the Meſſiah, amounts to the ſame with believing him to be King and Ruler; his being Anointed* (i. e. *being the* Meſſiah) *including that in it: Yet he has the Vanity to add in great Characters, THESE ARE ARTICLES; as if the putting them into theſe great Letters, would make make One Article Two.*

Anſw. Though no Letters will make One Article Two; yet that there is one God, and Jeſus Chriſt his only Son our Lord, who roſe again from the Dead, aſcended into Heaven, and ſitteth on the Right-Hand of God, ſhall come to judge the Quick and the Dead, are in the Apoſtles Creed ſet down as more than One Article, and therefore may very properly be called THESE ARTICLES, without ſplitting One into Two.

What, in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, I have ſaid of *One Article*, I ſhall always own; and in what Senſe I ſaid it, is eaſy to be underſtood; and with a Man of the leaſt Candor, whoſe Aim was Truth, and not Wrangling, it would not have occaſion'd one Word of Diſpute. But as for this *Unmasker*, who made it his Buſineſs not

to

to convince me of any Miſtakes in my Opinion, but barely to miſrepreſent me; my Buſineſs at preſent with him, is to ſhew the World, that what he has captiouſly and ſcurrilouſly ſaid of me relating to *one Article*, is falſe; and that he neither has nor can prove one of thoſe Aſſertions concerning it, above-cited out of him in his own Words. Nor let him pretend a Meaning againſt his direct Words: Such a Caviller as he, who would ſhelter himſelf under the Pretence of a Meaning, whereof there are no Footſteps, whoſe Diſputes are only Calumnies directed againſt the Author, without examining the Truth or Falſhood of what I had publiſhed, is not to expect the Allowances one would make to a fair and ingenuous Adverſary, who ſhew'd ſo much Concern for Truth, that he treated of it with a Serioufneſs due to the Weightineſs of the Matter, and uſed other Arguments beſides Obloquy, Clamour and Falſhoods, againſt what he thought Error. And therefore I again poſitively demand of him to prove theſe Words of his to be true, or confeſs that he cannot: *viz.*

III. *That I contend for One Article of Faith, with the Excluſion and Defiance of all the reſt.*

Two other Inſtances of this Sort of Arguments I gave in the 551ſt Page of my *Vindication*, out of the 115th and 119th Pages of his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, and I here demand of him again to ſhew, ſince he has not thought fit hitherto to give any Anſwer to it.

IV. *Where I urge, that there muſt be nothing in Chriſtianity, that is not plain, and exactly levelled to all Mens Mother Wit, and every common Apprehenſion.*

Or where he finds, in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, this other Propoſition:

V. *That the very Manner of every thing in Chriſtianity muſt be clear and intelligible; every thing muſt immediately be comprehended by the weakeſt Noddle, or elſe it is no Part of Religion, eſpecially of Chriſtianity.*

Theſe Things he muſt prove that I have ſaid: I put it again upon him to ſhew where I ſaid them, or elſe to confeſs the Forgery: For till he does one or t'other, he ſhall be ſure to have theſe, with a large Catalogue of other Falſhoods, laid before him.

Pag. 25. of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, he endeavours to make good his Saying, that *I ſet up One Article, with Defiance of all the reſt*, in theſe Words; *For what is excluding them wholly, but defying them? Wherefore, ſeeing he utterly excludes all the reſt, by repreſenting them as USELESS to the making a Man a Chriſtian, which is the Deſign of his whole Undertaking, it is manifeſt that he defies them.*

Anſw. This at leaſt is *manifeſt* from hence, that the *Unmasker* knows not, or cares not what he ſays. For whoever, but he, thought that a bare *Excluſion*, or paſſing by, was *Defiance?* If he underſtands it ſo, I would adviſe him not to ſeek Preferment. For Excluſions will happen; and if every *Excluſion* be *Defiance*, a Man had need be well aſſured of his own good Temper, who ſhall not think his Peace and Charity in Danger, amongſt ſo many Enemies that are at *Defiance* with him? *Defiance*, if with any Propriety it can be ſpoken of an Article of Faith, muſt ſignify a profeſſed Enmity to it. For in its proper Uſe, which is to Perſons, it ſignifies an open and declared Enmity raiſed to that Height, that he in whom it is, challenges the Party *defied* to Battle, that he may there wreak his Hatred on his Enemy in his Deſtruction. So that *my Defiance of all the reſt* remains ſtill to be proved.

But, *Secondly*, There is another Thing *manifeſt* from theſe Words of his, *viz.* That notwithſtanding his great Brags in his firſt Paragraph, his main Skill lies, in fanſying what would be for his Turn, and then confidently fathering it upon me. It never enter'd into my Thoughts, nor, I think, into any body's elſe, (I muſt always except the acute *Unmasker*, who makes no Difference between *Uſeful* and *Neceſſary*) that all but the fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith were *uſeleſs* to make a Man a Chriſtian; though, if it be true, that the Belief of the Fundamentals alone (be they few or many) is all that is *neceſſary* to his being made a Chriſtian, all that may any way perſuade him to believe them, may certainly be uſeful towards the making him a Chriſtian: And therefore here again I muſt propoſe to him, and leave it with him to be ſhew'd, where it is,

VI. *I have*

VI. *I have repreſented all the reſt as uſeleſs to the making a Man a Chriſtian?* And how it appears, *that this is the Deſign of my whole Undertaking?*

In his Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm, he ſays, *pag.* 115. *What makes him contend for one ſingle Article with the Excluſion of all the reſt? He pretends it is this, that all Men ought to underſtand their Religion.* This Reaſoning I diſowned, *p.* 550. of my *Vindication*, and intimated, *p.* 27. that he ſhould have quoted the Page where I ſo *pretended*. To this *p.* 26. he tells me with great Confidence, and in abundance of Words, as we ſhall ſee by and by, that I had done ſo; as if Repetition were a Proof. He had done better to have quoted one Place, where I ſo pretend. Indeed *p.* 27. for want of ſomething better, he quotes theſe Words of mine out of *p.* 540. of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*. *The all-merciful God ſeems herein to have conſulted the Poor of this World, and the Bulk of Mankind. THESE ARE ARTICLES that the labouring and illiterate Man may comprehend.* I ask whether it be poſſible for one to bring any thing more direct againſt himſelf? The Thing he was to prove was, that *I contended for one ſingle Article with the Excluſion of all the reſt, becauſe I pretended, that all Men ought to underſtand their Religion*, i. e. The Reaſon I gave, why there was to be *but one ſingle Article in Religion with the Excluſion of all the reſt*, was, becauſe Men ought to underſtand their Religion. And the Place he brings to prove my *Contending* upon that Ground *for one ſingle Article with the Excluſion of all the reſt*, is a Paſſage wherein I ſpeak of more than one Article, and ſay *theſe Articles*. Whether I ſaid *Theſe Articles* properly or improperly, it matters not in the preſent Caſe (and that we have examin'd in another Place) 'tis plain, I meant more than one Article, when I ſaid *theſe Articles*; and did not think, that the labouring and illiterate Man could not underſtand them, if they were more than one: And therefore I *pretended* not, that there muſt be but one, becauſe by illiterate Men more than one could not be underſtood. The reſt of this Paragraph is nothing but a Repetition of the ſame Aſſertion without Proof, which with the *Unmasker*, often paſſes for a Way of proving, but with no body elſe.

But, that I may keep that Diſtance, which he boaſts there is betwixt his and my Way of Writing, I ſhall not ſay this without Proofs. One Inſtance of his Repetition, of which there is ſuch Plenty in his Book, pray take here. His Buſineſs *p.* 26. is to prove, that *I pretended that I contended for one ſingle Article with the Excluſion of all the reſt, becauſe all Men ought to underſtand their Religion*, pag. 480. of my *Vindication*, I denied that I had ſo *pretended*. To convince me that I had, thus he proceeds.

Unmasker. *He founds his Conceit* of one Article *partly upon this, that a Multitude of Doctrines is obſcure, and hard to be underſtood.*

Anſwer. You ſay it, and had ſaid it before: But I ask you, as I did before, where I did ſo?

Unm. *And therefore he truſſes all up in one Article, that the poor People and Bulk of Mankind may bear it.*

Anſw. I deſire again to know where I made that Inference, and argued ſo for *one Article.*

Unm. *This is the Scope of a great Part of his Book.*

Anſw. This is Saying again, ſhew it once.

Unm. *But his Memory does not keep Pace with his Invention, and thence he ſays, he remembers nothing of this in his Book*, Vind. p. 550.

Anſw. This is to ſay, that it is in my Book. You have ſaid it more than once already; I demand of you to ſhew me where.

Unm. *This worthy Writer does not know his own Reaſoning, that he uſes.*

Anſw. I ask where does he uſe that *Reaſoning?*

Unm. *As particularly thus, that he troubles Chriſtian Men with no more, but* one Article: *BECAUSE that is intelligible, and all People high and low may comprehend it.*

Anſw. We have heard it affirm'd by you over and over again, but the Queſtion ſtill is, Where is that Way of arguing to be found in my Book?

Unm. *For he has choſen our, as he thinks, a plain and eaſy Article. Whereas the others, which are commonly propounded, are not generally agreed on (he ſaith,) and are dubious and uncertain. But the Believing that Jeſus the Meſſiah has nothing of Doubtfulneſs or Obſcurity in it.*

Anſw.

Anſw. The Word *For*, in the Beginning of this Sentence, makes it ſtand for one of your Reaſons; though it be but a Repetition of the ſame Thing in other Words.

Unm. *THIS the Reader will find to be the Drift and Deſign of ſeveral of his Pages.*

Anſw. This muſt ſignify, *That I trouble Men with no more but one Article becauſe* one only *is intelligible*, and then it is but a Repetition. If any thing elſe be meant by the Word *This*, it is nothing to the Purpoſe. For that I ſaid, that all Things neceſſary to be believ'd are plain in Scripture, and eaſy to be underſtood, I never deny'd; and ſhould be very ſorry, and recant it, if I had.

Unm. *And the Reaſon why I did not quote any ſingle one of them, was, becauſe he inſiſts on it ſo long together: and ſpins it out after this Way, in* p. 540. *of his* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *where he ſets down the* " ſhort, plain, eaſy and " intelligible Summary (*as he calls it*) of Religion, *couch'd in a ſingle Arti-* " *cle: He immediately adds*; The All-merciful God ſeems herein to have con- " ſulted the Poor of this World, and the Bulk of Mankind: Theſe are Articles " (*whereas he had ſet down but one*) that the labouring and illiterate Man may " comprehend."

Anſw. If *my inſiſting on it ſo long together*, was the Cauſe why, in your *Thoughts of the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, you did not quote any ſingle Paſſage; methinks here, in your *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, where you knew it was expected of you, my *inſiſting on it*, as you ſay, *ſo long together*, might have afforded at leaſt one Quotation to your Purpoſe.

Unm. *He aſſigns this as a Ground why it was God's Pleaſure that there ſhould be but* ONE POINT *of Faith,* BECAUSE *thereby Religion may be underſtood the better; the Generality of the People may comprehend it.*

Anſw. I hear you ſay it again, but want a Proof ſtill, and ask where I *aſſign that Ground?*

Unm. *This he repreſents as a great Kindneſs done by God to Man, whereas the Variety of Articles would be hard to be underſtood.*

Anſw. Again the ſame Cabbage; an Affirmation, but no Proof.

Unm. *This he enlarges upon, and flouriſhes it over after his Faſhion: And yet he deſires to know, When he ſaid ſo?* p. 551. *Vindic.*

Anſw. And if I did, let the World here take a Sample of the *Unmasker's* Ability or Truth, who ſpends above two whole Pages, 26, 27. in Repetitions of the ſame Aſſertion, without the producing any but one Place, for Proof; and that too againſt him, as I have ſhewn. But he has not yet done with confounding me by Dint of Repetition; he goes on.

Unm. *Good Sir, let me be permitted to acquaint you, that your Memory is as defective as your Judgment.*

Anſw. I thank you for the Regard you have had to it; for often Repetition is a good Help to a bad Memory. In requital, I adviſe you to have ſome Eye to your own *Memory* and *Judgment* too. For one or both of them ſeem a little to blame in the Reaſon you ſubjoin to the foregoing Words, *viz.*

Unm. *For in the very* Vindication *you attribute it to the Goodneſs and Condeſcenſion of the Almighty, that he requires nothing as abſolutely neceſſary to be believed, but what is ſuited to vulgar Capacities, and the Comprehenſion of illiterate Men.*

Anſw. I will, for the *Unmasker's* Sake, put this Argument of his into a Sylogiſm. If the *Vindicator*, in his *Vindication*, attributes it to the Goodneſs and Condeſcenſion of the Almighty, that he requires nothing to be believed, but what is ſuited to vulgar Capacities, and the Comprehenſion of illiterate Men; then he did, in his *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, pretend, that the Reaſon why he contended for *one* Article with the Excluſion of all the reſt, was, becauſe all Men ought to underſtand their Religion.

But the *Vidicator*, in his *Vindication*, attributes it to the Goodneſs and Condeſcenſion of Almighty God, that he requires nothing to be believed, but what is ſuited to vulgar Capacities, and the Comprehenſion of illiterate Men.

Ergo, in his *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, he pretended, that the Reaſon why he contended for one Article with the Excluſion of all the reſt, was becauſe all Men ought to underſtand their Religion.

This was the Propoſition to be proved, and which, as he confeſſes here, *p.* 26. I deny'd to remember to be in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity.* Who can but admire his Logick!

But beſides the Strength of *Judgment*, which you have ſhewed in this clear and cogent Reaſoning, Does not your *Memory* too deſerve its due Applauſe? You tell me, in your *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, that in * *p.* 29. of my *Vindication*, I deſir'd to know *when* I ſaid ſo. To which Deſire of mine, you reply in theſe Words before cited; *Good Sir, let me be permitted to acquaint you that your Memory is as defective as your Judgment; for in the very Vindication you attribute it to the Goodneſs and Condeſcenſion of the Almighty, that he requires nothing as abſolutely neceſſary to be believed, but what is ſuited to vulgar Capacities, and the Comprehenſion of illiterate Men*, p. 30.

* P. 551. this Edit.

Sure the *Unmasker* thinks himſelf at croſs Queſtions. I ask him in the 29*th* Page of my *Vindication*, *WHEN* I ſaid ſo? And he anſwers, that I had ſaid ſo in the 30*th* Page of my *Vindication*; i. e. when I writ the 29*th* Page, I ask'd the Queſtion, *When* I had ſaid, what he charg'd me with ſaying? And I am anſwer'd, I had ſaid it in the 30*th* Page; which was not yet written: *i. e.* I ask'd the Queſtion to day, *WHEN* I had ſaid ſo? And I am anſwer'd, I had ſaid it to morrow. As appoſite and convincing an Anſwer, to make good his Charge, as if he had ſaid, To morrow I found a Horſe-ſhoe. But perhaps this judicious Diſputant will eaſe himſelf of this Difficulty, by looking again into the 29*th* Page of my *Vindication*, out of which he cites theſe Words for mine; *I deſire to know WHEN I ſaid ſo?* But my Words in that Place are, *I deſire to know WHERE I ſaid ſo?* A Mark of his Exactneſs in quoting, when he vouchſafes to do it. For *Unmaskers*, when they turn Diſputants, think it the beſt Way to talk at large, and charge home in Generals: But do not often find it convenient to quote Pages, ſet down Words, and come to Particulars. But if he had quoted my Words right, his Anſwer had been juſt as pertinent. For I ask him *WHERE*, in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, I had ſaid ſo? And he anſwers, I had ſaid ſo in my *Vindication*. For *where*, in my Queſtion, refers to my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, which the *Unmasker* had ſeen, and charg'd with this Saying; and could not refer to my *Vindication*, which he had not yet ſeen, nor to a Paſſage in it, which was not then written. But this is nothing with an *Unmasker*; therefore what is yet worſe, thoſe Words of mine, *Vindication*, p. 29. relate not to the Paſſage he is here proving I had ſaid, but to another different from it; as different as it is to ſay, *That becauſe all Men are to underſtand their Religion, therefore there is to be but one Article in it*; and to ſay, *That there muſt be nothing in Chriſtianity that is plain and exactly levell'd to all Mens Mother Wit:* Both which he falſly charges on me; but 'tis only to the latter of them, that my Words, *I deſire to know where I ſaid ſo?* are apply'd.

Perhaps the well-meaning Man ſees no Difference between theſe two Propoſitions, yet I ſhall take the Liberty to ask him again, *Where* I ſaid either of them, as if they were two? Although he ſhould accuſe me again of *excepting againſt the Formality of Words*, and doing ſo fooliſh a Thing as to expect, that a diſputing *Unmasker* ſhould account for his Words, or any Propoſition he advances. 'Tis his Priviledge to plead he did not mean as his Words import, and without any more ado he is aſſoil'd; and he is the ſame *Unmasker* he was before. But let us hear him out on the Argument he was upon, for his Repetitions on it are not yet done. His next Words are,

Unm. *It is clear then, that you found your ONE Article on this, that it is ſuited to the vulgar Capacities: Whereas the other Articles, mention'd by me, are obſcure and ambiguous, and therefore ſurpaſs the Comprehenſion of the illiterate.*

Anſw. The latter Part indeed is now the firſt Time imputed to me; but all the reſt is nothing but an unprov'd Repetition, though uſhered in with *it is clear then*; Words that ſhould have a Proof going before them.

Unm. *But yet you pretend, that you have forgot that any ſuch Thing was ſaid by you.*

Anſw. I have indeed forgot, and notwithſtanding all your Pains by ſo many Repetitions to beat it into my Head, I fear I ſhall never remember it.

Unm. *Which ſhews that you are careleſs of your Words, and that you forget what you write.*

Anſw.

Anſw. So you told me before, and this repeating of it does no more convince me than that did.

Unm. *What ſhall we ſay to ſuch an oblivious Author.*

Anſw. Shew it him in his Book, or elſe he will never be able to remember that it is there, nor any body elſe be able to find it.

Unm. *He takes no notice of what falls from his own Pen.*

Anſw. So you have told him more than once. Try him once with ſhewing it him, amongſt other Things which fell from his own Pen, and ſee what then he will ſay: That perhaps may refreſh his Memory.

Unm. *And therefore within a Page or two he confutes himſelf, and gives himſelf the Lye.*

Anſw. 'Tis a Fault he deſerves to be told of over and over again. But he ſays, he ſhall not be able to find the two Pages wherein he *gives himſelf the Lye*, unleſs you ſet down their Numbers, and the Words in them, which confute, and which are confuted.

I beg my Reader's Pardon, for laying before him ſo large a Pattern of our *Unmasker*'s new-faſhion'd Stuff; his fine Tiſſue of Argumentation not eaſily to be match'd but by the ſame Hand. But it lay altogether in *p.* 26, 27, 28. and it was fit the Reader ſhould have this one Inſtance of the Excellencies he promiſes in his firſt Paragraph, in Oppoſition to my *Impertinencies, Incoherencies, weak and feeble Stugglings.* Other Excellencies he there promis'd upon the ſame Ground, which I ſhall give my Reader a Taſte of in fit Places: Not but that the Whole is of a Piece, and one cannot miſs ſome of them in every Page; but to tranſcribe them all, would be more than they are worth. If any one deſires more Plenty, I ſend him to his Book it ſelf. But ſaying a thouſand Times not being proving once, it remans upon him ſtill to ſhew,

VII. Where, in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, I pretend that I contend for one ſingle Article, with the Excluſion of all the reſt, becauſe all Men ought to underſtand their Religion.*

And in the next Place, Where it is that I ſay,

VIII. *That there muſt be nothing in Chriſtianity that is not plain and exactly level to all Mens Mother-Wit.*

Let us now return to his 8*th* Page. For the bundling together, as was fit, all that he has ſaid in diſtant Places upon the Subject of *One Article*, has made me treſpaſs a little againſt the *Jewiſh* Character of a *well-bred Man*, recommended by him to me out of the *Miſhna*. Though I propoſe to my ſelf to follow him as near as I can, Step by Step, as he proceeds.

In the 110*th* and 111*th* Pages of his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, he gave us a Liſt of his *Fundamental Articles*: Upon which I thus applied my ſelf to him, *Vind.* p. 5. "Give me Leave now to ask you ſeriouſly, Whether theſe you "have here ſet down under the Title of *Fundamental Doctrines*, are ſuch (when "reduc'd to Propoſitions) that every one of them is required to make a Man a "Chriſtian, and ſuch as without the actual Belief thereof, he cannot be ſav'd? "If they are not ſo every one of them, you may call them *Fundamental Doctrines* "as much as you pleaſe, they are not of thoſe Doctrines of Faith, I was ſpeak-"ing of; which are only ſuch as are requir'd to be actually believ'd to make a "Man a Chriſtian." And again, *Vindic.* p. 18. I ask'd him whether juſt theſe, "neither more nor leſs," were thoſe neceſſary Articles.

To which we have his Anſwer, *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, p. 8, &c. From *p.* 8. to 20. he has quoted near forty Texts of Scripture, of which he ſaith, *p.* 21. *Thus I have briefly ſet before* the Reader thoſe *Evangelical Truths, thoſe Chriſtian Principles which belong to the very Eſſence of Chriſtianity: I have prov'd them to be ſuch, and I have reduc'd moſt of them to certain Propoſitions, which is a Thing the Vindicator call'd for.*

Anſw. Yes: But that was not all the *Vindicator* call'd for, and had Reaſon to expect. For I ask'd, "Whether thoſe the *Unmasker* gave us in his *Thoughts*

" *concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, were the Fundamental Doctrines, without " an actual Belief whereof, a Man could not be a Chriſtian; juſt all, neither " more nor leſs?" This I had Reaſon to demand from him, or from any one, who queſtions that Part of my Book, and I ſhall inſiſt upon it till he does it, or confeſſes he cannot. For having ſet down the Articles, which the Scripture, upon a diligent Search, ſeem'd to me to require as neceſſary, and only neceſſary; I ſhall not loſe my Time in examining what another ſays againſt thoſe Fundamentals, which I have gather'd out of the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, till he gives me a Liſt of his Fundamentals which he will bide by; that ſo by comparing them together, I may ſee which is the true Catalogue of Neceſſaries. For after ſo ſerious and diligent a Search, which has given me Light and Satisfaction in this great Point, I ſhall not quit it, and ſet my ſelf on float again, at the Demand of any one who would have me be of his Faith, without telling me what it is. Thoſe Fundamentals the Scripture has ſo plainly given, and ſo evidently determin'd, that it would be the greateſt Folly imaginable to part with this Rule for asking; and give up my ſelf blindly to the Conduct of one, who either knows not, or will not tell me, what are the Points neceſſary to be believed to make me a Chriſtian. He that ſhall find fault with my Collection of Fundamentals only to unſettle me, and not to give me a better of his own, I ſhall not think worth minding, till, like a fair Man, he puts himſelf upon equal Terms, and makes up the Defects of mine by a compleat one of his own. For a Deficiency or Error in one Neceſſary is as fatal, and as certainly excludes a Man from being a Chriſtian, as in an hundred. When any one offers me a compleat Catalogue of his Fundamentals, he does not unreaſonably demand me to quit mine for nothing: I have then one, that being ſet by mine, I may compare them; and ſo be able to chuſe the true and perfect one, and relinquiſh the other.

He that does not do this, plainly declares, that (without ſhewing me the certain Way to Salvation) he expects that I ſhould depend on him with an implicit Faith, whilſt he reſerves to himſelf the Liberty to require of me to believe what he ſhall think fit, as he ſees Occaſion; and in Effect, ſays thus, " Diſtruſt thoſe " Fundamentals, which the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, have " ſhew'd to be all that is neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; " and though I cannot tell you, what are thoſe other Articles which are neceſ- " ſary and ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian, yet take me for your Guide, " and that is as good, as if I made up, in a compleat Liſt, the Defects of your " Fundamentals." To which this is a ſufficient Anſwer, *Si quid noviſti rectius imperti, ſi non, his utere mecum.*

The *Unmasker*, of his own accord, *p.* 110. of his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, ſets down ſeveral, which he calls *Fundamental Doctrines*. I ask him, whether thoſe be all? For Anſwer, he adds more to them in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*: But in a great Pet refuſes to tell me, whether this ſecond Liſt of Fundamentals be compleat: And, inſtead of anſwering ſo reaſonable a Demand, pays me with ill Language, in theſe Words, *pag.* 22. ſubjoin'd to thoſe laſt quoted, *If what I have ſaid will not content him, I am ſure I can do nothing that will; and therefore if he ſhould capriciouſly require any thing more, it would be as great Folly in me to comply with it, as it is in him to move it.* If I did ask a Queſtion which troubles you, be not ſo angry; you your ſelf were the Occaſion of it. I propos'd my Collection of Fundamentals, which I had with great Care ſought; and thought I had found clear in the Scripture; you tell me no, it is imperfect, and offer me one of your own. I ask whether that be perfect? Thereupon you grow into Choler, and tell me 'tis a fooliſh Queſtion. Why! then I think it was not very wiſe in you ſo forwardly to offer one, unleſs you had had one ready, not liable to the ſame Exception. Would you have me ſo fooliſh to take a Liſt of Fundamentals from you, who have not yet one for your ſelf; nor are yet reſolv'd with your ſelf, what Doctrines are to be put in, or left out of it? Farther, pray tell me, if you had a ſettled Collection of Fundamentals that you would ſtand to, why ſhould I take them from you upon your Word, rather than from an *Anabaptiſt*, or a *Quaker*, or an *Arminian*, or a *Socinian*, or a *Lutheran*, or a *Papiſt*; who, I think, are not perfectly agreed with you, or one another in Fundamentals? And yet there is none amongſt them,

them, that I have not as much Reaſon to believe upon his bare Word, as an *Unmasker*, who, to my certain Knowledge, will make bold with Truth. If you ſet up for Infallibility, you may have ſome Claim to have your bare Word taken, before any other but the Pope. But yet, if you demand to be an unqueſtionable Propoſer, of what is abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, you muſt perform it a little better than hitherto you have done. For it is not enough ſometimes to give us Texts of Scripture; ſometimes Propoſitions of your own framing, and ſometimes Texts of Scripture, out of which they are to be fram'd; as *pag.* 14. you ſay, *Theſe and the like Places afford us ſuch Fundamental and Neceſſary Doctrines as theſe:* And again, *p.* 16. after the naming ſeveral other Texts of Scripture, you add, *which Places yield us ſuch Propoſitions as theſe;* and then in both Places ſet down what you think fit to draw out of them. And *Page* 15. you have theſe Words: *And here likewiſe it were eaſy to ſhew, that Adoption, Juſtification, Pardon of Sins,* &c. *which are Privileges and Benefits beſtow'd upon us by the Meſſiah, are Neceſſary Matters of our Belief.* By all which, as well as the whole Frame, wherein you make ſhew of giving us your Fundamental Articles, it is plain, that what you have given us there, is nothing leſs than a compleat Collection of Fundamentals, even in your own Opinion of it.

But, good Sir, Why is it a *fooliſh* Queſtion in me? You have found fault with my Summary for being ſhort: The Defect in my Collection of Neceſſary Articles has rais'd your Zeal into ſo ſevere Cenſures, and drawn upon me, from you, ſo heavy a Condemnation, that if half that you have ſaid of me be true, I am in a very ill Caſe, for having ſo curtail'd the Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity. Is it *Folly* then for me to ask from you a compleat Creed? If it be ſo dangerous (as certainly it is) to fail in any neceſſary Article of Faith, Why is it *Folly* in me to be inſtant with you to give me them all? Or why is it *Folly* in you to grant ſo reaſonable a Demand? A ſhort Faith, defective in Neceſſaries, is no more tolerable in you, than in me; nay, much more inexcuſable, if it were for no other Reaſon but this, that you reſt in it your ſelf, and would impoſe it on others; and yet do not your ſelf know, or believe it to be compleat. For if you do, Why dare you not ſay ſo, and give it us all intire in plain Propoſitions; and not, as you have in great Meaſure done here, give only the Texts of Scripture, from whence, you ſay, neceſſary Articles are to be drawn? Which is too great an Uncertainty for Doctrines abſolutely neceſſary. For poſſibly all Men do not underſtand thoſe Texts alike, and ſome may draw Articles out of them quite different from your Syſtem; and ſo though they agree in the ſame Texts, may not agree in the ſame Fundamentals: And till you have ſet down plainly and diſtinctly your Articles, that you think contain'd in them, cannot tell whether you will allow them to be Chriſtians, or no. For you know, Sir, ſeveral Inferences are often drawn from the ſame Text; and the different Syſtems of diſſenting (I was going to ſay Chriſtians, but that none muſt be ſo, but thoſe who receive your Collection of Fundamentals, when you pleaſe to give it them) Profeſſors, are all founded on the Scripture.

Why, I beſeech you, is mine a *fooliſh* Queſtion to ask, What are the neceſſary Articles of Faith? 'Tis of no leſs Conſequence than, nor much different from the Jaylor's Queſtion in the ſixteenth of the *Acts*, *What ſhall I do to be ſaved?* and that was not, that ever I heard, counted by any one a *fooliſh Queſtion.* You grant, there are Articles neceſſary to be believ'd for Salvation: Would it not then be Wiſdom to know them? Nay, is it not our Duty to know and believe them? If not, Why do you with ſo much Out-cry reprehend me, for not knowing them? Why do you fill your Books with ſuch Variety of Invectives, as if you could never ſay enough, nor bad enough, againſt me, for having left out ſome of them? And if it be ſo dangerous, ſo criminal to miſs any of them, Why is it a *Folly* in me to *move* you to give me a compleat Liſt?

If Fundamentals are to be known, eaſy to be known (as without doubt they are) then a Catalogue may be given of them. But if they are not, if it cannot certainly be determin'd which are they; but the doubtful Knowledge of them depends upon Gueſſes, Why may not I be permitted to follow my Gueſſes as well as you yours? Or why, of all others, muſt you preſcribe your Gueſſes to me, when there are ſo many that are as ready to preſcribe as you, and of as

good

good Authority? The Pretence indeed, and Clamour is Religion, and the Saving of Souls: But your Buſineſs 'tis plain is nothing, but to over-rule and preſcribe, and be hearken'd to as a Dictator; and not to inform, teach, and inſtruct in the ſure Way to Salvation. Why elſe do you ſo ſtart and fling, when I deſire to know of you, what is neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, when this is the only material Thing in Controverſy between us; and my Miſtake in it has made you begin a Quarrel with me, and let looſe your Pen againſt me in no ordinary Way of Reprehenſion?

Beſides, in this Way which you take, you will be in no better a Caſe than I. For another having as good a Claim to have his Gueſſes give the Rule, as you yours; or to have his Syſtem receiv'd as well as you yours; he will complain of you, as well, and upon as good Grounds, as you do of me; and (if he have but as much Zeal for his Orthodoxy as you ſhew for yours) in as civil, well-bred and Chriſtian-like Language.

In the next Place, pray tell me, why would it be *Folly* in you to comply with what I require of you? Would it not be uſeful to me to be ſet right in this Matter? if ſo, why is it *Folly* in you to ſet me right? Conſider me, if you pleaſe, as one of your Pariſhioners, who (after you have reſolv'd which Catalogue of Fundamentals to give him, either that in your *Thoughts of the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, or this other here in your *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*; for they are not both the ſame, nor either of them perfect) ask'd you, Are theſe all Fundamental Articles neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; and are there no more but theſe? Would you anſwer him, that it was *Folly* in you to comply with him, in what he deſir'd? Is it of no Moment to know, what is requir'd of Men to be believ'd; without a Belief of which, they are not Chriſtians, nor can be ſav'd? And is it *Folly* in a Miniſter of the Goſpel, to inform one committed to his Inſtruction in ſo material a Point as this, which diſtinguiſhes Believers from Unbelievers? Is it *Folly* in one whoſe Buſineſs it is to bring Men to be Chriſtians, and to Salvation, to reſolve a Queſtion by which they may know, whether they are Chriſtians or no; and without a Reſolution of which they cannot certainly know their Condition and the State they are in? Is it beſides your Commiſſion and Buſineſs, and therefore a *Folly*, to extend your Care of Souls ſo far as this, to thoſe who are committed to your Charge?

Sir, I have a Title to demand this of you, as if I were your Pariſhioner: You have forc'd your ſelf upon me for a Preacher in this very Point, as if you wanted a Pariſhioner to inſtruct: And therefore I demand it of you, and ſhall inſiſt upon it till you either do it, or confeſs you cannot. Nor ſhall it excuſe you, to ſay it is *capriciouſly* requir'd. For this is no otherwiſe *capricious* than all Queſtions are *capricious* to a Man that cannot anſwer them; and ſuch an one I think this is to you. For if you could anſwer it, no body can doubt but that you would, and that with Confidence: For no body will ſuſpect 'tis the Want of that makes you ſo reſerv'd. This is indeed a frequent Way of anſwering Queſtions by Men, that cannot otherwiſe cover the Abſurdities of their Opinions, and their Inſolence of expecting to be believ'd upon their bare Words, by ſaying they are *capriciouſly* ask'd, and deſerv'd no other Anſwer.

But how far ſoever *Capriciouſneſs* (when prov'd, for ſaying is not enough) may excuſe from anſwering a material Queſtion, yet your own Words here will clear this from being a *capricious* Queſtion in me. For that thoſe Texts of Scripture which you have ſet down, do not, upon your own Grounds, contain all the Fundamental Doctrines of Religion, all that is neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; what you ſay a little lower, in this very Page, as well as in other Places, does demonſtrate. Your Words are, *I think I have ſufficiently proved, that there are other Doctrines beſides that* [Jeſus is the Meſſiah] *which are required to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; Why did the Apoſtles write theſe Doctrines? Was it not that thoſe they writ to, might give their Aſſent to them?* This Argument, for the Neceſſity of believing the Texts you cite, from their being ſet down in the *New Teſtament*, you urg'd thus, *p. 9. Is this ſet down to no Purpoſe in theſe inſpir'd Epiſtles? Is it not requiſite that we ſhould know it and believe?* And again, *p. 29. They are in our Bibles to that very Purpoſe to be believ'd.* If then it be neceſſary to know and believe thoſe Texts of Scripture,

ture, you have collected, becauſe the Apoſtles *writ them*, and they were not *ſet down to no Purpoſe*: And *they are in our Bibles on purpoſe to be believ'd*. I have Reaſon to demand of you other Texts, beſides thoſe you have enumerated, as containing Points neceſſary to be believ'd; becauſe there are other Texts which the *Apoſtles writ*, and were not *ſet down to no Purpoſe*, and *are in our Bibles on purpoſe, to be believ'd*, as well as thoſe which you have cited.

Another Reaſon of doubting, and conſequently of demanding, whether thoſe Propoſitions you have ſet down for Fundamental Doctrines, be every one of them neceſſary to be believ'd, and all that are neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, I have from your next Argument; which, join'd to the former, ſtands thus, *p.* 22. *Why did the Apoſtles write theſe Doctrines? Was it not that thoſe they writ to, might give their Aſſent to them? Nay, did they not require Aſſent to them? Yes verily, for this is to be prov'd from the Nature of the Things contained in theſe Doctrines, which are ſuch as had* immediate reſpect *to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means and Iſſue of their Redemption and Salvation.* If therefore all *Things which have an* immediate *reſpect to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means and Iſſue of Mens Redemption and Salvation*, are thoſe, and thoſe only, which are neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; may a Man not juſtly doubt whether thoſe Propoſitions which the *Unmasker* has ſet down, contain all thoſe Things, and whether there be not other Things contain'd in other Texts of Scripture, or in ſome of thoſe cited by him, but otherwiſe underſtood, that *have as* immediate a *Reſpect to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means and Iſſue of Mens Redemption and Salvation*, as thoſe he has ſet down? And therefore I have Reaſon to demand a compleater Liſt: For at beſt, to tell us, that *all Things that have an immediate Reſpect to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means and Iſſue of Mens Redemption and Salvation*, is but a general Deſcription of Fundamentals, with which ſome may think *ſome* Articles agree, and others *others*: And the Terms *immediate Reſpect*, may give Ground enough for Difference about them, to thoſe who agree that the reſt of your Deſcription is right. My Demand therefore is not a general Deſcription of Fundamentals, but for the Reaſons above-mention'd, the particular Articles themſelves, which are neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian.

It is not my Buſineſs at preſent, to examine the Validity of theſe Arguments of his, to prove all the Propoſitions to be neceſſary to be believ'd, which he has here in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, ſet down as ſuch. The Uſe I make of them now, is to ſhew the Reaſon they afford me to doubt, that thoſe Propoſitions which he has given us for Doctrines neceſſary to be believ'd, are either not all ſuch, or more than all, by his own Rule: And therefore I muſt deſire him to give us a compleater Creed, that we may know what in his Senſe is neceſſary, and enough to make a Man a Chriſtian.

Nor will it be ſufficient in this Caſe to do, what he tells us he has done, in theſe Words, *p.* 21. *I have briefly ſet before the Reader theſe Evangelical Truths, thoſe Chriſtian Principles which belong to the very Eſſence of Chriſtianity*; —— and *I have reduc'd moſt of them to certain Propoſitions, which is a Thing the Vindicator call'd for*, p. 16. With Submiſſion, I think, he miſtakes the *Vindicator*. What I call'd for was, not that *moſt of them* ſhould be *reduc'd to certain Propoſitions*, but that all of them ſhould: And the Reaſon, of my demanding that, was plain, *viz.* that then having the *Unmasker*'s Creed in clear and diſtinct Propoſitions, I might be able to examine, whether it was what God in the Scriptures indiſpenſibly requir'd of every Man to make him a Chriſtian, that ſo I might thereby correct the Errors or Defects of what I at preſent apprehended the Scripture taught me in the Caſe.

The *Unmasker* endeavours to excuſe himſelf from anſwering my Queſtion by another Exception againſt it, *p.* 24. in theſe Words: *Surely none but this Upſtart* Racovian *will have the Confidence to deny, that theſe Articles of Faith are ſuch as are neceſſary to conſtitute a Chriſtian, as to the Intellectual and Doctrinal Part of Chriſtianity; ſuch as muſt IN SOME MEASURE be known and aſſented to by him. Not that a Man is ſuppos'd every Moment to* actually *exert his Aſſent and Belief; for none of the Moral Vertues, none of the Evangelical Graces are exerted thus always. Wherefore that Queſtion,* in p. 16. *(though he ſays he asks it* ſeriouſly*) might have been ſpar'd,* "Whether every one of theſe Fundamentals is required to

" be

" be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, and ſuch as without the actual Belief " thereof, he cannot be ſaved?" *Here is* Serioufneſs *pretended when there is none; for the Deſign is only to cavil, and (if he can) to expoſe my Aſſertion. But he is not able to do it, for all his critical Demands are anſwer'd in theſe few Words, viz. That the Intellectual (as well as Moral Endowments) are ſuppos'd to be always in act: They are exerted upon occaſion, not all of them at a Time. And therefore he miſtakes if he thinks, or rather as he objects without thinking, that theſe Doctrines, if they be Fundamental and Neceſſary, muſt be* always actually believ'd. *No Man beſides himſelf ever ſtarted ſuch a Thing.*

This terrible long Combat has the *Unmasker* manag'd with his own Shadow, to confound the *Serioufneſs* of my Queſtion; and, as he ſays himſelf, is come off not only ſafe and ſound, but triumphant. But for all that, Sir, may not a Man's Queſtion be *ſerious*, though he ſhould chance to expreſs it ill? I think you and I were not beſt to ſet up for Criticks in Language, and Nicety of Expreſſion, for fear we ſhould ſet the World a laughing. Yet, for this once, I ſhall take the Liberty to defend mine here. For I demand in what Expreſſion of mine, I ſaid or *ſuppos'd* that a Man ſhould every Moment actually exert his Aſſent to any Propoſition requir'd to be believ'd? Cannot a Man ſay, that the *Unmasker* cannot be admitted to any Preferment in the Church of *England* without an *actual Aſſent to*, or ſubſcribing of the Thirty Nine Articles; unleſs it be *ſuppos'd* that he muſt every Moment, from the Time he firſt read, aſſented to, and ſubſcrib'd thoſe Articles, till he receiv'd Inſtitution and Induction, *actually exert his Aſſent* to every one of them, and repeat his Subſcription? In the ſame Senſe it is literally true, that a Man cannot be admitted into Church of Chriſt, or into Heaven, without *actually* believing all the Articles neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian, without ſuppoſing, that he muſt *actually exert that Aſſent every Moment*, from the Time that he firſt gave it, till the Moment that he is admitted into Heaven. He may eat, drink, make Bargains, ſtudy *Euclid*, and think of other Things between; nay, ſometimes ſleep, and neither think of thoſe Articles nor any thing elſe; and yet it be true, that he ſhall not be admitted into the Church, or Heaven, without an *actually Aſſent* to them: That Condition of an *actual Aſſent* he has perform'd, and until he recal that Aſſent by actual Unbelief, it ſtands good; and though a Lunacy or Lethargy ſhould ſeize on him preſently after, and he ſhould never think of it again as long as he liv'd, yet it is literally true, he is not ſav'd without an *actual Aſſent*. You might therefore have ſpar'd your Pains in ſaying, *That none of the Moral Virtues, none of the Evangelical Graces, are exerted THUS always*, till you met with ſome body who ſaid *THUS*. That I did ſo, I think would have enter'd into no body's Thoughts but yours, it being evident from *p.* 539. of my Book, that by *Actual* I meant *Explicit*. You ſhould rather have given a direct Anſwer to my Queſtion, which I here again *ſeriouſly ask* you, *viz.* Whether,

IX. Thoſe you call'd *Fundamental Doctrines*, in your *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, or thoſe *Chriſtian Principles which belong to the very Eſſence of Chriſtianity*, ſo many as you have given us of them in your *Socinianiſm Unmask'd* (for you may take which of your two Creeds you pleaſe) are juſt thoſe, neither more nor leſs, that are every one of them requir'd to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, and ſuch as without the actual, or (ſince that Word diſpleaſes you) the explicit Belief whereof he cannot be ſaved.

When you have anſwer'd this Queſtion, we ſhall then ſee which of us two is neareſt the right: But if you ſhall forbear railing, which, I fear, you take for arguing, againſt that Summary of Faith, which our Saviour and his Apoſtles taught, and which only they propos'd to their Hearers to be believ'd to make them Chriſtians, till you have found another perfect Creed of only neceſſary Articles, that you dare own for ſuch; you are like to have a large Time of Silence. Before I leave the Paſſage above cited, I muſt deſire the Reader to take notice of what he ſays concerning his Liſt of Fundamentals, *viz.* 'That *theſe his Articles of Faith, neceſſary to conſtitute a Chriſtian, are ſuch as muſt IN SOME*

SOME MEASURE be known and aſſented to by him: A very wary Expreſſion concerning Fundamentals. The Queſtion is about Articles neceſſary to be explicitly believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian. Theſe in his Liſt, the *Unmasker* tells us, are *neceſſary to conſtitute a Chriſtian, and muſt IN SOME MEASURE be known and aſſented to.* I would now fain know of the Reader, Whether he underſtands hereby, that the *Unmasker* means, That theſe his neceſſary Articles muſt be explicitly believ'd or not? If he means an explicit Knowledge and Belief, why does he puzzle his Reader by ſo improper a Way of ſpeaking? For what is as compleat and perfect as it ought to be, cannot properly be ſaid to be *in ſome Meaſure*. If his *in ſome Meaſure* falls ſhort of explicitly knowing and believing his Fundamentals, his neceſſary Articles are ſuch as a Man may be a Chriſtian without explicitly knowing and believing, *i. e.* are no Fundamentals, no neceſſary Articles at all. Thus Men, uncertain what to ſay, betray themſelves by their great Caution.

Having pronounc'd it *Folly* in himſelf to make up the Defects of my ſhort, and therefore ſo much blam'd, Collection of Fundamentals, by a full one of his own, though his Attempt ſhews he would if he could, he goes on thus, *p.* 22. *From what I* [the Unmasker] *have ſaid, it is evident, that the Vindicator is groſly miſtaken when he ſaith,* "*Whatever Doctrine the Apoſtles requir'd to be believ'd to make* "*a Man a Chriſtian, are to be found in thoſe Places of Scripture which he has quoted* "*in his Book.*" And a little lower, *I think I have ſufficiently prov'd that there are other Doctrines beſides that, which are required to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian.*

Anſw. Whatever you have proved, or (as you never fail to do) boaſt you have proved, will ſignify nothing, till you have prov'd one of theſe Propoſitions; and have ſhewn either,

X. That what our Saviour and his Apoſtles preach'd and admitted Men into the Church for believing, is not all that is abſolutely requir'd to make a Man a Chriſtian. Or,

That the believing him to be the *Meſſiah*, was not the only Article they inſiſted on to thoſe who acknowledg'd one God; and upon the Belief whereof they admitted Converts into the Church, in any one of thoſe many Places quoted by me out of the Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament*.

I ſay, *any one*: For though it be evident throughout the whole Goſpel, and the *Acts*, that this was the one Doctrine of Faith, which in all their Preachings every where they principally drive at; yet if it were not ſo, but that in other Places they taught other Things, That would not prove, that thoſe other Things were Articles of Faith abſolutely neceſſarily requir'd to be believ'd to make a Man Chriſtian, unleſs it had been ſo ſaid. Becauſe if it appears, that ever any one was admitted into the Church, by our Saviour or his Apoſtles, without having that Article explicitly laid before him, and without his explicit Aſſent to it, you muſt grant, that an explicit Aſſent to that Article is not neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian: Unleſs you will ſay, that our Saviour and his Apoſtles admitted Men into the Church, that were not qualified with ſuch a Faith, as was abſolutely neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian; which is as much as to ſay, that they allow'd and pronounc'd Men to be Chriſtians, who were not Chriſtians. For he that wants what is neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian, can no more be a Chriſtian, than he that wants what is neceſſary to make him a Man, can be a Man. For what is neceſſary to the Being of any Thing, is eſſential to its Being; and any Thing may be as well without its Eſſence, as without any Thing that is neceſſary to its Being: And ſo a Man be a Man without being a Man, and a Chriſtian a Chriſtian without being a Chriſtian; and an *Unmasker* may prove this without proving it. You may therefore ſet up, by your unqueſtionable Authority, what Articles you pleaſe, as neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian: If our Saviour and his Apoſtles admitted Converts into the Church without preaching thoſe your Articles to them, or requiring an explicit Aſſent to what they did not preach and explicitly lay down, I ſhall prefer their Authority to yours, and think it was rather by them, than by you, that God promulgated the Law of Faith, and manifeſted what that Faith was, upon which he would receive penitent Converts.

And though by his Apoſtles our Saviour taught a great many other Truths, for the explaining this Fundamental Article of the Law of Faith, that Jeſus is the Meſſiah; ſome whereof have a nearer, and ſome a more remote Connection with it, and ſo cannot be denied by any Chriſtian, who ſees that Connection, or knows they are ſo taught: yet an explicit Belief of any one of them is no more neceſſarily required to make a Man a Chriſtian, than an explicit Belief of all thoſe Truths which have a Connection with the Being of a God, or are revealed by him, is neceſſarily required to make a Man not to be an Atheiſt: though none of them can be denied by any one, who ſees that Connection, or acknowledges that Revelation, without his being an Atheiſt. All theſe Truths taught us from God, either by Reaſon or Revelation, are of great Uſe, to enlighten our Minds, confirm our Faith, ſtir up our Affections, *&c.* And the more we ſee of them, the more we ſhall ſee, admire, and magnify the Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Mercy, and Love of God in the Work of our Redemption. This will oblige us to ſearch and ſtudy the Scripture, wherein it is contain'd and laid open to us.

All that we find in the Revelation of the *New Teſtament*, being the declared Will and Mind of our Lord and Maſter, the *Meſſiah*, whom we have taken to be our King, we are bound to receive as Right and Truth, or elſe we are not his Subjects, we do not believe him to be the *Meſſiah*, our King, but caſt him off, and with the *Jews* ſay, we will not have this Man reign over us. But it is ſtill what we find in the Scripture, not in this or that Syſtem; what we, ſincerely ſeeking to know the Will of our Lord, diſcover to be his Mind. Where it is ſpoken plainly, we cannot miſs it; and it is evident he requires our Aſſent: Where there is Obſcurity either in the Expreſſions themſelves, or by Reaſon of the ſeeming Contrariety of other Paſſages, there a fair Endeavour, as much as our Circumſtances will permit, ſecures us from a guilty Diſobedience to his Will, or a ſinful Error in Faith, which Way ſoever our Enquiry reſolves the Doubt, or perhaps leaves it unreſolved. If he had required more of us in thoſe Points, he would have declared his Will plainer to us, and diſcovered the Truth contained in thoſe obſcrure, or ſeemingly contradictory Places, as clearly, and as uniformly as he did that Fundamental Article, that we were to believe him to be the *Meſſiah*, our King.

As Men, we have God for our King, and are under the Law of Reaſon: As Chriſtians, we have *Jeſus* the *Meſſiah* for our King, and are under the Law revealed by him in the Goſpel. And though every Chriſtian, both as a *Deiſt* and a *Chriſtian*, be obliged to ſtudy both the Law of Nature and the revealed Law, that in them he may know the Will of God, and of Jeſus Chriſt whom he hath ſent; yet in neither of theſe Laws is there to be found a ſelect Set of Fundamentals, diſtinct from the reſt, which are to make him a *Deiſt* or a *Chriſtian*. But he that believes one eternal inviſible God, his Lord and King, ceaſes thereby to be an Atheiſt; and he that believes *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, his King, ordain'd by God, thereby becomes a Chriſtian, is delivered from the Power of Darkneſs, and is tranſlated into the Kingdom of the Son of God, is actually within the Covenant of Grace, and has that Faith which ſhall be imputed to him for Righteouſneſs; and if he continues in his Allegiance to this his King, ſhall receive the Reward, Eternal Life.

He that conſiders this, will not be ſo hot as the *Unmasker*, to contend for a Number of Fundamental Articles, all neceſſary, every one of them to be explicitly believed, by every one, for Salvation, without knowing them himſelf, or being able to enumerate them to another. Can there be any Thing more abſurd, than to ſay, there are ſeveral Fundamental Articles, each of which every Man muſt explicitly believe upon Pain of Damnation, and yet not to be able to ſay, which they be? The *Unmasker* has ſet down no ſmall Number; but yet dares not ſay theſe are all. On the contrary, he has plainly confeſſed there are more; but will not, *i. e.* cannot tell what they are that remain behind: Nay, has given a general Deſcription of his Fundamental Articles, by which it is not evident, but there may be ten Times as many as thoſe he had named; and amongſt them (if he durſt or could name them) probably ſeveral, that many a good Chriſtian, who died in the Faith, and is now in Heaven, never once

once thought of; and others, which many, of as good Authority as he, would, from their different Syſtems, certainly deny and contradict.

This, as great an Abſurdity as it is, cannot be otherwiſe, whilſt Men will take upon them to alter the Terms of the Goſpel; and when it is evident, that our Saviour and his Apoſtles receiv'd Men into the Church, and pronounc'd them Believers, for taking him to be the *Meſſiah*, their King and Deliverer ſent by God, have the Boldneſs to ſay, this is not enough. But when you would know of them what then is enough, they cannot tell you: The Reaſon whereof is viſible, *viz.* becauſe they being able to produce no other Reaſon for their Collection of Fundamental Articles, to prove them neceſſary to be believ'd, but becauſe they are of Divine Authority, and contain'd in the Holy Scriptures; and are, as the *Unmasker* ſays, *writ there on purpoſe to be believ'd*, they know not where to ſtop, when they have once begun: Thoſe Texts that they leave out, or from which they deduce none of their Fundamentals, being of the ſame Divine Authority, and ſo upon that Account equally Fundamental with what they culled out, tho' not ſo well ſuited to their particular Syſtems.

Hence come thoſe endleſs and unreaſonable Contentions about Fundamentals, whilſt each cenſures the Defect, Redundancy, or Falſhood of what others require, as neceſſary to be believ'd: And yet he himſelf gives not a Catalogue of his own Fundamentals, which he will ſay is ſufficient and compleat. Nor is it to be wonder'd, ſince in this Way it is impoſſible to ſtop ſhort of putting every Propoſition, Divinely reveal'd, into the Liſt of Fundamentals; all of them being of Divine, and ſo of equal Authority; and upon that Account equally neceſſary to be believed by every one who is a Chriſtian; tho' they are not all neceſſary to be believed to make any one a Chriſtian. For the New Teſtament, containing the Laws of the *Meſſiah*'s Kingdom, in regard of all the Actions both of Mind and Body of all his Subjects; every Chriſtian is bound by his Allegiance to him, to believe all that he ſays in it to be true, as well as to aſſent, that all that he commands in it is juſt and good: And what Negligence, Perverſeneſs, or Guilt there is in his miſtaking in the one, or failing in his Obedience to the other, that this Righteous Judge of all Men, who cannot be deceiv'd, will at the laſt Day lay open, and reward accordingly.

'Tis no wnnder therefore, there have been ſuch fierce Conteſts, and ſuch cruel Havock made amongſt Chriſtians about Fundamentals; whilſt every one would ſet up his Syſtem upon Pain of Fire and Faggot in this, and Hell-Fire in the other World: Tho' at the ſame Time, whilſt he is exerciſing the utmoſt Barbarities againſt others, to prove himſelf a true Chriſtian, he profeſſes himſelf ſo ignorant that he cannot tell, or ſo uncharitable that he will not tell what Articles are abſolutely neceſſary and ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian. If there be any ſuch Fundamentals, as 'tis certain there are, 'tis as certain they muſt be very plain. Why then does every one urge and make a ſtir about Fundamentals, and no body give a Liſt of them? But becauſe (as I have ſaid) upon the uſual Grounds, they cannot: For I will be bold to ſay, that every one, who conſiders the Matter, will ſee, that either only the Article, of his being the *Meſſiah* their King, which alone our Saviour and his Apoſtles preach'd to the Unconverted World, and receiv'd thoſe that believ'd it into the Church, is the only neceſſary Article to be believ'd by a *Theiſt*, to make him a Chriſtian; or elſe that all the Truths, contain'd in the New Teſtament, are neceſſary Articles to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian: And that between theſe two it is impoſſible any where to ſtand; the Reaſon whereof is plain. Becauſe either the believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, *i. e.* the taking him to be our King, makes us Subjects and Denizons of his Kingdom, that is, Chriſtians: or elſe an explicit Knowledge of, and actual Obedience to the Laws of his Kingdom, is what is requir'd to make us Subjects; which, I think, is what was never ſaid of any other Kingdom. For a Man muſt be a Subject, before he is bound to obey.

Let us ſuppoſe it will be ſaid here, that an Obedience to the Laws of Chriſt's Kingdom is what is neceſſary to make us Subjects of it, without which we cannot be admitted into it, *i. e.* be Chriſtians: And if ſo, this Obedience muſt be univerſal; I mean, it muſt be the ſame Sort of Obedience to all the

Laws of this Kingdom: Which, ſince no body ſays is in any one ſuch as is wholly free from Error or Frailty, this Obedience can only lie in a ſincere Diſpoſition and Purpoſe of Mind to obey every one of the Laws of the *Meſſiah* deliver'd in the New Teſtament, to the utmoſt of our Power. Now believing right being one Part of that Obedience, as well as acting right is the other Part, the Obedience of Aſſent muſt be implicitly to all that is deliver'd there, that it is true. But for as much as the particular Acts of an explicit Aſſent cannot go any farther than his Underſtanding, who is to aſſent; what he underſtands to be the Truth deliver'd by our Saviour, or the Apoſtles commiſſion'd by him, and aſſiſted by his Spirit, that he muſt neceſſarily believe: It becomes a Fundamental Article to him, and he cannot refuſe his Aſſent to it, without renouncing his Allegiance. For he that denies any of the Doctrines, that Chriſt has deliver'd, to be true, denies him to be ſent from God, and conſequently to be the Meſſiah; and ſo ceaſes to be a Chriſtian. From whence it is evident, that if any more be neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, than the believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, and thereby taking him for our King, it cannot be any ſet Bundle of Fundamentals cull'd out of the Scripture, with an Omiſſion of the reſt, according as beſt ſuits any one's Fancy, Syſtem, or Intereſt: But it muſt be an explicit Belief of all thoſe Propoſitions, which he, according to the beſt of his Underſtanding, really apprehends to be contain'd, and meant in the Scripture; and an implicit Belief of all the reſt, which he is ready to believe, as ſoon as it ſhall pleaſe God, upon his Uſe of the Means, to enlighten him, and make them clear to his Underſtanding. So that in effect, almoſt every particular Man in this Senſe has, or may have a diſtinct Catalogue of Fundamentals, each whereof it is neceſſary for him explicitly to believe, now that he is a Chriſtian; whereof if he ſhould disbelieve, or deny any one, he would caſt off his Allegiance, disfranchize himſelf, and be no longer a Subject of Chriſt's Kingdom. But in this Senſe no body can tell what is Fundamental to another, what is neceſſary for another Man to believe. This Catalogue of Fundamentals every one alone can make for himſelf: No body can fix it for him; no body can collect or preſcribe it to another: But this is according as God has dealt to every one the Meaſure of Light and Faith; and has open'd each Man's Underſtanding, that he may underſtand the Scriptures. Whoever has us'd what Means he is capable of, for the informing of himſelf, with a Readineſs to believe and obey what ſhall be taught and preſcrib'd by *Jeſus* his Lord and King, is a true and faithful Subject of *Chriſt*'s Kingdom; and cannot be thought to fail in any thing neceſſary to Salvation.

Suppoſing a Man and his Wife, barely by ſeeing the wonderful Things that *Moſes* did, ſhould have been perſuaded to put themſelves under his Government; or by reading his Law, and liking it; or by any other Motive, had been prevail'd on ſincerely to take him for their Ruler and Law-giver; and accordingly (renouncing their former Idolatry and Heatheniſh Pollutions) in Token thereof had by Baptiſm and Circumciſion, the initiating Ceremonies, ſolemnly enter'd themſelves into that Communion under the Law of *Moſes*: Had they not thereby been made Denizons of the Common-wealth of *Iſrael*, and inveſted with all the Privileges and Prerogatives of true Children of *Abraham*, leaving to their Poſterity a Right to their Share in the promis'd Land, tho' they had died before they had perform'd any other Act of Obedience to that Law; nay, tho' they had not known whoſe Son *Moſes* was, nor how he had deliver'd the Children of *Iſrael* out of *Egypt*, nor whither he was leading them? I do not ſay, it is likely they ſhould be ſo far ignorant: But whether they were or no, 'twas enough that they took him for their Prince and Ruler, with a Purpoſe to obey him, to ſubmit themſelves entirely to his Commands and Conduct; and did nothing afterwards, whereby they diſown'd or rejected his Authority over them. In that Reſpect none of his Laws were greater or more neceſſary to be ſubmitted to one than another, tho' the Matter of one might be of much greater Conſequence than of another. But a Diſobedience to any Law of the leaſt Conſequence, if it carry with it a Diſowning of the Authority that made it, forfeits all, and cuts off ſuch an Offender from that Common-wealth, and all the Privileges of it.

This

This is the Caſe, in reſpect of other Matters of Faith, to thoſe who believe *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, and take him to be their King ſent from God, and ſo are already *Chriſtians*. 'Tis not the Opinion, that any one may have of the Weightineſs of the Matter, (if they are, without their own Fault, ignorant that our Saviour hath revealed it) that ſhall disfranchize them, and make them forfeit their Intereſt in his Kingdom: They may be ſtill good Subjects, tho' they do not believe a great many things, which Creed-makers may think neceſſary to be believed. That which is required of them, is a ſincere Endeavour to know his Mind declared in the Goſpel, and an explicit Belief of all that they underſtand to be ſo. Not to believe what he has reveal'd, whether in a lighter or more weighty Matter, calls his Veracity into Queſtion, deſtroys his Miſſion, denies his Authority, and is a flat diſowning him to be the *Meſſiah*; and ſo overturns that Fundamental and Neceſſary Article whereby a Man is a Chriſtian. But this cannot be done by a Man's Ignorance, or unwilful Miſtake of any of the Truths publiſh'd by our Saviour himſelf, or his authorized and inſpired Miniſters in the New Teſtament. Whilſt a Man knows not that it was his Will or Meaning, his Allegiance is ſafe, tho' he believe the contrary.

If this were not ſo, it is impoſſible, that any one ſhould be a Chriſtian. For in ſome things we are ignorant, and err all, not knowing the Scriptures. For the holy inſpired Writings, being all of the ſame Divine Authority, muſt all equally in every Article be fundamental and neceſſary to be believed; if that be a Reaſon, that makes any one Propoſition in it neceſſary to be believed. But the Law of Faith, the Covenant of the Goſpel, being a Covenant of Grace, and not of natural Right or Debt; nothing can be abſolutely neceſſary to be believed, but what, by this new Law of Faith, God of his good Pleaſure hath made to be ſo. And this, 'tis plain, by the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, to all that believed not already in him, was only the believing the only true God, and *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, whom he hath ſent. The Performance of this puts a Man within the Covenant, and is that which God will impute to him for Righteouſneſs. All the other Acts of Aſſent to other Truths, taught by our Saviour, and his Apoſtles, are not what make a Man a Chriſtian; but are neceſſary Acts of Obedience to be performed by one, who is a Chriſtian; and therefore being a Chriſtian, ought to live by the Laws of Chriſt's Kingdom.

Nor are we without ſome Glimpſe of Light, why it hath pleaſed God of his Grace, that the believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah* ſhould be that Faith which he would impute to Men for Righteouſneſs. 'Tis evident from Scripture, that our Saviour deſpiſed the Shame and endured the Croſs for the Joy ſet before him; which Joy, 'tis alſo plain, was a Kingdom. But in this Kingdom, which his Father had appointed to him, he could have none but voluntary Subjects; ſuch as leaving the Kingdom of Darkneſs, and of the Prince of this World, with all the Pleaſures, Pomps and Vanities thereof, would put themſelves under his Dominion, and tranſlate themſelves into his Kingdom: Which they did by believing and owning him to be the *Meſſiah* their King, and thereby taking him to rule over them. For the Faith for which God juſtifieth, is not an empty Speculation, but a Faith join'd with Repentance, and working by Love. And for this, which was in effect to return to God himſelf, and to their natural Allegiance due to him, and to advance as much as lay in them the Glory of the Kingdom, which he had promiſed his Son, God was pleaſed to declare he would accept them, receive them to Grace, and blot out all their former Tranſgreſſions.

This is evidently the Covenant of Grace, as deliver'd in the Scriptures: And if this be not, I deſire any one to tell me what it is, and what are the Terms of it. 'Tis a Law of Faith, whereby God has promiſed to forgive all our Sins upon our Repentance, and believing ſomething; and to impute that Faith to us for Righteouſneſs. Now I ask what 'tis by the Law of Faith we are required to believe? For till that be known, the Law of Faith is not diſtinctly known, nor the Terms of the Covenant upon which the All-merciful God graciouſly offers us Salvation. And if any one will ſay this is not known, nay, is not eaſily, and certainly to be known under the Goſpel,

pel, I desire him to tell me what the greatest Enemies of Christianity can say worse against it? For a Way propos'd to Salvation, that does not certainly lead thither, or is propos'd so as not to be known, are very little different as to their Consequence; and Mankind would be left to wander in Darkness and Uncertainty with the one as well as the other.

I do not write this for Controversy's sake; for had I minded Victory, I would not have given the *Unmasker* this new Matter of Exception. I know what ever is said, he must be bawling for his fashionable and profitable Orthodoxy, and cry out against this too which I have here added, as *Socinianism*, and cast that Name upon all that differs from what is held by those, he would recommend his Zeal to in Writing. I call it *bawling*, for whether what he has said be Reasoning, I shall refer to those of his own Brotherhood, if he be of any Brotherhood, and there be any that will join with him in his Set of Fundamentals, when his Creed is made.

Had I minded nothing but how to deal with him, I had tied him up short to his List of Fundamentals, without affording him Topicks of declaiming against what I have here said. But I have enlarged on this Point, for the sake of such Readers, who with a Love of Truth read Books of this kind, and endeavour to inform themselves in the Things of their Everlasting Concernment: It being of greater Consideration with me, to give any Light and Satisfaction to one single Person, who is really concerned to understand, and be convinced of the Religion he professes, than what a thousand fashionable or titular Professors of any Sort of Orthodoxy shall say or think of me, for not doing as they do; *i. e.* for not saying after others, without understanding what is said, or upon what Grounds, or caring to understand it.

Let us now consider his Argument, to prove the Articles he has given us to be Fundamentals. In his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, pag. 119. he argues from 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. where, he says, *Christianity is called a Mystery*; that *all Things in Christianity are not plain, and exactly level to every common Apprehension; that every Thing in Christianity is not clear, and intelligible and comprehensible by the weakest Noddle.* Let us take this for proved, as much as he pleases; and then let us see the Force of this subtle Disputant's Argument, for the Necessity there is, that every Christian Man should believe those, which he has given us for Fundamental Articles out of the Epistles. The Reason of that Obligation, and the Necessity of every Man and Woman's believing them, he has laid in this, that they are to be found in the *Epistles*, or in the *Bible*. This Argument for them we have over and over again in his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, as here, *p.* 9. thus: *Are they set down to no Purpose in these inspired Epistles? Why did the Apostles write these Doctrines, was it not, that those they writ to, might give their Assent to them?* pag. 22. *They are in our Bibles for that very Purpose to be believed.* pag. 25. Now I ask, Can any one more directly invalidate all he says here for the Necessity of believing his Articles? Can any one more apparently write Booty, than by saying that *these his Doctrines*, *these his Fundamental Articles* (which are after his fashion set down between the 8th and 20th Pages of this his first Chapter) are of necessity to be believed by every one, before he can be a Christian, because they are in the *Epistles* and in the *Bible*; and yet affirm that in Christianity, *i. e.* in the Epistles and in the Bible there are *Mysteries*, there are Things *not plain, not clear, not intelligible to common Apprehensions?* If his Articles, some of which contain Mysteries, are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, because they are in the Bible; then according to this Rule it is necessary for many Men to believe, what is not *intelligible* to them; what their *Noddles* cannot apprehend (as the *Unmasker* is pleased to turn the Supposition of vulgar Peoples understanding the Fundamentals of their Religion into Ridicule) *i. e.* it is necessary for many Men to do, what is impossible for them to do, before they can be Christians. But if there be several Things in the Bible, and in the Epistles, that it is not necessary for Men to believe, to make them Christians; then all the *Unmasker*'s Arguments from their being in the *Epistles*, is no Proof, that all his Articles are necessary to be believed to make a Man a Christian, because they are set down in the Epistles: Much less, because he thinks they may be drawn, according to his

System,

Syſtem, out of what is ſet down in the Epiſtles. Let him therefore either confeſs theſe and the like Queſtions, *Why did the Apoſtles write theſe? was it not, that thoſe they writ to, might give their Aſſent to them? Why ſhould not every one of theſe Evangelical Truths be believed and embraced? They are in our Bibles for that very Purpoſe*; and the like, to be impertinent and ridiculous. Let him ceaſe to propoſe them with ſo much Oſtentation, for they can ſerve only to miſlead unwary Readers: Or let him unſay what he has ſaid of Things *not plain* to *common Apprehenſions*, not *clear* and *intelligible*. Let him recant what he has ſaid of *Myſteries* in Chriſtianity. For I ask with him, *p.* 8. *where can we be informed, but in the ſacred and inſpired Writings?* It is ridiculous to urge, that any thing is neceſſary to be explicitly believed, to make a Man a Chriſtian, becauſe it is writ in the *Epiſtles* and *in the Bible*; unleſs he confeſs that there is no *Myſtery*, nothing not *plain* nor *intelligible* to vulgar Underſtanding, in the Epiſtles or in the Bible.

This is ſo evident, that the *Unmasker* himſelf, who, *p.* 119. of his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, thought it ridiculous to ſuppoſe, that the Vulgar ſhould underſtand Chriſtianity, is here of another Mind: And, *p.* 30. ſays of his Evangelical Doctrines and Articles neceſſary to be aſſented to, that they are *intelligible* and *plain*; there is no *Ambiguity and Doubtfulneſs in them*; *they ſhine with their own Light, and to an unprejudiced Eye are plain, evident and illuſtrious.*

To draw the *Unmasker* out of the Clouds, and prevent his hiding himſelf in the Doubtfulneſs of his Expreſſions, I ſhall deſire him to ſay directly whether the Articles, which are neceſſary to be believed, to make a Man a Chriſtian, and particularly thoſe he has ſet down for ſuch, are all plain and intelligible, and ſuch as may be underſtood and comprehended (I will not ſay in the *Unmasker*'s ridiculous Way, by the *weakeſt Noddles*, but) by every illiterate Countryman and Woman capable of Church-Communion?

If he ſays, Yes; then all Myſteries are excluded out of his Articles neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian. For that which can be comprehended by every Day-Labourer, every poor Spinſter, that is a Member of the Church, cannot be a Myſtery. And if what ſuch illiterate People cannot underſtand, be required to be believed to make them Chriſtians, the greateſt Part of Mankind are ſhut out from being Chriſtians.

But the *Unmasker* has provided an Anſwer in theſe Words, *p.* 31. *There is*, ſays he, *a Difficulty in the Doctrine of the Trinity, and ſeveral Truths of the Goſpel, as to the exact Manner of the Things themſelves, which we ſhall never be able to comprehend, at leaſt on this ſide of Heaven: But there is no Difficulty as to the Reality and Certainty of them, becauſe we know they are revealed to us by God in the Holy Scripture.*

Which Anſwer of *Difficulty in the Manner*, and no *Difficulty in the Reality*, having the Appearance of a Diſtinction, looks like Learning; but when it comes to be applied to the Caſe in Hand, will ſcarce afford us Senſe.

The Queſtion is about a Propoſition to be believed, which muſt firſt neceſſarily be underſtood. For a Man cannot poſſibly give his Aſſent to any Affirmation or Negation, unleſs he underſtand the Terms as they are join'd in that Propoſition, and has a Conception of the Thing affirm'd or deny'd, and alſo a Conception of the Thing concerning which it is affirmed or denied, as they are there put together. But let the Propoſition be what it will, there is no more to be underſtood than is expreſſed in the Terms of that Propoſition. If it be a Propoſition concerning a Matter of Fact, 'tis enough to conceive, and believe the Matter of Fact. If it be a Propoſition concerning the Manner of the Fact, the Manner of the Fact muſt alſo be believed, as 'tis intelligibly expreſſed in that Propoſition; *v. g.* ſhould this Propoſition περὶ ὑπερβολῆς be offer'd as an Article of Faith to an illiterate Countryman of *England*, he could not believe it: Becauſe, though a true Propoſition, yet it being propos'd in Words whoſe Meaning he underſtood not, he could not give any Aſſent to it. Put into *Engliſh*, he underſtands what it meant by the *Dead ſhall riſe*. For he can conceive, that the ſame Man, who was dead and ſenſeleſs, ſhould be alive again; as well as he can, that the ſame Man, who is now in a Lethargy, ſhould awake again; or the ſame Man that is now out

of

of his Sight, and he knows not whether he be alive or dead, ſhould return and be with him again: And ſo he is capable of believing it, though he conceives nothing of the Manner how a Man revives, wakes, or moves. But none of theſe Manners of thoſe Actions being included in thoſe Propoſitions, the Propoſition concerning the Matter of Fact (if it imply no Contradiction in it) may be believed; and ſo all that is required may be done, whatever Difficulty may be, *as to the* exact Manner how it is brought about.

But where the Propoſition is about the Manner, the Belief too muſt be of the Manner, *v. g.* The Article is, *The Dead ſhall be raiſed with ſpiritual Bodies*: And then the Belief muſt be as well of this Manner of the Fact, as of the Fact it ſelf. So that what is ſaid here by the *Unmasker* about the *Manner*, ſignifies nothing at all in the Caſe. What is underſtood to be expreſſed in each Propoſition, whether it be of the Manner or not of the Manner, is (by its being a Revelation from God) to be believed, as far as it is underſtood: But no more is required to be believed concerning any Article, than is contain'd in that Article.

What the *Unmasker*, for the removing of Difficulties, adds farther in theſe Words, *But there is no Difficulty as to the Reality and Certainty of the Truths of the Goſpel; becauſe we know, they are revealed to us by God in the Holy Scripture:* Is yet farther from ſignifying any Thing to the Purpoſe, than the former. The Queſtion is about underſtanding; and, in what Senſe they are underſtood, believing ſeveral Propoſitions, or Articles of Faith, which are to be found in the Scripture. To this, the *Unmasker* ſays, there can be *no Difficulty* at all *as to their Reality and Certainty; becauſe they are revealed by God.* Which amounts to no more but this, that there is no Difficulty at all in underſtanding and believing this Propoſition, *that whatever is revealed by God is really and certainly true.* But is the underſtanding and believing this ſingle Propoſition, the underſtanding and believing all the Articles of Faith neceſſary to be believed? Is this all the explicit Faith a Chriſtian need have? If ſo, then a Chriſtian need explicitly believe no more but this one Propoſition, *viz.* That all the Propoſitions between the two Covers of his Bible are certainly true. But I imagine the *Unmasker* will not think the believing this one Propoſition is a ſufficient Belief of all thoſe Fundamental Articles, which he has given us as neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian. For if that will ſerve the Turn, I conclude he may make his Set of Fundamentals as large and expreſs to his Syſtem as he pleaſes: *Calviniſts*, *Arminians*, *Anabaptiſts*, *Socinians*, will all thus own the Belief of them; *viz.* That all that God has revealed in the Scripture is really and certainly true.

But if believing this Propoſition, that all that is reveal'd by God in the Scripture is true, be not all the Faith which the *Unmasker* requires, what he ſays about the *Reality* and *Certainty* of all Truths reveal'd by God removes nothing of the Difficulty. A Propoſition of Divine Authority is found in the Scripture: 'Tis agreed preſently between him and me, that it contains a *real certain* Truth: But the Difficulty is, what is the Truth it contains, to which he and I muſt aſſent; *v. g.* The Profeſſion of Faith made by the Eunuch in theſe Words, *Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God*, upon which he was admitted into the Church as a Chriſtian, I believe contains a *real and certain Truth.* Is that enough? No, ſays the *Unmasker*, p. 87. it *includes in it that Chriſt was God*; and therefore it is not enough for me to believe, that theſe Words contain a *real certain* Truth: But I muſt believe they contain this Truth, that Jeſus Chriſt is God; that the Eunuch ſpoke them in that Senſe, and in that Senſe I muſt aſſent to them: Whereas they appear to me to be ſpoken, and meant here, as well as in ſeveral other Places of the *New Teſtament*, in this Senſe, *viz. That Jeſus Chriſt is the Meſſiah*, and in that Senſe in this Place I aſſent to them. The Meaning then of theſe Words as ſpoken by the Eunuch, is the Difficulty: And I deſire the *Unmasker*, by the Application of what he has ſaid here, to remove that Difficulty. For granting all Revelation from God to be *really* and *certainly* true (as certainly it is) how does the believing that general Truth remove any Difficulty about the Senſe and Interpretation of any particular Propoſition found in any Paſſage of the Holy Scriptures? Or is it poſſible for any Man to underſtand it in one Senſe, and believe it in another;

another; becauſe it is a Divine Revelation, that has *Reality* and *Certainty* in it? Thus much as to what the *Unmasker* ſays of the Fundamentals he has given us, *p.* 30. *viz.* That *no true Lover of God and Truth need doubt of any of them: For there is no Ambiguity and Doubtfulneſs in them.* If the Diſtinction he has uſed *of Difficulty as to the exact Manner, and Difficulty as to the Reality and Certainty of Goſpel-Truths*, will remove all *Ambiguity and Doubtfulneſs* from all thoſe Texts of Scripture, from whence he and others deduce Fundamental Articles, ſo that they will be *plain and intelligible* to every Man in the Senſe he underſtands them; he has done great Service to Chriſtianity.

But he ſeems to diſtruſt that himſelf, in the following Words. *They ſhine*, ſays he, *with their own Light, and to an unprejudic'd Eye are plain, evident, and illuſtrious; and they would always continue ſo, if ſome ill-minded Men did not perplex and entangle them.* I ſee the Matter would go very ſmooth, if the *Unmasker* might be the ſole authentick Interpreter of Scripture. He is wiſely of that Judges's Mind, who was againſt hearing the Counſel on the other ſide, becauſe they always *perplexed* the Cauſe.

But if thoſe who differ from the *Unmasker*, ſhall in their Turns call him the *Prejudiced* and *Ill-minded Man*, who *perplexes* theſe Matters (as they may with as much Authority as he) we are but where we were; each muſt underſtand for himſelf the beſt he can, till the *Unmasker* be received as the only *unprejudic'd* Man, to whoſe Dictates every one without Examination is with an implicit Faith to ſubmit.

Here again, *p.* 32. the *Unmasker* puts upon me what I never ſaid: and therefore I muſt deſire him to ſhew, where it is, that I pretend,

XI. That this *Propoſition*, that Jeſus is the Meſſiah, *is more intelligible than any of thoſe he has named.*

In his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, p. 120. He argues, that this Propoſition [*Jeſus is the Meſſiah*] has more Difficulty in it, than the Article of the Holy Trinity. And his Proofs are worthy of an *Unmasker*. *For*, ſays he, *here is an Hebrew Word firſt to be explain'd*; or (as he has this ſtrong Argument again, *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, p. 32.) *Here firſt the Name Jeſus, which is of Hebrew Extraction, tho' ſince Greciz'd, muſt be expounded.*

Anſw. Jeſus being a proper Name, only denoting a certain Perſon, needs not to be expounded, of what *Extraction* ſoever it be. Is this Propoſition, *Jonathan* was the Son of *Saul* King of *Iſrael*, any thing the harder, becauſe the three proper Names in it, *Jonathan*, *Saul* and *Iſrael*, are of *Hebrew Extraction?* And is it not as eaſy and as *level to the Underſtanding of the Vulgar* as this, *Arthur*, was the Son of *Henry* King of *England*; tho' neither of theſe Names be of *Hebrew Extraction?* Or cannot any *Vulgar Capacity* underſtand this Propoſition, *John Edwards writ a Book, Intituled*, Socinianiſm Unmask'd; till the Name *John*, which is of *Hebrew Extraction*, be explained to him? If this be ſo, Parents were beſt beware how hereafter they give their Children Scripture-Names, if they cannot underſtand what they ſay to one another about them, till theſe Names of *Hebrew Extraction* are expounded to them; and every Propoſition, that is in Writings and Contracts made concerning Perſons, that have Names of *Hebrew Extraction*, become thereby as hard to be underſtood as the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity.

His next Argument is juſt of the ſame ſize. The Word *Meſſias* muſt, he ſays, be explained too. Of what Extraction ſoever it be, there needs no more Explication of it than what our *Engliſh* Bible gives of it, where it is plain to any *Vulgar Capacity*, that it was uſed to denote that King and Deliverer whom God had promiſed. So that this Propoſition, *Jeſus is the Meſſiah*, has no more difficulty in it, than this, *Jeſus* is the promiſed *King* and *Deliverer*; or than this, *Cyrus* was King and Deliverer of *Perſia*: Which I think requires not much Depth of *Hebrew* to be underſtood. He that underſtood this Propoſition, and took *Cyrus* for his King, was a Subject and a Member of his Kingdom; and he that underſtands the other, and takes *Jeſus* to be his King, is his Subject, and a Member of his Kingdom. But if this be as hard as it is to ſome Men to underſtand the Doctrine of the Trinity, I fear many of

of the Kings in the World have but few true Subjects. To believe Jesus to be the *Messiah*, is (as he has been told over and over again) to take him for our King and Ruler, promised and sent by God. This is that, which will make any one from a *Jew* or *Heathen* to be a *Christian*. In this Sense it is very intelligible to *Vulgar Capacities*. Those who so understand and believe it, are so far from *pronouncing these Words as a Spell* (as the *Unmasker* ridiculously suggests, *pag.* 33.) that they therefore become Christians.

But what if I tell the *Unmasker*, that there is one Mr. *Edwards*, who (when he speaks his Mind, without considering how it will make for or against him) in another place, thinks this Proposition, *Jesus is the Messias*, very easy and intilligible? To convince him of it, I shall desire him to turn to the 74*th* Page of his *Socinianism Unmask'd*, where he will find that Mr. *Edwards*, without any great Search into the Hebrew Extractions, Interprets *Jesus the Messiah* to signify this, *That Jesus of* Nazareth *was that eminent and extraordinary Person propheſy'd of long before, and that he was sent and commissioned by God:* Which I think, is no very hard Proposition to be understood. But it is no strange thing, that that which was very easy to an *Unmasker* in one place, should be terrible hard in another; where want of something better requires to have it so.

Another Argument that he uses to prove the Articles he has given us to be necessary to Salvation, (*p.* 22.) is, because they are Doctrines which contain Things, that in their Nature have an *immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, End, Means, and Issue of Mens Redemption and Salvation.* And here I desire him to prove,

XII. That every one of his Articles contains Things so immediately relating to the *Occasion, Author, Way, Means, and Issue of our Redemption and Salvation*, that no body can be sav'd without understanding the Texts from whence he draws them, in the very same Sense that he does; and explicitly believing all these Propositions that he has deduc'd, and all that he will deduce from Scripture, when he shall please to compleat his Creed.

Page 23. He says of his Fundamentals, *Not without good Reason THEREFORE I call'd them Essential and Integral Parts of our Christian and Evangelical Faith: And why the Vindicator sleers at these Terms*, p. 549. *I know no Reason, but that he cannot confute the Application of them.*

Answ. One would think by the Word *therefore*, which he uses here, that in the precedent Paragraph, he had produc'd some Reason to justify his ridiculous Use of those Terms in his *Thoughts concerning Atheism*, p. 111. But nothing therein will he found tending to it. Indeed the foregoing Paragraph begins with these Words, *Thus I have briefly set before the Reader those Evangelical Truths, those Christian Principles which belong to the very Essence of Christianity.* Amongst these there is the Word *Essence:* But that from thence, or any thing else in that Paragraph, the *Unmasker* could with good Sense, or any Sense at all, infer as he does, *not without good reason, THEREFORE I called them the ESSENTIAL and INTEGRAL Parts of our Christian and Evangelical Faith*; requires an extraordinary sort of Logick to make out. What, I beseech you, is your *good Reason* too here, upon which you infer *Therefore*, &c? For it is impossible for any one but an *Unmasker*, to find one Word justifying his Use of the Terms *Essential* and *Integral*. But it would be a great Restraint to the running of the *Unmasker's* Pen, if you should not allow him the free use of illative Particles, where there are no Premisses to support them: And if you should not take Affirmations without Proof for Reasoning, you at once strike off above three quarters of his Book; and he will often, for several Pages together, have nothing to say. As for Example, from *p.* 28. to *p.* 35.

But to shew that I did not without Reason say, his Use of the Terms *Essential* and *Integral*, in the Place before quoted, was ridiculous; I must mind my Reader, that *p.* 109. of his *Thoughts concerning the Causes of Atheism*, he having said, that *the Epistolary Writings are fraught with other Fundamentals besides that one which I mention*; and then having set them down, he closes his Catalogue of them thus: *These are Matters of Faith contain'd in the Epistles, and they are*

Essential

Eſſential and Integral Parts of the Goſpel it ſelf, p. 111. Now what could be more ridiculous, than where the Queſtion is about Fundamental Doctrines, which are the *Eſſentials* of Chriſtian Religion, without an Aſſent to which a Man cannot be a Chriſtian; and ſo he himſelf calls them, *p.* 21. of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*; that he ſhould cloſe the Liſt he had made of *Fundamental Doctrines*, i. e. Eſſential Points of the Chriſtian Religion; with telling his Reader, *Theſe are Eſſential and Integral Parts of the Goſpel it ſelf?* i. e. Theſe which I have given you for *Fundamental*, for *Eſſential* Doctrines of the Goſpel, are the *Fundamental* and not *Fundamental*, *Eſſential* and not *Eſſential* Parts of the Goſpel mix'd together. For *Integral* Parts, in all the Wrirers I have met with, beſides the *Unmasker*, are contra-diſtinguiſh'd to *Eſſential*; and ſignify ſuch Parts as the Thing can be without, but without them will not be ſo compleat and intire as with them. Juſt ſuch an Acuteneſs, as our *Unmasker*, would any one ſhew, who taking upon him to ſet down the Parts *Eſſential* to a Man, without the having of which he could not be a Man, ſhould name the Soul, the Head, the Heart, Lungs, Stomach, Liver, Spleen, Eyes, Ears, Tongue, Arms, Legs, Hair and Nails; and to make all ſure, ſhould conclude with theſe Words; *Theſe are Parts contained* in a Man, *and are Eſſential and Integral Parts of a Man himſelf*; i. e. They are Parts, without ſome of which he cannot be a Man; and others, which tho' they make the Man intire, yet he may be a Man without them: As a Man ceaſes not to be a Man, though he want a Nail, a Finger, or an Arm, which are *Integral Parts* of a Man. *Riſum teneatis?* If the *Unmasker* can make any better Senſe of his *Eſſential and Integral Parts of the Goſpel it ſelf*, I will ask his Pardon for my Laughing: Till then he muſt not be angry, if the Reader and I laugh too. Beſides, I muſt tell him, that thoſe which he has ſet down are not the *Integral Parts of the Chriſtian Faith*, any more than the Head, the Trunk, and the Arms, Hands and Thighs are the Integral Parts of a Man: For a Man is not intire without the Legs and Feet too. They are ſome of the *Integral Parts* indeed; but cannot be call'd the *Integral Parts*, where any that go to make up the whole Man are left out: Nor thoſe the *Integral*, but ſome of the *Integral Parts* of the Chriſtian Faith, out of which any of the Doctrines propos'd in the *New Teſtament* are omitted: For whatever is there propos'd, is propos'd to be believ'd, and ſo is a Part of the Chriſtian Faith.

Before I leave his Catalogue of the *Eſſential and Integral Parts* of the Goſpel, which he has given us, inſtead of one containing the Articles neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, I muſt take notice of what he ſays, whilſt he is making it, *p.* 9. *Why then is there a Treatiſe publiſh'd, to tell the World that the bare Belief of a Meſſiah is all that is required of a Chriſtian?* As if there were no Difference between believing a *Meſſiah*, and believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*; no Difference between *requir'd of a Chriſtian*, and requir'd to make a Man a Chriſtian. As if you ſhould ſay, renouncing his former Idolatry, and being circumcis'd and baptiz'd into *Moſes*, was all that was required to make a Man an *Iſraelite*; therefore it was all that was required of an *Iſraelite*. For theſe two Falſhoods has he, in this one ſhort Sentence, thought fit ſlily to father upon me, the *humble Imitator of the Jeſuits*, as he is pleas'd to call me. And therefore I muſt deſire him to ſhew,

XIII. Where the *World is told in the Treatiſe that I publiſh'd, That the bare Belief of a Meſſiah is all that is requir'd of a Chriſtian?*

The ſix next Pages, *i. e.* from the twenty eighth to the End of his Second Chapter, being taken up with nothing but Pulpit Oratory out of its Place; and without any Reply, apply'd or applicable to any Thing I have ſaid in my *Vindication*, I ſhall paſs by, till he ſhews any Thing in them that is ſo.

In *Page* 36. this Giant in Argument, falls on me, and mauls me unmercifully about the Epiſtles. He begins thus: *The Gentleman is not without his Evaſions, and he ſees it is high time to make uſe of them. This puts him in ſome Diſorder. For when he comes to ſpeak of my mentioning his ill Treatment of the Epiſtles—— you may obſerve, that he begins to grow warmer than before. Now this meek Man is nettled, and one may perceive he is ſenſible of the Scandal that he hath given to good People, by his ſlighting the Epiſtolatory Writings of the Holy Apoſtles; yet he*

he is ſo cunning as to diſguiſe his Paſſion as well as he can. Let all this impernent and inconſiſtent Stuff be ſo. I am angry and cannot diſguiſe it, I am *cunning* and would diſguiſe it; but yet the quick-ſighted *Unmasker* has found me out, that I am *nettled*. What does all this notable Prologue of *Hiſtius Doctius*, of a *Cunning Man*, and in effect *no Cunning Man*, in *diſorder*, *warm'd*, *nettled*, in a *Paſſion*, tend to? But to ſhew, that theſe following Words of mine, *p.* 549. of my *Vindication*, viz. "I require you to publiſh to the World thoſe Pages which ſhew "my Contempt of the Epiſtles," are ſo full of Heat and Diſorder, that they need no other Anſwer. But *what need I, good Sir, do this, when you have done it your ſelf?* A Reply, I own, very ſoft; and whether I may not ſay, very ſilly, let the Reader judge. The *Unmasker* having accus'd me of contemning the Epiſtles, my Reply, in my *Vindication*, ibid. was thus: "Sir, when your "angry Fit is over, and the Abatement of your Paſſion has given way to the "Return of your Sincerity, I ſhall beg you to read this Paſſage in the 539*th* "Page of my Book. Theſe holy Writers (*viz.* the Penmen of the Epiſtles) "inſpir'd from above, writ nothing but Truth; and in moſt Places very "weighty Truths to us now, for the expounding, clearing, and confirming "of the Chriſtian Doctrine, and eſtabliſhing thoſe in it who had embrac'd "it. And again, *ibid.* The other Parts [*i. e.* beſides the Goſpels and the "*Acts*] of *DIVINE REVELATION* are Objects of Faith, and are ſo "to be received; they are Truths, of which none that is once known to be "ſuch, *i. e.* revealed, may, or ought to be disbelieved. And if this does not "ſatisfy you, that I have as high a Veneration for the Epiſtles as you, or any "one can have, I require you to publiſh to the World thoſe *PASSAGES* "which ſhew my Contempt of them." After ſuch direct Words of mine, expreſſing my Veneration for that Part of Divine Revelation which is contain'd in the Epiſtles, any one but an *Unmasker* would bluſh to charge me with *Contempt* of them; without alledging, when ſummon'd to it, any Word in my Book to juſtify that Charge.

If Hardneſs of Forehead were Strength of Brains, 'twere two to one of his Side againſt any Man I ever yet heard of. I require him to publiſh to the World thoſe *Paſſages* that ſhew my *Contempt* of the Epiſtles; and he anſwers me, *He need not do it, for I have done it my ſelf.* Whoever had common Senſe would underſtand, that what I demanded was, that he ſhould ſhew the World where, amongſt all I had publiſh'd, there were any *Paſſages* that expreſs'd *Contempt* of the Epiſtles: For it was not expected he ſhould quote *Paſſages* of mine that I had never publiſh'd. And this acute *Unmasker* (to this) ſays, I had publiſh'd them my ſelf. So that the Reaſon why he cannot find them, is, becauſe I had publiſh'd them my ſelf. But, ſays he, *I appeal to the Reader, whether (after your tedious Collection out of the four* Evangeliſts) *your paſſing by the Epiſtles, and neglecting wholly what the Apoſtles ſay in them, be not publiſhing to the World your Contempt of them?* I demand of him to publiſh to the World thoſe *Paſſages*, which ſhew my Contempt of the Epiſtles: And he anſwers, *He need not, I have done it my ſelf.* How does that appear? I have have *paſs'd* by the Epiſtes, ſays he. My paſſing them by then, are *Paſſages publiſh'd* againſt the Epiſtles? For *publiſhing of Paſſages* is what you ſaid you *need not do*, and what *I had done*. So that the *Paſſages* I have publiſh'd containing a Contempt of the Epiſtles, are extant in my ſaying nothing of them? Surely this ſame *paſſing by* has done ſome very ſhrewd Diſpleaſure to our poor *Unmasker*, that he ſo ſtarts whenever it is but nam'd, and cannot think it contains leſs than *Excluſion*, *Defiance*, and *Contempt*. Here therefore the Propoſition remaining to be prov'd by you is,

XIV. *That one cannot paſs by any thing without Contempt of it.*

And when you have prov'd it, I ſhall then ask you, what will become of all thoſe Parts of Scripture, all thoſe Chapters and Verſes that you have *paſs'd by*, in your Collection of Fundamental Articles? Thoſe that you have vouchſaf'd to ſet down, you tell us, *Are in the Bible on purpoſe to be believ'd.* What muſt become of all the reſt, which you have omitted? Are they there not to be believ'd? And muſt the *Reader* underſtand your *paſſing them by* to be a publiſhing to the World your *Contempt* of them? If ſo, you have Unmask'd your

ſelf;

ſelf: If not, but you may *paſs by* ſome Parts of Scripture, nay whole Epiſtles, as you have thoſe of St. *James* and St. *Jude*, without *Contempt*; Why may not I, without *Contempt*, paſs by others; but becauſe you have a Liberty to do what you will, and I muſt do but what you, in your good Pleaſure, will allow me? But if I ask you whence you have this Privilege above others; you will have nothing to ſay, except it be according to your uſual Skill in Divining, that you know my Heart, and the Thoughts that are in it, which you find not like yours, right, and orthodox, and good; but always evil and perverſe, ſuch as I dare not own, but hypocritically either ſay nothing of, or declare againſt: but yet with all my Cunning I cannot hide them from you; your all-knowing Penetration always finds them out; you know them, or you gueſs at them, as is beſt for your Turn, and that's as good: And then preſently I am confounded. I doubt whether the World has ever had any two-ey'd Man your equal, for Penetration and a quick Sight. The telling, by the Spectator's Looks, what Card he gueſſes, is nothing to what you can do. You take the Heighth of an Author's Parts, by numbring the Pages of his Book; you can ſpy an Hereſy in him, by his ſaying not a Syllable of it; diſtinguiſh him from the Orthodox, by his underſtanding Places of Scripture juſt as ſeveral of the Orthodox do; you can repeat by heart whole Leaves of what is in his Mind to ſay, before he ſpeaks a Word of it; you can diſcover Deſigns before they are hatch'd, and all the Intrigues of carrying them on, by thoſe who never thought of them. All this, and more you can do by the Spirit of Orthodoxy; or which is as certain, by your own good Spirit of Invention informing you. Is not this to be an errant Conjurer?

But to your Reply. You ſay, *After my* TEDIOUS *Collection out of the four Evangeliſts, my paſſing by the Epiſtles, and neglecting wholly what the Apoſtles ſay*, &c. I wondred at firſt why you mention'd not the *Acts* here, as well as the *four Evangeliſts*: For I have not, as you have in other Places obſerv'd, been ſparing of Collections out of the *Acts* too. But there was, it ſeems, a Neceſſity here for your omitting it: For that would have ſtood too near what follow'd, in theſe Words; And *neglecting wholly what the Apoſtles ſay*. For if it appear'd to the Reader, out of your own Confeſſion, that I allow'd and built upon the Divine Authority of what the Apoſtles ſay in the *Acts*, he could not ſo eaſily be miſled into an Opinion, that I contemned what they ſay in their Epiſtles. But this is but a ſlight Touch of your Leger-de-main.

And now I ask the Reader what he will think of a Miniſter of the Goſpel, who cannot bear the Texts of Scripture I have produc'd, nor my Quotations out of the four Evangeliſts? This, which in his *Thoughts of the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, p. 114. was want of *Vivacity and Elevation of Mind*, want of *a Vein of Senſe and Reaſon, yea, and of Elocution too*; is here, in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, a *Tedious Collection out of the four Evangeliſts*. Thoſe Places I have quoted, lie heavy, it ſeems, upon his Stomach, and are too many to be got off. But it was my Buſineſs not to omit one of them, that the Reader might have a full View of the whole Tenor of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles to the Unconverted *Jews* and *Gentiles*; and might therein ſee what Faith they were converted to, and upon their Aſſent to which they were pronounced Believers, and admitted into the Chriſtian Church. But the *Unmasker* complains there are too many of them: He thinks the Goſpel, the good News of Salvation, *tedious* from the Mouth of our Saviour and his Apoſtles: He is of Opinion, that before the Epiſtles were writ, and without believing preciſely what he thinks fit to cull out of them, there could be no Chriſtians; and if we had nothing but the four Evangeliſts, we could not be ſav'd. And yet 'tis plain, that every ſingle one of the Four contains the Goſpel of *Jeſus Chriſt*; and at leaſt, they all together contain all that is neceſſary to Salvation. If any one doubt of this, I refer him to Mr. *Chillingworth* for Satisfaction, who hath abundantly prov'd it.

His following Words (were he not the ſame *Unmasker* all through) would be beyond Parallel. *But let us hear why the Vindicator did not attempt to collect any Articles out of theſe Writings; he aſſigns this as one Reaſon:* "The Epiſtles "being writ to thoſe who were already Believers, it could not be ſuppos'd "that they were writ to them to teach them Fundamentals," *p.* 548. Vindic. *Certainly*

Certainly no Man would have conjectured that he would have uſed ſuch an Evaſion as this. I will ſay that for him, he goes beyond all Surmiſes, he is above all Conjectures, he hath a Faculty which no Creature on Earth can ever fathom. Thus far the *Unmasker* in his Oratorical *Strain.* In what follows, he comes to his cloſer Reaſoning againſt what I had ſaid. His Words are, *Do we not know that the four Goſpels were writ to and for Believers, as well as Unbelievers? Anſw.* I grant it. Now let us ſee your Inference: Therefore what theſe holy Hiſtorians recorded, that our Saviour and his Apoſtles ſaid and preach'd to Unbelievers, was ſaid and preach'd to Believers. The Diſcourſe which our Saviour had with the Woman of *Samaria*, and her Townſmen, was addreſs'd to Believers: becauſe St. *John* writ his Goſpel (wherein it is recorded as a Part of our Saviour's Hiſtory) for Believers as well as Unbelievers. St. *Peter*'s Preaching to *Cornelius*, and St. *Paul*'s Preaching at *Antioch*, at *Theſſalonica*, at *Corinth*, &c. was not to Unbelievers, for their Converſion; becauſe St. *Luke* dedicates his Hiſtory of the *Acts* of the Apoſtles to *Theophilus*, who was a Chriſtian, as the *Unmasker* ſtrenuouſly proves in this Paragraph. Juſt as if he ſhould ſay, that the Diſcourſes which *Caſar* records he had upon ſeveral Occaſions with the *Gauls*, were not addreſs'd to the *Gauls* alone, but to the *Romans* alſo; becauſe his Commentaries were writ for the *Romans* as well as others: Or that the Sayings of the antient *Greeks* and *Romans* in *Plutarch*, were not ſpoke by them to their Contemporaries only, becauſe they are recorded by him for the Benefit of Poſterity.

I perus'd the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles to the Unconverted World, to ſee what they taught and required to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians: And all theſe I ſet down, and leave the World to judge what they contain'd. The Epiſtles, which were all written to thoſe who had embrac'd the Faith, and were all Chriſtians already, I thought would not ſo diſtinctly ſhew what were thoſe Doctrines which were abſolutely neceſſary to make Men Chriſtians; they being not writ to convert Unbelievers, but to build up thoſe who were already Believers, in their moſt holy Faith. This is plainly expreſs'd in the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. v. 11, *&c. Of whom, i. e.* Chriſt, *we have many Things to ſay, and had to be utter'd, ſeeing ye are all dull of hearing. For when for the Time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again, which be the firſt Principles of the Oracles of God; and are become ſuch as have need of Milk and not of ſtrong Meat. For every one that uſeth Milk is unskilful in the Word of Righteouſneſs; for he is a Babe: But ſtrong Meat belongeth to him that is of full Age, even thoſe who by reaſon of Uſe have their Senſes exerciſed, to diſcern both good and bad. Therefore leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt, let us go on unto Perfection, not laying again the Foundation of Repentance from dead Works, and of Faith towards God, and of the Doctrine of Baptiſm, and of laying on of Hands, and of the Reſurrection of the Dead, and of Eternal Judgment.* Here the Apoſtle ſhews what was his Deſign in writing this Epiſtle: Not to teach them the Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion, but to lead them on to more Perfection; that is, to greater Degrees of Knowledge of the wiſe Deſign and wonderful Contrivance and carrying on of the Goſpel, and the Evidence of it; which he makes out in this Epiſtle, by ſhewing its Correſpondence with the *Old Teſtament*, and particularly with the Oeconomy of the Moſaical Conſtitution. Here I might ask the *Unmasker*, Whether thoſe many Things which St. *Paul* tells the *Hebrews* he had to ſay of Chriſt, (hard to be utter'd to them, becauſe they were dull of hearing) had not an *immediate Reſpect to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means, or Iſſue of their Redemption and Salvation:* And therefore, *whether they were ſuch Things, without the Knowledge of which they could not be ſav'd*, as the *Unmasker* ſays of ſuch Things, *p.* 23. And the like I might ask him, concerning thoſe Things which the Apoſtle tells the *Corinthians*, 1 Epiſt. Chap. iii. 2. that they *were not able to bear.* For much to the ſame Purpoſe he ſpeaks to the *Corinthians*, Epiſt. 1. Chap. iii. as in the above-cited Places he did to the *Hebrews*; *That he, as a wiſe Maſter-Builder, had laid the Foundation:* And that *Foundation* he himſelf tells us, is *Jeſus the Meſſiah*; and that there is no other Foundation to be laid. And that in this he laid the Foundation of Chriſtianity at *Corinth*, St. *Luke* records, *Acts* xviii. 4. in theſe Words: *Paul*, at Corinth, *reaſon'd in the Synagogue*

every

every Sabbath-day, and teſtify'd to the Jews that Jeſus was the Meſſiah. Upon which Foundation he tells them, there might be a Superſtructure. But that what is built on the Foundation is not the Foundation, I think I need not prove. He further tells them, that he had deſir'd to build upon this Foundation; but withal ſays, he had *fed them* till then *with Milk, and not with Meat; becauſe they were Babes, and had not been able to bear it, neither were they yet able.* And therefore this Epiſtle we ſee is almoſt wholly ſpent in Reproofs of their Miſcarriages, and in Exhortations and Inſtructions relating to Practice; and very little ſaid in it for the explaing any Part of the great *Myſtery* of Salvation contain'd in the Goſpel.

By theſe Paſſages we may ſee (were it not evident to common Senſe it ſelf, from the Nature of Things) that the Deſign of theſe Epiſtles was not to lay the Foundations, or teach the Principles of the Chriſtian Religion; they being writ to thoſe who had receiv'd them, and were Chriſtians already. The ſame holds in all the other Epiſtles; and therefore the Epiſtles ſeem'd not to me the propereſt Parts of Scripture, to give us that Foundation diſtinct from all the Superſtructures built on it; becauſe in the Epiſtles, the latter was the thing propos'd, rather than the former. For the main Intention of the Apoſtles in writing their Epiſtles, could not be to do what was done already; to lay down barely the Foundations of Chriſtianity to thoſe who were Chriſtians already; but to build upon it ſome farther Explication of it, which either their particular Circumſtances, or a general Evidencing of the Truth, Wiſdom, Excellencies, and Privileges, *&c.* of the Goſpel, requir'd. This was the Reaſon that perſuaded me to take the Articles of Faith abſolutely neceſſary to be receiv'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, only from the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles to the Unconverted World, as laid down in the Hiſtorical Part of the New Teſtament: and I thought it a good Reaſon. It being paſt doubt, that they in their Preachings propos'd to the Unconverted, all that was neceſſary to be believ'd to make them Chriſtians: And alſo, that that Faith, upon a Profeſſion whereof any one was admitted into the Church as a Believer, had all that was neceſſary in it to make him a Chriſtian; becauſe if it wanted any thing neceſſary, he had neceſſarily not been admitted: unleſs we can ſuppoſe, that any one was admitted into the Chriſtian Church by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, who was not yet a Chriſtian; or pronounc'd a Believer, who yet wanted ſomething neceſſary to make him a Believer, *i. e.* was a Believer and not a Believer at the ſame time. But what thoſe Articles were, which had been preach'd to thoſe to whom the Epiſtles were writ, and upon the Belief whereof they had been admitted into the Chriſtian Church, and became, as they are call'd, *Believers, Saints, Faithful, Elect*, &c. could not be collected out of the Epiſtles. This, tho' it were my Reaſon, and muſt be a Reaſon to every one who would make this Enquiry; and the *Unmasker* quotes the Place where I told him it was my Reaſon: yet he, according to his never-erring Illumination, flatly tells me, *pag.* 38. that it was not; and adds, *Here then is want of Sincerity*, &c. I muſt deſire him therefore to prove what he ſays, *pag.* 38. *viz.*

XV. That *by the ſame Argument that I would perſuade that* the Fundamentals *are not to be ſought for in the* Epiſtles, he can prove *that they* are *not to be ſought for in the Goſpels and in the* Acts; becauſe *even theſe were writ to thoſe that believed.*

And next I deſire him to prove, what he alſo ſays in the ſame Page, *viz.*

XVI. *That the Epiſtles being writ to thoſe that believ'd, was not an Argument that I did make uſe of.*

He tells us, *p.* 38. That it is the Argument whereby I *would perſuade*: and in the very ſame Page, a few Lines lower, ſays, *That it is not the Argument I did make uſe of.* Who, but an errant *Unmasker*, would contradict himſelf ſo flatly in the ſame Breath? And yet upon that he raiſes a Complaint of my *want of Sincerity.*

For

For *want of Sincerity* in one of us, we need not go far for an Inſtance. The next Paragraph, *p.* 38—40. affords us a groſs one of it; wherein the *Unmasker* argues ſtrongly, not againſt any thing I had ſaid, but againſt an Untruth of his own ſetting up. Towards the latter end of the Paragraph, *p.* 40. he has theſe Words: *It is, manifeſt that the Apoſtles in their Epiſtles taught Fundamentals; which is contrary to what this Gentleman ſays, that ſuch a thing could not be ſuppos'd.* And therefore the *Unmasker* has taken a great deal of Pains to ſhew, that there are Fundamental Doctrines to be found in the Epiſtles; as if I had deny'd it. And to lead the Reader into an Opinion that I had ſaid ſo, he ſets down theſe Words, *Could not be ſuppos'd*; as if they were my Words. And ſo they are, but not to that Purpoſe. And therefore he did well not to quote the Page, leſt the Reader, by barely turning to the Place, ſhould have a clear ſight of Falſhood, inſtead of that *Sincerity*, which he would make the Reader believe is wanting in me. My Words, *p.* 538. *Of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, are, "*NOR CAN IT BE SUPPOS'D*, that the ſending of ſuch Fundamentals was the Reaſon of the Apoſtles writing to any of them." And a little lower: "The Epiſtles therefore being all written to thoſe who were already Believers and Chriſtians, the Occaſion and End of writing them could not be to inſtruct them in that which was neceſſary to make them Chriſtians." The thing then that I deny'd, was not that there were any Fundamentals in the Epiſtles. For *p.* 539. I have theſe expreſs Words: "I do not deny but the great Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith are dropt here and there, and ſcatter'd up and down in moſt of them." And therefore he might have ſpar'd his Endeavours, in the next Paragraph, to prove, that there may be Fundamentals found in the Epiſtles, till he finds ſome body that denies it. And here again, I muſt repeat my uſual Queſtion, that with this ſincere Writer is ſo often neceſſary, *viz.*

XVII. Where it is that I ſay, *that it cannot be ſuppos'd that there are Fundamental Articles in the Epiſtles?*

If he hopes to ſhift it off by the Word *taught*, which ſeems fallaciouſly put in; as if he meant, that there were ſome Fundamental Articles *taught* neceſſary to be believ'd to make them Chriſtians, in the Epiſtles, which thoſe whom they were writ to, knew not before: in this Senſe I do deny it, and then this will be the

XVIIth Propoſition remaining upon him to prove, *viz.*

That there are Fundamental Articles neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, taught in the Epiſtles, which thoſe, whom they were writ to, knew not before.

The former part of his next Paragraph, *p.* 40. runs thus: *Hear another feigned Ground of his omitting the Epiſtles,* viz. *Becauſe the Fundamental Articles are here promiſcuouſly, and without diſtinction, mix'd with other Truths.* p. 41. *But who ſees not that this is a mere Eluſion? For on the ſame account he might have forborn to ſearch for Fundamental Articles in the Goſpels; for they do not lie there together, but are diſpers'd up and down. The Doctrinal and Hiſtorical Parts are mix'd with one another, but he pretends to ſever them. Why then did he not make a Separation between the Doctrines in the Epiſtles, and thoſe other Matters that are treated of there? He has nothing to reply to this, and therefore we muſt again look upon what he has ſuggeſted as a Caſt of his ſhuffling Faculty.*

The Argument contain'd in theſe Words is this. A Man cannot well diſtinguiſh Fundamental from Non-fundamental Doctrines in the Epiſtles, where they are promiſcuouſly mix'd with Non-fundamental Doctrines: Therefore he cannot well diſtinguiſh Fundamental Doctrines from others in the Goſpels, and the Acts, where they are mix'd with Matters of Fact. As if he ſhould ſay, one cannot well diſtinguiſh a Batchelor of Divinity from other Divines, where ſeveral of them ſtand together promiſcuouſly in the ſame Habit; therefore one cannot diſtinguiſh a Batchelor of Divinity from a *Billingſ-*

gate

gate Orator, where they ſtand together in their diſtinct Habits: Or that it is as eaſy to diſtinguiſh fine Gold from that of a little lower Allay, where ſeveral pieces of each are mix'd together; as it is to diſtinguiſh pieces of fine Gold from pieces of Silver, which they are mix'd among.

But it ſeems the *Unmasker* thinks it is as eaſy to diſtinguiſh between Fundamental and not Fundamental Doctrines, in a Writing of the ſame Author, where they are promiſcuouſly mix'd together, as it is to diſtinguiſh between a Fundamental Doctrine of Faith, and a Relation of Matter of Fact, where they are intermixedly reported in the ſame Hiſtory. When he has prov'd this, the *Unmasker* will have more Reaſon to tax me with *Eluſion*, *Shuffling* and *Feigning*, in the Reaſon I gave for not collecting Fundamentals out of the Epiſtles. Till then, all that Noiſe muſt ſtand amongſt thoſe ridiculous Airs of Triumph and Victory, which he ſo often gives himſelf, without the leaſt Advantage to his Cauſe, or Edification of his Reader; tho' he ſhould a thouſand times ſay, *That I have nothing to reply.*

In the latter part of this Paragraph, he ſays, *That neceſſary Truths, Fundamental Principles, may be diſtinguiſh'd from thoſe that are not ſuch, in the Epiſtolary Writings*, by the *Nature and Importance of them, by their immediate reſpect to the Author and Means of our Salvation. Anſw.* If this be ſo, I deſire him to give me a definitive Collection of Fundamentals out of the Epiſtles, as I have given one out of the Goſpels and the Acts. If he cannot do that, 'tis plain, he hath here given a diſtinguiſhing Mark of Fundamentals, by which he himſelf cannot diſtinguiſh them. But yet I am the Shuffler.

The Argument in the next Paragraph, *p.* 41. is this:

Neceſſary Doctrines of Faith, ſuch as God abſolutely demands to be believ'd for Juſtification, may be diſtinguiſh'd from Rules of Holy Living, with which they are mix'd in the Epiſtles; therefore Doctrines of Faith neceſſary, and not neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, may be diſtinguiſh'd as they ſtand mix'd in the Epiſtles. Which is as good Senſe as to ſay, Lambs and Kids may be eaſily diſtinguiſh'd in the ſame Penn, where they are together, by their different Natures: Therefore the Lambs I abſolutely demand of you, as neceſſary to ſatisfy me, may be diſtinguiſh'd from others in the ſame Penn, where they are mix'd, without any Diſtinction. Doctrines of Faith, and Precepts of Practice, are as diſtinguiſhable as doing and believing; and thoſe as eaſily diſcernible one from another, as thinking and walking: But Doctrinal Propoſitions, all of them of Divine Revelation, are of the ſame Authority, and of the ſame pecies, in reſpect of the Neceſſity of believing them; and will be eternally undiſtinguiſhable into neceſſary and not neceſſary to be believ'd, till there be ſome other Way found to diſtinguiſh them, than that they are in a Book which is all of Divine Revelation. Tho' therefore Doctrines of Faith, and Rules of Practice are very diſtinguiſhable in the Epiſtles, yet it does not follow from thence, that Fundamental and not Fundamental Doctrines, Points neceſſary and not neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians, are eaſily diſtinguiſhable in the Epiſtles. Which therefore remains to be prov'd: And it remains incumbent upon him,

XVIII. *To ſet down the Marks, whereby the Doctrines deliver'd in the Epiſtles, may eaſily and exactly be diſtinguiſh'd into Fundamental, and not Fundamental Articles of Faith.*

All the reſt of that Paragraph containing nothing againſt me, muſt be bound up with a great deal of the like Stuff which the *Unmasker* has put into his Book, to ſhew the World he does not *imitate me in Impertinences, Incoherences*, and *trifling Excurſions*, as he boaſts in his firſt Paragraph. Only I ſhall deſire the Reader to take the whole Paſſage concerning this Matter, as it ſtands in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, p. 539. "I do not deny, but the great "Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith are dropt here and there, and ſcatter'd up "and down in moſt of them. But 'tis not in the Epiſtles we are to learn "what are the Fundamental Articles of Faith, where they are promiſcuouſly, "and without diſtinction, mix'd with other Truths and Diſcourſes which "were (tho' for Edification indeed, yet) only Occaſional. We ſhall find and "diſcern

" diſcern thoſe great and neceſſary Points beſt in the Preaching of our Saviour " and his Apoſtles, to thoſe who were yet Stragers and ignorant of the Faith, " to bring them in, and convert them to it." And then let him read theſe Words, which the *Unmasker* has quoted out of them: *It is not in the Epiſtles that we are to learn what are Fundamental Articles of Faith, they were written for the reſolving of Doubts, and reforming of Miſtakes*; with his Introduction of them in theſe Words: *He commands the Reader not to ſtir a Jot further than the Acts.* If I ſhould ask him, where that Command appears, he muſt have recourſe to his old Shift, that he did not mean as he ſaid, or elſe ſtand convicted of a malicious Untruth. An Orator is not bound to ſpeak ſtrict Truth, tho' a Diſputant be. But this *Unmasker*'s writing againſt me will excuſe him from being of the latter: and then why may not Falſhoods paſs for Rhetorical *Flouriſhes*, in one who hath been us'd to popular Haranguing; to which Men are not generally ſo ſevere as ſtrictly to examine them, and expect that they ſhould always be found to contain nothing but preciſe Truth, and ſtrict Reaſoning? But yet I muſt not forget to put upon his Score, this other Propoſition of his, which he has, *p.* 42. and ask him to ſhew,

XIX. *Where it is that I command my Reader not to ſtir a Jot farther than the* Acts?

In the next two Paragraphs, *p.* 42----46. the *Unmasker* is at his natural Play, of Declaiming without Proving. 'Tis pity the *Miſhna*, out of which he takes his good *Breeding*, as it told him that *a well-bred and well-taught Man anſwers to the firſt in the firſt place*, had not given him this Rule too about Order, *viz.* That Proving ſhould go before Condemning; elſe all the fierce Exaggerations ill Language can heap up, are but empty Scurrility. But 'tis no wonder that the *Jewiſh* Doctors ſhould not provide Rules for a Chriſtian Divine, turn'd *Unmasker*. For where a Cauſe is to be maintain'd, and a Book to be writ, and Arguments are not at hand, yet ſomething muſt be found to fill it; Railing in ſuch Caſes is much eaſier than Reaſoning, eſpecially where a Man's Parts lie that Way.

The firſt of theſe Paragraphs, *p.* 42. he begins thus: *But let us hear further what this* Vindicator *ſaith to excuſe his Rejection of the Doctrines contain'd in the Epiſtles, and his putting us off with one Article of Faith.* And then he quotes theſe following Words of mine: " What if the Author deſign'd his Treatiſe, as the Title " ſhews, chiefly for thoſe who were not yet thoroughly and firmly Chriſtians; " purpoſing to work upon thoſe, who either wholly disbeliev'd, or doubted of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion?"

Anſw. This, as he has put it, is a downright Falſhood. For the Words he quotes, were not us'd by me *to excuſe my Rejection of the* Doctrines *contain'd in the Epiſtles*, or to prove there was but *one Article*; but as a Reaſon why I omitted the mention of *Satisfaction.*

To demonſtrate this, I ſhall ſet down the whole Paſſage as it is, *p.* 546. of my *Vindication*, where it runs thus:

" But what will become of me that I have not mention'd Satisfaction!

" Poſſibly this Reverend Gentleman would have had Charity enough for a " known Writer of the Brotherhood, to have found it by an *Innuendo* in thoſe " Words above quoted, of laying down his Life for another. But every thing " is to ſtrained here the other Way. For the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of* " *Chriſtianity*, &c. is of neceſſity to be repreſented as a *Socinian*; or elſe his " Book may be read, and the Truths in it, which Mr. *Edwards* likes not, be " receiv'd; and People put upon examining. Thus one, as full of happy Con- " jectures and Suſpicions as this Gentleman, might be apt to argue. But what " if the Author deſign'd his Treatiſe, as the Title ſhews, chiefly for thoſe " who were not yet thoroughly or firmly Chriſtians; propoſing to work on thoſe " who either wholly disbeliev'd, or doubted of the Truth of the Chriſtian Re- " ligion?"

To this he tells me, *p.* 43. that my *Title ſays nothing for me*, i. e. ſhews not that I deſign'd my Book for thoſe that disbeliev'd or doubted of the Chriſtian Religion.

Anſw.

Anſw. I thought that a Title that profeſs'd the *Reaſonableneſs* of any Doctrine, ſhew'd it was intended for thoſe that were not fully ſatisfy'd of the *Reaſonableneſs* of it; unleſs Books are to be writ to convince thoſe of any thing, who are convinc'd already. But poſſibly, this may be the *Unmasker*'s Way: And if one ſhould judge by his Manner of treating this Subject, with Declamation inſtead of Argument, one would think, that he meant it for no body but thoſe who were of his Mind already. I thought therefore, *The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, as deliver'd in the Scripture*, a proper Title to ſignify whom it was chiefly meant for: And, I thank God, I can with Satisfaction ſay, it has not wanted its Effect upon ſome of them. But the *Unmasker* proves for all that, that I could not deſign it chiefly for Disbelievers or Doubters of the Chriſtian Religion. *For*, ſays he, *p.* 43. *How thoſe that wholly diſregard and disbelieve the Scriptures of the* New Teſtament, *as* Gentiles, Jews, Mahometans, *and Atheiſts do*, (I crave Leave to put in Theiſts inſtead of Atheiſts, for a Reaſon preſently to be mention'd) *are like to attend to the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, as deliver'd in the Scripture, is not to be conceiv'd; and therefore we look upon this as all mere Sham and Sophiſtry. Anſw.* Though the *Unmasker* teaches good Breeding out of the *Miſhna*, yet I thought he had been a Miniſter of the Goſpel, and had taught Chriſtianity out of the Scripture. Why! good Sir, would you teach *Jews* and *Mahometans* Chriſtianity out of the *Talmud* and *Alcoran*; becauſe they are the Books, that at preſent, they *attend to* and believe? Or would you, laying by the Authority of all Books, preach Religion to Infidels in your own Name, and by your own Authority; laying aſide the Scripture? *Is it not to be conceiv'd*, no not by a Chriſtian Divine, that the Way to make Unbelievers Chriſtians, is to ſhew them the Reaſonableneſs of the Religion contain'd in the Scriptures? But it ſeems the *Unmasker* has a peculiar Way of preaching and propagating Chriſtianity without the Scripture, as ſome Men have a peculiar Way of diſputing without Reaſon.

In the Beginning of this Paragraph, *p.* 43. the *Unmasker*, that is always a fair Interpreter of my Meaning, and never fails to know it better than I do, tells me, That by thoſe that wholly disbelieve, *I muſt mean Atheiſt, Turks, Jews, and Pagans*, and by thoſe that are not firmly Chriſtians, *a few weak Chriſtians*. But did our *Unmasker* never hear of Unbelievers, under a Denomination diſtinct from that of *Atheiſts*, *Turks*, *Jews* and *Pagans*? Whilſt the Pulpit and the Preſs have ſo often had up the Name of *Theiſts* or *Deiſts*, has that Name wholly 'ſcap'd him? 'Twas theſe I chiefly deſign'd, and I believe no body of all that read my Vindication, but the *Unmasker*, miſtook me, if he did. But there at leaſt, *p.* 547. he might have found the Name, as of a Sort of Unbelievers not unknown amongſt us. But whatever he thought, it was convenient and a Sort of *Prudence* in him (when he would perſuade others, that I had not a Deſign which I ſay I had) to leſſen as much as he could, and cover the Need of any ſuch Deſign; and ſo make it, that I could not intend my Book to work upon thoſe that disbeliev'd, or did not firmly believe; by inſinuating, there were *few* or none ſuch amongſt us. Hence he ſays, that by thoſe that are not thoroughly and firmly Chriſtians, *I mean a F E W weak Chriſtians*; as well as under thoſe, who wholly disbelieve, he left the *Theiſts* out of my Meaning. I am very glad to hear from the *Unmasker*, that there are but *few weak Chriſtians*, few that have Doubts about the Truth of Chriſtianity amongſt us. But if there be not a great Number of *Deiſts*, and that the preventing their Increaſe be not worth every true Chriſtian's Care and Endeavours, thoſe who have been ſo loud againſt them have been much to blame; and I wiſh to God there were no Reaſon for their Complaints. For theſe therefore I take the Liberty to ſay, as I did before, that I chiefly deſign'd my Book; and ſhall not be aſham'd of this *Sophiſtry*, as you call it, if it can be *Sophiſtry* to alledge a Matter of Fact that I know; till you have Arguments to convince me, that you know my Intention in publiſhing it, better than I do my ſelf. And I ſhall think it ſtill no blameable *Prudence*, however you exclaim againſt *Prudence*, (as perhaps you have ſome Reaſon) that "I mention'd only "thoſe Advantages, that all Chriſtians are agreed in; and that I obſerv'd "that Command of the Apoſtle, *Rom.* xiv. 1. *Him that is weak in the Faith re-* "*ceive ye, but not to doubtful Diſputations*; without being a *Socinian*. I think I "did

" did not miſs, that I offer'd to the Belief of thoſe that ſtood off, that, and " only that, which our Saviour and his Apoſtles preach'd for the reducing the " Unconverted World. And would any one think he in earneſt went about " to perſuade Men to be Chriſtians, who ſhould uſe that as an Argument to " recommend the Goſpel, which he has obſerved Men to lay hold on as an Ob- " jection againſt it? To urge ſuch Points of Controverſy as neceſſary Articles " of Faith, when we ſee our Saviour and the Apoſtles urged them not as ne- " ceſſary to be believed to make Men Chriſtians, is (by our own Authority) " to add Prejudices to Prejudices, and to block up our own Way to thoſe Men, " whom we would have Acceſs to, and prevail upon."

I have repeated this again out of the the 546th Page of my *Vindication*, where there is more to the ſame Purpoſe; that the Reader may ſee how fully the *Unmasker* has anſwer'd it.

Becauſe I ſaid, " Would any one blame my Prudence, if I mention'd only " thoſe Advantages, which all Chriſtians are agreed in;" the *Unmasker* adds, *p.* 44. *Socinian Chriſtians*: And then as if the naming of that had gained him his Point, he goes on victoriouſly thus; *He has bethought himſelf better ſince he firſt publiſh'd his Notions, and (as the Reſult of that) he now begins to reſolve, what he writ, into Prudence. I know whence he had this Method (and 'tis likely he has taken more than this from the ſame Hand)* viz. *from the Miſſionary Jeſuits, that went to preach the Goſpel to the People of* China. *We are told, that they inſtructed them in ſome Matters relating to our Saviour; they let them know that Jeſus was the Meſſias, the Perſon promiſed to be ſent into the World: But they conceal'd his Sufferings and Death, and they would not let them know any thing of his Paſſion and Crucifixion. So our Author (their humble Imitator) undertakes to inſtruct the World in Chriſtianity, with an Omiſſion of its Principal Articles; and more eſpecially that of the Advantage we have by Chriſt's Death, which was the prime Thing deſign'd in his coming into the World. This he calls Prudence: So that to hide from the People the main Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, to diſguiſe the Faith of the Goſpel, to betray Chriſtianity it ſelf, is, according to this excellent Writer, the Cardinal Vertue of Prudence. May we be deliver'd then, ſay I, from a Prudential Racovian.* And there ends the rattling for this Time; not to be out-done by any Piece of Clock-work in the Town. When he is once ſet a going, he runs on like an Alarum, always in the ſame Strain of noiſy empty Declamation (wherein every thing is ſuppos'd and nothing prov'd) till his own Weight has brought him to the Ground: And then, being wound up with ſome new Topick, takes another run, whether it makes for or againſt him, it matters not; he has laid about him with ill Language, let it light where it will, and the *Vindicator* is paid off.

That I may keep the due Diſtance in our different Ways of Writing, I ſhall ſhew the Reader, that I ſay not this at random; but that the Place affords me Occaſion to ſay ſo. He begins this Paragraph with theſe Words, *p.* 42. *Let us hear farther what this Vindicator ſays to excuſe his Rejection of the Doctrines contain'd in the Epiſtles.* This *Rejection of the Doctrines contain'd in the Epiſtles*, was the not mentioning the *Satisfaction* of Chriſt, amongſt thoſe Advantages I ſhew'd, that the World received by his Coming. This appears by the Words he here quotes, as my Excuſe for that Omiſſion. In which Place, I alſo produced ſome Paſſages in my Book which *ſounded like it*, ſome Words of Scripture that are uſed to prove it; but this will not content him: I am, for all that, a *Betrayer of Chriſtianity and Contemner of the Epiſtles.* Why? Becauſe I did not out of them name *Satisfaction.* If you will have the Truth of it, Sir, there is not any ſuch Word in any one of the Epiſtles, or other Books of the *New Teſtament*, in my Bible, as *Satisfying* or *Satisfaction* made by our Saviour; and ſo I could not put it into my *Chriſtianity as deliver'd in the Scripture.* If mine be not a true Bible, I deſire you to furniſh me with one that is more Orthodox; or if the Tranſlators have *hid that main Article of the Chriſtian Religion*, they are the *Betrayers of Chriſtianity, and Contemners of the Epiſtles*, who did not put it there; and not I, who did not take a Word from thence, which they did not put there. For truly, I am not a Maker of Creeds; nor dare add either to the Scripture, or to the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Religion.

But you will ſay, *Satisfaction*, though not named in the Epiſtles, yet may plainly be collected out of them. *Anſw.* And ſo it may out of ſeveral Places in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, ſome whereof, which I took out of the Goſpels, I mention'd in my *Vindication*, p. 546. and others of them, which I took out of the Epiſtles, I ſhall point out to you now: As *p.* 490. I ſay the Deſign of our Saviour's Coming was to be *OFFERED* up; and *p.* 508. I ſpeak of the Work of our *REDEMPTION*; Words which in the Epiſtles are taken to imply *Satisfaction*. And therefore if that be enough, I ſee not, but I may be free from *betraying Chriſtianity*; but if it be neceſſary to name the Word *Satisfaction*, and he that does not ſo is a *Betrayer of Chriſtianity*, you will do well to conſider how you will acquit the Holy Apoſtles from that bold Imputation; which if it be extended as far as it will go, will ſcarce come ſhort of Blaſphemy: For I do not remember that our Saviour has any where named *Satisfaction*, or imply'd it plainer in any Words than thoſe I have quoted from him; and he, I hope, will 'ſcape the Intemperance of your Tongue.

You tell me, I had my *Prudence* from *the Miſſionary Jeſuits in* China, *who conceal'd our Saviour's Sufferings and Death*, becauſe *I undertake to inſtruct the World in Chriſtianity, with an Omiſſion of its Principal Articles.* And I pray, Sir, from whom did you learn your *Prudence*, when taking upon you to teach the Fundamental *Doctrines of Chriſtianity*, in your *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, you left out ſeveral, that you have been pleaſed ſince to add in your *Socinianiſm Unmask'd?* Or if I, as you ſay here, *betray Chriſtianity* by this *Omiſſion* of *this Principal Article*; what do you, who are a Profeſſed Teacher of it, if you omit any principal Article, which your *Prudence* is ſo wary in, that you will not ſay you have given us all that are neceſſary to Salvation, in that Liſt you have laſt publiſh'd? I pray who acts beſt the *Jeſuit* (whoſe *humble Imitator* you ſay I am) you or I; when pretending to give a Catalogue of Fundamentals, you have not reduced them to direct Propoſitions; but have left ſome of them indefinite, to be collected as every one pleaſes: and inſtead of telling us it is a perfect Catalogue of Fundamentals, plainly ſhuffle it off, and tell me, *p.* 22. *If that will not content me, you are ſure you can do nothing that will: If I require more, it is Folly in you to comply with me?* One Part of what you here ſay, I own to you, ſavours not much of the Skill of a *Jeſuit*. You confeſs your Inability, and I believe it to be perfectly true: That if what you have done already (which is nothing at all) *will not content me, you are ſure, you can do nothing that will content me*, or any reaſonable Man, that ſhall demand of you a compleat Catalogue of Fundamentals. But you make it up pretty well, with a Confidence becoming one of that Order. For he muſt have rub'd his Forehead hard, who in the ſame Treatiſe, where he ſo ſeverely condemns the Imperfection of my Liſt of Fundamentals, confeſſes that he cannot give a compleat Catalogue of his own.

You publiſh to the World in this 44th, and the next Page, that *I hide from the People the main Articles of the Chriſtian Religion; I diſguiſe the Faith of the Goſpel, betray Chriſtianity it ſelf, and imitate the Jeſuits that went to preach the Goſpel to the People of* China, by my Omiſſion of its *principal* or *main Articles*.

Anſw. I know not how I *diſguiſe* the Faith of the Goſpel, *&c.* in Imitation of the *Jeſuits* in *China*; unleſs taking Men off from the Inventions of Men, and recommending to them the Reading and Study of the Holy Scripture, to find what the Goſpel is, and requires, be *a diſguiſing the Faith of the Goſpel, a betraying of Chriſtianity, and an imitating the Jeſuits.* Beſides, Sir, if one may ask you, in what School did you learn that prudent Warineſs and Reſerve, which ſo eminently appears, *p.* 24. of your *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, in theſe Words: *Theſe Articles* (meaning thoſe which you had before enumerated as Fundamental) *of Faith, are ſuch as muſt IN SOME MEASURE be known and aſſented to by a Chriſtian, ſuch as muſt GENERALLY be received, and embraced by him?* You will do well the next Time to ſet down, how far your Fundamentals muſt *be known, aſſented to*, and *received*; to avoid the Suſpicion, that there is a little more of Jeſuitiſm in theſe Expreſſions, *in ſome Meaſure*

Meaſure known and aſſented to, and generally received and and embraced, than what becomes a ſincere Proteſtant Preacher of the Goſpel. For your ſpeaking ſo doubtfully of knowing and aſſenting to thoſe, which you give us for Fundamental Doctrines, which belong (as you ſay) to the very *Eſſence of Chriſtianity*, will hardly 'ſcape being imputed to your want of Knowledge, or want of Sincerity. And indeed the Word *General* is in familiar uſe with you, and ſtands you in good ſtead, when you would ſay ſomething, you know not what; as I ſhall have Occaſion to remark to you, when I come to your 91ſt Page.

Further, I do not remember where it was, that I mention'd or undertook to ſet down all the *principal* or *main Articles of Chriſtianity*. To change the Terms of the Queſtion from Articles neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, into *principal* or *main Articles*, looks a little Jeſuitical. But to paſs by that: The Apoſtles, when they *went to preach the Goſpel to People* as much Strangers to it, as the *Chineſes* were when the *Europeans* came firſt amongſt them, *Did they hide from the People the main Articles of the Chriſtian Religion, diſguiſe the Faith of the Goſpel, and betray Chriſtianity it ſelf?* If they did not, I am ſure I have not: For I have not omitted any of the *main Articles* which they preached to the Unbelieving World. Thoſe I have ſet down, with ſo much Care not to omit any of them, that you blame me for it more than once, and call it *tedious*. However you are pleaſed to acquit or condemn the Apoſtles in the Caſe of your ſupreme Determination, I am very indifferent. If you think fit to condem them for *diſguiſing* or *betraying the Chriſtian Religion*, becauſe they ſaid no more of *Satisfaction*, than I have done, in their Preaching at firſt to their Unbelieving Auditors, *Jews* or *Heathens*, to make them as I think Chriſtians (for that I am now ſpeaking of) I ſhall not be ſorry to be found in their Company, under what Cenſure ſoever. If you are pleaſed graciouſly to take off this your Cenſure from them, for this *Omiſſion*, I ſhall claim a Share in the ſame Indulgence.

But to come to what perhaps you will think you ſelf a little more concerned not to cenſure, than what the *Apoſtles* did ſo long ſince; for you have given Inſtances of being very apt to make bold with the Dead: Pray tell me, does the Church of *England* admit People into the Church of Chriſt at hap-hazard? Or without propoſing, and requiring a Profeſſion of all that is neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian? If ſhe does not, I deſire you to turn to the Baptiſm of thoſe of riper Years in our Liturgy: Where the Prieſt asking the Convert particularly, whether he believes the Apoſtles Creed, which he repeats to him; upon his Profeſſion that he does, and that he deſires to be baptized into that Faith, without one Word of any other Articles, baptizes him; and then declares him a Chriſtian, in theſe Words: *We receive this Perſon into the Congregation of Chriſt's Flock, and ſign him with the Sign of the Croſs, in Token that he ſhall not be aſham'd — to* CONTINUE *Chriſt's faithful Soldier and Servant.* In all this there is not one Word of *Satisfaction*, no more than in my Book, nor ſo much neither. And here I ask you, Whether for this *Omiſſion*, you will pronounce that the Church of *England diſguiſes the Faith of the Goſpel?* However you think fit to treat me, yet methinks you ſhould not let your ſelf looſe ſo freely againſt our firſt Reformers, and the Fathers of our Church ever ſince, as to call them *Betrayers of Chriſtianity it ſelf*; becauſe they think not ſo much neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, as you are pleaſed to put down in your Articles; but omit, as well as I, your *main Article of Satisfaction*.

Having thus notably harangu'd upon the Occaſion of my ſaying, " Would " any one blame my Prudence?" and thereby made me a *Socinian*, a *Jeſuit*, and a *Betrayer of Chriſtianity it ſelf*, he has in that anſwer'd all that ſuch a Miſcreant as I do or can ſay; and ſo paſſes by all the Reaſons I gave, for what I did; without any other Notice or Anſwer, but only denying a Matter of Fact, which I only can know, and he cannot, *viz.* my Deſign in Printing my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*.

In the next Paragraph, *p.* 45. in anſwer to theſe Words of St. *Paul*, *Rom.* xiv. 1. *Him that is weak in the Faith receive ye, but not to doubtful Diſputations*; which I brought as a Reaſon, why I mention'd not *Satisfaction* amongſt

mongſt the Benefits receiv'd by the coming of our Saviour; becauſe, as I tell him in my *Vindication*, p. 546. *My Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, as the Title ſhews, was "deſigned chiefly for thoſe who were not yet thoroughly or firmly Chri-"ſtians." He replies, and I deſire him to prove it,

XX. *That I pretend a Deſign of my Book which was never ſo much as thought of, till I was ſolicited by my Brethren to vindicate it.*

All the reſt in this Paragraph being either nothing to this Place of the *Romans*, or what I have anſwer'd elſewhere, needs no farther Anſwer.

The next two Paragraphs, p. 46—49. are meant for an Anſwer to ſomething I had ſaid concerning the Apoſtles Creed, upon the occaſion of his charging my Book with *Socinianiſm*. They begin thus:

This *Author of the New Chriſtianity* [*Anſw.* This New Chriſtianity is as old as the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, and a little older than the *Unmasker*'s Syſtem] *wiſely objects that the Apoſtles Creed hath none of thoſe Articles which I mention'd*, p. 547. *Anſw.* If that Author *wiſely objects*, the *Unmasker* would have done well to have replied *wiſely*. But for a Man *wiſely* to reply, it is in the firſt Place requiſite, that the Objection be truly and fairly ſet down in its full Force, and not Repreſented ſhort, and as will beſt ſerve the Anſwerer's Turn to reply to. This is neither wiſe nor honeſt: And this firſt Part of a *wiſe* Reply the *Unmasker* has failed in. This will appear from my Words and the Occaſion of them. The *Unmasker* had accuſed my Book of *Socinianiſm*, for omitting ſome Points, which he urged as neceſſary Articles of Faith. To which I anſwer'd, That he had done ſo only "to give it an ill Name, not "becauſe it was *Socinian*; for he had no more Reaſon to charge it with *Soci-*"*nianiſm* for the Omiſſions he mentions, than the Apoſtles Creed." Theſe are my Words, which he ſhould have either ſet down out of *p.* 547. which he quotes, or at leaſt given the Objection as I put it, if he had meant to have clear'd it by a fair Anſwer. But he, inſtead thereof, contents himſelf that *I object, that the Apoſtles Creed hath none of thoſe Articles and Doctrines which the* Unmasker *mention'd*. Anſw. This at beſt is but a Part of my Objection, and not to the Purpoſe which I there meant, without the reſt join'd to it; which it has pleaſed the *Unmasker* according to his laudable Way to conceal. My Objection therefore ſtands thus:

That the ſame Articles, for the Omiſſion whereof the *Unmasker* charges my Book with *Socinianiſm*, being alſo omitted in the Apoſtles Creed, he has no more Reaſon to charge my Book with *Socinianiſm*, for the Omiſſions mention'd, than he hath to charge the Apoſtles Creed with *Socinianiſm*.

To this Objection of mine, let us now ſee he how Anſwers, *p.* 47.

Nor does any conſiderate Man wonder at it [i. e. That the Apoſtles Creed hath none of thoſe Articles and Doctrines which he had mention'd] *For the Creed is a Form of outward Profeſſion, which is chiefly to be made in the Publick Aſſemblies, when Prayers are put up in the Church, and the Holy Scriptures are read. Then this Abridgment of Faith is properly uſed, or when there is not Time or Opportunity to make any Enlargement. But we are not to think it expreſly contains in it all the neceſſary and weighty Points, all the important Doctrines of Belief; it being only deſigned to be an Abſtract.*

Anſw. Another indiſpenſible Requiſite in a *wiſe* Reply is, that it ſhould be pertinent. Now what can there be more Impertinent, than to confeſs the Matter of Fact upon which the Objection is grounded; but inſtead of deſtroying the Inference drawn from that Matter of Fact, only amuſe the Reader with wrong Reaſons, why that Matter of Fact was ſo?

No *conſiderate Man*, he ſays, *doth wonder* that the Articles and Doctrines he mentioned, are omitted in the Apoſtles Creed: Becauſe *that Creed is a Form of outward Profeſſion*. Anſw. A *Profeſſion!* of what I beſeech you? Is it a *Form* to be Uſed for Form's ſake? I thought it had been a *Profeſſion* of ſomething, even of the Chriſtian Faith: And if it be ſo, any *conſiderate Man may wonder*

neceſſary

neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian Faith ſhould be left out of it. For how it can be an *outward Profeſſion* of the Chriſtian Faith, without containing the Chriſtian Faith, I do not ſee; unleſs a Man can *outwardly profeſs* the Chriſtian Faith in Words, that do not contain or expreſs it, *i. e.* profeſs the Chriſtian Faith, when he does not profeſs it. But he ſays, *'Tis a Profeſſion chiefly to be made uſe of in Aſſemblies. Anſw.* Do thoſe ſolemn *Aſſemblies* privilege it from containing the neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian Religion? This proves not that it does not, or was not *deſigned* to contain all Articles neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; unleſs the *Unmasker* can prove that a *Form* of *outward Profeſſion* of the Chriſtian Faith, that contains all ſuch neceſſary Articles, cannot be made uſe of in the Publick Aſſembles. *In the Publick Aſſemblies*, ſays he, *when Prayers are put up by the Church, and the Holy Scriptures are read, then this Abridgment of Faith is properly uſed; or when there is not generally Time or Opportunity to make an Enlargement. Anſw.* But that which contains not what is abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, can no where be *properly* us'd as a *Form of outward Profeſſion* of the Chriſtian Faith, and leaſt of all in the ſolemn *Publick Aſſemblies*. All the Senſe I can make of this is, That *this Abridgment* of the Chriſtian Faith, *i. e.* imperfect Collection (as the *Unmasker* will have it) of ſome of the Fundamental Articles of Chriſtianity in the Apoſtles Creed, which omits the greateſt Part of them, is made uſe of *as a Form of outward Profeſſion* of but part of the Chriſtian Faith in the *Publick Aſſemblies*; when by Reaſon of reading of the *Scripture* and *Prayers*, there is not *Time* or *Opportunity* for a full and perfect Profeſſion of it.

'Tis ſtrange the Chriſtian Church ſhould not find *Time* nor *Opportunity* in ſixteen hundred Years to make, in any of her Publick Aſſemblies, a Profeſſion of ſo much of her Faith as is neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian. But pray tell me, has the Church any ſuch full and compleat Form of Faith, that hath in it all thoſe Propoſitions, you have given us for neceſſary Articles, (not to ſay any thing of thoſe which you have reſerv'd to your ſelf in your own Breaſt, and will not communicate) of which the Apoſtles Creed is only a ſcanty *Form*, a brief imperfect *Abſtract*, *us'd* only to ſave Time in the Croud of other preſſing Occaſions, that are always in haſte to be diſpatch'd? If ſhe has, the *Unmasker* will do well to produce it. If the Church has no ſuch compleat Form, beſides the Apoſtles Creed, any where, of Fundamental Articles; he will do well to leave talking idly of this *Abſtract*, as he goes on to do in the following Words:

But, ſays he, *we are not to think that it expreſly contains in it all the neceſſary and weighty Points, all the important Doctrines of our Belief; it being only deſigned to be an Abſtract. Anſw.* Of what, I beſeech you, is it an *Abſtract?* For here the *Unmasker* ſtops ſhort, and as one that knows not well what to ſay, ſpeaks not out what it is an *Abſtract* of; but provides himſelf a Subterfuge in the generality of the preceding Terms, of *neceſſary and weighty Points*, and *important Doctrines* jumbled together; which can be there of no other uſe but to cover his Ignorance or Sophiſtry. But the Queſtion being only about *neceſſary* Points, to what purpoſe are *weighty and important Doctrines* joined to them; unleſs he will ſay, that there is no difference between *neceſſary* and *weighty Points*, Fundamental and *Important Doctrines?* And if ſo, then the Diſtinction of Points into neceſſary and not neceſſary, will be fooliſh and impertinent; and all the Doctrines cantain'd in the Bible will be abſolutely neceſſary to be explicitly believ'd by every Man to make him a Chriſtian. But taking it for granted, that the Diſtinction of Truths contain'd in the Goſpel into Points abſolutely neceſſary, and not abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, is good; I deſire the *Unmasker* to tell us, what the Apoſtles Creed is an Abſtract of. He will perhaps anſwer, that he has told us already in this very Page, where he ſays it is an *Abridgment of Faith*; and he has ſaid true in Words, but ſaying thoſe Words by rote after others, without underſtanding them, he has ſaid ſo in a Senſe that is not true. For he ſuppoſes it an *Abridgmen of Faith*, by containing only a few of the neceſſary Articles of Faith, and leaving out the far greater Part of them; and ſo takes a part of a thing for an *Abridgment* of it: whereas an *Abridgment* or *Abſtract* of any Thing, is the whole in little; and if it be of a Science or Doctrine, the *Abridgment* conſiſts in the eſſential or neceſſary Parts of it,

contracted

contracted into a narrower Compaſs than where it lies diffus'd in the ordinary way of Delivery, amongſt a great Number of Tranſitions, Explanations, Illuſtrations, Proofs, Reaſonings, Corollaries, *&c.* All which, tho' they make a Part of the Diſcourſe wherein that Doctrine is deliver'd, are left out in the *Abridgment* of it, wherein all the neceſſary Parts of it are drawn together into a leſs Room. But tho' an *Abridgment* need to contain none but the Eſſential and neceſſary Parts, yet all thoſe it ought to contain; or elſe it will not be an *Abridgment* or *Abſtract* of that Thing, but an *Abridgment* only of a Part of it. I think it could not be ſaid to be an *Abridgment* of the Law contain'd in an Act of Parliament, wherein any of the Things requir'd by that Act were omitted; which yet commonly may be reduc'd into a very narrow Compaſs, when ſtrip'd of all the Motives, Ends, Enacting Forms, *&c.* expreſs'd in the Act it ſelf. If this does not ſatisfy the *Unmasker* what is properly an *Abridgment*, I ſhall refer him to Mr. *Chillingworth*, who I think will be allow'd to underſtand Senſe, and to ſpeak it properly, at leaſt as well as the *Unmasker*. And what he ſays, happens to be in the very ſame Queſtion between *Knot* the Jeſuit, and him, that is here between the *Unmasker* and me: 'Tis but putting the *Unmasker* in the Jeſuit's Place, and my ſelf (if it may be allow'd me without Vanity) in Mr. *Chillingworth*, the Proteſtant's; and Mr. *Chillingworth*'s very Words, *Chap.* IV. §. 65. will exactly ſerve for my Anſwer. "You triſle affectedly, confounding the Apoſtles Belief of the whole Religion of Chriſt, as "it comprehends both what we are to do, and what we are to believe, with "that Part of it which contains not Duties of Obedience, but only the neceſſary Articles of ſimple Faith. Now, tho' the Apoſtles Belief be, in the "former Senſe, a larger Thing than that which we call the Apoſtles Creed; yet "in the latter Senſe of the Word, the Creed (I ſay) is a full Comprehenſion of "their Belief, which you your ſelf have formerly confeſs'd, tho' ſomewhat "fearfully and inconſtantly. And here again Unwillingneſs to ſpeak the Truth, "makes you ſpeak that which is hardly Senſe, and call it *an Abridgment of "ſome Articles of Faith.* For I demand thoſe *ſome Articles* which you ſpeak "of, which are they? Thoſe that are out of the Creed, or thoſe that are "in it? Thoſe that are in it, it comprehends at large, and therefore it is "not an *Abridgment* of them. Thoſe that are out of it, it comprehends not "at all, and therefore it is not an *Abridgment* of them. If you would call it "now an *Abridgment* of Faith, this would be Senſe; and ſignify thus much, "That all the neceſſary Articles of the Chriſtian Faith are compriz'd in it. "For this is the proper Duty of *Abridgments*, to leave out nothing neceſſary." So that in Mr. *Chillingworth*'s Judgment of an *Abridgment*, it is not Senſe to ſay as you do, *pag.* 47. That *we are not to think that the Apoſtles Creed expreſly contains in it all the neceſſary Points of our Belief, it being only deſign'd to be an Abſtract, or an Abridgment of Faith:* But on the contrary, we muſt conclude it contains in it all the neceſſary Articles of Faith, for that very Reaſon; becauſe it is an *Abridgment of Faith*, as the *Unmasker* calls it. But whether this that Mr. *Chillingworth* has given us here, be the Nature of an *Abridgment* or no; this is certain, that the Apoſtles Creed cannot be a *Form of Profeſſion* of the Chriſtian Faith, if any Part of the Faith neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian be left out of it: And yet ſuch a *Profeſſion* of Faith would the *Unmasker* have this *Abridgment* of Faith to be. For a little lower in the 47*th* Page, he ſays in expreſs Terms, That *if a Man believe no more than is in expreſs Terms in the Apoſtles Creed, his Faith will not be the Faith of a Chriſtian.* Wherein he does great Honour to the Primitive Church, and particularly to the Church of *England*. The Primitive Church admitted converted Heathens to Baptiſm, upon the Faith contain'd in the Apoſtles Creed: A bare Profeſſion of that Faith, and no more, was requir'd of them to be receiv'd into the Church, and made Members of Chriſt's Body. How little different the Faith of the Antient Church was from the Faith I have mention'd, may be ſeen in theſe Words of *Tertullian: Regula fidei una omnino eſt*, ſola, immobilis, *irreformabilis, Credendi ſcilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem Mundi conditorem, & Filium ejus Jeſum Chriſtum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum ſub Pontio Pilato, tertia Die reſuſcitatum à Mortuis, receptum in Cœlis, ſedentem nunc ad dextram Patris, venturum judicare vivos & mortuos, per carnis etiam Reſurrectionem. Hâc lege*

Fidei manente, cætera jam Diſciplinæ & Converſationis admittunt novitatem correctionis: Tert. de Virg. Velan. in Principio. This was the Faith that, in *Tertullian*'s Time, ſuffic'd to make a Chriſtian. And the Church of *England*, as I have remark'd already, only propoſes the Articles of the Apoſtles Creed to the Convert to be baptiz'd; and upon his profeſſing a Belief of them, asks whether he will be baptiz'd in *THIS FAITH*, which (if we will believe the *Unmasker*) *is not the Faith of a Chriſtian.* However the Church, without any more ado, upon the Profeſſion of *THIS FAITH*, and no other, baptizes him into it. So that the Antient Church, if the *Unmasker* may be believ'd, baptized Converts into that Faith which *is not the Faith of a Chriſtian.* And the Church of *England*, when ſhe baptizes any one, makes him not a Chriſtian. For he that is baptiz'd only into a Faith that *is not the Faith of a Chriſtian*, I would fain know how he can thereby be made a Chriſtian? So that if the Omiſſions, which he ſo much blames in my Book, make me a *Socinian*, I ſee not how the Church of *England* will eſcape that Cenſure; ſince thoſe Omiſſions are in that very Confeſſion of Faith which ſhe propoſes, and upon a Profeſſion whereof ſhe baptizes thoſe whom ſhe deſigns to make Chriſtians. But it ſeems that the *Unmasker* (who has made bold to unmask her too) reaſons right, that the Church of *England* is miſtaken, and makes none but *Socinian Chriſtians*; or (as he is pleas'd now to declare) no Chriſtians at all. Which, if true, the *Unmaker* had beſt look to it, whether he himſelf be a Chriſtian, or no; for 'tis to be fear'd, he was baptiz'd only into that Faith, which he himſelf confeſſes *is not the Faith of a Chriſtian.*

But he brings himſelf off in theſe following Words: *All Matters of Faith, in ſome manner, may be reduc'd to this brief Platform of Belief. Anſw.* If that be enough to make him a True and an Orthodox Chriſtian, he does not conſider who in this Way he brings off with him: For I think he cannot deny, that all Matters of Faith, in ſome manner, may be reduc'd to that *Abſtract* of Faith which I have given, as well as to that brief *Platform* in the Apoſtles Creed. So that for ought I ſee, by this Rule, we are Chriſtians or not Chriſtians, Orthodox or not Orthodox, equally together.

But yet he ſays in the next Words: *When he calls it an Abſtract or Abbreviature, it is imply'd, that there are more Truths to be known and aſſented to by a Chriſtian in order to making him really ſo, than what we meet with here.* The quite contrary whereof (as has been ſhewn) is imply'd by its being call'd an *Abſtract*. But what is that to the purpoſe? 'Tis not fit *Abſtracts* and *Abbreviatures* ſhould ſtand in an *Unmasker*'s Way. They are Sounds Men have us'd for what they pleas'd; and why may not the *Unmasker* do ſo too, and uſe them in a Senſe that may make the Apoſtles Creed be only a broken Scrap of the Chriſtian Faith? However, in great Condeſcenſion, being willing to do the Apoſtles Creed what Honour he could, he ſays, That *all Matters of Faith in ſome manner, may be reduc'd to this brief Platform of Belief.* But yet when it is ſet in Competition with the Creed, which he himſelf is making (for it is not yet finiſh'd) it is by no means to be allow'd as ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian. *There are more Truths to be known and aſſented to, in order to make a Man really a Chriſtian.* Which, what they are, the Church of *England* ſhall know, when this new Reformer thinks fit: And then ſhe may be able to propoſe to thoſe who are not yet ſo, a Collection of Articles of Belief, and baptize them a new into a Faith, which will really make them Chriſtians: But hitherto, if the *Unmasker* may be credited, ſhe has fail'd in it.

Yet he craves leave to tell me in the following Words, *pag.* 48. *That the Apoſtles Creed hath more in it than I, or my Brethren, will ſubſcribe to.* Were it not the undoubted Privilege of the *Unmasker* to know me better than I do my ſelf, (for he is always telling me ſomething of my ſelf which I did not know) I would, in my Turn, crave leave to tell him, that this is the Faith I was baptiz'd into, no one Tittle whereof I have renounc'd, that I know; and that I heretofore thought, that gave me Title to be a Chriſtian. But the *Unmasker* hath otherwiſe determin'd: And I know not now where to find a Chriſtian. For the Belief of the Apoſtles Creed will not, it ſeems, make a Man one: And what other Belief will, it does not yet pleaſe the *Unmasker* to tell us. But yet as to the *Subſcribing* to the Apoſtles Creed, I muſt take leave to ſay,

however

however the *Unmasker* may be right in the Faith, he is out in the Morals of a Chriſtian; it being againſt the Charity of one, that is really ſo, to pronounce, as he does, peremptorily in a Thing that he cannot know; and to affirm poſitively what I know to be a down-right Falſhood. But what others will do, it is not my Talent to determine; that belongs to the *Unmasker*. Though as to all that are my *Brethren* in the Chriſtian Faith, I may anſwer for them too, that they will alſo, with me, do that without which in that Senſe they cannot be my Brethren.

Page 49. The *Unmasker* ſmartly convinces me of no ſmall Blunder, in theſe Words: *But was it not judiciouſly ſaid by this Writer, that* " it is well for the " Compilers of the Creed, that they liv'd not in my Days?" *P.* 12. *I tell you, Friend, it was impoſſible they ſhould; for the Learned* Uſher, *and* Voſſius, *and others have prov'd, that that Symbol was drawn up not at once, but that ſome Articles of it were adjoin'd many Years after, far beyond the Extent of any Man's Life; and therefore the Compilers of the Creed could not live in my Days, nor could I live in theirs. Anſw.* But it ſeems that had they liv'd together, you could have liv'd in their Days. *But*, ſays he, *I let this paſs, as one of the Blunders of our thoughtful and muſing Author. Anſw.* And *I tell you, Friend, that* unleſs it were to ſhew your Reading in *Uſher* and *Voſſius*, you had better have let this *Blunder of mine* alone. Does not the *Unmasker* give here a clear Proof, that he is no Changeling? Whatever Argument he takes in hand, weighty or trivial, material or not material to the Thing in queſtion, he brings it to the ſame Sort of Senſe and Force. He would ſhew me guilty of an Abſurdity, in ſaying, " It was well for the Compilers of the Creed, that they liv'd not in his Days." This he proves to be a *Blunder*, becauſe they all liv'd not in one another's Days; therefore it was an Abſurdity to ſuppoſe they might all live in his Days. As if there were any greater Abſurdity to bring the Compilers, who liv'd poſſibly within a few Centuries of one another, by a Suppoſition, into one Time; than it is to bring the *Unmasker*, and any one of them who liv'd a thouſand Years diſtant one from another, by a Suppoſition to be Contemporaries: For 'tis by Reaſon of the Compilers living at a Diſtance one from another, that he proves it impoſſible for him to be their Contemporary. As if it were not as impoſſible in Fact, for him who was not born till above a thouſand Years after, to live in any of their Days, as it is for any one of them to live in either of thoſe Compilers Days that died before him. The Suppoſition of their living together is as eaſy of one as the other, at what Diſtance ſoever they liv'd and how many ſoever there were of them. This being ſo, I think it had been better for the *Unmasker* to have let alone the *Blunder*, and ſhew'd (which was his Buſineſs) that he does not accuſe the Compilers of the Creed of being *all over Socinianiz'd*, as well as he does me, ſince they were as guilty as I, of the Omiſſion of thoſe Articles (viz. *That Chriſt is the Word of God. That God was God incarnate. The eternal and ineffable Generation of the Son of God. That the Son is in the Father, and Father in the Son, which expreſſes their Unity*) for the Omiſſion whereof, the *Unmasker* laid *Socinianiſm* to my charge. So that it remains ſtill upon his Score to ſhew,

XXI. *Why theſe Omiſſions in the Apoſtles Creed, do not as well make the Abſtract, as my Abridgment of Faith, to be* Socinian?

Page 53. the Unmasker *deſires the Reader to obſerve, that this lank Faith of mine, is in a manner no other than the Faith of a Turk.* And I deſire the Reader to obſerve, that this Faith of mine was all that our Saviour and his Apoſtles preach'd to the unbelieving World. And this our *Unmasker* cannot deny, as I think will appear to any one, who obſerves what he ſays, *p.* 76, 77. of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*. And that they preach'd nothing but a *Faith, that was in a manner no other than the Faith of a Turk*, I think none amongſt Chriſtians, but this bold *Unmasker*, will have the Irreverence profanely to ſay.

He tells us, *p.* 54. That the *Muſſelmen* (or, as he has for the Information of his Reader very pertinently prov'd, ſhould be writ *Moſlemim*; without which, perhaps, we ſhould not have known his Skill in *Arabick*) or, in plain *Engliſh*, the *Mahometans, believe that Chriſt is a good Man, and not above the Nature of a Man,*

Man, and ſent of God to give Inſtruction to the World: And my Faith, he ſays, *is of the very ſame Scantling.* This I ſhall deſire him to prove; or, which in other Words he inſinuates in this, and the neighbouring Pages, *viz.*

XXII. That that Faith, which I have affirm'd to be the Faith which is requir'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, is no other than what *Turks* believe, and is contain'd in the Alcoran.

Or, as he expreſſes it himſelf, *p.* 55.

That a Turk, *according to me, is a Chriſtian, for I make the ſame Faith ſerve them both.*

And particularly to ſhew where 'tis, I ſay,

XXIII. That *Chriſt is not above the Nature of a Man*, or have made that a neceſſary Article of the Chriſtian Faith.

And next where it is,

XXIV. *That I ſpeak as meanly of Chriſt's Suffering on the Croſs, and Death, as if there were no ſuch Thing.*

For thus he ſays of me, *p.* 54. *I ſeem to have conſulted the* Mahometan *Bible, which did ſay, Chriſt did not ſuffer on the Croſs, did not die. For I, and my Allies, ſpeak as meanly of theſe Articles, as if there were no ſuch Thing.*

To ſhew our *Unmasker*'s Veracity in this Caſe, I ſhall trouble my Reader with ſome Paſſages out of my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, pag. 587. "When we "conſider that he was to fill out the Time foretold of his Miniſtry, and after "a Life illuſtrious in Miracles and good Works, attended with Humility, "Meekneſs, Patience and *SUFFERING*, and every Way conformable to "the Prophecies of him, ſhould be led as a Sheep to the *Slaughter*; and with "all Quiet and Submiſſion be brought to the *CROSS*, tho' there were no Guilt "or Fault found in him." And *p.* 490. "Contrary to the Deſign of his "Coming, which was to be *OFFER'D* up a Lamb, blameleſs and void of "Offence." And *p.* 499. "*Laying down his Life*, both for *Jews* and *Gentiles*. "*P.* 513. Given up to *Contempt*, *Torment* and *Death*." But ſay what I will, when the *Unmasker* thinks fit to have it ſo, it is ſpeaking out of *the* Mahometan *Bible*, That *Chriſt did not ſuffer on the Croſs, did not die*; or at leaſt, is *ſpeaking as meanly of theſe Articles as if no ſuch Thing had been.*

His next Slander is *p.* 55. in theſe Words: *This Gentleman preſents the World with a very ill Notion of Faith, for the very Devils are capable of all that Faith, which, he ſays, makes a Chriſtian.* It is not ſtrange, that the *Unmasker* ſhould miſrepreſent the Faith, which I ſay makes a Chriſtian; when it ſeems to be his whole Deſign to miſrepreſent my Meaning every where. The Frequency of his doing it I have ſhew'd in abundance of Inſtances, to which I ſhall add an eminent one here; which ſhews what a fair Champion he is for Truth and Religion.

Page 517. of my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, I give this Account of the Faith which makes a Chriſtian; That it is "Mens entring themſelves in the King-"dom of God; owning and profeſſing themſelves the Subjects of Jeſus, whom "they believe to be the *Meſſiah*, and receive for their Lord and King: For "that was to be baptiz'd in his Name." This Senſe of believing Chriſt to be the *Meſſiah*, that is, to take him for our King and Lord, who is to be obey'd, I have expreſs'd over and over again; as *p.* 519, 520. my Words are, "That as many of them as would believe Jeſus the Son of God (whom he ſent "into the World) to be the *Meſſiah*, the promis'd Deliverer, and would re-"ceive him for their King and Ruler, ſhould have all their paſt Sins, Diſo-"bedience and Rebellion forgiven them. And if for the future they liv'd "in ſincere Obedience to his Law, to the utmoſt of their Power, the Sins of "human Frailty for the Time to come, as well as thoſe of their paſt Lives,

"ſhould

" should for his Son's Sake, because they gave themselves up to him to be his " Subjects, be forgiven them: And so their Faith, which made them to be " baptiz'd into his Name (*i. e.* inroll themselves into the Kingdom of *Jesus* the " *Messiah*, and profess themselves his Subjects; and consequently live by the " Laws of his Kingdom) should be accounted to them for Righteousness." Which Account of what is necessary, I close with these Words: " This is the " *FAITH* for which God of his free Grace justifies sinful Man." And is this the *Faith* of Devils?

To the same Purpose, *p.* 521. are these Words: " The chief End of his " Coming was to be a King, and as such to be receiv'd by those, who would " be his Subjects in the Kingdom which he came to erect." And again, *p.* 520. " Only those who have believ'd Jesus to be the *Messiah*, and taken " him for their King, who with a sincere Endeavour after Righteousness in obey- " ing his Law, shall have their past Sins not imputed to them." And so again, *p.* 520, and 524. and in several other Places; of which I shall add but this one more, *p.* 524. " 'Tis not enough to believe him to be the *Messiah*, unless we " obey his Laws, and take him to be our King to reign over us." Can the Devils thus believe him to be the *Messiah?* Yet this is that which by these and abundance of other Places, I have shew'd to be the Meaning of believing him to be the *Messiah.*

Besides, I have expressly distinguish'd the Faith which makes a Christian, from that which the Devils have; by proving, that to the believing Jesus to be the *Messiah* must be join'd Repentance, or else it will not make them true Christians: And what this Repentance is, may be seen at large in *p.* 517, &c. some Expressions whereof I shall here set down: As *p.* 517. " Repentance " does not consist in one single Act of Sorrow (though that being first, and " leading, gives Denomination to the whole) but in doing Works meet for " Repentance; in a sincere Obedience to the Law of *Christ* the Remainder of " our Lives." Again: To distinguish the Faith of a *Christian* from that of Devils, I say expressly, out of St. *Paul*'s Epistle to the *Galatians*, " That which " availeth is *Faith*, but *Faith* working by *Love*; and that *Faith* without Works, " *i. e.* the Works of sincere Obedience to the Law and Will of *Christ*, is not " sufficient for our Justification." And *p.* 523. " That to inherit eternal Life, " we must love the Lord our God with all our Heart, with all our Soul, with " all our Strength, and with all our Mind." And *p.* 524. " Love *Christ* in keep- " ing his Commandments."

This, and a great deal more to this Purpose, may be seen in my *Reasonableness of Christianity*; particularly where I answer that Objection about the Faith of Devils, which I handle in *p.* 516, &c. and therein at large shew wherein the Faith of Devils comes short of the Justifying Faith which makes a Christian. And yet the good, the sincere, the candid *Unmasker*, with his becoming Confidence, tells his Readers here, *p.* 55. *That I present the World with a very ill Notion of Faith: For the very Devils are capable of all that Faith, which I say makes a Christian Man.*

To prevent this Calumny, I, in more Places than one, distinguish'd between Faith in a strict Sense, as it is a bare Assent to any Proposition, and that which is call'd Evangelical Faith, in a larger Sense of the Word; which comprehends under it something more than a bare simple Assent, as *p.* 483. " I mean, this is all is requir'd to be *believ'd* by those who acknowlede but " one Eternal Invisible God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth: For that there " is something more requir'd to Salvation, besides *believing*, we shall see here- " after." *P.* 484. " All I say that was to be believ'd for Justification. For " that this was not all that was requir'd to be done for Justification, we shall " see hereafter." *P.* 494. " Obeying the Law of the *Messiah* their King, being " no less riquir'd than their *believing* that *Jesus* was the *Messiah*, the King and " Deliverer, that was promis'd them." *P.* 516. " As far as *mere believing* " could make them Members of *Christ*'s Body." By these, and more the like Passages in my Book, my Meaning is so evident, that no body but an *Unmasker* would have said, that when I spoke of *believing* as a bare Speculative Assent to any Proposition as true, I affirm'd that was all that was required of a Christian for Justification: though that, in the strict Sense of the Word, is all

all that is done in *believing*. And therefore, I ſay, as far *as mere believing* could make them Members of *Chriſt*'s Body; plainly ſignifying, as much as Words can, that the *Faith*, for which they were juſtify'd, including ſomething more than a bare Aſſent. This appears not only from theſe Words of mine, *p.* 517. *St.* Paul *often, in his Epiſtles, puts Faith for the whole Duty of a Chriſtian*; but from my ſo often, and almoſt every-where interpreting *believing him to be the Meſſiah*, by *taking him to be our King*; whereby is meant not a bare idle Speculation, a bare notional Perſuaſion of any Truth whatſoever floating in our Brains; but an active Principle of Life, a *Faith* working by Love and Obedience. *To take him to be our King*, carries with it a right Diſpoſition of the Will to honour and obey him, join'd to that Aſſent wherewith Believers embrace this Fundamental Truth, that Jeſus was the Perſon who was, by God, ſent to be their King; he that was promis'd to be their Prince and Saviour.

But for all this, the *Unmasker*, p. 56. confidently tells his Reader that I ſay no ſuch Thing. His Words are: *But beſides this Hiſtorical Faith (as it is generally call'd by Divines) which is giving Credit to Evangelical Truths, as barely reveal'd, there muſt be ſomething elſe added to make up the true ſubſtantial Faith of a Chriſtian. With the Aſſent of the Underſtanding, muſt be join'd the Conſent or Approbation of the Will. All thoſe Divine Truths which the Intellect aſſents to, muſt be allow'd of by this Elective Power of the Soul. True Evangelical Faith is a hearty Acception of the Meſſias, as he is offer'd in the Goſpel. It is a ſincere and impartial Submiſſion to all Things requir'd by the Evangelical Law, which is contain'd in the Epiſtles as well as the other Writings. And to this Practical Aſſent and Choice, there muſt be added likewiſe a firm Truſt and Reliance in the bleſſed Author of our Salvation. But this late Undertaker, who attempted to give us a more perfect Account than ever was before of Chriſtianity, as it is deliver'd in the Scriptures, brings us no Tidings of any ſuch Faith belonging to Chriſtianity, or diſcover'd to us in the Scriptures. Which gives us to underſtand, that he verily believes there is no ſuch Chriſtian Faith; for in ſome of his numerous Pages (eſpecially* p. 506, &c.) *where he ſpeaks ſo much of Belief and Faith, he might have taken Occaſion to inſert one Word about this compleat Faith of the Goſpel.*

Though the Places above quoted out of my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, and the whole Tenor of the latter Part of it, ſhew the Falſhood of what the *Unmasker* here ſays; yet I will ſet down one Paſſage more out of it, and then ask our *Unmasker*, when he hath read them, whether he hath the Brow to ſay again, that *I bring no Tidings of any ſuch Faith?* My Words are, *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, p. 527, 528. " Faith in the Promiſes of God, relying and acquieſcing " in his Word and Faithfulneſs, the Almighty takes well at our Hands, as " a great Mark of Homage paid by us poor frail Creatures to his Goodneſs " and Truth, as well as to his Power and Wiſdom; and accepts it as an Ac- " knowledgment of his peculiar Providence and Benignity to us. And there- " fore our Saviour tells us, *John* xii. 44. *He that believes on me, believes not on* " *me, but on him that ſent me.* The Works of Nature ſhew his Wiſdom and " Power: But 'tis his peculiar Care of Mankind, moſt eminently diſcover'd " in his Promiſes to them, that ſhew his Bounty and Goodneſs; and conſe- " quently engages their Hearts in Love and Affection to him. This Oblation " of an Heart fix'd with Dependence and Affection on him, is the moſt ac- " ceptable Tribute we can pay him; the Foundation of true Devotion; and " Life of all Religion. What a Value he puts on this depending on his " Word, and reſting ſatisfy'd on his Promiſes, we have an Example in *Abra-* " *ham*; whoſe Faith was counted to him for Righteouſneſs; as we have be- " fore remarked out of *Rom.* iv. And his relying firmly on the Promiſe of God, " without any Doubt of its Performance, gave him the Name, of the Father " of the Faithful; and gain'd him ſo much Favour with the Almighty, that " he was call'd the Friend of God: The higheſt and moſt glorious Title can " be beſtow'd on a Creature."

The great Out-cry he makes againſt me in his two next Sections, *p.* 57—60. as if I intended to introduce Ignorance and Popery, is to be entertain'd rather as the Noiſe of a petulant Scold, ſaying the worſt Things ſhe could think of, than as the arguing of a Man of Senſe or Sincerity. All this mighty Accuſation is grounded upon theſe Falſhoods, That *I make it my great Buſineſs to beat*

Men

Men off from Divine Truths; That *I cry down all Articles of the Chriſtian Faith but one*; That *I will not ſuffer Men to look into Chriſtianity*; That *I blaſt the Epiſtolary Writings*. I ſhall add no more to what I have already ſaid about the Epiſtles, but thoſe few Words out of my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, p. 538, 539. "The "Epiſtles reſolving Doubts, and reforming Miſtakes, are of great Advantage to "our Knowledge and Practice." And, pag. 539. "An explicit Belief of what "God requires of thoſe, who will enter into, and receive the Benefits of the "New Covenant, is abſolutely requir'd. The other Parts of Divine Reve-"lation are Objects of Faith, and are ſo to be receiv'd. They are Truths "whereof none, that is once known to be ſuch [*i. e.* of Divine Revelation] "may or ought to be disbeliev'd."

And as for that other Saying of his, *That I will not ſuffer Men to look into Chriſtianity*; I deſire to know where that Chriſtianity is lock'd up, which *I will not ſuffer Men to look into*. My Chriſtianity, I confeſs, is contain'd in the written Word of God: And that I am ſo far from hindring any one to look into, that I every where appeal to it, and have quoted ſo much of it, that the *Unmasker* complains of being overlaid with it, and tells me 'tis *tedious*. "All "Divine Revelation, I ſay, p. 540. requires the Obedience of Faith; and that "every one is to receive all the Parts of it, with a Docility and Diſpoſition "prepar'd to embrace and aſſent to all Truths coming from God; and ſubmit "his Mind to whatever ſhall appear to him to bear that Character." I ſpeak, in the ſame Page, of Mens *endeavouring* to underſtand it, and of their *interpreting* one Place by another. This and the whole Deſign of my Book ſhews, That I think it every Chriſtian's Duty to read, ſearch, and ſtudy the Holy Scriptures; and make this their great Buſineſs: And yet the good *Unmasker*, in a Fit of Zeal, diſplays his Throat, and crys out, p. 59. *Hear, O ye Heavens, and give Ear, O Earth; judge whether this be not the Way to introduce Darkneſs and* Ignorance *into Chriſtendum; whether this be not blinding of Mens Eyes*, &c. For this mighty *Pathos* ends not there. And all things conſider'd, I know not whether he had not Reaſon, in his want of Arguments, this Way to pour out his Concern. For neither the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, nor the Apoſtles Creed, nor any thing elſe being with him the Faith of a Chriſtian, *i. e.* ſufficient to make a Chriſtian, but juſt his Set of Fundamental Articles (when he himſelf knows what they be:) In fine, nothing being Chriſtianity but juſt his Syſtem, 'tis time to cry out, Help Neighbours, hold faſt Friends; Knowledge, Religion, Chriſtianity is gone, if this be once permitted, that the People ſhould read and underſtand the Scripture for themſelves, as God ſhall enlighten their Underſtandings in the Uſe of the Means; and not be forc'd to depend upon me, and upon my chuſing, and my Interpretation, for the neceſſary Points they are to believe to make them Chriſtians: If I, the great *Unmasker*, have not the ſole Power to decree what is, or is not Fundamental, and People be not bound to receive it for ſuch, Faith and the Goſpel are given up; *Darkneſs* and *Barbariſm* will be brought in upon us by this *Writer's Contrivance*. For, *he is an Underhand Factor for that Communion, which cries up Ignorance for the Mother of Devotion and Religion*; i. e. in plain *Engliſh*, for Popery. For to this and nothing elſe tends all that Sputter he makes in the Sections before mention'd.

I do not think there was ever a more thorough-pac'd Declaimer than our *Unmasker*. He leaves out nothing that he thinks will make an affrighted Noiſe in the Ears of his Orthodox Hearers, tho' all the Blame and Cenſure he pours out upon others, light only on himſelf. For let me ask this zealous Upholder of Light and Knowledge, Does he think it reaſonable that any one, who is not a Chriſtian, ſhould be ſuffer'd to be undiſturb'd in his Pariſh? Nay, does he think fit that any ſuch ſhould live free from the *Laſh of the Magiſtrate*, or from the Perſecution of the *Eccleſiaſtical Power*? He ſeems to talk with another Air, *pag.* 65. In the next Place I ask, whether any one is a Chriſtian, who had not the Faith of a Chriſtian? Thirdly, I ask, Whether he has the Faith of a Chriſtian, who does not explicitly believe all the Fundamental Articles of Chriſtianity? And to conclude, I ask him, Whether all thoſe, that he has ſet down, are not Fundamental neceſſary Articles? When the *Unmasker* has fairly anſwer'd theſe Queſtions, it will be ſeen who is for Popery, and the Ignorance and Tyranny that accompanies it.

The

The *Unmasker* is for making and impoſing Articles of Faith: But he is for this Power in himſelf. He likes not Popery (which is nothing but the Tyranny and impoſing upon Mens Underſtandings, Faith, and Conſciences) in the Hands of the old Gentleman at *Rome*: But it would, he thinks, do admirably well in his own Hands. And who can blame him for it? Would not that be an excellent Way to propagate *Light* and *Knowledge*, by tying up all Men to a Bundle of Articles of his own Culling? Or rather to the Authority of Chriſt and his Apoſtles reſiding in him? For he does not, nor ever will, give us a full View of Fundamentals of his Chriſtianity: But like the Church of *Rome*, to ſecure our Dependence, reſerves to himſelf a Power of declaring others, and defining what is Matter of Faith, as he ſhall ſee Occaſion.

Now therefore veil your Bonnets to the *Unmasker*, all you that have a mind to be Chriſtians: Break not your Heads about the Scriptures, to examine what they require of you: Submit your Faith implicitly to the *Unmasker*, he will underſtand and find out the neceſſary Points for you to believe. Take them, juſt ſo many as he thinks fit to deliver them to you; this is the Way to be knowing Chriſtians: But be ſure, ask not whether thoſe he is pleas'd to deliver be every one of them Fundamental, and all the Fundamental Articles neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian: Such a *capricious* Queſtion ſpoils all, overturns Chriſtianity, which is intruſted to the *Unmasker*'s ſole keeping, to be diſpenſed out as he thinks fit. If you refuſe an implicit Faith to him, he will preſently find you have it for the Whore of *Babylon*; he will ſmell out Popery in it immediately: For he has a very ſhrewd Scent, and you will be diſcover'd to be an *Underhand Factor* for the Church of *Rome*.

But if the *Unmasker* were ſuch an Enemy, as he pretends, to thoſe *Factors*, I wonder he ſhould, in what he has ſaid concerning the Apoſtles Creed, ſo exactly jump with *Knot* the Jeſuit. If any one doubt of this, I deſire him to look into the fourth Chapter of *Knot*'s *Charity Maintain'd*, and there he will ſee how well our *Unmasker* and that *Jeſuit* agree in Argument; nay, and Expreſſion too. But yet I do not think him ſo far guilty, as to be employ'd as an *Underhand Factor* for Popery. Every body will, I ſuppoſe, be ready to pronounce him ſo far an Innocent, as to clear him from that. The Cunning of his Deſign goes not beyond the laying out of his preaching Oratory, for the ſetting up his own Syſtem, and making that the ſole Chriſtianity. To that End, he would be glad to have the Power of interpreting Scripture, of defining and declaring Articles of Faith, and impoſing them. This, which makes the abſolute Power of the Pope, he would not, I think, eſtabliſh at *Rome*; but 'tis plain he would have it himſelf, if he could get it, for the Support of the Chriſtianity of his Syſtem. An implicit Faith, if he might have the Management of it, and the taking Fundamentals upon Truſt from his Authority, would be of excellent Uſe. Such a Power in his Hands, would ſpread *Truth* and *Knowledge* in the World; *i. e.* his own Orthodoxy and Set of Opinions. But if a Man differs, nay, queſtions any thing of that, whether it be abſolutely neceſſary to make one a Chriſtian, 'tis immediately a *Contrivance* to let in Popery, and to bring *Darkneſs and Barbariſm into the Chriſtian World*. But I muſt tell the innocent *Unmasker*, whether he deſigns it or no, That if his calling his Syſtem the only Chriſtianity, can bring the World to receive from him Articles of Fairh of his own chuſing, as Fundamentals neceſſary to be believ'd by all Men to make them Chriſtians, which Chriſt and his Apoſtles did not propoſe to all Men to make them Chriſtans; he does only ſet up *Popery* in another Guiſe, and lay the Foundations of *Ignorance*, *Darkneſs*, and *Barbariſm* in the Chriſtian World: For all the *Ignorance* and *Blindneſs*, that Popery introduc'd, was only upon this Foundation. And if he does not ſee this (as there is Reaſon to excuſe his Innocence) 'twould be no hard Matter to demonſtrate it, if that were at preſent the Queſtion between us. But there are a great many other Propoſitions to be prov'd by him, before we come to that new Matter of Debate.

But before I quit theſe Paragraphs, I muſt go on with our *Unmasker*'s Account, and deſire him to ſhew, where it is,

XXV. *That I make it my Buſineſs to beat Men off from taking notice of any Divine Truths?*

Next,

Next where it is,

XXVI. That *I cry down all Articles of Christian Faith but one?*

Next, how it appears,

XXVII. That *I will not suffer Mankind to look into Christianity?*

Again, where it is,

XXVIII. That *I labour industriously to keep People in Ignorance*; or tell them, That *there is no Necessity of knowing any other Doctrines of the Bible?*

These, and several others of the like Strain, particularly concerning *One Article*, and the *Epistles* (which are his Common-Places) are to be found in his 59th and 60th Pages. And all this out of a Presumption, that his System is the only Christianity; and that if Men were not press'd and persuaded to receive that, just every Article of it, upon Pain of Damnation, Christianity would be lost: and not to do this, is to promote *Ignorance*, and contemn the Bible. But he fears where no Fear is. If his Orthodoxy be the Truth, and conformable to the Scriptures, the laying the Foundation only where our Saviour and his Apostles have laid it, will not overturn it. And to shew him, that it is so, I desire him again to consider what I said in my *Vindication, p.* 546. which, because I do not remember he any where takes Notice of in his *Reply*, I will here offer again to his Consideration: "Convince but Men of the "Mission of Jesus Christ; make them but see the Truth, Simplicity, and Rea- "sonableness of what he himself hath taught, and requir'd to be believ'd by "his Followers; and you need not doubt, but being once fully persuaded of "his Doctrine, and the Advantages which all Christians agree are receiv'd by "him, such Converts will not lay by the Scriptures; but by a constant Read- "ing and Study of them, will get all the Light they can from this Divine Re- "velation, and nourish themselves up in the Words of Faith and good Doc- "trine, as St. *Paul* speaks to *Timothy*."

If the Reading and Study of the Scripture were more press'd than it is, and Men were fairly sent to the Bible to find their Religion; and not the Bible put into their Hands only to find the Opinions of their peculiar Sect or Party, Christendom would have more Christians, and those that are, would be more knowing, and more in the right than they now are. That which hinders this, is that select Bundle of Doctrines, which it has pleas'd every Sect to draw out of the Scriptures, or their own Inventions, with an Omission (and as our *Unmasker* would say, a *Contempt*) of all the rest. These *choice* Truths (as the *Unmasker* calls his) are to be the standing Orthodoxy of that Party, from which none of that Church must recede without the Forfeiture of their Christianity, and the Loss of eternal Life. But whilst People keep firm to these, they are in the Church, and the Way to Salvation: which in effect, what is it but to encourage Ignorance, Laziness, and Neglect of the Scriptures? For what need they be at the Pains of constantly reading the Bible, or perplex their Heads with considering and weighing what is there deliver'd; when believing as the Church believes, or saying after, or not contradicting their *Domine* or Teacher, serves the Turn?

Further, I desire it may be consider'd what Name, that mere Mock-shew, of recommending to Men the Study of the Scripture, deserves; if, when they read it, they must understand it just as he (that would be, and they are too apt, contrary to the Command of Christ, to call their Master) tells them. If they find any thing in the Word of God, that leads them into Opinions he does not allow; if any thing they meet with in Holy Writ seems to them to thwart or shake the receiv'd Doctrines, the very proposing of their Doubts renders them suspected: Reasoning about them, and not acquiescing in what is said to them, is interpreted want of due Respect and Deference to the Authority of their Spiritual Guides; Disrepute and Censures follow: And if in pursuance of their

their own Light, they perſiſt in what they think the Scripture teaches them, they are turn'd out of the Church, deliver'd to Satan, and no longer allow'd to be Chriſtians. And is thus a ſincere and rightly directed Study of the Scriptures, that Men may underſtand and profit thereby, encourag'd? This is the Conſequence of Mens aſſuming to themſelves a Power of declaring Fundamentals, *i. e.* of ſetting up a Chriſtianity of their own making. For how elſe can they turn Men, of as unblamable Lives as others of their Members, out of the Church of Chriſt (for ſo they count their Communion) for Opinions, unleſs thoſe Opinions were concluded inconſiſtent with Chriſtianity? Thus Syſtems, the Inventions of Men, are turn'd into ſo many oppoſite Goſpels; and nothing is Truth in each Sect, but what juſt ſuits with them. So that the Scripture ſerves but, like a Noſe of Wax, to be turn'd and bent juſt as may fit the contrary Orthodoxies of different Societies. For 'tis theſe ſeveral Syſtems that to each Party are the juſt Standards of Truth, and the Meaning of the Scripture is to be meaſur'd only by them. Whoever relinquiſhes any of thoſe diſtinguiſhing Points, immediately ceaſes to be a Chriſtian.

This is the Way that the *Unmasker* would have Truth and Religion preſerv'd, Light and Knowledge propagated. But here too the different Sects giving equal Authority to their own Orthodoxies, will be quits with him. For as far as I can obſerve, the ſame Genius ſeems to influence them all; even thoſe who pretend moſt to Freedom, the *Socinians* themſelves. For when 'tis obſerv'd how poſitive and eager they are in their Diſputes; how forward to have their Interpretations of Scripture received for Authentick, tho' to others in ſeveral places they ſeem very much ſtrain'd; how impatient they are of Contradiction; and with what Diſreſpect and Roughneſs they often treat their Oppoſers: may it not be ſuſpected that this is ſo viſible a Warmth in their preſent Circumſtances, and Zeal for their Orthodoxy, would (had they the Power) work in them, as it does in others? They, in their Turns, would, I fear, be ready with their Set of Fundamentals; which they would be as forward to impoſe on others, as others have been to impoſe contrary Fundamentals on them.

This is, and always will be the unavoidable Effect of intruding on our Saviour's Authority, and requiring more now as neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, than was at firſt requir'd by our Saviour and his Apoſtles. What elſe can be expected among Chriſtians, but their tearing, and being torn in pieces by one another; whilſt every Sect aſſumes to it ſelf a Power of declaring Fundamentals, and ſeverally thus narrow Chriſtianity to their diſtinct Syſtems? He that has a mind to ſee how Fundamentals come to be fram'd and faſhion'd, and upon what Motives and Conſiderations they are often taken up, or laid down, according to the Humours, Intereſts, or Deſigns of the Heads of Parties, as if they were Things depending on Mens Pleaſure, and to be ſuited to their Convenience, may find an Example worth his Notice, in the Life of Mr. *Baxter*, Part II. p. 197—205.

Whenever Men take upon them to go beyond thoſe Fundamental Articles of Chriſtianity, which are to be found in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, where will they ſtop? Whenever any Set of Men will require more as neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men of their Church, *i. e.* in their Senſe Chriſtians, than what our Saviour and his Apoſtles propos'd to thoſe whom they made Chriſtians, and admitted into the Church of Chriſt; however they may pretend to recommend the Scripture to their People, in effect no more of it is recommended to them, than juſt comports with what the Leaders of that Sect have reſolv'd Chriſtianity ſhall conſiſt in.

'Tis no wonder therefore there is ſo much Ignorance amongſt Chriſtians, and ſo much vain Outcry againſt it; whilſt almoſt every diſtinct Society of Chriſtians magiſterially aſcribes Orthodoxy to a ſelect Set of Fundamentals, diſtinct from thoſe propos'd in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles; which in no one Point muſt be queſtion'd by any of its Communion. By this Means their People are never ſent to the Holy Scriptures, that true Fountain of Light, but hood-wink'd: A Veil is caſt over their Eyes, and then they are bid read their Bible. They muſt make it all chime to their Church's Fundamentals, or elſe they were better let it alone. For if they find any thing there againſt the receiv'd Doctrines, tho' they hold it and expreſs it in the very

Terms

Terms the Holy Ghoſt has deliver'd it in, that will not excuſe them. Hereſy will be their Lot, and they ſhall be treated accordingly. And thus we ſee how, amongſt other good Effects, Creed-making always has, and always will neceſſarily produce and propagate Ignorance in the World, however each Party blame others for it. And therefore I have often wondred to hear Men of ſeveral Churches ſo heartily exclaim againſt the implicit Faith of the Church of *Rome*; when the ſame implicit Faith is as much practiſed and requir'd in their own, tho' not ſo openly profeſs'd, and ingenuouſly own'd there.

In the next Section, the *Unmasker* queſtions the Sincerity of mine, and profeſſes the Greatneſs of his Concern *for the Salvation of Mens Souls*. And tells me of my *Reflection* on him upon that account, in my *Vindication*, p. 546, 547. *Anſw.* I wiſh he would, for the right Information of the Reader, every where ſet down, what he has any thing to ſay to in my Book, or my Defence of it, and ſave me the Labour of repeating it. My Words, in that Place, are, "Some "Men will not bear, that any one ſhould ſpeak of Religion, but according to "the Model that they themſelves have made of it. Nay, tho' he propoſes it "upon the very Terms, and in the very Words which our Saviour and his A-"poſtles preach'd it in; yet he ſhall not eſcape Cenſures and the ſevereſt In-"ſinuations. To deviate in the leaſt, or to omit any thing contain'd in their "Articles, is Hereſy, under the moſt invidious Names in faſhion; and 'tis "well if he eſcapes being a downright Atheiſt. Whether this be the Way for "Teachers to make themſelves hearken'd to as Men in Earneſt in Religion, "and really concern'd for the Salvation of Mens Souls, I leave them to con-"ſider. What Succeſs it has had towards perſuading Men of the Truth of "Chriſtianity, their own Complaints of the Prevalency of Atheiſm on the one "Hand, and the Number of *Deiſts* on the other, ſufficiently ſhew."

I have ſet down this Paſſage at large, both as a Confirmation of what I ſaid but juſt now; as alſo to ſhew, that the *Reflection* I there made, needed ſome other Anſwer than a bare Profeſſion of his *Regard to the Salvation of Mens Souls*. The Aſſuming an undue Authority to his own Opinions, and uſing manifeſt Untruths in the Defence of them, I am ſure is no Mark that the directing Men right in the Way to Salvation is his chief Aim. And I wiſh, that the greater Liberties of that Sort, which he has again taken in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, and which I have ſo often laid open, had not confirm'd that *Reflection*. I ſhould have been glad, that any thing in my Book had been fairly controverted, and brought to the Touch, whether it had or had not been confuted. The Matter of it would have deſerv'd a ſerious Debate (if any had been neceſſary) in the Words of Sobriety, and the charitable Temper of the Goſpel, as I deſir'd in my Preface: And that would not have miſ-become the *Unmasker*'s Function. But it did not conſiſt, it ſeems, with his Deſign. Chriſtian Charity would not have allow'd thoſe ill-meant Conjectures, and groundleſs Cenſures, which were neceſſary to his Purpoſe; and therefore he took a ſhorter Courſe, than to confute my Book, and thereby convince me and others. He makes it his Buſineſs to rail at it, and the Author of it, that that might be taken for a Confutation. For by what he has hitherto done, Arguing ſeems not to be his Talent. And thus far who can but allow his Wiſdom? But whether it be that *Wiſdom that is from above; firſt pure, then peaceable, gentle, eaſy to be intreated, full of Mercy, and good Fruits, without Partiality, and without Hypocriſy*; I ſhall leave to other Readers to judge.

His ſaying nothing to that other *Reflection*, which his Manner of expreſſing himſelf drew from me, would make one ſuſpect it favour'd not altogether of the Wiſdom of the Goſpel; nor ſhew'd an over-great Care of the Salvation of Souls. My Words, *Vindic.* p. 550. are; "I know not how better to ſhew "my Care of his Credit, than by intreating him, that when he takes next in "hand ſuch a Subject as this, wherein the Salvation of Souls is concern'd, he "would treat it a little more ſeriouſly, and with a little more Candour, leſt "Men ſhould find in his Writings another Cauſe of Atheiſm, which in this "Treatiſe he has not thought fit to mention. *Oſtentation of Wit* in general "he has made a Cauſe of Atheiſm, *p.* 28. But the World will tell him, That "frothy light Diſcourſes, concerning the ſerious Matters of Religion, and *Oſ-"tentation* of triflling miſ-becoming Wit in thoſe who come as Ambaſſadors "from

" from God, under the Title of Succeſſors of the Apoſtles in the great Com-
" miſſion of the Goſpel, is none of the leaſt Cauſes of Atheiſm." But this Advice I am now ſatsify'd (by his Second Part of the ſame Strain) was very improper for him; and no more reaſonable, than if one ſhould adviſe a Buffoon to talk gravely, who has nothing left to draw Attention, if he ſhould lay by his Scurrility.

The Remainder of this fourth Chapter, *p.* 61-67. being ſpent in ſhewing, why the *Socinians* are for a few Articles of Faith, being a Matter that I am not concern'd in; I leave to that forward Gentleman to examine, who examin'd Mr. *Edward*'s Exceptions againſt the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*; and who, as the *Unmasker* informs me, *p.* 64. was *choſen to vindicate my Attempt*, &c.

If the *Unmasker* knows that he was ſo *choſen*, it is well. If I had known of ſuch a Choice, I ſhould have deſir'd that ſome body ſhould have been *choſen to vindicate my Attempt*, who had underſtood it better. The *Unmasker* and *Examiner* are each of them ſo full of themſelves, and their own Syſtems, that I think they may be a fit Match one for another: And ſo I leave theſe Cocks of the Game to try it out in an endleſs Battle of Wrangling (till Death them part) which of them has made the true and exact Collection of Fundamentals; and whoſe Syſtem of the two ought to be the prevailing Orthodoxy, and be receiv'd for Scripture. Only I warn the *Examiner* to look to himſelf: For the *Unmasker* has the whip-hand of him, and gives him to underſtand, *p.* 65. that if he cannot do it himſelf by the Strength of his Lungs, the Vehemency of his Oratory, and endleſs Attacks of his Repetitions; the *Eccleſiaſtical Power* and the Civil *Magiſtrate*'s *Laſh*, have in Store demonſtrative Arguments to convince him that his [the *Unmasker*'s] Syſtem is the only true Chriſtianity.

By the Way, I muſt not forget to mind the *Unmasker* here again, that he hath a very unlucky Hand at gueſſing. For whereas he names *Socinus* as one from whom I receiv'd my *Platform*, and ſays, that *Crellius gave me my Cue*; it ſo falls out, that they are two Authors of whom I never read a Page. I ſay not this, as if I thought it a Fault if I had; for I think I ſhould have much better ſpent my Time in them, than in the Writings of our learned *Unmasker*.

I was ſure there was no offending the *Unmasker* without the Guilt of *Atheiſm*; only he here, *pag.* 69. very mercifully lays it upon my Book, and not upon my Deſign. The *Tendency of it to Irreligion and Atheiſm*, he has prov'd in an eloquent Harangue (for he is ſuch an Orator he cannot ſtir a Foot without a Speech) made, as he bids us ſuppoſe, by the *Atheiſtical Rabble*. And who can deny, but he has choſe a fit Employment for himſelf? Where could there be found a better Speech-maker for the *Atheiſtical Rabble?* But let us hear him: For tho' he would give the *Atheiſtical Rabble* the Credit of it, yet 'tis the *Unmasker* ſpeaks. And becauſe 'tis pity ſuch a Pattern of Rhetorick and Reaſon ſhould be loſt, I have for my Reader's Edification, ſet it all down *verbatim*.

" We are beholden to this worthy Adventurer for ridding the World of
" ſo great an Incumbrance, *viz.* That huge Maſs and unwieldy Body of Chriſ-
" tianity, which took up ſo much Room. Now we ſee that it was this Bulk,
" and not that of Mankind, which he had an Eye to, when he ſo often men-
" tion'd this latter. This is a Phyſician for our turn indeed: We like this
" Chymical Operator, that doth not trouble us with a Parcel of heavy Drugs
" of no Value, but contracts it all into a few Spirits, nay doth his Buſineſs
" with a ſingle Drop. We have been in Bondage a longe time to Creeds
" and Catechiſms, Syſtems and Confeſſions; we have been plagu'd with a te-
" dious Bead-roll of Articles, which our Reverend Divines have told us we
" muſt make the Matter of our Faith. Yea, ſo it is, both Conformiſts and
" Nonconformiſts (tho' diſagreeing in ſome other Things) have agreed in this
" to moleſt and crucify us. But this noble Writer (we thank him) hath
" ſet us free, and eas'd us, by bringing down all the Chriſtian Faith into one
" Point. We have heard ſome Men talk of Epiſtolary Compoſures of the
" New Teſtament, as if great Matters were contain'd in them, as if the
" great Myſteries of Chriſtianity (as they call them) were unfolded there:
" But we could never make any thing of them; and now we find that this
" Writer is partly of our Opinion. He tells us, that theſe are Letters ſent

" upon

" upon Occaſion, but we are not to look for our Religion (for now for this " Gentleman's ſake we begin to talk of Religion) in theſe Places. We be- " lieve it, and we believe that there is no Religion but in thoſe very Chap- " ters and Verſes, which he has ſet down in his Treatiſe. What need we " have any other Part of the New Teſtament? That is Bible enough, if not " too much. Happy, thrice happy ſhall this Author be perpetually eſteem'd " by us, we will chronicle him as our Friend and Benefactor. It is not our " Way to ſaint People, otherwiſe we would certainly canonize this Gentleman; " and when our Hand is in, his pair of Bookſellers, for their being ſo benefi- " cial to the World, in publiſhing ſo rich a Treaſure. It was a bleſſed Day " when this hopeful Birth ſaw the Light, for hereby all the Orthodox Creed- " Makers and Syſtematick Men are ruin'd for ever. In brief, if we be for " any Chriſtianity, it ſhall be this Author's; for that agrees with us ſingularly " well, it being ſo ſhort, all couch'd in four Words, neither more nor leſs. " It is a very fine Compendium, and we are infinitely oblig'd to this great " Reformer for it. We are glad at heart that Cnriſtianity is brought ſo low " by this worthy Pen-man, for this is a good Preſage that it will dwindle into " nothing. What! but one Article, and that ſo brief too! We like ſuch a " Faith, and ſuch a Religion, becauſe it is ſo near to none."

He hath no ſooner done, but as it deſerved, he cries out, *Euge Sophos! And is not the Reader*, quoth he, *ſatisfy'd that ſuch Language as this hath real Truth in it? Does not he perceive, that the diſcarding all the Articles but* ONE *makes way for the caſting off that too? Anſw.* 'Tis but ſuppoſing that the Reader is a civil Gentleman, and anſwers *Yes*, to theſe two Queſtions; and then 'tis Demonſtration, that by this Speech he has irrefragably prov'd the *Tendency* of my Book to *Irreligion and Atheiſm.*

I remember *Chillingworth* ſomewhere puts up this Requeſt to his Adverſary *Knot:* " Sir, I beſeech you, when you write again, do us the Favour to write " nothing but Syllogiſms. For I find it ſtill an extreme Trouble to find out the " conceal'd Propoſitions, which are to connect the Parts of your Enthymems. " As now for Example, I profeſs to you I have done my beſt Endeavour to " find ſome Glue, or Sodder, or Cement, or Thred, or any thing to tie " the Antecedent and this Conſequent together." The *Unmasker* agrees ſo much in a great Part of his Opinion with that Jeſuit (as I have ſhew'd already) and does ſo infinitely out-do him in ſpinning Ropes of Sand, and a coarſe Thred of Inconſiſtencies, which runs quite through his Book; that 'tis with great Juſtice I put him here in the Jeſuit's Place, and addreſs the ſame Requeſt to him.

His very next Words give me a freſh Reaſon to do it: For thus he argues, *p.* 72. *May we not expect, that thoſe who deal thus with the Creed*, i. e. *diſcard all the Articles of it but one, will uſe the ſame Method in reducing the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, abbreviate the former into one Precept, and the latter into one Petition? Anſw.* If he will tell me where this *Creed* he ſpeaks of is, it will be much more eaſy to anſwer his Demand. Whilſt his *Creed*, which he here ſpeaks of, is yet no where, it is ridiculous for him to ask Queſtions about it. The Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, I know where to find, in expreſs Words ſet down by themſelves, with peculiar Marks of Diſtinction. Which is the Lord's Prayer, we are plainly taught by this Command of our Saviour, *Luke* XI. 2. *When ye pray, SAY, Our Father*, &c. In the ſame Manner and Words we are taught what we ſhould believe, to make us his Diſciples, by his Command to the Apoſtles what they ſhould preach, *Mat.* X. 7. *As ye go, preach, SAYING.* What were they to ſay? Only this, *The Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand.* Or, as St. *Luke* expreſſes it, *Chap.* IX. 2. They were ſent *to preach the Kingdom of God, and to heal the Sick:* Which, what it was, we have ſufficiently explain'd. But this *Creed* of the *Unmasker*, which he talks of, Where is it? Let him ſhew it us diſtinctly ſet out from the reſt of the Scripture. If he knows were it is, let him produce it, or leave talking of it, till he can. 'Tis not the Apoſtles Creed, that's evident: For that Creed he has *diſcarded* from being the Standard of Chriſtian Faith, and has told the World in Words at length, That *if a Man* believes *no more than is in expreſs Terms in the Apoſtles Creed, his Faith will not be the Faith of a Chriſtian.*

Nay,

Nay, 'tis plain, that *Creed* has, in the *Unmasker*'s Opinion, the ſame *Tendency to Atheiſm and Irreligion*, that my Summary has. For the Apoſtles Creed reducing the Forty, or perhaps four Hundred Fundamental Articles of his Chriſtian Creed, to Twelve; and leaving out the greateſt Part of thoſe neceſſary ones which he has already, and will hereafter, in good time, give us; does as much diſpoſe Men to ſerve the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer juſt ſo, as my reducing thoſe Twelve to Two. For ſo many at leaſt he has granted to be in my Summary, *viz.* The Article of one God, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and the other of Jeſus the Meſſiah; tho' he every where calls them but *ONE*: Which, whether it be to ſhew, with what Love and Regard to Truth he continues, and conſequently began this Controverſy; or whether it be to beguile and ſtartle unwary, or confirm prejudic'd Readers, I ſhall leave to others to judge. 'Tis evident, he thinks his Cauſe would be mightily maim'd, if he were forc'd to leave out the Charge of *ONE* Article; and he would not know what to do for Wit or Argument, if he ſhould call them *two*: For then the whole Weight and Edge of his ſtrong and ſharp Reaſoning, in his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, pag. 122. would be loſt. There you have it in theſe Words: *When the Catholick Faith is thus brought down to one ſingle Article, it will ſoon be reduc'd to none; the Unit will dwindle into a Cypher.* And here again, it makes the whole Argument of his Atheiſtical Speech, which he winds up with theſe convincing Words: *We are glad to hear that Chriſtianity is brought ſo low by this worthy Pen-man; for this is a good Preſage, that it will dwindle into nothing. What! ONE Article, and that ſo brief too: We like ſuch a Faith and ſuch a Religion, becauſe it is ſo near NONE.* But I muſt tell this Writer of equal Wit, Senſe, and Modeſty, that this Religion which he thus makes a dull Farce of, and calls *near none*, is that very Religion which our Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt* and his Apoſtles preach'd, for the Converſion and Salvation of Mankind; no one Article whereof, which they propos'd as neceſſary to be receiv'd by Unbelievers to make them Chriſtians, is omitted. And I ask him, Whether it be his Errand, as one of our Saviour's Ambaſſadors, to turn it thus into Ridicule? For till he has ſhewn, that they preach'd otherwiſe, and more than what the Spirit of Truth has recorded of their Preaching in their Hiſtories, which I have faithfully collected and ſet down, all that he ſhall ſay, reflecting upon the Plainneſs and Simplicity of their Doctrine, however directed againſt me, will by his *Atheiſtical Rabble* of all kinds, now they are ſo well enter'd and inſtructed in it by him, be all turn'd upon our Saviour and his Apoſtles.

What Tendency this, and all his other Trifling in ſo ſerious a Cauſe as this is, has to the propagating of *Atheiſm and Irreligion* in this Age, he were beſt to conſider. This I am ſure, the Doctrine of but *one* Article (if the Author and Finiſher of our Faith, and thoſe he guided by his Spirit, had preach'd but *one* Article) has no more Tendency to Atheiſm, than their Doctrine of *one* God. But the *Unmasker* every where talks, as if the Strength of our Religion lay in the Number of its Articles; and would be preſently routed, if it had but a few: And therefore he has muſter'd up a pretty full Band of them, and has a Reſerve of the Lord knows how many more, which ſhall be forthcoming upon Occaſion. But I ſhall deſire to mind this Learned Divine, who is ſo afraid what will become of his Religion, if it ſhould propoſe but *one*, or a few Articles as neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, that the Strength and Security of our Religion lies in the Divine Authority of thoſe who firſt promulgated the Terms of Admittance into the Church, and not in the Multitude of Articles, ſuppos'd by ſome neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian: And I would have him remember, when he goes next to make Uſe of this ſtrong Argument of *ONE dwindling into a Cypher*, that *One* is as remote as a Million from none. And if this be not ſo, I deſire to know whether his Way of arguing will not prove Pagan Polytheiſm to be more remote from Atheiſm than Chriſtianity. He will do well to try the Force of his Speech in the Mouth of an Heathen, complaining of the Tendency of *Chriſtianity* to Atheiſm, by reducing his great Number of Gods to but *one*, which was *ſo near none*, and would therefore *ſoon be reduc'd to none*.

The

The *Unmasker* ſeems to be upon the ſame Topick, where he ſo pathetically complains of the *Socinians*, p. 66. in theſe Words, *Is it not enough to rob us of our God, by denying Chriſt to be ſo; but muſt they ſpoil us of all the other Articles of Chriſtian Faith but one?* Have a better Heart, good Sir, for I aſſure you no body can rob you *of your God*, but by your own Conſent, nor *ſpoil* you of any of the *Articles* of your *Faith*. If you look for them where God has placed them, in the Holy Scripture, and take them as he has fram'd and faſhion'd them there; there you will always find them ſafe and ſound. But if they come out of an Artificer's Shop, and be of human Invention, I cannot anſwer for them: they may, for ought I know, be nothing but an Idol of your own ſetting; up which may be pull'd down, ſhould you cry out never ſo much, *Great is* Diana *of the* Epheſians.

He, who conſiders this Argument of *one* and *none*, as managed by the *Unmasker*, and obſerves his pathetical Way of Reaſoning all through his Book, muſt confeſs, that he has got the very Philoſopher's Stone in diſputing. That which would be worthleſs Lead in others, he turns into pure Gold; his Oratory changes its Nature, and gives it the noble Tincture: So that what in plain Reaſoning would be Nonſenſe, let him but put it into a Speech or an Exclamation, and there it becomes ſtrong Argument. Whether this be not ſo, I deſire *Mode* and *Figure* may decide. And to thoſe I ſhall deſire he would reduce the Proofs, which, *p.* 73. he ſays he has given of theſe following Propoſitions, *viz.*

XXIX. *That I have corrupted Mens Minds.*

XXX. *That I have depraved the Goſpel.*

XXXI. *That I have abuſed Chriſtianity.*

For all theſe three, *p.* 73. he affirms of me without Proof, and without Honeſty.

Whether it be from Confuſion of Thought, or Unfairneſs of Deſign; either becauſe he has not clear diſtinct Notions of what he would ſay, or finds it not to his Purpoſe to ſpeak them clearly out, or both together; ſo it is, that the *Unmasker* very ſeldom, but when he rails, delivers himſelf ſo that one can certainly tell what he would have.

The Queſtion is, What is abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd by every one to make him a Chriſtian. It has been clearly made out from an exact Survey of the Hiſtory of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, that the whole Aim of all their Preaching every where was, to convince the unbelieving World of theſe two great Truths; Firſt, That there was one Eternal Inviſible God, Maker of Heaven and Earth: And next, That *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* was the *Meſſiah*, the promiſed King and Saviour. And that upon Mens believing theſe two Articles, they were baptized and admitted into the Church, *i. e.* receiv'd as Subjects of Chriſt's Kingdom, and pronounced Believers. From whence it unavoidably follows, that theſe two are the only Truths neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian.

This Matter of Fact is ſo evident from the whole Tenor of the four Goſpels, and the Acts; and preſſes ſo hard, that the *Unmasker*, who contends for a great number of other Points neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, thinks himſelf concern'd to give ſome Anſwer to it: but, in his uſual Way, full of Uncertainty and Confuſion. To clear this Matter, he lays down four Particulars. The firſt is, *p.* 74. *That the believing Jeſus to be the promiſed Meſſiah, was the firſt Step to Chriſtianity.*

The Second, *p.* 76. *That tho' this one Propoſition (viz.* of Jeſus the Meſſiah) *be mention'd alone in ſome Places, yet there is reaſon to think, and be perſuaded, that at the ſame time other Matters of Faith were propoſed.*

The Third, *p.* 76. *That tho' there are ſeveral Parts and Members of the Chriſtian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one place of Scripture.*

The Fourth, *p.* 78. *That Chriſtianity was erected by degrees.*

These Particulars he tells us, *p.* 74. *He offers to clear an Objection.* To see therefore whether they are pertinent or no, we must examine what the Objection is, as he puts it. I think it might have been put in a few Words: This I am sure, it ought to have been put very clear and distinct. But the *Unmasker* has been pleas'd to give it us, *p.* 73. as followeth: *Because I designed these Papers for the satisfying of the Reader's Doubts, about any thing occurring concerning the Matter before us, and for the establishing of his wavering Mind; I will here (before I pass to the Second General Head of my Discourse) answer a Query or Objection, which some, and not without some shew of Ground, may be apt to start. How comes it to pass, they will say, that this Article of Faith,* viz. *That Jesus is the Messiah or Christ, is so often repeated in the New Testament? Why is this sometimes urged, without the mentioning of any other Article of Belief? Doth not this plainly shew, that this is all that is requir'd to believ'd as necessary to make a Man a Christian? May we not infer from the frequent and sole Repetition of this Article in several Places of the Evangelists and the Acts, that there is no other Point of Faith of absolute Necessity; but that this alone is sufficient to constitute a Man a true Member of Christ.*

By which he shews, that he is uncertain which way to put the Objection, so as may be easiest to get rid of it: and therefore he has turn'd it several Ways, and put several Questions about it. As First,

Why this *Article of Faith,* viz. That Jesus is the Messiah, *is so often repeated in the New Testament?*

His next Question is, *Why is this sometimes urg'd without the mentioning any other Article of Belief,* which supposes, that sometimes other Articles of Belief are mention'd with it.

The third Question is, *May we not infer from the frequent and sole Repitition of this Article in several Places of the Evangelists and Acts?*

Which last Question is in effect, Why is this so frequently and alone repeated in the Evangelists and the Acts? *i. e.* in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles to Unbelievers. For of that he must give an Account, if he will remove the Difficulty. Which three, tho' put as one, yet are three as distinct Questions, and demand a Reason for three as distinct Matters of Fact, as these three are, viz. *frequently* propos'd; *sometimes propos'd alone*; and *always* propos'd alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apostles: for so in truth it was all through the Gospels and the Acts, to the unconverted Believers of one God *alone.*

These three Questions being thus jumbled together in one Objection, let us see how the four Particulars he mentions will account for them.

The first of them is this: *The believing Jesus to be the promis'd Messias,* was, says he, *the first Step to Christianity.* Let it be so; What do you infer from thence? The next Words shew: *Therefore this rather than any other Article was propounded to be believed by all those whom either our Saviour or his Apostles invited to embrace Christianity.* Let your Premises be never so true, and your Deduction of this Proposition be never so regular from them, it is all lost Labour. This Conclusion is not the Proposition you were to prove. Your Questions were, *Why this Article is so often propos'd?* And in those frequent Repetitions, *Why sometimes urged alone,* and *why always propos'd alone,* viz. *to those whom either our Saviour or his Apostles invited to embrace Christianity?* And your Answer is, because the believing *Jesus to be the Messias, was the first Step to Christianity.* This therefore remains upon you to be proved,

XXXII. *That because the believing Jesus to be the Messias, is the first Step to Christianity; therefore this Article is frequently propos'd in the New Testament, is sometimes propos'd without the mentioning any other Article; and always alone to Unbelievers.*

And when you have prov'd this, I shall desire you to apply it to our present Controversy.

His next Answer to those Questions, is in these Words, *p.* 76. *That tho' this one Proposition or Article be mention'd alone in some Places, yet there is reason to think and be perswaded, that at the same time other Matters of Faith were propos'd.* From whence it lies upon him to make out this Reasoning, *viz.* XXXIII.

XXXIII. *That becauſe there is Reaſon to think, and be perſuaded, that at the ſame Time that this one Article was mention'd alone (as it was ſometimes) other Matters of Faith were propos'd: Therefore this Article was often propos'd in the New Teſtament; ſometimes propos'd alone; and always propos'd alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles to Unbelievers.*

This I ſet down to ſhew the Force of his Anſwer to Queſtions: Suppoſing it to be true, not that I grant it to be true, That where *this one Article is mention'd alone, we have Reaſon to think, and be perſuaded, that at the ſame Time other Matters of Faith* [*i. e.* Articles of Faith neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian] *were propos'd:* And I doubt not but to ſhew the contrary.

His third Particular, in anſwer to the Queſtion propos'd in his Objection, ſtands thus, *p. 76. That though there are ſeveral Parts and Members of the Chriſtian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one Place of the Scripture*; which Anſwer lays it upon him to prove,

XXXIV. That becauſe *the ſeveral Parts of the Members of the Chriſtian Faith do not all occur in any one Place of Scripture*; therefore *this Article*, That Jeſus was the *Meſſias, was often propoſed in the* New Teſtament, *ſometimes propoſed alone, and always propoſed alone* in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, through the Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts and the Acts.

The fourth and laſt Particular, which he tells us is the main Anſwer to the Objection, is in theſe Words, *Page* 78.

That Chriſtianity was erected by Degrees.

Which requires him to make out this Argument, *viz.*

XXXV. *That becauſe Chriſtianity was erected by Degrees*, therefore *this Article*, That Jeſus was the Meſſias, *was often propos'd in the* New Teſtament, *ſometimes propoſed alone, and always propos'd alone in the Preachings of our Saviour and his Apoſtles to Unbelievers, recorded in the Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts and Acts.*

For as I ſaid before, in theſe three Queſtions he has put his Objection; to which he tells us this is the main Anſwer.

Of theſe four Particulars it is, that he ſays, *p.* 74. *To clear this Objection, and to give a full and ſatisfactory Anſwer to all Doubts in this Affair, I offer theſe enſuing Particulars, which will lead the Reader to the right Underſtanding of the whole Caſe.*

How well they have *clear'd the Objection*, may be ſeen by barely ſetting them down as Anſwers to theſe Queſtions, wherein he puts the Objection.

This is all I have hitherto done: Whereby is very viſible how well (ſuppoſing them true) they clear the Objection; and how pertinently they are brought to anſwer thoſe Queſtions wherein his Objection is contain'd. Perhaps it will be ſaid, that neither theſe, nor any thing elſe, can be an appoſite Anſwer to thoſe Queſtions put ſo together. I anſwer, I am of the ſame Mind. But if the *Unmasker* through Ignorance or Shuffling will talk thus confuſedly, he muſt anſwer for it. He calls all his three Queſtions one Objection, over and over again: And therefore which of thoſe Queſtions it does or does not lie in, I ſhall not trouble my ſelf to divine; ſince I think he himſelf cannot tell: For which-ever he takes of them, it will involve him in equal Difficulties. I now proceed to examine his Particulars themſelves, and the Truth contain'd in them. The firſt, *p.* 74. ſtands thus:

1. *The believing of Jeſus to be the promis'd Meſſias, was the firſt Step to Chriſtianity. It was that which made Way for the embracing of all the other Articles, a Paſſage to all the reſt. Anſw.* If this be, as he would have it, only the leading Article amongſt a great many other equally neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; this is a Reaſon, why it ſhould be conſtantly preach'd in the firſt Place.

Place. But this is no Reaſon why this alone ſhould be ſo often repeated, and the other neceſſary Points not be once mention'd. For I deſire to know what thoſe Articles are, that in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles are repeated or urg'd beſides this?

In the next Place, if it be true, that this Article, *viz.* That *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*, was only the firſt in Order amongſt a great many Articles as neceſſary to be believ'd; how comes it to paſs, that barely upon the Propoſal and believing of this, Men were admitted into the Church as Believers? The Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament* is full of Inſtances of this, as *Acts* viii. 5, 12, 13. ix. and in other Places.

Though it be true, what the *Unmasker* ſays here, *That if they did not give Credit to this in the firſt Place, that Jeſus of* Nazareth *was that eminent and extraordinary Perſon propheſy'd of long before; and that he was ſent and commiſſion'd by God, there could be no hope that they would attend to any other Propoſals relating to the Chriſtian Religion:* Yet what he ſubjoins, That *this is the true Reaſon, why that Article was conſtantly propounded to be believ'd by all that look'd towards Chriſtianity, and why it is mention'd ſo often in the Evangelical Writings*, is not true. For, firſt, this ſuppoſes that there were other Articles join'd with it. This he ſhould have firſt prov'd, and then given the Reaſon of it; and not, as he does here, ſuppoſe what is in queſtion, and then give a Reaſon why it is ſo; and ſuch a Reaſon that is inconſiſtent with the Matter of Fact, that is every where recorded in Holy Writ. For if the true Reaſon why the preaching of this Article, that *Jeſus was the Meſſiah*, as it is recorded in the Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament*, were only to make Way for the other Articles, one muſt needs think, that neither our Saviour and his Apoſtles (with Reverence be it ſpoken) were very ſtrange Preachers; or that the Evangeliſts, and Author of the *Acts*, were very ſtrange Hiſtorians. The firſt were to inſtruct the World in a new Religion, conſiſting of a great Number of Articles, ſays the *Unmasker*, neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, *i. e.* a great Number of Propoſitions making a large Syſtem, every one whereof is ſo neceſſary for a Man to underſtand and believe, that if any one be omitted, he cannot be of that Religion. What now did our Saviour and his Apoſtles do? Why! if the *Unmasker* may be believ'd, they went up and down with Danger of their Lives, and preach'd to the World. What did they preach? Even this ſingle Propoſition to make Way for the reſt, *viz. This is the eminent Man ſent from God* to teach you other Things: Which amounts to no more but this, That *Jeſus* was the Perſon which was to teach them the true Religion, but that true Religion it ſelf is not to be found in all their Preaching; nay ſcarce a Word of it. Can there be any thing more ridiculous than this? And yet this was all they preach'd; if it be true, that this was all which they meant by the preaching every where *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, and if it were only an Introduction, and a *making way* for the Doctrines of the Goſpel. But it is plain it was call'd the Goſpel it ſelf. Let the *Unmasker*, as a true Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, go and preach the Goſpel, as the Apoſtles did, to ſome Part of the Heathen World, where the Name of Chriſt is not known: Would not he himſelf, and every body think he was very fooliſhly employ'd, if he ſhould tell them nothing but this, That *Jeſus* was the Perſon promis'd and ſent from God to reveal the true Religion; but ſhould teach them nothing of that true Religion, but this Preliminary Article? Such the *Unmasker* makes all the Preaching, recorded in the *New Teſtament*, for the Converſion of the unbelieving World. He makes the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles to be no more but this; That the great Prophet promis'd to the World was come, and that *Jeſus* was he: But what his Doctrine was, that they were ſilent in, and taught not one Article of it. But the *Unmasker* miſ-repreſents it: For as to his accuſing the Hiſtorians, the Evangeliſts, and Writers of the *Acts* of the Apoſtles, for their ſhameful Omiſſion of the whole Doctrine of the Chriſtian Religion, to ſave his Hypotheſis, as he does under his next Head, in theſe Words; *That tho' this one Propoſition be mention'd alone in ſome Places, yet there is Reaſon to think and be perſuaded, that at the ſame Time other Matters of Faith were propos'd*; I ſhall ſhew how bold he makes with thoſe inſpir'd Hiſtorians, when I come to conſider that Particular.

How

How ridiculous, how ſenſleſs this bold *Unmasker*, and Reformer of the Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament*, makes the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, as it ſtands recorded of them by infallible Writers, is viſible. But taking it as in Truth it is there, we ſhall have a quite other View of it. Our Saviour preach'd every where the Kingdom of God, and by his Miracles declar'd himſelf to be the King of that Kingdom. The Apoſtles preach'd the ſame, and after his Aſcenſion, openly avow'd him to be the Prince and Saviour promis'd: But preach'd not this as a bare ſpeculative Article of ſimple Belief; but that Men might receive him for their King, and become his Subjects. When they told the World that he was the Chriſt, it was not as the *Unmasker* will have it: Believe this Man to be a Prophet, and then he will teach you his new Religion; which when you have receiv'd and embrac'd all and every Article thereof, which are a great Number, you will then be Chriſtians, if you be not ignorant or incredulous of any of them. But it was, Believe this Man to be your King ſent from God: Take him for ſuch, with a Reſolution to obſerve the Laws he has given you, and you are his Subjects, you are Chriſtians. For thoſe that truly did ſo, made themſelves his Subjects: And to continue ſo, there was no more requir'd than a ſincere Endeavour to know his Will in all Things, and to obey it. Such a Preaching as this of *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, the King and Deliverer that God Almighty had promis'd to Mankind, and now had effectually ſent to be their Prince and Ruler, was not a ſimple Preparation to the Goſpel: But when receiv'd with the Obedience of Faith, was the very receiving of the Goſpel; and had all that was requiſite to make Men Chriſtians. And without it be ſo underſtood, no body can clear the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles from that incredible Imperfection; or their Hiſtorians from that unpardonable Negligence, and not doing either what they ought, or what they undertook; which our *Unmasker* hath ſo impiouſly charg'd upon them, as will appear yet plainer in what I have to ſay to the *Unmasker*'s next Particular. For as to the Remainder of this Paragraph, it contains nothing but his Cenſure and Contempt of me, for not being of his Mind, for not ſeeing as he ſees; *i. e.* in effect not laying that Blame, which he does, either on the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, or on the inſpir'd Writings of their Hiſtorians, to make them comply with his Syſtem, and the Chriſtianity he would make.

The *Unmasker*'s ſecond Particular, *p.* 76. tells us, *That tho' this one Propoſition or Article be mention'd alone in ſome Places, yet there is Reaſon to think, and be perſuaded, that at the ſame Time other Matters of Faith were propos'd. For it is confeſs'd by all intelligent and obſerving Men, that the Hiſtory of the Scripture is conciſe; and that in relating of Matter of Fact, many Paſſages are omitted by the Sacred Penmen. Wherefore, tho' but this one Article of Belief (becauſe it is a leading one, and makes Way for the reſt) be expreſly mention'd in ſome of the Goſpels, yet we muſt not conclude thence, that no other Matter of Faith was requir'd to be admitted of. For Things are briefly ſet down in the Evangelical Records, and we muſt ſuppoſe many Things which are not in direct Terms related.*

Anſw. The *Unmasker* here keeps to his uſual Cuſtom of ſpeaking in doubtful Terms. He ſays, that where this one Article, that *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*, is alone recorded in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles; *We have Reaſon to be perſuaded, that at the ſame Time other Matters of Faith were propos'd.* If this be to his Purpoſe, by *Matters of Faith* muſt be meant Fundamental Articles of Faith, abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd by every Man to make him a Chriſtian. That ſuch *Matters of Faith* are omitted, in the Hiſtory of the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, by the Sacred Hiſtorians; this, he ſays, *we have Reaſon to be perſuded of.*

Anſw. They need be good Reaſons to perſuade a rational Man, that the Evangeliſts, in their Hiſtory of our Saviour and his Apoſtles (if they were but ordinarily fair and prudent Men) did, in an Hiſtory publiſh'd to inſtruct the World in a new Religion, leave out the neceſſary and fundamental Parts of that Religion. But let them be conſider'd as inſpir'd Writers, under the Conduct of the infallible Spirit of God, putting them upon and directing them in the writing of this Hiſtory of the Goſpel; and then it is impoſſible for any Chriſtian but the *Unmasker* to think, that they made any ſuch groſs Omiſſions, contrary

mention'd alone, implies, that in other Places it is not mention'd alone, but join'd with other neceſſary Articles. But then it will remain upon him to ſhew,

XXXVI. *In what Place either of the Goſpels or of the Acts, other Articles of Faith are join'd with this, and propos'd as neceſſary to be believed to make Men Chriſtians.*

The *Unmasker*, 'tis probable, will tell us, that the Article of Chriſt's Reſurrection is ſometimes join'd with this of the *Meſſiah*, as particularly in that firſt Sermon of St. *Peter*, Acts ii. by which there were three Thouſand added to the Church at one Time. *Anſw.* This Sermon well conſider'd, will explain to us both the Preaching of the Apoſtles, what it was that they propos'd to their unbelieving Auditors to make them Chriſtians; and alſo the Manner of St. *Luke*'s recording their Sermons. 'Tis true, that here are deliver'd by St. *Peter* many other *Matters of Faith*, beſides that of *Jeſus* being the *Meſſiah*: For all that he ſaid being of Divine Authority, is *Matter of Faith*, and may not be disbelievʼd. The firſt Part of his Diſcourſe is, to prove to the *Jews*, that what they had obſerved of extraordinary at that Time amongſt the Diſciples, who ſpake Variety of Tongues, did not proceed from Wine, but from the Holy Ghoſt: And that this was the Pouring out of the Spirit, propheſy'd of by the Prophet *Joel*. This is all *Matter of Faith*, and is written that it might be believ'd: But yet I think, that neither the *Unmasker*, nor any body elſe will ſay, that this is ſuch a neceſſary Article of Faith, that no Man could, without an explicit Belief of it, be a Chriſtian: Tho' being a Declaration of the Holy Ghoſt by St. *Peter*, it is ſo much a *Matter of Faith*, that no body to whom it is now propos'd, can deny it and be a Chriſtian. And thus all the Scripture of the *New Teſtament*, given by Divine Inſpiration, is *Matter of Faith*, and neceſſary to be believed by all Chriſtians to whom it is propos'd. But yet I do not think any one ſo unreaſonable as to ſay, that every Propoſition in the *New Teſtament* is a Fundamental Article of Faith, which is requir'd explicitly to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian.

Here now is a *Matter of Faith* join'd, in the ſame Sermon, with this Fundamental Article, That *Jeſus is the Meſſiah*; and reported by the Sacred Hiſtorian ſo at large, that it takes up a third Part of St. *Peter*'s Sermon, recorded by St. *Luke*: And yet it is ſuch a *Matter of Faith*, as is not contain'd in the *Unmasker*'s Catalogue of neceſſary Articles. I muſt ask him then, whether St. *Luke* were ſo *conciſe* an Hiſtorian, that he would ſo at large ſet down a *Matter of Faith* propos'd by St. *Peter*, that was not neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtan, and wholly to leave out the very mention of all the *Unmasker*'s additional neceſſary Articles, if indeed they were neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians? I know not how any one could charge the Hiſtorian with greater Unfaithfulneſs, or greater Folly. But this the *Unmasker* ſticks not at, to preſerve to himſelf the Power of appointing what ſhall, and what ſhall not be *neceſſary* Articles; and of making his Syſtem the Chriſtianity neceſſary, and only neceſſary to be receiv'd.

The next Thing that St. *Peter* proceeds to in this his Sermon, is, to declare to the Unbelieving *Jews*, that *Jeſus* of *Nazareth*, who had done Miracles amongſt them, whom they had crucified and put to Death, and whom God had raiſ'd again from the Dead, was the *Meſſiah*.

Here indeed our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death and Reſurrection are mention'd: And if they were no where elſe recorded, are *Matters of Faith*; which, with all the reſt of the *New Teſtament*, ought to be believ'd by every Chriſtian to whom it is thus propos'd, as a Part of Divine Revelation. But that theſe were not here propos'd to the Unbelieving *Jews*, as the Fundamental Articles, which St. *Peter* principally aimed at, and endeavour'd to convince them of, is evident from hence; that they are made uſe of as Arguments to perſuade them of this Fundamental Truth, *viz.* That *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*, whom they ought to take for their Lord and Ruler. For whatſoever is brought as an Argument to prove another Truth, cannot be thought to be the principal Thing aimed at in that Argumentation; tho' it may have ſo ſtrong and immediate a Connection with the Concluſion, that you cannot deny it without denying even

what

what is infer'd from it, and is therefore the fitter to be an Argument to prove it. But that our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death, and Reſurrection, were uſed here as Arguments to perſuade them into a Belief of this Fundamental Article, That *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*, and not as Propoſitions of a new Faith they were to receive; is evident from hence, that St. *Peter* preach'd here to thoſe who knew the Death and Crucifixion of *Jeſus* as well as he: And therefore theſe could not be propos'd to them as new Articles of Faith to be believ'd. But thoſe Matters of Fact being what the *Jews* knew already, were a good Argument, join'd with his Reſurrection, to convince them of that Truth, which he endeavour'd to give them a Belief of. And therefore he rightly infer'd from theſe Facts join'd together, this Concluſion, the believing whereof would make them Chriſtians: *Therefore let all the Houſe of* Iſrael *know aſſuredly, that God hath made that ſame Jeſus, whom ye have crucified, Lord and Chriſt.* To the making good this ſole Propoſition, his whole Diſcourſe tended: This was the ſole Truth he labour'd to convince them of; this the Faith he endeavour'd to bring them into; which as ſoon as they had receiv'd with Repentance, they were by Baptiſm admitted into the Church, and three Thouſand at once made Chriſtians.

Here St. *Luke*'s own Confeſſion, without that *of intelligent and obſerving Men*, which the *Unmasker* has recourſe to, might have ſatisfy'd him again, *that in relating Matters of Fact, many Paſſages are omitted by the ſacred Pen-men.* For, ſays St. *Luke* here, *ver.* 40. *And with many other Words*, which are not ſet down.

One would at firſt ſight, wonder why the *Unmasker* neglects theſe demonſtrative Authorities of the Holy Pen-men themſelves, where they own their Omiſſions, to tell us; that it is *confeſſed by all intelligent and obſerving Men, that in relating Matters of Fact, many Paſſages are omitted by the ſacred Pen-men.* St. *John*, in what he ſays of his Goſpel, directly profeſſes large Omiſſions, and ſo does St. *Luke* here. But theſe Omiſſions would not ſerve the *Unmasker*'s Turn; for they are directly againſt him, and what he would have: And therefore he had Reaſon to paſs them by. For St. *John*, in that Paſſage above-cited, *Chap.* xx. 30, 31. tells us, that how much ſoever he had left out of his Hiſtory, he had inſerted that, which was enough to be believ'd to eternal Life. *But theſe are written that ye might believe, and believing ye might have Life.* But this is not all he aſſures of, *viz.* That he had recorded all that was neceſſary to be believ'd to eternal Life: But he, in expreſs Words, tells us what is that *ALL* that is neceſſary to be believed to eternal Life; and for the Proof of which Propoſition alone, he writ all the reſt of his Goſpel, *viz.* That *we might believe.* What? Even this; *That Jeſus is the Chriſt the Son of God*, and that *believing* this, we *might have Life through his Name.*

This may ſerve for a Key to us, in reading the Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament*; and ſhew us why this Article, that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*, is no where omitted, though a great Part of the Arguments uſed to convince Men of it, nay very often the whole Diſcourſe made to lead Men into the Belief of it, be intirely omitted. The Spirit of God directed them every where to ſet down the Article, which was abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians; ſo that that could no ways be doubted of nor miſtaken: But the Arguments and Evidences, which were to lead Men into this Faith, would be ſufficient, if they were once found any where, though ſcatter'd here and there in thoſe Writings, whereof that infallible Spirit was the Author. This preſerv'd the Decorum us'd in all Hiſtories, and avoided thoſe continual large and unneceſſary Repetitions, which our critical *Unmasker* might have call'd *tedious*, with juſter Reaſon than he does the Repetition of this ſhort Propoſition, That *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*; which I ſet down no oftner in my Book, than the Holy Ghoſt thought fit to inſert in the Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament*, as conciſe as it is. But this it ſeems to our nice *Unmasker*, is *tedious*, tedious and offenſive. And if a Chriſtian, and a Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, cannot bear the being ſo often told, what it was that our Saviour and his Apoſtles every where preach'd to the Believers of one God, though it be contain'd in one ſhort Propoſition; what Cauſe of Exception and Diſguſt would it have been to Heathen Readers, ſome whereof might perhaps have been as Critical as the *Unmasker*,

masker, if this ſacred Hiſtory had in every Page been fill'd with the repeated Diſcourſes of the Apoſtles, all of them every where to the ſame Purpoſe, *viz.* to perſuade Men to believe, that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*? It was neceſſary even by the Laws of Hiſtory, as often as their Preaching any where was mention'd, to tell to what Purpoſe they ſpoke; which being always to convince Men of this one Fundamental Truth, 'tis no Wonder we find it ſo often repeated. But the Arguments and Reaſonings, with which this one Point is urged, are, as they ought to be, in moſt Places left out. A conſtant Repetition of them had been ſuperfluous, and conſequently might juſtly have been blam'd as *tedious*. But there is enough recorded abundantly to convince any rational Man, any one not wilfully blind, that he is that promiſed Saviour. And in this we have a Reaſon of the Omiſſions of the Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament*; which were no other than ſuch, as became prudent, as well as faithful Writers. Much leſs did that Conciſeneſs (with which the *Unmasker* would cover his bold Cenſure of the Goſpels and the Acts, and as it ſeems, lay them by with *Contempt*) make the holy Writers omit any Thing, in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, abſolutely neceſſary to be known and believed to make Men Chriſtians.

Conformable hereunto we ſhall find St. *Luke* writes his Hiſtory of the *Acts* of the Apoſtles. In the Beginning of it he ſets down at large ſome of the Diſcourſes made to the unbelieving *Jews*. But in moſt other Places, unleſs it be where there was ſomething particular in the Circumſtances of the Matter, he contents himſelf to tell to what Purpoſe they ſpoke; which was every where only this, That *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*. Nay, St. *Luke* in the firſt Speech of St. *Peter*, Acts ii. which he thought fit to give us a great Part of, yet owns the Omiſſion of ſeveral Things that the Apoſtle ſaid. For having expreſſed this Fundamental Doctrine, That *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*, and recorded ſeveral of the Arguments wherewith St. *Peter* urged it, for the Converſion of the unbelieving *Jews*, his Auditors, he adds, *ver.* 40. *And with many other Words did he teſtify and exhort, ſaying, Save your ſelves from this untoward Generation.* Here he confeſſes, that he had omitted a great deal which St. *Peter* had ſaid to perſuade them. To what? To that which in other Words he had juſt ſaid before, *ver.* 38. *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt*, i. e. Believe *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, take him as ſuch for your Lord and King, and reform your Lives by a ſincere Reſolution of Obedience to his Laws.

Thus we have an Account of the Omiſſions in the Records of *Matters of Fact* in the *New Teſtament*. But will the *Unmasker* ſay, That the Preaching of thoſe Articles that he has given us as neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, was part of *thoſe Matters of Fact*, which have been omitted in the Hiſtory of the *New Teſtament*? Can any one think, that *the Corruption and Degeneracy of humane Nature, with the true Original of it (the Defection of our firſt Parents) the Propagation of Sin and Mortality, our Reſtoration and Reconciliation by Chriſt's Blood, the Eminency and Excellency of his Prieſthood, the Efficacy of his Death, the full Satisfaction thereby made to divine Juſtice, and his being made an all-ſufficient Sacrifice for Sin, our Juſtification by Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, Election, Adoption*, &c. were all propos'd, and that too in the Senſe of our Author's Syſtem, by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, as Fundamental Articles of Faith, neceſſary to be explicitly believ'd by every Man, to make him a Chriſtian, in all their Diſcourſes to Unbelievers; and yet that the inſpired Pen-men of thoſe Hiſtories, every where left the Mention of theſe Fundamental Articles wholly out? This would have been to have writ not a *conciſe*, but an imperfect Hiſtory of *all* that *Jeſus* and his Apoſtles taught.

What an Account would it have been of the Goſpel, as it was firſt preach'd and propagated, if the greateſt Part of the neceſſary Doctrines of it were wholly left out, and a Man could not find from one End to the other of this whole Hiſtory, that Religion which is neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian? And yet this is that, which under the Notion of their being *conciſe*, the *Unmasker* would perſuade us to have been done by St. *Luke* and the other Evangeliſts in their Hiſtories. And 'tis no leſs than what he plainly ſays in his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, p. 109. where, to aggravate my Fault in paſſing by the Epiſtles, and to ſhew the Neceſſity of

ſearching

Searching in them for Fundamentals, he in Words blames me; but in Effect, condemns the Sacred Hiſtory contain'd in the Goſpels and the Acts. *It is moſt evident*, ſays he, *to any thinking Man*, that the Author of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity *purpoſely omits the Epiſtolary Writings of the Apoſtles, becauſe they are fraught with other Fundamental Doctrines beſides that one which he mentions. There we are inſtructed concerning theſe grand Heads of Chriſtian Divinity. Here*, i. e. in the Epiſtles, ſays he, *there are Diſcoveries concerning Satisfaction*, &c. And in the cloſe of his Liſt of *Grand Heads*, as he calls them, ſome whereof I have above ſet down out of him, he adds, *Theſe are the Matters of Faith contained in the Epiſtles*. By all which Expreſſions he plainly ſignifies, that theſe which he calls *Fundamental Doctrines*, are none of thoſe we are Inſtructed in, in the Goſpels and the Acts; that they are not *diſcover'd* nor *contain'd* in the Hiſtorical Writings of the Evangeliſts: Whereby he confeſſes, that either our Saviour and his Apoſtles did not propoſe them in their Preachings to their unbelieving Hearers; or elſe, that the ſeveral faithful Writers of their Hiſtory, wilfully, *i. e.* unfaithfully, every where omitted them in the Account they have left us of thoſe Preachings; which would ſcarce poſſibly be done by them all, and every where, without an actual Combination amongſt them, to ſmother the greateſt and moſt material Parts of our Saviour's and and his Apoſtles Diſcourſes. For what elſe did they, if all that the *Unmasker* has ſet down in his Liſt be Fundamental Doctrines; every one of them abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, which our Saviour and his Apoſtles every where preach'd to make Men Chriſtians; but yet St. *Luke* and the other *Evangeliſts*, by a very guilty and unpardonable *Conciſeneſs*, every where omitted them, and throughout their whole Hiſtory never once tell us, they were ſo much as propos'd, much leſs that they were thoſe Articles which the Apoſtles labour'd to eſtabliſh and convince Men of every where, before they admitted them to Baptiſm? Nay the far greateſt Part of them, the Hiſtory they writ does not any where ſo much as once mention? How after ſuch an Imputation as this the *Unmasker* will clear himſelf from laying by the four Goſpels and the Acts *with Contempt*, let him look; if my not collecting Fundamentals out of the Epiſtles had that Guilt in it. For I never deny'd all the Fundamental Doctrines to be there, but only ſaid, that there they were not eaſy to be found out, and diſtinguiſh'd from Doctrines not Fundamental. Whereas our good *Unmasker* charges the hiſtorical Books of the New Teſtament with a total Omiſſion of the far greateſt Part of thoſe Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, which he ſays are abſolutely neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian.

To convince the Reader what was abſolutely requir'd to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, and thereby clear the Holy Writers from the *Unmasker*'s Slander, any one need but look a little farther into the Hiſtory of the *Acts*, and obſerve St. *Luke*'s Method in the Writing of it. In the beginning (as we obſerv'd before) and in ſome few other Places, he ſets down at large the Diſcourſes made by the Preachers of Chriſtianity to their unbelieving Auditors. But in the Proceſs of his Hiſtory, he generally contents himſelf to relate, what it was their Diſcourſes drive at; what was the Doctrine they endeavour'd to convince their unbelieving Hearers of, to make them Believers. This we may obſerve is never omitted. This is every where ſet down. Thus *Acts* V. 42. he tells us, that *daily in the Temple, and in every Houſe, the Apoſtles ceaſed not to teach, and to preach* JESUS THE MESSIAH. The Particulars of their Diſcourſes he omits, and the Arguments they uſed to induce Men to believe, he omits: But never fails to inform us carefully what it was the Apoſtles *taught and preached*, and would have Men believe. The Account he gives us of St. *Paul*'s preaching at *Theſſalonica*, is this: That *three Sabbath Days he* REASON'D *with the Jews out of the Scriptures,* OPENING *and* ALLEDGING, *that the Meſſiah muſt needs have Suffer'd and Riſen again from the Dead; and that Jeſus was the Meſſiah*: Acts XVII. 2, 3. At *Corinth*, that *he* REASON'D *in the Synagogue every Sabbath, and* PERSUADED *the Jews and the Greeks, and* TESTIFIED *that Jeſus was the Meſſiah*; XVIII. 4, 5. That Apollos *mightily convinced the Jews,* SHEWING BY THE SCRIPTURES *that Jeſus was the Meſſiah*; XVIII. 27.

By theſe, and the like Places, we may be ſatisfy'd what it was that the Apoſtles *Taught* and *Preached*, even in this one Propoſition, That *Jeſus was the Meſſiah*: For this was the ſole Propoſition they *reaſon'd* about; this alone they *teſtify'd*, and they *ſhew'd out of the Scriptures*; and of this alone they endeavour'd to *convince* the *Jews* and the *Greeks*, that believed one God. So that it is plain from hence, that St. *Luke* omitted nothing that the Apoſtles *Taught* and *Preach'd*; none of thoſe Doctrines, that it was neceſſary to *convince* Unbelievers of, to make them Chriſtians: Tho' he in moſt Places omitted, as was fit, the Paſſages of Scripture which they alledg'd, and the Arguments thoſe inſpired Preachers uſed to *perſuade* Men to believe and embrace that Doctrine.

Another convincing Argument, to ſhew that St. *Luke* omitted none of thoſe Fundamental Doctrines which the Apoſtles any where propos'd as neceſſary to be believ'd, is from that different Account he gives us of their Preaching in other Places, and to Auditors otherwiſe diſpos'd. Where the Apoſtles had to do with Idolatrous Heathens, who were not yet come to the Knowledge of the only true God, there he tells us they propos'd alſo the Article of the one Inviſible God, Maker of Heaven and Earth: And this we find recorded in him out of their Preaching to the *Lyſtrians*, Acts XIV. and to the *Athenians*, Acts XVII. In the latter of which, St. *Luke*, to convince his Reader that he, out of *Conciſeneſs*, omits none of thoſe Fundamental Articles that were any where propos'd by the Preachers of the Goſpel, as neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians, ſets down not only the Article of *Jeſus the Meſſiah*, but that alſo of the one Inviſible God, Creator of all Things, which (if any neceſſary one might) this of all other Fundamental Articles might, by an Author that affected Brevity, with the faireſt Excuſe have been omitted, as being implied in that other of the *Meſſiah ordained* by God. Indeed, in the Story of what *Paul* and *Barnabas* ſaid at *Lyſtra*, the Article of the *Meſſiah* is not mention'd. Not that St. *Luke* omitted that Fundamental Article, where the Apoſtles taught it: But they having here begun their Preaching with that of the one Living God, they had not, as appears, time to proceed farther, and propoſe to them what yet remain'd to make them Chriſtians: All that they could do at that time, was to hinder the People from ſacrificing to them. And before we hear any more of their Preaching, they were, by the Inſtigation of the *Jews*, fallen upon, and *Paul* ſtoned.

This, by the Way, ſhews the *Unmasker*'s Miſtake in his firſt Particular, *p.* 74. where he ſays (as he does here again in the ſecond Particular, which we are now examing) that *believing Jeſus to be the Meſſiah, is the firſt Step to Chriſtianity; and therefore this, rather than any other, was propounded to be believed by all thoſe, whom either our Saviour, or the Apoſtles, invited to embrace Chriſtianity.* The contrary whereof appears here; where the Article of one God is propos'd in the firſt Place, to thoſe whoſe Unbelief made ſuch a Propoſal neceſſary. And therefore if his Reaſon (which he uſes again here, *p.* 76.) were good, *viz.* That the Article of the *Meſſiah* is expreſly mention'd alone, *becauſe it is a leading Article and makes Way for the reſt*, this Reaſon would rather conclude for the Article of *one God*; and that alone ſhould be expreſly mention'd inſtead of the other. Since, as he argues for the other, *p.* 74. *If they did not believe this in the firſt place, viz.* That there was one God, *there could be no hopes that they would attend unto any other propoſal relating to the Chriſtian Religion.* The Vanity and Falſhood of which Reaſoning, *viz.* That the Article of Jeſus the Meſſiah *was* every where *Propunded rather than any other, becauſe it was the leading Article*, we ſee in the Hiſtory of St. *Paul*'s preaching to the *Athenians*. St. *Luke* mentions more than one Article, where more than one was propos'd by St. *Paul*; tho' the firſt of them was that *leading Article* of one God, which if not received *in the firſt place, there could be no hope they would attend to the reſt.*

Something the *Unmasker* would make of this Argument of a *leading Article* for want of a better, tho' he knows not what. In his firſt *Particular*, *p.* 74. he makes uſe of it to ſhew, why there was but that one Article propos'd by the firſt Preachers of the Goſpel; and how well that ſucceeds with him, we have ſeen. For this is Demonſtration, that if there were but that one

one propos'd by our Saviour and the Apoſtles, there was but that one neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians; unleſs he will impiouſly ſay, that our Saviour and the Apoſtles went about preaching to no Purpoſe: For if they propos'd not all that was neceſſary to make Men Chriſtians, 'twas in vain for them to preach, and others to hear; if when they heard and believ'd all that was propos'd to them, they were not yet Chriſtians: For if any Article was omitted in the Propoſal, which was neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian, who tho' they believ'd all that was propos'd to them, they could not yet be Chriſtians; unleſs a Man can from an Infidel become a Chriſtian, without doing what is neceſſary to make him a Chriſtian.

Further, if his Argument of its being a *leading Article* proves, that that alone was propos'd, it is a Contradiction to give it as a Reaſon, why it was *ſet down alone* by the Hiſtorian, where it was not propos'd alone by the Preacher, but other neceſſary *Matters of Faith were propos'd with it*; unleſs it can be true, that this Article of *Jeſus is the Meſſiah*, was propos'd alone by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, becauſe it was a *leading Article*, and was mention'd alone in the Hiſtory of what they preach'd, becauſe it was a *leading Article*, tho' it were not propos'd alone, but jointly with other neceſſary *Matters of Faith*. For this is the Uſe he makes here again, *pag.* 76. of his *leading Article* under his ſecond *Particular, viz.* To ſhew why the Hiſtorians mention'd this neceſſary Article, of *Jeſus the Meſſiah*, alone, in Places where the Preachers of the Goſpel propos'd it not alone, but with other neceſſary Articles. But in this latter Caſe it has no Shew of a Reaſon at all. It may be granted as reaſonable for the Teachers of any Religion not to go any farther, where they ſee the firſt Article which they propoſe is rejected; where the *leading* Truth, on which all the reſt depends, is not received. But it can be no Reaſon at all for an Hiſtorian, who writes the Hiſtory of theſe firſt Preachers, to ſet down only the firſt and leading Article, and omit all the reſt, in Inſtances where more were not only propos'd, but believ'd and embrac'd, and upon that the Hearers and Believers admitted into the Church. 'Tis not for Hiſtorians to put any Diſtinction between leading or not leading Articles; but if they will give a true and uſeful Account of the Religion, whoſe Original they are writing, and of the Converts made to it, they muſt tell, not one, but all thoſe neceſſary Articles, upon Aſſent to which Converts were baptiz'd into that Religion, and admitted into the Church. Whoever ſays otherwiſe, accuſes them of falſifying the Story, miſleading the Readers, and giving a wrong Account of the Religion which they pretend to teach the World, and to preſerve and propagate to future Ages. This (if it were ſo) no Pretence of *Conciſeneſs* could excuſe or palliate.

There is yet remaining one Conſideration, which were ſufficient of it ſelf to convince us, that it was the ſole Article of Faith which was preach'd; and that if there had been other Articles neceſſary to be known and believed by Converts, they could not, upon any Pretence of *Conciſeneſs*, be ſuppos'd to be omitted: And that is the Commiſſions of thoſe, that were ſent to preach the Goſpel. Which ſince the Sacred Hiſtorians mention, they cannot be ſuppos'd to leave out any of the material and main Heads of thoſe Commiſſions.

St. *Luke* records it, *Chap.* iv. 43. that our Saviour ſays of himſelf, *I muſt go unto the other Towns to tell the good News of the Kingdom, for* (διὰ τοῦτο) *upon this Errand am I SENT.* This St. *Mark* calls ſimply *Preaching*. This Preaching, what it contain'd, St. *Matthew* tells us, *Chap.* iv. 23. *And Jeſus went about all Galilee, teaching in their Synagogues, and preaching the good News of the Kingdom, and healing all manner of Sickneſs, and all manner of Diſeaſes amongſt the People.* Here we have his Commiſſion, or End of his being ſent, and the Execution of it; both terminating in this, that he declar'd the good News that the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* was come; and gave them to underſtand by the Miracles he did, that he himſelf was he. Nor does St. *Matthew* ſeem to affect ſuch *Conciſeneſs*, that he would have left it out, if the Goſpel had contained any other Fundamental Parts neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians. For he here ſays, *All manner of Sickneſs, and all manner of Diſeaſes*, when either of them might have been better left out, than any neceſſary Article of the Goſpel, to make his Hiſtory *conciſe*.

We ſee what our Saviour was *ſent* for. In the next Place, let us look into the Commiſſion he gave the Apoſtles, when he *ſent* them to preach the Goſpel. We have it in the tenth of St. *Matthew*, in theſe Words: *Go not into the Way of the* Gentiles, *and into any City of the* Samaritans *enter ye not. But go rather to the loſt Sheep of the Houſe of* Iſrael. *And as ye go, PREACH, SAYING THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN IS AT HAND. Heal the Sick, cleaſe the Lepers, raiſe the Dead, caſt out Devils: Freely have ye received, freely give. Provide neither Gold, nor Silver, nor Braſs in your Purſes; nor Scrip in your Journey; neither two Coats, neither Shoes, nor yet Staves (for the Workman is worthy of his Meat). And into whatſoever City or Town ye ſhall enter, inquire who in it is worthy, and there abide till ye go thence. And when ye come into any Houſe, ſalute it. And if the Houſe be worthy, let your Peace come upon it; but if it be not worthy, let your Peace return to you. And whoſoever ſhall not receive you, nor hear your Words; when ye depart out of that Houſe or City, ſhake off the Duſt of your Feet. Verily, I ſay unto you, it ſhall be more tolerable for the Land of* Sodom *and* Gomorrha, *in the Day of Judgment, than for that City. Behold, I ſend you forth as Sheep in the midſt of Wolves: Be ye therefore wiſe as Serpents, and harmleſs as Doves. But beware of Men, for they will deliver you up to the Councils, and they will ſcourge you in their Synagogues. And ye ſhall be brought before Governors, and Kings, for my ſake, for a Teſtimony againſt them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, take no Thought how, or what ye ſhall ſpeak; for it ſhall be given you in that ſame Hour, what ye ſhall ſpeak. For it is not ye that ſpeak, but the Spirit of your Father which ſpeaketh in you. And the Brother ſhall deliver up the Brother to Death, and the Father the Child: And the Children ſhall riſe up againſt the Parents, and cauſe them to be put to Death. And ye ſhall be hated of all Men for my Name's ſake: But he that endureth to the End ſhall be ſaved. But when they perſecute you in this City, flee ye into another: For verily I ſay unto you, ye ſhall not have gone over the Cities of* Iſrael, *till the Son of Man be come. The Diſciple is not above his Maſter, nor the Servant above his Lord. It is enough for the Diſciple that he be as his Maſter, and the Servant as his Lord. If they have called the Maſter of the Houſe* Beelzebub, *how much more ſhall they call them of his Houſhold? Fear them not therefore: For there is nothing covered which ſhall not be revealed; and hid that ſhall not be known. What I tell you in Darkneſs, that ſpeak ye in Light: And what ye hear in the Ear, that preach ye upon the Houſe-tops. And fear not them which kill the Body, but are not able to kill the Soul: But rather fear him which is able to deſtroy both Soul and Body in Hell. Are not two Sparrows ſold for a Farthing? And one of them ſhall not fall on the Ground without your Father. But the very Hairs of your Head are all numbred. Fear ye not therefore, ye are of more Value than many Sparrows. Whoſoever therefore ſhall confeſs me before Men, him will I confeſs alſo before my Father which is in Heaven. But whoſoever ſhall deny me before Men, him will I alſo deny before my Father which is in Heaven. Think not that I am come to ſend Peace on Earth: I came not to ſend Peace, but a Sword. For I am come to ſet a Man at Variance againſt his Father, and the Daughter againſt her Mother, and the Daughter-in-Law againſt her Mother-in-Law. And a Man's Foes ſhall be they of his own Houſhold. He that loveth Father and Mother more than me, is not worthy of me: And he that loveth Son or Daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his Croſs, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his Life ſhall loſe it: And he that loſeth his Life for my ſake, ſhall find it. He that receiveth you, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that ſent me. He that receiveth a Prophet in the Name of a Prophet, ſhall receive a Prophet's Reward; and he that receiveth a righteous Man, ſhall receive a righteous Man's Reward. And whoſoever ſhall give to drink unto one of theſe little Ones, a Cup of cold Water only in the Name of a Diſciple, verily I ſay unto you, he ſhall in no wiſe loſe his Reward. And it came to paſs, when Jeſus had made an End of commanding his twelve Diſciples* ——

This is the Commiſſion our Saviour gave the Apoſtles, when he ſent them abroad to recover, and ſave *the loſt Sheep of the Houſe of* Iſrael. And will any of the *Unmasker's intelligent and obſerving Men* ſay, that the *Hiſtory of the Scripture* is ſo *conciſe, that any Paſſages*, any eſſential, any material, nay any Parts at all of the Apoſtles Commiſſion, *are here omitted by the Sacred Penman?*

man? This Commiſſion is ſet down ſo at full, and ſo particularly, that St. *Matthew*, who was one of them to whom it was given, ſeems not to have left out one Word, of all that our Saviour gave him in Charge. And it is ſo large, even to every particular Article of their Inſtructions, that I doubt not but my citing ſo much, *verbatim*, out of the ſacred Text, will here again be troubleſom to the *Unmasker*. But whether he will venture again to call it *tedious*, muſt be as Nature or Caution happen to have the better on't. Can any one who reads this Commiſſion, unleſs he hath the Brains as well as the Brow of an *Unmasker*, alledge that the *Conciſeneſs* of the Hiſtory of the Scripture has conceal'd from us thoſe Fundamental Doctrines, which our Saviour and his Apoſtles preach'd; but the ſacred Hiſtorians thought fit by Conſent, for unconceivable Reaſons, to leave out in the Narrative they give us, of thoſe Preachings? This Paſſage here, wholly confuteth that. They could preach nothing but what they were ſent to preach: And that we ſee is contained in theſe few Words, *Preach, ſaying, the Kingdom of Heaven is at Hand. Heal the Sick, cleanſe the Lepers, raiſe the Dead, caſt out Devils; i. e.* acquaint them that the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* is come, and let them know by the Miracles you do in my Name, that I am that King and Deliverer they expect. If there were any other neceſſary Articles that were to be believ'd, for the ſaving of the *loſt Sheep* they were ſent to, can one think that St. *Matthew*, who ſets down ſo minutely every Circumſtance of their Commiſſion, would have omitted the moſt important and material of it? He was an Ear-witneſs, and one that was ſent; and ſo (without ſuppoſing him inſpir'd) could not be miſled by the ſhort Account he might receive from others, who by their own, or others Forgetfulneſs, might have drop'd thoſe other Fundamental Articles, that the Apoſtles were order'd to preach.

The very like Account St. *Luke* gives us of our Saviour's Commiſſion to the Seventy, *Chap.* X. 1—16. *After theſe Things the Lord appointed other ſeventy alſo, and ſent them two and two before his Face, into every City and Place whither he himſelf would come. Therefore ſaid he unto them, The Harveſt truly is great, but the Labourers are few: Pray ye therefore the Lord of the Harveſt, that he would ſend forth Labourers into his Harveſt. Go your ways: Behold I ſend you forth as Lambs among Wolves. Carry neither Purſe, nor Scrip, nor Shoes: And ſalute no Man by the Way. And into whatſoever Houſe ye enter, firſt ſay, Peace be to this Houſe. And if the Son of Peace be there, your Peace ſhall reſt upon it; if not, it ſhall return to you again. And in the ſame Houſe remain Eating and Drinking ſuch Things as they give: For the Labourer is worthy of his Hire. Go not from Houſe to Houſe. And into whatſoever City ye enter and they receive you, Eat ſuch Things as are ſet before you. And heal the Sick that are therein, and* SAY UNTO THEM, THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS COME NIGH UNTO YOU. *But in whatſoever City ye enter, and they receive you not, go your ways out into the Streets of the ſame, and ſay, Even the very Duſt of your City which cleaveth on us, we do wipe off againſt you: Notwithſtanding be ye ſure of this, that the Kingdom of God is come nigh unto you. But I ſay unto you, that it ſhall be more tolerable in that Day for* Sodom, *than for that City. Wo unto thee* Chorazin, *Wo unto thee* Bethſaida: *For if the mighty Works had been done in* Tyre *and* Sidon, *which have been done in you, they had a great while ago repented, ſitting in Sackcloth and Aſhes. But it ſhall be more tolerable for* Tyre *and* Sidon *at the Day of Judgment, than for you. And thou* Capernaum, *which art exalted to Heaven, ſhalt be thruſt down to Hell. He that heareth you, heareth me: And he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me: And he that deſpiſeth me, deſpiſeth him that ſent me.*

Our Saviour's Commiſſion here to the Seventy, whom he ſent to preach, is ſo exactly conformable to that which he had before given to the Twelve Apoſtles, that there needs but this one thing more to be obſerv'd, to convince any one that they were ſent to convert their Hearers to this ſole Belief, That the Kingdom of the *Meſſiah* was come, and that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*: And that the Hiſtorians of the New Teſtament are not ſo *conciſe* in their Account of this Matter, that they would have omitted any other neceſſary Articles of Belief that had been given to the Seventy in Commiſſion. That which I mean is, the *Kingdom of the Meſſiah* is twice mention'd in it to be come, *verſ.* 9.

and

and 11. If there were other Articles given them by our Saviour to propoſe to their Hearers, St. *Luke* muſt be very fond of this one Article, when for *Conciſeneſs* ſake, leaving out the other Fundamental Articles that our Saviour gave them in Charge to preach, he repeats this more than once.

The *Unmasker*'s third Particular, *p.* 76. begins thus: *This alſo muſt be thought of, that tho' there are ſeveral Parts and Members of the Chriſtian Faith, yet they do not all occur in any one Place of Scripture.* Something is in it (whether owing to his Will, or Underſtanding, I ſhall not enquire) that the *Unmasker* always delivers himſelf in doubtful and ambiguous Terms. It had been as eaſy for him to have ſaid, There are ſeveral Articles of the Chriſtian Faith neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, as to ſay, (as he does here) *There are ſeveral Parts and Members of the Chriſtian Faith.* But as an Evidence of the Clearneſs of his Notions, or the Fairneſs of his Arguing, he always reſts in generals. *There are*, I grant, *ſeveral Parts and Members of the Chriſtian Faith*, which do no more *occur in any one Place of Scripture*, than the whole New Teſtament can be ſaid to *occur in any one Place of Scripture.* For every Propoſition deliver'd in the New Teſtament for Divine Revelation, is *a Part and Member of the Chriſtian Faith.* But 'tis not thoſe *Parts and Members of the Chriſtian Faith* we are ſpeaking of; but only ſuch *Parts and Members of the Chriſtian Faith* as are abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd by every Man, before he can be a Chriſtian. And in that Senſe I deny his Aſſertion to be true, *viz.* That they do not occur in any one Place of Scripture: For they do all occur in that firſt Sermon of St. *Peter*, Acts ii. 11. by which three Thouſand were at that Time brought into the Church, and that in theſe Words: *Therefore let all the Houſe of* Iſrael *know aſſuredly, that God hath made that ſame Jeſus, whom you have crucified, Lord and Chriſt. Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jeſus Chriſt.* Here is the Doctrine of Jeſus the *Meſſiah*, the *Lord*, and of *Repentance*, propos'd to thoſe who already believe one God; which, I ſay, are all the Parts of the Chriſtian Faith neceſſary to be receiv'd to make a Man a Chriſtian. To ſuppoſe, as the *Unmasker* does here, that more is requir'd, is to beg, not prove the Queſtion.

If he diſputes this Collection of mine out of that Sermon of St. *Peter*, I will give him a more authentick Collection of the neceſſary Parts of the Chriſtian Faith, from an Author that he will not queſtion. Let him look into *Acts* xx. 23, *&c.* and there he will find St. *Paul* ſaying thus to the Elders of *Epheſus*, whom he was taking his laſt Leave of, with an Aſſurance that he ſhould never ſee them again: *I have kept back nothing that was profitable unto you; but have ſhew'd you, and have taught you publickly, and from Houſe to Houſe, teſtifying both to the Jews, and alſo to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* If St. *Paul* knew what was neceſſary to make a Chriſtian, here it is: Here he (if he knew how to do it, for 'tis plain from his Words he deſign'd to do it) has put it together. But there is a greater yet than St. *Paul*, who has brought all the Parts of Faith neceſſary to Salvation into one Place; I mean our Saviour himſelf, *John* xvii. 13. in theſe Words: *This is Life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent.*

But the *Unmasker* goes on: *Therefore when in ſome Places, only one ſingle Part of the Chriſtian Faith is made mention of, as neceſſarily to be embrac'd in order to Salvation, we muſt be careful not to take it alone, but to ſupply it from ſeveral other Places, which make mention of other neceſſary and indiſpenſable Points of Belief. I will give the Reader a plain Inſtance of this,* Rom. X. 9. *If thou ſhalt believe in thy Heart, that God hath rais'd him* (i. e. *the Lord Jeſus*) *from the Dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved. Here one Article of Faith,* viz. *the Belief of Chriſt's Reſurrection* (*becauſe it is of ſo great Importance in Chriſtianity*) *is only mention'd: But all the reſt muſt be ſuppos'd, becauſe they are mention'd in other Places.*

Anſw. One would wonder that any one converſant in Holy Writ, with ever ſo little Attention, much more that an Expounder of the Scriptures, ſhould ſo miſtake the Senſe and Stile of the Scripture. Believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah* with a lively Faith, *i. e.* as I have ſhew'd, taking him to be our King, with a ſincere Submiſſion to the Laws of his Kingdom, is all that is requir'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; for this includes Repentance too. The believing him therefore to be the *Meſſiah*, is very often, and with great Reaſon, put both for

Faith

Faith and Repentance too; which are ſometimes ſet down ſingly, where one is put for both, as implying the other: and ſometimes they are both mention'd; and then Faith, as contradiſtinguiſh'd to Repentance, is taken for a ſimple Aſſent of the Mind to this Truth, That *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*. Now this Faith is variouſly expreſſed in Scripture.

There are ſome Particulars in the Hiſtory of our Saviour, allow'd to be ſo peculiarly appropriated to the *Meſſiah*, ſuch incommunicable Marks of him, that to believe them of *Jeſus* of *Nazareth* was in effect the ſame, as to believe him to be the *Meſſiah*, and ſo are put to expreſs it. The Principal of theſe is his Reſurrection from the Dead; which being the great and demonſtrative Proof of his being the *Meſſiah*, 'tis not at all ſtrange that the believing his Reſurrection ſhould be put for believing him to be the *Meſſiah*: ſince the declaring his Reſurrection, was a declaring him to be the *Meſſiah*. For thus St. *Paul* argues, *Acts* xiii. 32, 33. *We declare unto you good Tidings*, or, *we preach the Goſpel to you*, [for ſo the Word ſignifies] *how that the Promiſe that was made unto the Father, God hath fulfilled the ſame unto us their Children, in that he hath raiſed up Jeſus again.* The Force of which Argument lies in this, That if *Jeſus* was raiſed from the Dead, then he was certainly the *Meſſiah*: And thus the Promiſe of the *Meſſiah* was fulfilled, in raiſing *Jeſus* from the Dead. The like Argument St. *Paul* uſeth, 1 *Cor.* xv. 17. *If Chriſt be not raiſed, your Faith is vain, you are yet in your Sins*; i. e. if *Jeſus* be not riſen from the dead, he is not the *Meſſiah*, your believing it is in vain, and you will receive no Benefit by that Faith. And ſo likewiſe from the ſame Argument of his Reſurrection, he at *Theſſalonica* proves him to be the *Meſſiah*, Acts xvii. 2, 3. *And* Paul, *as in his manner was, went into* the Synagogue, *and three Sabbath-days Reaſoned with the* Jews *out of the Scriptures, opening and alledging that the Meſſiah muſt needs have ſuffer'd, and riſen again from the dead: And that this Jeſus, whom I preach unto you, is the Meſſiah.*

The neceſſary Connection of theſe two, that if he roſe from the Dead he was the *Meſſiah*; and if he roſe not from the Dead, he was not the *Meſſiah*; the chief Prieſt and Phariſees that had proſecuted him to Death, underſtood very well: who therefore *came together unto* Pilate, *ſaying, Sir, we remember that that Deceiver ſaid, whilſt he was yet alive, After three Days I will riſe again. Command therefore that the Sepulchre be made ſure unto the third Day, leſt his Diſciples come by Night and ſteal him away, and ſay unto the People, he is riſen from the Dead: So the laſt Error ſhall be worſe than the firſt.* The *Error* they here ſpeak of, 'tis plain, was the Opinion, that he was the *Meſſiah*. To ſtop that Belief, which his Miracles had procured him amongſt the People, they had got him put to Death: But if after that, it ſhould be believed, that he roſe again from the Dead, this Demonſtration that he was the *Meſſiah*, would but eſtabliſh what they had labour'd to deſtroy, by his Death: Since no one, who believ'd his Reſurrection, could doubt of his being the *Meſſiah*.

'Tis not at all therefore to be wonder'd, that his Reſurrection, his Aſcenſion, his Rule and Dominion, and his coming to judge the Quick and the Dead, which are Characteriſtical Marks of the *Meſſiah*, and belong peculiarly to him, ſhould ſometimes in Scripture be put alone, as ſufficient Deſcriptions of the *Meſſiah*; and the believing them of him, put for believing him to be the *Meſſiah*. Thus, *Acts* x. our Saviour in *Peter*'s Diſcourſe to *Cornelius*, when he brought him the Goſpel, is deſcrib'd to be the *Meſſiah*, by his Miracles, Death, Reſurrection, Dominion, and coming to Judge the Quick and the Dead.

Theſe, (which in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, I have upon this Ground taken the liberty to call *concomitant Articles*) where they are ſet alone for the Faith to which Salvation is promis'd, plainly ſignify the believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, that Fundamental Article which has the Promiſe of Life; and ſo give no Foundation at all for what the *Unmasker* ſays, in theſe Words: *Here one Article of Faith*, viz. *the Belief of Chriſt's Reſurrection (becauſe it is of ſo great Importance in Chriſtianity) is only mention'd; but all the reſt muſt be ſuppos'd, becauſe they are mention'd in other Places.*

Anſw. If all the reſt be of abſolute and indiſpenſible Neceſſity to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, *all the reſt* are every one of them of equal *Importance*. For Things of equal Neceſſity to any End, are of equal Importance

to

to that End. But here the Truth forc'd its Way unawares from the *Unmasker*. Our Saviour's Reſurrection, for the Reaſon I have given, is truly *of great Importance in Chriſtianity*; ſo great, that his being or not being the *Meſſiah* ſtands or falls with it: So that theſe two *important Articles* are inſeparable, and in effect make but one. For ſince that time, believe one, and you belive both; deny one of them, and you can believe neither. If the *Unmasker* can ſhew me any *one* of the Articles in his Liſt, which is not *of* this *great Importance*, mention'd alone with a Promiſe of Salvation for believing it, I will grant him to have ſome colour for what he ſays here. But where is to be found in the Scripture any ſuch Expreſſion as this: If thou ſhalt believe with thy Heart *the Corruption and Degeneracy of human Nature*, thou ſhalt be ſaved? or the like. This place therefore out of the *Romans* makes not for, but againſt his Liſt of neceſſary Articles. One of them alone he cannot ſhew me any where ſet down, with a *Suppoſition* of the reſt, as having Salvation promis'd to it. Tho' it be true, that that one which alone is abſolutely neceſſary to be ſuperadded to the Belief of one God, is in divers places differently expreſs'd.

That which he ſubjoins, as a Conſequence of what he had ſaid, is a farther Proof of this: *And conſequently*, ſays he, *if we would give an impartial Account of our Belief, we muſt conſult thoſe Places. And they are not all together, but diſperſed here and there. Wherefore we muſt look them out, and acquaint our ſelves with the ſeveral particulars which make up our Belief, and render it entire and conſummate.*

Anſw. Never was Man conſtanter to a looſe Way of talking. The Queſtion is only about Articles neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian: And here he talks of the *ſeveral Particulars which make up our Belief, and render it intire and conſummate*; confounding, as he did before, *Eſſential* and *Integral* Parts, which it ſeems he cannot diſtinguiſh. Our Faith is true and ſaving, when it is ſuch as God, by the New Covenant, requires it to be: But it is not *intire* and *conſummate*, till we explicitly believe all the Truths contain'd in the Word of God. For the whole Revelation of Truth in the Scripture, being the proper and intire Object of Faith; our Faith cannot be *intire* and *conſummate*, till it be adequate to its proper Object, which is the whole Divine Revelation contain'd in the Scripture: And ſo to make our Faith *intire* and *conſummate*, we muſt *not look out thoſe Places*, which he ſays, *are not all together*. To talk of *looking out*, and Culling of Places, is Nonſenſe, where the whole Scripture alone can *make up our Belief, and render it intire and conſummate*: Which no one, I think, can hope for in this frail State of Ignorance and Error. To make the *Unmasker* ſpeak Senſe, and to the Purpoſe here, we muſt underſtand him thus: *That if we will give an impartial Account* of the Articles that are neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, *we muſt conſult thoſe Places* where they are, *for they are not all together, but diſperſed here and there; wherefore we muſt look them out*, and acquaint our ſelves with the ſeveral Particulars *which make up* the Fundamental Articles of *our Belief*, and will render a Catalogue of them *intire* and *conſummate*. If his Suppoſition be true, I grant his Method to be reaſonable, and upon that I join Iſſue with him. Let him thus *give us an impartial Account of our Belief*; let him *acquaint us with the ſeveral Particulars which make up* a Chriſtian's *Belief, and render it intire and conſummate*. Till he has done this, let him not talk thus in the Air of a Method, that will not do: let him not Reproach me, as he does, for not taking a *Courſe*, by which he himſelf cannot do, what he reviles me for failing in. *But our haſty Author*, ſays he, *took another Courſe, and thereby deceiv'd himſelf, and unhappily deceiv'd others.* If it be ſo, I deſire the *Unmasker* to *take the Courſe* he propoſes, and thereby undeceive me and others; and *acquaint us with the ſeveral Particulars which make up* a Chriſtian's *Belief, and render it intire and conſummate*: For I am willing to be undeceiv'd: but till he has done that, and ſhewn us by the Succeſs of it, that his *Courſe* is better, he cannot blame us for following that *Courſe we have done.*

I come now to the fourth and laſt Particular, *p.* 78. which he ſays, *is the main Anſwer to the Objection*; and therefore I ſhall ſet it down in his own Words intire as it ſtands together. *This*, ſays he, *muſt be born in our Minds, that Chriſtianity was erected by Degrees, according to that Prediction and Promiſe of our Saviour, that the Spirit ſhould teach them all Things*, John XIV. 26. *and*

that

that he ſhould guide them into all Truth, John xvi. 13. viz. *after his Departure and Aſcenſion, when the Holy Ghoſt was to be ſent in a ſpecial Manner to enlighten Mens Minds, and to diſcover to them the great Myſteries of Chriſtianity. This is to be noted by us, as that which gives great Light in the preſent Caſe. The Diſcovery of the Doctrines of the Goſpel was gradual. It was by certain Steps that Chriſtianity climbed to its Height. We are not to think then, that all the neceſſary Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion were clearly publiſh'd to the World in our Saviour's Time. Not but that all that were neceſſary for that Time, were publiſh'd: But ſome which are neceſſary for the ſucceeding one, were not then diſcover'd, or at leaſt, not fully. They had ordinarily no Belief, before Chriſt's Death and Reſurrection, of thoſe ſubſtantial Articles*, i. e. *that he ſhould die and riſe again: But we read in the Acts, and in the Epiſtles, that theſe were formal Articles of Faith afterwards, and are ſince neceſſary to compleat the Chriſtian Belief. So as to other great Verities, the Goſpel increaſed by Degrees, and was not perfect at once. Which furniſhes us with a Reaſon, why moſt of the choiceſt and ſublimeſt Truths of Chriſtianity are to be met with in the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles, they being ſuch Doctrines as were clearly diſcover'd and open'd in the Goſpels and the Acts.* Thus far the *Unmasker*.

I thought hitherto, that the Covenant of Grace in Chriſt Jeſus had been but one, immutably the ſame: But our *Unmasker* here makes two, or I know not how many. For I cannot tell how to conceive, that the Conditions of any Covenant ſhould be chang'd, and the Covenant remain the ſame; every Change of Conditions, in my Apprehenſion, makes a new and another Covenant. We are not to think, ſays the *Unmasker*, *That all the neceſſary Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion were clearly publiſh'd to the World in our Saviour's Time; not but that all that were neceſſary for that Time were publiſh'd: But ſome which were neceſſary for the ſucceeding one, were not then diſcover'd, or, at leaſt, not fully. Anſw.* The *Unmasker*, conſtant to himſelf, ſpeaks here doubtfully, and cannot tell whether he ſhould ſay, that the Articles neceſſary to ſucceeding Times, were diſcover'd in our Saviour's Time, or no: And therefore, that he may provide himſelf a Retreat in the Doubt he is in, he ſays, *They were not clearly publiſh'd*; they *were not then diſcover'd, or at leaſt not fully.* But we muſt deſire him to pull off his Mask, and to that Purpoſe,

1. I ask him how he can tell, that all the neceſſary Doctrines were *obſcurely publiſh'd*, or, *in part diſcover'd?* For an obſcure publiſhing, a Diſcovery in part, is oppoſed to, and intimated in *not clearly publiſh'd, not fully diſcover'd.* And if a *clear* and *full* Diſcovery be all that he denies to them, I ask,

XXXVII. *Which thoſe Fundamental Articles are, which were obſcurely publiſh'd, but* not fully diſcover'd, in our Saviour's Time?

And next, I ſhall deſire him to tell me,

XXXVIII. *Whether there are any Articles neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, that were not diſcover'd at all in our Saviour's Time; and which they are?*

If he cannot ſhew theſe diſtinctly, it is plain he talks at random about them; but has no clear and diſtinct Conception of thoſe that were publiſh'd, or not publiſh'd, clearly or obſcurely diſcover'd, in our Saviour's Time. It was nececeſſary for him to ſay ſomething, for thoſe his pretended neceſſary Articles, which are not to be found any where propos'd in the Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, to their yet unbelieving Auditors; and therefore he ſays, *We are not to think all the neceſſary Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion were clearly publiſh'd to the World in our Saviour's Time.* But he barely ſays it, without giving any Reaſon, why *we are not to think ſo.* It is enough that it is neceſſary to his Hypotheſis. He ſays, *we are not to think ſo*, and we are preſently bound not *to think ſo.* Elſe from another Man, that did not uſurp an Authority over our Thoughts, it would have requir'd ſome Reaſon to make them think, that ſomething more was requir'd to make a Man a Chriſtian after, than in our Savour's Time. For, as I take it, it is not a very probable, much leſs a

ſelf-evident Propoſition, to be receiv'd without Proof, That there was ſomething *neceſſary for that Time*, to make a Man a Chriſtian, and ſomething more that was *neceſſary* to make a Chriſtian in the *ſucceeding Time*.

However, ſince this great Maſter ſays *we ought to think ſo*, let us in Obedience think ſo as well as we can; till he vouchſafes to give us ſome Reaſon to think, that there was more requir'd to believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian in the ſucceeding Time, than in our Saviour's. This, inſtead of removing, does but increaſe the Difficulty: For if more were neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian after our Saviour's Time, than was during his Life; how comes it, that no more was propos'd by the Apoſtles in their Preaching to Unbelievers for the making them Chriſtians, after our Saviour's Death, than there was before; even this one Article, that he was the *Meſſiah*? For I deſire the *Unmasker* to ſhew me any of thoſe Articles mention'd in his Liſt (except the Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of our Saviour, which were intervening Matters of Fact, evidencing him to be the *Meſſiah*) that were propos'd by the Apoſtles, after our Saviour's Time, to their unbelieving Hearers, to make them Chriſtians. This one Doctrine, that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*, was that which was propos'd in our Saviour's Time to be believed, as neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian: The ſame Doctrine was likewiſe what was propos'd afterwards, in the Preaching of the Apoſtles to Unbelievers, to make them Chriſtians.

I grant this was more *clearly* propos'd after, than in our Saviour's Time: but in both of them it was all that was propos'd to the Believers of one God, to make them Chriſtians. Let him ſhew, that there were any other propos'd in, or after our Saviour's Time, to be believ'd, to make Unbelievers Chriſtians. If he means by *neceſſary Articles publiſh'd to the World*, the other Doctrines contain'd in the Epiſtles; I grant they are all of them neceſſary Articles to be believ'd by every Chriſtian, as far as he underſtands them. But I deny, that they were propos'd to thoſe they were writ to, as neceſſary to make them Chriſtians, for this demonſtrative Reaſon; Becauſe they were Chriſtians already. For Example, Many Doctrines proving, and explaining, and giving a farther Light into the Goſpel, are publiſh'd in the Epiſtles to the *Corinthians* and *Theſſalonians*. Theſe are all of Divine Authority, and none of them may be diſbeliev'd by any one who is a Chriſtian: But yet what was propos'd or publiſhed to both the *Corinthians* and *Theſſalonians* to make them Chriſtians, was only this Doctrine, That *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*: As may be ſeen, *Acts* xvii, xviii. This then was the Doctrine neceſſary to make Men Chriſtians in our Saviour's Time; and this the only Doctrine neceſſary to make Unbelievers Chriſtians after our Saviour's Time. The only Difference was, that it was more clearly propos'd after, than before his Aſcenſion: The Reaſon whereof has been ſufficiently explain'd. But any other Doctrine but this, propos'd clearly or obſcurely, in, or after our Saviour's Time, as neceſſary to be believed to make Unbelievers Chriſtians, That remains yet to be ſhewn.

When the *Unmasker* ſpeaks of the Doctrines that were neceſſary for the *ſucceeding Time* after our Saviour, he is in Doubt whether we ſhould ſay they were, or were not *diſcover'd* in our Saviour's Time; and how far they were then *diſcover'd*: And therefore he ſays, *Some of them were not then diſcover'd, or at leaſt, not fully.* We muſt here excuſe the Doubtfulneſs of his talking, concerning the Diſcovery of his other neceſſary Articles. For how could he ſay they were diſcover'd or not diſcover'd, clearly or obſcurely, fully or not fully; when he does not yet know them all, nor can tell us, what thoſe neceſſary Articles are? If he does know them, let him give us a Liſt of them, and then we ſhall ſee eaſily whether they were at all publiſh'd or diſcover'd in our Saviour's Time. If there are ſome of them that were not at all diſcover'd in our Saviour's Time, let him ſpeak it out, and leave ſhifting: And if ſome of thoſe that were *neceſſary for our Saviour's Time*, but *for the ſucceeding one* only, were yet diſcover'd in our Saviour's Time, why were they not neceſſary to be believ'd in that Time? But the Truth is, he knows not what theſe Doctrines neceſſary for ſucceeding Times are, and therefore can ſay nothing poſitively about their Diſcovery. And for thoſe that he has ſet down, as ſoon as he ſhall name any one of them to be of the Number of thoſe *not neceſſary for our Saviour's Time*,

time, but *neceſſary for the ſucceeding one*, it will preſently appear, either that it was diſcover'd in our Saviour's Time; and then it was as neceſſary for his Time as the ſucceeding: or elſe, that it was not diſcover'd in his Time, nor to ſeveral Converts after his Time, before they were made Chriſtians; and therefore it was no more neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian in the ſucceeding, than it was in our Saviour's Time. However, general Poſitions and Diſtinctions without a Foundation, ſerve for ſhew, and to beguile unwary and inattentive Readers.

2. Having thus minded him, that the Queſtion is about Articles of Faith neceſſary to be explicitly and diſtinctly believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; I then, in the next Place, demand of him to tell me,

XXXIX. *Whether or no all the Articles neceſſary now to be diſtinctly and explicitly believ'd to make any Man a Chriſtian, were diſtinctly and explicitly publiſh'd or diſcover'd in our Saviour's Time.*

And then I ſhall deſire to know of him,

XL. *A Reaſon why they were not.*

Thoſe that he inſtances in, of *Chriſt's Death* and *Reſurrection*, will not help him one Jot: for they are not new Doctrines reveal'd, new Myſteries diſcover'd; but Matters of Fact, which happen'd to our Saviour in their due Time, to compleat in him the Character and Predictions of the *Meſſiah*, and demonſtrate him to be the Deliverer promis'd. Theſe are recorded of him by the Spirit of God in Holy Writ, but are no more neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, than any other Part of Divine Revelation, but as far as they have an immediate Connexion with his being the *Meſſiah*, and cannot be denied without denying him to be the *Meſſiah*: And therefore this Article of his Reſurrection (which ſuppoſes his Death) and ſuch other Propoſitions as are convertible with his being the *Meſſiah*, are, as they very well may be, put for his being the *Meſſiah*; and as I have ſhew'd, propos'd to be believed in the Place of it.

All that is reveal'd in Scripture has a conſequential Neceſſity of being believ'd by all thoſe, to whom it is propos'd; becauſe it is of Divine Authority, one Part as much as another. And in this Senſe all the Divine Truths in the inſpired Writings are Fundamental and Neceſſary to be believ'd. But then this will deſtroy our *Unmasker*'s ſelect Number of Fundamental Articles: and *the choiceſt and ſublimeſt Truths of Chriſtianity*, which he tells us, *are to be met with in the Epiſtles*, will not be more neceſſary to be believed than any, which he may think the commoneſt or meaneſt Truths in any of the Epiſtles or the Goſpels. Whatſoever Part of Divine Revelation, whether reveal'd before, or in, or after our Saviour's Time; whether it contain (according to the Diſtinction of our *Unmasker*'s nice Palate) *choice* or common, *ſublime* or not ſublime Truths, is neceſſary to be believ'd by every one, to whom it is propos'd, as far as he underſtands what is propos'd. But God, by *Jeſus Chriſt*, has entred into a Covenant of Grace with Mankind; a Covenant of Faith, inſtead of that of Works, wherein ſome Truths are abſolutely neceſſary to be explicitly believ'd by them to make Men Chriſtians; and therefore thoſe Truths are neceſſary to be known, and conſequently neceſſary to be propos'd to them to make them Chriſtians. This is peculiar to them to make Men Chriſtians. For all Men, as Men, are under a neceſſary Obligation to believe what God propos'd to them to be believed: But there being certain diſtinguiſhing Truths which belong to the Covenant of the Goſpel, which if Men know not, they cannot be Chriſtians; and they being ſome of them ſuch as cannot be known without being propos'd: thoſe, and thoſe only, are the neceſſary Doctrines of Chriſtianity I ſpeak of; without a Knowledge of and Aſſent to which, no Man can be a Chriſtian.

To come therefore to a clear Deciſion of this Controverſy, I deſire the *Unmasker* to tell me,

XLI. *What thoſe Doctrines are, which are abſolutely neceſſary to be propos'd to every Man to make him a Chriſtian?*

XLII. 1. *Whether they are all the Truths of Divine Revelation contain'd in the Bible?*

For, I grant this Argument (which in another Place he uſes for ſome of them, and truly belongs to them all) *viz.* That they were reveal'd and written there on purpoſe to be believ'd, and that it is indiſpenſably neceſſary for Chriſtians to believe them.

XLIII. 2. *Or whether it be only that one Article of Jeſus being the Meſſiah, which the Hiſtory of our Saviour and his Apoſtles Preaching has, with ſuch a peculiar Diſtinction, every where propos'd?*

XLIV. 3. *Or whether the Doctrines neceſſary to be propos'd to every one to make him a Chriſtian, be any Set of Truths between theſe two?*

And if he ſays this latter, then I muſt ask him,

XLV. *What they are? that we may ſee why thoſe rather than any other contain'd in the New Teſtament, are neceſſary to be propos'd to every Man to make him a Chriſtian; and if they are not every one propos'd to him, and aſſented to by him, he cannot be a Chriſtian.*

The *Unmasker* makes a great Noiſe, and hopes to give his unwary, tho' well-meaning Readers, odd Thoughts, and ſtrong Impreſſions againſt my Book, by declaiming againſt my *lank Faith*, and my *narrowing* of Chriſtianity to one Article; which, as he ſays, is the next Way to reduce it to *none*. But when it is conſider'd, it will be found, that 'tis he that narrows Chriſtianity. The *Unmasker*, as if he were Arbiter and Diſpenſer of the Oracles of God, takes upon him to ſingle out ſome Texts of Scripture; and, where the Words of Scripture will not ſerve his Turn, to impoſe on us his Interpretations and Deductions as neceſſary Articles of Faith; which is in effect, to make them of equal Authority with the unqueſtionable Word of God. And thus, partly in the Words of Scripture, and partly in Words of his own, he makes a Set of Fundamentals, *with an Excluſion* of all the other Truths deliver'd by the Spirit of God, in the Bible; tho' all the reſt be of the ſame Divine Authority and Original, and ought therefore all equally, as far as they are underſtood by every Chriſtian, to be believ'd. I tell him, and I deſire him to take notice of it, God has no where given him an Authority thus to garble the inſpir'd Writings of the Holy Scriptures. Every Part of it is his Word, and ought every Part of it to be believ'd by every Chriſtian Man, according as God ſhall inable him to underſtand it. It ought not be narrow'd to the Cut of the *Unmasker*'s peculiar Syſtem; 'tis a Preſumption of the higheſt Nature, for him thus to pretend, according to his own Fancy, to eſtabliſh a Set of Fundamental Articles. This is to diminiſh the Authority of the Word of God, to ſet up his own; and create a Reverence to his Syſtem, from which the ſeveral Parts of Divine Revelations are to receive their Weight, Dignity and Authority. Thoſe Paſſages of Holy Writ which ſuit with that, are *Fundamental*, *Choice*, *Sublime* and *Neceſſary*; the reſt of the Scripture (as of no great moment) is not Fundamental, is not neceſſary to be believ'd, may be neglected, or muſt be tortur'd to comply with an Analogy of Faith of his own making. But tho' he pretend to a certain Set of Fundamentals, yet to ſhew the Vanity, and Impudence of that Pretence, he cannot tell us which they are: and therefore in vain contends for a Creed he knows not, and is yet no where. He neither does, and which is more, I tell him he never can give us a Collection of his Fundamentals gather'd upon his Principles, out of the Scripture, with the Rejection of all the reſt as not Fundamental. He does not obſerve the Difference there is between what is neceſſary to be believed by every Man to make him a Chriſtian,

Chriſtian, and what is requir'd to be believ'd by every Chriſtian. The firſt of theſe is what, by the Covenant of the Goſpel, is neceſſary to be known, and conſequently to be propos'd to every Man, to make him a Chriſtian: The latter is no leſs than the whole Revelation of God; all the Divine Truths contain'd in Holy Scripture; which every Chriſtian Man is under a Neceſſity to believe, ſo far as it ſhall pleaſe God, upon his ſerious and conſtant Endeavours, to enlighten his Mind to underſtand them.

The Preaching of our Saviour and his Apoſtles, has ſufficiently taught us what is neceſſary to be propos'd to every Man, to make him a Chriſtian. He that believes him to be the promis'd *Meſſiah*, takes *Jeſus* for his King; and repenting of his former Sins, ſincerely reſolves to live for the future, in Obedience to his Laws, is a Subject of this Kingdom, is a Chriſtian. If he be not, I deſire the *Unmasker* to tell me, what more is requiſite to make him ſo. Till he does that, I reſt ſatisfy'd, that this is all that was at firſt, and is ſtill neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian.

This, tho' it be contain'd in a few Words, and thoſe not hard to be underſtood; tho' it be in one voluntary Act of the Mind relinquiſhing all irregular Courſes, and ſubmitting it ſelf to the Rule of him, whom God had ſent to be our King, and promis'd to be our Saviour: yet it having Relation to the Race of Mankind, from the firſt Man *Adam*, to the End of the World; it being a Contrivance, wherein God has diſplay'd ſo much of his Wiſdom and Goodneſs to the corrupt and loſt Sons of Men, and it being a Deſign to which the Almighty had a peculiar Regard in the whole Conſtitution and Oeconomy of the *Jews*, as well as in the Prophecies and Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament: This was a Foundation capable of large Superſtructures. 1. In explaining the Occaſion, Neceſſity, Uſe and End of his Coming. 2. Next, in proving him to be the Perſon promis'd, by a Correſpondence of his Birth, Life, Sufferings, Death, and Reſurrection, to all thoſe Prophecies and Types of him, which had given the Expectation of ſuch a Deliverer, and to thoſe Deſcriptions of him whereby he might be known, when he did come. 3. In the Diſcovery of the Sort, Conſtitution, Extent, and Management of his Kingdom. 4. In ſhewing from what we are deliver'd by him, and how that Deliverance is wrought out, and what are the Conſequences of it.

Theſe, and a great many more the like, afford great Numbers of Truths deliver'd both in the Hiſtorical, Epiſtolary, and Prophetical Writings of the New Teſtament, wherein the Myſteries of the Goſpel hidden from former Ages were diſcover'd; and that more fully, I grant, after the pouring out of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Apoſtles. But could no body take Chriſt for their promis'd King, and reſolve to obey him, unleſs he underſtood all the Truths that concern'd his Kingdom, or, as I may ſay, Myſteries of State of it? The Truth of the contrary is manifeſt out of the plain and uniform Preaching of the Apoſtles, after they had receiv'd the Holy Ghoſt, that was to guide them in all Truth. Nay, after the Writing of thoſe Epiſtles, wherein were contain'd the *Unmasker*'s *ſublimeſt* Truths; they every where propos'd to Unbelievers *Jeſus the Meſſiah* to be their King, *ordain'd* of God; and to this join'd Repentance: And this alone they preach'd for the Converſion of their Unbelieving Hearers. As ſoon as any one Aſſented to this, he was pronounc'd a Believer; and theſe inſpir'd Rulers of the Church, theſe infallible Preachers of the Goſpel, admitted him into Chriſt's Kingdom by Baptiſm. And this after, long *after our Saviour's Aſcenſion, when* (as our *Unmasker* expreſſes it) *the Holy Ghoſt was to be ſent in a ſpecial Manner to inlighten Mens Minds, and to diſcover to them the great Myſteries of Chriſtianity*, even as long as the Apoſtles liv'd: And what others were to do, who afterwards were to preach the Goſpel, St. *Paul* tells us, 1 *Cor.* iii. 11. *Other Foundation can no Man lay than that is laid, even Jeſus the Meſſiah.* Tho' upon this Foundation Men might build variouſly, Things that would, or would not hold the Touch; yet however, as long as they kept firm to this Foundation, they ſhould be ſaved, as appears in the following Verſes.

And indeed, if all the Doctrines of the Goſpel, which are contained in the Writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts, were neceſſary to be underſtood, and explicitly believed, in the true Senſe of thoſe that delivered them, to make a Man a Chriſtian; I doubt whether ever any one, even to this Day, was a

true

true Chriſtian: tho' I believe the *Unmasker* will not deny but that, e'er this, Chriſtianity (as he expreſſes it) *is by certain Steps climbed to its Height.*

But for this, the *Unmasker* has found a convenient and wiſe Remedy. 'Tis but for him to have the Power to declare, which of the Doctrines deliver'd in Holy Writ are, and which are not neceſſary to be believ'd, with an additional Power to add others of his own, that he cannot find there; and the Buſineſs is done. For unleſs this be allow'd him, his Syſtem cannot ſtand: unleſs his Interpretations be receiv'd for authentick Revelation, we cannot have all Doctrines neceſſary for our Time; in Truth, we cannot be Chriſtians. For to this only, what he ſays concerning the *gradual Diſcovery of the Doctrines of the Goſpel*, tends. *We are not to think*, ſays he, *that all the neceſſary Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion were clearly publiſh'd to the World in our Saviour's Time: Not but that all that were neceſſary for that Time were publiſh'd; but ſome that were neceſſary for the ſucceeding one were not then diſcover'd, or at leaſt not fully.*

I muſt here ask the *Unmasker* a ſhort Queſtion, or two; as Firſt,

XLVI. *Are not all the Doctrines neceſſary for our Time contained in his Syſtem?*

Next,

XLVII. *Can all the Doctrines neceſſary for our Time, be propos'd in the expreſs Words of the Scripture?*

When he has anſwer'd theſe two plain Queſtions (and an Anſwer to them I ſhall expect) the World will then ſee, what he deſigns by *Doctrines neceſſary for our Saviour's Time, and Doctrines neceſſary for ſucceeding Times*; whether he means any thing elſe by it, but the ſetting up his Syſtem, as the exact Standard of the Goſpel, and the true and unalterable Meaſure of Chriſtianity, in which *it has climb'd to its Height.*

Let not good and ſincere Chriſtians be deceiv'd, nor perplex'd by this Maker of another Chriſtianity, than what the infallible Spirit of God has left us in the Scriptures. 'Tis evident from thence, that whoever takes *Jeſus the Meſſiah* for his King, with a Reſolution to live by his Laws, and does ſincerely repent as often as he tranſgreſſes any of them, is his Subject; all ſuch are Chriſtians. What they are to know, or believe more, concerning him and his Kingdom, when they are his Subjects, he has left upon Record in the great and ſacred Code, and Conſtitutions of his Kingdom; I mean in the Holy Scriptures. All that is contain'd therein, as coming from the God of Truth, they are to receive as Truth, embrace as ſuch. But ſince it is impoſſible explicitly to believe any Propoſition of the Chriſtian Doctrine but what we underſtand, or in any other Senſe than we underſtand it to have been deliver'd in; an explicit Belief is, or can be requir'd in no Man, of more than what he underſtands of that Doctrine. And thus, whatſoever upon fair Endeavours he underſtands to be contain'd in that Doctrine, is neceſſary to him to be believ'd: nor can he continue a Subject of Chriſt upon other Terms.

What he is perſuaded is the Meaning of Chriſt his King, in any Expreſſion he finds in the Sacred Code; that, by his Allegiance, he is bound to ſubmit his Mind to receive for true, or elſe he denies the Authority of Chriſt, and refuſes to believe him: nor can be excus'd, by calling any one on Earth Maſter. And hence it is evidently impoſſible for a Chriſtian to underſtand any Text in one Senſe, and believe it in another, by whomſoever dictated.

All that is contain'd in the inſpir'd Writings, is all of Divine Authority, muſt all be allow'd for ſuch, and receiv'd for Divine and Infallible Truth, by every Subject of Chriſt's Kingdom, *i. e.* every Chriſtian. How comes then the *Unmasker* to diſtinguiſh theſe Dictates of the Holy Spirit into neceſſary and not neceſſary Truths? I deſire him to produce his Commiſſion, whereby he hath the Power given him to tell which of the Divine Truths contain'd in the Holy Scripture are of Neceſſity to be believ'd, and which not. Who made him a Judge or Divider between them? Who gave him this Power over the Oracles of God, to ſet up one, and debaſe another at his Pleaſure? Some, as he thinks fit, are the *choiceſt* Truths: And what I beſeech him are the other?

ther? Who made him a Chuſer, where no body can pick and chuſe? Every Propoſition there, as far as any Chriſtian can underſtand it, is indiſpenſably neceſſary to be believ'd: And farther than he does underſtand it, it is impoſſible for him to believe it. The Laws of Chriſt's Kingdom do not require Impoſſibilities, for they are all reaſonable, juſt, and good.

Some of the Truths deliver'd in Holy Writ are very plain: 'Tis impoſſible, I think, to miſtake their Meaning: And thoſe certainly are all neceſſary to be explicitly believ'd. Others have more Difficulty in them, and are not eaſy to be underſtood. Is the *Unmasker* appointed Chriſt's Vicegerent here, or the Holy Ghoſt's Interpreter, with Authority to pronounce which of theſe are neceſſary to be believed, and in what Senſe, and which not? The Obſcurity that is to be found in ſeveral Paſſages of the Scripture, the Difficulties that cover and perplex the Meaning of ſeveral Texts, demand of every Chriſtian, Study, Diligence, and Attention in reading and hearing the Scriptures; in comparing and examining them; and receiving what Light he can from all manner of Helps, to underſtand theſe Books, wherein are contain'd the Words of Life. This the *Unmasker*, and every one is to do for himſelf; and thereby find out what is neceſſary for him to believe. But I do not know that the *Unmasker* is to underſtand and interpret for me, more than I for him. If he has ſuch a Power, I deſire him to produce it. Till then, I can acknowledge no other infallible, but that Guide, which he directs me to himſelf here in theſe Words: *According to our Saviour's Promiſe, the Holy Ghoſt was to be ſent in a ſpecial Manner to enlighten Men's Minds, and to diſcover to them the great Myſteries of Chriſtianity.* For whether by *Men* he here means thoſe on whom the Holy Ghoſt was ſo eminently pour'd out, *Acts* ii. or whether he means by theſe Words, that ſpecial Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, whereby particular Men, to the End of the World, are to be led into the Truth, by opening their Underſtandings, that they may underſtand the Scriptures (for he always loves to ſpeak doubtfully and indefinitely) I know no other infallible Guide, but the Spirit of God in the Scriptures. Nor has God left it in my Choice, to take any Man for ſuch. If he had, I ſhould think the *Unmasker* the unlikelieſt to be he, and the laſt Man in the World to be choſen for that Guide: And herein I appeal to any ſober Chriſtian, who hath read what the *Unmasker* has with ſo little Truth and Decency (for 'tis not always Mens Fault if they have not Senſe) writ upon this Queſtion, whether he would not be of the ſame Mind?

But yet as very an *Unmasker* as he is, he will be extremely apt to call you Names, nay to declare you no Chriſtian; and boldly affirm you have no Chriſtianity, if you will not ſwallow it juſt as it is of his Cooking. You muſt take it juſt as he has been pleas'd to doſe it; no more, nor no leſs, than what is in his Syſtem. He hath put himſelf into the Throne of Chriſt, and pretends to tell you which are, and which are not the indiſpenſable Laws of his Kingdom: which Parts of his Divine Revelation you muſt neceſſarily know, underſtand, and believe, and in what Senſe; and which you need not trouble your head about, but may paſs by as not neceſſary to be believ'd. He will tell you that ſome of his neceſſary Articles are Myſteries, and yet (as he does *p.* 115. of his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm*) that they are eaſy to be underſtood by any Man, when explain'd to him. In anſwer to that, I demanded of him "who was to explain them? The *Papiſts*, I told him, would explain ſome "of them one Way, and the *Reform'd* another; the *Remonſtrants* and *Anti-*"*Remonſtrants* give them different Senſes; and probably the *Trinitarians* and "*Unitarians* will profeſs, that they underſtand not each other's Explications." But to this, in his Reply, he has not vouchſafed to give me any Anſwer; which yet I expect, and I will tell him why: becauſe as there are different Explainers, there will be different Fundamentals. And therefore, unleſs he can ſhew his Authority to be the ſole Explainer of Fundamentals, he will in vain make ſuch a Pudder about his Funnamentals. Another Explainer, of as good Authority as he, will ſet up others againſt them. And what then ſhall we be the better for all this Stir and Noiſe of Fundamentals? All the Effect of it will be juſt the ſame it has been theſe thouſand Years and upwards; Schiſms, Separations, Contentions, Animoſities, Quarrels, Blood and Butchery, and all that Train of Miſchiefs which has ſo long haraſs'd and defam'd Chriſtianity,

and

and are ſo contrary to the Doctrine, Spirit and End of the Goſpel: And which muſt ſtill continue as long as any ſuch *Unmasker* ſhall take upon him to be the Diſpenſer and Dictator to others of Fundamentals; and peremptorily to define which Parts of Divine Revelation are neceſſary to be believ'd, and which Chriſtians may with ſafety diſpenſe with, and not believe.

To conclude; What was ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian in our Saviour's Time, is ſufficient ſtill, *viz.* the taking him for our King and Lord, ordain'd ſo by God. What was neceſſary to be believ'd by all Chriſtians in our Saviour's Time as an indiſpenſable Duty, which they ow'd to their Lord and Maſter, was the believing all Divine Revelation, as far as every one could underſtand it: And juſt ſo it is ſtill, neither more nor leſs. This being ſo, the *Unmasker* may make what Uſe he pleaſes of his Notion, *That Chriſtianity was erected by Degrees*, it will no way (in that Senſe in which it is true) turn to the Advantage of his ſelect Fundamental neceſſary Doctrines.

The next Chapter has nothing in it but his great Bug-bear, whereby he hopes to fright People from reading my Book, by crying out, *Socinianiſm*, *Socinianiſm*. Whereas I challenge him again to ſhew one Word of *Socinianiſm* in it. But however it is worth while to write a Book to prove me a *Socinian*. Truly, I did not think my ſelf ſo conſiderable, that the World need be troubled about me, whether I were a Follower of *Socinus*, *Arminius*, *Calvin*, or any other Leader of a Sect amongſt Chriſtians. A Chriſtian I am ſure I am, becauſe I believe *Jeſus to be the Meſſiah*, the King and Saviour promis'd, and ſent by God: And as a Subject of his Kingdom, I take the Rule of my Faith and Life from his Will, declar'd and left upon Record in the inſpir'd Writings of the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts in the *New Teſtament*; which I endeavour, to the utmoſt of my Power, as is my Duty, to underſtand in their true Senſe and Meaning. To lead me into their true Meaning, I know (as I have above declar'd) no infallible Guide, but the ſame Holy Spirit, from whom theſe Writings at firſt came. If the *Unmasker* knows any other infallible Interpreter of Scripture, I deſire him to direct me to him: till then, I ſhall think it, according to my Maſter's Rule, not to be call'd, nor to call any Man on Earth *Maſter*. No Man, I think, has a Right to preſcribe to my Faith, or magiſterially to impoſe his Interpretations or Opinions on me: Nor is it material to any one what mine are, any farther than they carry their own Evidence with them. If this, which I think makes me of no Sect, entitles me to the Name of a *Papiſt*, or a *Socinian*, becauſe the *Unmasker* thinks theſe the worſt, and moſt invidious he can give me; and labours to fix them on me for no other Reaſon, but becauſe I will not take him for my *Maſter on Earth*, and his Syſtem for my Goſpel: I ſhall leave him to recommend himſelf to the World by this Skill, who no doubt will have Reaſon to thank him for the Rareneſs and Subtilty of his Diſcovery. For, I think, I am the firſt Man that ever was found out to be at the ſame Time a *Socinian*, and a Factor for *Rome*. But what is too hard for ſuch an *Unmasker?* I muſt be what he thinks fit; when he pleaſes, a *Papiſt*; and when he pleaſes, a *Socinian*; and when he pleaſes, a *Mahometan*. And probably, when he has conſider'd a little better, an *Atheiſt*; for I hardly 'ſcap'd it when he writ laſt. My Book, he ſays, had a Tendency to it; and if he can but go on, as he has done hitherto, from Surmiſes to Certainties, by that Time he writes next, his Diſcovery will be advanc'd, and he will certainly find me an *Athieſt*. Only one Thing I dare aſſure him of, that he ſhall never find, that I treat the Things of God or Religion ſo, as if I made only a Trade, or a Jeſt of them. But let us now ſee how at preſent he proves me a *Socinian*.

His firſt Argument is, my not anſwering for my leaving out *Matth.* xxviii. 19. and *John* i. 1. *pag.* 82. of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*. This he takes to be a Confeſſion, that I am a *Socinian*. I hope he means fairly, and that if it be ſo on my Side, it muſt be taken for a ſtanding Rule between us, that where any Thing is not anſwer'd, it muſt be taken for granted. And upon that Score, I muſt deſire him to remember ſome Paſſages of my *Vindication*, which I have already, and others which I ſhall mind him of hereafter, which he paſs'd over in Silence, and had nothing to ſay to; which therefore, by his own Rule, I ſhall deſire the Reader obſerve, that he has granted.

This

This being premiſed, I muſt tell the *Unmaker*, that I perceive he reads my Book with the ſame Underſtanding that he writes his own. If he had done otherwiſe, he might have ſeen, that I had given him a Reaſon for my Omiſſion of thoſe two, and other *plain and obvious Paſſages, and famous Teſtimonies in the Evangeliſts*, as he calls them; where I ſay, *p.* 547. "That if I have left out "none of thoſe *Paſſages* or *Teſtimonies*, which contain what our Saviour and "his Apoſtles preach'd and requir'd Aſſent to, to make Men Believers, I ſhall "think my Omiſſions (let them be what they will) no Faults in the preſent "Caſe. Whatever Doctrines Mr. *Edwards* would have to be believ'd, to make "a Man a Chriſtian, he will be ſure to find them in thoſe Preachings and *fa-*"*mous Teſtimonies* of our Saviour and his Apoſtles I have quoted. And if "they are not there, he may reſt ſatisfy'd, that they were not propos'd by "our Saviour and his Apoſtles, as neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men "Chriſt's Diſciples." From which Words, any one, but an *Unmasker*, would have underſtood my Anſwer to be, That all that was neceſſary to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians, might be found in what our Saviour and his Apoſtles propos'd to Unbelievers for their Converſion: But the two Paſſages abovemention'd, as well as a great many others in the Evangeliſts, being none of thoſe, I had no Reaſon to take notice of them. But the *Unmasker* having out of his good Pleaſure put it once upon me, as he does in his *Thoughts of the Cauſes of Atheiſm*, p. 107. That I was an *Epitomizer of the Evangelical Writings*, tho' every one may ſee I make not that my Buſineſs, yet 'tis no matter for that, I muſt be always Accountable to that Fancy of his. But when he has prov'd,

XLVII. *That this is not as juſt a Reaſon for my omitting them, as ſeveral other* obvious Paſſages *and* famous Teſtimonies *in the Evangeliſts, which I here mention, for whoſe Omiſſion he does not blame me*;

I will undertake to give him another Reaſon, which I know not whether he were not better let alone.

The next Proof of my being a *Socinian*, is, that I take the *Son of God* to be an Expreſſion us'd to ſignify the *Meſſiah*. *Slichtingius* and *Socinus* underſtood it ſo; and therefore I am, the *Unmasker* ſays, a *Socinian*. Juſt as good an Argument, as that I believe *Jeſus* to be a Prophet, and ſo do the *Mahometans*; therefore I am a *Mahometan*: Or thus, the *Unmasker* holds that the Apoſtles Creed does not contain all Things neceſſary to Salvation; and ſo ſays *Knot* the Jeſuit: Therefore the *Unmasker* is a Papiſt. Let me turn the Tables, and by the ſame Argument I am Orthodox again. For two Orthodox, Pious, and very Eminent Prelates of our Church; whom, when I follow Authorities, I ſhall prefer to *Slichtingius* and *Socinus*, underſtand it as I do, and therefore I am Orthodox. Nay, it ſo falls out, that if it were of Force either Way, the Argument would weigh moſt on this ſide: ſince I am not wholly a Stranger to the Writings of theſe two Orthodox Biſhops; but I never read a Page in either of thoſe *Socinians*. The never ſufficiently admir'd and valu'd Archbiſhop *Tillotſon*'s Words, which quoted, the *Unmasker* ſays, *do not neceſſarily import any ſuch thing*. I know no Words that *neceſſarily import* any thing to a Caviller. But he was known to have ſuch clear Thoughts, and ſo clear a Stile; ſo far from having any thing doubtful or fallacious in what he ſaid, that I ſhall only ſet down his Words as they are in his Sermon *of Sincerity*, p. 2. to ſhew his Meaning. *Nathanael*, ſays he, *being ſatisfy'd, that he* [our Saviour] *was the Meſſiah, he preſently own'd him for ſuch, calling him* THE SON OF GOD, *and the King of* Iſrael.

The Words of the other Eminent Prelate, the Biſhop of *Ely*, whom our Church is ſtill happy in, are theſe: *To be the Son of God, and to be Chriſt, being but different Expreſſions of the ſame Thing*: Witneſs, *p.* 14. And *p.* 10. *It is the very ſame Thing to believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, and to believe that Jeſus is the Son of God, expreſs it how you pleaſe. This* ALONE *is the Faith which can regenerate a Man, and put a Divine Spirit into him, that it makes him a Conqueror over the World, as Jeſus was.* Of this the *Unmasker* ſays, that this Reverend Author *ſpeaking only in a general Way, repreſents theſe two as the ſame thing*, viz.

That Jeſus is the Chriſt, and that Jeſus is the Son of God, becauſe theſe Expreſſions are apply'd to the ſame Perſon, and becauſe they are both Comprehended in one general Name, *viz. Jeſus*. *Anſw.* The Queſtion is whether theſe two Expreſſions, *the Son of God*, and *the Meſſiah*, in the Learned Biſhop's Opinion ſignify the ſame thing. If his Opinion had been ask'd in the Point, I know not how he could have declar'd it more clearly. For he ſays they are *Expreſſions of the ſame Thing*, and that *it is the very ſame Thing to believe that Jeſus is the Meſſiah, and to believe that he is the Son of God*; which cannot be ſo, if *Meſſiah* and *Son of God* have different Significations: For then they will make two diſtinct Propoſitions in different Senſes, which it can be no more the ſame thing to believe, than it is the ſame thing to believe that Mr. *Edwards* is a notable Preacher, and a notable Railer; or than it is to believe one Truth and all Truths. For by the ſame Reaſon, that it is the *ſame thing to believe* two diſtinct Truths, it will be the *ſame thing to believe* two thouſand diſtinct Truths, and conſequently all Truths. The *Unmasker*, that he might ſeem to ſay ſomething, ſays that the *Reverend Author repreſents theſe as the ſame thing*. Anſw. The *Unmasker* never fails, like *Midas*, to turn every Thing he touches into his own Metal. The Learned Biſhop ſays very directly and plainly, that *to be the Son of God*, and *to be the Meſſiah, are Expreſſions of the ſame thing*: And the *Unmaskers* ſays, he *repreſents theſe Expreſſions as one thing*: For 'tis of Expreſſions that both the Biſhop and he ſpeak. Now, *Expreſſions* can be *one Thing*, but one of theſe two Ways: Either in Sound, and ſo theſe two Expreſſions are not one; or in Signification, and ſo they are. And then the *Unmasker* ſays, but in other Words, what the Biſhop had ſaid before, *viz.* That theſe two, *to be the Son of God*, and *to be the Meſſiah*, are *Expreſſions of the ſame Thing*. Only the *Unmasker* has put in the Word *Repreſents* to amuſe his Reader, as if he had ſaid ſomething, and ſo indeed he does after his faſhion, *i. e.* obſcurely and fallaciouſly; which when it comes to be examin'd, is but the ſame Thing under ſhew of a Difference: Or elſe, if it has a different Meaning, is demonſtratively falſe. But ſo it be obſcure enough to deceive a willing Reader, who will not be at the Pains to examine what he ſays, it ſerves his Turn.

But yet, as if he had ſaid ſomething of Weight, he gives Reaſons for putting *Repreſents theſe two Expreſſions as one Thing*, inſtead of ſaying, theſe two are *but different Expreſſions of the ſame Thing*.

The firſt of his Reaſons is, Becauſe the Reverend Author is here *ſpeaking only in a General Way*. *Anſwer.* What does the *Unmasker* mean by a *General Way?* The Learned Biſhop ſpeaks of two Particular *Expreſſions* apply'd to our Saviour. But was his Diſcourſe ever ſo general, how could that alter the plain Signification of his Words, *viz.* That thoſe two are but *different Expreſſions of the ſame Thing*.

Secondly, *Becauſe theſe Expreſſions are apply'd to the ſame Perſon*. *Anſw.* A very demonſtrative Reaſon, is it not, that therefore they cannot be different Expreſſions of the ſame Thing?

Thirdly, *And becauſe they are both comprehended in one general Name*, viz. *Jeſus*. *Anſw.* It requires ſome Skill to put ſo many Falſhoods in ſo few Words, For neither both nor either of theſe Expreſſions are *comprehended* in the Name *Jeſus*: And that *Jeſus*, the Name of a particular Perſon, ſhould be a *general Name*, is a Diſcovery reſerv'd to be found out by this new Logician. However, General is a Learned Word, which when a Man of Learning has us'd twice, as a Reaſon of the ſame Thing, he is cover'd with *Generals*. He need not trouble himſelf any farther about Senſe; he may ſafely talk what Stuff he pleaſes, without the leaſt Suſpicion of his Reader.

Having thus ſtrongly prov'd juſt nothing, he proceeds and tells us, p. 91. *Yet it does not follow thence, but that if we will ſpeak ſtrictly and cloſely, we muſt be forc'd to confeſs they are of different Significations.* By which Words (if his Words have any Signification) he plainly allows, that the Biſhop meant as he ſays, that theſe two are but *different Expreſſions of the ſame Thing*: But withal tells him, that if he will *ſpeak cloſely and ſtrictly*, he muſt ſay, *they are of different Significations*. My Concernment in the Caſe being only, that in the Paſſage alledg'd, the Reverend Author ſaid, that the *Son of God*, and the *Meſſiah*, were *different Expreſſions of the ſame Thing*, I have no more to demand after

theſe

theſe Words of the *Unmasker*; he has in them granted all I would have: And I ſhall not meddle with his *ſpeaking cloſely and ſtrictly*, but ſhall leave it to the deciſive Authority of this ſuperlative Critick to determine, whether this learned Biſhop, or any one living, beſides himſelf, can underſtand the Phraſes of the *New Teſtament*, and *ſpeak ſtrictly and cloſely* concerning them. Perhaps his being yet alive, may preſerve this eminent Prelate from the malicious driveling of this *Unmasker*'s *Pen*, which has beſpatter'd the Aſhes of two of the ſame Order, who were no mean Ornaments of the *Engliſh* Church; and if they had been now alive, no body will doubt but the *Unmasker* would have treated them after another Faſhion.

But let me ask the *Unmasker*, whether (if either of theſe pious Prelates, whoſe Words I have above quoted, did underſtand that Phraſe of the *Son of God* to ſtand for the *Meſſiah*; which they might do without holding any one *Socinian* Tenet) he will dare to pronounce him a *Socinian*. This is ſo ridiculous an Inference, that I could not but laugh at it. But withal tell him, *Vindic.* p. 550. "That if the Senſe wherein I underſtand thoſe Texts be a "Miſtake, I ſhall be beholden to him to ſet me right: But they are not "popular Authorities, or frightful Names, whereby I judge of Truth or "Falſhood." To which I ſubjoin theſe Words: "You will now no doubt "applaud your Conjectures, the Point is gain'd, and I am openly a *Socinian*: "Since I will not diſown, that I think the *Son of God* was a Phraſe, that a-"mong the *Jews* in our Saviour's Time, was us'd for the *Meſſiah*, tho' the *So-"cinians* underſtand it in the ſame Senſe. And therefore I muſt certainly be "of their Perſuaſion in every thing elſe. I admire the Acuteneſs, Force, and "Fairneſs of your Reaſoning; and ſo I leave you to triumph in your Con-"jectures." Nor has he fail'd my Expectation: For here, *p.* 91. of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, he, upon this, erects his Comb, and crows moſt mightily. *We may*, ſays he, *from hence as well as other Reaſons, pronounce him the ſame with thoſe Gentlemen* (i. e. as he is pleas'd to call them, *my good Patrons and Friends the* Racovians) *which you may perceive he is very apprehenſive of*, and thinks, that this will *be reckon'd a good Evidence of his being, what he deny'd himſelf to be before.* The Point is gain'd, *ſaith he*, and I am openly a *Socinian*. *He never utter'd truer Words in his Life, and they are the Confutation of all his Pretences to the contrary. This Truth, which unwarily drop'd from his Pen, confirms what I have laid to his Charge.* Now you have ſung your Song of Triumph, 'tis fit you ſhould gain your Victory, by ſhewing,

XLIX. *How my underſtanding* the Son of God *to be a Phraſe us'd amongſt the* Jews *in our Saviour's Time, to ſignify the* Meſſiah, *proves me to be a* Socinian.

Or if you think you have prov'd it already, I deſire you to put your Proof into a Syllogiſm: For I confeſs my ſelf ſo dull, as not to ſee any ſuch Concluſion deducible from my underſtanding that Phraſe as I do, even when you have prov'd that I am miſtaken in it.

The Places, which in the *New Teſtament* ſhew that the *Son of God* ſtands for the *Meſſiah*, are ſo many, and ſo clear, that I imagine no body that ever conſider'd and compar'd them together, could doubt of their Meaning, unleſs he were an *Unmasker*. Several of them I have collected and ſet down in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, p. 479 — 483, 485 — 487, 494 — 496.

Firſt, *John the Baptiſt*, John i. 20. when the *Jews* ſent to know who he was, confeſs'd he himſelf was not the *Meſſiah*. But of *Jeſus* he ſays, *ver.* 34. after having ſeveral Ways, in the foregoing Verſes, declar'd him to be the *Meſſiah*; *And I ſaw and bare Record, that this is the* SON OF GOD. And again, *Chap.* iii. 26—36 he declaring *Jeſus* to be, and himſelf not to be the *Meſſiah*, he does it in theſe ſynonymous Terms, of the *Meſſiah* and *the Son of God*; as appears by comparing, *ver.* 28, 35, 36.

Nathaniel owns him to be the *Meſſiah*, in theſe Words, *John* i. 50. *Thou art the* SON OF GOD, *Thou art the King of* Iſrael: Which our Saviour, in the next Verſe, calls *Believing*; a Term, all through the Hiſtory of our Saviour, uſed

uſed for owning *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*. And for confirming that Faith of his, that he was the *Meſſiah*, our Saviour further adds, that he ſhould ſee *greater Things*, i. e. ſhould ſee him do greater Miracles, to evidence that he was the *Meſſiah*.

Luke iv. 41. *And Devils alſo came out of many, crying, Thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of God; and he rebuking them, ſuffered them not to ſpeak.* And ſo again, St. *Mark* tells us, *Chap.* iii. 11, 12. *That unclean Spirits, when they ſaw him, fell down before him, and cried, ſaying, Thou art the Son of God. And he ſtrictly charged them, that they ſhould not make him known.* In both theſe Places, which relate to different Times, and different Occaſions, the Devils declare *Jeſus* to be *the Son of God*. 'Tis certain, whatever they meant by it, they uſed a Phraſe of a known Signification in that Country. And what may we reaſonably think they deſigned to make known to the People by it? Can we imagine theſe unclean Spirits were Promoters of the Goſpel, and had a mind to acknowledge and publiſh to the People the Deity of our Saviour, which the *Unmasker* would have to be the Signification of the Son of God? Who can entertain ſuch a Thought? No, they were no Friends to our Saviour: And therefore deſired to ſpread a Belief of him, that he was the Meſſiah, that ſo he might by the Envy of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* be diſturbed in his Miniſtry, and be cut off before he had compleated it. And therefore we ſee our Saviour in both Places forbids them to make him known; as he did his Diſciples themſelves, for the ſame Reaſon. For when St. *Peter*, Mat. xvi. 16. had own'd *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, in theſe Words; *Thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God*; it follows, *ver.* 20. *Then charged he his Diſciples, that they ſhould tell no Man, that he was Jeſus the Meſſiah:* Juſt as he had forbid the Devils to make him known, *i. e.* to be the *Meſſiah*. Beſides, theſe Words here of St. *Peter* can be taken in no other Senſe, but barely to ſignify that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*, to make them a proper Anſwer to our Saviour's Queſtion. His firſt Queſtion here to his Diſciples, *ver.* 13. is, *Whom do Men ſay that I the Son of Man am?* The Queſtion is not, of what Original do you think the *Meſſiah*, when he comes, will be? For then this Queſtion would have been as it is, *Mat.* xxii. 42. *What think you of the Meſſiah, whoſe Son is he?* If he had enquir'd about the common Opinion concerning the Nature and Deſcent of the *Meſſiah*. But his Queſtion is concerning himſelf; *Whom* of all the extraordinary Perſons, known to the *Jews*, or mention'd in their Sacred Writings, the People thought him to be? That this was the Meaning of his Queſtion, is evident from the Anſwer the Apoſtles gave to it; and his further Demand, *ver.* 14, 15. *They ſaid, Some ſay thou art* John the Baptiſt, *ſome* Elias, *and others* Jeremias, *or one of the Prophets. He ſaith unto them, But WHOM ſay ye that I am?* The People take me, ſome for one of the Prophets or extraordinary Meſſengers from God, and ſome for another: But which of them do you take me to be? Simon Peter *anſwered and ſaid, Thou art the Meſſiah, the Son of the living God.* In all which Diſcourſe, 'tis evident there was not the leaſt Enquiry made by our Saviour concerning the Perſon, Nature, or Qualifications of the *Meſſiah*; but whether the People or his Apoſtles thought him, *i. e. Jeſus* of *Nazareth*, to be the *Meſſiah*. To which St. *Peter* gave him a direct and plain Anſwer in the foregoing Words, declaring their Belief of him to be the *Meſſiah*: Which is all that, with any manner of Congruity, could be made the Senſe of St. *Peter*'s Anſwer. This alone of it ſelf were enough to juſtify my Interpretation of St. *Peter*'s Words, without the Authority of St. *Mark* and St. *Luke*, both whoſe Words confirm it. For St. *Mark*, Chap. viii. 29. renders it, *Thou art the Meſſiah*; and St. *Luke*, Chap. ix. 18. *The Meſſiah of God.* To the like Queſtion, *Who art thou? John the Baptiſt* gives a like Anſwer, *Joh.* i. 19, 20. *I am not the Chriſt.* By which Anſwer, as well as by the following Verſes, it is plain, nothing was underſtood to be meant by that Queſtion, but which of the extraordinary Perſons promis'd to, or expected by, the *Jews*, art thou?

John xi. 27. The Phraſe of the *Son of God* is made uſe of by St. *Martha*: and that it was us'd by her to ſignify the *Meſſiah*, and nothing elſe, is evident out of the Context. *Martha* tells our Saviour, that if he had been there before her Brother died, he, by that Divine Power which he had manifeſted in

ſo

ſo many Miracles which he had done, could have ſaved his Life: And that now, if our Saviour would ask it of God, he might obtain the Reſtoration of his Life. *Jeſus* tells her, he ſhall riſe again: Which Words *Martha* taking to mean, at the general Reſurrection, at the laſt Day: *Jeſus* thereupon takes occaſion to intimate to her, that he was the *Meſſiah*, by telling her, that he was *the Reſurrection and the Life*: i. e. That the Life, which Mankind ſhould receive at the general Reſurrection, was by and through him. This was a Deſcription of the *Meſſiah*: It being a received Opinion amongſt the *Jews*, that when the *Meſſiah* came, the Juſt ſhould riſe, and live with him for ever. And having made this Declaration of himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, he asks *Martha*, Believeſt thou this? What! Not whoſe Son the *Meſſiah* ſhould be? But whether he himſelf was the *Meſſiah*, by whom Believers ſhould have eternal Life at the laſt Day. And to this ſhe gives this direct and appoſite Anſwer; *Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Chriſt, the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World.* The Queſtion was only whether ſhe was perſuaded that thoſe, who believe in him, ſhould be rais'd to eternal Life; that was in effect, whether he was the *Meſſiah*: And to this ſhe anſwers, *Yea, Lord*, I believe this of thee: And then ſhe explains what was contain'd in that Faith of hers; even this, That he was the *Meſſiah*, that was promis'd to come, by whom alone Men were to receive eternal Life.

What the *Jews* alſo underſtood by the *Son of God*, is alſo clear from that Paſſage at the latter end of *Luke* xxii. They having taken our Saviour, and being very deſirous to get a Confeſſion from his own Mouth, that he was the *Meſſiah*, that they might from thence be able to raiſe a formal and prevalent Accuſation againſt him before *Pilate*; the only Thing the Council ask'd him, was, whether he was the *Meſſiah*, v. 67. To which he anſwers ſo in the following Words, that he lets them ſee he underſtood, that the Deſign of their Queſtion was to entrap him, and not to believe in him, whatever he ſhould declare of himſelf. But yet he tells them, *Hereafter ſhall the Son of Man ſit on the right Hand of the Power of God*: Words that to the *Jews* plainly enough own'd him to be the *Meſſiah*; but yet ſuch as could not have any Force againſt him with *Pilate*. He having confeſs'd ſo much, they hope to draw yet a clearer Confeſſion from him. *Then ſaid they all, Art thou then the Son of God? And he ſaid unto them, Ye ſay that I am. And they ſaid, What need we any further Witneſs? For we our ſelves have heard of his own Mouth.* Can any one think that the Doctrine of his *Deity* (which is that which the *Unmasker* accuſes me for waving) was that which the *Jews* deſign'd to accuſe our Saviour of before *Pilate*; or that they needed Witneſſes for? Common Senſe as well as the Current of the whole Hiſtory, ſhews the contrary. No, it was to accuſe him, that he own'd himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, and thereby claim'd a Title to be King of the *Jews*. The Son of God was ſo known a Name amongſt the *Jews* to ſtand for the *Meſſiah*; that having got that from his Mouth, they thought they had Proof enough of Treaſon againſt him. This carries with it a clear and eaſy Meaning. But if the *Son of God* be to be taken, as the *Unmasker* would have it, for a Declaration of his Deity, I deſire him to make common and coherent Senſe of it.

I ſhall add one Conſideration more, to ſhew that the *Son of God* was a Form of Speech then us'd amongſt the *Jews* to ſignify the *Meſſiah*, from the Perſons that us'd it, *viz. John the Baptiſt*, *Nathanael*, St. *Peter*, St. *Martha*, the *Sanhedrim*, and the *Centurion*, Luke xxvii. 54. Here are *Jews*, *Heathens*; *Friends*, *Enemies*; *Men*, *Women*; *Believers*, and *Unbelievers*; all indifferently uſe this Phraſe of the *Son of God*, and apply it to *Jeſus*. The Queſtion between the *Unmasker* and me, is, whether it was us'd by theſe ſeveral Perſons, as an Appellation of the *Meſſiah*, (or as the *Unmasker* would have it) in a quite different Senſe; as ſuch an Application of Divinity to our Saviour, that he that ſhall deny that to be the Meaning of it in the Minds of theſe Speakers, denies the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*. For if they did ſpeak it without that Meaning, it is plain it was a Phraſe known to have another Meaning; or elſe they had talk'd unintelligible Jargon. Now I will ask the *Unmasker*, whether he thinks that the Eternal *Generation*, or, as the *Unmasker* calls it, *Filiation* of *Jeſus* the Son of God, was a Doctrine that had enter'd into the Thoughts of all the Perſons

Perſons above-mention'd, even of the *Roman Centurion*, and the Soldiers that were with him watching Jeſus? If he ſay he does, I ſuppoſe he thinks ſo only for this Time, and for this Occaſion: And then it will lie upon him to give the World convincing Reaſons for his Opinion, that they may think ſo too: Or if he does not think ſo, he muſt give up this Argument, and allow that this Phraſe, in theſe Places, does not neceſſarily import the Deity of our Saviour, and the Doctrine of his eternal Generation: And ſo a Man may take it to be an Expreſſion ſtanding for the *Meſſiah*, without being a *Socinian*, any more than he himſelf is one.

There is one Place, the *Unmasker* tells us, *p.* 87. *that confutes all the Surmiſes about the Identity of theſe Terms. It is*, ſays he, *that famous Confeſſion of Faith which the* Ethiopian *Eunuch made, when* Philip *told him he might be baptized if he believed. This, without doubt, was ſaid according to that Apprehenſion which he had of Chriſt, from* Philip's *inſtructing him; for it is ſaid, he preach'd unto him Jeſus*, ver. 35. *He had acquainted him that Jeſus was the Chriſt, the Anointed of God, and alſo that he was the Son of God, which includes in it that he was God. And accordingly this noble Proſelyte gives this Account of his Faith, in order to his being baptized, in order to his being admitted a Member of Chriſt's Church; I believe that Jeſus is the Son of God: Or you may read it according to the* Greek, *I believe the Son of God to be Jeſus Chriſt. Where there are theſe two diſtinct Propoſitions:*

1ſt, *That Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Meſſiah.*

2dly, *That he is not only the Meſſiah, but the Son of God.*

The *Unmasker* is every where ſteddily the ſame ſubtle Arguer. Whether he has prov'd, that the *Son of God*, in this Confeſſion of the *Eunuch*, ſignifies what he would have, we ſhall examine by and by. This at leaſt is Demonſtration, that this Paſſage of his overturns his Principles; and reduces his long Liſt of Fundamentals to two Propoſitions, the Belief whereof is ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian. *This noble Proſelyte*, ſays the *Unmasker*, *gives this Account of his Faith, in order to his being baptiz'd, in order to his being admitted a Member of Chriſt's Church.* And what is that Faith, according to the *Unmasker*? He tells you *there are* in it *theſe two diſtinct Propoſitions*, viz. I believe, *1ſt, That* Jeſus *is the* Chriſt, *the* Meſſiah: *2dly, That he is not only the* Meſſiah, *but the Son of God.* If this *famous Confeſſion*, containing but theſe two Articles, were enough to his being baptiz'd; if this Faith were ſufficient to make *this noble Proſelyte* a Chriſtian; what is become of all thoſe other Articles of the *Unmasker*'s Syſtem, without the Belief whereof, he in other Places tells us a Man cannot be a Chriſtian? If he had here told us, that *Philip had not Time nor Opportunity*, during his ſhort Stay with the Eunuch, to explain to him all the *Unmasker*'s Syſtem, and make him underſtand all his Fundamentals; he had had Reaſon on his Side: And he might have urg'd it as a Reaſon why *Philip* taught him no more. But nevertheleſs he had, by allowing the *Eunuch*'s *Confeſſion of Faith* ſufficient for his Admittance *as a Member of Chriſt's Church*, given up his other Fundamentals as neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian; even that of the *Holy Trinity:* And he has at laſt reduc'd his neceſſary Articles to theſe two, *viz.* That *Jeſus is the Meſſiah*; and that *Jeſus is the Son of God.* So that after his ridiculous calling mine a *lank Faith*, I deſire him to conſider what he will now call his own. Mine is next to *none*, becauſe, as he ſays, it is but *one* Article. If that Reaſoning be good, his is not far from *none:* It conſiſts but in two Articles, which is next to *one*, and very little more remote from *none* than *one* is. If any one had but as much Wit as the *Unmasker*, and could be but as ſmart upon the Number *Two*, as he has been upon an *Unit*, here were a brave Opportunity for him to lay out his Parts; and he might make vehement Complaints againſt one, that has thus *crap'd our Faith, corrupted Mens Minds, depray'd the Goſpel, and abus'd Chriſtianity.* But if it ſhould fall out, as I think it will, that the *Unmasker*'s two Articles ſhould prove to be but one; he has ſaved another that Labour, and he ſtands painted to himſelf with his own Charcoal.

The *Unmasker* would have the *Son of God*, in the Confeſſion of the Eunuch, to ſignify ſomething different from the *Meſſiah*: And his Reaſon is, becauſe elſe it would be an *abſurd Tautology. Anſw.* There are many Exegetical Expreſſions put together in the Scripture, which tho' they ſignify the ſame thing,

yet

yet are not *abſurd Tautologies*. The *Unmasker* here inverts the Propoſition, and would have it to ſignify thus, *The Son of God is Jeſus the Meſſiah*; which is a Propoſition ſo different from what the Apoſtles propos'd every where elſe, that he ought to have given a Reaſon why, when every where elſe they made the Propoſition to be of ſomething affirm'd of *Jeſus* of *Nazareth*, the Eunuch ſhould make the Affirmation to be of ſomething concerning the Son of God: As if the Eunuch knew very well what the *Son of God* ſignify'd, *viz.* as the *Unmasker* tells us here, that it included or ſignify'd *God*; and that *Philip* (who we read at *Samaria* preach'd ὁν Χριστὸν, the *Meſſiah*, i. e. inſtructed them who the *Meſſiah* was) had here taken Pains only to inſtruct him, that this God was *Jeſus* the *Meſſiah*, and to bring him to aſſent to that Propoſition. Whether this be natural to conceive, I leave to the Reader.

The *Tautology*, on which the *Unmasker* builds his whole Objection, will be quite remov'd, if we take *Chriſt* here for a proper Name, in which Way it is us'd by the Evangeliſts and Apoſtles in other Places, and particularly by St. *Luke*; as *Acts* ii. 38. iii. 6, 20. iv. 10. xxiv. 24, *&c.* In two of theſe Places it cannot with any good Senſe be taken otherwiſe; for if it be not in *Acts* iii. 6. and iv. 10. us'd as a proper Name, we muſt read thoſe Places thus, *Jeſus the Meſſiah of Nazareth*. And I think it is plain in thoſe others cited, as well as in ſeveral other Places of the New Teſtament, that the Word *Chriſt* is us'd as a proper Name. We may eaſily conceive, that long before the *Acts* were writ, the Name of *Chriſt* was grown by a familiar Uſe to denote the Perſon of our Saviour, as much as *Jeſus*. This is ſo manifeſt, that it gave a Name to his Followers; who, as St. *Luke* tells us, xi. 26. were call'd *Chriſtians*; and that, if Chronologiſts miſtake not, twenty Years before St. *Luke* writ his Hiſtory of the Apoſtles: And this ſo generally, that *Agrippa* a *Jew* uſes it, *Acts* xxvi. 28. And that *Chriſt*, as the proper Name of our Saviour, was got as far as *Rome*, before St. *Luke* writ the *Acts*, appears out of *Suetonius*, l. 5. And by that Name he is call'd in *Tacitus*, Ann. l. 15. 'Tis no wonder then that St. *Luke*, in writing this Hiſtory, ſhould ſometimes ſet it down alone, ſometimes join'd with that of Jeſus, as a proper Name; which is much eaſier to conceive he did here, than that *Philip* propos'd more to the Eunuch to be believ'd to make him a Chriſtian, than what in other Places was propos'd for the Converſion of others, or than what he himſelf propos'd at *Samaria*.

His 7th Chapter is to prove, that I am a *Socinian*, becauſe I omitted Chriſt's *Satisfaction*. That Matter having been anſwer'd, *p.* 594. where it came properly under Conſideration, I ſhall only obſerve here, that the great Streſs of his Argument lies as it did before; not upon my total Omiſſion of it out of my Book, but on this, that *I have no ſuch Thing in the Place where the Advantages of Chriſt's Coming are purpoſely treated of*; from whence he will have this to be an unavoidable Inference, *viz. That I was of Opinion, that Chriſt came not to ſatisfy for us*. The Reaſon of my Omiſſion of it in that Place, I told him, was becauſe my Book was chiefly deſign'd for *Deiſts*; and therefore I mention'd only thoſe Advantages, which all Chriſtians muſt agree in; and in omitting of that, complyd with the Apoſtle's Rule, *Rom.* xiv. To this he tells me flatly, that was not the *Deſign* of my Book. Whether the *Unmasker* knows with what Deſign I publiſh'd it better than I my ſelf, muſt be left to the Reader to judge: For as for his Veracity in what he knows, or knows not, he has given ſo many Inſtances of it, that I may ſafely refer that to any body. One Inſtance more of it may be found in this very Chapter, where he ſays, *I pretend indeed*, pag. 546. *that in another Place* of my *Book*, I mention *Chriſt*'s Reſtoring all Mankind from the State of Death, and reſtoring them to Life; and his laying down his Life for another, as our Saviour profeſſes he did. *Theſe few Words this* Vindicator *hath pick'd up in his Book ſince he wrote it. This is all, thro' his whole Treatiſe, that he hath drop'd concerning that Advantage of Chriſt's Incarnation*; i. e. Chriſt's Satisfaction. *Anſw.* But that this is not *all* that I drop'd thro' my whole Treatiſe concerning that Advantage, may appear by thoſe Places above-mention'd, *p.* 597. where I ſay, that the Deſign of Chriſt's Coming was to be *offer'd up*; and ſpeak of the Work of *Redemption*; which are Expreſſions taken to imply our Saviour's Satisfaction. But the *Unmasker* thinking I ſhould have quoted them, if there had been any more, beſides thoſe mention'd in my *Vindication*, upon

upon that Preſumption ſticks not boldly to affirm, that there were no more; and ſo goes on with the Veracity of an *Unmasker*. If affirming would do it, nothing could be wanting in his Cauſe that might be for his Purpoſe. Whether he be as good at proving, this Conſequence (amongſt other Propoſitions which remain upon him to be prov'd) will try, *viz.*

L. *That if the Satisfaction of Chriſt be not mention'd in the Place where the Advantages of Chriſt's coming are purpoſely treated of, then I am of Opinion, that Chriſt came not to ſatisfy for us:*

Which is all the Argument of this 7*th* Chapter.

His laſt Chapter, as his firſt, begins with a Commendation of himſelf; particularly, it boaſts his freedom from *Bigotiſm*, *Dogmatizing*, *Cenſoriouſneſs*, and *Uncharitableneſs*. I think he hath drawn himſelf ſo well with his own Pen, that I ſhall need refer the Reader only to what he himſelf has writ in this Controverſy, for his Character.

In the next Paragraph, *p.* 104. he tells me, *I laugh at Orthodoxy.* Anſw. There is nothing that I think deſerves a more ſerious Eſteem than right Opinion (as the Word ſignifies) if taken up with the Senſe and Love of Truth. But this Way of becoming Orthodox, has always Modeſty accompanying it, and a fair Acknowledgment of Fallibility in our ſelves, as well as a Suppoſition of Error in others. On the other ſide, there is nothing more ridiculous than for any Man or Company of Men to aſſume the Title of Orthodoxy to their own Set of Opinions, as if Infallibility were annex'd to their Syſtems, and thoſe were to be the ſtanding Meaſure of Truth to all the World; from whence they erect to themſelves a Power to cenſure and condemn others for differing at all from the Tenets they have pitch'd upon. The Conſideration of human Frailty ought to check this Vanity: But ſince it does not, but that with a ſort of Allowance it ſhews it ſelf in almoſt all Religious Societies, the playing the Trick round ſufficiently turns it into Ridicule. For each Society having an equal Right to a good Opinion of themſelves, a Man by paſſing but a River or a Hill, loſes that Orthodoxy in one Company, which puffed him up with ſuch Aſſurance and Inſolence in another; and is there, with equal Juſtice, himſelf expos'd to the like Cenſures of Error and Hereſy, which he was ſo forward to lay on others at home. When it ſhall appear that Infallibility is entail'd upon one Set of Men of any Denomination, or Truth confin'd to any Spot of Ground, the Name and Uſe of Orthodoxy, as now it is in faſhion every where, will in that one Place be reaſonable. Till then, this ridiculous Cant will be a Foundation too Weak to ſuſtain that Uſurpation that is rais'd upon it. 'Tis not that I do not think every one ſhould be perſuaded of the Truth of thoſe Opinions he profeſſes. 'Tis that I contend for; and 'tis that which I fear the great Sticklers for Orthodoxy often fail in. For we ſee generally that Numbers of them exactly jump in a whole large Collection of Doctrines, conſiſting of abundance of Particulars; as if their Notions were by one common Stamp printed on their Minds, even to the leaſt Lineament. This is very hard, if not impoſſible, to be conceiv'd of thoſe who take up their Opinions only from Conviction. But how fully ſoever I am perſuaded of the Truth of what I hold, I am in common Juſtice to allow the ſame Sincerity to him that differs from me; and ſo we are upon equal Terms. This Perſuaſion of Truth on each ſide, inveſts neither of us with a Right to cenſure or condemn the other. I have no more reaſon to treat him ill for differing from me, than he has to treat me ill for the ſame Cauſe. Pity him, I may; inform him fairly, I ought: but contemn, malign, revile, or any otherwiſe prejudice him for not thinking juſt as I do, that I ought not. My Orthodoxy gives me no more Authority over him, than his (for every one is Orthodox to himſelf) gives him over me. When the Word Orthodoxy (which in effect ſignifies no more but the Opinions of my Party) is made uſe of as a Pretence to domineer (as ordinarily it is) it is, and always will be ridiculous.

He ſays, *I hate even with a deadly Hatred all Catechiſms and Confeſſions, all Syſtems and Models.* I do not remember, that I have once mention'd the Word *Catechiſm*, either in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, or *Vindication*: but he knows

knows *I hate them deadly*, and I know I do not. And as for *Syſtems* and *Models*, all that I ſay of them, in the Pages he quotes to prove my Hatred of them, is only this, *viz.* in my *Vindication*, p. 546. "Some Men had rather you "ſhould write Booty, and croſs your own Deſign of removing Mens Prejudi- "ces to Chriſtianity, than leave out one Tittle of what they put into their "Syſtems.——— Some Men will not bear it, that any one ſhould ſpeak of Re- "ligion, but according to the Model that they themſelves have made of it." In neither of which Places do I ſpeak againſt *Syſtems* or *Models*, but the ill Uſe that ſome Men make of them.

He tells me alſo in the ſame Place, *p.* 104. that I *deride Myſteries*. But for this he hath quoted neither Words nor Place: And where he does not do that, I have Reaſon, from the frequent Liberties he takes to impute to me what no where appears in my Books, to deſire the Reader to take what he ſays not to be true. For did he mean fairly, he might, by quoting my Words, put all ſuch Matters of Fact out of Doubt; and not force me ſo often as he does to demand where it is: As I do now here again,

LI. *Where it is that I deride Myſteries?*

His next Words, *p.* 104. are very remarkable: They are, *O how he* [the Vindicator] *grins at the Spirit of Creed-making?* P. 548. Vind. *The very Thoughts of which do ſo haunt him, ſo plague and torment him, that he cannot reſt till it be conjured down. And here, by the way, ſeeing I have mention'd his Rancour againſt Syſtematick Books and Writings, I might repreſent the Miſery that is coming upon all Bookſellers, if this Gentleman and his Correſpondents go on ſucceſsfully. Here is an effectual Plot to undermine* Stationers-Hall; *for all Syſtems and Bodies of Divinity, Philoſophy, &c. muſt be caſhier'd: Whatſoever looks like Syſtem muſt not be bought or ſold. This will fall heavy on the Gentlemen of* St. Paul's Church-yard, *and other Places.* Here the politick *Unmasker* ſeems to threaten me with the Poſſe of *Paul's Church-yard*, becauſe my Book might leſſen their Gain in the Sale of Theological *Syſtems*. I remember that *Demetrius the Shrine-maker, which brought no ſmall Gain to the Craftſ-men whom he call'd together, with the Workmen of like Occupation, and ſaid to this Purpoſe; Sirs, Ye know, that by this Craft we have our Wealth: Moreover ye ſee, and hear, that this* Paul *hath perſuaded, and turn'd away much People, ſaying, that they be no Gods that are made with Hands; ſo that this our Craft is in danger to be ſet at nought. And when they heard theſe Sayings, they were full of Wrath, and cry'd out, ſaying, Great is* Diana *of the* Epheſians. Have you, Sir, who are ſo good at Speech-making, as a worthy Succeſſor of the Silver-Smith, regulating your Zeal for the Truth, and your writing Divinity by the Profit it will bring, made a Speech to this Purpoſe to the *Craftſmen*, and told them, that I ſay, Articles of Faith, and Creeds, and Syſtems in Religion cannot be made by Mens Hands or Fancies; but muſt be juſt ſuch, and no other than what God hath given us in the Scriptures? And are they ready to cry out to your Content, *Great is* Diana *of the* Epheſians? If you have well warm'd them with your Oratory, 'tis to be hop'd they will heartily join with you, and beſtir themſelves, and chuſe you for their Champion, to prevent the *Miſery*, you tell them, *is coming upon them*, in the Loſs of the Sale of *Syſtems and Bodies of Divinity*: For, as for *Philoſophy*, which you name too, I think you went a little too far; nothing of that kind, as I remember, hath been ſo much as mention'd. But however, ſome ſort of Orators, when their Hands are in, omit nothing true or falſe, that may move thoſe they would work upon. Is not this a worthy Employment, and becoming a Preacher of the Goſpel, to be a Sollicitor for *Stationers-Hall?* And make the Gain of the *Gentlemen of Paul's Church-yard* a Conſideration for or againſt any Book writ concerning Religion? This, if it were ever thought on before, no body but an *Unmasker*, who lays all open, was ever ſo fooliſh as to publiſh. But here you have an Account of his Zeal: The Views of Gain are to meaſure the Truths of Divinity. Had his Zeal, as he pretends in the next Paragraph, no other Aims, but the *Defence of the Goſpel*; 'tis probable this Controverſy would have been manag'd after another Faſhion.

Whether

Whether what he ſays in the next, *pag.* 105. to excuſe his ſo often pretending to *know my Heart and Thoughts*, will ſatisfy the Reader; I ſhall not trouble my ſelf. By his ſo often doing it again in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, I ſee he cannot write without it. And ſo I leave it to the Judgment of the Readers, whether he can be allow'd to know other Mens Thoughts, who in many Occaſions ſeems not well to know his own. The Railing in the Remainder of this Chapter I ſhall paſs by, as I have done a great deal of the ſame Strain in his Book: Only to ſhew how well he underſtands or repreſents my Senſe, I ſhall ſet down my Words, as they are in the Pages he quotes, and his Inferences from them.

Vindication, p. 549, 550.

I know not but it may be true, that the *Anti-Trinitarians* and *Racovians* underſtand thoſe Places as I do: But 'tis more than I know that they do ſo. I took not my Senſe of thoſe Texts from thoſe Writers, but from the Scripture it ſelf, giving Light to its own Meaning, by one Place compar'd with another. What in this Way appears to me its true Meaning, I ſhall not decline; becauſe I am told that it is ſo underſtood by the *Racovians*, whom I never yet read; nor embrace the contrary, tho' the Generality of Divines I more converſe with, ſhould declare for it. If the Senſe wherein I underſtand thoſe Texts be a Miſtake, I ſhall be beholden to you, if you will ſet me right. But they are not popular Authorities, or frightful Names whereby I judge of Truth or Falſhood.

Socinianiſm Unmask'd, p. 108.

The profeſs'd Divines of England, *you muſt know, are but a pitiful Sort of Folks with this great* Racovian *Rabbi. He tells us plainly, that he is not mindful of what the Generality of Divines declare for*, p. 549. *He labours ſo concernedly to ingratiate himſelf with the Mob, the Multitude (which he ſo often talks of) that he hath no Regard to theſe. The Generality of the Rabble are more conſiderable with him, than the Generality of Divines.*

He tells me here of the *Generality of Divines*. If he had ſaid of the Church of *England*, I could have underſtood him: But he ſays, *The profeſs'd Divines of* England; and there being ſeveral Sorts of Divines in *England*, who, I think, do not every where agree in their Interpretations of Scripture; which of them is it I muſt have Regard to, where they differ? If he cannot tell me that, he complains here of me for a Fault, which he himſelf knows not how to mend.

Vindication, p. 548, 549.

The Liſt of Materials for his Creed, for the Articles are not yet form'd; Mr. *Edwards* cloſes, p. 111. with theſe Words: *Theſe are the Matters of Faith contain'd in the Epiſtles; and they are Eſſential and Integral Parts of the Goſpel it ſelf.* What juſt theſe, neither more nor leſs? *l.* 4. If you are ſure of it, pray let us have them ſpeedily, for the Reconciling of Differences in the Chriſtian Church, which has been ſo cruelly torn about the Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, to the great Reproach of Chriſtian Charity, and Scandal of our true Religion.

Socinianiſm Unmask'd, p. 109.

This Author, as demure and grave as he would ſometimes ſeem to be, can ſcoff at the Matters of Faith contain'd in the Apoſtles Epiſtles, p. 548.

Does the Vindicator here *ſcoff at the Matters of Faith contain'd in the Epiſtles?* or ſhew the vain Pretences of the *Unmasker*; who undertakes to give us out of the Epiſtles a Collection of Fundamentals, without being able to ſay whether thoſe he ſets down be all or no?

Vindication, p. 552.

I hope you do not think, how contemptibly ſoever you ſpeak of the *Venerable Mob*, as you are pleas'd to dignify them, *pag.* 117. that the Bulk of Mankind, or in your Phraſe the *Rabble*, are not concern'd in Religion, or ought not

Socinianiſm Unmask'd, p. 110.

To coaks the Mob, *he profanely brings in that Place of Scripture*; Have any of the Rulers believ'd in him?

not to underſtand it in order to their Salvation. I remember the *Phariſees* treated the Common People with Contempt; and ſaid, *Have any of the Rulers or of the* Phariſees *believed in him? But this People, who knoweth not the Law, are curſed.* But yet theſe, who in the Cenſure of the *Phariſees* were curſed, were ſome of the *Poor*, or, if you pleaſe to have it ſo, the *Mob*, to whom the Goſpel was preached by our Saviour, as he tells *John*'s *Diſciples*, Mat. xi. 5.

Where the *Profaneneſs* of this is, I do not ſee; unleſs ſome unknown Sacredneſs of the *Unmasker*'s Perſon make it *Profaneneſs* to ſhew, that he, like the *Phariſees* of old, has a great Contempt for the Common People, *i. e.* the far greater Part of Mankind; as if they and their Salvation were below the Regard of this elevated Rabbi. But this of *Profaneneſs* may be well born from him, ſince in the next Words my mentioning another Part of his Carriage is no leſs than *Irreligion.*

Vindication, p. 550.

He prefers what I ſay to him my ſelf, to what is offered to him from the Word of God, and makes me this Compliment, that I begin to mend about the Cloſe, *i. e.* when I leave off quoting of Scripture, and the dull Work was done of *going through the Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts and the Acts*, which he computes, *p.* 105. to take up three Quarters of my Book.

Socinianiſm Unmask'd, *p.* 110.

Ridiculouſly and irreligiouſly he pretends, that I prefer what he ſaith to me, to what is offer'd to me from the Word of God, *p.* 550.

The Matter of Fact is as I relate it, and ſo is beyond *Pretence*; and for this I refer the Reader to the 105th and 114th Pages of his *Thoughts concerning the Cauſes of Atheiſm.* But had I miſtaken, I know not how he could have call'd it *Irreligiouſly.* Make the worſt of it that can be, how comes it to be *Irreligious?* What is there Divine in an *Unmasker*; that one cannot pretend (true or falſe) that he prefers what I ſay, to what is offer'd him from the Word of God, without doing it *Irreligiouſly?* Does the very aſſuming the Power to define Articles, and determine who are, and who are not Chriſtians, by a Creed not yet made, erect an *Unmasker* preſently into God's Throne, and beſtow on him the Title of *Dominus Deuſque noſter*, whereby Offences againſt him come to be irreligious Acts? I have miſrepreſented his Meaning; let it be ſo: Where is the *Irreligion* of it? Thus it is: The Power of making a Religion for others (and thoſe that make Creeds do that) being once got into any one's Fancy, muſt at laſt make all Oppoſitions to thoſe Creeds and Creed-makers, Irreligion. Thus we ſee in Proceſs of Time it did in the Church of *Rome*: But it was in Length of Time, and by gentle Degrees. The *Unmasker*, it ſeems, cannot ſtay, is in haſte, and at one Jump leaps into the Chair. He has given us yet but a Piece of his Creed, and yet that is enough to ſet him above the State of human Miſtakes or Frailties; and to mention any ſuch Thing in him, is to do *Irreligiouſly.*

We may further ſee, ſays the *Unmasker*, p. 110. *how counterfeit the Vindicator's Gravity is, whilſt he condemns frothy and light Diſcourſes*, p. 550. Vindic. And *yet in many Pages together moſt irreverently treats a great Part of the Apoſtolical Writings, and throws aſide the main Articles of Religion as unneceſſary. Anſw.* In my *Vindic.* p. 549. you may remember theſe Words; "I require you to publiſh "to the World thoſe Paſſages which ſhew my Contempt of the Epiſtles." Why do you not (eſpecially having been ſo call'd upon to do it) ſet down thoſe Words, wherein *I moſt irreverently treat a great Part of the Apoſtolical Writings?* At leaſt, why do you not quote thoſe *many Pages* wherein I do it? This looks a little ſuſpiciouſly, that you cannot: And the more, becauſe you have in this very Page not been ſparing to quote Places which you thought to your Purpoſe. I muſt take Leave therefore (if it may be done without Irreligion) to aſſure the Reader, that this is another of your many Miſtakes in Matters of Fact, for which you have not ſo much as the Excuſe of Inadvertency: For, as he ſees, you have been minded of it before. But an *Unmasker*, ſay what you will to him, will be an *Unmasker* ſtill.

He

He cloſes what he has to ſay to me, in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, as if he were in the Pulpit, with an Uſe of Exhortation. The falſe Inſinuations it is fill'd with, make the Concluſion of a piece with the *Introduction*. As he ſets out, ſo he ends, and therein ſhews wherein he places his Strength. A Cuſtom of making bold with Truth, is ſo ſeldom curable in a grown Man, and the *Unmasker* ſhews ſo little Senſe of Shame, where it is charg'd upon him, beyond a Poſſibility of clearing himſelf; that no body is to trouble themſelves any farther about that Part of his eſtabliſh'd Character. Letting therefore that alone to Nature and Cuſtom, two ſure Guides, I ſhall only entreat him, to prevent his taking Railing for Argument (which I fear he too often does) that upon his Entrance every where upon any new Argument, he would ſet it down in Syllogiſm; and when he has done that (that I may know what is to be anſwer'd) let him then give vent as he pleaſes, to his noble Vein of Wit and Oratory.

The lifting a Man's ſelf up in his own Opinion, has had the Credit in former Ages to be thought the loweſt Degradation that human Nature could well ſink it ſelf to. Hence ſays the Wiſe Man, *Prov.* xxvi. 6. *Anſwer a Fool according to his Folly, leſt he be wiſe in his own Conceit:* Hereby ſhewing, that Self-conceitedneſs is a Degree beneath ordinary Folly. And therefore he there provides a Fence againſt it, to keep even Fools from ſinking yet lower, by falling into it. Whether what was not ſo in *Solomon*'s Days, be now, by Length of Time, in ours, grown into a Mark of Wiſdom and Parts, and an Evidence of great Performances; I ſhall not enquire. Mr. *Edwards*, who goes beyond all that ever I yet met with, in the Commendation of his own, beſt knows why he ſo extols what he has done in this Controverſy. For fear the Praiſes he has not been ſparing of in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, ſhould not ſufficiently trumpet out his Worth, or might be forgotten; he, in a new Piece, entitled, *The Socinian Creed*, proclaims again his mighty Deeds, and the Victory he has eſtabliſh'd to himſelf by them, in theſe Words: *But he and his Friends (the One-Article-Men) ſeem to have made Satisfaction by their profound Silence lately, whereby they acknowledge to the World, that they have nothing to ſay in Reply to what I laid to their Charge, and fully prov'd againſt them*, &c. *Socinian Creed*, p. 128. This freſh Teſtimony of no ordinary Conceit, which Mr. *Edwards* hath of the Excellency and Strength of his Reaſoning in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, I leave with him and his Friends to be conſider'd of at their Leiſure: And if they think I have miſapply'd the Term of Conceitedneſs, to ſo wiſe, underſtanding, and every way accompliſh'd a Diſputant (if we may believe him) I will teach them a Way how he, or any body elſe, may fully convince me of it. There remains on his Score, mark'd in this Reply of mine, ſeveral Propoſitions to be prov'd by him. If he can but find Arguments to prove them that will bear the ſetting down in Form, and will ſo publiſh them, I will allow my ſelf to be miſtaken. Nay, which is more, if he or any body in the 112 Pages of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, can find but ten Arguments that will bear the Teſt of Syllogiſm, the true Touch-ſtone of right arguing; I will grant that that Treatiſe deſerves all thoſe Commendations he has beſtow'd upon it, tho' it be made up more of his own Penegyrick, than a Confutation of me.

In his *Socinian Creed* (for a *Creed-maker* he will be; and whether he has been as lucky for the *Socinians* as for the *Orthodox*, I know not) *p.* 120. he begins with me, and that with the ſame conquering Hand and Skill which can never fail of Victory; if a Man has but Wit enough to know what Propoſition he is able to confute, and then make that his Adverſary's Tenet. But the Repetitions of his old Song concerning *one Article, the Epiſtles*, &c. which occur here again, I ſhall only ſet down; that none of theſe excellent Things may be loſt, whereby this acute and unanſwerable Writer has ſo well deſerv'd his own Commendations: *viz.* That I ſay *there is but one ſingle Article of the Chriſtian Truth neceſſary to be believ'd and aſſented to by us*, p. 121. That I *ſlight the Chriſtian Principles, curtail the Articles of our Faith, and raviſh Chriſtianity it ſelf from him*, p. 123. And that I *turn the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles into waſte Paper*, p. 127, &c.

Theſe, and the like Slanders, I have already given an Anſwer to in my Reply to his former Book. Only one new one here I cannot paſs over in Silence; becauſe

becauſe of the remarkable Profaneneſs which ſeems to me to be in it; which, I think, deſerves publick Notice. In my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, I have laid together thoſe Paſſages of our Saviour's Life, which ſeem'd to me moſt eminently to ſhew his Wiſdom, in that Conduct of himſelf, with that Reſerve and Caution which was neceſſary to preſerve him, and carry him through the appointed Time of his Miniſtry. Some have thought I had herein done conſiderable Service to the Chriſtian Religion, by removing thoſe Objections which ſome were apt to make from our Saviour's Carriage, not rightly underſtood. This *Creed-maker* tells me, *p.* 127. *That I make our Saviour a Coward:* A Word not to be applied to the Saviour of the World by a pious and diſcreet Chriſtian upon any Pretence, without great Neceſſity and ſure Grounds. If he had ſet down my Words, and quoted the Page (which was the leaſt could have been done to excuſe ſuch a Phraſe) we ſhould then have ſeen which of us two, this impious and irreligious Epithet given to the Holy *Jeſus*, has for its Author. I the mean time, I leave it with him, to be accounted for by his Piety, to thoſe, who by his Example ſhall be encourag'd to entertain ſo vile a Thought, or uſe ſo profane an Expreſſion of the *Captain of our Salvation*, who freely gave himſelf up to Death for us.

He alſo ſays in the ſame, *p.* 127. *That I every where ſtrike at Syſtems, the Deſign of which is to eſtabliſh one of my own, or to foſter Scepticiſm, by beating down all others.*

For clear Reaſon or good Senſe, I do not think our *Creed-maker* ever had his Fellow. In the immediate preceding Words of the ſame Sentence, he charges me with *a great Antipathy againſt Syſtems*; and before he comes to the End of it, finds out my *Deſign* to be the *eſtabliſhing one of my own.* So that this, *my Antipathy againſt Syſtems*, makes me in love with one. My *Deſign*, he ſays, *is to eſtabliſh a Syſtem of my own, or to foſter Scepticiſm in beating down all others.* Let my Book, if he pleaſes, be my Syſtem of Chriſtianity. Now is it in me any more *foſtering Scepticiſm*, to ſay my Syſtem is true, and others not, than it is in the *Creed-maker* to ſay ſo of all other Syſtems but his own? For, I hope, he does not allow any Syſtem of Chriſtianity to be true, that differs from his, any more than I do.

But I have ſpoke againſt all Syſtems. *Anſw.* And always ſhall, ſo far as they are ſet up by particular Men or Parties, as the juſt Meaſure of every Man's Faith; wherein every Thing that is contain'd, is required and impoſed to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian: Such an Opinion and Uſe of Syſtems I will always be againſt, till the *Creed-maker* ſhall tell me, amongſt the Variety of them, which alone is to be received and reſted in, in the Abſence of his Creed; which is not yet finiſhed, and, I fear, will not as long I live. That every Man ſhould receive from others, or make to himſelf ſuch a Syſtem of Chriſtianity as he found moſt conformable to the Word of God, according to the beſt of his Underſtanding, is what I never ſpoke againſt, but think it every one's Duty to labour for, and to take all Opportunities as long as he lives, by ſtudying the Scriptures every Day, to perfect.

But this, I fear, will not go eaſily down with our Author; for then he cannot be a *Creed-maker* for others: A Thing he ſhews himſelf very forward to; how able to perform it, we ſhall ſee when his Creed is made. In the mean time, talking loudly and at random about Fundamentals, without knowing what is ſo, may ſtand him in ſome ſtead.

This being all that is new, which I think my ſelf concern'd in, in this *Socinian Creed*, I paſs on to his *Poſtſcript*. In the firſt Page whereof, I find theſe Words: *I found that the Manager of the* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity *had prevail'd with a Gentleman to make a Sermon upon my Refutation of that Treatiſe, and the Vindication of it.* Such a Piece of Impertinency as this might have been born from a fair Adverſary: But the Sample Mr. *Edwards* has given of himſelf in his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, perſuades me this ought to be bound up with what he ſays of me in his Introduction of that Book, in theſe Words: *Among others, they thought and made choice of a Gentleman, who they knew would be extraordinary uſeful to them. And he, it is probable, was as forward to be made uſe of by them, and preſently accepted of the Office that was aſſign'd him:* And more there to the ſame purpoſe. All which, I know to be utterly falſe.

'Tis

'Tis pity that one who relies ſo intirely upon it, ſhould have no better an Invention. The *Socinians* ſet the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. on work to write that Book; by which Diſcovery the World being (as Mr. *Edwards* ſays) *let into the Project*, that Book is confounded, *baffled*, blown off, and by this skilful Artifice there is an End of it. Mr. *Bold* preaches and publiſhes a Sermon without this irrefragable Gentleman's good Leave and Liking: What now muſt be done to diſcredit it, and keep it from being read? Why, Mr. *Bold* too, was ſet on work by *the Manager of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. In your whole Store-houſe of Stratagems, you that are ſo great a Conqueror, have you but this one Way to deſtroy a Book which you ſet your Mightineſs againſt, but to tell the World it was a Job of Journey-work for ſome body you do not like? Some other would have done better in this new Caſe, had your happy Invention been ready with it: For you are not ſo baſhful or reſerv'd, but that you may be allow'd to be as great a Wit as he who profeſs'd himſelf ready at any Time, to ſay a good or a new Thing, if he could but think of it. But in good earneſt, Sir, if one ſhould ask you, Do you think no Books contain Truths in them which were undertaken by the *Procuration* of a Bookſeller? I deſire you to be a little tender in the Point, not knowing how far it may reach. Ay, but ſuch Bookſellers live not at the *Lower End of Pater-Noſter-Row*, but in *Paul's Church-Yard*, and are the Managers of other-gueſs Books, than *The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*. And therefore you very rightly ſubjoin, *Indeed it was a great Maſter-piece of Procuration, and we can't but think that Man muſt ſpeak Truth, and defend it very impartially and ſubſtantially, who is thus brought on to undertake the Cauſe.* And ſo Mr. *Bold's* Sermon is found to have neither Truth nor Senſe in it, becauſe it was printed by a Bookſeller at the lower End of *Pater-Noſter-Row*; for that I dare ſay, is all you know of the Matter. But that is Hint enough for a happy Diviner to be ſure of the reſt, and with Confidence to report that for certain Matter of Fact, which had never any being but in the fore-caſting Side of his Politick Brain.

But whatever were the Reaſons that mov'd Mr. *B*—— to preach that Sermon, of which I know nothing; this I am ſure, it ſhews only the Weakneſs and Malice (I will not ſay, and ill Breeding, for that concerns not one of Mr. *Edwards's* Pitch) of any one who except againſt it, to take notice of any Thing more than what the Author has publiſh'd. Therein alone conſiſts the Error, if there be any; and that alone thoſe meddle with, who write for the ſake of Truth. But poor Cavillers have other Purpoſes, and therefore muſt uſe other Shifts, and make a Buſtle about ſomething beſides the Argument, to prejudice and beguile unwary Readers.

The only Exception the *Creed-maker* makes to Mr. *Bold's* Sermon, is the Contradiction he imputes to him, in ſaying; "That there is but one Point or Article "neceſſary to be believ'd for the making a Man Chriſtian: And that there are "many Points *beſides this*, which Jeſus Chriſt hath taught and reveal'd, which "every ſincere Chriſtian is indiſpenſibly oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand:" And, "That there are particular Points and Articles, which being known to "be reveal'd by Chriſt, Chriſtians muſt indiſpenſibly aſſent to." And where now is there any thing like a Contradiction in this? Let it be granted, for Example, that the *Creed-maker's* Set of Articles (let their Number be what they will, when he has found them all out) are neceſſary to be believed, for the making a Man a Chriſtian. Is there any Contradiction in it to ſay, There are many Points beſides theſe, which Jeſus Chriſt hath taught and reveal'd, which every ſincere Chriſtian is indiſpenſibly obliged to endeavour to underſtand? If this be not ſo, it is but for any one to be perfect in Mr. *Edwards's* Creed, and then he may lay by the Bible, and from thence-forth he is abſolutely diſpenſed with, from ſtudying or underſtanding any thing more of the Scripture.

But Mr. *Edwards's* Supremacy is not yet ſo far eſtabliſh'd, that he will dare to ſay, that Chriſtians are not oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand any other Points reveal'd in the Scripture, but what are contain'd in his Creed. He cannot yet well diſcard all the reſt of the Scripture, becauſe he has yet need of it for the compleating of his Creed, which is like to ſecure the Bible to us for ſome Time yet. For I will be anſwerable for it, he will not be quickly able to reſolve what Texts of the Scripture do, and what do not contain Points neceſſary

to

to be believ'd. So that I am apt to imagine, that the *Creed-maker*, upon ſecond Thoughts, will allow that ſaying, There is but One, or there are but Twelve, or there are but as many as he ſhall ſet down (when he has reſolv'd which they ſhall be) neceſſary to the making a Man a Chriſtian; and the ſaying, there are other Points beſides contain'd in the Scripture, which every ſincere Chriſtian is indiſpenſibly oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand, and muſt believe when he knows them to be reveal'd by Jeſus Chriſt, are two Propoſitions that may conſiſt together with a Contradiction.

Every Chriſtian is to partake of that Bread and that Cup, which is the Communion of the Body and Blood of Chriſt. And is not every ſincere Chriſtian indiſpenſibly oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand theſe Words of our Saviour's Inſtitution, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood?* And if upon his ſerious Endeavour to do it, he underſtands them in a literal Senſe, that Chriſt meant that that was really his Body and Blood, and nothing elſe; muſt he not neceſſarily believe, that the Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper, is chang'd really into his Body and Blood, tho' he doth not know how? Or, if having his Mind ſet otherwiſe, he underſtands the Bread and Wine to be really the Body and Blood of Chriſt, without ceaſing to be true Bread and Wine: Or, elſe, If he underſtands them, that the Body and Blood of Chriſt are verily and indeed given and receiv'd in the Sacrament, in a Spiritual manner: Or, laſtly, If he underſtands our Saviour to mean by thoſe Words, only the Bread and Wine to be a Repreſentation of his Body and Blood; in which Way ſoever of theſe Four, a Chriſtian underſtands theſe Words of our Saviour to be meant by him, is he not oblig'd in that Senſe to believe them to be true, and aſſent to them? Or can he be a Chriſtian, and underſtand theſe Words to be meant by our Saviour, in one Senſe, and deny his Aſſent to them as true, in that Senſe? Would not this be to deny our Saviour's Veracity, and conſequently his being the *Meſſiah* ſent from God? And yet this is put upon a Chriſtian, where he underſtands the Scripture in one Senſe, and is requir'd to believe it in another. From all which 'tis evident, that to ſay there is One, or any Number of Articles neceſſary to be known and believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, and that there are others contain'd in the Scripture, which a Man is oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand, and oblig'd alſo to aſſent to as he does underſtand them, is no Contradiction.

To believe Jeſus to be the Meſſiah, and to take him to be his Lord and King, let us ſuppoſe to be that only which is neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian: May it not yet be neceſſary for him, being a Chriſtian, to ſtudy the Doctrine and Law of this his Lord and King, and believe that all that he deliver'd is true? Is there any Contradiction in holding of this? But this *Creed-maker*, to make ſure Work, and not to fail of a Contradiction in Mr. *Bold*'s Words, miſ-repeats them, *p.* 241. and quite contrary both to what they are in the Sermon, and what they are as ſet down by the *Creed-maker* himſelf, in the immediately preceding Page. Mr. *Bold* ſays, "There are other Points that Je-"ſus Chriſt hath taught and reveal'd, which every ſincere Chriſtian is indiſ-"penſibly oblig'd to underſtand; and which being known to be revail'd by "Chriſt, he muſt indiſpenſibly aſſent to." From which the *Creed-maker* argues thus, p. 240. *Now if there be other Points and particular Articles, and thoſe many, which a ſincere Chriſtian is oblig'd, and that neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly to underſtand, believe, and aſſent to; then this Writer hath in effect yielded to that Propoſition I maintain'd,* viz. *That the Belief of one Article is not ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian, and conſequently he runs counter to the Propoſition he had laid down.*

Is there no Difference, I beſeech you, between being *indiſpenſibly oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand*, *and being indiſpenſibly oblig'd to underſtand any Point?* 'Tis the firſt of theſe Mr. *Bold* ſays, and 'tis the latter of theſe you argue from, and ſo conclude nothing againſt him; nor can you to your Purpoſe. For till Mr. *Bold* ſays (which he is far from ſaying) that every ſincere Chriſtian is neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly oblig'd to underſtand all thoſe Texts of Scripture, from whence you ſhould have drawn your neceſſary Articles (when you have perfected your Creed) in the ſame Senſe that you do; you can conclude nothing againſt what he hath ſaid concerning that one Article, or any thing that looks like *running counter* to it. For it may be enough to conſtitute a Man a Chriſtian, and one of Chriſt's Subjects, to take Jeſus to be the Meſſiah,

Meſſiah, his appointed King, and yet without a Contradiction; ſo that it may be his indiſpenſible Duty, as a Subject of that Kingdom, to endeavour to underſtand all the Dictates of his Sovereign, and to aſſent to the Truth of them, as far as he underſtands them.

But that which the good *Creed-maker* aims at, without which, all his neceſſary Articles fall, is that it ſhould be granted him, that every ſincere Chriſtian was *neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly oblig'd* to underſtand all thoſe Parts of Divine Revelation, from whence he pretends to draw his Articles in their true Meaning, *i. e.* juſt as he does. But his Infallibility is not yet ſo eſtabliſh'd, but that there will need ſome Proof of that Propoſition. And when he has prov'd that every ſincere Chriſtian is *neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly* oblig'd to underſtand thoſe Texts in their true Meaning; and that his Interpretation of them is that true Meaning: I ſhall then ask him, Whether *every ſincere Chriſtian is not as neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly oblig'd* to underſtand other Texts of Scripture in their true Meaning, tho' they have no Place in his Syſtem?

For Example, To make Uſe of the Inſtance above-mention'd, is not every ſincere Chriſtian *neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly* oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand theſe Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood*, that he may know what he receives in the Sacrament? Does he ceaſe to be a Chriſtian, who happens not to underſtand them juſt as the *Creed-maker* does? Or may not the old Gentleman at *Rome* (who has ſomewhat the antienter Title to Infallibility) make Tranſubſtantiation a Fundamental Article neceſſary to be believ'd there, as well as the *Creed-maker* here makes his Senſe of any diſputed Text of Scripture a Fundamental Article neceſſary to be believ'd?

Let us ſuppoſe Mr. *Bold* had ſaid that inſtead *of one Point*, the right Knowledge of the *Creed-maker's* one hundred Points (when he has reſolv'd on them) doth conſtitute and make a Perſon a Chriſtian; yet there are many other Points Jeſus Chriſt hath taught and reveal'd, which every ſincere Chriſtian is indiſpenſibly oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand, and to make a due Uſe of: For this I think the *Creed-maker* will not deny. From whence, in the *Creed-maker's* Words, I will thus argue: *Now if there be other Points and particular Articles; and thoſe many, which a ſincere Chriſtian is oblig'd, and that neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly, to underſtand and believe, and aſſent to; then this Writer doth in effect yield to that Propoſition which I maintain'd*, viz. *That the Belief of thoſe one hundred Articles is not ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian:* For this is that which I maintain; that upon this Ground, the Belief of the Articles which he has ſet down in his Liſt, are not ſufficient to make a Man a Chriſtian; and that upon Mr. *Bold's* Reaſon, which the *Creed-maker* inſiſts on againſt one *Article*, *viz.* becauſe there are many other Points Jeſus Chriſt hath taught and reveal'd, which every ſincere Chriſtian is as neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly oblig'd to endeavour to underſtand and make a due Uſe of.

But this *Creed-maker* is cautious, beyond any of his Predeceſſors: He will not be ſo caught by his own Argument; and therefore is very ſhy to give you the preciſe Articles that every ſincere Chriſtian is neceſſarily and indiſpenſibly oblig'd to underſtand, and give his Aſſent to. Something he is ſure there is that he is indiſpenſibly oblig'd to underſtand and aſſent to, to make him a Chriſtian; but what that is, he cannot yet tell. So that whether he be a Chriſtian or no, he does not know; and what other People will think of him, from his treating of the ſerious Things of Chriſtianity, in ſo triſling and ſcandalous a Way, muſt be left to them.

In the next Paragraph, *p.* 242. the Creed-maker *tells us*, *Mr.* Bold *goes on to confute himſelf, in ſaying*, "A true Chriſtian muſt aſſent unto this, that Chriſt "Jeſus is God." But this is juſt ſuch another Confutation of himſelf as the before-mention'd, *i. e.* as much as a Falſhood ſubſtituted by another Man, can be a Confutation of a Man's ſelf, who has ſpoken Truth all of a-piece. For the *Creed-maker*, according to his ſure Way of *baffling* his Opponents, ſo as to leave them nothing to anſwer, hath here, as he did before, chang'd Mr. *Bold's* Words, which in the 35th Page, quoted by the *Creed-maker*, ſtand thus: "When a true Chriſtian underſtands that Chriſt Jeſus hath taught, that *He* "*is a God*, he muſt aſſent unto it:" Which is true and conformable to what he had ſaid before, That every ſincere Chriſtian muſt endeavour to underſtand

the

the Points taught and reveal'd by Jeſus Chriſt, which being known to be reveal'd by him, he muſt aſſent unto.

The like Piece of Honeſty the *Creed-maker* ſhews in the next Paragraph, *p.* 243. where he charges Mr. *Bold* with ſaying, *That a true Chriſtian is as much oblig'd to believe that the Holy Spirit is God, as to believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt*, p. 40. In which Place, Mr. *Bold*'s Words are; "When a true Chriſtian underſtands "that Chriſt Jeſus hath given this Account of the Holy Spirit, *viz.* that *He* "*is God*; he is as much oblig'd to believe it, as he is to believe that *Jeſus is* "*the Chriſt*:" Which is an unconteſtable Truth, but ſuch an one as the *Creed-maker* himſelf ſaw would do him no Service, and therefore he mangles it, and leaves out half to ſerve his Turn. But he that ſhould give a Teſtimony in the ſlight Affairs of Men, and their temporal Concerns, before a Court of Judicature, as the *Creed-maker* does here, and almoſt every where, in the great Affairs of Religion, and the everlaſting Concern of Souls, before all Mankind, would loſe his Ears for it. What therefore this worthy Gentleman alledges out of Mr. *Bold*, as a Contradiction to himſelf, being only the *Creed-maker*'s Contradiction to Truth and clear Matter of Fact, needs no other Anſwer.

The reſt of what he calls *Reflections on Mr.* Bold's *Sermon*, being nothing but either rude and miſ-becoming Language of him; or pitiful childiſh Application to him, to change his Perſuaſion at the *Creed-maker*'s Entreaty, and give up the Truth he hath own'd, in Courteſy to this doughty Combatant; ſhews the Ability of the Man. Leave off begging the Queſtion, and ſuperciliouſly preſuming that you are in the right; and inſtead of that, ſhew it by Argument: And I dare anſwer for Mr. *Bold*, you will have him, and I promiſe you with him one Convert more. But arguing is not, it ſeems, this notable Diſputant's Way. If boaſting of himſelf, and contemning others, falſe Quotations, and feign'd Matters of Fact, which the Reader neither can know, nor is the Queſtion concern'd in it if he did know, will not do; there is an End of him: He has ſhewn his Excellency in ſcurrilous Declamation; and there you have the whole of this unanſwerble Writer. And for this, I appeal to his own Writings in this Controverſy, if any judicious Reader can have the Patience to look them over.

In the Beginning of his *Reflections on Mr.* Bold's *Sermon*, he confidently tells the World, That *he had found that the Manager of the* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity *had prevail'd on Mr.* Bold *to preach a Sermon upon his* Reflections, *&c.* And adds, *And we cannot but think, that that Man muſt ſpeak the Truth, and defend it very impartially and ſubſtantially, who is thus brought on to undertake the Cauſe.* And at the latter end he addreſſes himſelf to Mr. *Bold*, as one that is *drawn off* to be an under Journeyman-Worker in *Socinianiſm*. In his gracious Allowance, *Mr.* Bold *is ſeemingly a Man of ſome Reliſh of Religion and Piety*, p. 244. He is forc'd alſo to own him to be a Man, of *Sobriety* and *Temper*, p. 245. A very good Riſe, to give him out to the World, in the very next Words, as a Man of a profligate Conſcience: For ſo he muſt be, who can be *drawn off* to preach or write for *Socinianiſm*, when he thinks it a moſt dangerous Error; who can *diſſemble with himſelf*, and *choak his inward Perſuaſions* (as the *Creed-maker* inſinuates that Mr. *Bold* does, in the ſame Addreſs to him, *p.* 248.) and write contrary to his Light. Had the *Creed-maker* had Reaſon to think in earneſt, that Mr. *Bold* was going off to *Socinianiſm*, he might have reaſon'd with him fairly, as with a Man running into dangerous Error: Or if he had certainly known that he was by any By-ends prevail'd on to undertake a Cauſe contrary to his Conſcience, he might have ſome Reaſon to tell the World, as he does, *p.* 239. *That we cannot think he ſhould ſpeak Truth, who is thus brought to undertake the Cauſe.* If he does not certainly know that Mr. *Bold was* THUS *brought to undertake the Cauſe*, he could not have ſhewn a more villainous and unchriſtian Mind, than in publiſhing ſuch a Character of a Miniſter of the Goſpel, and a worthy Man, upon no other Grounds, but becauſe it might be ſubſervient to his Ends. He is engag'd in a Controverſy, that by Argument he cannot maintain; nor knew any other Way from the Beginning to attack the Book he pretends to write againſt, but by crying out *Socinianiſm*; a Name he knows in great Diſgrace with all other Sects of Chriſtians, and therefore ſufficient to deter all thoſe who approve and condemn Books by Hear-ſay, without

examining their Truth themſelves, from peruſing a Treatiſe to which he could affix that Imputation. Mr. *Bold*'s Name (who is publickly known to be no *Socinian*) he foreſees will wipe off that falſe Imputation, with a great many of thoſe who are led by Names more than Things. This ſeems exceedingly to trouble him, and he labours Might and Main to get Mr. *Bold* to quit a Book as *Socinian*, which Mr. *Bold* knows is not *Socinian*, becauſe he has read and conſider'd it.

But tho' our *Creed-maker* be mightily concern'd that Mr. *B——d* ſhould not appear in the Defence of it: Yet this Concern cannot raiſe him one Jot above that Honeſty, Skill, and good Breeding, which appears towards others. He manages this Matter with Mr. *B——d*, as he has done the reſt of the Controverſy; juſt in the ſame Strain of Invention, Civility, Wit, and good Senſe. He tells him, beſides what I have above ſet down, *That he is drawn off to debaſe himſelf and the Poſt*, i. e. *the* Miniſtry, *he is in*, p. 245. *That he hath ſaid very ill Things to the leſſening and impairing, yea, to the defaming of that Knowledge and Belief of our Saviour, and of the Articles of Chriſtianity, which are neceſſarily requir'd of us*, p. 245. *That the Devout and Pious* (whereby he means himſelf, for *one* and *none* is his own beloved Wit and Argument) *obſerving that Mr. Bold is come to the Neceſſity of but* ONE *Article of Faith, they expect that he may in time hold that* NONE *is neceſſary*, pag. 248. *That if he writes again in* the ſame *Strain, he will write rather like a* Turkiſh *Spy, than a* Chriſtian *Preacher*; *That he is a Backſlider, and ſailing to* Racovia *with a Side-Wind*: Than which, what can there be more ſcurrilous, or more malicious? And yet at the ſame time that he outrages him thus, beyond not only what Chriſtian Charity, but common Civility would allow in an ingenuous Adverſary, he makes ſome aukard Attempts to ſooth him, with ſome ill-tim'd Commendations; and would have his under-valuing Mr. *Bold*'s *Animadverſions* paſs for a Compliment to him: becauſe he, for that reaſon, pretends not to believe *ſo crude and ſhallow a Thing* (as he is pleas'd to call it) to be his. A notable Contrivance to gain the greater Liberty of railing at him under another Name, when Mr. *B——d*'s, it ſeems, is too well known to ſerve him ſo well to that Purpoſe. Beſides, it is of good Uſe to fill up three or four Pages of his *Reflections*; a great Convenience to a Writer, who knows all the Ways of *baffling* his Opponents, but Argument, and who always makes a great deal of Stir about Matters foreign to his Subject; which, whether they are granted or deny'd, make nothing at all to the Truth of the Queſtion on either Side. For what is it to the *Shallowneſs* or Depth of the *Animadverſions*, who writ them? Or to the Truth or Falſhood of Mr. *B——d*'s Defence of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, whether a *Layman*, or a *Churchman*; a *Socinian*, or one of the *Church of England*, anſwer'd the *Creed-maker* as well as he? Yet this is argu'd as a Matter of great Weight: But yet in Reality it amounts to no more but this, that a Man of any Denomination, who wiſhes well to the Peace of Chriſtianity, and has obſerv'd the horrible Effects the Chriſtian Religion has felt from the Impoſitions of Men in Matters of Faith, may have Reaſon to defend a Book, wherein the Simplicity of the Goſpel, and the Doctrine propos'd by our Saviour and his Apoſtles, for the Converſion of Unbelievers, is made out, tho' there be not one Word of the diſtinguiſhing Tenets of his Sect in it. But that all thoſe, who under any Name are for impoſing their own Orthodoxy, as neceſſary to be believ'd, and perſecuting thoſe who diſſent from them, ſhould be all againſt it, is not perhaps very ſtrange.

One Thing more I muſt obſerve of the *Creed-maker* on this Occaſion: In his *Socinian Creed*, Chap. VI. the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. and his Book, muſt be judg'd of by the Characters and Writings of thoſe, who entertain or commend his Notions. *A profeſs'd Unitarian has defended it*; therefore he is a *Socinian*. The Author of *A Letter to the Deiſts* ſpeaks well of it; therefore he is a *Deiſt*. Another, as an Abettor of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, he mentions, *pag.* 125. whoſe Letters I have never ſeen: And his Opinions too are, I ſuppoſe, ſet down there as belonging to me. Whatever is bad in the Tenets or Writings of theſe Men, infects me. But the Miſchief is, Mr. *Bold*'s Orthodoxy will do me no good: But becauſe he has defended my Book againſt Mr. *Edwards*, all my Faults are become his, and he has a mighty

Load

Load of Accusations laid upon him. Thus contrary Causes serve to good a natured, so charitable, and candid a Writer as the *Creed-maker*, to the same Purpose of Censure and Railing. But I shall desire him to figure to himself the Loveliness of that Creature, which turns every thing into Venom. What others are, or hold, who have express'd favourable Thoughts of my Book, I think my self not concern'd in. What Opinions others have publish'd, make those in my Book neither true nor false; and he that for the sake of Truth would confute the Errors in it, should shew their Falshood and Weakness as they are there: But they who write for other Ends than Truth, are always busy with other Matters; and where they can do nothing by Reason and Argument, hope to prevail with some by borrow'd Prejudices and Party.

Taking therefore the *Animadversions*, as well as the *Sermon*, to be his whose Name they bear, I shall leave to Mr. *B—d* himself to take what Notice he thinks fit of the little Sense, as well as great Impudence of putting his Name in Print to what is not his, or taking it away from what he hath set it to, whether it belongs to his Bookseller or Answerer. Only I cannot pass by the palpable Falsifying of Mr. *B—d*'s Words, in the Beginning of his Epistle to the Reader, without mention. Mr. *B—d*'s Words are; "Whereby I came "to be furnish'd with a truer and more just Notion of the main Design of "that *TREATISE.*" And the good *Creed-maker* sets them down thus; *The main Design of MY OWN TREATISE OR SERMON*: A sure Way for such a Champion for Truth to secure to himself the Laurel or the Whetstone.

This irresistible Disputant (who silences all that come in his Way, so that those that would, cannot answer him) to make good the mighty Encomiums he has given himself, ought (one would think) to clear all as he goes, and leave nothing by the way unanswer'd, for fear he should fall into the Number of those poor *baffled* Wretches, whom he with so much Scorn reproaches, that they *would* answer *if they could.*

Mr. *B—d*, begins his *Animadversions* with this Remark, that our *Creed-maker* had said, That *I give it over and over again in these formal Words, viz. That nothing is requir'd to be believ'd by any Christian Man but this*, That Jesus is the Messiah. To which Mr. *B—d.* replies, *pag.* 4. in these Words; "Tho' I "have read over the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, &c. with some Attention, "I have not observ'd those formal Words in any Part of that Book, nor any "Words that are capable of that Construction; provided they be consider'd "with the Relation they have to, and the manifest Dependence they have on "what goes before, or follows after them."

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

Whether it was because *he would not*, or because *he could not*, let the Reader judge. But this is down upon his Score already, and it is expected he should answer to it, or else confess that he *cannot*. And that there may be a fair Decision of this Dispute, I expect the same Usage from him, that he should set down any Proposition of his, I have not answer'd to, and call on me for an Answer, if *I can*; and if *I cannot*, I promise him to own it in Print.

The *Creed-maker* had said, *That it is most evident to any thinking and considerate Person, that I purposely omit the Epistolary Writings of the Apostles, because they are fraught with other Fundamental Doctrines, besides that which I mention.*

To this Mr. *B—d* answers, *pag.* 5. That if by "*Fundamental Articles*, Mr. "*Edwards* means here, all the Propositions deliver'd in the Epistles, concern-"ing just those particular Heads he [Mr. *Edwards*] had there mention'd; it "lies upon him to prove, That Jesus Christ hath made it necessary, that every "Person must have an explicit Knowledge and Belief of all those, before he can "be a Christian."

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

And yet without an Answer to it, all his Talk about *Fundamentals*, and those which he pretended to set down in that Place, under the Name of *Fundamentals*, will signify nothing in the present Case; wherein, by *Fundamentals*, were meant such Propositions which every Person must necessarily have an explicit Knowledge and Belief of, before he can be a Christian.

Mr. *B—d*, in the ſame Place, *pag.* 6, 7. very truly and pertinently adds, "That it did not pertain to [my] Undertaking to enquire what Doctrines "either in the *Epiſtles*, or the *Evangeliſts* and the *Acts*, were of greateſt Mo- "ment to be underſtood by them who are Chriſtians; but what was neceſſary "to be known and believ'd to a Perſon's being a Chriſtian. For there are "many important Doctrines, both in the *Goſpels*, and in the *Acts*, beſides this, "*That Jeſus is the Meſſiah.* But how many ſoever the Doctrines be, which are "taught in the *Epiſtles*, if there be no Doctrine beſides this, *That Jeſus is the* "*Meſſiah*, taught there as neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; "all the Doctrines taught there will not make any thing againſt what this Au- "thor has aſſerted, nor againſt the Method he hath obſerv'd: Eſpecially, con- "ſidering we have an Account, in the *Acts of the Apoſtles*, of what thoſe Per- "ſons, by whom the Epiſtles were writ, did teach as neceſſary to be believ'd "to Peoples being Chriſtians."

This, and what Mr. *B—d* ſubjoins, "That it was not my Deſign to give "an Abſtract of any of the inſpir'd Books," is ſo true, and has ſo clear Rea- ſon in it, that any but this Writer would have thought himſelf concern'd to have anſwer'd ſomething to it.

But to this Mr. *Edwards* Answers not.

It not being it ſeems a *Creed-maker*'s Buſineſs to convince Mens Underſtand- ing by Reaſon, but to impoſe on their Belief by Authority, or where that is wanting, by Falſhood and Bawling. And to ſuch Mr. *Bold* obſerves well, *p.* 8. "That if I had given the like Account of the Epiſtles, that would have been "as little ſatisfactory as what I have done already, to thoſe who are reſolv'd "not to diſtinguiſh *betwixt what is neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chri-* "*ſtian, and thoſe Articles which are to be believ'd by thoſe who are Chriſtians*, as they "can attain to know that Chriſt hath taught them."

This Diſtinction the *Creed-maker*, no where that I remember, takes any No- tice of; unleſs it be *p.* 255. where he has ſomething relating hereunto, which we ſhall conſider when we come to that Place. I ſhall now go on to ſhew what Mr. *Bold* has ſaid, to which he anſwers not.

Mr. *Bold* farther tells him, *p.* 10. That if he will prove any thing in Oppo- ſition to the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. it muſt be this; "That Jeſus "Chriſt and his Apoſtles have taught, that the Belief of ſome one Article, "or certain Number of Articles diſtinct from this, *That Jeſus is the Meſſiah*, "either as excluſive of, or in Conjunction with the Belief of this Article, "doth conſtitute and make a Perſon a Chriſtian: But that the Belief of this, "That Jeſus is the Meſſiah, alone, doth not make a Man a Chriſtian."

But to this Mr. *Edwards* irrefragably Answers nothing.

Mr. *Bold* alſo, *p.* 10. charges him with his falſly accuſing me in theſe Words: *He pretends to contend for one ſingle Article, with the Excluſion of all the reſt, for this Reaſon; becauſe all Men ought to underſtand their Religion.* And again, where he ſays I aim at this, viz. *That we muſt not have any Point of Doctrine in our Religion, that the Mob doth not at the very firſt naming of it perfectly underſtand and agree to*; Mr. *Bold* has quoted my expreſs Words to the contrary.

But to this, this unanſwerable Gentleman Answers nothing.

But if he be ſuch a mighty Diſputant, that nothing can ſtand in his Way; I ſhall expect his direct Anſwer to it, among thoſe other Propoſitions which I have ſet down to his Score, and I require him to prove if he can.

The *Creed-maker* ſpends above four Pages of his *Reflections* in a great Stir who is the Author of thoſe *Animadverſions* he is reflecting on. To which, I tell him, it matters not to a Lover of Truth, or a Confuter of Errors, who was the Author; but what they contain. He, who makes ſuch a deal of do about that which is nothing to the Queſtion, ſhews he has but little mind to the Argument; that his Hopes are more in the Recommendation of Names, and Prejudice of Parties, than in the Strength of his Reaſons, and the Good- neſs of his Cauſe. A Lover of Truth follows That, whoever be for or a- gainſt it; and can ſuffer himſelf to paſs by no Argument of his Adverſary, without taking notice of it, either in allowing its Force, or giving it a fair An- ſwer. Were the *Creed-maker* capable of giving ſuch an Evidence as this, of his Love of Truth, he would not have paſs'd over the Twenty firſt Pages of

Mr.

Mr. *Bold's Animadversions* in Silence. The Falshoods that are therein charg'd upon him would have requir'd an Answer of him, if he *could* have given any: And I tell him he must give an Answer, or confess the Falshoods.

In his 255th Page, he comes to take notice of these Words of Mr. *Bold*, in the 21st Page of his *Animadversions*, viz. "That a Convert to Christianity, "or a Christian, must necessarily believe as many Articles as he shall attain to "know that Christ Jesus hath taught." *Which*, says the Creed-maker, *wholly invalidates what he had said before in these Words*, viz. "That *Jesus Christ*, and "his *Apostles*, did not teach any thing as necessary to be believ'd to make a "Man a Christian, but only this one Proposition, That *Jesus of* Nazareth "*was the Messiah.*" The Reason he gives to shew, That the former of these Propositions (in Mr. *Bold*) *invalidates* the latter, and that *the Animadverter contradicts himself*, stands thus: *For*, says he, *if a Christian must give Assent to all the Articles taught by our Saviour in the Gospel, and that necessarily; then all those Propositions reckon'd up in my late Discourse, being taught by Christ or his Apostles, are necessary to be believ'd. Answ.* And what, I beseech you, becomes of the rest of the Proposition *taught by Christ or his Apostles*, which you have not *reckon'd up in your late Discourse?* Are not they necessary to be believ'd, *if a Christian must give an Assent to ALL the Articles taught by our Saviour and his Apostles?*

Sir, If you will argue right from that Antecedent, it must stand thus: *If a Christian must give an Assent to ALL the Articles taught by our Saviour and his Apostles, and that necessarily*; then all the Propositions in the New Testament, taught by Christ or his Apostles, are necessarily to be believ'd. This Consequence I grant to be true, and necessarily to follow from that Antecedent, and pray make your best of it: But withal remember, that it puts an utter End to your select Number of Fundamentals, and makes all the Truths deliver'd in the New Testament necessary to be explicitly believed by every Christian.

But, Sir, I must take notice to you, that if it be uncertain whether he that writ the *Animadversions*, be the same Person that preach'd the *Sermon*, yet it is very visible that 'tis the very same Person that reflects on both; because he here again uses the same Trick in answering in the *Animadversions*, the same thing that had been said in the *Sermon*, viz. By pretending to argue from Words as Mr. *Bold's*, when Mr. *Bold* has said no such thing. The Proposition you argue from here, is this: *If a Christian must give Assent to all the Articles taught by our Saviour, and that necessarily.* But Mr. *Bold* says no such thing. His Words, as set down by your self are: "A Christian must necessarily be-"lieve as many Articles as he shall attain to know that Christ Jesus hath "taught." And is there no Difference between *ALL that Christ Jesus hath taught; and AS MANY as any one shall attain to know that Christ Jesus hath taught?* There is so great a Difference between these two, that one can scarce think even such a *Creed-maker* could mistake it. For one of them admits all those to be Christians, who taking *Jesus* for the *Messiah*, their Lord and King, sincerely apply themselves to understand and obey his Doctrine and Law, and do believe all that they understand to be taught by him: The other shuts out, if not all Mankind, yet Nine Hundred Ninety Nine of a Thousand, of those who profess themselves Christians, from being really so. For he speaks within compass, who says there is not one of a Thousand, if there be any one Man at all, who explicitly knows and believes all that our Saviour and his Apostles taught, *i. e.* All that is deliver'd in the New Testament, in the true Sense that it is there intended. For if giving Assent to it, in any Sense, will serve the Turn, our *Creed-maker* can have no Exceptions against *Socinians*, *Papists*, *Lutherans*, or any other, who acknowledging the Scripture to be the Word of God, do yet oppose his System.

But the *Creed-maker* goes on, *pag.* 255. and endeavours to prove, that what is necessary to be believ'd by every Christian, is necessary to be believ'd to make a Man a Christian, in these Words: *But he will say, the Belief of those Propositions* makes not a Man a Christian. *Then, I say, they are not necessary and indispensible; for what is absolutely necessary in Christianity, is absolutely requisite to make a Man a Christian.*

Ignorance,

Ignorance, or ſomething worſe, makes our *Creed-maker* always ſpeak doubtfully or obſcurely, whenever he pretends to argue; for here *abſolutely neceſſary in Chriſtianity* either ſignifies nothing, but abſolutely neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian; and then it is proving the ſame Propoſition by the ſame Propoſition: Or elſe has a very obſcure and doubtful Signification. For, if I ask him whether it *is be abſolutely neceſſary in Chriſtianity* to obey every one of our Saviour's Commands, what will he anſwer me? If he anſwers, *NO*; I ask him which of our Saviour's Commands is it not *in Chriſtianity abſolutely neceſſary* to obey? If he anſwers, *YES*; then I tell him, by his Rule there are no Chriſtians; becauſe there is no one that does in all things obey all our Saviour's Commands, and therein fails to perform what is *abſolutely neceſſary in Chriſtianity*; and ſo, by his Rule, is no Chriſtian. If he anſwers, Sincere Endeavour to obey, is all that is *abſolutely neceſſary*; I reply, And ſo Sincere Endeavour to underſtand, is all that is *abſolutely neceſſary*: Neither perfect Obedience, nor perfect Underſtanding is *abſolutely neceſſary in Chriſtianity*.

But his Propoſition being put in Terms clear, and not looſe and fallacious, ſhould ſtand thus, *viz. What is abſolutely neceſſary to every Chriſtian, is abſolutely requiſite to make a Man a Chriſtian.* But then I deny, that he can infer from Mr. *Bold*'s Words, that thoſe Propoſitions (*i. e.* which he has ſet down as fundamental, or neceſſary to be believ'd) are *abſolutely neceſſary* to be believ'd by every Chriſtian. For that indiſpenſible Neceſſity Mr. *Bold* ſpeaks of, is not abſolute, but conditional. His Words are, *A Chriſtian muſt believe as many Articles as he ſhall attain to know that Jeſus Chriſt hath taught.* So that he places the indiſpenſible Neceſſity of Believing, upon the Condition of attaining to know that Chriſt taught ſo. An Endeavour to know what *Jeſus Chriſt* taught, Mr. *B—d* ſays truly, is *abſolutely neceſſary* to every one who is a Chriſtian; and to believe what he has attain'd to know that *Jeſus Chriſt* taught, that alſo, he ſays, is *abſolutely neceſſary* to every Chriſtian. But all this granted (as true it is) it ſtill remains (and eternally will remain) to be prov'd from this (which is all that Mr. *Bold* ſays) that ſomething elſe is abſolutely requir'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, beſides the unfeigned taking *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, his King and Lord; and accordingly, a ſincere Reſolution to obey and believe all that he commanded and taught.

The Jailor, *Acts* xvi. 30. in anſwer to his Queſtion, what he ſhould *do to be ſav'd*; was anſwer'd, That *he ſhould believe in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* And the Text ſays, that the Jailor *took them the ſame Hour of the Night, and waſh'd their Stripes, and was baptized, he and all his Straightway.* Now, I will ask our *Creed-maker*, whether St. *Paul*, in ſpeaking to him the *Word of the Lord*, propos'd and explain'd to him all thoſe Propoſitions and *Fundamental Heads of Doctrine*, which our *Creed-maker* has ſet down as neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian. Let it be conſider'd, the Jailor was a Heathen, and one that ſeems to have no more Senſe of Religion or Humanity, than thoſe of that Calling uſe to have: For he had let them alone under the Pain of their Stripes without any Remedy, or ſo much as the Eaſe of waſhing them, from the Day before, till after his Converſion; which was not till after Midnight. And can any one think, that between his asking what he ſhould *do to be ſav'd*, and his being *baptiz'd*, which the Text ſays, was *the ſame Hour* and *Straightway*; there was time enough for St. *Paul* and *Silas*, to explain to him all the the *Creed-maker's* Articles, and make ſuch a Man as that, and all his Houſe, underſtand the *Creed-maker*'s whole Syſtem: Eſpecially, ſince we hear nothing of it in the Converſion of theſe, or any others, who were brought into the Faith in the whole Hiſtory of the Preaching of our Saviour and the Apoſtles? Now let me ask our *Creed-maker*, whether the Jailor was not a Chriſtian, when he was baptized; and whether if he had then immediately died, he had not been ſaved, without the Belief of any one Article more than what *Paul* and *Silas* had then taught him? Whence it follows, that what was then propos'd to him to be believ'd (which appears to be nothing but that *Jeſus* was the *Meſſiah*) was all that was abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd to make him a Chriſtian; tho' this hinders not but that afterwards it might be neceſſary for him, indiſpenſibly neceſſary, to believe other Articles, when he attained to the Knowledge that Chriſt had taught them. And the Reaſon of it is plain: Becauſe the knowing

that

that Chriſt hath taught any thing, and the not receiving it for true, (which is believing it) is inconſiſtent with the believing him to be the *Meſſiah*, ſent from God to enlighten and ſave the World. Every Word of Divine Revelation, is abſolutely and indiſpenſibly neceſſary to be believ'd, by every Chriſtian, as ſoon as he comes to know it to be taught by our Saviour or his Apoſtles, or to be of Divine Revelation. But yet this is far enough from making it abſolutely neceſſary to every Chriſtian to know every Text in the Scripture, much leſs to underſtand every Text in the Scripture; and leaſt of all, to underſtand it as the *Creed-maker* is pleas'd to put his Senſe upon it.

This the good *Creed-maker* either will not, or cannot underſtand: But gives us a Liſt of Articles cull'd out of the Scripture by his own Authority, and tells us thoſe are abſolutely neceſſary to be believ'd by every one, to make him a Chriſtian. For what is of *abſolute Neceſſity in Chriſtianity*, as thoſe he ſays are, he tells us is abſolutely requiſite to *make a Man a Chriſtian*. But when he is ask'd, whether theſe are all the Articles of abſolute Neceſſity to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; this worthy Divine, that takes upon him to be a Succeſſor of the Apoſtles, cannot tell. And yet, having taken upon him alſo to be a *Creed-maker*, he muſt ſuffer himſelf to be call'd upon for it again and again, till he tells us what is of abſolute Neceſſity to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, or confeſs that he cannot.

In the mean time, I take the Liberty to ſay, that every Propoſition deliver'd in the New Teſtament by our Saviour, or his Apoſtles, and ſo receiv'd by any Chriſtian as of Divine Revelation, is of as abſolute Neceſſity to be aſſented to by him, in the Senſe he underſtands it to be taught by them, as any one of thoſe Propoſitions enumerated by the *Creed-maker*: And if he thinks otherwiſe, I ſhall deſire him to prove it. The Reaſon whereof is this, That in Divine Revelation the Ground of Faith being only the Authority of the Propoſer; where that is the ſame, there is no difference in the Obligation or Meaſure of believing. Whatever the *Meſſiah* that came from God taught, is equally to believ'd by every one who receives him as the *Meſſiah*, as ſoon as he underſtands what it was he taught. There is no ſuch thing as garbling his Doctrine, and making one Part of it more neceſſary to be believ'd than another, when it is underſtood. His Saying is, and muſt be, of unqueſtionable Authority to all that receive him as their heavenly King; and carries with it an equal Obligation of Aſſent to all that he ſays as true. But ſince no body can explicitly aſſent to any Propoſition of our Saviour's as true, but in the Senſe he underſtands our Saviour to have ſpoken it in; the ſame Authority of the *Meſſiah*, his King, obliges every one abſolutely and indiſpenſibly to believe every Part of the New Teſtament in that Senſe he underſtands it: For elſe he rejects the Authority of the Deliverer, if he refuſes his Aſſent to it in that Senſe which he is perſuaded it was deliver'd in. But the taking him for the *Meſſiah*, his King and Lord, laying upon every one who is his Subject an Obligation to endeavour to know his Will in all Things; every true Chriſtian is under an abſolute and indiſpenſible Neceſſity, by being his Subject, to ſtudy the Scriptures with unprejudiced Mind, according to that Meaſure of Time, Opportunity, and Helps which he has; that in theſe ſacred Writings, he may find what his Lord and Maſter hath by himſelf, or by the Mouths of his Apoſtle, requir'd of him, either to be believ'd or done.

The *Creed-maker*, in the following Page, 256. hath theſe Words: *It is worth the Reader's obſerving, That notwithſtanding I had in twelve Pages together* (viz. *from the Eighth to Twentieth*) *prov'd that ſeveral Propoſitions are neceſſary to be believ'd by us, in order to our being Chriſtians; yet this Sham-Animadverter attends not to any one of the Particulars which I had mention'd, nor offers any thing againſt them, but only in a Lumping way, dooms them all in thoſe magiſterial Words;* I do not ſee any Proofs he produces, *p.* 21. *This is his wonderful Way of confuting me, by pretending that he cannot ſee any Proof in what I alledge; and all the World muſt be led by his Eyes.*

Anſw. *It is worth the Reader's obſerving*, that the *Creed-maker* does not reply to what Mr. *Bold* has ſaid to him, as we have already ſeen, and ſhall ſee more as we go on; and therefore he has little reaſon to complain of him, for not having anſwer'd enough. Mr. *Bold* did well to leave that which was an inſignificant *Lump*,

Lump, ſo as it was together: For 'tis no *wonderful* Thing *not to ſee any Proof*, where there is no Proof. There is indeed, in thoſe Pages the *Creed-maker* mentions, much Confidence, much Aſſertion, a great many Queſtions asked, and a great deal ſaid after this Faſhion: But for a Proof, I deny there is any one. And if what I have ſaid in another Place already, does not convince him of it, I challenge him, with all his *Eyes* and thoſe of the *World* to boot, to find out in thoſe Twelve renown'd Pages, one Proof. Let him ſet down the Propoſition, and his Proof of its being abſolutely and indiſpenſibly neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian; and I too will join with him in his Teſtimonial of himſelf, that he is *irrefragable*. But I muſt tell him before-hand, talking a great deal looſly will not do it.

Mr. *Bold* and I ſay we cannot ſee any Proof in thoſe Twelve Pages: The Way to make us *ſee*, or to convince the World that we are blind, is to ſingle out one Proof out of that Wood of Words there, which you ſeem to take for Arguments, and ſet down in a Syllogiſm, which is the fair Trial of a Proof or no Proof. You have indeed a Syllogiſm in the 23*d* Page, but that is not in thoſe Twelve Pages you mention. Beſides, I have ſhew'd in another Place, what that proves; to which I refer you.

In Anſwer to the *Creed-maker*'s Queſtion, about his other Fundamentals found in the Epiſtles; *Why did the Apoſtles write theſe Doctrines? Was it not, that thoſe they writ to, might give their Aſſent to them?* Mr. *Bold*, p. 22. replies; "But then it may be asked again, Were not thoſe Perſons Chriſtians, to whom "the Apoſtles writ *theſe Doctrines*, and whom they requir'd to aſſent to them? "*Yes, verily:* And if ſo, What was it that made them Chriſtians before "their Aſſent to *theſe Doctrines* was requir'd? If it were any Thing beſides "their believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, it ought to be inſtanced in, and made "out."

But to this Mr. *Edwards* Answers not.

The next Thing in Controverſy between Mr. *Bold* and the *Creed-maker*, (for I follow Mr. *B—d*'s Order) is about a Matter of Fact, *viz.* Whether the *Creed-maker* has prov'd, "That *Jeſus Chriſt* and his Apoſtles have taught, That no "Man can be a Chriſtian, or ſhall be ſav'd, unleſs he have an explicit *Knowledge* "*of all thoſe Things which have an immediate Reſpect to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means and Iſſue of our Salvation, and which are neceſſary for the knowing the true Nature and Deſign of it?*" This, Mr. *Bold*, p. 24. tells him, "he has not "done." To this the *Creed-maker* replies, *p.* 258.

And yet the Reader may ſatisfy himſelf, that this is the very Thing that I had been proving juſt before, and indeed, all along in the foregoing Chapter. *Anſw.* There have been thoſe who have been ſeven Years proving a Thing, which at laſt they could not do; and I give you ſeven Years to prove this Propoſition which you ſhould there have prov'd, and I muſt add to your Score here, *viz.*

LII. *That Jeſus Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, have taught, that no Man can be a Chriſtian, or can be ſav'd, unleſs he hath an explicit Knowledge of all thoſe Things which have an immediate Reſpect to the Occaſion, Author, Way, Means and Iſſue of our Salvation, and which are neceſſary for our knowing the true Nature and Deſign of it.*

Nor muſt the poor Excuſe, of ſaying, It was not neceſſary *to add any farther Medium*, and *proceed to another Syllogiſm, becauſe you had ſecur'd that Propoſition before:* go for Payment. If you had *ſecur'd it*, as you ſay, it had been quite as eaſy, and much more for your Credit, to have produc'd the Proof whereby you had *ſecur'd it*, than to ſay you had done it; and thereupon to reproach Mr. *Bold* with *Heedleſneſs*? and to tell the World, that *he cares not what he ſaith.* The Rule of fair Diſpute, is indiſpenſibly to prove, where any Thing is denied. To evade this, is ſhuffling; and he that, inſtead of it, anſwers with ill Language, in my Country, is call'd a *Foul-mouth'd Wrangler.*

To the *Creed-maker*'s Exception to my Demand, about the *actual* Belief of all his *Fundamentals* in his new *Creed*, Mr. *Bold* asks, *p.* 24. "Whether a Man "can believe particular Propoſitions, and not *actually* believe them?"

But to this Mr. *Edwards* Answers not.

Mr.

Mr. *Bold*, *p.* 25. farther acknowledges the *Creed-maker*'s fundamental Propoſitions to "be in the Bible; and that they are for this Purpoſe there, that they "might be believ'd:" And ſo, he ſaith, "is every other Propoſition which is "taught in our Bibles." But asks, "How will it thence follow, that no Man "can be a Chriſtian, till he particularly know, and actually aſſent to every Pro-"poſition in our Bibles?

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

From *p.* 26. to 30. Mr. *Bold* ſhews, That the *Creed-maker*'s Reply, concerning my not gathering of Fundamentals out of the Epiſtles, is nothing to the Purpoſe; and this he demonſtratively proves.

AND TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

The *Creed-maker* had falſly ſaid, That *I bring no Tidings of an Evangelical Faith:* and thence very readily and charitably infers; *Which gives us to underſtand, that he verily believes there is no ſuch Chriſtian Faith.* To this Mr. *Bold* thus ſoftly replies, *p.* 31. "I think Mr. *Edwards* is much miſtaken, both in his "Aſſertion and Inference:" And to ſhew that he could not ſo infer, adds; "If the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. had not brought any "Tidings of ſuch a Faith, I think it could be thence juſtly infer'd, that *he* "*verily believes there is no ſuch Chriſtian Faith:* becauſe his Enquiry and "Search was not concerning *Chriſtian Faith*, conſider'd *ſubjectively*, but *ob-*"*jectively*; what the Articles be which muſt be believ'd to make a Man "a Chriſtian; and not, with what ſort of Faith theſe Articles are to be "believ'd."

To this the *Creed-maker* anſwers indeed; but it is ſomething as much worſe than nothing, as Falſhood is worſe than Silence. His Words are, *p.* 258. *It may be queſtion'd, from what he* [the Animadverter] *hath the Confidence to ſay,* p. 31. viz. *There is no Enquiry in the* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *concerning Faith ſubjectively conſider'd, but only objectively*, &c. And thus having ſet down Mr. *B*——*d*'s Words otherwiſe than they are; for Mr. *Bold* does not ſay *there is no Enquiry*, i. e. no Mention, (for ſo the *Creed-maker* explains *Enquiries* here. For to convince Mr. *Bold*, that there is an *Enquiry*, i. e. Mention of *Subjective Faith*, he alledges, That Subjective Faith is *ſpoken of* in the 191ſt and 192d Pages of my Book.) But Mr. *Bold* ſays, not that Faith conſider'd ſubjectively, is *not ſpoken of* any where in the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. But "that "the Author's *Enquiry* and *Search* (*i. e.* the Author's Search, or Deſign of his "Search) was not concerning Chriſtian Faith conſider'd ſubjectively." And thus the *Creed-maker*, impoſing on his Reader, by perverting Mr. *Bold*'s Senſe, from what was the Intention of my *Enquiry and Search*, to what I had ſaid in it, he goes on, after his ſcurrilous faſhion, to inſult, in theſe Words which follow; *I ſay, it may be gueſs'd from this, what a Liberty this Writer takes, to aſſert what he pleaſes.* Anſw. *To aſſert what one pleaſes*, without Truth, and without Certainty is the worſt Character can be given a Writer: and with Falſhood to charge it on another, is no mean Slander and Injury to a Man's Neighbour. And yet to theſe ſhameful Arts muſt he be driven, who finding his Strength of managing a Cauſe to lie only in Fiction and Falſhood, has no other but the dull *Billingſgate* way of covering it, by endeavouring to divert the Reader's Obſervation and Cenſure from himſelf, by a confident repeated Imputation of that to his Adverſary, which he himſelf is ſo frequent in the Commiſſion of. And of this, the Inſtances I have given, are a ſufficient Proof: In which I have been at the Pains to ſet down the Words on both Sides, and the Pages where they are to be found, for the Reader's full Satisfaction.

The Cauſe in Debate between us is of great Weight, and concerns every Chriſtian. That any Evidence in the Propoſal, or Defence of it, can be ſufficient to conquer all Mens Prejudices, is Vanity to imagine. But this, I think, I may juſtly demand of every Reader, that ſince there are great and viſible Falſhoods on one ſide or the other (for the Accuſations of this kind are poſitive and frequent) he would examine on which Side they are: And upon that, I will venture the Cauſe in any Reader's Judgment, who will be but at the Pains of turning to the Pages mark'd out to him; and as for him that will not do that, I care not much what he ſays.

The *Creed-maker*'s following Words, *p.* 258. have the natural Mark of their Author. They are theſe: *How can this Animadverter come off with peremptory declaring, that Subjective Faith is not enquir'd into in the Treatiſe of the* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *&c. when in another place,* p. 35. and 36. *he avers, That Chriſtian Faith and Chriſtianity, conſider'd ſubjectively, are the ſame?* Anſw. In which Words there are two manifeſt Untruths: The one is, That Mr. *Bold peremptorily declares, that Subjective Faith is not enquir'd into,* i. e. ſpoken of, in the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. Whereas Mr. *Bold* ſays in that Place, *p.* 31. "If he [*i. e.* the Author] had not ſaid one Word concerning Faith ſub-"jectively conſider'd." The *Creed-maker*'s other Untruth, is his ſaying, *That the Animadverter avers,* p. 35, 36. *that Chriſtian Faith and Chriſtianity, conſider'd ſubjectively, are the ſame.* Whereas 'tis evident, that Mr. *Bold*, arguing againſt theſe Words of the *Creed-maker*, *(The Belief of Jeſus being the Meſſiah was one of the firſt and leading Acts of Chriſtian Faith)* ſpeaks in that Place of *an Act of Faith*, as theſe Words of his demonſtrate: "Now, I apprehend that Chri-"ſtian Faith and Chriſtianity, conſider'd ſubjectively (and an *ACT* of Chri-"ſtian Faith, I think, cannot be underſtood in any other Senſe) are the very "ſame." I muſt therefore deſire him to ſet down the Words, wherein the *Animadverter peremptorily declares,*

LIII. *That ſubjective Faith is not enquir'd into, or ſpoken of, in the Treatiſe of the* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *&c.*

And next, to produce the Words wherein the *Animadverter avers,*

LIV. *That Chriſtian Faith and Chriſtianity, conſider'd ſubjectively, are the ſame.*

To the *Creed-maker*'s ſaying, *That the Author of the* Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *&c. brings us no Tidings of Evangelical Faith belonging to Chriſtianity,* Mr. *Bold* replies; That I have done it in all thoſe Pages where I ſpeak of taking and accepting *Jeſus* to be our King and Ruler; and particularly he ſets down my Words out of *p.* 301.

But to this Mr. *Edwards* Answers not.

The *Creed-maker* ſays, *p.* 59. of his *Socinianiſm Unmask'd*, that the Author of the Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *tells Men again and again, that a Chriſtian Man, or Member of Chriſt, needs not know or believe any more than that one individual Point.* To which Mr. *Bold* thus replies, *p.* 33. "If any Man will ſhew "me thoſe Words in any part of the *Reaſonableneſs*, &c. I ſhall ſuſpect I was "not awake all the Time I was reading that Book: And I am as certain as "one awake can be, that there are ſeveral Paſſages in that Book directly con-"trary to theſe Words. And there are ſome Expreſſions in the *Vindication of* "*the Reaſonableneſs*, &c. one would think, if Mr. *Edwards* had obſerv'd them, "they would have prevented that Miſtake."

But to this Mr. *Edwards* Answers not.

Mr. *Bold*, *p.* 34. takes notice, that the *Creed-maker* had not put the Query or Objection right; which, he ſays, *Some, and not without ſome ſhew of Ground, may be apt to ſtart:* And therefore Mr. *Bold* puts the Query right, *viz.* "Why did "Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles require Aſſent to, and Belief of this one Article "alone, *viz.* That *Jeſus is the Meſſiah*, to conſtitute and make a Man a Chriſtian, "or true Member of Chriſt (as it is abundantly evident they did, from "the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*) if the Belief of more Articles is abſolutely "neceſſary to make and conſtitute a Man a Chriſtian."

But to this Mr. *Edwards* Answers not.

And therefore I put the *Objection* or Query to him again, in Mr. *Bold*'s Words, and expect an Anſwer to it, *viz.*

LV. *Why did Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles require Aſſent to, and Belief of this one Article alone,* viz. *That* Jeſus is the Meſſiah, *to make a Man a Chriſtian (as it is abundantly evident they did, from all their Preaching recorded throughout the whole Hiſtory of the Evangeliſts and the Acts) if the Belief of more Articles be abſolutely neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian?*

The

The *Creed-maker* having made believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, only *one of the firſt and leading Acts of Chriſtian Faith*; Mr. *Bold*, p. 35. rightly tells him, That, " Chriſtian Faith muſt be the Belief of ſomething or other: And if it " be the Belief of any thing beſides this, That *Jeſus is the Chriſt or Meſſiah*, that " other Thing ſhould be ſpecified; and it ſhould be made appear, that the Be- " lief that *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*, without the Belief of that other Propoſition, is " not Chriſtian Faith."

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

Mr. *B----d*, in the four following Pages, 36---39. has excellently explained the Difference between that Faith which conſtitutes a Man a Chriſtian, and that Faith whereby one that is a Chriſtian, believes the Doctrines taught by our Saviour; and the Ground of that Difference: And therein has fully overturn'd this Propoſition, That *believing Jeſus to be the Meſſiah, is but a Step, or the firſt Step to Chriſtianity.*

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

To the *Creed-maker*'s ſuppoſing that other Matters of Faith were propos'd with this, That *Jeſus* is the *Meſſiah*; Mr. *Bold* replies, That this ſhould be prov'd, *viz.* That other Articles were propos'd, as requiſite to be believ'd to make Men Chriſtians. And *p.* 40. he gives a Reaſon why he is of another Mind, *viz.* " Becauſe there is nothing but this recorded, which was inſiſted on " for that Purpoſe."

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

Mr. *Bold*, p. 42. ſhews, that *Rom.* x. 9. which the *Creed-maker* brought againſt it, confirms the Aſſertion of the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs*, &c. concerning the Faith that makes a Man a Chriſtian.

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

The *Creed-maker* ſays, *p.* 78. *This is the main Anſwer to the Objection*, (or Query above propos'd) viz. *That Chriſtianity was erected by Degrees.* This, Mr. *Bold*, p. 43. proves to be nothing to the Purpoſe, by this Reaſon; *viz.* " Be- " cauſe what makes one Man a Chriſtian, or ever did make any Man a Chri- " ſtian, will at any Time, to the End of the World, make another Man a Chri- " ſtian:" And asks, Will not that make a Chriſtian now, which made the Apo- " ſtles themſelves Chriſtians?"

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

In Anſwer to his ſixth Chapter, Mr. *Bold*, p. 45. tells him, " It was not my " Buſineſs to diſcourſe of the Trinity, or any other particular Doctrines pro- " pos'd to be believ'd by them who are Chriſtians; and that it is no fair and " juſt Ground to accuſe a Man, for rejecting the Doctrines of the Trinity, and " that Jeſus is God, becauſe he does not interpret ſome particular Texts to " the ſame Purpoſe others do."

BUT TO THIS Mr. *Edwards* ANSWERS NOT.

Indeed he takes notice of theſe Words of Mr. *Bold*, in this Paragraph, *viz.* " Hence Mr. *Edwards* takes occaſion to write many Pages about theſe Terms, " [viz. *Meſſiah and Son of God*] But I do not perceive that he pretends to offer " any Proof that theſe were not ſynonymous Terms amongſt the *Jews* at that " Time, which is the Point he ſhould have prov'd, if he deſign'd to invalidate " what this Author ſays about that Matter." To this the *Creed-maker* replies, *p.* 257. *The Animadverter doth not ſo much as offer one Syllable to diſprove what I delivered, and cloſely urged on that Head. Anſw.* What need any Anſwer to diſprove, where there is no Proof brought that reaches the Propoſition in queſtion? If there had been any ſuch Proof, the producing of it, in ſhort, had been a more convincing Argument to the Reader, than ſo much bragging of what has been done. For here are more Words ſpent (for I have not ſet them all down) than would have ſerv'd to have expreſs'd the Proof of this Propoſition, *viz.* That the Terms above-mention'd were not ſynonymous amongſt the *Jews*, if there had been any Proof of it. But having already examin'd what the *Creed-maker* brags he has *cloſely urg'd*, I ſhall ſay no more of it here.

To the *Creed-maker*'s making me a *Socinian*, in his Eighth Chapter, for not naming Chriſt's Satisfaction amongſt the Advantages and Benefits of Chriſt's Coming into the World; Mr. *Bold* replies, " 1. That it is no Proof, becauſe " I promiſed not to name every one of them. And the Mention of ſome " is

" is no Denial of others." 2. He replies, That " Satisfaction is not ſo ſtrict-
" ly to be termed an Advantage, as the Effects and Fruits of it are; and that
" the Doctrine of Satisfaction inſtructs us in the Way how Chriſt did, by di-
" vine Appointment, obtain thoſe Advantages for us." And this was an An-
ſwer that deſerv'd ſome Reply from the *Creed-maker*.

BUT TO THIS HE ANSWERS NOT.

Mr. *Bold* ſays right, that this is a Doctrine that is of mighty Importance for a Chriſtian to be well acquainted with. And I will add to it, that it is very hard for a Chriſtian who reads the Scripture with Attention, and an unprejudic'd Mind, to deny the *Satisfaction* of *Chriſt*: but it being a Term not uſed by the Holy Ghoſt in the Scripture, and very variouſly explain'd by thoſe that do uſe it, and very much ſtumbled at by thoſe I was there ſpeaking to, who were ſuch as I there ſay, " who will not take a Bleſſing, unleſs they be inſtructed what
" need they had of it, and why it was beſtowed upon them;" I left it, with the other diſputed Doctrines of Chriſtianity, to be look'd into (to ſee what it was Chriſt had taught concerning it) by thoſe who were Chriſtians, and believed Jeſus to be the Saviour promiſed, and ſent from God. And to thoſe who yet doubted that he was ſo, and made this Objection; " What need was
" there of a Saviour?" I thought it moſt reaſonable to offer ſuch Particulars only as were agreed on by all Chriſtians, and were capable of no Diſpute, but muſt be acknowledg'd by every body to be needful. This, though the Words above-quoted out of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. *p.* 529. ſhew to be my *Deſign*; yet the *Creed-maker* plainly gives me the Lye, and tells me it was not my *Deſign*. All the World are *faithleſs*, *falſe*, *treacherous*, *hypocritical*, *Strainers upon their Reaſon and Conſcience*, *Diſſemblers*, *Journeymen*, *mercenary Hirelings*, except Mr. *Edwards*: I mean, all the World that oppoſes him. And muſt not one think he is mightily beholden to the Excellency and Readineſs of his own Nature, who is no ſooner engag'd in Controverſy, but he immediately finds out in his Adverſaries theſe Arts of Equivocation, Lying and Effrontery in managing of it? Reaſon and Learning, and acquir'd Improvements, might elſe have let him gone on with others in the dull and ordinary Way of fair arguing; wherein poſſibly he might have done no great Feats. Muſt not a rich fertile Soil within, and a prompt Genius wherein a Man may readily ſpy the Propenſities of baſe and corrupt Nature, be acknowledg'd to be an excellent Qualification for a Diſputant, to help him to the quick Diſcovery and laying open of the Faults of his Oponents; which a Mind otherwiſe diſpos'd would not ſo much as ſuſpect? Mr. *Bold*, without this, could not have been ſo ſoon found out to be a *Journeyman*, a *Diſſembler*, an *hir'd Mercenary*, and ſtor'd with all thoſe good Qualities, wherein he hath his full Share with me. But why would he then venture upon Mr. *Edwards*, who is ſo very quick-ſighted in theſe Matters, and knows ſo well what villainous Man is capable of?

I ſhould not here, in this my *Vindication*, have given the Reader ſo much of Mr. *Bold*'s Reaſoning, which though clear and ſtrong, yet has more Beauty and Force as it ſtands in the whole Piece in his Book: Nor ſhould I have ſo often repeated this Remark upon each Paſſage, *viz. To this Mr.* Edwards *anſwers not*; had it not been the ſhorteſt and propereſt Comment could be made on that triumphant Paragraph of his, which begins in the 128*th* Page of his *Socinian Creed*; wherein, among a great deal of no ſmall ſtrutting, are theſe Words: *By their profound Silence they acknowledge they have nothing to reply.* He that deſires to ſee more of the ſame noble Strain, may have recourſe to that eminent Place. Beſides, It was fit the Reader ſhould have this one Taſte more of the *Creed-maker*'s Genius, who paſſing by in Silence all theſe clear and appoſite Replies of Mr. *Bold*, loudly complains of him, *p.* 259. *That where he* [*Mr.* Bold] *finds ſomething that he dares not object againſt, he ſhifts it off.* And again, *p.* 260. *That he doth not make any offer at Reaſon; there is not the leaſt Shadow of an Argument.—As if he were only hir'd to ſay ſomething againſt me* [the Creed-maker] *tho' not at all to the Purpoſe: And truly, any Man may diſcern a* MERCENARY *Stroke all along*; with a great deal more to the ſame Purpoſe. For ſuch Language as this, mix'd with Scurrility, neither fit to be ſpoken by, nor of a Miniſter of the Goſpel, make up the Remainder of his *Poſtſcript*. But to prevent this for the future; I demand

mand of him, That if in either of his Treatiſes there be any thing againſt what I have ſaid, in my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, which he thinks not fully anſwer'd, he will ſet down the Propoſitions in direct Words, and note the Page of his Book where it is to be found; and I promiſe him an Anſwer to it. For as for his Railing, and other Stuff, beſides the Matter, I ſhall hereafter no more trouble my ſelf to take notice of it. And ſo much for Mr. *Edwards*.

THERE is another Gentleman, and of another Sort of Make, Parts, and Breeding, who (as it ſeems, aſham'd of Mr. *Edwards*'s Way of handling Controverſies in Religion) has had ſomething to ſay of my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. and ſo has made it neceſſary for me to ſay a Word to him, before I let theſe Papers go out of my Hand. It is the Author of *The Occaſional Paper*, Numb. 1. The ſecond, third, and fourth Pages of that *Paper*, gave me great Hopes to meet with a Man who would examine all the Miſtakes which come abroad in Print, with that Temper and Indifferency that might ſet an exact Pattern for Controverſy, to thoſe who would approve themſelves to be ſincere Contenders for Truth and Knowledge, and nothing elſe, in the Diſputes they engag'd in. Making him Allowance for the Miſtaes that Self-Indulgence is apt to impoſe upon Human Frailty, I am apt to believe he thought his Performances had been ſuch: But I crave Leave to obſerve, that good and candid Men are often miſled, from a fair unbiaſs'd Purſuit of Truth, by an over-great Zeal for ſomething that they, upon wrong Grounds, take to be ſo; and that it is not ſo eaſy to be a fair and unprejudic'd Champion for Truth, as ſome who profeſs it think it to be. To acquaint him with the Occaſion of this Remark, I muſt deſire him to read and conſider his nineteenth Page; and then to tell me,

1. Whether he knows, that the *Doctrine* propos'd in the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. was *borrow'd*, as he ſays, from *Hobbes*'s *Leviathan*? For I tell him, I borrow'd it only from the Writers of the Four *Goſpels*, and the *Acts*; and did not know that thoſe Words he quoted out of the *Leviathan*, were there, or any Thing like them. Nor do I know yet any farther, than as I believe them to be there, from his Quotation.

2. Whether affirming, as he does poſitively, this, which he could not know to be true, and is in it ſelf perfectly falſe, were meant to increaſe or leſſen the Credit of the Author of the *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. in the Opinion of the World? Or is it conſonant with his own Rule, *p.* 3. *of putting candid Conſtructions on what Adverſaries ſay*? Or with what follows, in theſe Words; *The more divine the Cauſe is, ſtill the greater ſhould be the Caution. The very diſcourſing about Almighty God, or our holy Religion, ſhould compoſe our Paſſions, and inſpire us with Candor and Love. It is very indecent to handle ſuch Subjects in a manner that betrays Rancor and Spite. Theſe are Fiends that ought to vaniſh, and ſhould never mix either with a Search after Truth, or the Defence of Religion.*

3. Whether the Propoſitions which he has, out of my Book, inſerted into his nineteenth Page, and ſays, *are conſonant to the Words of the Leviathan*, were thoſe, of all my Book, which were likelieſt to give the Reader a true and fair Notion of the Doctrine contain'd in it? If they were not, I muſt deſire him to remember and beware of his *Fiends*. Not but that he will find thoſe Propoſitions there to be true. But that neither he nor others may miſtake my Book, this is that, in ſhort, which it ſays:

1. That there is a Faith that makes Men Chriſtians.

2. That this Faith is the believing *Jeſus of Nazareth* to be the *Meſſiah*.

3. That the believing *Jeſus* to be the *Meſſiah*, includes in it a receiving him for our Lord and King, promis'd and ſent from God: And ſo lays upon all his Subjects an abſolute and indiſpenſible Neceſſity of aſſenting to all that they can attain the Knowledge that he taught; and of a ſincere Obedience to all that he commanded.

This, whether it be the Doctrine of the *Leviathan*, I know not. This appears to me out of the *New Teſtament*, from whence (as I told him in the *Preface*) I took it to be the Doctrine of our Saviour and his Apoſtles; and I would not willingly be miſtaken in it. If therefore there be any other Faith beſides this, abſolutely requiſite to make a Man a Chriſtian, I ſhall here again deſire

deſire this Gentleman to inform me what it is; *i. e.* to ſet down all thoſe Propoſitions which are ſo indiſpenſibly to be believ'd, (for 'tis of ſimple Believing, I perceive, the Controverſy runs) that no Man can be a *Believer*, i. e. a Chriſtian, without an actual Knowledge of, and an explicit Aſſent to them. If he ſhall do this with that Candor and Fairneſs he declares to be neceſſary in ſuch Matters, I ſhall own my ſelf oblig'd to him: For I am in earneſt, and I would not be miſtaken in it.

If he ſhall decline it, I, and the World too, muſt conclude, that upon a Review of my Doctrine, he is convinc'd of the Truth of it, and is ſatisfy'd that I am in the right. For it is impoſſible to think that a Man of that Fairneſs and Candor which he ſolemnly prefaces his Diſcourſe with, ſhould continue to condemn the Account I have given, of the Faith which I am perſuaded makes a Chriſtian; and yet he himſelf will not tell me (when I earneſtly demand it of him, as deſirous to be rid of my Error, if it be one) what is that more, which is abſolutely requir'd to be believed by every one, before he can be a Believer: *i. e.* what is indiſpenſibly neceſſary to be known, and explicitly believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian.

Another Thing which I muſt deſire this Author to examine by thoſe his own Rules, is, What he ſays of me, *p.* 30. where he makes me to have a Prejudice againſt the Miniſtry of the Goſpel, and their Office, from what I have ſaid, in my *Reaſonableneſs*, &c. *p.* 530, 531. concerning the *Prieſts* of the World, in our Saviour's Time; which he calls *bitter Reflections*.

If he will tell me what is ſo *bitter*, in any one of thoſe Paſſages which he has ſet down, that is not true, or ought not to be ſaid there, and give me the Reaſon why he is offended at it; I promiſe him to make what Reparation he ſhall think fit, to the Memory of thoſe *Prieſts* whom he with ſo much Good Nature patronizes, near Seventeen Hundred Years after they have been out of the World; and is ſo tenderly concern'd for their Reputation, that he excepts againſt that, as ſaid againſt them, which was not. For one of the three Places he ſets down, was not ſpoken of Prieſts. But his making my mentioning the Faults of the Prieſts of old, in our Saviour's Time, to be an *Expoſing the Office of the Miniſters of the Goſpel* now, *and a Vilifying thoſe who are employ'd in it*; I muſt deſire him to examine, by his own Rules of Love and Candor, and to tell me, Whether I have not Reaſon here again to mind him of his *FIENDS*, and to adviſe him to beware of them? And to ſhew him why I think I have, I crave Leave to ask him theſe Queſtions:

1. Whether I do not all along plainly, and in expreſs Words, ſpeak of the Prieſts of the World, preceding, and in our Saviour's Time? Nor can my Argument bear any other Senſe.

2. Whether all I have ſaid of them be not true?

3. Whether the repreſenting truly the Carriage of the *Jewiſh*, and more eſpecially of the *Heathen* Prieſts in our Saviour's Time, as my Argument requir'd, can expoſe the Office of the Miniſters of the Goſpel now? Or ought to have ſuch an Interpretation put upon it?

4. Whether what he ſays of the *Air and Language I uſe reaching farther*, carry any thing elſe in it but a Declaration, that he thinks ſome Men's Carriage now, hath ſome Affinity with that I have truly ſaid of the Prieſts of the World before Chriſtianity; and that therefore the Faults of thoſe ſhould have been let alone, or touch'd more gently, for fear ſome ſhould think theſe now concern'd in it?

5. Whether, in Truth, this be not to accuſe them with a Deſign to draw the Envy of it on me? Whether out of Good Will to them, or to me, or both, let him look. This I am ſure, I have ſpoke of none but the Prieſts before Chriſtianity, both *Jewiſh* and *Heathen*. And for thoſe of the *Jews*, what our Saviour has pronounc'd of them, juſtifies my *Reflections* from being *bitter*; and that the Idolatrous Heathen Prieſts were better than they, I believe our Author will not ſay: And if he were preaching againſt them, as oppoſing the Miniſters of the Goſpel, I ſuppoſe he would give as ill a Character of them. But if any one extends my Words farther than to thoſe they were ſpoke of, I ask whether that agrees with his Rules of *Love and Candor?*

I ſhall impatiently expect from this Author of *The Occaſional Paper*, an Anſwer to theſe Queſtions; and hope to find them ſuch as becomes that Temper, and Love of Truth which he profeſſes. I long to meet with a Man, who laying aſide Party, and Intereſt, and Prejudice, appears in Controverſy ſo as to make good the Character of a Champion of Truth for Truth's ſake; a Character not ſo hard to be known whom it belongs to, as to be deſerv'd. Whoever is truly ſuch an one, his Oppoſition to me will be an Obligation. For he that propoſes to himſelf the convincing me of an Error, only for Truth's ſake, cannot, I know, mix any *Rancour*, or *Spite*, or Ill-will, with it. He will keep himſelf at a diſtance from thoſe *Fiends*, and be ready to hear, as offer Reaſon. And two ſo diſpos'd, can hardly miſs Truth between them, in a fair Enquiry after it; at leaſt, they will not loſe Good-breeding, and eſpecially Charity, a Vertue much more neceſſary than the attaining of the Knowledge of obſcure Truths, that are not eaſy to be found; and probably, therefore, not neceſſary to be known.

The unbiaſs'd Deſign of the Writer, purely to defend and propagate Truth, ſeems to me to be that alone which legitimates Controverſies. I am ſure, it plainly diſtinguiſhes ſuch from all others, in their Succeſs and Uſefulneſs. If a Man, as a ſincere Friend to the Perſon, and to the Truth, labours to bring another out of Error, there can be nothing more beautiful, nor more beneficial. If Party, Paſſion, or Vanity, direct his Pen, and have a hand in the Controverſy; there can be nothing more unbecoming, more prejudicial, nor more odious. What Thoughts I ſhall have of a Man that ſhall, as a Chriſtian, go about to inform me what is neceſſary to be believed to make a Man a Chriſtian, I have declar'd, in the *Preface* to my *Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity*, &c. nor do I find my ſelf yet alter'd. He that in Print finds fault with my imperfect Diſcovery of that wherein the Faith which makes a Man a Chriſtian conſiſts, and will not tell me what more is requir'd, will do well to ſatisfy the World what they ought to think of him.

F I N I S.

THE INDEX TO THE SECOND VOLUME.

A.

ABRAHAM (*the Patriarch*) *his War proves not a Sovereign Power*, p. 146.
Had no Authority over Lot, 148.
Abridgment of Faith, *what 'tis*, 600, 601.
Absolute Monarchy, *its being* Jure Divino, *a new Doctrine*, 103.
Not prov'd Divine from Adam's *Sovereignty by Creation*, 106. *nor from his Sovereignty by Donation*, 109.
How destructive 'tis to Mankind among the the Turks, 113.
Eve's *Subjection proves it not to be* Jure Divino, 116. *nor* Adam's *Fatherhood*, 119.
'Tis not prov'd Divine by the Command, Honour thy Father, 122.
It flows not from Fatherhood and Property, 127.
Supposing it Jure Divino, *'tis necessary to know the Person invested with it*, 130.
The Absurdity of supposing it to descend from Adam *by Heirship*, 137.
Nor Proof of it from Jacob *or other Patriarchs*, 140——148. *Nor from* Noah's *Sons*, 149. *Nor from the Dispersion of* Babel, 150.
Not enjoy'd by them, 151.
Nimrod *had no Right to it*, 152, 153.
The Dukes of Edom, *and several Kings mention'd in Scripture, Proofs against it*, 153.
Inconsistent with Civil Society, 183.
Why the Subjects of it are kept from destroying one another, 184.
How it came to be restrained by Laws, ibid.
Acts of the Apostles (*Book so called*) *The Author charg'd not his Readers against stirring beyond it*, 594.
How wisely as well as faithfully 'twas written by St. Luke, 625, 626.
Actual Assent *to Fundamental Articles, how necessary*, 575, 576.
Adam, *no Proof of his Absolute Power over his Children*, 105, 106.
Had no absolute Authority by Creation, 106.
Nor by God's Appointment, 107.
The Grant (Gen. 1. 28.) *gave him no Power over Men*, 110.
The same Grant was given to all Men, 111, 115.
Supposing he was Proprietor of all Things, this proves not his Sovereignty, 115, 116.
His absolute Dominion not prov'd by Eve's *Subjection*, 116.
Of the Conveyance of his suppos'd Monarchical Power, 129.
The Absurdity of supposing any one Heir of his Authority, 137.
The Difficulties of discovering his true Heir, 138, 143——146.
Wrong Notions concerning his Fall, 474, 475.
What he fell from, 474.
Allegations *between contending Parties, to be esteem'd false till prov'd*, 561.
Apostles, *the Wisdom of our Lord in chusing such mean Persons*, 507, 508.
The Holy Spirit coming, illuminated their Minds, 512, 513.
Arbitrary Government *worse than none*, 197.
No Right to it from Conquest, 212.
Article, *how the Author pleads for one Article of Faith*, 563—567.
Articles (*of the Church of* England) *The* 13*th argued from, against Force in Religion*, 406.

The INDEX to

The 17th argu'd from, to the ſame Purpoſe, 460.

Articles *(of Religion) ſome have been ſeveral* 100 *Years explaining, yet not underſtood,* 552.

Of Chriſtianity, and ſuch as are neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian, different, 598.

Athanaſius's Creed, *of the damnatory Sentence in it,* 412.

Atheiſm, *charg'd by ſome upon all who differ from 'em,* 155, 413.

Is not to be tolerated by Magiſtrates, 413, 414.

Want of Seriouſneſs in Diſcourſing of Divine Things, may occaſion it, 611.

How falſly The Reaſonableneſs, *&c. is charg'd with promoting it,* 612, 613.

Author *(of this Book) falſly charg'd with making but one Article neceſſary in formal Words,* 563.

Falſly accus'd of defying ſome Articles of Chriſtianity, 564. *and of new-modelling the Apoſtles Creed,* 565.

The ſeveral Articles made neceſſary by him, 566.

Falſly charg'd with ſaying, all Things in Chriſtianity muſt be level'd to every Underſtanding. 567, 571.

Requires Proof of his making all but one Article uſeleſs to make a Man a Chriſtian, 567, 568.

Denies his contending for but one, that Men may underſtand their Religion, 568—571.

Not guilty of Folly in requiring a compleat Liſt of Fundamentals, 572, 574.

His Opponent compar'd to a Judge, who was againſt hearing both Sides, 585.

Not juſtly call'd Socinian, *for omitting what is not expreſs'd in the Apoſtles Creed,* 602.

His Faith unjuſtly repreſented as little different from that of a Turk, 603, 604.

His Account of Faith very different from the Faith of Devils, 604—606.

Unjuſtly charg'd with patronizing Ignorance, 607.

His Adverſary's arguing from one *to* none, *would equally ſerve a Pagan,* 614.

How he proves himſelf a Chriſtian, 640.

Sometimes repreſented a Socinian, ſometimes a Papiſt, &c. 640, 658.

Why he omitted ſeveral Paſſages in the Evangeliſts, 641.

We ſhould judge of an Author by what he ſpeaks, not the contrary, 658, 660, 661.

Authority *(Political) not required in the Fifth Commandment,* 124. *Vid.* Political Power.

B.

BAlance *of Trade. Vid.* Trade.

Believe. *To believe* on *our Saviour, and* in his Name, *what 'tis,* 491, 492, 494.

'Tis neceſſary to believe every thing known to be reveal'd in Scripture, 539, 580.

What muſt be believ'd explicitly, and what implicitly, 580.

We muſt believe the manner *of Things, when reveal'd,* 583.

Believing. *Diſtinction between the Manner and Reality of Things, removes not the Difficulties of it,* 584.

Bentley *(Dr.) his Judgment of the Cauſe of Infidelity,* 437.

Bills of Exchange, *the only uſe of 'em,* 11, 72.

Birth-right, *Dominion don't naturally belong to it,* 140.

Bold, *(Mr.) The Author's Letter of Thanks to him,* 558.

Vindicated from contradicting himſelf 654—657.

His Opponent's ſcurrilous Reflections upon him, 657, 658.

How falſly his Words are cited, 659.

Several remarkable Paſſages in him not anſwer'd, 659, 660, 664—667.

Groundleſly charg'd with not anſwering his Oppoſer, 663, 664.

Why ſo much of his Reaſoning is mention'd by the Author, 668.

Book, *two Ways of making one unanſwerable,* 561.

Bookſellers *ſtirr'd up againſt the Author by his Adverſary,* 649.

Briars. *Vid.* Thorns.

Bullion. *Vid.* Silver.

Buyers, *plenty of them makes things dear,* 20.

C.

CAreleſs *of their Salvation, ſuch not to be neglected,* 279, 353.

Caſtration, *as juſtly to be us'd by the Magiſtrates to make chaſte, as Force to promote Religion,* 267, 445.

Ceremonies *of the* Jews *were beggarly Elements, and much more thoſe which are human,* 302.

Children, *not born in a full State of Equality,* 173. *yet they are born to it,* ibid.

When they come to be Free, 174.

How they are ſaid to be born Free, 175.

Chriſt, *the Meaning of his Anſwer,* John 6. 70. *p.* 496.

Why he expreſly reveal'd not his Meſſiahſhip to his Diſciples, 496, 497.

More clearly diſcover'd his being the Meſſiah a little before his Sufferings, 497, &c. *yet even then he did not expreſly declare this to the Jewiſh Rulers,* 502.

How wiſely he anſwer'd his captious Enemies, 504.

Why he own'd himſelf to be the Son of God before the High-Prieſt, 505.

Why he would not expreſly own himſelf a King before Pilate, 505, 506.

His Innocency atteſted even by Judas *and* Pilate, 509.

Why he ſpoke obſcurely of his deſtroying Jeruſalem, *(Matt.* 24.) 510.

Judas *being gone, he ſpake more explicitly of his Kingdom,* 511.

To the laſt he requir'd his Diſciples only to believe him to be the Meſſiah, 511, 514.

Expreſly apply'd the Promiſes of the Meſſiah to himſelf, after his Reſurrection, 515.

Much oftner mention'd his Kingly Office than any other, 521. *How*

How he fulfill'd the Moral Law, ibid.
What we may think the State of those who never heard of him, 529.
The Necessity of his coming to make God known, 530—532. *To teach Men their Duty*, 532—536. *To instruct in the right Forms of Divine Worship*, 536. *To give sufficient Encouragement to a good Life*, 536, 537. *And to assure Men of Divine Assistance*, 537, 538.
The Jews *understood not his Deity to be signified by the Phrase*, The Son of God, 645, 646.
The Word Christ *often us'd as a proper Name*, 647.
Christians, *some so call'd are of different Religions*, 255.
What is necessary to be believ'd to make Men so, 577, 578, 637.
Whether all Things of this sort were reveal'd in our Saviour's Time, 633.
What was sufficient to make Men such in Christ's Time, is so still, 640.
Are oblig'd to believe all which they find our Saviour taught, 654, 655, 661, 663.
All things necessary to be believ'd by them, are not necessary to their being such, 662.
Why they must believe whatever they find reveal'd by Christ, 662, 663.
Christianity, *prevailing without Force, a Mark of its Truth*, 260, 433, 434.
The Fundamental Articles of it easy to be understood, 540, 552.
Church, *what it is*, 235.
None born a Member of it, ibid.
The Power of it, 236.
Has no Authority to persecute, 237.
Magistrates have no Power to enforce its Decrees, 242.
Is to determine indifferent Circumstances of Worship, 245.
Magistrates have not Power to prohibit in it, what is lawful in the Common-wealth, ibid.
Civil Interests, *what they are*, 234.
The Duty of Magistrates to secure 'em, ibid.
Civil Society, *Vid.* Political Society.
Clergy, *their Office sufficient without other Employments*, 308.
Clip'd-Money *should pass only for its Weight*, 91, 93. *The great Mischief of its passing otherwise*, 93, 94.
The Charge of Re-coining it should not be born by the Publick, 95.
Coin, *Vid.* Money.
Coinage, *paid for by Tax on Wine*, 43. *Costs nothing to the Owner*, 43, 50. *Makes not Standard Silver worth less than before*, 56.
The Charge of it computed, 58.
Ascertains the Quantity of Silver by a publick Mark, 68. *And so is a Security to the Receiver*, 69.
The Art of it should be kept secret, 96.
Coming of Christ. *Vid.* Christ.
Commission *of our Lord was to convince Men he was the Messiah*, 627.
Of the Apostles and of the Seventy, was of the same Tenor, 628, 629.
Commodities, *the Goodness of 'em don't always increase their Price*, 21.
The Consumption of 'em enhances their Value, ibid.
How the vending of them is increas'd, 22.
Common-wealth, *how Men come under the Government of it, and how far*, 192.
The End of it is the Preservation of Property, 193.
The several Forms of it, 194.
How the Word is us'd by the Author, p. 195.
Its highest Power can't be absolutely arbitrary, ibid.
Common-wealth *must be govern'd by standing Laws*, 196.
Three Kinds of Power therein, 199.
The Subordination of its Powers, 200.
What it is, 234.
End of it not to force Men in Religion, but to free them from such Force, 325.
No Necessity to exclude Jews, *&c. from it, to prevent the Seduction of Christians*, 333, 334.
Community, *how the* Supreme Power *is ultimately therein*, 200.
Conditions, *Vid.* Covenant.
Conformity *(in Religion) and not Conviction, is the End of Penal Laws*, 264, 379.
Men may be brought to it without true Religion, 374.
No Ground to presume 'tis always upon Conviction, 374, 375.
Whether it be from Reason and Conviction or not, can't be certainly known, 380, 381.
Some Things requir'd to it, hard to be understood, 411, 412.
Conjugal Society, *how made*, 180.
The Cause of its long Continuance in Mankind, 180, 181.
Conquest *gives not Right of Governing to the Aggressor*, 207.
If Unjust, the Conquer'd may appeal to Heaven for Justice, 208.
When Just, it gives an Absolute Power over the Lives of the Conquer'd, 209.
Yet not over their Estates, and why, 209, 210.
Consideration, *to force Men to it, impracticable*, 339.
Conformists may need Punishment to bring them to it, as much as Dissenters, 340.
'Tis hard to understand, whether Penal Laws are design'd to bring to it, 409. *Vid.* Examination.
Conscience *none can be sav'd by acting contrary to it, tho' it be erroneous*, 242, 243.
Laws contrary to it must be passively submitted to by private Men, 249, 250.
A Man sins by acting contrary to it, tho' it be misguided, 297, 377.
Corn, *the Price of it depends on its Plenty*, 81.
Covenant *is chang'd when the Conditions of it are chang'd*, 633.
Coward, *The Author most unworthily charg'd with making our Saviour so*, 653.
Creed *(of the Apostles) not new-model'd by the Author*, 565.

Con-

The INDEX to

Contains all Things neceſſary to be believ'd to make a Man a Chriſtian, 599—602.
The Compilers of it may be charg'd with Socinianiſm, *by the ſame Rule the Author is*, 603.
Of St. Athanaſius, *Vid.* Athanaſius.
Creeds *ought not to be impos'd by the Magiſtrate*, 300.
Creed-maker, *Vid.* Edwards.

D.

DEfiance, *what it ſignifies*, 467.
Of any Truth unjuſtly charg'd on the Author, 564—567.
Deiſts, *what is neceſſary to make Men ſuch*, 578.
The Reaſonableneſs of Chriſtianity, *written chiefly for ſuch*, 595.
Devils, *why they can't be ſav'd by Believing*, 516.
Diſſenters *ſhould not be puniſh'd to make them conder, more than others*, 340.
Ought to be convinc'd a Church is true, before they conform to it, 341.
To puniſh them for not conſidering, is to puniſh them without Law, 270, 342.
If they muſt be puniſh'd, 'tis hard to ſet Bounds how far, 278, 350——357.
The Severity formerly us'd againſt them in England, 358.
How long, 'tis pretended, they muſt be puniſh'd, 279, 361.
Puniſhing, under Pretence of their not examining, juſtifies the French *Perſecution*, 270, 464.
Diviſions, *Vid.* Sects *and* Schiſm.

E.

EDwards *(Dr.* John*) complain'd of for his Charge of Atheiſm*, 545.
His accuſing the Author of Socinianiſm, *refuted*, 546.
His Commendations of himſelf, 562.
His Rule for good Breeding out of the Miſhna, *ibid.*
Sometimes repreſents the Word Meſſiah *as eaſy, ſometimes hard to be underſtood*, 586.
Liberty taken by him, in uſing illative Particles, ibid.
Repreſents Fundamentals, both as Eſſential and Integral Parts of Religion, 587.
Charg'd with aſſuming the Power of the Pope to himſelf, 608.
His Harangue for the Atheiſtical Rabble, 612, 613.
Edwards *(Dr.) Of his arguing from* one *to* none, 614, 615.
His Reaſons of but one Article being ſo often requir'd, conſider'd, 615—627.
Accus'd of Unfairneſs in Citations, 650, 651.
Charg'd with inſiſting on what concerns not the Subject, 658.
Blam'd for Readineſs to find unknown Faults in his Oppoſers, 668.
Remarks on a triumphant Paragraph of his 668, 669.
Epicuriſm, *not to be tolerated by the Magiſtrate*, 114.
Epiſtles *(of the Apoſtles) why written, and how to be underſtood*, 538.
Not deſign'd to teach Fundamental Articles of Faith, 538, 590—592.
Wiſely explain the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity, 539.
The Author's Notion of them vindicated, 548, &c.
No Contempt caſt on them by him, 588, 651.
Paſſing by any of 'em, no Argument of deſpiſing them, 588, 589.
Doctrines neceſſary and not neceſſary, hard to be diſtingniſh'd in them, 592, 593.
Equality *(Natural) may be alter'd by ſeveral Things*, 173.
Eſau, *his Forces prov'd him not an Heir to* Adam's *Dominions*, 148.
Ἔτι *(in* John 11. 54.*) is better render'd* yet, *than* no more, 500.
Evangeliſts, *numerous Citations out of them ill call'd a tedious Collection*, 589.
Tho' they wrote for Believers, yet they relate Chriſt's Doctrine to Unbelievers, 590.
No good Reaſon to ſuppoſe them defective in relating Fundamentals, 619, 620.
Contain all Doctrines neceſſary to make a Man a Chriſtian, 620, 621.
They wrote ſome Things not neceſſary to this End, 622.
When they made greateſt Omiſſions, yet they recorded all Things neceſſary to Chriſtianity, 623.
Wiſely obſerv'd the Genuine Rules of Hiſtory, 623, 624.
Fundamental Articles unjuſtly ſuppos'd to be omitted by them, 624.
To charge them with ſuch Omiſſions, is to accuſe 'em of Unfaithfulneſs, 625.
Omitted no neceſſary Article for brevity ſake, 626, 627.
Evidence *which may be ſufficient for one, may not be ſo for another*, 362.
Men are incompetent Judges, what is ſufficient to every one, 363, 364.
Examination *(of Religion) Force no proper Means to lead to it*, 270.
Many Conformiſts, as well as others, neglect it, 271—273.
None can be judicially prov'd to refuſe it, 272.
To puniſh a whole Party as neglecting it, is abſurd, 273.
Many are uncapable of making it ſtrictly, 276.
How far 'tis neglected, muſt be refer'd to the Divine Judgment, 277.
Want of it, only pretended for puniſhing Diſſenters, 288, 289, 386.
Puniſhment for want of it, would fall heavy upon many Churchmen, 289.
The Abſurdity of uſing Force to promote it, 289, 290.

None

None but God can judge when 'tis sufficient, 363.
The Duty of Magistrates, as well as others, 392, 393.
Making want of it the Ground of the Punishment, renders Magistrates uncertain whom to punish, 466.
Exchange *(of Money) in several Places, how regulated*, 25.
When 'tis high or low, 72. *The Reasons of both*, ibid.
Exclusion *of some Truths, the Author vindicated from it*, 564—567.
Excuse, *Persons may be without it before God, and yet not before Men*, 418, 419.

F.

FACT, *common Justice makes Allegations of it false, till prov'd*, 561.
Faith, *Articles of it not to be impos'd by human Laws*, 248.
How it differs from Knowledge, properly so call'd, 296, 418.
What Faith is requir'd, as the Condition of eternal Life, 479, 581.
Justifying Faith consists in believing Jesus to be the Messiah, 516.
Very acceptable to God, and whence 'tis so, 527, 528.
Consists in relying on the Goodness and Faithfulness of God, 528, 529.
The Fundamental Articles of it are well explain'd, tho' not taught in the Epistles, 538, 539.
The Essentials of it best learn'd from the Gospels and Acts, 539.
The Author does not make only one Article of it necessary, 563, 587.
Other Truths useful besides the necessary Article of it, 578.
But one Article of it not pleaded for, that Religion may be easily understood, 569, 570.
Faith: *A practical Faith plainly taught by the Author*, 606.
An intire Faith believes every Scripture-Truth, 632, 635.
How but one Article was taught by the Apostles to make Men Christians, 634.
Whether all Articles of it necessary to the being Christians were discover'd in our Saviour's Time, 635.
The Author falsly accus'd of bringing no Tidings of an Evangelical Faith, 665, 666.
Fathers, Filmer's *Account of their Authority*, 104, 105.
Have not an Absolute Power over their Children, 119.
Give not Life to their Children, 119, 120.
Seldom intend to communicate Life, and sometimes wish the contrary, 120.
Have no Power to expose their Children, 121.
Some Fathers have fatten'd and eat their Children, ibid.
Have not Power to sacrifice their Off-spring, 121, 122.
Their Authority can't be transfer'd more than that of a Husband, 135—137.
Their Power may be forfeited, but not alienated, 136.
How they, in time, became Princes, 178, 179, 187.
Fatherhood, Moses *and* Joshua *not made Governors by the Right of it*, 155.
The Judges and Kings of Israel *ruled not by this Title*, 156.
Filmer *(Sir* Robert*) a Breviate of his System of Government*, 102.
Asserts that none are born free, 102, 103.
His Reasons against native Freedom consider'd, 103, 104.
His Notions of Fatherly Authority, 104, 105.
He affirms Kings to be above Law, 104.
His strange Interpretation of Scripture, 112.
Sufficiently confutes his own Scheme, 125.
Says, it matters not how Kings come by their Power, 130.
Makes an Usurper have Right to govern, 130, 143.
First-born, *has no natural Right, by being so, to Dominion*, 140, 141, &c.
Flood *(of* Noah*) Idolatry generally prevailed not soon after it*, 438.
The true Religion continu'd above 2000 Years after it, 439.
Formal Words, *when charg'd, ought to be expresly prov'd*, 562, 563.
Force, *when without Authority to be oppos'd with Force*, 202.
Promises extorted by it, not binding, 208, 211.
Is not capable to convince the Mind, 235.
The Use of it belongs only to Magistrates, 237.
Christianity flourish'd best when without the help of it, 260.
Not lawful, tho it might prove some way useful, 262.
Force *(in Religion) usually prejudices Men against it*, 263, 280.
Used only to produce Conformity, not Conviction, 264.
Not necessary to make Men consider, ibid.
The Use of it for this End is a vain Pretence, 265.
Is much more likely to bring Men to Error than Truth, ibid.
Employ'd to make People consider, is neither Useful nor Just, 266.
No Warrant in Scripture for using it, 268.
No less necessary for Conformists, than Non-Conformists, 269, 381, 382, 457, 458.
The Uncertainty of the pretended End for which it should be us'd, 274—277, 370, 371.
None have Right to use it, 281.
Should rather be us'd to drive bad Men out of the Church, than to bring any in, 282.
Those who plead for the moderate Use of it, should shew what Bounds should be set to it, 290, 291, 392.

The INDEX to

If some Force may be used to bring Men to Religion, more may be us'd to advance them in it, 290, 291.
No Sovereign has Authority to use it toward another, 304.
Not necessary to promote Religion, tho' Religion be necessary, 305.
Not likely to advance the true Religion, but the contrary, 306, 311.
May be avoided by outward Conformity alone, 307, 319, 320.
Unreasonably us'd to make Men judge more sincerely for themselves, 310.
Takes the Care of Mens Souls from themselves, 318, 319.
Magistrates not commission'd by the Law of Nature to use it, 322.
How Parents are authoriz'd to use it, 323. *and Masters*, 324.
Not using it, intimates not a Power given in vain, 326.
Force: *The use of it makes not Men good, nor secures God's Blessings to a Nation*, 330.
By the same Rule, a lesser Degree of it is needful, a greater may be so, 347, 348.
No proper Means to remove Prejudices, 363.
Concerning the End of its being used, 365.
'Tis equally just for one Church to use it as another, 378.
The Spiritual Gain which Sufferers may reap, tho' it be misapply'd, a vain Pretence, 393, 394.
Kings being Nursing Fathers, *&c. no good Argument for using it*, 394, 395.
Its Use, tho' design'd to bring Men to Truth, may bring them to Falshood, 396.
Is likely to lead far more into Error than Truth, 397——399.
No Proof that ever it has done good, 398.
Using it to make Men consider, impertinent, 400. 401.
The Use of it can't promote real Holiness, 403, 404.
If it brings any to Consideration, 'tis only by Accident, 404.
Is most likely to prevail on the Loose and Careless, 405.
Its Unfitness to bring Men to true Religion, argu'd from the 13th Article of our Church, 406.
May require extraordinary Strength to withstand it, when us'd to bring to a false Religion, 407.
May be equally us'd by all Magistrates, who believe their Religion true, 408, 411.
'Tis absurd to use it, without pretending to Infallibility, 410, 411.
Christ might have empower'd his Apostles to use it, 423, 424.
The want of it not at first supply'd by Miracles, 426, &c.
Is necessary (if at all) to make Ministers do their Duty, 435.
The Use of it prevented not a horrible Apostacy in the Roman *Empire*, 443.
Has (as far as History informs us) always been Injurious to true Religion, 444.
The Use of it no Scripture-Method for advancing Religion, 449, 450, 456.
The Difference between using it in Civil Government, and in Religion, 452.
It can't be prov'd, that God blessed it as a Means to Salvation, 456.
Foul-mouth'd Wrangler, *who is to be so call'd*, 664.
Free, *Men are naturally so*, 103, 124, 125.
Freedom *(natural) Men not depriv'd of, without their own Consent*, 191.
How Men subject themselves to any Government, 192.
Fundamental Articles *(of Faith) where to be found*, 572.
Whence unreasonable Contentions arise about them, 579.
How the same Things may be so to one, and not to another, 580.
How all Truths may become so, ibid.
Many Things not so, tho' found in the New Testament, 582.
How they must be all plain to every Capacity, 583.
The Mischief of making more than Christ made, 610.

G.

GAmesters, *injurious to the publick Welfare*, 17.
Glory of God, *what meant by it in* Rom. 3. 23. *p.* 519.
God *speaks in Scripture so as to be understood*, 117.
Is dishonour'd, by calling Persecution his Cause, 469.
Belief of his Being, the Foundation of all Religion, 483.
Ordinarily works by natural Means, 508, 509.
His Image consists partly in Immortality, 517——519.
Gold, *altering its Value, by a Law, in Proportion to Silver, tends to impoverish a Nation*, 47, &c.
Not the Measure of Commerce, as Silver is, 72.
Why it should, notwithstanding this, be coin'd, ibid.
The Proportion between it and Silver, 92.
Government *can't naturally descend by Hereditary Right*, 134.
How it differs from Property, ibid.
That which gives Right to it in the present Possessor, must give it to the Successor, 134, 135.
'Tis absolutely necessary to know who has the the Right to it, 138, 144.
How many Ways it may be dissolv'd, 217—219.
What Right the Community have to preserve themselves under ill Management of it, 219, 220.
No great Danger of a People's being forward to change it, 220, 221.
Government: *The End of it is the Good of Mankind*, 222.

Barclay *himself allows the People to defend themselves from the tyrannical Abuse of it*, 223.
How the Abuse of it may be resisted, 224.
When, according to Barclay, *Governors lose their Right to it*, 225.
Who must be Judge when 'tis forfeited by those who are intrusted with it, 226, 227.
Guineas, *how raising them impoverish'd the Nation*, 92.

H.

HEIR *(to Government) none can be so but by the Laws of the Community*, 134, 135.
Controversies about him have caus'd great Mischief in Nations, 138.
Primogeniture gives no natural Right to be so, 140——142.
Heresy, *wherein it consists*, 255.
Imposers of their own Interpretations of Scripture, guilty of it, 256.
Hobbes's Leviathian, *our Author unjustly charg'd with borrowing from it*, 669.
Holland, *why the Interest of Money is low there*, 33.
Men may lend there for as much Interest as they can get, ibid.
Why the Merchants of it under-sell others, 39.
How Ducatoons came to be scarce there, 46.
Holy Ghost, *why he could not come till our Saviour's Ascension*, 512.
Hooker, *his Judgment concerning Civil Government*, 283.
Human Society, *the Preservation of it is the Magistrate's Province*, 249.
No Opinion contrary to the Safety of it should be tolerated, 250.

I.

I Am, *(in* John 13. 19.*) means*, I am the Messiah, 511.
Jacob *became not a Sovereign by getting the Birth-right*, 140, &c.
James *I. (King of* England*) his Judgment of Tyranny*, 214.
Idolaters *may be tolerated*, 246.
Why not tolerated by the Law of Moses, 247.
Their Case was peculiar among the Israelites, *ibid.*
Idolatry *did not root out the true Religion soon after the Flood*, 438.
Was probably first introduc'd by great Men, 439, 440.
The most likely Original of it was Tyranny, 440, 441.
Jerusalem, *Christ preach'd but little there, and why*, 488.
Jews, *the Power of Life and Death taken from them before our Saviour's Time*, 489.
Immortality, *The Image of God partly consists in it*, 517—519.
Indifferent Things, *The Magistrate's Power about them*, 243.
Not to be impos'd in Divine Worship, 244.
Some of them to be determin'd by a Church, 244, 245.
Infallible Guide, *only the Spirit of God speaking in Scripture, is so*, 639, 640.
Infidels, *who chiefly hinder their Conversion*, 337.
The Reasonableness of Christianity *written chiefly for them*, 594, 595.
Inheritance, *How Goods come to descend by it from Parents to Children*, 132.
Political Government naturally descends by it no more than Conjugal, 134, 135.
Interest *(of Money) can't be effectually limited by a Law*, 4.
The ill Consequences of attempting to limit it, 4, 5.
The difference between Natural and Legal Interest, 6.
What raises the natural Interest, ibid.
Can be no more limited than the Hire of Houses and Ships, 6, 7.
The Mischiefs of reducing it low, 7.
The Rent of Land, &c. may as well be limited, 17.
Sinking it, increases not the Value of other Commodities, but the contrary, 23.
Yet 'tis fit the Law should lay some Restraint upon it, and why, 31.
Reasons for 6 l. per Cent. *being the best Proportion*, 32.
The height of it no Prejudice to Trade, 32, 33.
Why 'tis low in Holland, 33.
If 'twere generally low, 'twould be an Advantage to Trade, 34.
The lowering of it would render it more difficult to borrow, 37.
Job. *The Book of him probably written by a* Jew, 336.
Ἰσραὴλ *and* Ἰακὼβ, *what they signify in* Mark 14. 56, 59. *p.* 505.
Judah *(the Patriarch) had no Dominion of Life and Death*, 146.
Judgment *(final) how Christ will proceed therein*, 526, 527.

K.

KIngdom, *grows rich or powerful just as a Farmer does*, 11.
Kingdom of God, *what preaching it means*, 515.
Kings, *their being call'd* Nursing Fathers, *how to be understood*, 394.

L.

LAbour, *much more owing to it than to Nature*, 170.
First gave Right to Property, 167, 169, 171.
Land, *the yearly Rent of it might better be limited than the Interest of Money*, 18.
The Price of it raises not by lowering of Interest, 19. *The Cause of this*, 20.
Rises in proportion to the Number of Buyers, 20, 26.

The INDEX to

What increaſes the Sellers of it, 26.
What augments the Number of its Purchaſers, 27.
The Value of it decreaſes with the Decay of Trade, ibid.
Too much Advance of its Price, an Injury to the Publick, 31.
Why Men pay Taxes for it, tho' mortgaged, 36.
How it came at firſt to be appropriated, 167—169.
Land-holders, *want of Trade a great Loſs to them*, 13, 27.
Law *(of* Moſes*) why Idolatry was puniſh'd by it*, 247.
Forrigners not compell'd to obſerve the Rites of it, ibid.
Law *(of God) all have ſinn'd againſt it*, 477.
God's Juſtice vindicated in giving ſo difficult a one to Men, ibid.
Law *(of Works) what is meant by it*, 477, 178.
Is contain'd in the Law of Moſes, 478.
Law *(of Faith) how it differs from that of Works*, 478, 520, 521.
Vid. Moral Laws.
Law-makers, *how thoſe who are wiſe uſe to proceed*, 270, 463.
Laws *(human) muſt not be contrary to the Law of Nature or Scripture*, 196.
Legiſlative Power, *how 'tis bounded*, 198.
The End of it is the outward good of Society, 249.
Liberty, *how Men are, by Nature, in the State of it*, 160.
Wherein it conſiſts, 165.
Reſtraints by the Law of Nature, conſiſtent with it, 174.
How far 'tis given up by becoming Members of a Common-wealth, 193.
Lineal Succeſſion, *not reſtor'd in the Kings of* Iſrael, 156.
None obſerv'd among the Rulers of Iſrael *till* David's *Time*, 157.
Love, *Proſecutions riſing from it would rather be againſt Wickedneſs than Opinions*, 232, 233.
Lowndes *(Mr.) propounded to have our Money reduc'd to one Fifth leſs Value*, 73.
His Reaſons for leſſening the Value of Money, anſwer'd, 73——97.

M.

MAgiſtrates, *their Duty is to ſecure Civil Intereſts, not the Salvation of Souls*, 234.
Care of Souls only common to them with others, 235.
Are as liable to Error in Religion, as others, 235, 261, 311, 453.
Ought not to uſe Force in Matters of Religion, 240.
Have no Authority to impoſe Ceremonies in the Church, 243, 301. *Nor to be forbid thoſe us'd by others*, 245.
Their Power about indifferent Things, 243.
May not puniſh all Sins againſt God, 246, 362.
Are to puniſh only thoſe Things which injure the Society, 248.
By what Means they are brought to join with Churchmen in Perſecution, 254.
Have no Commiſſion to puniſh Errors in Religion, 261.
Only a ſmall Number of them of the true Religion, 265.
No Advantage in committing the Care of our Souls to them, 287, 288, 291.
Their uſing Force to promote the true Religion or their own, is in effect the ſame, 295, 296, 298, 468.
Have no Authority to impoſe Creeds, 300.
Are not to judge of Truth for other Men, 309.
Have not more Knowledge of Religion than others, 310.
The Apoſtle's ſaying, We can do nothing againſt the Truth, but for it, *not applicable to them*, 313, 390.
Have not Authority, like Parents or School-Maſters, to uſe Force, 324, 325.
Magiſtrates: *Diſcovering them to be in the wrong, adds little to finding out the Truth*, 290, 389, 390.
Ought to aſſiſt Religion, by ſuppreſſing Wickedneſs, 437.
Are not commiſſion'd by the Law of Nature, to uſe Force in Religion, 448, 449.
Manner, *as well as Reality of Things, how to be believ'd*, 583, 584.
Means *(of Salvation) no other ſhould be us'd than what God has appointed*, 269, 454, 455, 459.
What are proper for promoting Religion, 270.
Thoſe which are ſufficient, are given to all, 447.
The greateſt part of the World without them, if Force be neceſſary, 455.
Meſſiah, *That Jeſus is He, the primary Article of Chriſtianity*, 480, &c.
Is ſynonymous with the Son of God, 484, 485, 643——646.
Declar'd by Miracles, by Circumlocutions, and by expreſs Words, 486, 487.
Why our Saviour ſo much conceal'd his being He, 487, 488.
Had our Lord plainly aſſerted himſelf to be ſo, 'twould have expos'd him to the Roman *Power*, 489.
Our Saviour ſomewhat conceal'd his being ſo, to avoid the Rage of the Jewiſh *Rulers*, 487, 488. *And of the* Roman *Governors*, 489. *As alſo to prevent the* Jews *from rebelling*, 490.
Why our Lord expreſly own'd himſelf ſuch to the Woman of Samaria, 491.
How our Saviour's Wiſdom appear'd in the gradual Diſcovery of his being ſo, 507, 508.
His Kingdom call'd, by the Jews, The World to come, 510.
Believing Jeſus to be ſo, a juſtifying Faith, 516.
This Hebrew Word is ſufficiently explain'd in the New Teſtament, 552.

That

That Jesus is the Messiah, is not hard to be understood, tho' both Words are Hebrew, 585.
This Name sometimes pretended to be easy, at other times hard to be understood, 586.
Believing Jesus to be so, is more than the first Step to Christianity, 617, 618.
Ministers *(of Religion) of what sort they are, who want to have their Doctrine inforc'd*, 299.
Doing their Duty aright, would render Force unnecessary, 462, 463.
Mint, *Our Gain by Trading is that which alone brings Bullion into it*, 84. *Vid.* Coinage.
Miracles *never us'd to supply the want of Force*, 423, 424, 427, 460, 461.
Absurdly reckon'd among human Means, 425, 426.
Not wrought in the view of all who were converted, 426.
We have the same Advantage by them as most had in the first Ages, ibid.
Were continu'd (according to Church-History) after Christianity was establish'd by Human Laws, 428——430.
Were not often repeated to those who rejected the Gospel, 431.
Will be always necessary, supposing them so, whenever Men neglect their Duty, 433.
How the pretended Miracles of the Church of Rome *are supported by the Doctrine of Force*, 268, 445, 446.
Were not a necessary Means of Conviction in the Apostles time, 461, 462.
Our Saviour appeals to his for proving him the Messiah, 492. 493.
Mishna *(of the* Jews*) a Rule of good Breeding taken out of it by Dr.* Edwards, 502.
Monarchy, *how Government, at first, generally came to be so*, 188.
Vid. Absolute Monarchy.
Money *due to Foreigners can't always be paid in Goods or Bills of Exchange*, 10.
Necessity of a Proportion of it in Trade, 12.
Want of it very injurious to Land-holders, 13.
Lowering the Value of it increaseth not the Value of other Things, 17, 18.
'Tis valu'd according to the Plenty or Scarcity of Commodities, 16, 18.
Mischievous Consequences of a Scarcity of it, 24, 25.
Want of it at last falls upon Land, 35, 36.
How the Value of it may be said to be raised, 39.
It can't be really rais'd, unless in Proportion to its Plenty or Scarceness, 40.
Raising it in Denomination, tends to impoverish a Nation, 41, 42.
Is valu'd according to the Quantity of Silver contain'd in it, 42. *How it came to be otherwise when clip'd*, 45.
The Advantage of it in Commerce, above uncoin'd Silver, 43.
The Cause of melting it down, ibid.
'Tis better for the Publick to be mill'd than hammer'd, 44, 76.
Raising the Denomination will not hinder the Exportation of it, 45.
The Value of it should be kept as steddy as possible, 48.
Money: *The Proportion should always be exactly kept between that of Gold and Silver*, 47——49.
Constant Equality of its Value, the Interest of every Country, 49.
Making it lighter than it should be, is unjust, 52, 61, 69, 87.
Lowering it, no Advantage in Selling or Letting of Land, 54, 61.
Why so little is sometimes coin'd, 57.
'Tis really valuable according of its Weight, 55, 59. *This must be understood of Silver without the Alloy*, 60.
Why so much was coin'd in Queen Elizabeth's *Time, and after*, 62.
How it answers all Things, 67.
The Denomination alters not the intrinsick Value, 70.
Lessening its real Value, is worse than clipping, 70, 83.
Its being current only for its Weight, is the most effectual Way to stop the Mischief of Clipping, 70, 71.
'Tis necessary, in proportion to the Plenty of it in neighbour Nations, 71.
'Twill always be of equal Value with the same Weight of Standard Silver, 76.
What causes the Exportation of it, 77.
It ought not to be made lighter, tho' Silver were grown dearer, 78. 79.
Lessening it would be a Gain to Money-hoarders, but a Loss to others, 79, 80.
By making it One Fifth lighter, Creditors and Landlords lose 20 per Cent. *p.* 81.
And Labourers also lose by it, unless they have One Fifth more Wages, ibid.
The Change of its Name will not alter its Value, 83, 85.
The Insignificancy of Lessening explain'd by familiar Similitudes, 84.
If a Crown of it (e. g.) be call'd 75 *Pence, 'twill buy no more Goods than if it be call'd* 60 *Pence*, 85, 86.
Lowering its Value will not render it more generally useful, 86, 87.
It can't be of the full Price of Bullion, because of exporting the latter, 87, 88.
The true raising it is by putting more Silver in it, 88.
How it has been alter'd in former Times, and the most probable Occasions of it, 88, 89.
How to prevent the melting of it down, or exporting it, 94, 95.
How the Use of it first inlarg'd the Extent of Property, 171, 172.
Vid. Interest of Money.
Moral Law *is establish'd by the Gospel*, 478.
How 'tis fulfill'd and confirm'd by our Saviour, 521——525.
Morality *of the Gospel is the most excellent*, 532——536.

The INDEX to

Myſteries, *The Author vindicated from the Charge of deriding them*, 649.

N.

NAme *of Chriſt, believing in it ſignifies him to be the Meſſiah*, 491.
National Religion, *none ſuch can claim to be the true, excluſive of others*, 417.
Nature, *Men are, by it, in a State of Equality*, 160.
By it People have Liberty, but not Licence, ibid.
In the State of it every one has Right to puniſh the Breach of its Law, 161, 162.
The Inconveniencies of it not greater than of Abſolute Monarchy, 162.
Independent Princes are ſtill in the State of it, 162, 163.
Noah *had Authority given him in common with his Sons*, 112.
Was not the ſole Heir of the World, 114.
Had a greater Dominion over the Creatures than Adam, 114, 115.
None of his Sons Heir to Adam *more than the reſt*, 149.
Of the Continuance of the true Religion taught by him, 438.
Had no Commiſſion to promote the true Religion by Force, 443.

O.

OBedience *(Sincere) a neceſſary Condition of the Goſpel*, 525.
Occaſional Paper, *a Reply to ſeveral Things therein*, 669, &c.
One *(Article) how arguing from* one *to* none *might be us'd by a Pagan*, 614.
Vid. Article.
Opinions *merely ſpeculative, ought to be tolerated*, 248.
Contrary to human Society, are not to be tolerated, 250, 251.
Oppreſſion *is the great Cauſe of Civil Commotions*, 252.
Orthodoxy, *when a Pretence to it is ridiculous*, 648.

P.

PAgan *might argue from* one *to* none, *as the Author's Antagoniſt does*, 614.
Paganiſm, *how Zeal againſt it ſhould be expreſs'd*, 335, 336.
Par *(in the exchange of Money) what it means*, 72.
Parables, *why Chriſt us'd them in ſpeaking of his Kingdom*, 494.
Parental Power, *perhaps a more fit Phraſe than (as uſual) Paternal Power*, 173.
Parental Power, *how it differs from Political*, 176, 178.
Parents, *their Power temporary, but the Honour due to 'em perpetual*, 176.
The Ground and Extent of their Power over their Children, 323.
May give Maſters Authority to uſe Force upon their Children, 324.
Παῤῥησια, *The Meaning of this Greek Word*, 503.
Party, *in the true Eccleſiaſtical Notion, ſignifies Profeſſors without Piety*, 469.
Patriarch, *This Name denotes not having Sovereign Power from* Adam, 149, 154.
Patrick *(Biſhop) his Notion of Chriſtianity*, 553.
How he underſtood the Phraſe, Son of God, 641, 642.
Paul *(the Apoſtle) The general Drift of his Preaching*, 526.
Penal Laws, *not deſign'd to make Men conſider, but conform*, 402, 403.
How a National Religion loſes Ground by the Relaxation of them, 413.
Whether Atheiſm, &c. increaſe by their Relaxation, 413, 414.
Vid. Puniſhment.
Penalties, *Vid.* Force.
Perjury, *to be carefully prevented by Lawmakers*, 4.
Frequent Oaths a great Occaſion of it, 5.
Perſecution, *what it ſignifies*, 295.
If 'twere deſign'd for ſaving Souls, Perſons conforming on it would be examin'd concerning their Convictions, 264, 389.
Only uſeful to fill the Church with Hypocrites, 398.
Vid. Force, Puniſhments.
Peru, *ſome of its Inhabitants fatten'd and eat their Children*, 121.
Pilate *could not find our Saviour guilty of Treaſon, tho' he was charg'd with it*, 506, 507.
Political Power, *what 'tis*, 159.
Tho' in ſome Caſes 'tis Abſolute, *yet not* Arbitrary, 197, 198.
Political Societies, *how fram'd*, 182.
How they began, 185.
Muſt be determin'd by the Majority, unleſs they agree on a greater Number, 185, 186.
Why we have no Hiſtorical Account of their Beginning, 186.
All Advantages which may be gain'd by 'em, can't be reckon'd the End of 'em, 283, 284.
Power, *Paternal, Political, and Deſpotical*, 206.
Vid. Supreme.
Prejudices, *not to be remov'd by Force*, 363.
Vid. Force.
Prerogative, *wherein it conſiſts*, 203, 204. *How, and why 'tis ſometimes limited*, 204.
The End of it is the Publick Good, 205.
Who may judge concerning the right or wrong Uſe of it, ibid.
If People are injur'd by it, they may appeal to Heaven, 205, 206.
Price *of Things not always proportionable to their Uſefulneſs*, 20, 21.
Of foreign Commodities advances by being tax'd, but that of home ones falls, 28, 29. *The Reaſon of this*, 29.
Prieſts *(Jewiſh and Heathen) reflecting on them, not expoſing Goſpel-Miniſters*, 670.
Property, *How Men come to have it*, 166.
How 'tis naturally bounded, 167, 171.
In Land, and other Things, at firſt acquir'd by Labour, 167, 168.
How this is a common Advantage, 169.
'Twas at length ſettled by Laws, 171.
Can't be rightly taken from any without their Conſent, 197.

Provi-

the Second Volume.

Providence, *The Bounty of it in making the moſt uſeful Things commonly the cheapeſt*, 21.

Prudence *of the Author, unjuſtly compar'd with that of the Jeſuits in* China, 597.

Puniſhments *(for Errors in Religion) are unjuſt, tho' moderate*, 263.

Not lawfully us'd to make People conſider, 268, 314.

Human Laws inflict them not to make Men examine, 270.

The Pretence for inflicting them, in France, *on the Proteſtants*, ibid.

National Churches need them as much as Diſſenters, 274.

If beneficial, 'tis unkind to with-hold them from any, 275.

The Difficulty of determining the due Meaſures of them, 278, 350——354.

Commonly leaſt us'd, where they are moſt needful, 279.

'Tis unjuſt to inflict them for inforcing things not neceſſary, 341.

The Fault for which they are inflicted, points out the End of them, 340, 365.

Leaving the Meaſure of them to the Magiſtrate's Prudence, juſtifies the greateſt, 355, 356, 359.

Admitting them as neceſſary in Matters of Religion, leads to the ſharpeſt Severities, 357.

Prejudice the Minds of Men againſt Truth, 365.

Are deſign'd only to bring to outward Conformity, 374, 410.

Puniſhments: *Not inflicted by the Apoſtles, to bring Men to Religion, or make them conſider*, 451, 452.

Of God, never inflicted on any, except for their own Sins, 476.

R.

REaſon, *The Inſufficiency of it without Revelation*, 530——537.

Rebellion, *the Word ſometimes us'd for a lawful War*, 213.

The beſt Means to prevent it, is good Government, 221.

Governours may be guilty of it as well as the Governed, ibid.

Redemption; *the Doctrine of it founded upon the Suſpicion of* Adam's *Fall*, 474.

What it reſtores Men to, 476.

Religion, *is the ſame to all who have the ſame Rule of Faith and Worſhip*, 255.

If true, it prevails by its own Strength, without Force, 260.

Vid. True Religion.

Rents; *the Advantage of paying them Quarterly or Weekly*, 14.

The Cauſes of their falling, 34.

Repentance *is a neceſſary Condition of the Goſpel*, 516, 517.

Repreſentatives *of the People, how ſometimes very unequal*, 262.

Corrupting them, or pre-engaging the Electors, tends to diſſolve the Government, 220.

Reſiſtance *of Tyranny, when 'tis lawful*, 215.

When 'tis unlawful to be us'd, 216.

'Tis warrantable to uſe it for repelling illegal Force, 222, 223.

Reſurrection *(of Chriſt) the Neceſſity of believing it*, 481.

The Belief of it put for believing him to be the Meſſiah, 631.

Revelation; *the Neceſſity of it to direct us to Heaven*, 530, 537.

Reynolds, *a remarkable Story of two Brothers of this Name*, 266, 397.

Righteouſneſs, *whence Faith is accounted for it*, 528.

S.

SAcrament *(of the Lord's Supper) how it has been proſtituted by Human Laws*, 264.

Who are to be blam'd for its Proſtitution, 382.

Salvation *(of Souls) the Care of it belongs not to Magiſtrates, as ſuch*, 234, 235.

Why the Care of each Man's belongs only to himſelf, 249.

Not the Deſign of Penal Laws about Religion, 264.

Pretending Care of this for uſing Force in Religion, is Prevarication, 386.

Impoſſible to be promoted, by forcing People in Religious Matters, 469.

Satisfaction *(of Chriſt) why not directly inſiſted on in* The Reaſonableneſs, *&c.* 546.

The Omiſſion of it no Proof of the Author's being a Socinian, 598, 599, 647, 648.

'Tis hard for one who reads the Scripture with Attention, to deny it, 668.

Scepticiſm *not juſtly chargeable upon Toleration*, 413, 414.

Schiſm, *wherein it conſiſts*, 256.

Who are the chief Cauſes of it, 337.

School-maſters, *their uſing Force to make their Scholars learn, is no warrant for uſing it in Religious Matters*, 324, 383.

Scriptures *are to be conſulted as our Guide in Religion*, 289, 387, 388.

Contain all neceſſary Means of Salvation, 448, 449, 459.

'Tis not abſolutely neceſſary to know and believe all Things contain'd therein, 539, 540.

'Tis neceſſary to believe all which we know to be taught in them, 539.

Speak, in Eſſentials, ſuitably to the meaneſt Capacity, 540, 541, 551, 552.

We ſhould learn our Religion out of them, 609.

The Miſchief of making them chime in with our previous Notions, 610, 611.

All Things therein are neceſſary to be believ'd, when underſtood, 635——639.

Sects *(or Diviſions) who are the chief Cauſe of them*, 337.

Whether national Churches may not be ſuch as well as others, 338.

Sedition, *where-ever 'tis practis'd, ſhould be puniſh'd alike*, 253.

Self-Conceitedneſs *is worſe than Folly*, 650.

Sellers, *plenty of them makes things cheap*, 29.

Shem

The INDEX to

Shem *(the Patriarch) was no absolute Monarch*, 151.
Silver *is ten times more plentiful now than two hundred Years ago, and why*, 23.
'Tis therefore Nine Parts in Ten cheaper, ibid.
Properly speaking, none of it is finer than other, 67.
Measures, the Value of other Things, 68.
Silver: *How Standard is, in* England, *proportion'd with Allay*, 68, 69.
The Advantages of its being mix'd with Copper, in Money, 69.
Is brought in by an Over-balance of Trade, 71.
Is alone the Measure of Commerce, and not Gold, 72, 73.
When it may be said to rise or fall in the Value of it, 74, 75.
'Tis always in Value according to its Weight, if Standard, 75.
How unreasonable 'tis to pretend it to be worth more uncoin'd, than coin'd, 82.
Whence uncoin'd sometimes advances in the Price of it, 82, 83.
Sins, *several of them are not punishable by Magistrates*, 246.
Slaves, *Men are not born such*, 103, &c.
The Israelites *were not so when return'd out of* Egypt, 155.
Jacob's *Sons were not such, as appears by* Reuben *and* Judah, *ibid.*
Slavery, *'tis hard to suppose any one to plead for it in earnest*, 102.
Wherein it consists, 165.
Society, *every Advantage which may be attain'd by it, is not the End of it*, 327.
Vid. Conjugal, Political, Human.
Socinians, *are apt to impose their Notions as well as others*, 610.
The Author unreasonably tax'd to be one of them, 641——643.
Socinianism, *The* Reasonableness of Christianity *unjustly charg'd with it*, 546, 547, 549, 550.
Son of God, *A Man's understanding this Phrase, as some* Socinians *do, is no Proof of his being one*, 641.
Signifies the same Thing with the Messiah, 643——645. *The Confession of the Eunuch* (Acts 8.) *proves not the contrary*, 646, 647.
Soul, *The Care of it belongs not to Magistrates, as such*, 234.
The Care of Mens own better left to themselves, than to others, 291.
Spain *is it self poor, tho' it furnishes all other Nations with Gold and Silver*, 35.
Splitting *one Article into two, not rightly charg'd on the Author*, 566.
Supreme *Power of the Common-wealth, where it lies*, 200, 201.
Syllogism *is the true Touch-stone of right arguing*, 650.
Systems, *the Author hates them not, but only complains of the Abuse of 'em*, 648, 649, 653.

T.

TAXES *generally fall, at last, upon Land*, 27, 28.
Increase the Price of Foreign, but lessen that of Home Commodities, 29.
Tho' laid upon Trade in Holland, *yet they chiefly impoverish Land-holders*, 30.
Thorns *and Briars may be laid in the Way by Providence, but should not by Men*, 304.
Tiberius *(the* Roman *Emperor) a very jealous Prince*, 507.
Tillotson *(Archbishop) how he understood this Phrase*, The Son of God, 641.
Toleration *(in Religion) often vindicated upon too narrow Principles*, 231.
Chief Mark of the true Church, 232.
Is very agreeable to Gospel, and to Reason, 234.
Is not inconsistent with Excommunication, 237.
Should be mutually exercis'd by different Churches, 238.
Ought to be promoted by Church-Officers, 239.
'Tis the Duty of Magistrates, 240.
Should not be extended to all immoral Practices, 245.
Ought to be extended to Pagans and Idolaters, 246, 259.
To whom it may not be extended, 250, 251.
All Churches should profess it as the Foundation of their Liberty, 251.
Granting it, prevents Dangers from Dissenting Assemblies, 252.
Will cause all who enjoy it, to be watchful for the Publick Peace, 253.
Should extend to all Things lawful in common Conversation, ibid.
Want of it produces Disturbances upon account of Religion, 254.
Truth is a Gainer by it, 260.
Is no Cause of Sects and Divisions, 395.
The pretended ill Effects of it refuted, 415——415.
True Religion in no danger to be lost by it, 436.
Is not the Cause of general Corruption, 441.
Trade *inriches a Nation more than Mines do*, 7.
Is hinder'd by lowering the Interest of Money, ibid.
When 'tis Gainful, or a Loss to a Nation, 9.
The general Decay of it lessens the Value of Land, 27.
Trade: *What is the Over-balance of it*, 71.
Translation *(of the Bible) a Remark concerning the Authority of the* English *one*, 449.
True Religion, *of the highest Concern to all Persons*, 371.
Force no proper Means to bring Men to it, 371, 372, 396, 442, 443.
Is dishonour'd by using Force for promoting it, 372.
Several Persons may be of it, tho' differing in some Things, 373, 376.
All who suppose themselves to be of it, have equal Right to impose on others, 415, 416.
No Nation can lay claim to it, exclusive of others, 417.
Magistrates must know it before they can punish the Rejecters of it, 419, 420, 468.
Lenity the best Way of promoting it, 421, 422.
Whether it can subsist without actual Miracles or Force, 423, &c.

'Twas

'Twas not lost for want of Force in a few Ages after the Flood, 438.
Truth *(of Religion) the best Way to find it is by a good Life*, 261, 444, 445.
Tyranny, *wherein it consists*, 214.
Speech of King James I. *concerning it*, ibid.
The Greatness of the Persons exercising it, aggravates the Crime, 215.
Promoting it, was probably the first Cause of Idolatry, 440, 441.

U.

UNbelievers, *Vid.* Infidels.
Uniformity, *(the Act of) the declar'd Intention of it*, 402.
Unitarians, *Dr.* Edwards's *witty Remark upon this Word*, 565.
Unity, *wherein that which Christ pray'd for consists*, 336.
Who are most guilty of breaking it, 337.
Unmasker, *Vid.* Edwards.
Use *(of Money) Vid.* Interest.
Useful, *several Truths are so, but yet not necessary to Salvation*, 578.
Usefulness *of Things don't always render them lawful*, 262, 267.
We are liable to judge wrongly concerning it, 268.
To argue from the Lawfulness of Things, is presumptuous, 269.
Usurpation, *wherein it consists*, 213.

W.

WAR, *the State of it described*, 163.
He that seeks the Life or Liberty of another, is in a State of it, ibid.
How it differs from the State of Nature, 164.
Avoiding it the Design of forming Society, ibid.
West-Indies, *some Nations there have no Supreme Governour, unless in Time of War*, 285, 331.
Wheat *more fit than most other Things, for a common Measure of Trade*, 23.
'Tis not so useful for Exchange, as Money, 24.
Word of God, *what is meant by it in* John 5. 31. *p.* 478, 488.
Worship, *the Law of Nature ascribes the Power of appointing the Parts of it to God only*, 301.
Writer *(of Controversies) what kind of one the Author desires*, 671.

F I N I S.

BIBLIOTEKA SZKOŁY GŁÓWNEJ HANDLOWEJ

Zdezynf. 1966 m