



Bodleian Libraries

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

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

For more information see:

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



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

Francis Hope. D.D. Dean of Worcester
T H E

Doctrine of W-----r still the same:

Or, His New DEFENCE of the

Lord Bishop of Bangor's

S E R M O N, &c.

C O N S I D E R ' D

As the Performance of a Great Critick, a Man of Sense, and a Man of Probity.

By an Impartial Hand.

*Sed quanto Ille magis formas se vertet in omnes,
Tanto, Gnate, magis contende tenacia vincla;
Donec talis erit, mutato corpore, qualem
Videris, incepto tegetet cum lumina somno.*

Virg.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. KNAPTON, at the Crown in
St. Paul's Church-Yard. 1720.

LIBRARY OF THE
BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
2007



1877



The *D---n* of *W-----r's*
New DEFENCE of the Lord
Bishop of *Bangor's* SERMON,
&c. Consider'd.



IT has been observ'd long ago, upon a like Occasion to the present, that when *Cardinals* appear abroad without the Ensigns of their Dignity, it is in order to avoid the Trouble of giving or receiving any Compliments. But then it ought to be remark'd at the same time, that They never give, nor receive, any *Affronts* or *Rudenesses*. There is something in this Manner of Appearing that is agreeable and innocent, without being indecent. It avoids the Uneasiness of *Ceremony* to ones self, without giving the Uneasiness of *Rude Treatment* to Others. But some Spirits cannot be content with this Common Manner of being *incognito*, in which a Man is allowed to pass as *Unknown*; and in which he will be always respected as long as he preserves a *Decorum*, and does not break in upon the Rules either of *Society*, or of *Good Manners*.

There is Another Sort of *Mock-appearance*, now too much in fashion. It is this. Many have found that the *Characters* They are obliged to sustain in their daily Appearance and ordinary Life, are too great a Confinement to the Freedom of their Souls; that they chain up the natural Bent and Vigour of their Minds; and give too close a Restraint to the Passions and Dispositions They feel within. And therefore, They have invented a way of remedying so great an Evil. They have resolved, at some certain times, to throw off these *Common Appearances*, which are in truth the Restraints of a *Real Disguise*, in which They should otherwise pass their whole Life; and assume Their own *Real Characters* by way of a *Disguise*, which is indeed only Nominal. For the *Real Disguise* is changed for the *Seeming One*; and the *Seeming Disguise* is indeed the *Real Man*, whose *Inside* and *Outside* have by this means only changed their Situation.

This succeeds very well with Those who have preserved their *External Characters* or *Persons* uniformly in ordinary Life; and know how to vary from Them, with Address, whenever they change the Appearance. But when an Unskilful Actor mixes himself in such a *Scene*; not knowing himself enough to be sensible that He has, in his ordinary Character, been exactly the same that He is now going to appear; nothing is received and entertained with more *Ridicule*. As soon as He comes upon the *Stage*, He betrays Himself. Either his *Aukward Gait*, or some other Peculiarity in his *Manner*, makes him known. Or, if not, as soon as He speaks, his *Words* reveal him. Perhaps the *Rudeness* of his *Freedom*, which He mistakes for *Wit*; Or the *Affectation* of Something more than ordinary, which He mistakes for a Superiority of *Genius*; Or some other *Propriety*, which He cannot separate from Himself, immediately discover Him. The only Reason why
He

He attempts to appear in *Disguise*, is to display more freely the same Dispositions which He has not been able to hide in his ordinary Habit. And He is treated accordingly. In such Assemblies, every One who enters is upon an Equality: And He who uses *Freedom*s; must be content to accept them in return.

It is just thus in the *Disguises* of Writers. There are Those who can assume a *Character* differing from their own in their ordinary Life, and are able to keep up to it with Regularity and Uniformity. There are Those who assume One with the same View; but are not able to stir a Step in it without shewing Themselves too plainly to be the very reverse to what They would *personate*. And some chuse to *imagine* themselves in *Disguise*, merely to give themselves a loose, and to shew more of *Themselves*, and their own True *Natural Tempers*, than They are willing to hope They do, in their ordinary *Persons*.

There is no one, I confess, who had ever less Occasion, or less Temptation, to take this Method than the *D—n* of *W——r*. He has shewn as much *Contempt* of the *Bishop of Bangor*; has treated him with as much Rudeness, and as keen Reproach; whilst He calls Himself by *his own Name*; and *owns Himself* to be Himself; as any one need wish to do. And then for the display of his *Learning* and *Criticism*; there is still less need of his going out of his proper ordinary Character. But I know not what it is. He has judg'd this a very narrow Sphere of *Action*: And has chosen *Another*, in which he seems to think the *Licentiousness* of Words to be the True *Freedom* of Conversation. Here He hopes, He may *wanton* in Abuse, in Misrepresentation, and in personal Reproaches, entirely foreign to the Cause into which He has unfortunately thrust Himself. And since He has chosen *This*, instead of the *Answer* of a *Man* and of a *Christian* to what has been urged upon

upon Him ; it is fit He should enjoy it with all its Benefits. And therefore, I, an *Impartial* Man, and a constant Observer of the Progress of the present Debate, tho' greatly inferior to Him in Learning, yet enter into the present Contest with Him in another Respect upon an Equal Foot. I am here likewise in *Disguise*, to carry on the *Conversation* with Him and to shew him how greatly he is mistaken in Himself and his Art ; and how much the *same Man* he is, *In Disguise* and *Out of Disguise*.

The Expectation of the World perhaps was that the *D—n* should at least have *first* defended Himself, before he made a new Attack upon Another. But as He pass'd some time in the Camp of the greatest General the World perhaps ever saw, he became acquainted with the *Stratagem* of removing the Seat of *War* into the Enemies Country. And imagining that *Every Maxim* is fit for *Every Thing*, and *Every Occasion* ; and that *Every Head* and *Every Hand* are equally fit for the Application and Execution of *Every Rule*, he resolv'd to put this *Stratagem* in Practice. And accordingly, some time before the *Bishop of Bangor's* Answer to the *D—n's* Sermon, it was given out that this Method would be taken ; and the *Materials* were got ready for the Attack, and utter Desolation of the *Bishop's* Sermon ; which was now to be torn to Pieces with a mighty and unrestrained Force of *Criticism* and *Satyr*.

But the next *Stratagem* of the *D—n's* was to avoid all Appearance of being at all concern'd in the Attempt. To this Purpose, and to amuse the World, He writes a *Postscript* to his own *Sermon*, with his Name to it : In which he says, at the End of it, that " he took that Opportunity to wash his Hands " of *Personal Matters*, ONCE FOR ALL ; to clear his " Way, &c." And after such a Piece of exquisite Cunning as This, would any Man suspect that this same *Washer of his Hands* should foul them immediately in

a much greater *Quantity of Personal Scandal* ; nay, that he was at that same time doing it ? If *Truth and Sincerity* were only appointed to be like *Cloths*, to be worn and laid aside at Pleasure ; something might be said for the *D—n's* Conduct, in *speaking* deceitfully, in order to hide his *acting* so. Or, if he had the perfect *Dexterity* of hiding himself from the World ; He might, with less offence, act such a Part. Indeed, when a *Child* shuts his own Eyes, he is apt to fancy that *Nobody* sees him : And we see, it sometimes happens to a *Man*, that because he does not know *Himself*, he therefore imagines the World does not know him. But when a Person cannot forbear, when He is *in Disguise*, to be exactly *Himself out of Disguise* ; or when He has the misfortune to be *so like Nobody, that Nobody is like Him* ; it shews an *Injudiciousness* to imagine that He can be taken for any *Other Man*, or any *Other Man for Him*. And certainly such a One had better not attempt to cover himself ; at least not by any Thing that must look so much like a *Falseness*, as soon as the *Discovery* is made. A Man of *True Native Probity* would with *Difficulty* permit himself to use a *Prevarication*, even tho' he were sure no other Man could ever know of it. It would be enough to *Him* that he could not hide it from himself. And the inward *Consciousness* of it would be a *Wound* in his own Breast, too uneasy for him to chuse to endure. But in Cases where the *Deceit* can't be carried on, a *Christian Divine* makes but an *ill Figure*, who declares, in his own Name, that he washes his *Hands of Personal Matters ONCE FOR ALL*, when he is found at the same time more deeply plunging himself in the Filth and Mire of *Personal Abuses*. There is no Harm in assuming *another Person*, or attempting to hide *Ones own*. But there is an *Immorality* in first declaring, in ones own Person, what a Man knows at that time not to be true. But I
will

will spare him; and say nothing more, than that it is very certain that He, who has given it us under his own Hand that he has † already acted a **MEAN and UNGENEROUS Part**, merely because he was *ask'd* to do it, is very capable of acting a still more **MEAN and UNGENEROUS Part without being ask'd**.

I have now observed the *Stratagems* at the opening this New War. We shall see how it is carried on. It is the *Attack* of One who appears in the Habit of a *Christian*, a Man of *Sense*, and a *Great Critick*. The *Defense* shall answer to it in these Respects. It begins, after a due and ingenious Preparation, at page 5. And the *Critick* opens the War. The *Bishop's* Words in the *Introduction* to his *Sermon* are these, as He cites them. "One of those great Effects which Length of time is seen to bring along with it, is the Alteration of the Meaning annex'd to certain Sounds. The Signification of a Word, well known and understood by Those who first made use of it, is very insensibly varied by passing through many Mouths, and by being *taken* and *given* by Multitudes in common Discourse." I have printed the same Words in a different Character, which the *D—n* has, that his *Critical* Remarks may the better be compared with them.

1. He supposes his Lordship would have said, *given* and *taken*. *Tantanne rem tam negligenter!* I, on the other Side, suppose, *Not*. But if the *D—n* does not see plainly the *Reason* of this, I'm sure, it is not worth while to tell him: because He who does not see it at first, will hardly understand it when it is told him. But the *D—n*, *not intending to insist upon* * *little Things*, only cries out upon the *Heap of Improperities in these few Lines*.

† *Postfc.* p. 43.

* P. 5.

2. *In which*, says he, *Length of Time* is said to be *seen*. Go thy ways for a *Grammarians*, a *Critick*, and a *Man of Sense*. *Length of Time* is *not* here said to be *seen*; but to be *seen* to bring along with it, &c. If the *D* — *n* therefore, has forgot such *Trifles*, as the *Construction* of a plain *Sentence*; I will teach him to find it out. Let him ask the *Question*, *What is seen?* The *Answer* will be, *not length of Time*, which is the *D* — *n*'s *Answer*: But, That *Length of Time* brings along with it such an *Effect*. *This is seen*. I will give Him another *Rule* to find out the *Sense* of such a difficult *Passage*: And that is to change the *Passive* into the *Active*. For to say, *Length of Time is seen* to bring along with it, is no more than to say, *We see* that *Length of Time* brings along with it. I will bring Him an *Example*, of greater weight to Him than any *Rule* of mine: And that is *his own*. For, as if a *Fatality* attended such an *Uneasy Itch of Pedantry*, We have it here in his own *Words*, *Length of Time is said* — At which *Word* let such Another as *Himself* make a stop, and exclaim, *How can Length of Time be said?* And he will see the *Beauty* of his own *Criticism*. *Criticism* did I call it? Let every *Man* who loves *True Learning*, pardon me. These are the *Doctæ Ineptiæ* which have brought the *Name* of *Critick* into *Contempt*, amongst *Those* who will not be at the *Pains* to distinguish between the *Importune Pedant*, and the *Judicious Scholar*. Or is it so, that so great a *Critick* cavils at the *Application* of the *Word seen*, where the *Bodily Eyes* cannot be made use of? Let the *D* — *n* of *W* — *r* himself, in his own *Person*, teach Him that an *Absurdity* may be *visible*; may be said to be *seen*, tho' it can't possibly be *seen*: And let every other of the best *Authors*, in all *Languages*, I will not say *instruct*, but awaken the *Remembrance* of this *Hypercritick*, who can't read a *Page* in *Any* of their *Writings* without perpetually meeting

ing with this Figure. What an excellent *Critique* would such a Person make upon some of *Tully's* finest and most beautiful Expressions?

3. The next *Impropriety* is, that ' *Length of Time* ' is *seen to bring along with it an Effect*. And is it not worth while to be born a great *Genius*; and to be educated in the midst of Books and Learned Men, to make such Discoveries as this? But is it not thus indeed? Does not *Time bring along with it* its own Effects, in the common Language of all Writers? Is not *Old Age* very commonly and properly said to bring along with it *Feebleness*? And may not that *Feebleness* be stiled the *Effect* of *Old Age*? Does not the mere Affectation of *Criticism* always *bring along with it* that *Ridicule* which it produces? For the *Phrase* is not that *Time brings along an Effect*, as this Author's way of printing it would impose it upon his *Reader*; but that *Time brings along with it this Effect*.

4. But this is not all. This *Effect* is said to be produced by *very insensible*, i. e. (says our *Critick*) *Invisible Degrees*. The great *Criticism* here must lie in this, that *That* cannot be *seen to be an Effect* of *Time*, which is produced by *Insensible Degrees*, that is, *Invisible Degrees*. *Risum teneatis?* The Sentence in which the Word *seen* is *figuratively* used, is completely made an end of. Another Sentence begins, as distinct from it, as if it were in another Treatise. And it is this. " The Signification of a Word--- is " *very insensibly* varied by passing thro' many Mouths," &c. Let this *Critick* now put *very invisibly* in the Place of *very insensibly*, and try whether it is an Equivalent Expression. And let any one judge whether He is not an *extraordinary* Man, who, in criticising upon *Words*, in order to make an Expression, which is both *common* and *proper*, to appear ridiculous, puts in its Place *Another* which is neither *common* nor *proper*. Which is as much as to say, The *Bishop* ought to have talk'd Nonsense, tho' He *did not* 5.

5. The last *Impropriety* * is, that this particular *Effect* of Length of Time is said to be a *great Effect*, tho' no *Effect* of Time is more natural, or less surprizing. As if nothing could be *Great*, but what is *Unnatural* or *Surprizing*. The *Effect* of the Sun is very *Great* every Year; and yet nothing more natural, or less surprizing. The Ruines of Old Rome are a *Great Effect* of Time: And produced by *Insensible* Degrees. And yet no *Effect* of Time is more natural, or less surprizing. If a certain Person goes on to bless the World with such Observations every Week for Years together, the *Effect* of his long Study will be allowed to be *Great*; tho' it will cease to be surprizing, and be acknowledged to be as *Natural* to this sort of *Genius*, as *Play* is to *Children*.

Some Men give themselves leave to *trifle*, to shew their *Wit* or *Humour*; which is *entertaining*: Some Men *trifle* merely for *trifling's* Sake; which is *Inoffensive*: And some Men condescend to *Trifle*, as if it were on Purpose to shew an impotent *Inclination* to hurt, even where *Wit*, and *Sense*, and *Grammar* all stand in opposition to Them; — *Aversis Musis, & Apolline nullo*.

6. The next *Critical Remark* is that *A. Gellius* expressed Himself (who doubts it?) better than the *Bishop*, in these elegant Words, *Animadvertere est pleraque verborum Latinorum ex eâ significatione, in quâ nata sunt, decessisse vel in aliam longè vel in proximam; eamque decessionem factam esse consuetudine & inscitia temere dicentium quæ cuiusmodi sint, non didicerint*. Let us translate this into *English*, and preserve the same Figures of Speech; and it will run thus. ' It is to
' be remark'd that very many of the Latin Words
' have departed out of that *Sense* or *Signification*, in
' which they were born, into Another sometimes very

* P. 5, 6.

‘ distant from it, and sometimes the very next to it ;
 ‘ and that this *Departure* has been effected by *Custom*,
 ‘ and by the *Ignorance*, &c.” And if it had been in
 the Case of *Religion*, I am apt to think, he would
 have added, *By the Passions and Evil Designs of Others*.
 It is certain that This is very well, and very beauti-
 fully express’d. Every good Judge thought so, even
 when it first appeared. There was only one *Lepidus*
 at that Time of a contrary Mind. This Man’s
 true Name, it is to be remark’d, was *Lepus* ; but a
 strong Fancy and Resolution took Him of chang-
 ing it into *Lepidus* : Tho’ all the Learned Men of
 the Age contended against Him, that, as from *Calor*
 and *Tepor* came *Calidus* and *Tepidus*, so, *Lepidus* could
 not be form’d from *Lepus*, but from *Lepor* alone, to
 which his *Name* had not the least relation. He
 was very angry at this : and, against the Opinion
 of them All, He said at first that *He was content his* †
Reputation for Learning should stand and fall with
that Etymology. But, upon second Thoughts, He
 had recourse to another Pretence : and insisted up-
 on it, that there was some Proof that the *Original*
Name of his House, was Lepidus ; and there * *was great*
Reason to suspect that the Two Letters I D. had by some
Accident dropt out of the Old Writings belonging to
the Family. To which no one reply’d. This *Le-*
pidus was a Man of *Letters*, who, besides the *Advan-*
tage of a Learned Education, much Leisure, and the
best Books, had kept Company for many Years with
the greatest Critick of that Age. But all this would
 not form Him what He wish’d to be. For by an
 injudicious *Imitation*, He arriv’d only as far as a little
External Resemblance to a Critick. He thought *Cri-*
ticism consisted in *finding Fault* ; and that the more
 Faults any one could appear to find in any *Writer*,

 † See *A late Postsc.* p. 44.

 * *New Defence, &c.* p. 46.
 the

the greater Critick He shew'd himself to be : And so by attempting to turn *Others* into *Ridicule*, became a *Jest* himself. This *Lepidus*, amongst other Exploits, made great Sport with the foregoing *Observation* of *A. Gellius*. First, It was a very common one: And then, It was express'd with *Many Improperities* in so little a Compass of Words. What? Said *Lepidus*, Can *Words* be said to be *Born*?— To be *born* IN such or such a *Sense*, as a *Man* is *born* IN such a *Country*? Can *Words* be said to *depart*, to go away, OUT OF one *Sense*, INTO another, just as a *Man* goes OUT OF one *Country*, INTO Another; when They are known to have neither *Will* nor *Feet*? And can this *Departure* be, in the next Words, properly said to be effected by *Custom*, and *Ignorance*?— The *Consequence* of all this was, that *Lepidus* was judg'd by all the *Learned Men* of the Age, to be *Litteratus sine Doctrinâ*: and it came to be a *Maxim* that a *Pedant* was a greater *Enemy* to the *Elegance* of *Language*, than an *Ignorant*. *Pace vestrâ liceat dixisse, Primi omnium Eloquentiam perdidistis*, was apply'd to Those who resembled Him in his Art. He himself was no longer thought, what every one before had expected to find Him: And was avoided like the *Man* in *Horace*, *Indoctum doctumque fugat Recitator acerbus*.

7. The next *Curious Remark* is, that the *Bishop* has assign'd, as the great Instruments of this Evil, not only the *Ignorance* of some, but the *Passions* and *Bad Designs* of others. And ridiculous *Questions* are here ask'd, * which only put one in Mind of Something which is inseparable from the Disease of *Cavilling*. For I believe every *Reader* but the *D—n* can easily apprehend that *Additions* and *Alterations* in the *Ideas* annex'd to *Words* used in *Religious Matters*, may be produ-

* P. 7.

ced by Length of Time, the Ignorance of *Some* Co-operating with the *Bad Designs* of *Others*: and that *Designing Men* intended that this Effect should take Place as soon as possible: But, as all Things cannot be swallowed at first, that *Length of Time* was necessary in many Instances; and that every Age furnish'd both *Design* and *Ignorance* enough to forward the *Effect*; till at last the *Mass* of *Ideas* was well jumbled together, and became One *Complicated Notion*, Essential to the *Religion* of some Men, and some Whole Countries. If the *D—n* cannot understand this to be a consistent Way of speaking; He is at Liberty to think as he pleases of it.

8: The next *Complaint* is, * That the Bishop sends Men to the *Originals* of Things; but does not tell us where they are to be found; and then to the *Law of Reason*, which is still harder to be known, and is what every *Schemist* is pleas'd to make it; — then we are sent to the *Declarations* of *Jesus Christ*. Here again, either the *D—n* did not read, or did not understand. For the *Bishop* does not name the *Law of Reason*, as distinct from the *Originals of Things*; but by the *Originals of Things*, in Religion, sufficiently declares that He means the *Law of Reason* in Those Points which can be traced back thither; and the *Declarations* of *Jesus Christ*, &c. One may pass over this curious Remark, that the *Law of Reason* is harder to be known than the *Originals of Things*, till He shall explain it, who alone could make it. But is the *Law of Reason*, on which all *Faith*, as well as *Morality*, is founded, to be treated by a *Christian Preacher*, as what every *Schemist* is pleas'd to make it? Why did not the same *Critick* go on to object against sending *Christians* to the *Declarations* of *Jesus Christ*, as be-

ing only what *every Commentator, or System-Forger, is pleas'd to make them?*

9. But this is not all. The *Bishop* sends Men to the *Declarations of Jesus Christ*, in such Matters * ONLY as took their Rise from Those Declaratrons. Here the *Critick* changes his *Character* from *Bad* to *Worse*, in order to represent the *Bishop* as *advising Men not* to have Recourse to the *New Testament*, in any *other Matters*. Whereas the Words are, 'In such Matters, (not in such Matters ONLY,) as take their Rise SOLELY from those, *Declarations:*' And the evident Design was to Warn Men against going to the *Declarations* of Any *other Persons* in such Matters, as took their Rise SOLELY from the *Declarations of Christ* and his *Apostles*. This and the Former Rule being put together, do not at all imply that *Christians* are not to consult the *New Testament* in *All Points* there mentioned or recommended: but They do indeed imply that in *some Points* the *Law of Reason* is to be taken in; and in *some*, that the *Declarations* of the *New Testament* are alone to direct them; viz. in Those Points which have no other *Original* but the *Reveal'd Will* of God. Nor does this *Direction Exclude the Whole Old Testament at once*; unless it be in the *Opinion* of One who can think a *Christian* can read the *New Testament*, without having all that *Regard* to the *Old*, which the *New* engages him to have.

10. The *D* — *n* is pleas'd to 'tell his † Lordship what (*He says*) seems to be as yet a Secret to Him, That the Sacred Books are not, as to the Style of them, Writ either in the Elegancy of Oratory, or the Exactness of Philosophy' — He goes on learnedly to observe that *St. Paul* own'd himself *Rude in Speech*; and his coming to

* P. 8,

† P. 8.

the *Corinthians* not to have been in the *Words of Human Wisdom*; &c. I remember a *Grave Man*, who was remarkable in Publick Places for *Whispering* in *Every Bodies* Ear, what *Every Body* knew as well as Himself. But his *Misfortune* was, that He would often tell a Man for a *Secret*, what that very Man had just before been speaking aloud in the same Company. The *D—n* is not very unlike Him. He reveals One of his *Learned Secrets*, which every Boy at the University knew before He was *born*. And He reveals it to One, who is well known to have as often express'd Himself of the same Mind, as Any other Person whatsoever. In his *Sermon* particularly, it is so far from being true that the *Bishop* was representing the *Scripture* as full of *Accurate Definitions*; that He does expressly say, in *Page* the *ninth*, Not that He mentions the Particulars before alledg'd out of the *New Testament*, because *There* Christians will find *Accurate Definitions*, according to the *Rules of Art*; but that He mentions them, because *They* will *There* find the ' *Original Intention* of such Words; [that is, the *Original Intention* of them in their Religion;] OR the ' *Nature* of the Things design'd to be signify'd by ' *Them*, declar'd and fix'd—— by some SUCH ' *Marks*, as may, if we will attend to them, ' *GUIDE* and *GUARD* us in our *Notions* of ' *Those* Matters, in which we are most of all ' *concern'd*.' Is this citing the *New Testament* as a *Treatise de usu Verborum*? But what does this *Critick* now do? He changes *This* into what he pleases, only to tell us a *Secret* which has no more Relation to It, than if He had observ'd that the *New Testament* does not teach us *Mathematicks*. And He learnedly argues thus, if He argues at all. The *Sacred Books* are not, (*says He*), as to the *Style* of them, Writ in the *Elegancy* of *Oratory*: Therefore, *They* are not Writ So as to be the *Best Directions* to Men about

bout the Nature of the Duties most of all enjoin'd
 in Them. Here, in my Turn, I will tell the *D—n*
 a *Secret*, which He plainly appears to be Ignorant
 of; *viz* That the *Elegancy* of *Oratory* is so far from
 being useful in the teaching Men the *True Notions*
 of Things, that it is well judg'd to be most com-
 monly quite the contrary: That it is rightly apply'd
 only when it is apply'd to the *Passions*, in order to
move Men to what is Good; but that their *Understand-*
ings are much better inform'd in a plainer and less
Figurative Way. Therefore, even supposing the
Bishop had refer'd to the *Scripture* as a Book of *Ac-*
curate Definitions; the *D—n's* *Argument* here is as
 if He should answer to a Man that had recom-
 mended *Euclid* as containing the *Best Definitions* in
 Points of *Mathematicks*, That *Euclid* is not Writ in
 the *Elegancy* of *Oratory*; and therefore cannot con-
 tain *Accurate Definitions*, which are the very Reverse to
 the *Elegancies* of *Oratory*. Again, The Sacred Books,
says He, are not, as to their *Style*, Writ in the Ex-
 actness of *Philosophy*; I suppose He means *Natural*
Philosophy: Therefore, They cannot contain the
 plainest and safest Accounts of the Duties of the
 Christian Religion. Again, *St. Paul* own'd Him-
 self *Rude in Speech*: and Therefore, His *Directions*
 in the most Important Points, are not Safer and
 Better for *Christians*, than *Modern Definitions*, &c.
 Another *Secret*, which I will here recommend to
 the *D—n*, is, that tho' it was not fit that the
Essential Doctrines of *Christianity* should be preach'd
 in the *enticing Words* of *Man's Wisdom*; but *plainly*
 laid down, and made to depend upon the *Demon-*
stration of the Spirit and of Power, 1 Cor. ii. 4. that
 notwithstanding This, I say, *St. Paul* was not
 truly *Rude in Speech*, as oppos'd to One who speaks
 or writes in the *Elegancy* of *Oratory*; nor own'd Him-
 self to be so: That he uses that *Expression*, 2 Cor. xi.
 6. and another of the like Sort, *Ch. xii. 11.* as the
 C Say-

Sayings of his Enemies, rather than affirms it of Himself: which is highly probable from hence, that He speaks of his being *Rude in Speech*, at the very Time when he is Writing with all the *Dexterity* and *Figures* of an *Orator*, or *Pleader*. And I may defy the *D—n*, with all his Skill in *Oratory*, to give an Instance of a more Moving, Artful, or Insinuating Vindication, than That which He there makes of Himself. But supposing it otherwise; and that neither there, nor in the *Acts*, *St. Paul* had shewn himself at all skillful in *Oratory*; the *Argument* is worthy of the *Cavil*. *St. Paul* did not deliver the great Truths of *Christianity* in the Figures of *Rhetorick*: Therefore, He did not deliver Them in the plainest and most instructive Manner. One would think All this were inserted to shew an Equal Skill in *Logick*, and *Critick*.

10. The *D—n* ridicules the * *Bishop* for Illustrating his *Observation* about *Words*, by these Four Particulars, *Religion*, the *Worship of God*, *Prayer*, and the *Love of God*; all, says He, very improperly Chosen, and all treated with the utmost Inaccuracy. He, it seems, can't understand that it was proper, in an *Observation* made purposely with Regard to *Christians* and their *Religion*, to instance in *Words*, which in the Beginning of *Christianity* had a Signification very different from what has been given Them since. But the *D—n* seems to think this very improper, because they have All a Place in the *Law*, and the *Prophets*, and are founded in *Reason* and the *Light of Nature*. He seems to have already forgot that the *Bishop's* *Observation* related to *Words*; that therefore, it was necessary to cite *Words*; and that, as on one Hand, the *Book of Reason* has no *Words* in it; which I desire the *D—n* to observe;

So to *Christians*, consider'd as *Christians*, nothing can be more proper, upon this Occasion, than to consider what Sense was put upon *Important Words* by *Christ* their *Master*, and his *Apostles*. This answers the Purpose of the Observation exactly: and in Cases where the *First Preachers* of the *Gospel* have spoken plainly, I hope, nothing can be more useful than for *Christians* to regard *Their Sense* of Words, in Opposition to the Senses put upon them by *Modern Christians*: which is the Intent of the Observation. But because the *D* puts off the *Critick* a little here, and assumes the Character of a *Falsifier*; I will stop to observe, that it is not in his Power to produce one Word to shew that the *Bishop* ever spoke or thought of *Arraigning* (as He * says) *the Generality of the Writers of the Establiſh'd Church, of DESIGNEDLY Seducing their Flocks in Matters of the greatest Concern to their Salvation.* If He thinks that an *Observation*, touching only some, and this in ALL Churches equally, will support it; He understands neither the *Propriety* of *Language*, nor the *Universal Custom* of *All Preachers and Writers*, in their Turns. Let Him look into the *Beginning* of the *Sermon of Church-Authority*, in which He will see the *Dean of Worcester* out of *Disguise*; and he will find ALL SIDES (in His polite Language) expressly accused of *Rarely* submitting to the *Scripture*, and of being greatly defective in *Impartiality*, &c. nor can He read *One Writer* of any Sort, without meeting with numberless Observations of this Nature: which were never thought to imply any Thing but what was *Harmless* and *Inoffensive*; till *One* arose, who attempted to destroy the Use of *Language*, by pretending to understand it better than *Others*; but *One*, fated to condemn himself in

almost every Step He takes. After this *severe Misrepresentation* of Another, He himself declares, * in this same Book, that these *Abuses, or Changes of the Senses of Words,* arise either from the Superstition, or from the CORRUPTION and HYPOCRISY of Men. I am sure this *Corruption and Hypocrisy* can't help forward these *Abuses,* without DESIGN; and therefore, I am sure He has contradicted Himself upon *this Subject,* in the Blindness and Inadvertence of his *Wrath:* unless He has Recourse to this *Salvo,* which I freely give him Leave to do; viz. That the *Corruption and Hypocrisy,* which has help'd to produce these *Abuses,* always was, and still is, only in the *Poor Laity.*

II. As to the *Instance* of the Word *Religion;* the D——n goes on upon his old Mistake, and † asks ' Whether the *Bishop* really thinks that St. *James* in this Place intended to give a *Complete Definition* of the Word *Religion?* Or that *Signification,* which is the Word in the *Original,* is properly, in its first and strict Sense, the *Visitation, &c?* I answer, it is evident, He thought no such Thing: But was instancing in a Word of Importance in *Christianity,* not with Regard to its *first and strict Sense;* but with Regard to what was declar'd to be understood by it, in the *Beginnings* of *Christianity;* &c. From which *Description* of it, *Christians* ought to take their Notions; and not from the later *Additions* and *Alterations* of Men. But as One *Mistake* draws on *Another;* and as a Man once out of the Way, the more He goes forward, the more He goes out of the Way; so it is with the D——n. He observes that, according to this Account, the Belief of a *Future State* is left out: which arises from his not at all consider-

* P. 18.

† P. 11.

ing what He has read in St. James, that the *Foundation* of All was *Faith*; &c. After this, He gravely observes that it had not been *improper* if St. James had added to his Expression *before God*, even the *Father*, this likewise, and *before our Lord Jesus Christ*; and that *this would not have been Injurious to the Supremacy * of the Father*. Who said it would? I hope therefore, that All who think and write upon this *Subject*, will observe at least This, which so Great and Orthodox a Critick has here, without any Call, officiously taught Them, that the Joyning the *Son* with the *Father* in the same Sentence, is not Injurious to the *Supremacy* of the *Father*; or, in other Words, does not prove their *Co-Equality*. But, as the *Bishop* did not concern Himself with what St. James MIGHT have said, if he would; which, in *Him*, would have been *Ridiculous Impertinence*; but what he actually did say: So, if He had, He would, I believe, have given us a more undeniable *Proof* of the *Observation* from that *Passage* which the *D — n* has overlook'd, in which St. Paul charges *Timothy*, 1 *Tim. v. 21. ἰνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ*, before *God*; and then, not only *before our Lord Jesus Christ*, but *before the Elect Angels*, who have never YET been put in Competition with the *Father*, for the *Supremacy*. The *D — n* goes on, like Himself, to contend against the *Bishop* for the Necessity of making Use of *Rites* and *Ceremonies*; and at last declaring, that He means only Those *without which Publick Worship † cannot subsist*: Whereas, the *Bishop* has not spoke one single Word against *These*; that is, against Any Thing, without which *Publick Worship* cannot subsist; but against making *Religion* to consist in such and such *particular Observations*, without Any of which *Publick Worship* can subsist. This, the *Bishop* complains, is done by

* P. 12.

† P. 14.

calling them *External Religion*. The *D—n*, it seems, can't understand how calling *That* by the Name of *Religion*, which is not *Religion*, (so you do but put the Word *External* before it,) can have any ill *Effect* upon *Any Christians*: And affirms that *This* is *shifting* the *Terms* of the *Observation*; which I leave to *Any Head* in *England*, but *his own*, to determine. But not only this: He rises higher, and proves it to be a very *proper* Expression, only by affirming it with Solemnity. The *Circumstances*, it seems, without which *Publick Worship* can't be perform'd, are from henceforward to be call'd *Religion*. In a very little Time I expect the *D—n* to *prove*, or *affirm*, (which is all one with Him,) that the *Cane*, or the *Coach*, without which an *Infirm* Man cannot attend the *Publick Worship*, and which therefore, He must make use of, is a *Part* of his *Religion*, and very *properly* call'd his *External Religion*; and the like Discoveries, as New as They are useful, for the Improvement of *True Religion*. But I hope the *D—n* will prove that *Religion* was thus described *at the Beginning*: or else, after ALL, the *Bishop's* Observation about the *Alteration* of the *Sense* of the *Word*, will stand but too much confirm'd.

12. The Instance of the *Worship* of *God* comes next: Under which, the *D—n* says, the *Bishop* must mean to accuse *Protestant Countries* in what He says about the *Neglect* and *Diminution* of the *FATHER*. But this, He affirms, is not in the least true of Them, * *unless it be esteemed a Diminution to the Father, that they Worship the Son also, which They do, (says He,) in Conformity to the Catholick Church of ALL Ages; and in Obedience to our Saviour's own Words, that Men should Honour the Son, even as*

they Honour the *Father*. It is here first to be observ'd, that the *D——n* does not pretend to shew that the *Worship* of *GOD* was not exactly so described by our *Saviour*, as the *Bishop* has represented it. But that which concerns the *D——n* most at present, is his *Character* as a *Critick*, a *Church-Historian*, and a *Man of Skill* in the *Scripture-Language*. Under these *Personages* He has insulted *Others*. And therefore, far from a *Thought* of bringing any *Disgrace* upon the *Cause* it self; but only in *Return* to *One* who has here hurt it by putting It upon a wrong *Bottom*; and set Himself up for a *Great Dictator* in *Sacred Literature*, and *History*; Let Him, if He can; and He must attempt it, if He will not pass for a *Pretender* in what He has here affirm'd: Let Him, I say, prove these *Two Points*. 1. That the *Worship* paid to the *Son*, in the *Protestant Countries*, (how just and well-grounded soever,) is paid Him in *Conformity* to the *Catholick Church* of *ALL Ages*. Nay, I will abate Him a great deal of this *Trouble*; and only require Him to prove that *It is in Conformity* to the *Catholick Church*, in the *First*, *Second*, and *Third Centuries*; or that the *Practice* of those *Ages* was the *Same* with *That* of the *Protestant Churches*. He will gain a great deal of *Credit*, and perhaps something more *substantial* too by it: And yet, He knows He can't do it; nor won't attempt it. 2. That the *Worship* paid to the *Son*, in the *Protestant Countries*, is in *Obedience* to our *Saviour's* own *Words*, that *Men should Honour the Son*, even as they Honour the *Father*. And here, let this *Critick*, who has so insulted *Others* upon any imagin'd *Mistake* of the *Meaning* or *Application* of a *single Text*; let Him only prove *That this Text* relates at all to *Religious Worship*, and it shall in some *Measure* atone for his *Rashness*: tho', after that, He is obliged to prove that every *Instance* and *Degree* of *Worship* given to the *Son* in the *Protestant*

Countries, is justified by *This Text*. Or, to this Purpose, as a *Critick*, let Him only shew, from any one good Authority, that *Kabōs*, the Word used *John v. 23.* implies in it an *Equality*. And when He has done all this, I require Him to reconcile what He has here affirm'd with so much Assurance, to his own Affirmation in this very Book, * *That our Prayers are to be offer'd to the FATHER, in the Name of Jesus Christ, by his own Express Command. Without his Endeavour to prove these Points, He will shew Himself but a Pretender to Orthodoxy above Those whom He abuses; as well as a vain Affirmer of what He will not attempt to make out: And with that Endeavour He will shew himself but a Pretender to Knowledge in the Sacred Writings, or Ecclesiastical History.*

13. He goes on to *Prayer*: And affirms that the *Bishop* is the *First* that ever † thought that *Calm* and *Undisturb'd* were *Characteristicks* of *Prayer*. I will give this Great Reader of the Antients, *Two* or *Three* Instances, even from Some of the Earliest of *Them*; which may at least be said to contain something like *This*. *Cum modestiâ & humilitate adorantes magis commendabimus Deo preces nostras*, says *Tertullian* ‡: which he explains, by blaming some sort of outward Behaviour in such a Manner as to shew his Judgment that the *Soul* within should be *calm*, and composed. In another Place ** He says, *Nec ab Irâ solummodo, sed omni omnino Confusione Animi libera debet esse Orationis Intentio*—— and then adds, *de tali Spiritu emissa qualis est Spiritus ad quem mittitur*. Here is his general Rule, when He was expressly treating of *Prayer*, That the Mind ought to be free from *ALL* Confusion; that it ought to be in a *Calm Undisturb'd Estate*— that the *Intention*,

* P. 17. † P. 15. ‡ De Oratione, C. xiii. ** Ib. C. x. that

that is, the most ardent *Stretch* of *Devotion* (if I may so translate it) ought to proceed from such a *Spirit* or *Mind*, as *That* is, to which it is directed. Whether *That* be not a *Spirit* or *Mind*, *Calm* and *Undisturbed*, I leave to any One to judge. St. *Cyprian*, after *Tertullian*, expresses himself thus. *Sic autem Orantibus sermo & Precatio cum disciplina, QUIETEM continens & pudorem.* — *Congruit verecundo MODESTIS precibus orare* — And that St. *Cyprian* thought this *QUIES*, (from whence some would have proved Him the *Father* of the *Quietists*) or *Calmness*, to be perfectly consistent with a due Sense of Sins, is evident from his referring to the *Example* of the *Publican* in the *Parable*. Otherwise, probably He might have been represented as teaching that there is no need of being *disturbed* at our *Sins*; and the like. To *this*, the *D---n* seems to apply what the *Bishop* has said; and, against All the Rules of Language, in a Case where *One* Word is made use of in Opposition to *Another*, seems to handle it, as if *Calm* signify'd *Cold*, and *Undisturb'd* signify'd *Insensible*. I will name *One* Writer more of the *Ancients*, and that is *Origen*. In his Book *περὶ ἰουχῆς* * He does, as *Tertullian* does, take occasion from observing that Prayer is not consistent with *Anger*, to add, *καὶ παρανομιῶν λογισμῶν*, which signifies in general all sort of Confusion and *Disturbance* within; and implies that the Mind must not be ruffled, not only with *Anger*, but with Any other *Affection*, or *Commotion*. And this in general answers to *Calm* and *Undisturbed* in *English*: And the Rule is the same good Rule, whether This *Commotion* and *Disturbance* within be raised by False and Groundless Ecstasical *Passions*; or by any other Cause. It were easy to cite some of the *Best English Divines*, who have in effect laid down the same

* *Edit. Bas.* p. 27.

Rule, in order to guard *Christians* against the Uneasy Thought that *such Warmth*, and *Ecstasies*, are necessary to *Prayer*, as They cannot work up Themselves to; and which yet They find have been spoken of as necessary by the *Mystick Writers*, and Men of exalted Passions, both amongst *Papists* and *Protestants*, *Churchmen* and *Dissenters*.

But as the *Bishop* expressly opposes that *Calm and Undisturb'd Composure of Mind*, which He speaks of, to the *Ecstatick Commotions*, which *some* have made necessary to *Prayer*; so, if the *D—n* be displeas'd with This, there is no *Medium*: And He has free leave to define *Prayer*, (and to quote *Scripture* for it as pertinently as He has done it already,) by declaring it to be a *Tumultuous, Tempestuous, Disturb'd Address to God*; void of all *Calmness*, and of every Thing that can make it a *reasonable Service*; and utterly inconsistent with all *Composedness of Mind*; the very Supposition of which destroys its Essence. For the rest; the *D—n* should have answered what has already been said to *Dr. Snape*, and Others, upon this Subject, before he had repeated their *Objections*, and their *Texts*, with little added to *Them*, except the *Pedantry of Greek Characters*, where *English Words* would have serv'd as well. Only *One Thing* more I must mention, as very entertaining, in this *Critick*; and that is, the Remark that “ for a Christian *Bishop* to give us a Description of *Prayer*, in which there is nothing of *Faith*, or of *Jesus Christ*, is astonishing, and THAT at a Time when He is undertaking to set Us all right,” &c. Now it happens that This is the *very and plain Reason*, why the *Bishop* did not mention those Particulars expressly, and why it would have been entirely foreign to his Purpose to mention Them, *viz.* because his *Observation* related to *Those Points* alone, in which *Alterations* had been made from the *Original Design of Christianity*: And therefore, for this very Reason, it had

had been impertinent in *Him*, in *this Place*, and upon *this Occasion*, to have insisted upon *Faith*, or the Name of *Jesus Christ*; no *Christian* having denied either that *Faith* was necessary to *Prayer*, (no, nor *Heathen* neither, with the *D — n's* good Leave) or that *Christians* were to pray to *God* in the Name of *Jesus Christ*. But this *Remarker* neither considers what is observ'd, nor why; but talks as if a single *Transient Observation*, upon one single Account, were design'd as an *Accurate Treatise* upon every Thing relating to *Prayer*.

14. The *D — n* next comes to the *Love of God*, and of our *Saviour*: And here again blunders; and confounds a *Description* to guide Men into the *Best Knowledge* of their *Duty*, produced to shew how differently *Men* have talk'd about it, and how much they have perplex'd *Themselves* and *Others* by this Means: He confounds this, I say, with a *Just and Adequate Idea*, or *Accurate Definition* of it. But nothing is more worthy of his *Accuracy*, than the wonder He expresses, † that the *Bishop* should not for the *Love of God* send Us to *God's own Command* about it, which requires a greater Degree of *Love* than any other *Words* can well express, with all the *Heart*, and *Mind*, and *Soul*, and *Strength*: When the very *Point* before Him was *How* this *Loving God* with all the *Heart*, and *Mind*, and *Soul*, and *Strength*, was described in the *N. T.* and what *Characters* were there laid down to discover when we truly do so. And when the *D — n* will explain why *St. John* describes this *Love of God*, by *Keeping his Commandments*, and not by repeating *Those Words*; He will then justify the *Bishop* likewise.

15. These particular Remarks are succeeded by a *General One*, as worthy as *Themselves*, of a *Criti-*

cal Observer of Men, Words, and Things: And which terminates in *this*, that because the *Abuses* complain'd of arise either from the Superstition, or from the Corruption and Hypocrisy of Men; therefore the *Bishop* is *totally mistaken* when He imputes the *Change of Sense*, in the Words mentioned, to *Gradual Alterations*. For the *same Causes* will in all Times produce the *same Effects*: And therefore, *What?* Why therefore, the *Notions of Religion, of Worship, of Prayer, &c.* were as corrupt, as destructive, at the beginning of Christianity, and in the *first* Ages, as They have been in *Any Christian Country* since Or thus, It is absurd to suppose that *Corruptions* came by Degrees into the *Church of Christ*, because there was always *Superstition and Hypocrisy*; and They always produce the same Effects; or, in other Words, because they have always, it seems, been *Universal*, and equally effectual in the destroying Right Notions of all that is good. And because *Heathens* had *bad Notions of Religion*, and the *Duties* of it; and because all Men are alike; therefore, it is impossible that *Christians* should have *gradually* departed from the *Simplicity* either of *Faith* or *Practice*. *Tanti est habere nasum!* The *Notion of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, for Instance, could not be altered *gradually* by *Christians*, because *Christians* having been always *Men*; and *Men* having been always alike in *Superstition* and *Hypocrisy*; the very same complicated *corrupt Notion* of this *Sacrament* must have been all at once from the very Beginning, without any *gradual Alteration* from *Good to Bad*, and from *Bad to Worse*. This is the *True Art of Demonstration*, before which even *Matters of Fact*, stubborn as they are, must bow down, and fall!

16. We are at length brought to the *Main Instance*, viz. the *Notion of the Church of Christ*. And here first, the *Old Topick* is revived of arraigining all the Churches in the Christian World; and then,
the

the *Church of England* in particular. To which the *D--n* knows the *Answer*, That if a general Complaint about altering the Sense of a Word, be the *Arraigning* All the *Churches* of the *Christian World*; how much more did *Luther*, or *Erasmus*, arraign them All? Or How shall Any one write or speak, but such as can quietly acquiesce in, or applaud, every Thing that is said or done throughout the *Christian World*? And what in particular must be thought of the *Dean of Worcester*, who begins his *Sermon of Church-Authority*, with a Publick Arraignment of ALL SIDES expressly; in which beautiful Expression, I suppose ALL *Churches* are comprehended; unless it may be said, from the Nature of his Observation, that He meant only to arraign the *Church of England*, and ALL Protestant Churches. And this again serves as a Reply to his *Main Abuse*, that such a Complaint touches the *Church of England* particularly: For why did not He, in that *Sermon*, except the *Church of England* by Name, out of his general Reproach; or the *Divines* of this *Church*? Or rather, why did He express Himself in such a Manner, as that His Reproach MUST touch the *Church of England*; and then so severely blame the *Bishop's Complaint*, which is perfectly consistent, not only with the *Foundation* of this *Church*, but with its most Authentick Declarations; and particularly with the *Article* cited by Him, which is express'd in the most general Words, and relates entirely to *Particular Congregations* met together, and not to the *Whole Church of Christ*: as has been often already in Publick observ'd. But to return to some of his *Cavils*, which He mistakes for *Criticisms*.

17. The * *Bishop* says, *The Church is the Number of Those who believe Christ to be the Messiah: that is,*

* P. 21.

(says our Critick,) *the Messiah to be the Messiah.* Let it be read in the *Bishop's Sermon*; * and see how it sounds there. — ‘The Notion of the *Church of Christ*, which, at first, was only the *Number*, small or great — of Those who believed *Him* to be the *Messiah*, &c.’ — What can this Excellent Critick mean? 1. Would He have had the *Bishop* have call'd it the *Church of Jesus*, contrary to all *Use*, which is the *Law*, of Language? Or, 2. Would He have had *Him*, after He had call'd it the *Church of Christ*, needlessly to have put in the Word *Jesus* instead of *Him*? Or, 3. Does his Skill in Language run so low, that He must be told that the Name *Christ* has obtain'd in the *English Tongue*, as the Name designing the *Person* of our Saviour? And therefore, that *Christ*, in the common Way of speaking, in all our *Sermons*, is not used for *the Christ*, or the *Messiah*; but for the Name of that *Master*, whose Disciples we profess our selves? And that, tho' it be true, that to say *The Christ* is the *Messiah*, is saying nothing; yet to say that *Christ* is the *Messiah*, is totally different, in the Opinion of All who know that *Use* is the *Rule of Language*? Or, 4. Is it needful to tell Him that the same *Ridicule of Criticism* may be exercised upon the Word *Jesus* it self? If one should say that *Jesus* is our Saviour; such a deep Critick, as the present, might reply, from his profound Skill in the *Hebrew*, that this is as much as to say *our Saviour* is *our Saviour*. Such Observations as these, may sometimes happen to be the *Excrescencies* from the *Passions* of a good Critick not upon his guard: but they look much more like the *Marks* of a *Littleness* of *Soul* within, void of that *True Judgment* which is more necessary to form a Critick, than the mere *Copia Verborum*; which, without

* P. 10.

Other, serves only to shew what is wanting within.

18. As to what follows about the Consequences of This Description of the Universal Church, that if All who believe *Jesus* to be the *Messiah*, are *Christians*, or of his *Church* or *Kingdom*, then this Number may subsist without *Governors*; and that *Instituted Religion* can have no *Institutions*; and that there is an *End* of all *Form*, and *Government*; and I know not what: All this is worthy of the *Rest*; and of One who considers not what All the Greatest of the *Protestant Writers* have said against the *Papists*, in their *Accounts* of the *Universal Church of Christ*: which they have affirm'd expressly to be compos'd of *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, as well as of *Others*: Nay, who considers not what the *Dean of Worcester* himself has, in his famous *Sermon*, acknowledg'd, that * in the *Church Catholick* there is no *Subordination* of the *Parts* to one another; which as utterly destroys all *Order* in particular Churches, as the *Description* now before us does; that is, *not at all*. I will add, that the same weak *Objection* lies against what is repeated, in the same general Manner, over and over again, in the *New Testament*; not only that the *Point* requisite to make Men *Christians*, fit for *Baptism*, was only the believing *Jesus* to be the *Christ*, or the *Son of God*; but in a much higher *Form* of *Expression*, That *Every one that believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*, 1 John v. 1. And consequently, that the *Reproaches* of this *Writer* must fall upon the *Sacred Writings* themselves. But no such *Objections* ought to lie against *Them*, particularly in this *Writer's* *Opinion*, who has taken *Pains* to shew how much is contained † in this *One Article*. Which, tho' it be

* P. 30.

† P. 22.

done, by Way of *Affirmation* only, with great Un-accuracy, and without any Proof from the *Scripture Phraseology*, as well as with his usual *Ambiguity* or *Nothingness*; yet destroys His own Cavils. For if all the Things mention'd by the *D—n*, be truly contain'd, and necessarily imply'd, in this *One Article*, *Jesus* is the *Christ*; then it can be no Crime to make that general *comprehensive Article*, the *constituent Article* of a Man's Christianity. And He himself shall by this bear Witness against Himself, by Way of *Self-Contradiction*, that This is so far from having a Tendency to bring down *Christianity* to *Deism*; that it implies in it the Belief of the *Highest* and most abstruse *Doctrines* of *Christianity*. And indeed, He must be blind, who does not see that at least it leads Men to *Jesus Christ*, as their Teacher; and to search after All the *Truths* and *Doctrines* taught by Him. And what would Men have more?

19. One positive Affirmation of this Man of Reading, is, That as They who have appeared fond of this *Doctrine* of *One Article*, [Let it be remembered how comprehensive a *One* it is,] follow'd no Christian Bishop, so no Christian Bishop before his *L...p* has followed Them. This again, tho' affirm'd with Assurance, and for Reproach-Sake, is His own *Mistake*, or *Rash* Presumption. Let the *D — n* consult *Archbishop Tillotson's Sermon* * upon *John xx. 31.* where He will find it asserted and proved that *the Believing Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God*, which He shews to be Expressions of the same † force, and to signify his being the *Messiah sent by God*; &c. He will find it prov'd, I say, that This is truly and properly the *Faith* of the *Gospel*: And prov'd, not from this general Article's containing in it certainly whatever We our

* Vol. 12. *Serm.* 8. † P. 222.

selves think we find in it ; but from its leading Men necessarily to * receive Christ as a *Teacher*, and to enquire after all his *Commands* and *Doctrines*. Neither does it at all alter the Case, what *one* Man understands to be implied in it ; and what *Another*. I would beg to know how much the *Eunuch*, in the *Acts*, as well as All the *First Converts* to Christianity, could be supposed to comprehend, before they were received and treated as *Christians* upon their Assent to this *One General Article*. Let the *D* — *n* consult Bishop *Taylor*, in his *Liberty of Prophecy* ; and see if He be not Zealous † for the same ; “ That nothing is of prime and original necessity “ to be believed but this, *Jesus Christ our Redeem-* “ *er* ” : Not excluding whatever is in the *Bowels* and *Fold* of this great Article, which He explains to be All without which neither the *Thing* could be acted, nor the *Proposition* understood. He mentions particularly, *Jesus Christ the Son of the Living God*, the *Crucifixion* and *Resurrection* of *Jesus*, *Forgiveness of Sins* by his *Blood*, *Resurrection of the Dead* and *Life Eternal* ; and these He mentions, because *Salvation is promis'd to the Explicit Belief of These Articles* ; and then goes on to warn against making the *Consequences* from these *Articles*, tho' certain to our selves, ** necessary to be explicitly believ'd by All others.

Bishop *Patrick* is Another Contradiction to the *Dean's Assertion* ; who, in his *Treatise call'd The Witnesses to Christianity*, and dedicated to *Archbishop Sheldon*, does, in the plainest *Terms*, lay it down that these Two Expressions, †† *Jesus is the Christ*, and, *Jesus is the Son of God*, are the same in *Meaning* ; and import his being sent into the *World* by *God*, as He profess'd himself to

* P. 220.

† P. 8, 9.

** P. 11.

†† P. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

be. Nay, I will observe to this Writer **Two Particulars**. 1. That Dr. *Patrick* here quotes and approves the Opinion of *St. Hierom*, * *that the Apostles were not yet such Proficients, as to understand the Eternal Generation of our Lord Jesus from the Essence of the Father*; when this Phrase the *Son of God* was first commonly used by Them; which therefore, could not signify any Thing but the *Messiah*, promised and sent into the World by God. 2. That He cites and approves *Lactantius's* † Observation, that the Name *Christ* was a Name of Power and Dominion, signifying Him to be their **SOVEREIGN**. *Sic enim Judæi Reges suos appellabant, For in this Style the Jews were wont to speak of their Kings, whom they call'd Christs, or God's Anointed*: Which will very much confirm the *Bishop's* whole Design in his Sermon.

Here therefore, are **Three Bishops**, of very great Reputation, to confront the *D—n's* rash Assertion about a *Matter of Fact*, of which He seems to know nothing. And how many have of late follow'd Them in this, the *D—n* can't judge merely from the Press. I could give Instances of some now living, and of Those who have always had the Happiness to be esteem'd amongst the greatest Friends and Ornaments to our Church, who have preach'd the same Doctrine. But I have said enough.

20. The next *Cavil* is the *Bishop's* speaking of the *Church of Christ*, as of a *Number of Believers*, &c. “ by ** which (says He) the Reader loses Sight of that Union which is Essential to the Constitution of A Church;” forgetting that the *Dean of Worcester* himself has allow'd that in the *Universal Church* there is no Subordination of Parts to one another; that is, in other Words, *no such Union as*

* P. 11, 12.

† P. 13.

** P. 22.

there is in *particular Churches*: or else, weakly confounding *The Church*, and *A Church*; and consequently *That Union with Christ by Faith*, which makes the *Universal Church*, the *Church*; and is express'd in the *Bishop's Description*; with that *Union* of another Sort, which is necessary to *Membership* in a particular visible Church, or a particular Congregation of Christians. As to the *Bishop's Opinion* about *Order* and *Government*, and *Subordination* in particular Churches, He has said enough in his *Answer* to the *Dean of Worcester*, and in other Places, to vindicate Himself, and his *Doctrine*, from such *Reproaches* as are here fixt upon it.

What follows to p. 28. has been over and over again said by Others, long ago; and has been answer'd in what has pass'd, and perhaps wearied the World enough already, in this Controversy: to all which the *D—n* seems to be a Stranger. But whether one shall admire most the *Misrepresentation*, or the *Low Malice*, of referring the *Bishop* to the *Times of Confusion*; and of setting forth his Notion of the *Kingdom of Christ*, as leading Men to Rebellion and Enthusiasm, and I know not what: This will remain a Doubt. Our Saviour profess'd himself a *King*, notwithstanding all the *D—n's* Imaginary ill Consequences: And all his *Disciples* ought to own Him as such. And the declaring *His Kingdom* to be NOT of this World, and firmly adhering to *This*, is the direct *Antidote* to the *Mad Poison* of those *Enthusiasts*, who went upon the very contrary Maxim; as well as to all Pretensions of Ecclesiastical Rulers, to usurp *Civil Authority*. And as for the *Times of Confusion* and *Licentiousness*; if the *Bishop* has any Concern in them, so has the *Dean of Worcester*. For as the *One* has in effect asserted no more than the *Right* of the *People* to judge for Themselves, according to the *Laws of Christ*: so has the

Other, in his *Mock-Vindication of Church-Authority*, own'd and asserted expressly the same Right. And thus, As He cannot *argue* without *Self-Contradiction*; so neither can He *reproach* without *Self-Condernation*.

In, p. 31, 32. the *D——n* only lets us know how much better He could handle a *Text*, or a *Subject*, than the *Bishop* can; which no One can doubt of, who has read that *Sermon*, upon which He has declared He will put all his *Reputation* for Learning. This is yielded to Him. And his *Cavils* here shall be let to pass, because They are much the same that have been already answer'd in Print by the *Bishop* himself.

21. In p. 33. the *Critick* begins to resume his *Character*. He complains the *Bishop* does not use *Scripture Language*, where He speaks of Christ's *Laws*; or rather of *Christ* as a *Law-giver*. A True *Critick* would have known that *Doctrines* deduced by Way of Consequence from a *Text* of *Scripture*, are not supposed nor expected to be in the Words of *Scripture*. But being a very exact Observer of the Language of *Scripture*, He tells us we have frequent Mention of Christ's Precepts and Instructions in *Scripture*, but never of his *Laws*. *Ib.* Still the same Man! only more and more unhappy in his Observations. If He had kept to the *Word* used in our *English Translation*, where-ever it refers to *Christ*; He ought to have told us that Christ's *Commands*, and *Commandments* (not his *Precepts*) are frequently spoken of. But this Observation the *D——n* perhaps avoided, because *these Words* would sound more like the *Language* commonly used concerning *Kings*, than the *Word Precepts*: which (tho' used by our *Translators*, upon other Occasions, as the *English* of the same *Greek Word*, yet) in our Language is used even of the *Doctrines* of *Philosophers*, or any Persons
void

void of all *Authority*. But the *Argument* is here equal to the *Observation*. It is improper to style our Lord a *Law-giver*; because there is not, in *Scripture*, Mention of his *Laws* by that *Name*. Whereas They are call'd his *Commandments*; which expresses his *sole Right* to the being *Law-giver* to *Christians*, under God, still more strongly. Just as if a Man should say, The *King of France* is not a *Law-giver*, because his *Injunctions* are call'd *Edicts*, and *Arrets*, and not *Laws*: which Words are higher, and imply a more absolute Right in Him to *Legislation*. And now, to use the *D—n's* own Word *Precepts*; As *Precepts*, with *Sanctions* to them, are properly *Laws*, in the strict Sense; and as our Lord gave Us *Precepts* with *Sanctions* to them, in his *Ministry* here on Earth; I hope the *D—n*, as a *Divine*, will allow these to be *Laws*, and Him a *Law-giver*. And tho' these very Words should not be found in *Scripture*, yet as a *Critick* I hope He will upon second Thoughts allow that the *Sense* of them is there; and therefore, that his *Cavil* is vain, which is founded upon the Expectation of finding the very Words of *Scripture* where there was no Occasion for them. And indeed his Argument here against the *Bishop*, can be no better than This. It does not follow from *Christ's* being a *King* that He is a *Law-giver*, because He gives only *Authoritative Precepts*, or *Commands* with *Penalties* annex'd; that is, because He gives *Laws* in the highest and strictest Sense.

22. As for all that follows, p. 34. Let the *D—n* own the *Observations* there made, in his *Large Answer* which He has promised in due time: And I am very confident, they will be clearly shewn to be either *False*, or *Impertinent*. Only before we quit this Scene of *exquisite Trifling*, I cannot forbear to take Notice of Two of his *Observations* upon this Subject. 1. That "one Person may be said to be the sole *King* and *Law-giver*; and yet notwithstanding

“ standing that Restriction, the same Terms, tho’
 “ NOT exactly in the SAME Sense, may be appli-
 “ ed to Another”. Here He acknowledges that the
 same Terms cannot be applied to these Different
 Persons in the same Sense: That is, He acknow-
 ledges, against his own Design, the only material
 Point in this Question, *viz.* That no Persons under
Christ, are now PROPERLY *Law-givers*, as He is
 Law-giver to Christians under GOD. 2. That “ the
 “ Gospel is never call’d *A Law* in the singular Number
 “ — above once or twice in the Epistles, and
 “ then ’tis rather in Allusion to the *Law*, than by
 “ a strict Propriety of Speech.” An Argument,
 which will equally prove that the *Law* it self, the
Law of Moses, was no *Law*; but only call’d so in Al-
 lusion to the *Laws* of Other Nations; and which
 is injudiciously urg’d to shew that an Institution full
 of Commands, Precepts, Prohibitions, with *Sancti-*
ons annex’d to Them, cannot be call’d a *Law* with-
 out *impropriety of Speech*. But may *Speech* and *Lan-*
guage, say I, be ever secure from the Attacks of such
Knights-Errant!

At last the *D — n* concludes that GOD is the
Supreme King and Law-giver, and *Christ* is neither,
 but as under Him. What He could possibly mean by
 this, when the Question it self is, Who is the *Law-*
giver to Christians under God, I should be at a loss
 to imagine; because it is no more against the *Bishop’s*
Doctrine, than if He had observ’d that *Christ* was
 sent into the World by God: and no more to his
 own Purpose, *viz.* the proving *Christ* not to be a
Law-giver, than it is to the proving that *Moses* was
 not a *Law-giver*: I should be at a loss, I say, to know
 the Intent of this, unless it were plain from what
 follows, — And by a like Gradation (says He)
Those Titles MAY belong to Others under Christ. Well,
 If so, there can be no harm, I hope, in applying
 them to *Christ*, whom the *D — n* has at length ac-
 knowledg’d

knowledg'd to be a *Law-giver* to Christians under God ; and so has destroy'd all his own *Criticisms*. If they **MAY** belong to *Others* ; *viz.* the Ministers of Christ ; I hope He will shew Us that **They DO** and **MUST** belong to Them in the *same Sense*, which is the only Point before Him ; and that then He will consider how to reconcile This with what He has just now said ; and with the *Dean of Worcester's* declaring, in his *Sermon*, the Apostles themselves to have the *Authority of Faithful Witnesses*, and Deliverers of what They receiv'd from Christ ; and not of *Law-makers*, &c. Another little Contradiction !

23. His Argument against the *Bishop*, as denying All *Authority* even in Indifferent Matters, because They may come to be * Matters of Conscience, falls back upon the *Dean of Worcester*, who has, in his *Sermon*, left the People excused in *Non-compliance*, not only upon their *sincere*, but their *Invincible, Persuasion*. And this being founded entirely upon their Right to be guided by their own *Consciences*, is unavoidably extended to All Points becoming Matters of *Conscience*. But if his Mind be so soon changed ; and He be now for *Absolute Authority*, and *Absolute Obedience*, in what He calls *Indifferent Matters*, but what *Another Christian* cannot think so : Let Him apply *Force* ; and have the Glory of being an *Advocate* for what, He says, He is an Enemy to ; the grossest and most Undisguised Persecution.

24. After a little *Cavilling*, from which one would hope the *D—n* had been asleep since this *Controversy* began, there opens a most excellent Scene, p. 37, 38. “ Was not, says He, “ the same Spirit which “ was given to Them, (*viz.* the *Apostles*) given to “ the Church, to lead it into all Truth, and to con-

“ tinue with it to the End of the World, and till
 “ *Christ's* coming again”? Let us here look back,
 and take in what He has * before said, that He
 “ puts the Defence of *Church-Authority* upon an Ex-
 “ press Commission from our Saviour to his Apo-
 “ stles and their Successors, *to which End*” (tho' no
End has been mention'd) “ He has promised his
 “ *Spirit should be with them to the End of the World*”.
 Jo. xvi. 16. Matth. xxviii. 20. Who can forbear to
 admire a *Man*, who knows how so dextrously to
 change his *Batteries*? In the *Dean of Worcester's Ser-*
mon, written expressly for the *Vindication of Church-*
Authority, I do not remember that *this Text*, which
 is here spoken of, as the *Best Foundation*, is
 so much as *once* named. But now the *Scene* is
 to be changed. Let Us therefore attend to a *Man*,
 who has been severe upon *Others* for misinterpreting,
 as He thinks, one *Text of Scripture*; and to a *Man*,
 who professes at length to teach Us the *True Ground*
 of *Church-Authority*.

Now therefore, there can be no Meaning in all
 this, unless it be to shew Us how this *Text* secures
 to the *Apostles Successors*, at first one would think,
 the same Privileges with the *Apostles*; — but at
 last we shall find, according to Custom — *Just*
nothing at all. How long *Church-Authority* will like
 to be so treated and insulted, I know not. The
D—n here speaks of the *same Spirit*, as given to the
Church, which was given to the *Apostles*. But then
 He lets us not know what He means by this Word,
Church. He has used it, in this very *Treatise*, for
 a common Congregation of *Laity* and *Clergy* met
 together for *Worship*; and declared This to be a
grave, plain, and honest Definition of it. And yet
 here I fear, He is going, without any warning, to

confine it to the *Clergy*; which is the most dire& Contradiction of the Design of the *Article* in which it is: Nay, not to the *Clergy* in their ordinary Function, and discharge of their Office; but perhaps to the *Clergy* met together, to settle *Points* in *Another Form*, than That in which Christ and his Apostles settled them. I fear this, I say: because, if He means not this, He betrays his *Argument*, and ruins all that follows about *Councils*. Well, He then observes that This Spirit is given to the *Church*, to *Lead* it—— And he adds as his Comment, “ To lead it, I say; Not to “ compel and force the Teachers of the Word,” (I thought it would end in this) “ into all Truth, “ but gently to guide them.” Now, would not any one think that here was a *Resting-place*, and that the *Teachers* were declar’d to be thus gently guided by such a Divine Leader? Nothing less. “ Which “ *Guidance*, says He, ’tis certain the Ministers of “ the Gospel may, and OFTEN do resist.” Well, some Men have a Privilege of saying what They please of the *Clergy*! Thus we find, It is the same Spirit that was given to the *Apostles*, and to the *Clergy* for ever: only with this Unfortunate Difference, that it certainly led the *Apostles* into ALL Truth; and that it is as certain, it does not lead the succeeding *Clergy* into All Truth. But yet we are comforted again. For He adds, “ But if They (the *Clergy*) “ are not wanting to the Spirit, the Spirit will “ not be wanting to Them.” And what is This to the *Cause* of the *Clergy*, which is here professedly undertaken, when the same may be said of *Laymen* enquiring after all necessary Truth: and is certainly true of that Divine and Gracious Spirit? But now let us be very attentive to the next Dictate. “ And the Governours of the Church, IF They act “ in the Fear of God, and under the GUIDANCE “ of his Spirit, AND take DUE Care not to de- “ ceive, or be deceived, may be as sure NOT to

“err in their Decisions, as if they were INFALLIBLE.” What Society of Men would not purchase such a Defender? 1. These *Governours* must act in the Fear of God. 2. They must act under the GUIDANCE of his Spirit. 3. This, it seems, is not enough: But they must, besides this, take DUE Care *not to be deceiv'd*. 4. And then, having taken *due Care* NOT to be deceiv'd, They may be certain *They are not deceiv'd*; and be as sure *not to Err*, as if They were INFALLIBLE. This *one Secret*, if it had been happily discover'd, might have sav'd the Church of Rome the *Uneasy Task* of claiming *Absolute Infallibility*; by the Sound of which It frightens Men, whilst It might have secur'd to it self *Certain Infallibility* without it, by only adding *one Link* farther to this *Curious Chain of Thoughts*; which all Men MUST add who will contend for the *Indisputable Authority* of Any *Human Decisions* in Religion whatsoever. The *Romanists* had nothing to do but to say thus. The same Spirit was promised to *Us*, that was given to the Apostles. The Governours of the Church acting, in the Fear of God, under the Guidance of his Spirit, and taking DUE Care not to be deceiv'd, are *certainly INFALLIBLE*, tho' not *absolutely*. And consequently, at the *Council of Trent*, and the like Assemblies, All these Conditions concurring, Every Thing is rightly decreed. But *that Church* was not aware of this: and therefore, unnecessarily claim'd *Infallibility*, without any I F's. How much happier the *Protestant Churches*, who can be sure, by the Help of such a Defender, *To be in the Right*, without the Load of a Profess'd *Infallibility*! Tho' some, perhaps, who are never contented without having their Reason satisfy'd, may still find Fault with a *Rule* laid down for so important a Point, which is so circular, that it only looks like *Something*, whilst it really is *No-thing*.

thing. These *Governours* must take DUE Care not to be deceiv'd; and then They will not be deceiv'd, for this very good Reason, because, if They are deceiv'd, it is plain They have not taken DUE Care in the *D—n's* Sense: And this also for the same Sort of very good Reason; because, if They had taken DUE Care, They *would not have been deceived.* And so *about and about.* It is no better than saying, Take *due* Care to be in the Right, and you will never be in the Wrong; because, if ever you are in the Wrong, it is plain you have not taken *due* Care to be in the Right. And again, If you have a Mind *never* to be in the *Wrong*, there is a certain Rule for this, and that is to take DUE CARE always to be in the Right. — *Non tali auxilio, nec Defensoribus istis* —

But in the mean while the main *Question* returns, How shall the *Laity* know whether their *Spiritual Governours* have taken DUE CARE; which alone makes their Decisions Equivalent to *Infallible*, and consequently *Authoritative*? How? Why solely by examining their *Decisions*: as the *Protestant Laity* serve the *Popish Guides*. For if their *Decisions* are *Right*; then only They have taken *due Care*. And if They are *Wrong*; then They have not taken *due Care*; and so cannot claim the Rights of *Infallibility*. This is the only Method, even in Consequence of the *D—n's* Opinion, who allows, with respect to *All Sorts*, that the *Ministers* of the *Gospel* may reject the *Guidance* of the *Holy Spirit* it self. Therefore, there must be a *Criterion* to judge when They have, and when They have not. And this can be no other than *that Rule*, to which all Truths in *Christianity* must be conformable. And by this *Rule* alone, the *People* must judge, (and not their *Guides*,) whether their *Guides* have taken All *due Care* not to be deceiv'd. He who thus defends the Church, and thus discovers a *New Method of Infallibility*, and a *New Foundation*

for *Authority*, which destroys it self, and lays the same Necessity upon the *Laity* of judging for Themselves, which it professes to remove; will very soon discover, together with This, in what latent Sense He is the *Defender of Councils and Fathers*.

Especially let it be remark'd, with what a Sentence this Discovery of *Infallibility* is closed. "Necessarily Infallible it must be acknowledged, They (the *Clergy*) are not; therefore, They CAN NOT be *Law-Makers, Judges or Interpreters*, absolutely and PROPERLY, tho' such a Power should be allow'd to the *Apostles*." Here then is a *Publick Acknowledgment* that Christ has left behind Him (at least excepting the *Apostles*) No *Law-Makers, Judges, or Interpreters*; None who can claim these Titles PROPERLY. Let any one read the *Bishop's Proposition* upon this same Subject, where the Word *Properly* is likewise the Word; and he will not forbear to wonder at the *Usage* He has met with for saying this same Thing.

25. The *D*—*n's* next *Objection*, * *viz.* that even *Christ's Authority* was *derived*; and that *his Commands* are *God's Commands*; as the *Apostle's* are *His*; is a great Truth, often inculcated by our Lord himself: and no more an *Objection* against the *Bishop's Doctrine*, than *his own*: The *Question* being not, whether *Christ* were not *sent by God*; but whether He were not sent to be our *Law-giver*, and the *Author and Completer* of our Faith; and whether He, by *Himself*, and his *Immediate Followers*, did not *completely* execute that *Design*.

He goes on † in the same Way. "A Kingdom and Laws, necessarily suppose Government: And from the King's being absent, and never interposing, &c." He says, it plainly follows,

* P. 38.

† P. 39.

that “there certainly are *Vicegerents, Interpreters,* and *Judges,* the very Thing that the *Bishop* would “have *Christians* not believe.” *Reader,* This is the same *Author* who has declared, in the very foregoing *Page,* that the *Governours* of the *Church* cannot be *Law-Makers, Judges, or Interpreters, PROPERLY.* This properly is One of the Words which the *Bishop* has used upon this *Occasion:* and it is at least as good in his *Mouth,* as in the *D—n’s.* Now, these Two Expressions, CERTAINLY ARE, and CANNOT BE, are as great Contradictions in Terms as can well be imagin’d, unless they be thus reconcil’d. There CANNOT BE, in the *Church of Christ, Law-Makers, Judges, or Interpreters, PROPERLY* so call’d. There CERTAINLY ARE *Vicegerents, Interpreters, and Judges,* in the *Church of Christ, IMPROPERLY* so call’d. If this be his *Meaning;* as it must be, without the most gross *Self-Contradiction;* let it be apply’d to the *Bishop’s* *Affirmation;* and all will go well: And every *Reader* will judge what *Trifling* this is. But if he will be resolv’d to contradict Himself, and to affirm, in a *Page* * which confronts the other Face to Face, that from *Christ’s* *Absence,* and *Laws,* it does follow that the *Governours* of the *Church* are *Judges* and *Interpreters, PROPERLY* speaking; which before He deny’d them to be; He is answerable for it. Whereas, if He means only such *Judges,* as are not *Authoritative* in their *Sentence;* and such *Interpreters,* as (He owns over and over again,) *May* and *Do* mistake; he is guilty only of arguing against Nobody, and of greatly abusing the *Reader’s* *Time* and *Patience.*

To what is said † about *Sanctions, &c.* Enough has been long ago reply’d in the *Bishop’s* *Answer* to the *Committee;* too much, I find, for this *Author* to take the least *Notice* of it.

* P. 39.

† P. 40.

26. In p. 42. After having taken Notice of an *Un-accuracy* in the *Bishop's* way of *expressing* a *Proposition* about the *Laws* of *Christ*; He goes on to oppose the *Proposition* it self, by *Mistake* after *Mistake*.

1. 'Tis evident (says He) His L——p took "the *WHOLE* Description he gives Us of these *Laws*, from the *Sermon* in the *Mount*, without "looking farther." Now the *contrary* to this is very evident to Any, who will attend to the *Bishop's* Way of Expression. For as there is mention of the *Will* of *God*, which may be an *Allusion* to a Declaration in that *Sermon* upon the *Mount*; so is there mention of the *Nature* of *God* known by the common Reason of Men, and of the Imitation of that *Nature*, &c. which Expressions manifestly relate to many *Passages* in the *Epistles*, as well as *Gospels*. Besides that it is manifest that under the *Laws* of *Christ* the *Bishop* comprehends, throughout his *Sermon*, Our *Lord's* Declarations by his *Apostles*, as well as by His own Mouth. If the *D——n* dislikes the *Phrase*, The *Nature* of *God*, and has any latent *Querck* under his Words, *Essential* *Attributes*, to distinguish Them from the *Moral* *Attributes* of *God*; He may call to mind, not only that *All* *Divines* have, in their *Sermons*, long spoke of the *Divine* *Nature* in the same Sense with the *Bishop*; but that *St. Peter* speaks of *Christians* being *Partakers* of the *Divine* *Nature*; and that the *Liturgy* of the *Church* of *England* teaches Us, that it is the *NATURE* of *God* *always* to have *Mercy*: And then, I hope, He will not go on to destroy *All* before Him, merely to hurt *One*.

2. The *D——n* here affirms that, by the *Will* of his *Father* which is in *Heaven*, Our *Lord* means the *Will* declared to the *Jews* in the *Law* and the *Prophets*, *NOT* as it is discoverable by human Reason, &c. I would beg to know of the *D——n*, first, whether the *Moral* *Law* itself, even the *Moral* *Law* in the *Ten* *Commandments*, does not leave the *Nature* and *Extent* of

of the Duties there enjoy'd or imply'd, very much to the Common Reason of Mankind: And *secondly*, whether the *Prophets* do not Themselves send Men to the Natural Notions of God, and of Just and Right. Let Him interpret that of the *Prophet*, *What doth the Lord thy God require of Thee, but to do justly, to love Mercy, and to walk humbly*; and He will find his Mistake. And, whatever might be contained in the original Design of the *Law*; let any one consider the Manner in which our Lord treats of the Duties of Religion, in the *Sermon on the Mount*; and that He himself lays upon his Disciples the *Great Points* there mentioned, as what they knew little of before; and that He does not there send Them to *that Law*, but plainly call them to *Himself*: And from hence it may be judg'd how just an Interpreter the *D——n* is.

3. When our *Saviour* exhorts Them to *imitate* God, according to the *D——n*, He does not send Them to the *Nature*, but to the *Example*, of God: As if He could possibly send Them to the *Example*, without sending Them to the *Moral Nature* of God, upon which that *Example* is founded. And here, lest He should avoid any Opportunity of mistaking, and of contradicting Himself, He first observes that our *Saviour* (mark here the Accurateness of the *Expression*, worthy of so nice a *Critick* who can't bear the *Word Appeals*!) SENDS his Hearers to the *Divine Goodness*, declared to Them in the *sacred Books*; Whereas there is not *one Word* tending that Way: And then, feeling perhaps within Himself that this was not right, He adds, — *And daily experienced in the COMMON Providences, which Good and Bad share alike*. Thus does this Writer deal with our Blessed Lord's *Sermon on the Mount*. He affirms that by the *Will of God* mentioned in it, there is nothing meant but the *Will of God* declared in the *Law* and the *Prophets*, as distinct from the *Common Reason*
of

of Mankind: And immediately He affirms that the Experience of Men, and the Common Providences of God, are here appeal'd to; which yet are the Points upon which their *Common Reason* argues. A *Critick*, who can thus *Criticise* himself into a *Maze* of Contradiction; A *Commentator*, who can tell Us that, when our *Saviour* speaks of imitating the *Beneficence* of *Almighty God*, in letting his *Sun* to shine, and his *Rain* to fall, upon the *Ungrateful* and the *Wicked*, He did, in that very Passage, send his Hearers to the *Divine Goodness* as declared in the *sacred Books*; and consequently, who can represent our Lord as appealing to the *Law* and the *Prophets*, for this Truth, that *God* lets his *Sun* shine, and his *Rain* fall upon All without any difference or distinction, (which is solely a Matter of *Experience* in all Nations equally;) is a very fit Person to exercise his Satyr upon *Others*, with an Air of *Superiority*, little less than what *Infallibility* itself could assume.

4. But the Great *Nostrum* is now coming again.
 1. The *Bishop* calls those *Laws* which are not *Laws*. Away with all Trifling upon so sacred a Subject! Supposing the *Bishop* to have thought of nothing but the *Sermon* upon the *Mount*, (which appears to be a mere *Invention*;) yet, *Instructions*, *Directions*, *Doctrines*, *Exhortations*, or whatsoever the *D--n* pleases to call them, so deliver'd by a *Prophet*, or *Teacher*, or whatsoever He will please to call our Blessed Lord: I say, These *Instructions* so delivered, as these were upon the *Mount*, with solemn *Denunciations* of *Punishments*, as well as *Rewards*, annex'd to Them; and *this* by a Person who not only had, but at that time claim'd, *Authority* to do it thus; are *Laws* properly speaking. And if the same Person was *after* this declar'd to be our *King*, These *Instructions*, tho' supposed to be delivered *before* He was possess'd of *Regal Dignity*, are to *Us*, his *Laws* properly speaking, even in the *D--n's* Sense, if he will adhere to
 any

any one Point He lays down. For, 2 In order to shew that the *Bishop* has not taken Notice of those Commands "which may most properly be call'd "the *Laws of Christ*", (when it was not the *Bishop's* Design to *specify* Particulars;) He allows that "the "Two Sacraments may most properly be call'd his "Laws: *Baptism* being commanded by Him *after* "He was invested in the *Regal Office*; and the "Lords *Supper*, just as he was entring upon it"; (that is, I beg the *Reader* to observe, *before* He was invested with it;) "and which *St. Paul* receiv'd af- "terwards by immediate *Inspiration* from Him."

From hence many Good Things will follow. As, 1. That Our *Saviour* had a *Kingdom*; was a *King*, and had a Number of *Subjects* properly so call'd, at least immediately after his *Resurrection*: Seemingly a little contradictory to the *Dean of Worcester's Sermon*, p. 27, 28. 2. That either the *Institution* of the *Lord's Supper* was a *Law to Christians*, before and without the *Revelation* of it to *St. Paul*; or not. If it were not; then no Persons were obliged to observe it, under the *Penalty* of *Christ's Displeasure*, till *St. Paul* had the immediate *Revelation* of it; and then, *None* but such as were so happy as to hear of that particular *Revelation* to *St. Paul*: To affirm which is absurd *Trifling*. If it were a *Law*, tho' it were a *Command* given *before* the *D--n* allows our *Lord* to be invested in the *Regal Office*; then it is evident that his other *Precepts* and *Commands*, given with *Penalties* expressly and particularly annex'd, (which *This* has not but in the *general*;) are *Laws* properly speaking. And, 3. If what the *Apostles* declare of the *Will of Christ*, under the *Direction* of his *Spirit*, after the *Time* to which the *D--n* has fix'd his *Regal Investiture*, are *Laws* properly speaking; then certainly all their *Repetitions* or *Confirmations* of the *Declarations of Christ*, after his *Ascension*, (if the *D--n* will make these necessary) are sufficient, by his

own way of Reasoning, to give the Name of *Laws* to all the *Precepts* before deliver'd by our *Lord* himself. And as for all *their own* Declarations of the Will of God, with Promises and Threatnings; *these* the *D—n* must allow to be properly *Laws*, by his own Accurate Rule just now refer'd to. Now, all These the *Bishop* constantly takes in, as the *Laws of Christ*. But on the contrary, had He, under a Pretence of *Accuracy*, (which is none,) laboured with Vehemence against our *Blessed Lord's Precepts* being, or being call'd, *Laws*: What an *Outcry* should we have heard against This, as an *Attack* even upon *Christianity* it self!

27. In, p. 45. We come to what the *Bishop* has said, about the *Rewards* and *Punishments* proper to *Human Societies*, as such, *viz.* that our Saviour was far from thinking These the Instruments of such a Persuasion as He thought acceptable to God. Now let Us see how the *D—n* argues against This. 1. This does not follow, says He, from our *Lord's Silence*, or from his not annexing them Himself, as *Sanctions*, to his *Laws*. Nobody ever said that This follow'd merely from his *Silence*; but from his *Silence* concerning These, joined with his *Open Declarations* of quite *Other Sanctions*. 2. The *D—n* argues, How * should One, who was no *Temporal Prince*, annex *Temporal Sanctions*? Right again. How indeed? And therefore, Because He was not a *Temporal Prince*, (nor is yet transform'd into One,) from this very Thing the *Bishop* argues that *Temporal Sanctions* are not proper in his *Kingdom*; nor indeed possible in it, consider'd as *His*: He, who is *King*, being the Person who of right annexes *Sanctions* to his own *Laws*; and Our *Blessed Lord*, as a *King* of another Sort, having annex'd *Sanctions* of another

* P. 44.

Sort. 3. The *Dean* puts a Case that the *Jewish Governours*, and *Roman Emperor*, had been converted by our *Blessed Lord*; and then asks, "Whether our Lord would have been offended at their Offer of Protection, and Encouragement from the Civil Power, in favour of his Religion, and of all such as should embrace the Belief of it, as a Thing unlawful, and inconsistent with his own Regal Dignity, or the Sanction of his Laws, or the Nature of his Religion"? The *D—n* can see no Ground from our *Saviour's* Conduct for such a Thought. I answer, for myself, 1. That I am persuaded, He would not have been offended either at their *Conversion*, or their *Protection*. 2. If the *Emperor* had proceeded to offer Him a *Publick Law*, that every One who should believe (or profess to believe) in Jesus, as the *Christ*, should be intitled to the *Emperor's* Favour, and to the Posts and Offices, the *Profits* and *Honours*, in his Gift; and that no *Others*, Not One of Those who should not believe in Him, should be capable of Any such: Upon this Supposition, I think nothing is plain from the whole *Genius* of the *Gospel*, if *This* be not, That our *Saviour* would have refused and forbid All such *Declarations*. He would, I doubt not, have instructed the *Emperor* better, and have declared that such *Sanctions* so promulgated might add to the Number of *Professors*, but not to the Number of *Believers*; that They might make Multitudes of the *Emperor's* Religion, without making One of *Christ's* Religion; that He was *King* in his own *Kingdom*, and had fix'd such *Sanctions* as were suitable to the Nature and Design of it; and that *Temporal Ones* from the *Emperor* could be only the *Sanctions* of the *Emperor's* Laws, and not of *His*: That the *Faith* which alone He required, and sought after, and which alone could be pleasing to *God*, was to be founded upon a *sincere* and impartial Examination of the *Truth* of

his *Pretensions*: In short, That He accounted of the *Honours* and *Profits* of this World, not as of the most Beneficial Things to the *Grand Design* He had in view. The *D—n* * may think as He pleases: But I beg leave to think thus, as long as I can read the *Gospel*.

28. But now a more *Learned Critical* Scene opens, upon Occasion of the *Bishop's* having cited *St. Paul*, as setting forth the Conduct of the *Apostles* in these Words, *Knowing the Terrors of the Lord, we persuade Men*. The *D—n's* Remarks now follow. 1. The Word in this *Text*, is *Terror*, in the singular Number; and not *Terrors*. Most important! But permit Me to put in a *Plea* or *Two* upon occasion of this terrible Charge. And, 1. This incomparable *Critick*, who in this same *Page* can find out Holes in *Greek Manuscripts* for *Negative Particles* to drop out of, has not *Critical Sagacity* enough to see that the little Letter *s* may much more easily creep into the Print, in our Days, than a Whole Word, altering a Sentence from an *Affirmative* to a *Negative*, could fall out of a *Manuscript* heretofore, without the least Notice. Which is the more wonderful in *Him*, because, if one may give any Credit to a late *Advertisement*, and be determined by the Manner of expressing it, the *Dean of Worcester* himself, in his own Person, had the Unhappiness lately of experiencing the Carelessness of our *Printers*; and of having these three Words, is often quoted, put into his late Accurate and Christian Postscript, instead of these *Seven* others, makes great Use of *Mr. Locke's Principles*. For This I must take to be the Meaning of the *Advertisement*, in the *Daily Courant*, Feb. 3. rather than imagine that so Good a Christian would not have publickly acknowledg'd a *Personal Injury*,

if He *Himself*, and not his *Printer*, had been guilty of One. But, 2. Tho' the *Bishop* might indeed have had an easy Method of stopping the Force of this great *Criticism*, by following this unexceptionable Example, and publishing a little dark *Advertisement* in a Corner of Another, unobserv'd, *P. 19. l. 17.* for *Terrors* read *Terror*: And tho' this would have been much more justifiable, than in a Case of *Personal Accusation*; yet, let the Word stand as it is. And now let this Writer himself tell Us where the Fault is. He Himself owns the Word to be meant of the *Terror* of the Day of Judgment: And the *Bishop* appears to mean the very same; and only to use the Word *Terrors* in the Plural, because it answers more exactly to the *Terrors of this World* mentioned in the opposite Part of the *Sentence*. Is it now, a *Crime*, in citing a *Passage*, and This without naming the Place where it is, to change a *Word* from *Singular* to *Plural*, whilst there cannot be the Pretence of the least Alteration in the *Sense*? How would the *Fathers* take this from their *New Friend* and *Patron*, who are famous for *citing Texts*, without any scrupulous regard to the very *Words*; and sometimes in Opposition to their true meaning? How will All those, the *Best of Divines*, take it, who have, in numberless Instances, never scrupled to use *Texts of Scripture*, by way of *Allusion* only to a Point they could not belong to? Nay, what can this *Author* himself reap from his own Remark? It is but in *p. 42.* that He affirms that our *Saviour* says, in the Sermon upon the *Mount*, that *He only* shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, &c. This is by *Memory* too: For the Words are not so, either in the *English*, or *Greek*. The meaning is so. And thus in the *other Case*, the *Meaning* is no more alter'd by putting *Terrors* for *Terror*, than it is in *this*, by adding a *Word*. Nay, I will shew before I make an End, that He makes very free with several

ral *Scripture-Texts*, not without great Misapplication, and Mistake, in this very Book.

2. Another of his *Remarks* is, that St. Paul speaks here of the "*True Motive, by which He was acted*", &c. As if This were not the very same *Motive*, He made use of to *persuade Men*!—But the great Secret, with which the *Critick's* Breast was swelling and labouring, now comes forth.

3. "Had his *L*—*p* consider'd well the Expression — and compared it with *Gal. i. 10.* " and *1 Cor. iv. 3.* He would have seen great Reason to suspect That the *Negative Particle* has by some Accident been dropt in this Place, and that the *True Reading* is *ἐκ ἀπορίας πείθομαι* — " We do not make our Court to Men, but endeavour to approve our selves to God." It has been often observed that There are *Men*, in common Life, who are never easy in Company, till They have successfully given vent to their own *Witticisms* and *Repartees* ready prepared before-hand. And it is as true an Observation that there are *Pedants* in the *Learned World*, who *travail with a Criticism, as a Woman in Labour of a Child.* They are *big* with the *happy Emendation*; and They feel themselves in *pain*, till They are *deliver'd* of it: and so throw it out, at the first Opportunity, They themselves can create. But let Us consider what may be said to this Grand Observation.

1. Supposing this whole *Text* out of the *Bible*; or the *Negative Particle* brought back into it; the *Bishop's* Account of the *Apostles* Conduct in their Preaching still remains punctually true. 2. Supposing the *Text* wrong translated; the making use of the *English* establish'd *Translation*, for the use of *English* Hearers, where the *Tenor* of the *N. T.* is on the same side, is both *proper*, and universally *common*. But now, 3. Supposing the *Bishop* had consider'd what is here alledg'd; and had been so

Imprudent as to have vented it; let the World judge, from what He has met with, whether He would not have been treated, and perhaps by this same *Author*, as a *Corrupter* of the *Sacred Scripture*, and a *Destroyer* even of the most certain and undoubted *Readings* of the *Greek Testament*; besides the ordinary *Complements* of *Ignorance* and *Unskilfulness* in *Language*.

4. I will now come to the *Point* with this *Critick*. I have consider'd the *Expressions* made Use of in this whole Verse, in Comparison with the *Places* He refers to. The *Passage* 1 Cor. iv. 3. has no *Word* in it, to support this rash *Conjecture*; but only imports that *St. Paul* did not depend upon what *Man* thought of Him, but upon the *Judgment* of *God* about Him. Will it follow from hence, that therefore, *St. Paul* meant, in *another Place*, in *Another Epistle*, to say nothing but *This*, which He had often already declared? The *other Passage*, *Gal.* i. 10. as far as the Use of the Word *πειθω* can make it, is more nearly allied to the present. But only by that single Word: for the whole Turn of the *Sentence* is quite different. In *Gal.* i. 10. the Word *πειθω* belongs both to *God* and *Men*. 'Αρετι ἢ ἀνθρώπου *πειθω*, ἢ τὸν θεόν; Nay, The same Sense is continued on, in other *Expressions*. And if it were so here, 2 Cor. v. 11. It would be some *Argument*. But it is quite otherwise— *Knowing the Terror of the Lord*, ἀνθρώπου *πειθομεν* — Then follows, not ἀλλὰ τὸν θεόν, or θεόν ὃ *πειθομεν*, (which might have justify'd the *E-mendation*) but, in quite another *Form*, θεῷ δὲ *παρανεώμεθα* — *And in this Conduct* we are made manifest to *God*, as his sincere *Servants*. What follows? Not any *Thing*, as in the *other Passage*, against being acceptable to *Men*; but a *Hope* that they should be made manifest, as sincere, in the *Consciences* of the *Corinthians* also. Now therefore, To take *Occasion* from a *Passage*, where the same *Phraseology* is
not

not continu'd and preserv'd, to alter a *Proposition* from an *Affirmative* to a *Negative*, where the *Sense* does not require it; is a Sign of Little, but that a Man has got some Wandring Words and Ideas floating about in his Head, and *will be* making use of them, even when and where it is all over Injudicious to do it. This is *properly Tinkering* the *New Testament*; which is worse than what this Writer * calls *Tinkering a Government*. For this is to make *Holes* in that Sacred Book for *Negative Particles* to drop out of. And what is the *Consequence*? If a *Negative Particle* may have drop'd out in *one Place*; it may have drop'd *in* to another. And *He* that could find out *this Instance* of the *Former*, *without* the Concurrence of *Any One Manuscript*, *without* the Testimony of *any One Old Version*, *without* the Hint of *any One Antient Commentator*, or *Father*, as far as appears; may at length discover several Instances of the *Latter*, *against* the Consent of *All* these put together. And thus, by the *Force of a Conjectural Genius*, *without Judgment*, *Affirmative Propositions* may become *Negative*; and *Negative* become *Affirmative*! *Critical Conjectures* are certainly allowable and valuable, where there is a *Necessity* or a *Reason* for an *Alteration*, even in the most *Sacred Books*. But *Wanton Conjectures*, void of all *Necessity* and *Proof*; and unsupported by *Any Hint* from *Testimony*, should not be proposed for fear of farther ill *Consequences*. But if this *Writer* has found *any Ease* by being deliver'd of this *Criticism*; let *that* be pardon'd in *Him*, which would have been unpardonable in *Another*.

Only there is *One Circumstance* which is peculiar against *Him*, that He has no *Right* even so much as to interpret the Word $\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\theta\omicron\mu\omicron\mu$, to signify

* P. 53.

Any sort of Courting, or *Addressing* to, Men; or *Perswasion*; or any thing like It. For the *Dean of Worcester's* Argument is equally good *here*, and where * He made Use of it. Will it be said that *πειθορρη* in this Place properly signifies *perswading Men*, or *making Court* to them? Let us hear St. James iii. 3. *Behold we put Bits in the Horses Mouths*, (strong Bits, not persuasive Arguments) *That they may obey us*, *περὶ τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτῶν ἵππων*. A certain Proof that *πειθω*, the *Active*, in another Place, can signify nothing but *Forcing* and *Ruling Men* in the Manner of *Horses*!

Lastly, Let us observe this *Writer's* Interpretation of this *Text*, so happily mended. *We do not make our Court to Men, or study to please Them; but endeavour to approve our selves to God*. Now, when He can prove that *δεῖν δὲ πεφανέρωμεθα*, *But or And we are made manifest to God*, can possibly be design'd to signify precisely, *We endeavour to approve our selves to God*; it will then appear that He consider'd and understood the *Diſtion* of St. Paul in this latter Part of the Verse, as well as He thought He did in the former. In the mean while, let the *Sacred Books* be free from *such Attempts*, as are neither required from the *Defect* of the *Present Copies*; nor justify'd by the *Context*; nor supported by one single Authority. And let this *Writer* know that such *Sallies* as this, are the *Knight-Errantry* of *Criticism*, which is not content with *Redressing* the real *Grievances* it meets with: but wanders thro' the *World* in *Quest* of *Adventures*; and sees *Enemies* and *Monsters* where there are *None*; and fancies *Distresses* where all is well; and pushes its *Lance* at every *Phantom* of its own.

* Serm. P. 12.

29. Before I go forward, I will add here Another Instance of this *Author's* Skill in *Criticism*, from p. 65, 66. design'd by *Him* to shew the *Bishop's* Ignorance ; but, as it has often happen'd, ending in the Discovery of his own. " His L---p (*says He*) * proves " *there can be no Right in Fallible Men to such an Au-* " *thority*— because Christ is said, *Heb. xii. 2.* to be " *the Author and Finisher of our Faith*, (that is, says " the Bishop, *τελειωτής, Perfecter*) of *that Faith* which " was ONCE deliver'd, &c." And upon this He immediately insults. Before I come to the Sense of this Text, given by this *Writer*, I must be so free as to tell *Him*, having first consulted the Passage here refer'd to, that this State of the Matter, tho' supported in Appearance by a formal Citation of the Page, is a *Misrepresentation* worthy only of such a *Writer*. The *Sentence* in the *Bishop's* Book is this. " It (that is, the *Authority* of making *Humane Un-* " *contestable Decisions in Points of Faith*) " is not " rejected merely because it has been abused ; but " because there can be no Right in Fallible Men " to such an Authority : And because Christ is the " *Author and Finisher (τελειωτής Perfecter) of our Faith*". — Here then it appears, in Contradiction to this *Inventer*,

1. That the *Bishop* is not there proving that there can be no such Right in *Fallible Men* ; but giving the Reasons why the Authority there mention'd, is rejected. And He says, It is rejected, because in *Fallible Men*, (or Men consider'd as *Fallible*;) there can be no Right to such an *Authority* ; i. e. to an Authority which requires *Infallibility*. This is the *first* Reason, taken from the Nature of *Man* ; without any Express Relation to *Christ*, or his Religion. The *second* Reason is as truly misre-

* Post. in Ans. to the Bishop of Oxford ; P. 235, 236.

presented. The *Bishop* does not argue, There can be no Right to such an Authority in *Fallible Men*, BECAUSE Christ is, or is said to be, the *Author* and *Finisher* of our Faith; which is the *D—n's* own *Incoherent Invention*: But He is here plainly giving *Another* different Reason, why such an Authority is rejected; *viz.* Because Christ is the *Author*, &c. And here again, The *Bishop* does not say, It is rejected — because Christ is SAID (*Heb. xii. 2.*) to be — (which is *Another Invention*;) but because He is the *Author* and *Finisher*, (*τελειωτής* *Perfector*) of our Faith: alluding, indeed, to those *Titles* given Him in that *Text*; but not citing it, as this *Writer* has injuriously done for Him; or binding Himself to maintain *This* to be the *precise* Meaning of the Word there: That is, Doing no more than what All the Best Writers do; Expressing an uncontested Truth by a Word or Phrase used indeed in a particular *Text*, but without citing the *Text*, or appearing to lay the Strefs of his Argument upon the exact Meaning of the *Phrase* in that particular Place. A *false Critick*, whose Aim is only to find Fault, sees this in a *false Light*: and runs to the *Attack* rashly and blindly; wounding *Himself*, in his Rage, as well as all *Writers* around Him.

But now, Let us suppose that the *Bishop* had expressly interpreted the Word *τελειωτής*, in this particular Passage, to signify the *Completer* of our Faith; or the Person who deliver'd it to his Followers *Perfect* and *Complete*. I will not mention here that, whatever *τελειωτής* may signify, the Title *ἄρχηγός*, *Author*, *Leader*, *Director*, of our Faith, (or however it be translated,) implies in it by Consequence the *Other*, and leads to it; and will serve the *Bishop's* Argument as well. But to come to the Point; the *Apostle* having, in the foregoing *Chapter*, set forth many *Actions* and *Sufferings* of Men, which were the Effect of their *Faith*, and supported by It,

He comes to fix the Eyes of *Christians* upon an Example of greater Consequence to *Them*; the Example of their own *Master*. And in doing this, it could not be at all improper for *Him* to turn their Thoughts to *Jesus Christ* under the Character of the *Author, Beginner, and Complete Deliverer* of that *Faith*, by which *Christians* were to live and overcome the World. And upon this Consideration alone, I will ask this *Writer*, Where is the Absurdity, or the Sign of Total Ignorance of the *Scripture*, to suppose that *Christians* are here call'd upon, in order to their suffering patiently by Virtue of their Faith, to look upon the Example of their Great Master, who call'd them to this *Faith*, and who was the Complete Deliverer of this *Faith* to them?

But this will be the better supported against the present *Critick*, by observing into how many Absurdities He runs himself, for fear of admitting This Interpretation. "The Sense of which" (speaking of the *Passage* in the *Original*) "is plainly This, and NOTHING else" (says* our *Dictator*) "that we should run with Patience the Race of Faith set before us — having *Jesus* also for our Pattern, who has himself led the glorious way, is the ἀρχηγός Author, and will be Our Rewarder, τελειωτής; will crown our Sufferings at the last Day with a happy Immortality. [See *Heb. ii. 10. 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.*"] Was ever Any Thing, with so much Solemnity of Positiveness, deliver'd with so much Unaccuracy? For, 1. The *Race* here mentioned, to be run with *Patience*, is the *Race of Sufferings* set before the *Christians* of that time. This is the *Race* which (accurately speaking) the *Sacred Writer* is here encouraging them to run; to which the Word *Patience* properly relates: and a *Race*,

* P. 66.

which They were to run by Virtue of their *Faith*, which is propos'd to Them as Their Support in this *Race of Sufferings*. This may be call'd the *Race of Faith*, in another Respect. But the Thing precisely here meant is the *Race of Sufferings*. 2. The Nature of the Argument is here changed by this *Interpreter*. The *Author* of the *Epistle* does not say, *Looking unto Jesus*, who will reward your *Sufferings*: — But, *Looking unto Jesus* — who for the Joy that was set before Him, endured the *Cross*, despising the *Shame*; and who has himself obtained a *Reward*. This is what the *Sacred Writer* directly recommends to the Consideration of *Christians*, in this Place: not that *Christ* will be their *Rewarder*; however True in it self; but that *Christ* himself ran the same *Race of Sufferings*, by *Faith*; and Himself sought after and obtained a *Reward*, in so doing. 3. The Titles *Ἀρχηγός*, and *πλειωθῆς*, ἢ *πίστεως*, are applied to *Jesus*, (as the *Writer* passes along,) to urge upon *Christians* the Motive of such an Example of patient Suffering. But the *D—n* represents his Design as terminating in what is not once plainly expressed in these Words; which, supposing them to relate particularly to *Our Faith*, import no more than the calling *Christians* to regard *Christ* their *Master*. 4. These Titles both equally belong to ἢ *πίστεως*—*Jesus* the *Ἀρχηγός* and *πλειωθῆς*, (whatever the Words signify;) of *Our Faith*. The *Critick* here interprets this Passage thus; “ Who is the *Ἀρχηγός* Author, and “ will be *Our Rewarder*, *πλειωθῆς*, will crown our *Sufferings*, &c.

Observe, *Reader*, that in this very Place the *D—n* is professing the utmost Accuracy; and chastising, with his usual Superiority, what He supposes to be the utmost Unaccuracy. And what does He produce? Why, It seems, The *Text* before Him is to be thus interpreted, *Looking unto Jesus*, “ who is the *Ἀρχηγός* “ *Author*”— The *Author* of what? Of *Nothing*, as far as our *Interpreter* leads Us. For it follows —

“ And

“ And will be our Rewarder, *πλειώτης.*” So that, in a Critical exact Manner of Interpreting, *Ἀρχηγός τῆ πίστεως* signifies *THE Author — of Nothing*; And *πλειώτης τῆ πίστεως* signifies *OUR Rewarder*; That is, *τῆ πίστεως*, with respect to the former of these Titles, signifies *Nothing*; and, with respect to the Latter, signifies *Of Us*. Thus does He settle the *Only Meaning* of this Text, by interpreting it against *Grammar*, and without *Sense*. But he goes on to explain *πλειώτης.* by these Words, *will crown our Sufferings, &c.* by which He must mean, *will be the Rewarder of our Sufferings.* I have observed already that this does not suit with the Design of this Passage, in which *Jesus* is represented as *seeking* and *receiving*, not as *giving a Reward*. But besides this, Did ever *Critick* of the lowest Form affirm that in *Any Passage of Scripture,* *πιστις* can signify precisely *Our Sufferings*? And particularly, if the *D——n* will have it so in *This Passage*; then *Ἀρχηγός,* which He renders the *Author,* must signify precisely the *Author* of our *Sufferings,* because *both Words* belong to the same thing. But this is highly *Absurd*; which is something worse than its being egregiously *Unaccurate*: And yet *This,* in a *determined Critick* sparing Nobody around Him, is a little intolerable. 4. The Texts of *Scripture* here cited, according to Custom, are of no Service to the Purpose for which they are cited. In the one, *2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.* *St. Paul* declares that He has run his Race, and that He expects a Reward from Christ; but without once calling Him either *Ἀρχηγός* or *πλειώτης* of our *Faith*; about which Expressions alone we are here concerned. In the other, *Heb. ii. 10.* it is said to be fitting that God, in bringing many Sons to Glory, should make the Captain (*τῆ αρχηγίας*) of their Salvation perfect thro’ Sufferings. The Word here is *πλειῶσαι,* as it is *πλειώτης,* in the Passage before Us. When it is applied to *Persons,* as it is in this Place, *Heb. ii. 10.* and *Heb. xi. 40.* it signifies even then, the perfecting them, or the bringing them to

Per-

Perfection. It does not signify *Rewarding*, primarily and of it self; but accidentally and consequentially, as the *Rewarding* them is the Thing which finishes and compleats All with Respect to *Them*. But, in the contested Passage, *Heb. xii. 2.* *God*, or the *Father*, is not the *πλειωθῆς*; but *Jesus*: And He is not styl'd, the *πλειωθῆς* of the Persons of his Followers; but of *That Faith*, of which also He is the *Ἀρχηγός* in the same Verse. So that here is a great difference. *τελειώσῃ*, in one Place; and the Passive *πλειωθῆσι*, in Another, when spoken of *Persons*, imply in them consequentially the *Idea* of *Rewarding*, and being *Rewarded*, because That is the *Perfection*, or finishing, of the States of those *Persons*. But where the Title *τελειωθῆς* is given to *Jesus*, and not to *God*, or the *Father*; and is apply'd to *Faith*; to the *Thing* it self, and not to the *Persons* of the *Faithful*; there it is far from evidently signifying the *Rewarder* of *Faith*; or of our *Sufferings*, which this exact Man has put instead of the Word *Faith*. And consequently, this *Passage* is far from receiving any Light from Those others cited by our *Critick*; unless it be just enough to discover that it must be interpreted differently from what He would infer merely from the Sound of the same, or like Words. Again, Christ is called, *Heb. ii. 10.* Ὁ Ἀρχηγός τῆς σωτηρίας—The *Author*, or *Captain*, of our *Salvation*; Here, He is call'd Ἀρχηγός τῆς πίστεως, The *Author*, or *Leader*, or *Beginner* of our *Faith*: In both Places represented as the Great *Founder* or *Teacher* of the *Gospel-Dispensation*. To this *Idea* it is much more agreeable, to interpret *πλειωθῆς* by *Perfector* and *Completer* of the same *Faith*, the same *Dispensation*, than to make the *Perfector* of our *Faith* signify here the *Rewarder* of our *Sufferings*, to which the Word *Ἀρχηγός* interpreted *Author* by our *Critick* himself, can have no relation.

I have now prov'd that this *Writer's* Interpretation of this *Passage* is full of great *Mistakes*. I have, as

I pass'd, said enough to shew that our Lord *Jesus* is represented in it, as *seeking*, not *giving*, a *Reward*; that *this* Circumstance, and the Signification of the Word *τελειωθῆς*, when applied to the Thing *Faith*, and not to *Persons*, sufficiently justify the *Interpretation* oppos'd by the *D--n*. I have argued thus far, supposing the Word *Faith* here to mean the *Faith* of *Christians* precisely. But I will beg his leave just to mention *Another* Interpretation: Which, from the *Words* themselves, and the *Connexion* of them to what goes before, I confess, appears to me more exact. And it is this--- *Ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸ τὴν πίστιν,* [as it is τὴν πίστιν, *ch. xi. 39.*] *ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν.* Looking upon *Jesus* the Great Captain and Perfecter of *Faith*; upon Him who is the Great *Leader* in this *Affair*, and who has brought *Faith* to *Perfection* in his own Example of *Patience* under *Sufferings*. For it is *Faith*, of which the *Writer* was speaking in general before; and not *our Faith* in particular. This, I confess, appears at present the most *Unexceptionable* Sense of this Place. But I affirm nothing positively: nor am so vain as to say (with our *Author*,) that *This*, or the *Foregoing*, is the *Sense*; and *Nothing else*. I think it becomes Us to leave doubtful and obscure *Passages*, to the farther *Enquiries* of *Learned Men*.

If it be now evident that the *D——n* has no certain Ground for his Excessive Positiveness; it will be much more evident that He has no Excuse from any *Discoveries* He has here made, for his Unequal'd Rudeness. For supposing the *Bishop* had mistaken the *precise Sense* of an *obscure Passage*; (which yet, it does not appear, He was at all thinking to fix;) Is this a sufficient *Reason* for this *Great Genius* to break out into *Insults*, and to add, " Sure his *L——p* —— will, before He writes again, be persuaded seriously to read over the *New Testament*, or not meddle in *Controversies*,

“verfies, where there is no taking one Step right, without a good Knowledge of it.” If an *Angel* in Knowledge ſhould ſpeak thus; it would be only a Sign that He had felt little within Himſelf of the Imperfections which give an Alloy to the Human Understanding. But when One, who is himſelf but a *Man*; and a *Man*, who has ſhewn Himſelf bewildred in numerous Miſtakes, and Self-Contradictions; a *Man*, who knows *Experimentally* how eaſy it is to *Err*, and how hard to guard againſt it; a *Man*, who feels that He can’t always keep his own *Great Capacity* ſecure from *Human Weakneſſes*, and even more than *Common Miſtakes*: When a *Man* thus accompliſh’d, forgets that He is a *Man*; and aſſumes an *Aire* which *Infallibility* it ſelf cannot juſtify; It becomes the *Duty* of Any One, who converſes with Him, to ſhew Him to Himſelf in his true Colours of *Weakneſs*, *Frailty*, and *Self-Condernation*. *Homo ſum, humani nihil a me alienum puto*, is a Saying of too much Virtue for Men of ſome *Tempers* to like, or to make their own. But all who know themſelves cannot but embrace the *Sentiment*, and take a Pleaſure in the *Acknowledgment*. The Suppoſition is, The *Biſhop* did not rightly explain the Meaning of *τελειωθης* in *Heb. xii. 2*. Well, Let it be granted; tho’ nothing like it here appears. Why then, it follows that He never read over the *New Teſtament* ſeriouſly; and is worthy of nothing but the *Insults* of a ſo much *Greater Man*, as this *Writer* has ſhewn Himſelf to be. That is, in other Words, This *Incomparable Writer* has found out a *Proof* that there never was a *Man* yet in the World who had ſeriouſly read over the *New Teſtament*, or was fit to *meddle in Controverſy*; becauſe there never was a *Writer* who has not been miſtaken in the *Interpretation* of *Scripture*. I know Him well enough, to know that He will except *Himſelf*, and the *Dean of Worceſter*; Himſelf in *Diſguiſe*, and Him-

Himself out of Disguise. But my *Friendship* to Him forces me to tell Him a *Truth*, which perhaps others may hide from Him; "That at this Day there lives not a Man, pretending to the Name and Accuracy of a *Scholar*, whose present Circumstances could, in the Eyes of the World, make this superior Aire of Insult less Tolerable or Excusable, than it is in Him." He is at present thought of, as *One* who has, in his own Example, given abundant Proof of Human Frailties, and Errors. He has upon his Hands many of his own *Criticisms*, and Learned Observations upon Scripture-Language, waiting for and demanding his *Defence*; already despaired of by the Best and most Disinterested Judges, and gasping for Life, without *his* Relief. He leaves them to themselves without any Help from his Medicinal Hand; and, wounded as He is from Head to Foot, without One whole Part about Him, He runs from *Himself*, (which is no Wonder;) and, as his only remaining Comfort, upbraids and outrages every One that stands in his Way, for not being *Invulnerable*. Whoever has a Right to reproach the *Bishop* as *Unfit* for *Controversy* upon Account of a *Mistake* in interpreting a *Text*; This *Author* has none. I will not stir a Step out of the present *Scene* of *Action*, to convince Him that, by the same *Argument*, He himself is in a much more desperate Condition. But I will spare Him, and give Him but *Eight Instances* of *Misinterpretations* of Scripture, some of them very gross, out of this same short *Book*, in which He breaths so much Contempt and Destruction around Him. 1. The *Text* about *Nursing-Fathers*, and *Nursing-Mothers*, which He has unjustifiably, and without the least Ground, interpreted, *p.* 47. to relate to the Temporal Protection and Encouragement of the *Church of Christ*: to which it has no possible Relation. 2. The *Text*, wherein the *Civil Magistrate* is call'd the *Minister*

nister of God, whilst He was an Enemy to Christianity ; which, in *p.* 50. He has interpreted to relate to his Obligation to enforce the Censures of a *Christian Church*, with his Power of *Temporal Punishments*: from which Point it is as distant as *Earth* from *Heaven*. 3. The *Texts*, John xiv. 16. Mat. xxviii. 20. which He cites expressly, *p.* 30. as promising the *Spirit of Christ*, for the Ends of that *Church-Authority* which is the Matter of present *Debate*; and which He here says is founded upon an *Express Commission* from our Saviour to his Apostles, and their Successors. A gross Imposition upon his Reader, from One who has more than once devested the *Apostles* themselves of Any *Authority*, but that of *Faithful Witnesses* to what was taught them; and who has, in this very Book, in effect assur'd his Reader that such *Texts* do not belong to the present *Church-Governours*, in the Sense in which they belong'd to the *Apostles*; nay, that they do not belong to *Church-Authority* in Those who succeed the *Apostles*, any farther than This, that the *Ministers* of the *Gospel*, taking Care not to be deceiv'd, will not be deceiv'd. The *Scripture* is too Sacred a *Book* to be turn'd into Sport at this Rate. 4. The *Text*, 2 Cor. v. 11. the latter Part of which, *But, or And we are made manifest to God*, He interprets, *p.* 46. in his *Critical Capacity*, to mean precisely, *But we endeavour to approve our selves to God*; which He can never justify. 5. The *Text* Mat. vii. 21. in which He affirms that by the *Will* of God our Saviour precisely means the *Will* declared to the *Jews* in the *Law* and the *Prophets*. 6. The *Texts* Mat. v. 45, 48. in which He affirms the Imitation of God to refer to his Goodness declared to the *Jews* in the same *Sacred Books*, when it is wholly and expressly refer'd to his *Common Providence*. 7. The *Text* now before Us, *Heb.* xii. 2. of which He affirms that nothing else can be the *Meaning* but this,

that *Jefus* is the Author, and will be our Rewarder— &c. the former Part of which has it self No *Meaning* at all; and therefore, cannot be the *Meaning* of this Place. 8. The *Text* John v. 23. which He in effect affirms, p. 15. to belong to *Religious Worship*; and to command and justify that very Religious Worship which is paid to the *Son* in the *Protestant* Countries. If He should say that He has not expressly *cited* some of these, but only alluded to them without any *Design* of accurately fixing their *Meaning*; Let Him remember that *This* was exactly the *Bishop's* Case, and see in this the *Inexcusableness* of those *Insults* to which He has run with so much *Pleasure*. But besides that *This* Excuse is No Excuse in *His* Mouth; It concerns not that greater Number of them, which He has *cited*, and expressly thus interpreted.

Behold now this *Great Man*, even whilst He is assuming the Aire of a *Corrector* of all *Unaccuracy* in *Style*, and of an *Exact Critical Interpreter* of particular *Texts*, and of a severe *Censurer* of the *Low Abilities* of *Others*; indulging Himself in a *Liberty* of *Writing* without the common *Coherence* of *Grammar*, and with *Forms* of *Expression*, which, to return Him his own polite Words, *I should not scruple in any other Writer, to call NONSENSE*; and, what is Worse, putting the most unjustifiable *Senses* upon *Scripture-Texts*, whilst He is insulting *Others* for *Mistakes* existing only in his own *Imagination*. This is *He*, who, prompted by his own *Genius*, and call'd forth by the *Distresses* of *Antient Authors*, comes to relieve Them from what They suffer under the *Stupidity* and *Ignorance* of *Others*; the *Righter* of *Wrongs*, and *Redresser* of *Injuries*, done to Them by the *Unaccuracy* of Those who will meddle with them, without the Advantage of *His* Accomplishments. But, alas! He falls as *Others* fall: only perhaps with a greater Weight to prevent his rising again,
than

than *Any* around Him; and *certainly* with the Joy of the *By-standers*, who are never better pleas'd than to see *such Souls* give particular Proof of their *Frailties*, at *that very Time* when they are insulting the unavoidable Imperfections of *Human Nature*, and in effect claiming to *Themselves* an Exemption from them. Let Us now return to the *Book* before Us.

30. In p. 47. the *D — n*, after having represented the *Bishop's Doctrine*, just as He himself pleas'd, attempts to prove that the Application of *Worldly Motives* to *Christ's Religion* is not opposite to the *Maxims* upon which He founded His Kingdom. Upon this Subject, He acknowledges that our *Blessed Lord* did not command, nor intimate, that This ought to be done: But from his own Imagination, represents our *Saviour* and his *Apostles* as always thinking and speaking of the *Christian Religion* as in a State of Persecution; and from thence would insinuate that, whenever this State of Persecution should cease, *then* the Motives of the *other World* were to be back'd and assisted by the *Motives* of *this World*. As if *Christians* could be truly *Religious*, even in a State of *Freedom* from all *Persecution*, without acting, in their *Christian Capacity*, upon the *Motives* of the *other World* alone; any more than in a *State* of *Persecution*: or as if *This Freedom* from actual *Persecution* were immediately to introduce an Alteration in the *Motives* of their *Actions*, consider'd as *Christians*. But He asks, *Did not our Lord know the Time would come when the Kingdoms of the Earth would become the Kingdoms of the Lord; and that Kings would be Nursing-Fathers, and Queens, Nursing-Mothers of his Church? Our Saviour certainly knew that the Profession of his Religion would come to be very much extended; and that Emperors and Kings would profess themselves Christians; and that Persecution by profess'd Unbelievers would cease. From hence therefore, it appears, by the D—n's own Confession*
 against

against Himself, That our *Blessed Lord* did not always think of the Profession of his Religion, as in a State of perpetual *Persecution*. And the *Argument* from hence, turns strongly upon the *D--n*, who furnishes Us with it: as it often has done in other Cases. “Our *Saviour* knew that the *Princes* of this World: would many of them come to profess his Religion. He knew that his *Church* would in *time* be free from *Persecution*, as well as He knew that It would, before that time, suffer *Persecution*. And yet He never once appoints, never once mentions, never once hints it to be the *Duty* of *Men* of *Power* to mix the Affairs of *this* World with his *Pure* and *Undeiled Religion*. He himself, *knowing all that was to come*, leaves his *Religion* to subsist upon the *Motives* of *Another World*: Therefore, One would think it natural to conclude, That He thought *these* the *only* proper *Motives*; and that *Others* were of a *Nature* not agreeable to his *Design*. And again, Our *Saviour* knew, without doubt, that many *Kings* and *Queens* would in time be *Nursing-Fathers* and *Nursing-Mothers*, in so mistaken a *Sense*, as to resemble those *Over-fond Parents*, who spoil or kill their *Children* by *over-indulging*, or *over-feeding* Them. But does it follow that every Thing which He *foreknew*, He *approved* of; even tho’ He left behind Him not one Word about it? This would bring Us to *Great Absurdities*, indeed: And yet all that the *D—n* urges amounts to little but this, Did not our Lord *know*, &c? Yes, Our Lord did *know*. But let Me ask a harder Question,—Did He *approve*?

But this is not all. The *D—n* has not only made use of this *Text* here, but also in his *Preface* to his own *Sermon*. It is in *Isaiab*, ch. xlix. v. 23. And I wonder that the *D—n*, when He was engaged in so good a *Work*, did not quote the whole of it; and ask, Did not our Lord *know* that *Kings* would be *Nursing-Fathers*, and their *Queens Nursing-Mo-*

Mothers of his Church: and did not He know that They should bow down to it, with their Face toward the Earth; and lick up the Dust of its Feet? Why should All Writers, who cite this endearing and obliging Text, stop short in the Middle; and not give it All to the Church, as well as a Part of it; but only because the latter Part looks them in the Face, and has something so shocking in it, when so applied, that They are conscious it has no relation to the Point in Hand? Besides this, Can such a Writer as this, so warm in a Cause touching the Authority of the Church, forget that the Church of Christ is not the Child of Kings and Queens becoming Christians, but the Mother; that the Business of a Mother is to nurse and feed her Children, and not to be fed by them: and that the Church is thus represented even by Those, who are perpetually quoting this Text? Nay, the D—nought to be put in mind that, whether He will constantly allow it or no, Christian Kings and Queens are a Part of this very Church, to which They are here represented as Nurses: And that if this Text relates to Christ's Church, then Christian Kings and Queens are to nurse Themselves; amongst others; and to bow down to Themselves; and to lick up the Dust of their own Feet. An Observation, sufficient to shew, if it were not plain from the Context it self, that the Kings and Queens, spoken of in this Text, are not Persons of the same Nation or Religion with Those whose Servants They are represented to be; and therefore, that This cannot relate to the Christian Church under Christian Emperors. I hope, nothing that I have said can push the D——n to the Extremity of maintaining that the Church, which Christian Princes are to bow down to, as well as to Nurse; and the Dust of whose Feet They are to lick, is The Clergy only, that is, a Part only of Christ's Church: because He has already applied this Text otherwise; and this would be only avoiding some

Ab-

Aburdities by running into *Others*. But before I quit this Subject, I must say a Word to Him, in *His own Way*. Either He knew the whole of this Passage, or not. If not; and only took it upon *Hearsay* or *Memory*; He has shewn his *ignorance* and his *Hast* together. If He knew it; and wilfully interpreted It, against the Context, and the plain Meaning of the Words; then He has *falsified a Text*, to serve a *Purpose* which it was never design'd to serve. To lie for God, is what God condemns and abhors. But to lie for the Church is, I think, something more inexcusable. Upon both Suppositions, let Him hear himself, * and, before He writes again, be persuaded seriously to read over the Bible; or not meddle in a Controversy, where there is no taking one step right without a good Knowledge of it.

The *D* — *n* goes on to appeal to the Practice of the *Christians*, after they had *Christian Emperors*; Who, He says, gladly accepted the Assistance of the Imperial Authority to establish Christianity, and to protect the Church by such Laws as could most effectually secure it against Heresy and Schism. Other Christians will appeal from this Practice of Frail Men, to the Nature and Laws of the Gospel itself; nay, and to the Observation of All the *Best Writers*, who are ever extolling the *Ages* before these *Blessed Times*, as much more pure and uncorrupted than the following. But let not the *D* — *n* here make his Reader believe that Any Mortal has ever contended against the Protection of the Emperor against Persecution; or against his Support of the Ministers of Christ's Gospel in their Work of Persuasion and truly Christian Preaching; or for the giving up our own present Establishment.

* P. 66.

As for what follows about *Humane Laws*, encouraging Virtue and discouraging Vice, and determining all Things which immediately concern *Humane Society*; it only shews that the *D—n* has forgot how fully this Subject has been handled heretofore.

31. I must not pass over some of his excellent *Lessons* for the *Church*, and for *Princes*, which follow.

“ The Faith * of the Church OUGHT to be SECURED from the Corruption of *Heresies*, and its Unity from the Mischiefs of Causeless Separations, by the Censures † it has a Right to inflict: And the Interest the State has in preventing the Mischiefs that *Unavoidably* attend the Distractions of the People in Matters of Religion, to pass by OTHER Reasons, gives it a Right to enforce the Censures of the Church by good and *wholesome Laws*”. Words, which ought to be writ in *Letters of Gold*! as coming from an *Enemy to Persecution*; from *One* who has openly put in a *Plea*, first against All severe Usage of *Learned* and *Virtuous Men* involv'd in *Heresy*; and then the like *Plea* † in favour of the *Unlearned* involv'd in *Causeless Separation*; hoping that *both God and Man will make Great Allowances to this*, [*viz.* the mere present Persuasion of Men, in Contradiction to his own former Assertion] *in such as are illiterate, and uneducated*. But now, it seems, neither Church nor State can, or ought, to make Any such Allowances either to *Learned* or *Unlearned*. The Point is laid down in general: And the *Reason* given for it is of that Unlucky Nature, that it holds forth no more good to the *Christian Church*, than it does to the *Mahometan*; nor to the *Protestant Church*, than it does to the *Papist*; nor to the *Church of England*, than it does to the *Kirk of Scotland*. The *Mufti's Censures in Turkey*,

* P. 49.

† *Postscript to Sermon.*

the *Grand Seignior* must enforce. The *Popish Church* must be back'd by the *Popish Princes*. The *Protestant* by the *Protestant*. For the *Distractions* of the *People* are the same Reason every where. And this is the *Man* who speaks of *Hobbes* and the *Leviathan*, of *Atheists* and *Deists*, in reproach to *Others*! This is the *Defender* of *Christianity* and the *Church*, by making *Them* the *Instruments* of *Oppression*; and of the *State*, by making *It* the *Executioner* of the *Church's* Will and Pleasure. If *Unbelievers* do not applaud this; yet, I am sure, (which is much worse,) They will argue from it, whenever They defend their own Cause.

But the *D——n* has a *Scripture-Argument* for this barefaced Defence, of all *Heathen* and *Popish Persecution*: Which is this — “ And how 'tis any more
 “ inconsistent with the *Spiritual* Sanctions of *Christ's*
 “ Laws, that *Church-Censures* should be attended
 “ with *Civil Penalties* upon Offenders, than it is
 “ with the same Sanctions, for *St. Paul* to inflict a
 “ *Corporal Punishment*, in Virtue of his *Apostolical*
 “ Power, on the like Offenders, I must own, says
 He, “ I CAN'T see”: Who would not think
 Him in earnest? But yet He immediately lets Us
 know that He CAN see — For He adds — “ ONLY
 “ that Governours MAY BE mistaken in their Appli-
 “ cation of them” — He might have added ex-
 pressly — And *St. Paul* COULD NOT. Well then,
 It being so, that *St. Paul* could not misapply His
 Power in this Case; but that *Ordinary Governours*
 may misapply *Theirs*; Here is an *Essential Difference*
 between them: And this *Writer* himself has decla-
 red it, whilst He would insinuate that there is none.
 And indeed, it is our *Blessed Lord's* own Reason,
 for not plucking up the *Tares*, — *Lest ye pluck up the*
Wheat also. He might have added Another Reason
 also, *viz.* that *St. Paul's* Punishments certainly were
 inflicted upon *Dishonest Wickedness*; and the Punish-
 ments

ments of *Ordinary Governours* upon what the *D—n* calls *Herefy* and *Schism*, in the modern Sense of the Word. And to shew Us what that is, let all Christian Countries give in their several and contradictory Testimonies. Nay, I will venture to add *Another* very material *Difference* between *St. Paul*; and *Civil Governours*, in this Case, tho' totally neglected by such *Writers* as the present: That *St. Paul* was immediately call'd, commissioned, and directed, by the *Spirit of God*, to that Part of his Behaviour: Whereas *Civil Governours* at best are only call'd to It by *Weak Men*, arguing consequentially from what They imagine to be Useful to their own *Sect* or *Party*; or by *Themselves*, thro' a mistaken Notion of *Political Prudence*. But it is some Satisfaction to have the *D—n* on our Side, in *one* particular. *Governours*, says He, *may be mistaken*. But what follows? For He seldom can rest in *one* Inconsistency. "This therefore * says He, is no Objection 'in such Cases where They can't WELL be mistaken". It will puzzle any less learned *Grammarian* than *Himself*, to find out what is the Meaning of the Word, *Therefore*, in this Place. It is here used by way of deducing something from what went before. And the *Reasoning* stands thus: *Because Governours may be mistaken: Therefore*, this is no Argument against their applying or calling for *Corporal Punishments* in those Cases, in which They *cannot* WELL be mistaken; that is, in Cases in which They *may be mistaken*. What an excellent *Dexterity* in *Logick* is here shewn, only by adding this little Word WELL, after CANNOT? For the *Reader* is unwarily deceived; and led to imagine that *cannot well be mistaken*, is the same with *cannot be mistaken*. If it be not the same, the *Argument* is entirely fal-

lacious: And whether it be, or be not, *Therefore* has nothing to do here; unless it signifies the same with *But*, or *Notwithstanding*.

But another *Salvo* is at hand. "A FEW Mistakes, says this † Writer, "are not to be put in the Balance against the great Advantages arising to Religion and Virtue, by the Civil Powers interposing Themselves in the Encouragement of THEM"; that is, in the Encouragement of *Religion* and *Virtue*: to which He would now unfairly draw the Attention of the *Reader*; tho' in the next Sentence but one, He declares, He means the Great Advantages arising to *Religion* and *Virtue*, from the *Civil Powers* punishing *Heresies* and *Schisms*; with Corporal Punishments. How Few these Mistakes are, cannot be judg'd from so happy a Nation as *England* is; and will be, till such Unchristian Notions have corrupted it: But from Those Nations abroad, where this *Doctrine* appears in its full Power, and is accompanied, in Practice, with all its actual Consequences. And in *Them* it will be found that These *Few Mistakes* are One long never-interrupted Scene of *Iniquity* and *Oppression*; which has defaced *Christianity* it self, and quite crush'd the *Heresy* and *Schism* of *Protestantism*. And the *Great Advantages* of This Method to *Religion* and *Virtue*, and of what This *Author* means, at least sometimes, by *Civil Sanctions* and *Civil Penalties*, and the like, in Cases of Religion, must be judg'd of, not from the *Nation* and *Church* of *England*, but from the whole *Christian World*. Let this *Author* look around Him, therefore, and see if these *Civil Punishments* of *Heresy* and *Schism*, for which he is contending, are not, in All *Papish* Countries, the Destruction of All that is laudable in *Science*, and *Religion*; and, in

Others, if They do not exceedingly and effectually hinder Men from enquiring into those *Truths*, and performing that *Worship*, (I will not say, which the *Gospel* proposes, but) which the *Church of England* it self embraces and wishes to see propagated? And the next Time He writes, let Him at least be so good to that *Church*, which He would seem to defend, as to maintain that *Civil Sanctions* and *Punishments*, in the Case of *Heresy* and *Schism*, do good ONLY in *England* and *Ireland*; but infinite Mischief every where else: Because it is impossible They should do good, both when They *protect* and when They *crush* the same Religious *Doctrines*, and *Worship*.

32. The *D—n* goes on to teach Us that “*Schism*, or a *Causeless Separation*, is to separate when it was THEIR *Duty* (excellent Grammar!) not to do so: And that it is therefore, an Offence against the Government of the Church, and an Offence of extreme ill consequence.” We *Protestants*, I know, used to reply to the *Romanists*, upon their urging this *Argument*, That we are to be governed by our own *Consciences* duly inform’d; that our *Consciences*, after all our Enquiries, tell us, ’tis *our Duty* to separate—and therefore, that it is no just Offence against the Government of the Church, &c. But the *D—n* now overlooks all this; and plainly means by *Schism*, the Separation of Men, when He himself thinks it *their Duty* not to separate. And upon this He adds, “What Reason therefore, can be given why It should not be discouraged by all PROPER Methods?” But were there ever such quick *Changes* and *Turns* of Words? Or was there ever seen such an *Artist* in the *Legerdemain* of *Logick*? For, who ever said that *Schism* ought not to be discouraged by PROPER Methods? But the Misery is, that *Christians* will not think Those alone the *Proper Methods*, which are agreeable to the Nature and Design of the *Gospel*. And as to this Writer; He has here determined the *Proper Methods*

Methods to be *Civil Penalties*: And, by just and necessary Consequence, such *Civil Penalties* as alone can be effectual for the *End* intended. As to *Himself* in particular, I know of nothing more proper, upon this *Occasion*, than to refer *Him* to the *Dean of Worcester*. He will teach *Him*; He has taught *Him* already, in his *Sermon*, That a sincere Persuasion, nay, an *Invincible Persuasion*, excuses our Separatists before *God*: And in his *Postscript*, He goes farther, and hopes that both *God* and *Man* will make great Allowances for *Them*, acting according to their present *Persuasion*. For the *Learned Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, He has often put in a *Plea*. Let none of *Them* therefore, be affrighted at what follows here about *Heresy*. “ So for * *Heresy*, says this “ Author, ’tis the setting up of *New Doctrines* against the *Faith*; and” (*observe!*) “ *WHEN They* “ are what *They* are call’d, *They* *GENERALLY* “ speaking proceed from an *Evil Mind* and *Corrupt* “ *Heart*, and open a *Way* to all *Manner* of *Licentiousness*. *St. Paul* therefore thunders out against “ *Such,*” &c. From hence it follows, that *Doctrines* which are not really *New*; (and this *Point* will take up a great deal of *Time* in the *Trial*;) or, being *New*, which do not proceed from a *Corrupt Mind*, and do not open a *Way* to all *Manner* of *Licentiousness*, and the like, may come to find *Favour*, and to be excepted out of this *Author’s* *Catalogue* of *punishable Heresies*. Thus highly indebted to this *Uncertain Advocate*, are the *Unity* and the *Faith* of the *Church*; whilst He is abusing *Others* for pleading for only *Christian Methods* of securing them. Observe again, the *Uncertainty* and *Management* of his *Zeal*. “ *St. Paul* thunders out against *SUCH* the severest *Censures*, *If any Man* “ *Love not the Lord JESUS, let Him be Anathema,*

* P. 50.

“ Maranatha. And the Church, in the LIKE
 “ Case, has a Right, It is HER Duty to follow his
 “ Example, and the Magistrate MAY lawfully and
 “ commendably enforce THEIR Censures with the
 “ Power He is invested with, as the *Minister of*
 “ *God*”. The *Unaccurate Construction* of this Sen-
 tence ; the Word HER in the former, and THEIR
 in the latter Part of it, ought not to be remark’d,
 I confess, but in so severe a *Critick*. But the plea-
 sant way of playing with *Words*, in so great a *Cause*,
 ought to be remark’d, in One who professes to plead
 the *Cause* of *Civil Punishments* for *Heresy*. St. Paul,
 says He, thunders against SUCH ; that is, *Such Per-*
sons ; (tho’ this *Grammarian* has not before said a
 Word about *Persons*;) against Men of *Evil Minds*
 and *Corrupt Hearts* ; against *Disbonest Wicked Here-*
ticks. But what is this *Spiritual Anathema* to the
 Cause of punishing *Hereticks* with *Corporal Punish-*
ments? Or what will be got by All this, unless we can
 tell who are *Honest*, and who not? Again, The
Church has a Right, in a LIKE Case, to follow St.
Paul’s Example, and to say as he did: That is, in
 the Case of *Corrupt Hearts* and *Licentiousness*, &c.
 But then, who will give It a Criterion to judge of
 particular Persons, *Who* they are that are thus
 Wicked, or *Who* they are that *Love not the Lord JE-*
sus? And without This, what is a General Decla-
 ration to the Case of Censures upon particular Per-
 sons; which is the only Point in Debate? Again,
 what is the *Church*? the *Clergy* alone? Or in Con-
 junction with the *Laity*? which this *Writer* will
 not uniformly determine. But chiefly observe, that
 All is dwindled into this—The Magistrate MAY en-
 force the *Censures* of the *Church*. He does not here say,
 It is his *Duty* to do so. But it comes to this, That
 He may enforce the *Censures* of the *Church*, provi-
 ded the *Church* follows St. Paul’s Example, who
 only thunder’d against *Disbonest Wickedness* ; and
 this,

this, in the Instance produced, only by a *General Declaration*, unapplied to any particular Person. And the *Magistrate*, as it follows, may do This by his Power, as *Minister of God*. This is the Expression, *Rom. xiii. 4*. And here We have another gross Misinterpretation of a *Text of Scripture*: In which this *Title* was given to the *Roman Emperor*, before He was a *Nursing-Father* to the *Church*; and given him solely with regard to the general Concerns of *Human Society*, as Such, without the least Imagination of his enforcing the *Censures* of the *Church*; nay, with the *Knowledge* of his being an *Enemy* to it. Thus is the *Power* of the *Church*, and of the *Magistrate*, defended, or rather banter'd! How happy is so Important a Cause in such a *Defender*, who has given it up, in almost every step he has taken in it!

33. In p. 51, and 52. follow the most unjustifiable *Misrepresentations* of the *Bishop's* Sense and Words: One, under the Notion of a *Criticism*, viz. That Christ has no where said, *My Kingdom is my Kingdom*: Whereas the *Bishop's* Affirmation is, that Christ has assur'd Us that the *Kingdom* He speaks of, *This Kingdom*, is *His Kingdom*, and not the *Kingdom* of any Men: which is no *Identical Proposition*, unless in the *Opinion* of One who is resolv'd to have it so. Another is, that the throwing off all Regard to other *Authority* is, in the *Bishop's* Account, the best Proof of our Subjection to the *Authority* of *Christ*: and This explained, as if, according to *Him*, the *Bulk* of *Mankind* had no Need of *Instructors*: Or, as if, says this Writer, *They would learn the better from them, the less Regard they have to them*. What End is there of debating with One, who changes the *Terms* of the *Question* just as He pleases? He knows, the *Dispute* is about *Authoritative Guides*, or *Masters*, amongst Men, in the *Affair* of *Eternal Salvation*; and that no one has ever denied a *Regard* to be due to *Christian Teachers*; but

an *Immoderate Regard*, which puts Them in the Place of *Christ* himself. For if the *People* look upon Those who have the Office of *instructing* them, as to be *regarded* so as to be obeyed in whatever They shall please to teach them; there is an End of All the Main Design of *Christianity* and *Religion*: And this is actually the Case in those Countries where They are taught *such a Regard*. But if They *regard* them as Persons endeavouring, to the best of their *Power*, to lay before them the Faith and Duties of the *Gospel* of *Christ*, and not to preach *Themselves*; then, the *First* and *Immediate* Regard must be to *Christ*; then, the *People* are to compare what is taught them with that *Gospel*: And then, whilst they accept thankfully of all Helps to the Understanding and Practice of their *Duty*; They are bound still to keep their Eye upon *Christ*, as the *Author* of their *Faith*, and the sole Determiner of the Terms of their Salvation. Against *this*, truly stated, We have not a Word alledg'd.

34. In p. 52. The *Author* puts on the Face of being an Advocate for *Two sorts* of Men, whom the *Bishop* could not, it seems, approve of. First, for Those who contend for *such an Authority* as obliges Men to profess even what They cannot believe to be *True*. Can any one imagine that such as These could be pleasing to any *Protestant*? But mark the *Answer* of this declared Enemy to all *Persecution*. "If there be any such Men," says He, "their Fault I think lies, Not in contending for Unity of Profession, but in not taking Care that the Things to be profess'd, be such as ought to be profess'd." So that we see, where-ever Care has been taken that the Things to be profess'd be such exactly, as He *Himself* thinks ought to be profess'd; it follows, that He thinks an *Authority* may be there claim'd, and insisted on, obliging Men to profess even what These Men *Themselves* cannot believe to be true. Such
L another

another *Enemy to Persecution*, who, for the Sake of it, can cast off all regard to *Sincerity and Charity*; and talk with Satisfaction of forcing Men to profess what They themselves think They ought not to profess; is, I believe, hardly to be found. But as plain as This is, let it be overlook'd, since it has been in effect often contradicted by Himself.

35. The other sort of Men are Those, who would retain such an Authority, as shall oblige Men to forbear the Profession and Fabrication of what They do believe, let them believe it of never so great Importance. Upon this the *D*—*n*† observes most judiciously, against *Nobody*, that Silence is due under proper Limitations——that a plenary Indulgence is not to be allow'd to All People to LIBEL the Government in Church or State at Pleasure——Nay, the Supposition is made that a Man's Conscience will permit Him to hold his Tongue, against the very Supposition before Him——He declares against exposing and defaming a Constitution, because it is not perfect——He avers that it is not right to be ALWAYS tinkering——and the like noble Points; as distant from the Complaint before Him, as if he had been pleading learnedly against the late Rebellion. For what is all this to the Purpose? *This, and This, and This, is not allowable.* And therefore, *Another Point*, totally different from all These, is not allowable. But nothing is better than the Conclusion of this *Hurangue* in Favour of that Obedience of Silence which, He says, is due, in *Ecclesiastical Matters*, ordinarily: But which All Protestants know, and teach, Not to be due ordinarily in any One Popish Country under the Sun. At last, We are told by this *Advocate for Silence*, that All who have *Scruples* may apply to their Superiors in a modest and respectful way, both in Par-

liament and *Convocation*. So then, *Silence* is at least ordinarily our Duty ; (for *this* He must mean, if He means any Thing :) but we need not be *silent*. If so be, We do but write modestly and respectfully ; and take Care to dedicate or address our Writings to our *Superiors* in *Parliament*, or *Convocation* ; All is right and well. For, says He, “ No Body by an “ Obligation to Silence is precluded the Use of “ these Methods :” That is, No-body, by an *Obligation* to *Silence*, is oblig’d to be *silent*. All will say, Content, and so let it be.

Would you not think now that All is right, and that Men might speak ? Do but read on ; and you will be entertained with the *great Objections* that lie against even *This*, which is declared to be allowed. — “ It gives Opportunity to Faction and En- “ thusiasm, to Hereticks and Schismatics, to Li- “ bertines, Deists, and Atheists, to seduce the *Un- “ learned*, to the great Prejudice of true Religion “ and Virtue, and to the apparent Disturbance of “ the Civil Government, PERHAPS the total Sub- “ version of Both” : [i. e. *Both all Three*.] Well, what shall we then resolve upon ? Shall it be allowed, or shall it not, that *Men* may have the *Liberty* here spoken of ? Or shall *They* only have it, upon Condition They address all their Books to the *Parliament*, or *Convocation* ? Will *This* at all qualify the Mischief ? Or, will an *Address* of this Sort turn *Poison* into *Wholesome Food* ? And will not this give the same Opportunity to *Faction* and *Enthusiasm*, *Atheists*, *Deists*, and the long Train that are generally joined with them ? What can One say to such *Contradiction* as *This*, but that *Truth* is too hard for *Design* ?

But now, let us turn to the other side of the *Question* ; and let the *D. n* judge fairly of the Effects of that *Authority*, which commands the *Silence* for

which He pleads, from all Appearances in those Countries where those Effects are plain and visible? Is it not this *Authority*, enjoying *Silence*, which has introduced *Atheism* into the *Hearts*, and *Hypocrisy* into the Practice, of Men; which has utterly confounded *Truth* and *Falshood*; which has made Men love *Darkness* more than *Light*; which has furnish'd *Deists* and *Libertines* with almost every Argument They make use of, against *Religion*; which has destroy'd the very Appearance of *Virtue*, and made it stand for nothing but *Absolute Submission* to All Absurdities; and which either shuts up All Men in *Ignorance*, or forces them to *Dissimulation*, of the most important Truths? And have not these *some Proportion* to the *Evils* He enumerates; which arise chiefly from the want of *Charity*; and which Men have no Call, or Commission, to redress by *Force* and *Power*? Or, because *Some* abuse *Liberty*, is This a *Reason* for *Tyranny*? Did the *First Reformers* think thus? Or was the *Church of England* thus form'd? But enough.

Let us now hear Another excellent Reason against this *Liberty*, as it is here laid down. "What good * Effects it can have, in proportion to its evil ones, is not so easy to see, because (*says He*) the Christian Faith cannot be made or unmade now, nothing being the true Faith that was not so from the beginning. And as long as the Church teaches nothing but what was expressly taught in the purest times, or is perfectly agreeable thereto, 'tis in vain for any one to attempt to prove it in an Error." Observe the Argument, and the Ambiguity. The *Christian Faith* is only what it was in the Beginning. Therefore, No good can come of Enquiring, what was the *Christian Faith* at the

Beginning: Whereas the *Argument* in Truth ought to be, Therefore, Enquiries are necessary to find what it was at the Beginning.

But again, The *Church* teaches no Doctrine, but what was expressly taught in the purest times. Therefore, This being self-evident, Away with all Enquiries. Whereas the Argument here ought to be, This Conformity to the purest Ages cannot be known, but by *Enquiry*: Therefore, Enquiry is necessary. And this Enquiry cannot possibly hurt the *Church*, but must serve it; because it teaches nothing but what is agreeable to the purest Ages. Therefore, says the *D—n*, 'tis in vain for any one to attempt to prove It in an *Error*: but therefore, 'tis not in vain to make the strictest Enquiry, to find out this. But the *D——n* either means by the Words *as long*, to say no more than This, that when the Church is in the Right, no one can prove It to be in the Wrong; but not to affirm It to be in the Right; which is *Shuffling*: Or else to confine his Observation to the *Church of England*; and then He must allow that, All other Churches having not kept strictly to the Pattern of the primitive and purest Ages, Liberty of Examination and Writing ought to be allowed within *Their* Bounds; because it is *not in vain* to attempt to prove *Them* to be in Error. But how much a better Complement to *His own Church* had it been, to have declared, what is certainly true, That, the fewer its Faults, and the greater its Excellencies are, the more ought it to invite and to allow the Freedom of Examination and Enquiry? How much more like is This, to the Conduct of *Christ* himself, who did not tell Men that, He delivering nothing but *Truth*, it was *in vain* for Them to ask Questions, or make Enquiries; but invited and required them to examine and prove his Doctrine and his Works?

36. In p. 55. The *D—n's* next Imputation is, That the Bishop *insinuates that the Nicene Faith was the Effect of Party-Interest, or Court-Influence.* For, says He, *The Bishop says, that the deciding of Controversies in Matters of Religion by Councils, is a Method that did not begin effectually to shew itself till the Emperor was become a profess'd Christian, and it was worth while for the Ambitious to disturb, crush, and oppress one another.* Now, Reader, Consult the *Bishop's Postscript*, p. 231, 232. and you will find that the *Question* was not about the General Point of *Deciding Controversies in Matters of Religion by Councils*; but about making *New Creeds, New Decisions in Fundamental Points of Faith*; and imposing These by way of *Test*. This is the *first* Mistake. You will find next, that the Passage He cites relates only to the *Bishop of Oxford's* particular Manner of treating his *Cause*: That it was not design'd to affirm absolutely that so and so the Case stood at that *Council*; but to observe an *Absurdity* in the *Bishop of Oxford's* affirming a certain *Method* to have been always customary from the *Most Primitive Ages, and then producing, as the first Instance, the Council of Nice: That is, here is a Method the Most Primitive, which did not begin effectually to shew it self till the Emperor, &c.* Which *Observation* had not been made, if the *Bishop of Oxford* had produced any *One truly Antient Instance.* This is the *second* Mistake; the taking that for an *Absolute Observation*, which was wholly *relative to Another Person's Representation of the Matter.* Besides that in the Word *Effectually*, inserted by the *Bishop* into his *Observation*, there is an *Acknowledgment* couch'd that there were a few *Instances* of something tending the same way, before *Constantine's* time. This the *D—n* overlook'd, because it would have prevented the *Display* of his *Knowledge in Church-History*: For the Sake of which alone, He must be suppos'd to mention the
 Case

Case of *Paul of Samosata*. For the *Two Bishops*, it is evident to any *Reader*, were debating only about the framing *New Tests* by Way of *Creeeds* in *New Language*. And the *Bishop of Bangor* is so far from denying that there were *too early* Instances of *Personal Condemnations*; that indeed He expressly complains of it, *p. 234*. This is the *third* Mistake; the not distinguishing between the *Condemnation of Persons*; and the making of *New Creeeds*, as *Tests*.

But since He has unnecessarily here intimated to Us, what every one knew before, That this *Condemnation* of *Paul* was under an *Emperor* who was not a *Christian*; I must add, That this *Condemnation* was not left to *it self*; but that, in some time, the *Emperor* by *Force* dispossest Him of the House he liv'd in. Perhaps the *D — n* may think it for *their Honour*, that They took Help against one Another, from that *Secular Arm*, under which They were *all* still very frequently groaning. But it certainly will confirm the main Design of the *Bishop's* Observation, if it should appear from the Circumstances of the Story, That both *Paul*, and His *Adversaries*, in their *Contest*, depended upon the Support of those *Contending Powers*, in whose Quarrels They severally engaged themselves. But however *this* be; I hope it is no Crime to affirm that at the *Time* of the *Council of Nice* the *Emperor* was become a profess'd *Christian*; and that it was *then* worth while for the *Ambitious* to disturb, crush, and oppress one another. If this be *Fact*; then the *Insinuation* that the *Nicene Faith*, at that *Time* settled, was the Effect of *Party-Interest*, or *Court-Influence*, is the *D — n's* own *Insinuation*; a Consequence which He has drawn from a *Fact*, which He cannot deny to be true; and therefore, an *Imputation* which He (not the *Bishop*,) has laid upon the *Council*; and which consequently He alone is to answer for. The *Bishop*, it is plain from the whole *Passage*, censures
Both

Both Sorts equally. The *Minority* at the *Nicene Council* might be the *Court-Favourites*, for ought any Thing the *Bishop* has said. As for the *D—n's* Observation, that without *Court-Influence* there could be no Room for the *Prevalency* of a *Faction*; It is contradicted, at some certain Times, by what is seen in every *Assembly* we can cast our Eyes upon. But, As the *Bishop* gave Him no Occasion to digress upon the Subject of the *Nicene Council*; So the *Impartiality*, the *Quiet*, the *Decency*, the *Disinterested* and *Christian Management* of all Proceedings in it; the *Just* and *Catholic* Reasons for the *Test* there fram'd; the *Antiquity*, *Simplicity*, and *Intelligibleness* of the Expressions chosen, and impos'd upon All;— These Points are, I hope, too visible to need any of this *Writer's* Harangues in their Justification, and Praise.

Two Things must yet be remark'd, before we quit this Part of the Subject. The first is a *Quotation* out of *Mr. Chillingworth*, to teach, as He says, the *Bishop* to speak of *Councils* with a little more *Decency*: But, indeed, to abuse that *Great dead Man*. For it is a Sentence so guarded and modify'd in it self, that the *Bishop* may very consistently affirm the same; as in Effect he has really done. And the *D—n* knows, He cannot make this single Little Sentence relate to Matters of *necessary Faith*, settled *Authoritatively* by *Councils*, as the Guides either of our *Belief*, or our *Profession*; (which is the only Point before him;) without making that Excellent and Consistent *Reasoner*, in the same *Breath*, giving to *Councils* that *Authority*, which it was the main Design of his whole Work to take from *Them*, and lodge solely in the *Holy Scriptures*.

The other Ever memorable Sentence is *That*, with which the *D—n* concludes His Account of the *Nicene Council*. " 'Tis next to giving up *Christianity* as a Cheat and *Imposture*, says He, to think " God would SUFFER his Church to err so soon, " in so Fundamental a Point, as THEY did, (*Gram-*
mar

mar again!) “ if the *Nicene Council* err’d in their
 “ Decisions; since ’tis evident, from all the Mo-
 “ numents left Us of the primitive Church, that
 “ their Decisions may be traced up to the very
 “ earliest of those that are certainly Genuine; OR,
 “ at least that there is nothing to be found INCON-
 “ SISTENT with them.” Excellent Defender of so
 Important a Cause, at the Expence of Christianity
 it self! By the *Early Writings* here mentioned, He
 must, without doubt, mean the *Early Writings* of
 those *Christians* who were *Fallible* and *Uninspired*:
 For I would not suppose Him guilty of so much
Absurdity, as to argue thus, ’Tis next to the giving
 up *Christianity*, to suppose the *Inspired Writers* to be
 suffered to err: that is, to suppose *Those in Error*,
 who are suppos’d at the same time to be kept *free*
from Error. No, It is plain, His Argument, on
 its strongest side, is This. The *Decisions* of the *Ni-*
cene Council in a *Great Point of Faith*, are agreeable
 to the most *Early Writers* of the *Fallible* and *Unin-*
spired Followers of the *Apostles*. ’Tis next to the
 giving up *Christianity*, to suppose that these *Early*
Writers could *err* in those Points. Therefore, ’Tis
 next to the giving up *Christianity* to suppose that the
Majority of the *Nicene Bishops* did *err*, in the same
 Points. And what can this *Assurance* be built up-
 on? Did *Almighty God* ever promise that, after his
Gospel was compleatly deliver’d, He would secure
Those Christian Writers, of the *earliest Times*, from
Error? Alas! There are but *Few* remaining of the
First Age after the *Apostles*: And *They* say little or
 nothing that can relate to this Subject. These are
 followed by *Others*, at several Intervals. But *They* are
 all *Men*; and, what *They* wrote that can relate to this
 Subject, *They* wrote in their own *Style* and *Lan-*
guage; and according to their own *Scheme* of *Philo-*
sophy. Their *Expressions* sometimes differ so much,
 that it costs the *Learned Moderns* much pains to make
 M them

them look towards the same Thing. And, in most of what They say, They do not pretend that They received *this* or *that* directly from the *Apostles*, or *Apostolical Men*; but plainly deliver it as their own present Sentiment, and sometimes in a very loose undeterminate Manner. Let this *Writer* remember all this; and consider what an *Alteration*, in a whole *Scheme of Doctrines*, a very *Few Years* are often seen to make, by means of a *Variety of Judgment and Expression*: and then let Him, if He can, put the *Truth of Christianity* upon the *Unerringness* of these *Writers*.

But let us consider the *Two Points* here laid down.

1. That "the *Decisions of the Nicene Council* may be traced up to the *Earliest Writers*:" which Point if you come to examine, you will find that by the EARLIEST Writers, are not meant the EARLIEST *Writers*; and that about the *Sense of any Early Writers*, who have touch'd upon the same *Subject*, there is, and ever will be, *Eternal Debates and Differences*. The *D* — *n* seems sensible of this *Uncertainty*; and therefore, very cunningly, and with great *Sleight of hand*, adds, 2. "Or, That there is nothing to be found *inconsistent* with" these *Earliest Writers*. Which is, I confess, a most excellent Rule. For this will prove the *Truth, and Unerringness of the Nicene Decisions*, even supposing the *Earliest Writers* never to have said one Word about the *Points* in question. And if it be enough to say of *Any Creed*, that It is an *Unexceptionable and truly Christian Creed*, because there is nothing in It which absolutely contradicts what was written by the *Earliest Christians*; we may come to have *New Creeds*, with *New Additions*, made and impos'd with Justice, till the *Christian World itself* shall not be able to contain the *Creeds that shall be framed*. Not to mention the *Great Differences* amongst the most *Learned Men*, as to *This Point* likewise;

upon

upon which the *D——n's Mock-Defence* of the *Nicene Creed* is built. How much more *Christian*, and more honourable to this *Creed*, is the *Declaration* of that *Church* it self, for which the *D——n* pretends so much *Zeal*, in It's *eighth Article*. "The *Nice—*
Creed ought to be receiv'd—for It may be prov'd", (Not by the Writings of Fallible Men, but) "by
 "most certain *Warrants* of Holy Scripture." I like This *Creed* so well, as heartily to wish that all *Christians* had long ago stop'd, where *That* stops; and that no such *Writer* as This may ever again bring a *Disgrace* upon it, by such *Defences*, as weaken *Christianity* it self, without *strengthening* the *Creed*.

A *Papist* can in much the same Manner trace up the *Decisions* of his Church to the *Earliest Writers*, from whose *Unerring Capacity* the *Unerringness* of *Others* through the whole *Chain* may be deduced. For if the *Earliest* CANNOT be suppos'd to be mistaken, in their *Discourses* upon what *They* receiv'd from the *Apostolical Teachers*, without giving up *Christianity*; then, neither could the *very Next* to them be *mistaken* in what *They* received from *Them*; nor the *Next* to *These*; and so down, till it be declared to be the *giving up of Christianity as a Cheat*, to call in question any *Thing* decided by a *Majority* in *Council*: Especially, if it were a *Council of Grave Wise Men*, met together (according to our Author's Rule) in the *Fear of God*, under the *Guidance of his Spirit*, and taking *due care* NOT to be deceiv'd, &c. And it may become a *Papist*, as *Such*, to hazard *Christianity* it self, in *this* manner, rather than not carry the *Point* of *Authority*. But for a *Protestant Divine* to act such a *Part*! This, I confess, is something for which at present I want a *Name*. But, whatever becomes of particular *Creeds* of Men's making; let *Me* tell this *Author*, That *Christianity* is not so easily given up, as *He* seems to imagine. It rests upon quite

other Foundations, than the *Infallibility* of *Any Uninspired Men*. And *He* who puts it's *Truth* upon such an Unjustifiable Supposition, either does not *know* how *Strong* it is, or does not *care* how *Weak* it is.

37. Now, *Reader*, observe the End of all this. “ These Considerations (*says the D—n*, p. 27.) “ make it very justly to be doubted, whether the “ Fundamental and Universally receiv'd Articles of “ the *Christian Faith*, should be suffered to be the “ Subjects of PAMPHLETS, which come into all “ Hands, and not only fill the Minds of ignorant “ well meaning People with endless Scruples and “ Perplexities ; but give the Enemies of Religion “ a Handle to call every Thing into doubt, as if “ nothing either were, or could be, certain in the “ *Gospel-Revelation.*” To which I must say a few Things by way of *Answer*. As, 1. That the *Scruples* of *well-meaning People* are much more pleasing to *God*, than a *Blind suppos'd Faith* ; taken up without Enquiry, or without knowing distinctly either *What* is believ'd, or *Why* it is profess'd to be believ'd. 2. That neither the *D—n*, nor All the Persons in the World put together, have any *Call* or *Commission* to put an End to these *Scruples*, if they could, by determining that there shall be *no Enquiries* about Matters of *Infinite Importance*. 3. That his *Reasons*, taken from the *Peace* of *This World*, are of no weight against what relates entirely to *Another World*. 4. That the *Great Points* which make the *Enemies* of *Religion* call Things into doubt, are such a *Conduct*, and such *Principles*, as are here avowed by a *Christian Divine*. 5. That if there were no such *Friends* to *Religion* as *Those* are, who profess these Principles of *Darkness* and *Slavery* ; it is very probable, there would be no such *Enemies* to *Religion*, as are here complain'd of. *Wo be to Them by whom* such Offences come. 6. That *He* himself has given

ven the *Enemies of Religion* a much greater Handle, by what He has just now said, against *Christianity*, than Any *Freedom of Enquiry* can give them; without which, not Any One doubt They have can ever be clearly and satisfactorily resolv'd. And 7. That the *Enemies of Religion* can procure and read *Bound Books*, as easily as *Pamphlets*.

38. The *Bishop* observ'd, in his *Sermon*, that without the *Liberty of Enquiry and Speech*, the *Reformation* could not have been brought about, &c. One would think this very plain, and very unexceptionable: But mind the *D——n's Answer*, viz. That our *Reformation* was made in a *Regular way*, and by our *Governours*: Meaning our *Civil Governours*. Upon which, Let me ask Him, Whether many poor Creatures were not burnt and destroy'd, even by the *Civil Power*, in the Reigns of King *Henry the VIII.* and Queen *Mary*, for that *Liberty of speaking*, without which the *Reformation* could not have begun *here*: not to mention *other Countries*? But this is not the *Point*: For the *Liberty of Speech* contended for, was in behalf of the *Laity*, in distinction from their *Spiritual Governours*: And it was affirm'd that, without *This Liberty* in the *Laity*, the *Reformation* had never been. And here, let me ask this *Writer*; Did any Number of the ἡγούμενοι, the προεστώτες, the προεστώτες, the πρεσβύτεροι, the διδασκαλοὶ, the ποιμένες, the ἐπίσκοποι; the long Train mentioned in the *Dean of Worcester's Sermon*;--Did a *Majority* of these, in *Council* or *Convocation* assembled, ordain, promote, or encourage the *Beginnings* of this Work? Or was it not begun by particular Persons amongst the *Laity*, and *Clergy*, against their *Spiritual Governours*: and at last effected by the *Civil Power*, i. e. the *Laity*; whose *Duty of Submission*, according to *some Men*, ought to have prevented it.

But *Another Answer* He makes, is by asking,
 “ Does it follow that a *Submission of Silence* is not
 “ due

“ due to Authority in a Church Well-reform’d,
 “ because it could not have been reform’d if such
 “ a Submission had been paid to the Corrupt
 “ Church, from which THEY did reform”? If
 there be *Authority* to impose it, without doubt it
 ought to be paid. But, the Question being about
 a *Silence* in Points purely of a Religious Nature,
 which a *Christian* judges to be of the utmost Impor-
 tance; It is impossible, This should be a *Duty* in
 One Church, if it be not a *Duty* in Another. *Well-*
reform’d, Ill-reform’d, Corrupt, make no Differ-
 ence but This, that the *Better* and more *Perfect* any
Church is, the more Encouragement ought to be gi-
 ven to the Freedom of all Serious Enquiries.
 And if any *Protestant Church* determines otherwise,
 It builds again the Things it has destroy’d: And claims
 to It self peculiarly an *Authority*, which is the same
 every where; and which equally results from the
 Commission of *Popish Church-Governours,* and *Pro-*
testant.

39. The *Bishop*, in his *Sermon*, declared that a
Peace procured by the *Imposition* of *Outward Profes-*
sion, or of *Silence,* was the *Lethargy* of the *Church,*
 &c. The *D—n* carries on the *Allegory*; and prefers
 this State to the *Convulsions* and *Ragings* of People *dis-*
tracted with Enthusiasm. The *D—n,* it seems, knows
 no middle State of *Health* and *Vivacity* between a
Lethargy and a *Fever*; no *Medium* between *Stupidi-*
ty and *Madness.* And from hence I conclude that,
 if He had studied *Medicine* as well as He has studied
Divinity, He would prescribe *Opiates* to Men in full
Health, merely for fear that *Full Health* should end
 in *Madness.* If any one of his Patients should plead
 his *Right* to enjoy that Goodness of Constitution,
 which it had pleas’d God to give Him; this *Phy-*
sician would answer Him — Sir, you may flatter
 your self. But it is possible, this *Vigour* may end in
Distraction; and therefore, as *Sleep* is better than
 Mad-

Madness; I must prescribe you a *Lethargy*, for fear you should one Time or other come to be *Raving Mad*. If this will not be so agreeable to your self; yet it will certainly be *easier* to *Tbose* about you, who will with less Difficulty rule and govern you in that *Quiet Distemper*, than in the *Ragings* of a violent *Fever*. If the *Patient* should reply, That it seems unaccountable to bring Him into a *Certain Disease*, in order to keep off an *Uncertain One*, of which there is *no Appearance*; the only Step remaining to such a *Physician* is, to affirm, That it is the *Method* of the *College*; That *Physicians* are the *Guides* and *Directors* of *Health*; and that, without this *Remedy* against the *Evil* of *present Health*, and its deplorable *Consequences*, All the vigorous Men in the World may come to claim the *Right* of Enjoying what God and Nature have given them; and so the Earth may be in *Danger* of being Peopled with *Raving Mad men*.

This I take to be exactly parallel to a *Grave Divine* telling the *People* that They must not enquire, nor ask *Questions*, because *They*, or *Others*, may possibly come to think *They know* more than *They really know*; and that They had better wrap themselves up in *Ignorance* and *Silence*, for fear they should *Heat* themselves too much with *Thinking*: contrary to the whole *Conduct* of our *Blessed Lord*, and to all the *Maxims* of his *Religion*; as well as to a very true *Observation*, That where-ever there is *most Liberty* of Enquiry, there is *least Enthusiasm*: Or, that *Enthusiasm* is the *Natural Product* of *Darkness*, and *Ignorance*.

40. The *D* — *n* in p. 61, 62. seems to have a great Mind to be reviving *old antiquated Scandal* and *Infamy*, by *Dark Hints* of Something or other, which He is afraid to express plainly. I would advise Him, as a *Friend*, when He is resolv'd upon this sort of *Argument*, to come early into
Scandal,

Scandal, before the *Cream* of it is quite gone. For when an exalted *Genius* descends so far into the *Mire*, as to take up with the very *Dregs* of the *Dregs* of *Scandal*; this only shews that *Nothing* stoops so low, when it *should not*, as *Something* which never stoops at all when it *should*. But if He will go on, let him only speak plainly; and not by Unintelligible *Innuendoes*; and then, I have Commission to assure Him that the World shall soon be made Judge, as formerly it was, of the Restlessness and Inexcusableness of *Unchristian Calumny*.

The foregoing Parts of this Performance were *mix'd* with Personal Abuse: We now come to whole Pages of *Unmix'd Scandal*; which will teach Us still more and more, That *Resentment* is the most *Powerful* and most *Blind* of all *Human Commotions*; that it racks the Minds of Those it possesses, till it makes them throw off all Concern for their *own Reputation* and Honour, and sacrifice even Their own dear Characters to their dearer Passion. If one were to put what now follows into the Shape of *Argument*, it must appear in some such Form as This. Are You, my Lord, qualify'd to write *Common Sense*? You—pretend to lay down Any Good Doctrine; or to express Your self according to the Rules of *Grammar*; or to understand any Thing of the *Scripture-Diction*? You—undertake to confute the *Dean of Worcester's* Learned and Critical Observations? You—who have not yet been personally in your *Diocese*? You—endeavour to teach *Christians* the Nature of Christ's Kingdom, and Religion; when *Nazareus* and the *Independent Whig* so plainly speak better of You, than of Those who abuse you?—&c.

Do you blush at This, Mr. D—n, when it is put into the Form of an *Argument*? It is plain then, that It was all design'd for *Mere Scandal*; the easiest Work of *Human Nature* corrupted into Evil; but the most Infamous to Any Man

Man who professes *Argument*. And yet, it must be own'd that this Writer is not wholly out of the Way of *Reasoning*, in this *Article*. In the *Postscript* to the *last Edition* of the *Dean of Worcester's Sermon*, He first tells Us that He *publish'd* that *Sermon*, in which He owns He acted a *Mean and Ungenerous Part*, because He was *ask'd*; and then, He lets Us know that He acted this *Mean and Ungenerous Part*, when He concluded his *L—p* was gone, or going soon, to his *Diocese*; that is, that He made it more *Mean*, and more *Ungenerous*, by doing it at a *Time* when He concluded the *Bishop* too busy to attend to it. This *Account* of his own *Disposition*, we have under his own *Hand*, when No-body ask'd him for *It*. He had *Goodness* of *Disposition* enough to think This was not a right or a generous *Part*: but he assures us he had *Badness* of *Disposition* enough to get over that small *Difficulty*; and to do it, *knowing* it to be such. This *Journey* of the *Bishop's* has been much, it seems, in his *Thoughts*: And He is still uneasy about it. And, indeed, It was very *Unjustifiable* in the *Bishop*, not to be *Busy* in his *Diocese*, when the *Dean* thought He had taken Him at that *Advantage*. For, if the *Bishop* had been thus employ'd, he could not perhaps have troubled the World with an *Answer* to the *Sermon* about *Church-Authority*. Without some such *Reason*, This whole *Topick* is of no more Concern to the *D—n*, than the *Archbishop* of *Toledo's* Absence from his *Diocese*; Nay, without some such *Supposition*, the present *Principles* and *Temper* of the *D—n* must carry Him to wish that the *Bishop* may never be seen in his *Diocese*. For, besides that His *Presence* there would rob the *D—n* of One of the *Chief Topicks* of *Reproach*, to which He has fled for *Help*; If the *Bishop* be the *Man* that the *D—n* has set Him forth to be, No one can, in *Christian Compassion* to the *Diocese*, wish His *Residence* in it.

In *this* Part of the Country, there are great *Helps* at Hand; the powerful Remedies of the *Dean* of *Worcester's* *Logick*, and *Critick*; of his Skill in Language, and Address in *Controversy*; always ready to prevent or cure the Poison of *Bad Doctrines*. But who knows how quickly, and how fatally, the *Evil* of *Pernicious Principles* might creep thro' Countries, at so great a Distance from such *Helps*?

I wish, for the sake of all that is Good, and for the sake of the *Greatest Men* that have lived in past Ages, that the *D——n* had omitted the *other Reproach*, taken from the Professions of *Approbation* coming from Those, of whom we will, at present, suppose the *Worst* that even the *D——n* himself, in all his Indignation against the *Bishop*, insinuates of them. And now, let this *Friend to Religion* answer and tell Us, Whether the *Applauses* and *Approbation* given by *Known Atheists* to those Principles of *Church-Power*, which He himself would be thought to defend, are any *Real Objection* against Them: Whether the *Zeal* of Infidels in *Italy* for an *Establish'd Church*; or for the Civil Sanctions of worldly Power, to support and guard it; are any Argument against *Establishments*: Whether the *Encomiums* of *Papists*, very liberally bestow'd upon some *Great Church-men*, shall pass for the future for *Real Infamy*, and Blots upon their *Good Names*. And, to come nearer the present Case, I would ask, Whether the *Approbation* often given by Real, or Supposed *Unbelievers*, to such Men as *Erasmus*, *Melanchthon*, *Grotius*, *Dr. Tillotson*, *Mr. Chillingworth*, *Mr. Hales*; to the *Late Author* of *The Difficulties and Discouragements*; and to a Multitude of *Others* in the *Christian World*; in Opposition to their Adversaries, and on Account of their Universally Good and Noble Principles: Whether such *Approbation* can, by any *Man*, not blinded by the Rage of Personal Ill-will, be urg'd to their *Disgrace*, or to the *Diminution*

nation of their Illustrious Characters. Nay, I would ask, Whether the *D——n* will allow the *Approbation* of many of the *Best Christians* this Age can boast of, to be an Argument *in Favour* of the *Bishop*: And if He will not; with what Conscience He can urge the *Approbation* of *Others*, as of any Weight *against* Him. But whom do I speak to? It is but worthy of *Him*, who just now shew'd his Willingness to hurt *Christianity* it self, rather than to allow Men to think that the *Majority* of the *Council of Nice* were in an Error: *It is but worthy*, I say, of such a One, to hurt some of the *Greatest Names* that the *Christian World* ever knew, rather than *One hated Name* should not receive a *Wound*.

But this at least ought to be remark'd, that the *Bishop* has publickly endeavour'd, long ago, to answer the most plausible *Objections* of *Unbelievers*; and that the *D——n* ought certainly to have done something of this Sort, before he had given vent to this *Reproach*. And *One* other *Observation* I will presume to mention to *Him*: viz. “ That Those
 “ Persons, whom He points at, may speak well of
 “ the *Bishop*, and of those *Principles* of Universal
 “ good Influence upon Human Society, which He
 “ has maintain'd: But that, whenever They argue
 “ or inveigh against the *Clergy*, or Any Thing rela-
 “ ting to Religion, They take their *Topicks*, NOT from
 “ the *Bishop*, or HIS *Principles*; but chiefly from the
 “ Principles and *Conduct* of *Others* quite different
 “ from Him.” And I appeal to any Person in
 the World, except *One*, whether the *D——n's* Behaviour in this Controversy, (not to mention *Others*) has contributed, in the least Degree, to the removing the Prejudices of Any *Sceptick* or *Unbeliever*; or rather, whether it has not actually furnish'd Some with *New Prejudices*. And for my own Part; were I in the *Bishop's* Case, I should much

rather chuse to have the *Applauses* of *Unbelievers*, (supposing them to be *Such*;) to answer for, than their *Infidelity* it self. For the *former* I could account from hence, That every Man of Natural Good-Nature and Regard to *Society*, as well as to Himself, cannot but like those *Principles* which destroy All *Persecution*, and bring in *Universal Forbearance*: And that these *Applauses* have chiefly arisen from the *Ill-Treatment* and *Abuses* receiv'd from *Others*; and that if *Their Conduct* has given this *Handle*, *They* alone are answerable for it. But as for the *latter*; if I had given any Occasion to the hardening of their Hearts; if I had represented the *Gospel* as a *System* of *Tyranny*; or *Fallible Men* as the Rulers of the Faith of Christians; or talk'd in such a Manner, upon such Important Subjects, as to confirm Them in any Bad Opinion of the *Gospel*; I should think my self very unhappy, and that I had, indeed, too much to answer for.

The *D——n*, I must acknowledge, has this peculiar Happiness in the present *Reproach*, almost unknown to Him in Any other; *viz.* that he is very secure from having it retorted upon Him; being One of those very few *Writers*, whose *Reputation* in the *Controversy* now on Foot, No Sort of Men *Injure* by their *Applauses*. It is impossible to reproach Him, from Any *Quarter*, with the *Praises* either of *Believers* or *Unbelievers*; *Papists* or *Protestants*; *Church-Men* or *Dissenters*; *High-Church Men* or *Low-Church-Men*; *Free-Thinkers* or *Slavish-Thinkers*. He has so brought it about, by his peculiar *Dexterity* in *Controversy*; by his *saying* and *unsaying*; by his *giving* and *taking* again; and by all his *Variety* of *Behaviour*; that He has not been able to gain the *Good Word* even of *Those* who would be well enough pleased to see the *Man* whom He opposes so ill treated, if *They* did not see the

Cause,

Cause, which He would seem to defend, so *ill-treated* also at the same Time.

But if the *D* — *n* still loves the *easy Work* of *Reproach* better than the *Uneasy Task* of *Argument*; Let him enter fairly into it. And if He can shew That the *Bishop* ever sought after, or encouraged, the *Applauses* of Any sort of Men; or ever attempted to set *Himself* up, to the Prejudice of any other Man in the World; or ever attack'd Any of his *Bitterest Adversaries* in the manner in which He himself has been attack'd; or ever encouraged, or permitted, where his Power could reach, the *least Appearance* of such an *Attack*: Nay, If He will but shew, what He has * here laid to his Charge, That the *Bishop*, in any of his Books, under the greatest Provocation, has either said, or insinuated, that “*His Adversaries*, (that is, *Those* who have appeared against Him in this *Controversy*,) are *strange Creatures*, *Men of Avarice and Ambition*, governed by *Interest and Passion*: If He will but shew *All*, or *Any*, of these Things, I promise Him, for my Part, That I not only will not think of *Him*, (which I must otherwise do) as of a *Willful Calumniator*, against the Evidence of *Open Day-Light*; but I will join with Him in his *Satyr* against the *Bishop*.

But hitherto, All the World, I have thought, has been *Witness* that the *Bishop* has neither broke into their *Families*, nor enter'd into their *Private Characters*, to rake after *Scandal*; that He has neither taxed Any of Them with a *Falshood* in an *Appeal* to God; nor with affronting their *Saviour* in direct Terms; nor with neglecting their *Cures*; nor with Any Thing so injurious to *Themselves*, as well as so foreign to all Argument: Nay, That, as to their *Temper*, and *Charity*, and *Self-*

* P. 65.

contradiction, here mention'd by the *D—n*; He has not troubled the World either about *These*, or Any Thing else relating to *Them*, but as *They* unavoidably arose in *their own* Writings, and from *their own* Words, and Manner of debating. Nor will the *D—n*, as far as I can recollect, be able to produce One *severe Observation* out of his Books, relating to Any of these, but what *naturally* arose out of the *Argument*, or *Matter of Fact*, then before Him; and what He had a right to make, if He would not give up *Himself*, and his *Cause*, to *False Accusation*, and *False Arguments*.

I must here take Notice of that Part of the *Note* added at the *End* of this *Book*, which relates to the *Bishop's* Citations out of *Mr. Chillingworth*; not only to shew the *Groveling Genius* of some Men, who can stoop to the most *Trifling Instances* of *Reproach*, and argue as if it were a *Crime* to cite the undoubted *Sentiments* of *Mr. Chillingworth*, unless you immediately transcribe them your self from his *Book*; tho' they are as well and as commonly known, as *A. B. C.* Not only for this; but to shew how far from *Truth* and *Exactness* this *Exquisite Writer* can permit *Himself* to depart, in his *Representations* of *Matters of Fact*, in which He professedly appeals to his own *Eye-sight*; and that in the *Least Things*, as well as the *Greatest*, He is uniformly the *same Misrepresenter*. And this, which otherwise it was not worth while to touch, I shall now do, because the Right Reverend the *Bishop of Oxford*, in his late *Defence*, has condescended to refer his *Reader* to this *Passage*; and to betray his Satisfaction in so mean and low an *Accusation*; which He has made his own, without so much as once examining whether it be *True*: For which *Conduct*, in taking up *Reproaches* and *Scandal*, upon the *Report* of *Others*, in Cases where his own *Eye-sight* can and ought to direct Him, I hope, for the sake
of

of Religion it self, He will not again cite St. Paul, who abhorr'd it.

The *D—n* assures the World, from his own Discovery, that in Dr. Clark's Preface (this *Accurate Man* is out already, for it is in his *Introduction*) to his *Scripture-Doctrine*, p. 13, 14. "There are all the same Passages, with ALL the same Omissions," which are in the *Bishop's Citations*, "with this Difference, that the good *Bishop* has given us the Words of Dr. Clark, which contain the Sense of a *Latin Quotation*, not *Englisbed* by Mr. Chillingworth, as if they had been *his*." You see, Reader, this is the only Difference which this Gentleman will allow between the Citations; and you find, He avers, upon his own Eye-sight, that in Dr. Clark there are ALL the same Omissions. I have been so used to the Frauds of such Writers as This, that I now never believe them, even in Cases where They appear most solemn and positive. And therefore, I reviewed Dr. Clark's Introduction, p. 13, 14. with my own Eyes. And I found, 1. That in This Instance of printing the *Englisb* of some *Latin Words*, in such a Manner as that the Words may appear Mr. Chillingworth's; that is, without any Change of the Letter, or any other Mark of Distinction from the rest of Mr. Ch——'s *Englisb Words*: that in This, I say, which the *D—n* mentions as the only Difference, there is no Difference at all. For in Dr. Clark's Book, after the *Latin*, (printed in Hooks, and in a different Character,) follows the *Englisb*, exactly as if (it were a Continuation of the foregoing *Englisb*; and as if it were Mr. Chillingworth's own. This is the first Falshood against Eye-sight. 2. I affirm, from my own Eye-sight, that, in the same Sentences, cited by Dr. Clark, there are not ALL the same Omissions, which are in the *Bishop's Citations*. 1. In the *Doctor's Introduction*, p. 13. towards the Bottom, I find these Words,
and

and laying them upon Men's Consciences together, under the equal Penalty of Death and Damnation. In the Bishop's Postscript, p. 239. in the Citation of the same Sentence, I find them left out, with the Common Mark of Omission added, which was enough to have forewarn'd the D——n against his false Assertion. 2. Again, In the Doctor's *Introd.* p. 14. near the Top, I find these Words, *And that which makes them continue the Common Incendiary of Christendom.* But in the Bishop's Postl. p. 240. I find the same Sentence cited, but *these Words* left out, with the Mark of Omission likewise, to stare the D——n in the Face. 3. Once more, I find the *Latin Words* He refers to, retained by Dr. Clark, and omitted by the Bishop; who is here censured for the great Crime of giving the *English Reader* the Sense of them, without the trouble of the *Latin.* Here then, it is evident, *first,* That there is *no Difference* in That particular, in which *alone* this Writer says *there is* a Difference: And then, that there are *Three Omissions* in the Bishop's Citations, not *One* of which is in Dr. Clark; tho' this *Rash Man* affirms, from his own *Eye-sight*, that They are *All* there. And therefore, I, who have often already used this *Writer's Weapons* against *Himself*, will now argue thus. If the *Sameness* of the *Omissions* in their Citations, here suppos'd, be an *Argument* that the Bishop took them at *second Hand* from the Doctor; as the D——n urges it to be: Then, Their Difference from one another, and the *Omissions* not being the *same*, (as Any one may see, but such a *Collator*) is a good Argument, in his own Account, that the Bishop did *not* take them at *second Hand* from the Doctor. It becomes such a *Disease* of *Cavilling* to be accompanied with *Blindness* not to see, and with *Positiveness* not to prevent, the *Self-Condernation* It ought always to produce.

Reader,

Reader,

I have now gone thro' this Elaborate Piece, in which *Argument* and *Criticism*, *Calumny* and *Wit*, so happily vie together; and with so steady an equality, that the *Lowness* of the *Wit* keeps exact pace with the *Lowness* of the *Calumny*; whilst the *Argument* and the *Criticism* of It uniformly contend to give equal Proofs of *Frailty* and *Mistake*.

The whole *Turn* of the *Performance* is very *Unlucky* to this *Writer*. The *Humour*, or *Wit*, of it is all made to lie in *this*, That the *Bishop's* Sermon was drawn up in *great Haste*; and therefore, it is but reasonable to expect, It should be full of *Great* and *Palpable Blunders*, &c. But *such Writers* as *This* ought to have better *Memories*. The *Dean of Worcester* has utterly confounded All the *Wit* of this *Turn*, before it appears. *Haste* in the *Composition*, He has prov'd, by an *Instance* not to be call'd in question by *this Writer*, to be perfectly consistent with the *Utmost Accuracy*, and *Exactness* of *Learning*. In his late *Postscript*, p. 44. He lets *Us* know that his *famous Sermon* was a *Hasty One*, begun and ended in *Two Days*, and review'd within the same time; as his *Words* must be understood, unless *He* would have *Us* think that *Reviewing* and *Correcting* do not belong to the *Composition* of a *Sermon*: And yet, It is so perfect, that, *whatever Reputation* *He* has for *Learning*, *He is content*, it should stand or fall with *this same hasty Sermon*. So that, tho' it must be acknowledg'd that it would have been *Witty* in any *other Man*, to have revived this *Old Turn* of *Humour*; yet in the *D—n* it is nothing but the *Continuation* of *Self-Contradiction*, because *He* has declared the greatest *HASTE* to be no manner of *Proof* of *Unaccuracy*.

From his *Prosecution* of his *Design* thro' the *whole*, every one will take upon *Him* to judge, whether *He* has shewn himself a *Critick*, or a *Pedant*; a *Man of Learning* and *Sense*, or a *Man of Trifling*, *Positiveness*,

tiveness, and *Self-Contradiction*; a *Man of Probi-ty*, &c. or —

The Great Difference of a *Pedant* from a *True Critick*, appears in nothing more than in his descending to cavil at *Words* and *Phrases*, where the *Points* in debate are of the greatest Importance; and depend upon *Arguments* of quite another sort. When this *Spirit* shews it self voluntarily, eagerly, and without any Call; It betrays a *Littleness* of *Genius*, unknown to a truly *Great Critick*: And when it is visibly design'd to turn off the Eyes of the World from *such Mistakes* in the greatest Points, as cannot be defended; it loses its End: And when it is at the same time discover'd that even these *Little Cavils* upon *Trifles* are a *Heap of New Blunders*; (as indeed it commonly happens that They who love to pursue such *Trifles*, do not understand even these *Trifles* themselves;) It then ends in *Ridicule*.

Learning is the most *Ornamental*, as well as the most *Useful*, Accomplishment, belonging to *Human Life*. But the *Affectation* of it, where it is not; and the *Itch* of shewing it, where it is not proper; are *Both* of them *Ridiculous* in *Those* who are guilty of *Them*, and *Nauseous* to *Others*. And it is to the *Writings* in which such *Accomplishments* appear, that we owe the *Observation*, that “*Learning* is like “*Armour*; a *Defence* to a *Strong Man*, but a *Burthen* to a *Weak one*.” A *Man* of a *Sound Judgment* strengthens His *Character* by it: But upon *Another*, it is only a *Weight*, that serves to embarrass Him; and at last to sink Him lower than He would have fallen without it.— Δέπνησεν δὲ πικρῶν, ἀεγβῆσε δὲ τιυχῆ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ — The *Clattering* of the *Armour* makes his *Fall* the more remarkable; as the *Weight* of it makes it more fatal.

A *Man's good Sense* is discovered, not only in the *Truth* and *Consistency* of his *Main Propositions*; but in the *Manner* of maintaining them. Perpetual
Self-

Self-Contradiction is a perpetual *Deviation* from *Sense*. An *over bearing Positiveness* in asserting, is something very different from *Judiciousness*. And an *Uncertain* use of *Words*, *affirming* and *retracting* in the same breath; is only saying NOTHING in very loose Expressions. When *this* is intended; It is no better than a little *Low Cunning*, which lasts, in its effect, no longer than till it is seen through: And when *not intended*; It is all *Inconsistency*, and *Shortsightedness* within: And in *both* Cases, very distant from *Soundness* of Judgment. *Quicquid dico, aut erit, aut non*, is the best *Motto* for such *Oracles*, whose most solemn *Declarations* about the most *Important* Points are all over *Ambiguous*, and equally *Deceitful* on both sides of the *Question*. And then, if it be true, as a great Man has said, *That Want of Decency is want of Sense*; Let the *Reader* himself examine this *Writer* strictly: And if He can discover in Him, any Mark of *Modesty* or *Good Manners*; any Sign either of a *Consciousness* of his own *Failings*, or an *Indulgence* to the *Common Weaknesses* of *Others*; any *Resemblance* of *Charity*, or *Candour*, or *Humanity*: I may promise that his *Good Sense* shall never more be call'd in question.

Probity is a *Tender* Point to touch upon. But all the *Marks* of *Probity* are certainly *here*, if they can be found in a *Private Personal Attack*, following close upon a *Publick Declaration* to the contrary; carry'd on in the *Dark* by One, who shuns the *Open War* He himself began; and pursued with all the *Violence* of *Personal Contempt*, *Scandal*, and *Misrepresentation*.

I will not here offend Him, as I find the *Bishop* has done upon the like *Occasion*, by recapitulating the *Numerous Self Contradictions* scatter'd throughout this *Work*. Nor will I here set together the *Many Grammatical Failures*, which appear in this *Accurate Piece*, — Ὅσα γράμματος π Κοίτη π. — Nor had I taken any *Notice* of the *Few* I have remark'd, as I pass'd;

but in Reply to the *Condescending Genius* of One, who has triumph'd in such *Trifles*.

I cannot forbear to observe, before I make an End, that the *D—n* certainly will by degrees improve in the *Principles* He has a *Mind* to seem to espouse. And nothing gives greater *Hopes* of *This Improvement*, than the *sudden Spleen* He has taken against the *Liberty* of the *Press*. There was a *Time*, and that no longer ago than the *Date* of his late *Sermon*, that He was not for discouraging the *Enquiries* of *Learned* and *Virtuous Men*, even in *Points* of the *Highest Importance*. But now, I see, He is determin'd to confine *Inquisitive Men* to *Trifles*; to *Subjects*, which, in his own *Words*, p. 57. are *NOT* of *great Consequence*, which ever *Way* they be decided. *Important Matters*, it seems, are *Those* that deserve the *Least* of *Mens Care*! And then again, Whatever *Pieces* *Inquisitive Men* may write upon *Important Matters*, sometimes He will not allow them to be *printed*, unless *They* are address'd to the *Parliament* or *Convocation*. This *Sort* of *Publication*, He says, is no *Breach* of the *Great Law* of *Silence*, which is *One* of his *Fundamental Laws* of *Religion*, and *Society*. [And yet, I have known the *Time*, when *This* very *Circumstance* has been call'd *Impudence*.] Sometimes again, His *Zeal* seems to lie against *Pamphlets* only; and He does not appear to have thoroughly resolv'd the *Suppression* of *Large Bound Books*. But I don't love, He should begin to meddle with such *Things*. For I can't help arguing that *He*, who will suppress what He calls *Pamphlets*, if *They* want an *Address* to the *Parliament* or *Convocation*; will, and must, (upon the same good *Principle*, that a *Lethargy* is much better than a *Fever*,) quickly come to suppress *All Books*, let them be *Bound*, or *not Bound*; let them be so address'd, or not so address'd.

The *Secret*, as it is said, is *This*. The *D—n* himself has lately receiv'd some Affronts from the *Press*. The *Press* has a little discompos'd Him ; and put his *Learned Reputation* into some *Disorder*. And, as He himself is now determin'd on which Side to seem to be ; and is, in outward Appearance, firmly engaged in the Behalf of *All receiv'd Doctrines* ; having himself now no farther Occasion for the Liberty of the *Press*, of which He has had all the Use He desires ; He forgets its past Kindnesses, and resolves to be reveng'd upon It for its present Inconveniencies : And so, in the Heat of his Displeasure, calls aloud to the *Civil Power* for Help against such an *Enemy* ; and in effect proclaims it to be Right and Just, that Those only on *One Side* be allowed to publish their Thoughts. How much better was the Behaviour of the *Honest Quaker*, who, when He found Himself sore press'd with an *Argument*, tho' He esteem'd it no better than a *Carnal Weapon*, yet, did not call aloud to the *Secular Arm* for Help ; but contented Himself with crying out as vehemently as He could—— O Argument, Argument, the Lord rebuke Thee !





P O S T S C R I P T.

IT may perhaps be thought Not right, to point out plainly a particular Person, as the *Author* of a *Nameless Piece*. And indeed, I am so much of this Mind, that I think every One has a *Right* to publish his *Thoughts* upon any *proper* Subjects, and in any *proper* Manner, under what Shape He pleases. And therefore, I concern not my self with any *other Nameless Books*, in which the *D——n* may have express'd his Sentiments, without transgressing the Rules which all Writers ought to observe. But the Case is quite different when an Unmanly and Personal Scene is open'd. If a *Man*, who has already invited Another into the *open Field*, or profess'd to attack Him publicly ; either assaults Him in a *Mask* ; or comes behind Him to *stab* Him in the *Dark* ; or *runs* from a *Fair and Open War*, into a *Base and Cover'd* Revenge ; And especially, if He has before-hand openly declared that He will not seek Redress in any such dishonourable Methods : There is something so shocking in *this* Procedure, that He is esteem'd to have forfeited all *Right* to the Privileges of *Civiliz'd Society* ; and to have thrown himself out of the *Rules* of *Common Life* : And every *By-stander* will think it his *Duty* to help to *Unmask* such a Man, and to produce Him into *open Light*.

In

In the *Second Edition* of the *D—n's* Performance, the World is threaten'd with something still farther, in the *same* dishonourable Way. Let it come, whenever He pleases. If *the Measure of his Reputation* be not yet *full*; it will be so in time. There are *Those*, who will never cease to detect such a *Man*, and shew Him to the World in his *proper Colours*. And whoever is neglected, in *this Controversy*; No Neglect, I can assure Him, will be shewn of Him. In *every Step*, He will be followed closely: And watch'd in *every Motion*. There is now preparing, against his *second Attack* appears, An Exact Catalogue of his *Blunders in Criticism*, his *Incoherencies in Grammar*, his *Unaccuracies in Style*, his wrong *Conclusions in Logick*, his *Inconsistencies in Doctrine*, his *Self-Contradiction in Principles*, his *Ambiguity and playing with Words* in the most *weighty Points* which He professes to settle; together with some *Flowers of his Good Manners*: Which will be justify'd by, what alone has made it necessary, his *Assuming Air of Superiority and Correction of Others in Insignificant Trifles*, in order to divert the *Reader from the most Important of all Causes*.

F I N I S.





Errata and Addenda.

PAge 4. Line 28. *read* appear. P. 9. l. 6. *from the Bottom, after* visible; *add*, [Sermon of Church-Authority, p. 29.]. P. 17. l. *the last*, after *cb. xii. 11.* *add*, [*tho' I be nothing.*] P. 18. l. 1. *for*, affirms it, *read* as his own Account. P. 21. l. 18. *after* but, *add* with. P. 30. l. *the last*, *after* without, *add* the. P. 40. l. 9. *for* xvi. *read* xiv. *Ibid* l. 13, 14. *for* this Text which is, *read* these Texts which are, *Ib.* l. 14. *for*, is, *read* are. *Ib.* l. 15. *after* named, *add*, as *Any* Foundation of *Church-Authority*. P. 61. l. 5. *after* *Sufferings*, *add*, as is plain from the whole Context; and particularly from v. 11. P. 64. l. 30. *after* made, *add*, (or rather, borrow'd from *Grotius* and *Dr. Hammond*). P. 76. l. 20. *for* actual, *read* natural. P. 89. l. 30. *after* of, *add*, Those who liv'd in the Beginning of.

