

*The Reasonableness of Nonconformity to the
Church of England, in 'Points of WORSHIP.*

A
Second Defence

O F

A SERMON, preach'd at Newark,
June 2. 1736. Intituled, *The Vanity of human
Institutions in the Worship of GOD.*

Against the Exceptions of Mr. JOHN BEACH,
in his *Appeal to the Unprejudiced.*

Done in the Form of a DIALOGUE,
wherein Mr. Beach's Arguments are all expressed
in his own Words.

By *Jonathan Dickinson, M. A.*

Not every Separation, but only a causeless Separation from the external Communion of any Church, is the Sin of Schism. — Imposing upon Men, under Pain of Excommunication, a Necessity of professing known Errors and practising known Corruptions, is a sufficient and necessary Cause of Separation. — To leave the Church, and to leave the external Communion of a Church, is not the same Thing. — This little Armour, rightly placed, will repel all those Batteries, which you threaten shall be so furious. CHILLINGWORTH.

I know that the common Sense of most that are serious in practical Christianity, is against your formal Ways of Worship, and against the Course that you have taken in this Land: but the Spirit of Prophaneness complieth with you, and doteth on you, in all Places that ever I was acquainted in. Bear with plain Truth: it is in a Cause of everlasting Consequence. BAXTER

Boston, NEW ENGLAND,
Printed and Sold by Kneeland and Gen, 1738.

ARTIST'S MUSEUM

THE ARTIST'S MUSEUM
OF THE
ARTISTS' ASSOCIATION

OF THE
ARTISTS' ASSOCIATION
OF THE
ARTISTS' ASSOCIATION

ARTIST'S MUSEUM



THE ARTIST'S MUSEUM
OF THE
ARTISTS' ASSOCIATION



Mr. *Dickinson's*

SECOND Defence of his SERMON,

Intituled,

*The Vanity of human Institutions in the
Worship of GOD.*







T O

Mr. John Beach.

S I R,

IT is not from a Disregard to your Person, nor a Neglect of your triumphant Performance, that I have not before now acknowledged your Favour; but from bodily Indispositions, which rendered me uncapable of writing. As soon as I was favoured with sufficient Health and Leisure, I have given you the following View of the Impressions your Letter has made upon me; and offered you the Reasons why I am not convinced by your Arguments. Tho' I have not taken Notice of all that appears exceptionable in your Letter, I think I have answered whatever immediately enters the Merits of the Cause — I have for the most Part purposely overlook'd your Flouts and Fleets, and left you in the undisturb'd Possession of your Merriment; being rather too old and too dull to answer such Kind of Arguments, and to find out the Force of Sneer and Banter. — Whether you are convinced by

by my Reasonings, or not, you must (I think) acknowledge the Justice of the Method I have taken to answer yours ; your Arguments being always proposed in the very Words of your Book. And if you had taken the same Method in your Appeal, you would have been voted a juster Disputant ; tho' you might have lost some Occasions of Triumph and Insult. I hope I may now expect the Justice from you (if you think this worthy of your Animadversions) that you directly answer the Arguments here offered : and not (as before) evade what you don't incline to answer ; and change the Question in Debate, for what you think more favourable to your Cause. — Be pleased to take in good Part these Reasons of the steadfast and unshaken Principles of

Elizabeth Town,
Feb. 1. 1737, 8

Your old Friend,
and humble Servant,

J. Dickinson.

CONTENTS.

- N. B.** Mr. *Beach's* Presbyterian Orders not derived from meer *Laymen.* p. 121.
- The *New England* Ministry, a true and valid Ministry by Mr. *Beach's* own Concession. p. 121, 2.
- Mr. *Dickinson's* charitable Sentiments, as to the Church of *England*, and *Arminians.* p. 126.



ERRATA.

Pag. 20. lin. 29 read *this* l 36. r. *jection* p. 30 l. 35. r. *Institutions.* p. 33. l. 15 r. *confited.* p. 35. l. 26. r. *Matth.* xxiii l. 26. r. called *Masters.* l. 36. r. *Way.* p. 49 l. 29. r. *tell me.* p. 54. l. 15. r. *of Willworship* --- l. 20. r. *unlawful.* p. 58 l. 32. r. *Inquire.* p. 59. l. 3. r. *you please.* p. 74. l. 2. r. *are no* p. 83. l. 6. r. *manfully* --- l. 29 r. *Tissera.* p. 87. l. 20. r. *de pseudogr.* p. 89. l. 24. r. *clearer* p. 94 l. 1. r. *ori.* p. 99. l. 1. r. *and the.*





*The Reasonableness of Nonconformity, to the
Church of England, in Point of Worship,*

A R G U E D,

In a Dialogue between D. and B.

D.  SIR, having lately published my Exceptions against your *Vindication*, I have taken the Liberty of waiting upon you in Order to a free Conference upon the Subject debated between us, that I may obtain your Sentiments of my *Defence*.

B. SIR, I have had a Sight of the DEFENCE of your Complaints against the Church of England. And I have so great a Value for your Person, and so just a Sense of my Obligations to you, that though I am in a poor State of Health, and the Task you have set me, by multiplying your Complaints, will necessarily prove lengthy; yet having, as you tell me, a special Call, and as my own Conscience assures me, a good Cause, I shall cheerfully undertake it (p. 1)

D. The Affair before us is a religious Debate; which therefore deserves to be treated with Meekness and good Temper. Neither your Cause, nor
B mine,

mine, will gain any Thing by our violating the Laws of Decency and good Manners. And it concerns us to remember in this Debate, that *the Wrath of Man works not the Righteousness of God.*

B. *I pray God to give me a deep Sense of his Presence, & the impartial Account he will call me to for every injurious Expression; and that I may remember, that by my Words I must be justified, or by my Words I must be condemned. (p. 2.)*

D. By this your solemn Address to God, I may expect Nothing but fair Treatment, no wrathful Expressions, no unkind Reflections: For those Things you must own would be injurious. And I hope, the Book you object against, has given you no Occasion of any Heat of Spirit; for I am not sensible of any Acrimony of Style, or any abusive Language contained in it. I'm sure I endeavour'd in that whole Discourse (notwithstanding all the Provocation given me) to treat you like a Christian, and like a Gentleman.

B. *The greatest Trouble I am like to meet with, is the naming your manifold Untruths, Misrepresentations and Slanders. For though you don't think it any Sin in you to commit them; and the Eye cannot see itself; yet I fear you'll count it unpardonable Bitterness in me to tell you, that you have committed them. (p. 2.)*

D. Hold, Sir; have you so soon forgot your solemn Address to God! Could one have expected, after such serious and solemn Expressions, that your very next Words should have contained so much Heat and Bitterness! Can you persuade your self, or persuade the World about you, that these are not *injurious Expressions*? Is it no injury to represent

represent me to be so harden'd in Impiety, as to think it no Sin to be guilty of manifold Untruths, Misrepresentations and Slanders? I hope, I have not deserved such a Character from you, or from any Man else; And therefore entreat you, to leave off these Invectives, which no Way enter the Merits of the Cause; and I think can be no way serviceable to your Reputation.

B. Pray, Mr. D. free your self from this blind and bitter Zeal, (p. 3.) What do you mean by publishing such a scurrilous Libel? (p. 6.) You have so accus'd your self to make Complaints against that Church that never hurt or injured you, that you think you may say any Thing right or wrong, so it be by way of Complaint. As to notorious Untruths, I wonder that your Conscience did not say that you are now writing such, (p. 11.) Pray let me ask you, is there any such Sin as Slandering in the World? if there is, how can you excuse your Assertions, than which Nothing can be more false. (Ibid.) You are so delighted with this vile Slander, that you are never weary of repeating it. (p. 20.) Let me entreat you to be Sober one Moment, and tell me, is this Reasoning, or is it Raving? — I suspect that you are dreaming and talking in your Sleep. — It is a Sign that your Brain is disturbed. (p. 21.) Did you use any Prudence, I had almost said Conscience, when you published one of the blackest Slanders that Pen could write? (p. 52.) If I may judge by what I have seen, there is more Supercilliousness and Arrogancy in the little Finger of a certain Gentleman, than I ever observed in all the Bishops I have ever seen. (p. 54.) Certainly you was reduced to the doleful Necessity of the Woman* in the Poet, who

* Mrs. JUNO:

Flectere si nequeo Superos, Acheronta movebo.

B 2

being

being enraged at her Unsuccessfulness in her Attempts, took up this Resolution,

Since Heaven is deaf, and will no Pity shew,
I'll try what Hell and the black Host can do.

(p. 66.)

But pray remember, that we write in the Presence of God; and must answer for every unjust Insinuation; ----- And much more for the blackest Calumnies. (ibid.) Do such shameless Slanders become a godly Divine? (p. 83.) You go on ranting and railing, when your Conscience told you that we don't differ one Hair's Breadth about the Thing: (p. 75.) By this I am thoroughly convinced, that in your complaining against the Church, you have only acted a Part; and hence must think that you meant no more by the frightful Accusations in your Books, but only to please some uneasy People at Newark. (p. 105.)

D. I have met with frequent Complaints, in the Management of Controversy, of Personal Injury and Abuse: but don't remember that ever I saw a Parallel to this. How astonishing is this Conduct of your's! Is it possible, that a Man under such solemn Impressions of his Account at the Day of Judgment for every injurious Expression, as you just now declared, should be guilty of all these Injuries? Is it possible for you to represent me as applying to *Hell* and the *black Host* for Assistance, and in the very same Breath call upon me to remember, that *we write in the Presence of God, and must answer for every unjust Insinuation?* --- Can you think that none of these are *injurious Expressions*? Is it no Injury to point me out as a vile scurrilous Libeller, Slanderer and Calumniator, chargeable with notorious Falshood and Untruth, as designedly worshipping

shipping the Devil, and as acting a Part against my own Conscience &c. ? What Cause have I given you to esteem me such a profligate and abandoned Creature ?

B. *Perhaps you may think I have been too tart in some Expressions. But if you consider that you are the Aggressor, and have without any known Cause, published a Set of virulent Charges against the whole Church of England, and all the Rulers of the Nation both civil and ecclesiastical, who have established and do uphold it ; you can't but think a little Warmth and Zeal not only pardonable, but even justifiable, in vindicating so vast a Body of abused Persons. (p. 106.)*

D. Were this Charge true ; and were you appointed Patron or Advocate of this vast Body of abused Persons, methinks you might have thought of some way to vindicate them without *Swords and Staves*. A good Cause needs no such Methods of Defence ; and a bad Cause will gain nothing by them, but deserv'd Contempt. — However, I must confess, I am surprized at this Imputation. I thought I had offered all my Exceptions, against what we esteem exceptionable in your Church, with as much Temper and Decency as possible. Be pleased to give me some Instances of that Scurrility and Virulency, you so tragically complain of ; and I will retract every Thing of that Nature as publickly as you please.

B. *You have condemned all the Christians upon Earth, excepting a small Handsful, as Hypocrites, and vain Worshippers, and hateful to God (p. 37.) You say, our Worship is exactly like the Worshippers of Baal their crying half a Day, O Baal, hear us, (p. 48) You have condemned all Repetitions in Prayer. (p. 49)*
You

You call the Cross at Baptism a cursed Instrument, the principal Badge of Popery (p. 53.) You tell ignorant People, that we are like the Papists in their Adoration of their breaden God, whom they carry about the Streets, that all People may fall down at the Sight of it, and worship it as God Almighty. (p. 66.) You represent our most serious Devotions as vain, hypocritical, like the brutish Cries of the Worshippers of Baal, as horrid Profaneness and mocking of God. (p. 103.) Your Book throughout represents the Way that I am leading Souls in, as the certain Road to Hell, my Worship you say is vain, my Doctrine is Arminianism, and my Discipline none at all: and is not this the broad Way to Destruction? (p. 105.)

D. I find many more such like Charges in your *Appeal to the unprejudiced*. But I can't but esteem this as an Aggravation, instead of an Excuse, of your bitter injurious Treatment. — For it's most certain, that there are no such Expressions in my Book; but your self is the Author of 'em all. You seem now to have lost the *deep Sense of God's Presence, and the impartial Account he will call you to for every injurious Expression*, which you so seriously desired to keep the Impression of. Are these Representations no injurious Expressions? Or am I so vile an Antagonist, as to be incapable of receiving Injuries, that you are so forward to fasten any Sort of Charges upon me, that you are willing to have me wear?

B. *I am resolved to be so far from exaggerating, that I will silently pass over many of your lesser Mistakes, when they don't affect the Cause, though I am persuaded, that you would insult over your Adversary more than a little, if you found him guilty of such Blunders as in p. 85, where you reckon up the several Steps Christ took*

took to accomplish our Redemption. First you reckon his Nativity, and secondly his Birth, by which it is evident, that you don't know, that his Nativity and Birth are the same Thing. (p. 2.)

D. I could have pointed out to you several more such Mistakes of the Press in that same Discourse, that would have given you like Cause of Triumph. But these (it seems) you have overlook'd; and found out but this single Blunder (as you are pleased to call it) to make your self merry with. This however you are willing to set in as a ludicrous a View as you can, for the Diversion of your self and your Reader. And since you are in this pleasant Mood, will you be pleased to accept of a Rowland for your Otter, which shall be at your Service upon the easy Condition of your answering a few Questions. And first,

What Reason had you, in your *Vindication*, to charge me with notorious *Untruths* &c.?

B. I would not call it a Lie, because that is provoking. I dare not call it a Mistake, for I could not believe so knowing a Gentleman as you could so mistake (p. 10) If your strange Mistakes had been committed by some old Woman, one could pass them by with a Smile; but in so knowing and judicious a Man as you it is unaccountable. (p. 40.)

D. Is this the Character of one who don't know that *Nativity* and *Birth* are the same Thing? It seems then, that I am a very ignorant, knowing and judicious Man. But what do you think of my objecting against the *Repetitions* in the Litany?

B. As I knew a craz'd Man, who often was
confident

confident that he saw Apparitions in the Air, when really the Apparitions were not in the Air, but in his disturb'd Brain : so the vain Repetitions are not in the Common Prayer ; but in your Imagination. (p. 51.) Pray rub your Eyes, and get them open ; for it is a Sign that your Brain is disturb'd. (p. 21.)

D. Why do you talk so angrily, what Hurt has my Book done you ?

B. I sincerely love you ; and hope to meet you in a more peaceable World. (p. 106.) But when People bear such wise and sober Divines as you, talk and jeer at such a Rate, they presently think that our Liturgy is a kind of Conjuring. (p. 104.) Do such shameless Slanders become a godly Divine ? (p. 83.)

D. Thus you have given me a finish'd Character ; Wherein (I must say with Mr. Chillingworth) you have discovered in your self the true Genius and Spirit of Detraction. According to your Description of me (*O Rem ridiculam, Cato, et jocosam !*) I'm an ignorant, false, knowing, judicious, craz'd, wise, sober, wicked, godly Divine : One that prays to the black Host of Hell, and yet one whom you sincerely hope to meet in Heaven. — But passing over these personal Matters, be pleas'd to proceed:

B. I next observe that you complain, that I did not take Notice of your imputing Arminianism to us. The Charge you have laid thus : The generality of the Clergy of the Church are profess'dly Arminians. And the Doctrine of original Sin, of our Justification by the imputed Righteousness of Christ, of the Efficacy of the sovereign free Grace of God, &c. are exploded and ridiculed by some of the most eminent Clergy of the Church

Church of England. This is your black and horrid Charge, against the generality, yea the most eminent of our Clergy &c. You have no Proof that the generality of our Clergy are Hereticks, but what is invisible, which is much like silent Thunder. (p. 7, 8.)

D. Then you take this to be a black and horrid Charge, and *Arminianism* to be *Heresy*.

B. It is crafty enough in you, to tell People that the Ministers of the Church are *Arminians*. For they know no Difference between an *Arminian* and a *Sociinian*; but take them to be some strange Monsters, of whom they had best have a Care. — Ask these Men what an *Arminian* is, and one will tell you that an *Arminian* is one that expects to be sav'd by his good Works; another will tell you that an *Arminian* denies free Grace; a third will say, that an *Arminian* is one who denies original Sin. And he may as well say, he is one who denies a God or Jesus Christ. (p. 8, 9)

D. You must mean by this (if you have any Meaning) that *Arminianism* is innocent enough; and that the Imputation of it to your Clergy can be for Nothing but an Amusement to the Populace, and an imaginary Scare-Crow. So that, according to you, I am guilty of a black horrid Charge of orthodox *Heresy*. But tell me plainly, do you profess your self an *Arminian*?

B. Tho' I am under no Necessity; yet to gratify your Importunity, I will tell you what I have learn'd to believe, by the little Acquaintance I have had with the Writings of our Clergy. As to original Sin, I believe all Mankind are made Sinners by Adam's Sin: Or the Wrath and Curse of God for Adam's Sin, is due to every

C

every Child born into the World. — And so as to all the other Articles, I am sure that in a sound Sense, the generality of our Clergy believe & preach them. (p. 6)

D. As to the other Articles debated between the *Arminians* and us, you don't tell us what is the sound Sense in which you believe them, whether it be an *Arminian* or a *Calvinist* Sense. But it seems, you fully believe all *Adam's* Posterity Sinners, exposed to the *Wrath and Curse of God*, due to them for his Sin.

B. *The Goodness of God made it impossible, that Adam's Posterity should be eternally lost, and condemned to the Pains and Flames of Hell, any otherwise than through their own personal Guilt and Wickedness.* (p. 7, 8.)

D. A new Paradox! The *Wrath and Curse of God* is due to every Child, born into the World, for *Adam's Sin*: And yet it is impossible, that *Adam's* Posterity should be the Subjects of *God's Wrath and Curse*, but for their own *personal Guilt and Wickedness*. However, you give us this Evidence of your being no *Arminian*, that you believe *original Sin*.

B. One Thing more I would observe: first you say, we are *Arminians*; and then you say, we explode *original Sin*. Now both can't be true, for *Arminius* taught the *Doctrine of original Sin*. (p. 8.)

D. Then it seems you are no *Arminian*; but it is a *black horrid Charge* to call you so, because you believe the same *Doctrine* that *Arminius* did. Methinks it might have been as much to the Purpose, to have declared, that you believe the same *Doctrines* that the *Calvinists* do. B.

B. We dare not say, that millions of Infants are tortured in Hell to all eternity, for a Sin that was committed thousands of Years before they were born. --- And are such as these the Doctrines, you say, are so dear to the Presbyterians at Newark? If so, I am sorry for them with all my Heart. (p. 6, 7.)

D. What do you mean by imputing these Doctrines to us? I have lived as long among the Presbyterians as you have, and I never heard any Thing like this once taught among them. We do all of us leave the future State of Infants to the Righteous Determination of that God whose tender Mercies are over all his Works, without such positive and bold Conclusions as you are pleased to make. What Reason have you to suppose we are got so far into the contrary Extream from *Arminianism*?

B. I am sure, I have heard you preach as rank *Arminianism* as ever I heard in the Church. --- I am sure, you can as safely join with the Church, as with the Dissenters; for the most eminent of their Teachers, to my Knowledge, are as much *Arminians* as our Clergy. (p 9.)

D. Then as to us (it seems) we are at the greatest Extreams from *Arminianism*; and yet rank *Arminians*. And as to your Clergy, it is a black and horrid Charge to call 'em *Arminians*; because we are as much *Arminians* as they, that is, we are both *Arminians*. Shall we now sum up your Evidence upon this Head?

It is a black and horrid Charge, to impute the innocent orthodox Heresy of *Arminianism* to your Clergy. As for your self, you are no *Arminian*; for you believe *original Sin*: and so did *Arminius*.

C 3.

You

You believe the Wrath and Curse of God for Adam's Sin, due to every Child born into the World; and yet due to none, but for their own *personal* Guilt and Wickedness. As for us, you insinuate we are at the most dangerous Extrems from *Arminianism*; and yet rank *Arminians*. Our Teachers are as much *Arminians* as your Clergy, whom you are proving to be no *Arminians*. ----- This I take to be a fair and just Representation of your Reasoning, and the Sum of all you have offered upon this Head. And who can be so blind as to fail of Conviction from such Arguments as these? I cannot but say, as one in a like Case, *Nubila meus est Hac ubi regnant*. — As to the black and horrid Charge, as you call it, You your self know and do not deny, and the World is sufficiently instructed, that the generality of your Clergy that have lately written upon those Subjects, are of the *Arminian* or *Remonstrant* Perswasion, in the *five Articles* debated between us and them. And what Justice there is in your imputing the same Opinions to me, and to the most eminent of our Teachers; I leave to the Censure of those, most acquainted with our Ministry. — And thus I am prepared to attend to what you have further to say.

B: You say, I made no reply to the Reasons you offered against requiring as a religious Duty, what God has not required as such. But did I not show, that you and not the Church were guilty of this? And that you have made a Business even in this Sermon to contradict your Text; and teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men? (p. 9.)

D. That we may "come out of the Clouds," and not contend in the Dark, it will be proper to state the Case something particularly; and then let the
World

World judge, who requires as a religious Duty, what God has not required as such; who are chargeable with Impositions upon Men's Consciences, and with *teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, you or We.*

The Church of *England* is establish'd upon a Hierarchy, consisting of *Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Arch-Deacons, Deans, Prebendaries, Rectors, Curates &c.* to whom may be added a List of *Lay-Officers*, such as *Chancellors, Commissaries, Proctors, Apparitors &c.* None of whom (as established in the Church of *England*) do we find once mention'd in the Scriptures. The inferior Clergy must, upon their Admission to Orders, swear to perform true and canonical Obedience to the Bishop, and to his Successors; tho' required to *call no Man Master, but Christ.* When ordain'd to the Ministry, and by the awful Bonds of that sacred Character, oblig'd to preach the Gospel, to be *instant in Season, and out of Season*, they are not allowed to preach without the Bishop's Licence. That an unlicensed Minister is bound by his Office to preach the Gospel; but by this Order of your Church forbid to preach, till he has paid for a Liberty to do his Duty. You tell us, that Christ has committed the Government of his Church only to the Bishops; and yet a considerable Part of the Church of *England* is exempt from episcopal Jurisdiction. Of this Dr *Whitby** complains, that "the Exemptions settled by the papal Authority, do put many Parts of this Church into a very disjointed State; while in some Places the Laity, and in many others the Presbyters, exercise episcopal

* Upon *Rom. XIV. 6.*

" Jurisdiction

“ Jurisdiction, independent on the Bishops, in
 “ Contradiction to their Principles.” In these
 Exemptions, it's certain, the Bishop has no Juris-
 diction at all. And the Case is not much better
 any where else: For tho' the *spiritual Courts* be
 held in the Name of the Bishop; yet the Power
 of Excommunication and Absolution belongs to
 meer *Laymen*, who proceed without the Bishop's
 Direction; and can legally proceed most contrary
 to his Will. That altho' all Power of Discipline is
 held to be vested in him; yet he can exercise
 none, but as these *Laymen* please. “ Discipline
 “ (says one of your own Authors) is lost; and
 “ will not be permitted by the State, which by
 “ vertue of *Conge d'estires, Quare Impedit*, Prohibi-
 “ tions &c. have made themselves the sole and
 “ ultimate Judges, not only of all Bishops and
 “ Churches; but of their Excommunications,
 “ and every Exercise of their spiritual Jurisdic-
 “ tion. *

And what Sort of *Discipline* is exercised in these
 spiritual Courts in the Bishop's Name, but meerly
civil Penalties? If the excommunicate Person does
 not satisfy the Court in forty Days, there comes
 out a Writ against him, which commits him to
Prison, where he must lie, till he pays the Fees of
 the Court; and makes such Submission as is en-
 join'd him. This he cannot escape, but by a good
 round Sum of Money, which commonly will answer
 the End. And how agreeable this is to the Dis-
 cipline Christ has appointed in his Church, the
 World must judge. But whether agreeable or not,
 every Minister of the Church of *England*, is ob-
 liged to publish to his Congregation, the Sen-

* *Case of the Regal. & Pontif.* p. 166.

tence

tence of Excommunication pronounced by these Laymen, tho' upon never so trivial Occasions. They must act by an implicit Faith; and submit to this, if never so contrary to their own Judgments. Such is the boasted Government of your Episcopal Church.

And it is much the same Case, with Respect to the *Admission* of Ministers to their *special Charge*. The People are not only deprived of their natural Right of chusing their Minister; but the Bishop himself, it seems, cannot refuse the Clergyman recommended by the *Patron*, how insufficient soever for the Charge. And even this Right of Patronage is often bought and sold. It's common to buy the Right of the next Presentation to a Living, for any Expectant, who will have a legal Claim to it, as soon as it becomes void. He will enjoy the Benefits of it, how unqualified soever. The Bishop cannot prevent it. And there are some Ministers that have the Income of several Parishes, which they never take any Pastoral Care of at all. It's enough if they commit the Work to such a *Curate* as they can hire cheapest, while they themselves live in Splendor upon the rich Revenues; and never so much as reside in their Parish.

Each Minister of the Church of *England* is obliged to admit to the *Lord's-Supper* all Officers that hold Commissions in the State, be they never so profane; or else he may incur great Damages, if sued for refusing such an one that holy Ordinance. Nor has he Power to keep the most notorious Sinners from the Sacrament above *fourteen* Days; unless he will be at the very great Charge of putting them into the spiritual Court.

And as to the *Bishop* himself, whom you suppose to be the Source of all Jurisdiction, he is merely
the

the King's Creature ; and created by his Writ of *Conge d'Eslire*. All the pretended Election of the *Dean and Chapter* is but a Piece of Pageantry. And what else can we suppose their solemn Prayer to God for the Direction of the Holy Ghost, in the Choice of a fit Person for their Bishop, when there is one already appointed, which they dare do no other than accept, how disagreeable soever to their Minds !

This is the State of the english Hierarchy, unto which every Minister of your Church is obliged to declare his *unfeigned Assent and Consent*. And unto which I shall be ready in like Manner to declare my Assent, when you can prove it agreeable either to Scripture or Reason. But in the mean Time you must pardon me, if I can neither envy or imitate your Change ; nor believe this the best constituted Church in the World.

You have already heard my Exceptions against your *Liturgy*, with the long Train of Rites and Ceremonies, which you acknowledge to be of human Original, without any Scriptural Institution or Warrant ; all of which must be complied with to a *Punctilio*, by every Conformist.

And what is worse than all the rest, is the *Injunction* of all these Things, and their *Imposition* as Terms of Communion, without the least Allowance for scrupulous Consciences. We must approve of all these Things, how unscriptural and unreasonable soever they appear to us ; or be refused the Fellowship of your Church, and be excommunicated. Whosoever shall affirm, that the *Form of Worship* in your Church is corrupt superstitious or unlawful, or containeth any Thing in it that is contrary to the Scriptures, is *excommunicated* by your *fourth Canon*. — Whosoever shall affirm, that any of your *nine and thirty Articles* are

are in any Part superstitious or erroneous, or such as he may not with a good Conscience subscribe to, is *excommunicated* by your *fifth Canon*. — Whosoever shall affirm, that the *Rites and Ceremonies* of the Church of *England* may not with good Conscience be approved, used and subscribed to, are *excommunicated* by your *sixth Canon*. — Whosoever shall affirm, that the Government of the Church of *England*, by *Arch Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Arch-Deacons* and *the rest* that bear Office in the same, is repugnant to Word of God, is *excommunicated* by your *seventh Canon*. — Whosoever shall pretend to *Groan* under the Burthen of certain *Grievances*, imposed upon them by the Church of *England*, are *excommunicated* by your *tenth Canon*. — Whosoever shall affirm or maintain, that there are within this Realm *other Meetings, Assemblies, or Congregations* of the King's *born Subjects*, than such as by the Laws of the Land are held and allowed, which may rightly challenge to themselves the Name of true and lawful *Churches*, are *excommunicated* by your *eleventh Canon*.

This then is the State of the Case. We must believe, that your *Arch Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Arch-Deacons, Rectors, Curates &c.* have Scripture-Warrant, or be extommunicated — We must allow, that your spiritual Courts manag'd by *Lay-Chancellors, Commissaries, Proctors, Apparitors, &c.* and the Discipline by them exercised, are agreeable to the Word of God; and that you are right in solemnly confessing the want of that godly Discipline that was in the primitive Church, every first Day of *Lent*; or we must be excommunicated. — We must acknowledge, that your *Bishops* have all the Power of Jurisdiction and Discipline; and yet allow it to be right, that they have no Jurisdiction at all in the Exemptions; and that all the

D

Power

Power of Discipline belongs to your *spiritual Lay-Courts*. — We must allow, that your Ministers are bound by their Ordination Vows to preach the Gospel; and yet bound not to preach, till the Bishop's *Licence* is obtain'd and paid for — We must allow, that Ministers are under the most solemn Bonds of Duty, to take Care of the Flocks committed to their Charge; and yet that it is lawful for them to have a *Plurality* of Parishes, from whom they receive rich Benefices, and never perform any pastoral Duty to them. — We must allow, that it's a Minister's Duty, to take solemn Care not to prostitute the sacred Ordinance of the Lord's Supper to scandalous Persons; and yet that he must administer this holy Ordinance to every one that bears *Commission in the State*, whatever his moral Character be; and to all Persons that are *sixteen Years old* For *all these* by your Constitution are oblig'd to communicate at *Easter*, under Pain of being Cited into the spiritual Courts. — In a Word, we must believe, that all your *Rites and Ceremonies* are agreeable to the Word of God, tho' our Consciences dictate the contrary. If our Consciences can't stretch thus far, if they fall short in any Instance, we are *ipso Facto* excommunicated by your Canons. — And now, Sir, I would enquire of you, whether these Things are not Impositions; whether in these, or at least in some of these Things, you don't teach for *Doctrines the Commandments of Men*? Come, "Hinch not, dally not."

B. You have propos'd and requir'd (as much as in you lies,) That as a religious Duty, which God never propos'd or requir'd. You have taught People, that it is a religious Duty to abstain from a stinted imposed Prayer, when God never requir'd Men to avoid it. You have taught it as a religious Duty, to sit at the
Sacrament;

Sacrament ; not to use a good Prayer, which the Papists use ; when God never proposed or required these Things. You, and not the Church, I shew'd, are guilty of this Crime, of requiring that as a religious Duty, which God has not required as such. (p. 9, 10)

D. I shall not spend Time to complain of the Injustice of this Representation ; but consider it as respecting my Opposition to, and Objections against the Imposition of your Rites and Ceremonies ; And in that View of the Case, I take this to be the Sum of your Reasoning. — We don't like all your Injunctions and Impositions ; and must therefore be guilty of teaching for *Doctrines the Commandments of Men*. We find Fault with some Things in your Church, which you say are not expressly forbid or declared to be sinful in the Scriptures ; and whoever do so, require as a religious Duty what God has not proposed or required ; and are thereby guilty of the Charge in the debated Text. — But will this Reasoning hold good ? What if those Things that are not in express Terms forbidden in the Scripture, should prove inconsistent with the general Rules of the Word of God ; and if this should be the Case with respect to the Subjects debated between you and me (as it may possibly appear to be, before we have done) Is our objecting against these Things, nevertheless, *teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men* ? If so, we have nothing to do, but to act by an implicit Faith, and to take Care not to contradict any human Impositions, lest we *teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*. And if so, your Church is in the highest Degree chargeable, in rejecting so many *Papish* Rites and Institutions, which are no where expressly forbidden in the Scriptures.

If you answer to this, that the Impositions of the Church of *Rome*, which you have rejected, are contrary to the general Rules in the Word of God; and those in your Church, which we reject, are agreeable to the general Rules in the Word of God; and therefore we are chargeable with this Guilt, but you not: We have then *your* Word for it on one Side of the Question, that your Impositions are agreeable to the Word of God; We have also the *Papists* Word for it on the other Side, that their Impositions are agreeable to the Word of God; And we have the fullest Evidence in our own Minds, that they are neither one nor the other agreeable to his Word. How then must we understand this Argument of yours, so as to find out by it who are, and who are not guilty of this Charge? Are all they guilty, that reject such human Injunctions, as the *Imposers* themselves *say* are agreeable to the Word of God? If so, the Church of *England* should well consider what they have been doing, in rejecting the *Mass-Book*. If not so, your Argument comes to Nothing; for we have but your bare Word in Favour of your Impositions. — But perhaps you will tell us, that they are guilty, who reject *such* Impositions as are really *in themselves* agreeable to the Word of God, without Respect to any Man's Word for or against them. But then, how must his appear? who must determine it? If the *Imposers* may determine the Case, we have the former Consequences brought upon us. If it belongs to others to determine it, no man can be guilty, who follows his Judgment and Conscience in rejecting human Impositions.

But what can you mean, by our *requiring* a Rejection of those Impositions as a *religious Duty*; saying only, that we refuse to put our Necks into the

the Yoke you have wreathed for us, and give our Reasons why we do so, while we are content that those who are otherwise minded, should enjoy their own Opinion, and our Communion too in all sacred Ordinances ? All we demand of them, is to give the same Liberty. We teach no Commandments at all but the Commandments of God ; and it is our known and received Principle, that we are to obey no Commandments but his, in Matters of Religion, of Conscience, and eternal Salvation : While, you acknowledge, that the debated Rites and Ceremonies you impose, are meerly of human Original. So that the great Question between you and me is, Whether they are guilty of *teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*, who teach that there are no Commandments in religious Affairs binding upon Men's Consciences, but the Commandments of God ; or they who teach, that the Commandments of Men are also binding upon our Consciences : That is, in other Words, they who *teach for Doctrines the Commandments of God*, or they who *teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men* ?

Speak out plainly ; do you impose any Thing upon Men's Consciences, or not ? If you do, the Case is determin'd, you *teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*. If you do not, shew us where these Things are required in *Scripture*, that you enjoin and impose upon us. Answer this consistently ; and the Debate is ended.

B. *Where has God commanded you to receive the Lord's Supper at Noon ? Where has God commanded you to give the Sacrament in leavened Bread ? Where has God commanded you to stand up when you preach ? Where has God commanded you to preach by Notes, to sing in Meeter, which is of late Invention ? Where*
has

has God commanded you to sit upright at the Communion, to give a Name in Baptism; and a hundred Things more which you do without any Scruple? Speak to the Point, are these Things from Heaven or of Man? (p. 31.)

D. Were it granted, that all these Things are human Inventions in the Worship of God; Is there no Difference between the *practising* and the *imposing* these Things? Are not every Body allowed Communion in our Churches, with full Liberty to act according to their own Conscience in all these Things, or any other of the like Kind that you can imagine? If there be any Particular that they don't approve, they are welcome to join in what they do approve. There never was amongst us any Censure pass'd upon any Person, on these Accounts. But on the contrary, your *Canons* are charged with the Thunderbolts of Excommunication, against every one that won't agree with you, in every Punctilio of your Hierarchy and uninstituted Rites. There can be no Abatement of a Ragg of a Ceremony, either for the Peace of our Consciences, or the Peace of the Church and Nation: That we are forced to forsake the Church of *England*, or the Peace of our own Consciences; and it becomes absolutely necessary that the Church be divided, or Multitudes of the best Christians in the Nation must live in a Course of Sin against their own Light; and this without any other Necessity, than the Imposers Pleasure. For you own the scrupled Rites to be all of them indifferent; even those very Rites, on Account of which so many excellent Men in our Nation are not only refused all Priveleges in the Church, but, all Offices in the State.

. If I should yet suppose these Things to be hu-
man

man Inventions in God's Worship, they are all of them (sitting at the Lord's Supper only excepted) what both you and we agree in ; and what are no where contested in any of the protestant Churches. And therefore if these Things had been enjoin'd as Terms of Communion, would there be no Difference between enjoining those Things which no Body scruples ; and imposing such Things as are conscienciously scrupled, by much the greatest Part of the Reformation ?

And lastly, there are none of your Instances (excepting that of sitting at the Lord's Supper, which I shall have Occasion hereafter to consider more distinctly) that come up to the Case debated between you and me. I opposed human Inventions in the Worship of God : you instance in meer Circumstances and Appendages of Worship, which I before allowed to be necessarily left to human Prudence. There can be no Action without some necessary Circumstances ; and where these are not provided for in Scripture, they are left absolutely indifferent to our own Choice. Thus for Instance, Christ has commanded us to attend the Lord's Supper ; but has not directed whether it shall be observed at Noon or at Night, whether with leaven or unleavened Bread. It is therefore a necessary Circumstance, that there be some Time appointed, and some Sort of Bread provided, which must be left to human Prudence. So likewise, he hath required Ministers to preach ; but has not told us whether standing or sitting, with Notes or without ; and the Posture and Methods of Preparation are necessary Circumstances, that are left to our own Prudence, to be determined in each Society, agreeable to the general Rules, that *all Things be done decently and in Order*. And the same may be said of the other Instances mention-
ed

ed by you. These are all natural Circumstances, that necessarily belong to every religious Duty ; and they must of Necessity be determin'd, or the Duty can't be attended. The Decision therefore of these Circumstances is required by the Law of Nature, which is the Law of God, since they are not decided by the written Word. — But by what Argument will it follow, that because necessary Circumstances and Appendages of Worship are left to human Appointment, that therefore unnecessary and scrupled Circumstances of Worship, may be appointed and imposed ? Or that because meer Circumstances of Worship are left to human Direction, that therefore new Acts, Modes, or Forms of Worship may be invented and enjoin'd ? And that all your unscriptural Hierarchy, all your Methods of Discipline, all your Pluralities and Nonresidencies, all your Patronages and Sales of Advowsons or next Avoydances, and all your Rites and Ceremonies, must be approved as necessary to be comply'd with, for the Sake of the human Authority that enjoin them ? I think, Sir, that there is a very great Difference in the Cases ; and therefore that all you have said is nothing to the Purpose, unless you can prove, that we are as much bound to obey, with an implicit Faith, whatever unscriptural Institutions you are pleased to impose upon us, as to observe the Regulation of those natural and necessary Circumstances, without which a religious Duty can't be perform'd at all.

B. You more than insinuate, that we teach our People a blind Obedience to their spiritual Guides ; and an absolute Subjection to their Impositions. But pray let me ask you, Is there any such Sin as Slandering in the World ? If there is, how can you excuse these Assertions ?

Assertions? — We do indeed teach our People, that when our Governours command us to do lawful Things, it is our Duty to obey, and that in Obedience to God, than which Nothing is more plainly taught in Scripture, and Rebellion is as the Sin of Witchcraft, 1. Sam. xx. 23. But if our Rulers command what God has forbidden, or forbid what God has commanded, we must die rather than obey them; and every Man must judge for himself, whether the Rulers Command be repugnant to God's, or not. (p. 11.)

D. You should first have proved (what we deny) that God has given a *legislative Power* to your Church, in the Affairs of Religion and Conscience; or authorized any Men upon Earth, to make Laws and Institutions in Matters of his *Worship*, and in the Affairs of Conscience and Salvation. Tho' we are bound to obey our lawful and rightful Rulers, in all those Things wherein God has given them Power to command us; yet we are not bound to obey all them that call themselves our Rulers, nor even our lawful Rulers themselves in those Things wherein God has not given them Power to command us. Be pleased therefore to shew us, whence this Authority is derived; and to whom it belongs: Whether to the Rulers of the Church of *Rome*, and to the *Inquisition*, or to the Rulers of the *Greek Churches*, or to the Rulers of the *reformed Churches* abroad; of the Church of *Scotland*, of the Church of *England*, or of the Churches of this *Country*, or to all of these: If to *all* of these, how can you justify the Reformation, in Disobedience to the Rulers in the Church of *Rome*? If to the Rulers of the Church of *England* only, let them produce their Commission, whereby they have this Power, exclusive of others; and we will obey them. But I think, you will allow, that if this Authority is
E given

given to the Rulers of *any* Church, it is given to the Rulers of *every* Church. This Claim must be every where equal. And as the Authority of every Church is equal, so their Decrees must be equally binding by vertue of that Authority. The Decrees of the *Council of Trent* must be as Obligatory upon our Consciences, as the *Canons* of an *english Convocation*.

Not will it at all help the Case, to qualify this Assertion by limiting this imaginary Power to *lawful Things*. For who must be Judge in the Case, whether these Things are lawful, or not? If the *Church of England* may determine this Case, and we must stand to her Determination, her Power is absolute, and we are under an Obligation to blind Obedience and absolute Subjection. And if your Church is Judge whether her Injunctions are lawful or not, the *Church of Rome* is also Judge whether her Injunctions are lawful or not: And those that live under her Government, are by the same Reason bound to obey in whatever she determines lawful.

But you tell us, *every Man must judge for himself whether the Ruler's Command be repugnant or God's, or not*. Now do but stand by this Concession, and the Debate is ended. We then do judge for our selves, that all this pretended Power to command, in the Points under Debate, is contrary to God's Command. We do judge for our selves, that Christ has given Power to *no* Man upon Earth, to make any such Injunctions, to ordain any such Impositions, or to vex our Consciences with any such Inventions of Men. We do judge for our selves, that Christ only is King in his Church; that here we have *but one Lawgiver, who is able to save or destroy*, Jam. iv. 12. And so by your own Confession, we are under no Obligation to Obedience in the debated Points. — If you enquire, In what

what then are we to obey them, who rule over us in the Lord? I answer, In their teaching us whatsoever Christ has commanded; and in Nothing else. It's Authority enough, to represent Christ's Person in explaining his Will to us; and we are bound to obey them when they can convince us, that what they teach is agreeable to his Will; and no further. That our Obedience to them must always terminate in Christ's Authority; and not in theirs. For we may call no Man Master, since one is our Master, even Christ. Mat. xxiii. 8, 10.

Thus I am prepared to hear you upon the main Question debated between us, Whether the Injunctions and Impositions in the Church of England are not teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, contrary to Mark vii. 7.

B. I am to prove, that the Thing reproved by our Settler was not barely the enjoining that innocent Rite of washing Hands; but the teaching that this was a Thing necessary to avoid that Defilement, that would render them displeasing and unacceptable to God. (p. 12.)

D. It seems, the Question between us is a very slippery Thing, that gets easily out of Hand, and indeed quite out of Sight. In my Sermon on this Text I endeavour'd to shew, that proposing and requiring as a religious Duty what God has not proposed as such nor required of us, the enjoining Terms of Communion which God has not enjoined, and the imposing any Terms of Communion by penal Sanctions, is teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. In Opposition to which, you in your Vindication assert, That to teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, is no more nor less, than to teach that That is a divine Law or Ordinance, which is really but an human Appointment; When Men father those

those Practices on God which have only an human Original. — That what our blessed Saviour means by teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, is to teach that human Customs are divine Laws. p. 5, 7.

In my Defence, I endeavour'd to vindicate my own Sense of this Text, and to refute yours. Your Sense of my Performance may be conjectured by this, that you are pleas'd not only wholly to overlook all my Arguments; but entirely to change the Question, and to put the Debate upon a new Foot.

How, I beseech you, came it the Matter for you to prove, that the Thing reprov'd by our Saviour was not barely enjoining that innocent Rite of washing Hands; when that which was before asserted by you, and should now be defended, was, that *what our blessed Saviour meant, was their belying God, adding to his Law, and teaching that he has command'd what he has not command'd, or forbidden that which he has no where forbidden, p. 7.* Have you now given up that Case? Do you acknowledge, that you had put the Controversy upon a wrong Issue; and that your Vindication is indefensible; that you have nothing to say in Proof of these Assertions, Nothing in Answer to my Arguments against them?

Besides, you know that this is what I never oppos'd. It was not *bare Injunctions*; but Church-Injunctions, religious Injunctions; and the making these Injunctions Terms of Communion, that I supposed to be condemn'd by our blessed Saviour, and to be *teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.* So that all your Pains is quite Cost; and all your Reasoning a meer trifling Impertinence.

You tell us, that the Thing reprov'd by our Saviour was the *teaching, that this was a Thing necessary to avoid that Defilement, that would render them displeasing*

displeasing and unacceptable to God But what I pray is this to the Purpose? How does this justify your Vindication, that had taught so very different a Doctrine? Is it the same Thing to teach, that this is *necessary* as a Tradition of the Elders, to avoid that Defilement that would render them displeasing to God; and to teach that this was a *divine Command*?

And how does this acquit the Church of England from the same Charge here laid against the Pharisees? Don't they also teach, that Conformity to their Institutions is *necessary* to avoid that Defilement, that would render us displeasing and unacceptable to God? And don't you your self also teach us the same Thing? What mean these hideous Outcries of damning Schism, with which we are attacked from every Quarter, for our Nonconformity to the Church's Institutions? Is there no Defilement in Schism, that renders Men displeasing to God? How came we all to be excommunicated by your Canon? Will your Church excommunicate Men for such Things as have no Defilement in them, that renders them displeasing to God? Don't you your self represent us as guilty of *Rebellion which is as the Sin of Witchcraft*? And is there no Defilement in Rebellion and Witchcraft, that renders Men displeasing to God? Be so kind as to tell me, are we under any religious Obligation to observe your Church's Impositions, or not?

B *Primarily and of it self the Law of God only obliges the Conscience; because God only has a direct Power over the Conscience; but ecclesiastical Laws indirectly and by Vertue of God's Law* When therefore in such Cases we obey the Commands of our Rulers, we don't so properly obey them, as God. (p. 16.) When these Circumstantials are once determined by human Authority, they cease to be indifferent to Subjects, tho' they

they remain indifferent still in their own Nature. (p. 19)

D. Well then, I hope we shall hear no more of these Things being indifferent, since you own that they cease to be indifferent to Subjects, when once they are determined by human Authority. Are not all the contested Rites and Institutions of your Church, determined by human Authority? And therefore, whatever they were originally in their own Nature, do they not by this Conclusion of yours cease to be indifferent now they are determined? I hope you won't pretend, that they are indifferent and not indifferent at the same Time. — I hope also you will no longer pretend, that you place no Religion in these Things, since you tell us, when in such Cases we obey the Commands of our Rulers; we don't so properly obey them as God. For all Religion consists in Nothing else but Obedience to him.

And to apply this to the present Question: If these Things being determined by human Authority, are become necessary to Subjects, is there no Defilement in the Neglect of necessary Duties, that will render us displeasing and unacceptable to God? If these Institutions are to be observed in Obedience to God, is there no Defilement in Disobedience to God, that will render us displeasing and unacceptable to him? Thus you see; that all your Pains upon this Subject might have been well spared, unless your Reasonings had been more to the Purpose. — It would be but a trifling Mispence of Time, to take any Notice of your impertinent evading the Point in Debate; and your artful changing the Question between us.

In a Word, turn which Way you will or can, this Charge will stick too close to be shaken off. Whatever Church enjoin their own Instructions in religious Affairs upon the Consciences of Men, are

are by your Concessions, chargeable (in the same Respect that the Pharisees were) with teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. If it were supposed, as was asserted in your Vindication, that the Pharisees Guilt lay in teaching that human Customs are divine Laws * Don't you your self teach the same Thing? when you tell us, that your ecclesiastical Laws do oblige us indirectly, and by Vertue of God's Law; and when in such Cases we obey our Rulers, we don't so properly obey them as God. They taught, (you say) that their Observances were a divine Command. † You teach, that your Institutions must be observed by Vertue of God's Law; and that it's our Duty to obey, and that in Obedience to God. † Now I entreat you to shew me the Difference between your Doctrine and theirs. They require their Observances as Commands of God. You require yours in Obedience to God; and consequently because God has commanded them. How can they be observed by Vertue of God's Law, if God's Law don't require it; or in other Words, if God don't command it? Whether this Command be direct or indirect, it's Nothing to the Purpose, as long as you require our Conformity to your own Inventions, as much as the Pharisees did, in Obedience to God; and by Vertue of his Law

If it be supposed, as you now assert, that the Pharisees Crime lay in teaching, that this was a Thing necessary to avoid that Defilement, which would render them unacceptable and displeasing to God; Don't you also teach the same Thing, when you tell us, that when once these Circumstantial are determin'd by human Authority, they cease to be indifferent to Subjects? That is, they become

* p. 7. † p. 6. † Appeal p. 11,

necessary

necessary Duties. And I'm sure, it's a Defilement displeasing to God, to neglect necessary Duties; unless our Obedience be indifferent and necessary at the same Time.

If it be supposed, as you tell us in your *Appeal* p. 12. that the Pharisees enjoin'd their Observance of these Things, *without any Regard to human Authority imposing or requiring it*: Yet you your self do in Effect teach the same Thing, when you tell us, that *we don't so properly obey our Rulers in these Observances, as God*. That is, that the required Obedience is properly to be performed, not to our Rulers, but immediately to God: or in other Words, that we obey *without Regard to human Authority*; but properly with Regard to God's Authority, imposing or requiring our Obedience: The very Thing you condemn in the Pharisees. If this Imagination of yours, which you so strongly assert without any Proof, or possibility of Proof, were therefore indeed the Case of the Pharisees, I don't see how it will help you. I can't understand what Difference you can possibly make, between your Case and theirs; unless it be proved, that it's more innocent in it self to impose all your Rites, Ceremonies, and unscriptural Institutions upon the Consciences of Men, than for the Pharisees to enjoyn the washing of Hands before Meat.

If you object against all this, that the Pharisees esteem'd it a *moral Evil* to omit the washing of Hands, before Meat; I would enquire, whether you esteem it a *moral Evil*, or not, to refuse Subjection to the Impositions of the Church of *England*? If so, if it be *Rebellion which is as the Sin of Witchcraft*, if it be *Disobedience to God*, to refuse Subjection to these Things: The Sentence is yet pass'd from your own Mouth; and by your Decree the Case is the same. But it seems a *moral Evil*

Evil, we are under no moral Obligation to observe your Injunctions ; and are guilty of no Sin in rejecting them. Now try your Skill. Fasten, if you can, any Fault upon the *Pharisees* in the Case before us, that won't by the same Argument be chargeable upon any Church in the World, that impose human Impositions in religious Affairs upon Men's Conscience.

B. *Is it not undeniably evident, that the Pharisees taught People, that if they did not wash their Hands before they eat, some of the Filth might mix with their Food, and go down into their Heart or Soul, and pollute it ; and so render them detestable in the Sight of God. The Truth is, the Pharisees had made a Religion which consisted in their own superstitious Opinions and Conceits, about washing Hands, Cups, Pots, brazen Vessels, and Tables, Mark vii. 4. Those human Inventions were taught for Doctrines, i. e. divine Ordinances. p. 14.*

D. I shall not spend Time to make any Reflections upon your *Anatomy*, nor to compare it with your *Divinity*. You would perhaps not take it kindly, if I should enquire of you, what Passage you find for the Food into the Heart, or what Part or Nook of the *Soul* the *Pharisees* supposed the Food went into for Concoction, when it went down into the *Heart* or *Soul*, and polluted it. But that which I'm to consider is, in what Respect the Doctrine of the *Pharisees* was more superstitious than the Doctrines of any Church in the World, that enjoin and impose their own Impositions upon Men's Consciences in the Worship of God. What is *Superstition*, but a religious Injunction or Observance, that God has not commanded or required ? Now let this be apply'd to your Impositions. Has
 F God

God required Obedience to these, or has he not? If you tell us, he has required Obedience to them, shew us the Statute, and we submit. If he has not required Obedience to them, they are *supra Statutum*; and it is Superstition to impose them upon our Consciences.

But the Pharisees (you say) taught these human Inventions for Doctrines, i. e. divine Ordinances. And pray don't you teach your human Inventions for Doctrines too? Don't you teach us to observe them even in the Worship of God? And don't you even teach, that they are divine Ordinances, when you require our Observance of them in Obedience to God, and by Vertue of his Law?

B. Christ never condemned the Use of innocent and indifferent Rites, when they were not taught as divine Ordinances. Nay tho' they in Authority did abuse their Power, binding heavy Burthens and grievous to be born; yet said he to his Disciples, the Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses's Chair, all therefore they bid you observe, that observe and do. Mar. xxiii. 1, 2. (p. 15.)

D. It's most certain, that Christ did forbid the Use of this innocent and indifferent Rite of washing Hands before Meat, when it was enjoind as a religious Duty; tho' there be not a Word in all the Context (nor have you pretended to bring the least Evidence but your own Assertion) that they taught this to be a divine Ordinance. It's plain from the Text: It's plain from the Words of the Prophet, from whom our Saviour quoted this Text, that the bare imposing their own Institutions as religious Duties, the bare teaching their own Precepts as religious Observances, was the Thing condemned by our blessed Saviour. *Their Fear towards me* (says the Prophet) *is taught by the Pre-*
cepts

cepts of Men, Isa. xxix. 13. That is (says a famous Expositor upon the Place) they *Worship me, not in such a Way and Manner as I have commanded and perscribed: but according to their own, and other Men's Inventions.* Not a Word in the Prophet, not a Word in the Evangelist, of any Pretence that these Things were divine Commands: This is the meer chimerical Imagination of Mr. *Beach*, and the Authors he copies from. It's true, they thought it a *Defilement*, not to observe the Tradition of the *Elders*; and so does every Church practically declare, that enjoin their own religious Appointments upon Men's Consciences. But how (I beseech you) does that prove, that they taught these Precepts to be immediately divine Ordinances?

Does *Christ* never condemn the Use of innocent and indifferent Rites, when they are not taught as divine Ordinances? Yes, Sir, *Christ* ever condemns the Use of any Rites (how indifferent soever) being imposed upon Men's Consciences, and made the Matter of religious Worship. Matth. xx. 25, 26. *The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion; and they that are great, exercise Authority upon them: but it shall not be so with you.* Matth. xxii. 10. *Neither be ye called Master, for one is your Master, even Christ.* Matth. xxviii. 18, 20. *All Power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth: go ye therefore &c. teaching them to observe all Things, whatsoever I have commanded you.* Rom. xiv. 4, 10, 13, 15, 21. *Who art thou that judgest another Man's Servant? To his own Master he standeth or falleth, But why dost thou judge thy Brother, or why dost thou set at nought thy Brother? Let us not therefore judge one another any more; but judge this rather, that no Man put a stumbling Block, or Occasion to fall, in his Brother's Way. But if thy Brother be grieved with thy Meat, now walkest thou*

thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy Meat, for whom Christ died. It is good neither to eat Flesh, nor to drink Wine, or any Thing whereby thy Brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak Gal. v. 1, 12, 13. Stand fast therefore in the Liberty where-with Christ has made us free; and be not entangled again with the Yoke of Bondage. I would they were even cut off which trouble you. For, Brethren, ye have been called unto Liberty Col ii 8. Beware lest any Man spoil you through Philosophy and vain Deceit, after the Tradition of Men after the Rudiments of the World; and not after Christ Jam iv. 12 There is one Lawgiver, who is able to save or destroy. Who art thou that judgest another? In these and many other Places of Scripture, does our Lord deny to all the Men in the World, any Authority to impose upon Men's Consciences; and condemns all such Impositions, whatever Pretences to Indifferency may be made by the Imposers.

It's true, our blessed Saviour did require his Disciples to hearken to the Scribes and Pharisees Doctrine: but this must be understood to imply such Doctrine only, as was agreeable to the Word of God. For in the following Verses, he forbids his Disciples to imitate them; and forbids them to call either the Pharisees or any Men else Masters; so that they were to observe what they bid them do, with this Limitation, that they acknowledged no Master but Christ, verse 10. And consequently they were not allowed to submit to any of their own Inventions, Dictates, or Injunctions.

B. Consider the monstrous Consequences that necessarily follow your Position, that we must not submit to the most innocent or indifferent Rites when enjoined by lawful Authority. If this be allowed of, then there can be no such Thing as Obedience to Rulers. The Scripture is
very

very full and express in requiring us to submit to them that have the Rule over us, and obey them: but now there is no Room for this Submission, if we will not allow them to interpose their Authority, in such Things as are indifferent and innocent.

D. Here again you have entirely changed the Question between us; and have therefore spent a great deal of Pains to no Purpose. The Question in Debate is, Whether any Authority in the Church may impose any human Institutions in God's Worship, and in religious Affairs, upon the Consciences of Men; and whether we are under any Obligation to obey such Institutions, how innocent and indifferent soever they may be in themselves, abstracted from the Consideration of their religious Use, and human Original? This is the State of the Case between us, as it was particularly considered in the Sermon you oppose. And the Affirmative in this Question is what you ought now to have proved, if you would say any Thing to the Purpose: But it seems, you thought you could harangue more plausibly upon another Subject. And therefore rather chose to lose the Subject in Debate, than to lose an Opportunity of Insult and Triumph. But let us consider the Case in a proper Light; and see whether any of these monstrous Consequences that you speak of, will necessarily follow from my Position.

You must remember, that the Extent of our Obedience either to natural or civil Rulers, in Affairs that are under their Cognizance, is quite out of the Question; and therefore all the fine Flourishes in your *Appeal*, serve for no other Purpose, but to set off the Promptness of your fruitful Invention. And as to ecclesiastical Rulers, 'twould not have been improper for you to have laid the
Foundation

Foundation of your Insults, upon some Pretence of Proof, that there is such Authority by Heaven committed to them, as I am impleading. For, as Mr. *Chillingworth* observes, "Man cannot be obliged by Man; but to what either *formally* or *virtually* he is obliged by God; for, all just Power is from God.

You charge it as my Position, that we must not submit to the most innocent and indifferent Rite when enjoin'd by lawful Authority; and if you had added, when the lawful Authority enjoin such Rite as a Part of the Worship of God, make it a religious Duty, or impose it upon Men's Consciences, I own it to be my Position. For in such Case, the lawful Authority go beyond their Power; and invade the Prerogative of the great Head and King of the Church. Their Injunctions are not therefore to be submitted to, out of any Regard to their Authority imposing them upon us. I have said something to this already, that will (I think) help to illustrate and confirm this Position. Let us now see what Work it will make, to invert this Proposition; and assert the contrary for Truth.

If you contradict what I delivered in my Sermon, and have endeavoured to defend, you must assert; That it's always our Duty to submit to those Rites and Institutions, that are originally and of themselves innocent and indifferent, when they are made religious Duties, brought into the Worship of God, made Terms of Communion, and imposed upon our Consciences, by the lawful Authority in the Church. Is this Doctrine true, or is it not? I think you must acknowledge, that it's either true or false. If false, all human Institutions in the Affairs of Religion, all Church-Impositions, all Terms of Communion which Christ has not appointed, must fall to the Ground; and the Debate

bate between you & me is decided against you. For how innocent and indifferent soever originally and in themselves, all your Hierarchy, all the Constitutions and Institutions of your Church, and all your Rites and Ceremonies of human Invention, may be imagined; yet their being made religious Duties, their being brought into the Worship of God, and imposed upon our Consciences, expose them as much as any others, to be rejected, if we are not always under Bonds of Obedience to the Authority that impose such Things upon us. I must therefore necessarily suppose, that you hold this Doctrine for true. Your Cause requires that you should, and both your Books are a meer impertinent Evasion, if you do not hold it for Truth. Let us then consider the Consequences, and see which Position affords those that are most monstrous, yours or mine.

The wetting our Fingers in Water, is certainly in it self an innocent Action: How then came the Church of *England* to scruple and leave off the Use of *Holy Water*, when they entered the Church, since it was required by the lawful Authority of the Church of *Rome*? And since Uction is a harmless Action, how comes it about that the Church of *England* while it retains the Cross in Baptism, has thrown out *Chrism*? The making the Sign of the Cross, you must acknowledge in it self an innocent Action: Why then don't you, as formerly, cross your selves upon all Occasions, in Conversation as well as in Worship, and in one Part of Worship as well as in another? The bowing the Head, or the Knee, is in it self an innocent indifferent Rite: What Reason can there be to scruple doing this before the Image of a Saint, and before a *Crucifix*, any more than toward the *Altar*? Thus you see how quick this Doctrine will lead us to
Rome.

Rome. For you know that all these Things, and multitudes more of the like Nature, are required by the lawful Authority in that Church. And I am afraid that this Doctrine will even carry us further than *Rome*, if we receive it in all it's necessary Consequences. What can be in it self more innocent, than throwing a little *Frankincense* into the *Fire*? What then ail'd the Croud of *Martyrs* in the heathen Persecutions, to sacrifice their Lives to their own Obstinacy, rather than burn a little of this fragrant Gum in an *Idol's Temple*, when commanded by the supreme Authority in the State, and high Priest in that Pagan Church; and even when they were allowed to reserve the inward Thought and View to themselves? And it's more than an innocent Thing, to eat Victuals when hungry: What hurt then canit be to eat well dressed Food, when one is hungry, in an *Idol's Temple*, if it be required by lawful Authority? And yet the Apostle *Paul* was so scrupulous, as to forbid it; and to call it a *partaking of the Table of Devils*, 1. Cor. x. 21 ---- What say you to these Things? Do you scruple any of them? Won't you obey the Authority that requires these innocent and indifferent Rites! Why, *there's no Room at all for your Submission to Authority, if you won't allow them to interpose in such Things as are indifferent and innocent, as all these Things are originally and in themselves.*

But perhaps you would further limit this Rule of our Obedience; and tell us, that we are only to submit to those Rites and Institutions, that are in all their Circumstances, after their Imposition, innocent and indifferent. But then you your self have assured us, that there can be no such Case; and that the Imposition it self takes away their Indifferency. You have taught us, that *when once these Circum-*
stantials

stantials are determined by human Authority, they cease to be indifferent to Subjects ; that is, they become necessary Duties. And therefore you must by this Rule, be bound to observe all these Things I have newly mention'd ; or at least they must all be thus bound, that live under Popish and Pagan Government.

Besides, for you to say, that the Things in Debate between you and me are innocent and indifferent after they are imposed, would be a barefaced begging the Question. The very Thing you opposed, and what you ought to have disprov'd, was, that there are no human Institutions in religious Worship, no Impositions upon Men's Consciences, innocent and indifferent after their Imposition, how innocent and indifferent soever originally and of themselves. This was what I endeavoured to prove ; and it was your Business to have answered my Arguments : but this you have never attempted. It does not therefore make a very good Appearance, for you now to take this for granted, without any Proof.

But if you were allowed this Limitation, it won't at all help your Cause. For who must be Judges, whether these religious Injunctions are innocent and indifferent, in all their Circumstances, after they are imposed ? Must the Imposers judge ? If so, they'll be sure to judge in their own Favour. The Papists themselves will never plead Guilty. They'll determine, that all their Institutions are innocent and indifferent ; and they that live under their Government must notwithstanding this Limitation, submit to them all. But if we must judge for ourselves, there are none of 'em innocent and indifferent when once they are imposed ; and so we are not bound to Obedience to any of 'em, to one religious Injunction more than another

ther. Here again I provoke you to try your Skill ; and see if you can by any Art avoid " *the monstrous Consequences that necessarily follow your Position.*"

B. *Your Gloss upon this Text is one of the wildest and most extravagant Fancies that ever was published in the World ; That an innocent and lawful Thing becomes unlawful, when once it's commanded by lawful Authority ; when it's so far from that, that then it becomes a Duty. (p. 17.)*

D. Well, then it ceases to be indifferent as soon as it is commanded ; for it is not indifferent whether Duty be perform'd or not. If it by this Means becomes a Duty, then there must be no Limitation to our Obedience in this Case. All Things that are indifferent in themselves, lose their Indifferency as soon as commanded. They become a Duty ; and must be observed as soon as required and enjoin'd by the lawful Authority in the Church of *Rome*, or any where else, as well as when enjoin'd by the lawful Authority of the Church of *England*. But how does this become a Duty ? Is it by Virtue of the Authority that commands it ? If so, it is the Duty of all under the papal Government, to obey all their Injunctions before considered. For they are all innocent and indifferent in themselves ; are all commanded ; and they have determin'd of 'em all, that they are innocent after their Injunction. I hope you won't pretend to that Authority in your Church, that you will allow no where else. If you pretend to found this Duty of Obedience upon God's Authority, that requires Subjection to Rulers, this also brings all the same Consequences upon you. For this Doctrine is just as true at the *Vatican*, as at *Lambeth* ; and you are as much bound to obey Autho-

rity at *Rome*, as in *England*; as I have observ'd before.

To sum up all in a Word: We must allow Submission to all religious Injunctions and Impositions upon Men's Consciences of human Invention, which the Imposers are pleased to call innocent and indifferent; or we must deny a Submission to all such Injunctions. They are all of 'em a Duty, or none of 'em a Duty. There is no possible Medium. Distinguish here, if you can; and set such Limitations to this Duty of ecclesiastical Obedience, in the Affairs of Religion and Conscience, as won't either exempt us from any Obligation to Conformity to the Church of *England*, or else oblige all that live in Popish Countries, to a Conformity to the Church of *Rome*.

B. *Well, since you have concluded that the Scriptures don't expressly forbid saying Mass, I would have you rub your Forehead once more; and e'en face us down, that it's as lawful to go to Mass as to go to Church.*
(p. 33.)

D. How often have I told you, though I acknowledge there is the greatest Difference in the Nature of the Things imposed, in the Church of *Rome*, and in the Church of *England*, that I could yet see no Difference at all in the Authority to impose them. But since you still insist upon this Point, let us consider the Case a little distinctly.

The Church of *Rome* hath (without any Scripture Pattern or Precept) appointed an *Hierarchy*, consisting of *Arch-Bishops, Arch-Deacons, Prebendaries, Rectors, Curates* &c. which are also to be found in your Church. The Church of *Rome* hath also appointed a Number of *Cardinals, Abbots, Monks*, and in a

Word a variety of Orders, both regular and secular, which your Church hath rejected. Now I would enquire, what Authority that Church hath to appoint the former of these Orders, which she hath not to appoint the latter, since both are human Institutions, without any Foundation in Scripture. The Church of *England* have set up spiritual Courts, consisting of Laymen, such as *Chancellors, Commissioners, Proctors, Apparators, &c.* with Power to inflict pecuniary and corporal Punishments, upon the Transgressors of their ecclesiastical Laws. The Church of *Rome* have set up an Inquisition, to inflict corporal Punishment in like Cases. I again enquire, what Authority the Church of *England* hath, for the one of these Courts, that the Church of *Rome* hath not for the other? The Church of *England* have a *Prayer Book* of human Invention, which they impose upon their People, as the Medium of Devotion, and a Term of Communion. The Church of *Rome* also hath a *Prayer-Book* of human Invention, which they likewise impose in the same Manner. And I entreat you to tell me, what Authority you have to impose your Liturgy, which they have not to impose theirs. The Church of *England* use the Sign of the *Cross* at Baptism: The Church of *Rome* use it in various other Cases. And have not they the same Authority for their Use of the Sign of the *Cross*, as you have for yours? The Church of *England* have a Book of *Canons*, by which you excommunicate all Dissenters: The Church of *Rome* have Books of *Canons* or *Decretals*, by which they excommunicate all Hereticks. And han't they the same Authority that you have, to excommunicate all that reject their unscriptural Institutions? I might mention a great many other Instances of the same Kind, to exemplify the Case. But do
you

you your self think of what Instance you please; and the same Consequences will follow. I am at an utter Loss what Answer you can give to this, if you will undertake to answer to the Purpose. If you tell me, that the popish Impositions are in themselves sinful; and are therefore to be rejected: I allow it to be true. But what Answer will you give to such an Exception against your Impositions, if it should happen to be made? What Answer can you give to the Objection that is constantly made, that all these Impositions upon Men's Consciences are always in themselves sinful; that the Church of *Rome* mayn't likewise make in Vindication of theirs? You esteem yours agreeable to the Scripture, and they esteem theirs so. And whoever conscienciously scruples either the one or the other, are of a contrary Opinion. There can be therefore no dernier Resort in this Case, no Decision, but *Church-Authority*, which I think must be acknowledged equal both in *Rome* and in *England*, which was the Thing to be proved.— In a Word, there can be no Reason given for your monopolizing this Church-Authority to your selves. And therefore you must approve of it in *Rome*, as well as in *England*; or acknowledge that both are obliged to leave those Things indifferent, which Christ has left so. And why is it not so done?

B. *When you ask, why they did not leave those Things indifferent, you may as well ask, why they took any Care about the Worship of God? And why they did not leave every Man to his Fancy and wild Humour?*
(p. 19.)

D. Won't this Argument sound as well from the Mouth of a Papist, as a Protestant? Is there
not

not as much Occasion to take Care of the Worship of God in Rome, as an England? Are Men any more to be left to their Fancies and wild Humours, in the one than the other Church? But how trifling is this Pretence, wherever it is made? If they leave every Thing indifferent, which Christ has left indifferent, there will be the same Care taken about the Worship of God, which our blessed Lord himself has taken; and is not that sufficient Care of the Worship of God? They will in this Case leave no Man more to his Fancy and wild Humour, than Christ himself has done. Consider therefore where this Imputation will terminate.

B. I will also ask you the same Question. Suppose I should turn Dissenter again, and have a Mind to join with you: Why will you not leave those Things indifferent, which Christ has left indifferent? Why will you impose upon me those Terms of Communion, which Christ has not imposed? Why will you oblige me to receive the Sacrament at Noon, in leavened Bread, at the Hands of a Layman, when you allow Christ never appointed these Things? Why will you impose upon me a Prayer of your own Invention, when a well digested Form that I am acquainted with before hand is to me much better and more edifying? Why will you oblige me to pull off my Hat at the Lord's Table, when Christ allows us a friendly Familiarity with him at his Table, and never commanded Men to put off their Hats? And why must I conform to many other Ceremonies, which God has left indifferent? Answer this Question honestly; and you will answer your own with the same Breath. (p. 19)

D. I have told you before, that it's impossible to perform any religious Duty, without the necessary and natural Circumstances, that belong to all our

our Actions; and upon which they depend. Now it can be no Imposition upon Men's Consciences, no Infringement of their Freedom and Liberty, to perform the Duties, which God has required of us, some Way or other; nor to determine which of those necessary Circumstances are most agreeable to the Solemnity of the Duty, or the State of our Churches. Thus much we are obliged to, by the Precept which enjoins the Duty upon us; and by the very Law of Nature, which is the Law of God. And whatever, more than this, you can find enjoin'd in our Churches, I freely give up to you. For I acknowledge that Impositions are at least as bad among us, as among you.

These Things being premised, let your Instances be considered. You demand why I oblige you to receive the Sacrament at Noon, in leaven'd Bread, at the Hands of a Layman? To which I answer as before, that Christ has required us to observe this Ordinance; but has not determin'd whether at Noon or at Night, whether in leaven'd or unleaven'd Bread, whether it shall be handed about, after Consecration, by the Minister or some other. And it's absolutely necessary, that in each of these Cases it be done some Way or other; and here *Wisdom is profitable to direct*. But if you scruple this Method of partaking of the Ordinance; and can find a sufficient Number to join with you, I will administer it to you at Evening, in unleaven'd Bread; and carry about the Elements with my own Hands after the Consecration, rather than wound your Conscience. And what can you desire more?

But you demand again, *Why will you impose upon me a Prayer of your own Invention &c?* I answer, I think conceived Prayers grounded on divine Institution; and crave the Liberty of acting in this im-
portant

portant Duty according to my own Conscience. And is this imposing upon you? Then you are imposed upon by every one that don't think as you think, and practice as you practice. Besides, this is agreeable to your own Practice, in making a Prayer of your own before Sermon, *allowed* (you tell us) by your *Canons*. (p. 41.) Whether you are allowed this Liberty, I shall not divert at present to dispute (consult your famous *Bennet's Treatise of the Joyn't Use of Prayer*, who is fully in the Negative) but supposing it, I argue, How then are you imposed upon by *our* performing that Duty agreeable to *your own Opinion and Practice*; unless we will also perform it in all the Methods that you are pleased to invent and require? — But you say, *a well invented Form is to you much better, and more edifying*. You are then welcome to use such a Form, and act according to your own Persuasion; and may yet be treated by us as Brethren in all Respects. How trifling is your Pretence of Imposition in this Case, on our Part?

You further demand, *Why will you oblige me to pull off my Hat at the Lord's Table?* I answer, I don't know, that ever any Body was obliged to this, or ever needed any other Obligation, than the natural Laws of Decency; and the express Declaration of the Apostle, that a Man ought not to cover his Head in publick Worship, 1 Cor. xi. 7.

It is, I confess, Matter of Surprise to me, that you can so much as pretend to find among us a Parallel to your Impositions: when there are to many human Inventions imposed upon Men's Consciences in your Church, which you can't pretend to be natural and necessary Circumstances; nor founded on divine Institution, as all those Things are (according to our best Judgment of Things) which you except against. And yet we are declared

Declared *ipso Facto* excommunicated by your Canons, for not approving these Things.

B. You say, that our Canons do declare all that dissent from the Church *ipso Facto* excommunicate: That is, such Persons excommunicate themselves. (p. 21.)

D. No, Sir, they don't excommunicate themselves. They would gladly have remain'd Members of the Church of England, with Liberty of their Consciences in these Points: But were excommunicated by a juridical Sentence of your Convocation. Witness the Multitudes of Petitions that were made to this Purpose; and one that was signed with a thousand Hands: And Witness the two famous Conferences, that at the Saxons and that in the first of William and Mary.

B. Presbyterians, Independants, Baptists, Lutherans, and Calvinists are allowed to come to our Communion; and many such do actually come, and are welcome. We don't impose upon People's Consciences such a tyrannical Yoke as you do; and oblige 'em by a particular Covenant, to continue with your own Church: But with us it is quite otherwise; any good Christian may come, and receive the Sacrament with us to Day, and to Morrow, if he sees Cause, he may join with you. (p. 92, 100.)

D. What you mean by a particular Covenant to continue with our own Churches, I don't know: and can consider it only, as some News you are pleased to tell me. And I have only this Remark to make upon it, that if it be News concerning any Thing that I am acquainted with, I must suppose it to refer to the late Minister at New Town, before he was enlightned and brought into the
H
best

best constituted Church in the World ; or else it must be suspicious News, that wants Confirmation.

As to any good Christian's communicating indifferently with your Church & with us, *with the one to Day, and with the other to Morrow*, which you say he may do ; I ask, may he do it by Authority of your Canons ? which forbid *Schismatics* the Communion of your Church, and some that I hope are good Christians bear that Character, in your Canons. Or may he do it with Approbation of the most celebrated Defenders of your Church ? Have they not loudly condemned such a Practice, compar'd it to *Adultery* ; and pronounc'd it as *contrary to all Principles of Church-Communion, as any Thing possibly can be* ?* I doubt, very few of your Brethren will stand by you in the Concession you have made.

But I would enquire, *Upon what Terms* Presbyterians, Independants, Baptists, Lutherans, and Calvinists are allowed to come to your Communion ? Can they have their Children baptized in your Church, without the scrupled Institutions of Sureties and the Sign of the Cross ? Can they be admitted to the Lord's Table, and be allowed the Posture that their Consciences tell them it's their Duty to use ? Can they be abated one Ragg of a Ceremony, for the Sake of their Consciences, or for the Peace of the Church ? Or may any of these be allowed to be Members of the Church of *England*, without a compleat Conformity to

* These are the Words of Dr. Sherlock, in his Resolution of that Case, *Whether it be lawful to communicate with two distinct and separate Churches,*

every of your Injunctions, how unscriptural and unreasonable soever they may appear to them? It seems we are greatly obliged to the Church of *England*, that they will allow us to be the Boat, and they the Bank; that they'll allow us to approve and submit to all their Institutions, whether we think them Right or Wrong.

Thus I have (I think) said enough to clear the Point in Debate; and given a sufficient Answer to all that you have said in your *Appeal*, tho' I have not particularly considered some Things there offered, which do not so immediately affect the present Controversy. And I am now ready to attend upon what you have further to offer; and shall only premise, that if we are bound to Obedience to these religious Injunctions, by Vertue of the supreme *Civil* Authority's enjoining or establishing them, you would do well to clear it up to us, what Establishment we are here in this Country bound to submit to. The Church of *Scotland* is as much established as the Church of *England*; and by the same Authority; and that Establishment as much extends to this Country as the other; and consequently the *Presbyterians* in this Country act as agreeable to the Determination of our Rulers, as you do. If such Determination binds our Consciences here, you are bound in Conscience to be a *Presbyterian*, as well as an *Episcopalian* "As for the Authority of your Church (so speak in Mr. *Chillingworth's* Language) That is no common Principle agreed upon betwen us, and therefore from that you are not to dispute against us: We might press you with our Judgment as well and as justly as you do us with your's" —
Can any Bishop of your Church claim Authority over any in this Country but free Consenters? Or can any Command of his be of Force to oblige
H 2 such

such Ministers as have never taken the Oath of Canonical Obedience? What human Law is our Nonconformity to your Church a Breach of? Can we be said to disobey lawful Authority in refusing your Ceremonies, when they were never enjoined on us? As Mr. Baxter expostulated (Anno 1658) "What's all this to such Counties as this where I live, and most else in England, that know of no Bishop they have (and they rejected none) nor doth any come and command them Obedience? Must we be unchristened, unchurch'd and damned, for not obeying, when we have none to obey, nor none that calls for our Obedience?"

B. Come we now to your Charge of Will-Worship: Here you find a deal of Fault with Dr. Patrick's Definition, and spend some Pages to prove, that Will-Worship is that Worship which is founded upon the Will of Man, With all my Heart, Let us be tryed by your Definition, and I am sure we shall be justified: For we have no Worship but what is founded on the Will of God. But tho' it be an easy Thing to vindicate the Church, yet I think it impossible to free such Separatists as you from the Folly of Will-Worship. For you say as the Will-Worshippers in St. Paul's Time, Touch not, taste not, handle not, — that is, don't kneel in the most solemn Acts of Worship, even when you receive the Body and Blood of the Son of God; don't hear a Chapter out of the Apocrypha; don't submit to the Bishops, tho' they be Christ's Ministers, and the King's too. (p. 27, 28.)

D. You allow, that Will-Worship is that Worship which is founded upon the Will of Man. Well, Let us then consider, whether you have no Worship but what is founded upon the Will of

of God; and whether there be no *Will-Worship* among you, in the Apostles Sense of *Will-Worship*, in that second Chapter to the *Colossians*.

I before observ'd to you in my *Defence*, that the imposing of *Meats, Drinks, and holy Days* were instanced in the 16th Verse of that Chapter; *Voluntary Humility* in the 18th; *The Rudiments of the World and human Ordinances* in the 20th; forbidding to *touch, taste, or handle*, in the 21st; all the *Commandments of Men* in the 22d Verse; as being a *Shew of Wisdom in Will-Worship*, Verse 23. But it seems this touched you too nearly, to admit an Answer; and you have taken the safest Course, not to say a Word about it. But pray, Sir, allow me to consider the Case. Have you no *holy Days* of human Appointment in your Church? Have you no *voluntary Humility*, for Instance, in your making *Kneeling at the Lord's Supper* a necessary Term of Communion, which Christ never appointed; but gave us a contrary Example, when he himself instituted and celebrated that holy Ordinance? Have you no *human Ordinances*? Don't you your self acknowledge, that all your Rites and Ceremonies are meerly of human Original? Don't your Church forbid to *touch taste or handle*, when the appoints ninety five Days of Fasting or Abstinence every Year? Have you no *Commandments of Men*, when your Canons enjoin upon us the Observation of all these Things, upon Pain of Excommunication? I can't imagine how these Things were *Will-Worship* among the *Colossians*; and not *Will-Worship* among you. Pray, Sir, be pleased to shew us any Difference between their Case and yours, if you possibly can. Shew us how the Nature of these Things came to be changed, when imposed by you, from what it was when they were imposed upon them.

But

But it seems we are the Persons chargeable with *Will-Worship*, because we say *Touch not, taste not, handle not*; when we refuse Subjection to your Institutions. I think what is said above makes it evident, that your Impositions are according to the Determination of the Apostle in the Text under Consideration, all of them *Will-Worship*. And if your Arguings be just, it is a just Conclusion, that it's *Will-Worship* to refuse *Will-Worship*. But before this Conclusion be taken for granted, you should prove one of these three Things; either that *Will-Worship* is lawful in your Church; or that what was *Will-Worship* among the *Colossians*, is not so among you; or else that the Imposition *Will-Worship* by ecclesiastical Rulers takes away the Evil of it; and makes it a Duty. One of these three Things must be proved; or else all your fine Reasonings must fall to the Ground.

B. *The Crime of the old Will-Worshippers lay--- in teaching that that was lawful in it self, which really was lawful; that some Things were sinful, which God had no where forbidden, which is manifestly your Case.* (p. 29.)

D. I have already shewn, that it consisted also in all Sorts of human Inventions and Impositions in the Affairs of Religion and Conscience. But suppose yours to be a full Account of the Matter, how (I pray you) is it manifestly our Case? I cannot take your Word for it, that God has no where forbidden a Subjection to such Institutions and Impositions as yours are. God has required us to stand fast in the Liberty wherewith Christ has made us free; and not to be entangled again in a Yoke of Bondage, Gal. v. 1. Not to be brought under the Power of any, even in Things in themselves lawful, 1 Cor. vi 12.

Not

v. 12.

Not to give Place by Subjection, no not for an Hour, to those that would spy out our Liberty, and bring us into Bondage, Gal. ii. 4, 5. He has required us to acknowledge no Master but Christ, Matth. xxiii. 8. as I have shewed you before. So that whatever Charges you are pleased to lay against us, we are acquitted by a higher Judge.

But suppose we are weak Brethren, in these debated Points, and make wrong Inferences from Scripture and the Nature of Things; This I must acknowledge possible; for we are but fallible Men: How should we then be treated by you, if this be the Case; or which is all one, if you imagine this to be the Case? The Apostle answers this Question particularly. Take heed (says he) lest by any Means, this Liberty of yours prove a Stumbling-Block to them that are weak. Through thy Knowledge shall thy weak Brother Perish, for whom Christ dyed? When ye so sin against the Brethren and wound their weak Consciences, ye sin against Christ, 1 Cor. viii. 9, 11, 12. Him that is weak in the Faith, receive you; but not to doubtful Disputations. Who art thou that judgest another Man's Servant, to his own Master he standeth or falleth. For Meats destroy not the Work of God. All Things indeed are pure; but it's Evil for that Man who eateth with Offence. Rom. xiv. 1, 4, 20.

Nay let us further suppose, that we are in a Mistake in our conscientious Scruples of those Things, that are in themselves innocent and indifferent, & no where forbidden in Scripture: Yet This is a Mistake which we sincerely profess we cannot help. And will Christ reject us or our Services, for such a Mistake? No, we may expect more Mercy from him in this Case, than we can find from you. It's certain, they who scrupled eating of Meat in the Apostles Times, were causelessly scrupulous

scrupulous, by the Apostles own Decision of the Case. And yet of such an one the Apostle tells us, *God hath received him. He shall be holden up; for God is able to make him stand. He is one for whom Christ dyed.* Rom. xiv. 3, 4, 15. *Meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat are we the better, neither if we eat not are we the worse.* Whence he concluded, that he would eat no Meat while the World standeth, rather than make his Brother to offend. 1 Cor. viii. 5, 13. What then becomes of all your fine Flourishes in this Case? Whose Decree must stand in this Cause, God's or your's?

To sum up all in a Word. The great Design of the Christian Institution is, to bring us to Charity, Kindness, Compassion, and Benevolence towards one another, as well as to Devotion towards God, and Dependance upon him. These Things are accordingly insisted upon by the Author of our Religion, they are repeatedly inculcated and enforced by the most solemn Motives, as being absolutely necessary to our standing before our Judge in Peace, in the Day of his Appearing and Kingdom. Whence it necessarily follows, that all those Impositions upon Men's Consciences, which tend to embitter their Minds one against another, to ensnare them to profess or practise contrary to their Opinion, to cut them off from the Pleasures or Advantages of Society, to injure their Estates, hurt their Reputations, or render their Lives painful or uneasy, must be repugnant to our holy Religion, (which consists in *Love, Joy, Peace, Long-suffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith, Meekness, and Temperance*, Gal. v. 22, 23.) whatever Pretences, and whatever Apologies may be made for these Things. And since these are the necessary Consequences of the Imposition of your unscriptural *Hierarchy*, with all your Rites and Ceremonies

nies of human Invention, of your spiritual Courts; and your Excommunication of all that differ from you in these Things. I shall conclude with Mr. Addison, "Sure when I see such dreadful Consequences arising from a Principle, I would be as fully convinced of the Truth of it, as of a mathematical Demonstration, before I would venture to act upon it, or make it a Part of my Religion."

B. To be plain with you, It is a great piece of Impertinency, to talk so much about the spiritual Courts in England, unless we knew more about them (p. 93) As to us in this Country, we have nothing to do with Chancellors &c. (Vind. p. 45)

D. But, Sir, I hope they that live in the near View of these Ecclesiastical Courts, may pretend to know something about 'em, and talk of 'em without being charg'd with Impertinence. Now they tell us; "The Constitution and Proceedings of these Courts are condemned by all Parties. It seems therefore a little surprizing, that nothing is done, either to regulate them, or put a Stop to their exorbitant Power. The High-Church-Party complain, that Church Discipline is left in the Hands of Lay-Chancellors, which ought to be manag'd by the Clergy. And the Sense of the Whigs with regard to this Matter, is express'd in the following Words of Bishop Burnet, in the Conclusion of the History of his own Life and Times. "As for the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction (says he) it has been the Burthen of my Life, to see how it was administr'd. Our Courts are manag'd under the Rules of the Canon-Law, dilatory and expensive: and as their Constitution is bad, the Business is small; and therefore all possible Contrivances are us'd to make the most of

I

of those Causes that come before them; so that they are *universally* DREADED and HATED. God grant, that a Time may come, in which that noble Design, so near being perfected in King Edward VI Days, of the *Reformatio Legum ecclesiasticarum*, may bereviv'd and establish'd!" --- Take another Testimony from a Writer of your own Church, in a Book call'd, *The Church's Wifd for the restoring of Discipline consider'd*. Page 271, 272. he has these Passages; "The subordinate Officers in our Courts do at present, as all the World see, but *ill* manage the Power of the Church, *converting it chiefly to their own Advantage, with little or no Regard to the Ends of Religion*; insomuch that the *Strictness* of Discipline is *wholly abated*; the *Exercise* of that which is, is *corrupted*; the Proceeding against Offenders *partial and dilatory*; and if any *Penances* are enjoin'd, 'tis with almost *no Respect* to true *Repentance*, nor is much Consideration of *that* had in *Relaxation* of Censures. So many *subterfuges* and *Evasions* are also found in almost every Case, that the good Rules of Discipline seldom take place." --- I hope you'll admit your own Witnesses to speak in this Case, who can't but be sufficiently inform'd.

And as to us of this Country, if the Church of *England* ever comes to be an Establishment here, we must know more about these spiritual Courts to our Cost; and find something to do with *Chancellors* &c. and feel all the Hardships of these Impositions I complain of. I would therefore expostulate with those that are so fond of a Change; and require of them, why they are in such Haste to put their Necks into the Yoke? Since we have all the Substantials of divine Worship that is found in the Church of *England*, without these burthensome Encumbrances; why are they so earnest to
bring

bring a Yoke upon the Neck of the Disciples, that neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear ?

B. You may entertain what Scruples you please ; and yet the Doors of our Church are open to receive you, and all the Dissenters in the Nation. Her Arms are stretched out to embrace you all. (p. 19.)

D. True ; If notwithstanding our Scruples, and against the Dictates of our Consciences, we will conform to every Tittle of your Injunctions ; but not otherwise. Will you, can you abate for the Sake of our Scruples, any of these Rites, that you your selves own to be indifferent and of human Original ? Will you allow any of our Congregations to belong to, and be Parts of your Church, if we will comply (your selves being Judges) with every Thing, that Christ has made necessary to the Communion of Saints, either in this or the eternal World ? Is there any Remedy for us ; but that we must either Sin against our Consciences ; and condemn our selves in the Things we allow ; or forsake your Church ? And yet you your selves own, that the Things for which this Necessity is brought upon us, are indifferent and unnecessary, as I observ'd before.

B. You will not admit us to your Communion, unless we will submit to your Way of Worship and Discipline. Nor can we admit you, unless you submit to our Way. (p. 97.)

D. We will admit you to our Communion, whether you submit or no, to any Thing which we don't think essentially necessary to be submitted to, and which we don't think to be enjoin'd as necessary, by our great Lawgiver himself. For Instance,

stance, if you think it your Duty to Kneel at the Lord's Supper, there's none of our Churches would refuse you our Communion, (if otherwise qualified) with the Liberty of your own Posture. But we can have no such Liberty with you. This is our special Grievance, that you impose those Things upon our Consciences, which are not necessary in your own Opinion; and which are sinful in ours. Only take off the Yoke that you your selves acknowledge to be not necessary; and there will be no more Complaint.

Let all unscriptural Impositions and superstitious Presumptions be discharged out of your Church, and see if we don't readily embrace its Communion. We claim but the Liberty, wherewith Christ has made us free: and this we have a Right to insist upon, but you have no Right to deprive us of. Hear your own Master *Chillingworth*, whose Gloss upon my Text, I hope, you will not pronounce a wild and extravagant Fancy, as you have done mine. "Our Saviour (says he *) tells the Scribes and Pharisees, *That in vain they worshipped God, teaching for Doctrines Men's Commandments, &c.* Certainly, that which *St. Austin* complains of, as the general Fault of Christians of his Time, was parallel to this: *Tammultis Presumptionibus sic plena sunt omnia*, All Things or all Places, are so full of so many Presumptions, and these exacted with such Severity, nay with Tyranny, that he was more severely censured, who in the Time of his OCTAVES touched the Earth with his naked Feet, than he which drowned and buried his Soul in Drink; Certainly, if this be not to teach for Doctrines Men's

* Relig. of PROT. Chap. III. Sect. 47.

" Command.

“ *Commandments*, I know not what is. And there-
 “ fore these superstitious Christians might be said to
 “ *worship God in vain*, as well as the Scribes and
 “ Pharisees. And yet great Variety of *Superstiti-*
 “ *ons* of this kind, were then already spread over
 “ the Church, being different in divers Places.
 “ — These are the Things of which he (St
 “ *Austin*) presently says after, *The Church of God*
 “ *placed between Chaff and Tares, tolerates many*
 “ *Things*. Which was directly against the Com-
 “ mand of the Holy Spirit, given by St. Paul, *To*
 “ *stand fast in that Liberty wherewith Christ hath made*
 “ *her free, and not to suffer her self to be brought in*
 “ *Bondage to these Servile Burdens*.

Thus I have considered all that immediately
 affects the Cause between you and me in the ge-
 neral Debate; and must refer it to our Readers,
 whether I han't a juster Occasion than you had,
 of your triumphant Conclusion. *Thus I have a-*
bundantly prov'd, that the Foundation of your Vindi-
cation and Appeal, is a gross Mistake; and therefore
all that you have built upon it must necessarily sink
with it. If it be as I think I have made it appear
 to be, an unjustifiable Thing, to impose any hu-
 mane Institutions in religious Affairs, and in the
 Worship of God upon Men's Consciences, then
 the Imposition of all your Rites and Ceremonies
 upon our Consciences, is unjustifiable, whether our
 particular Exceptions against them are well ground-
 ed or not. That I think, whatever can be said
 in Favour of them is already answered, in that
 they are all proved to be unwarrantable Impositi-
 ons. I shall however wait upon you further; and
 consider what you have to say against our parti-
 cular Exceptions. But having been thus large in
 the Consideration of Impositions in general, I shall
 be more brief in considering the particular Cases.

B. I

B. I come now to your particular Charges. 1. You say, *stinted and imposed Liturgies, are teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men; and that because the Scripture has not imposed nor prescribed any; and say you, is not this a good Reason? I answer, no by no Means. For then your extemporary Prayers are teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men; for the Scripture no where imposes or prescribes those extemporary Prayers, you impose upon your Congregation.* (p. 33.)

D. I have offered a Variety of Arguments in my Defence, by which I endeavoured particularly and largely to prove, that the Imposition of the Prayer Book in the Church of England, is teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. But you have tho't (it seems) that the easiest and safest Way of answering that Book, is to take no Notice of the Arguments there advanced. I shall therefore refer my Reader thither for Satisfaction; and but briefly remark a few Things upon what is now offered. And

1. The lawfulness of using Forms of Prayer comes not into the present Question. For (as I had observ'd in the Sermon you are pleased to oppose) it is not the Question, whether any Forms of Prayer are lawful, this is on all Hands acknowledged. Forms may be very useful to such ignorant Persons, as know not how to Pray without them; And we make no Doubt but those of your Opinion may be, accepted of God, in a serious and devout Performance of the Duty of Prayer by a Form. Let such therefore have the full Liberty of following their own Inclinations and devout Affections, that either thro' Ignorance want, or that by the Prejudice of Education or any other Means have the best Opinion of, these (either real or imaginary)

imaginary) Helps to Devotion. But then, we would not have those Things imposed upon us, that don't want them, nor find them Helps to our Devotion. We would not by them be deprived of improving the Gift of Prayer which God has given us; nor be forced to use Crutches, when we have the free Use of our Limbs. This you know to be the Case; and therefore all the pathetick Exclamations, all the vehement Expostulations in your *Appeal*, about condemning all the Christians in the World, are altogether impertinent, and unworthy of particular Notice.

The Question between you and me is, whether the imposing any Forms of Prayer upon the Consciences of Men, in the stated and constant Worship of God; and making them necessary Terms of Communion; and whether the imposing your Prayer-Book in particular in that Manner, *be not teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men?* This being the Case in Debate. I shall Endeavour to prove

2. That such Impositions of any Forms of human Invention, in the stated and constant publick Worship of God; and that such Imposition of the Common Prayer-Book, *is teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.* And then shall take some Notice of your Objections.

I had before observ'd to you, that the Imposition of these Forms was either by the *Commandment of God*, or the *Commandment of Men*. If the former, shew us the Precept by which God has commanded it; and we submit. If the latter, the Case is determin'd, and there needs no Dispute. It concerns you Sir, to answer this Argument one Way or the other; and not to evade it. Here are Forms of Prayer imposed by your Church. They are taught for Doctrines in your Church,

in

in the same Sense that the washing of Hands was by the Pharisees, in the debated Text; and these Doctrines are the *Commandments of God*, or the *Commandments of Men*. Now speak plainly, which are they? If you will answer directly, I am much mistaken if you don't contradict all you have said in both your Books. If you assume the former of these; and tell us, this is required by the *Commands of God*, you at once destroy all your copious Reasons upon the indifferency of these Things; and upon your placing no Religion in them, which is the Foundation of your whole Structure. If you assume the latter; and allow, that these are the *Commandments of Men*, you give us the Question, you teach for Doctrines the *Commandments of Men*. I know no Way of a direct Answer to this Argument, but to allow one of these two Things with their Consequences to be true; or to prove that these Forms are enjoin'd, neither by the *Commands of God or Man*, which is the height of Absurdity.

B. I answer that then your extemporary Prayers are teaching for Doctrines the *Commandments of Men*.

D. Well, were this supposed, what follows from it? Can't you be chargeable with a Fault, I pray, because your Neighbour is guilty of the same? If the Accusation be never so just, still the Argument retains it's Force; and the Answer is but an Evasion, that would be as pertinently urged in Favour of the *Mass-Book*, as of your *Prayer-Book*. A *Roman Catholic* could with the same Propriety, answer any Argument against their *Mass-Book* in the same Manner. And if this Retortion be true in your Mouth, it would be true in theirs. If it defend

defend the *Common-Prayer-Book*, it would with equal Force defend their whole Liturgy, were it ten Times so bad as it is. So that notwithstanding all you have said or can say, the Argument retains its full Force; and *Mark vii. 7.* does condemn this Part of your Impositions.

But let us consider the Case a little; and see whether this Answer be't as unjust, as it is impertinent. — You your self will allow, that we are commanded to pray in the publick Worship of God, to *pray with all Prayer and Supplication in the Spirit*; that we are particularly directed as to the Manner of performing this Duty. And you must allow, that there is no Precept, no Warrant, no Example in the whole Bible, for Forms of Prayer, of meerly human Composure, to be used, much less to be imposed, in the publick Worship of God. Whence I argue, that the Command to pray, does either require us to pray with or without imposed Forms of human Composure; or else leaves it to our Choice, to do in that Case, as we think best. If with such Forms, shew me either Precept or Example in the whole Bible to warrant it; and I submit. But if no such Thing can be found, it must be without such Forms: or else it must be left to our own Choice, to act in that Affair as we think best. If you assume the latter of these, I enquire; To whose Choice is this left? Who are to act in it as they think best, the Imposers or the Body of the People? If the former, then we are bound to the Use of the *Mass-Book* in popish Countries, as well as to the *Prayer-Book* in *England*: And every Liturgy in the World, let it be never so corrupt and never so idolatrous, must be comply'd with. But if the People are to chuse, then every Body has full Liberty in this Case by divine Appointment; and ought to be left at full Liberty,

K

without

without any Church Censure, without any Inconvenience to his religious or civil Rights, without any unkind Treatment; or any Injury to his civil or sacred Communion, to his Honours, Reputation, or any other valuable Interests whatsoever. Which is the Thing I contend for. I think it falls nothing short of mathematical Demonstration, that the Scripture by enjoining the Duty of Prayer in the publick Worship of God, does require us either to pray without a Form of human Composure, or leave it to every one's Liberty, to act in that Affair as we think best. It cannot subject us to all the Caprices, Irreligion, or Idolatry of every Person or Society, that will compose for us, or impose upon us, what Forms they please.

Now take which Side of the Question you please; and it equally makes against you. If the Scripture requires us to pray without Forms of human Composure, the Case is decided, there's no more to be said. If the Scripture leaves this Matter to every one's Choice, to act as he thinks best, Why do you contradict the Scripture-Institution? Why don't you leave it as the Scripture has left it? It is in vain for you to pretend, that *it is just so in your Church as I say it should be*, as long as your Church-Canons stand in Force and excommunicate us all upon this Account; and so long as we are deny'd all Membership in your Church; and those of our Profession in *England* all Privileges in the State, for our scrupling those Impositions.

But that this Affair may be yet set in a clearer Light, let us consider in what Manner we are directed to perform the Duty of Prayer in Scripture; and see whether these Directions are compatible with imposed Forms of human Composure.

We are directed, Eph. vi. 18. to *pray with all Prayer and Supplication in the Spirit*. Now will your
Prayer-

Prayer-Book, or can any Form whatsoever, supply us with Matter of Prayer for the various Exigences, Occasions and Circumstances of Life, which we are called to? It's plain, they cannot; and therefore it's to be presumed they were not designed to be the Methods of performing this Duty; which ought to be accommodated to all the Circumstances of a holy Providence towards us. To exemplify this: we have lately had terrible Displays of the divine Displeasure, by fearful Sightings in the Heavens, accompany'd with a terrible *Earthquake*: and our People are generally stupid, and inconsiderate of these Prognosticks of our Lord's Appearing. How shall we *humble ourselves under the mighty Hand of God*? How shall we give him the Glory of our Preservation? How shall we supplicate a due Impression of these divine Terrors upon our People? Will the *Prayer-Book* supply us in this Case? It's plain, it will not; nor in any other uncommon Exigence or Change of Providence.

We are taught, Rom. viii. 16. *Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our Infirmities, for we know not what we should pray for as we ought &c.* But how can this be true, that we know not what we should pray for, if we pray by a Form; and are always acquainted with the Matter of our Prayers? You pretend indeed, that *what the Spirit helps Man to, is not the Words of Prayer; but such Groanings that cannot be uttered.* But the Text assures us, that he helps in the Matter of Prayer, as well as the other; and it's in vain here to dispute against the Letter of the Text.

In a Word, we that use conceived Prayers in God's publick Worship, have at least this Advantage of you. We have Scripture-Patterns and Examples to warrant our Conduct. We have the

Examples of the whole Church under the legal Dispensation. We have the Examples of Christ himself and his Apostles. And you are not capable to bring one Example from Scripture, of one Form of human Composition, being made the Matter of constant publick Worship; or one Direction to the Church, to compose or use, much less to impose, any Form of Prayer for the constant publick Worship of God. We shall therefore think our selves safe in our Conduct, notwithstanding any Pretences of greater Reverence and Decency, or greater Affection and Devotion, in the Use of Forms than without them, since we have not only our own Experience to plead against all such Pretences; but all the Instances of publick Prayer in the whole Bible, to vouch for us. Let such therefore, that complain of the Indecency and want of Affection in the Use of conceived Prayers, consider where this Charge will terminate; and whether they don't equally fix this Charge upon all the holy Men of God, whose Prayers are recorded in the Bible, as upon us,

B. I observ'd in my Letter, that God himself had appointed Forms of Prayer. A Form for a City in Case of an uncertain Murther committed near it, Deut. xxi. 7. Forms for all the People to be used at the Temple, Deut. xxvi. 5, 6, 7. So Verse 13, 14. (p. 40)

D. These Proofs you alledge, are so impertinent, and the Answer to 'em in my Defence so particular, that the Case may be safely left as it is, to the Censure of the Reader. Let him but read the Texts, and judge between us, whether they at all affect the present Controversy, whether they at all relate to the constant and stated publick Worship

Worship of God. — But were it allow'd, that God himself had appointed Forms of Prayer, by what Argument does it appear, that because God has done so, you may do so? How does this justify the composing and imposing Forms of human Invention?

B. *Christ has prescribed a Form for Christians; and commanded us, when we pray, to say, Our Father &c (ibid)*

D. What is that, or any other such Pretence, to your Prayer-Book? How do you prove, because Christ had Authority to prescribe a Form of Prayer, that therefore you have the same Authority? If we may use a Form of Christ's composing, must we therefore use one of your composing? Was the *Lord's Prayer* a Form of human Invention, imposed upon the People? which is the only Case now debated. To what purpose then is it urged in this Case? I shall only add, that passing by the Evidence that the *Lord's Prayer* was not given for a Form but a Pattern of Prayer, both from the different Representation of that Prayer in *Matthew* and *Luke*, (whereby it appears true to Demonstration, that it was not design'd for an exact stated Form, for constant necessary Use; or else that there were two Forms prescribed and enjoin'd by our blessed Saviour) as also from the Practice of the *Apostles*, who did not use it in their constant publick Worship; and therefore did not understand it as a Form prescribed for such Use: Passing this by (I say) it might be proper to enquire of you, if Christ did prescribe this for a Form, why don't the Church of *England* use it? It's certain they never do. What they pretend to use as such, doth not agree with the Form either in *Matthew* or *Luke*; in neither of whom do we find that Pe-
tition,

ition, *Forgive us our Trespases as we forgive them that trespass against us.*

B. *When the Age of Miracles returns again, I will gladly quit a Liturgy to join in inspired Prayers. (p.41.)*

D. There is no need of miraculous Gifts, to perform the Duty of Prayer acceptably to God, and profitably to our selves. Every Minister of the Gospel, that is qualified to compose Sermons for the People, is qualified to compose Prayers for himself and them; and is as much concerned in the latter, as in the former Case; to adapt them to the Occasion.

B. *When Miracles ceased, the Church of Christ used stated Forms &c; and so has the Church of England ever since the Reformation, --- until some Jesuits in Disguise set up the extempore Way, on Purpose to draw away the People; and make a Schism in the Church.*

D. *Pierce (in his Answer to Nichols) Robinson (in his Answer to Bennet) and other of our learned Writers have fully prov'd, that there were no Liturgies or set Forms used, much less imposed, in their publick stated Prayers in the primitive Church for several Ages. You would do well to read those Authors, before you are too positive in a Case of this Kind.*

As to your romantick Story of the *Jesuits in Disguise*, be pleased to produce your Authority; and be pleased also, when you tell the Story of *Cummins & Heath*, to add the famous Exploits of *Gara-gantua*, equally credible, and founded upon as good Authority. But before you do either of them, you would do well to read *Dr. Collinges's Answer to Dr. Scott's Case of Forms of Prayer*, where that

Legend

Legend is set in a proper and clear Light, and the most palpable Marks of Folly as well as Forgery discover'd upon it. Or you may consult *Witber's* Answer to *Agate*, where only two Circumstances of this wonderful Tale are mention'd, which quite shake the Credibility of it, and make it appear with a truly romantick Air.

B. *Your second Charge against the Church is, that they have taken a great Part of the Prayer Book, yea the whole Method and Form of it, out of the popish Liturgy. (p. 42.) How foolish, how ridiculous is it, to argue against the Use of this or that good Thing or Prayer, because the Papists use it! As if it was a Crime to hold any Thing in common with them. (p. 45.)*

D. We cannot think the *Common Prayer-Book* a good Thing as impos'd upon us for our constant publick Worship, either as to its Form, which is so very confused and immethodical; or as to its Matter, which is not only very defective, but contains so many Things justly exceptionable. And I think the World has seen, that it has not prov'd a very good Thing in it's Consequences; and in the sad Confusion it has occasioned in our Nation. But then we don't argue against it because the Papists have used it; but because it had no other Foundation but *papal Use*. We can't think very well of a Protestant Church's going to *Rome* to learn to pray. This can be exemplified in no Protestant Church but yours; and we see no Reason why it should be so in yours. It's a hard Case, when there is *no Smith in Israel*, but we are forced to go to the *Philistines* to sharpen our Goads.

You give us your Word without any Proof, of a *Liturgy* constantly used for publick Worship, in
Chrysoptom's

Chrystom's Times.— But I can't take your Word in this Case; because I think the contrary can be made most evident, as you may see by reading the Authors I but now directed you to. And I have no present Disposition to weary my self or you, by running into the Wilds of Antiquity in this Pursuit, since the Argument is so little affected by it. As to all the pretended *Liturgies* of the primitive Church, they have been abundantly proved by learned Men to be spurious and of later Date.

B. *Your third Charge is, the Tautologies in the Common Prayer, or Repetitions, are teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men. And you say, we use the same Words twenty Times. To this I answered, when the People say twenty Times, We beseech thee to hear us good Lord, it is in the Conclusion of twenty different Prayers. (p. 46.)*

D. Before I distinctly consider what you here offer, it will be proper to state the Case between us; and to observe, that I have no where condemned all *Repetitions* in Prayer, or at all blamed the occasional Reiteration of the same Thing by a devout Soul enflamed with ardent Affection, especially in private Devotions. Yet I can't but think, that the Argument retains its full Force against your *Liturgy*, notwithstanding this Concession. Partly, because there can be no Security, that the whole Assembly shall always be favour'd with such a Degree of devout Affection, every Time the Litany is used, as shall make such *Repetitions* a reasonable Service; and partly, because there is no warmth of Affection or Degree of Devotion, that can make it a reasonable Service, to repeat one *Petition* so often as yours are repeated; not

nor are these numerous Repetitions at all calculated to raise either our Affections or Devotion ; but to take off the Edge of both, by keeping the Mind so constantly intent to the very same Thing, without any Variation.

You tell us, that when you repeat the same Petition twenty Times, it's in the Conclusion of twenty different Prayers. But the same Answer may with equal Justice be given to any Charge of vain Repetitions, that can possibly be imagined. It may be alledged, that they are all different Prayers, upon the same Grounds. The State of the Case is this : In one continued Service, the People by Way of Response must say, *Good Lord deliver us*, eight Times ; and, *We beseech thee to bear us good Lord*, one and twenty Times successively, without saying any Thing else. It's true, that there are as many short Petitions offered by the Minister, to which these Responses are made ; but it's also as true, that if all these Petitions were used by the Minister in one continued Prayer, and *good Lord deliver us*, or *we beseech thee to bear us good Lord*, once pronounced by the People, (if they must bear a vocal Part in your Prayers) it would be full as pertinent ; and I think, much more Devout. And what Reason can possibly be given, why they must be thus often repeated ? I may add, that this same continued Service begins with eight distinct Repetitions of these Words, *Have Mercy upon us miserable Sinners*, between the Minister and People, without any other Petition intervening ; or any Thing else to diversify this Address, but the bare naming the glorious God in his several personal Relations. And the same Service ends with the Repetition of these Words, *Have Mercy upon us*, seven Times, and *Hear us*, four Times ; tho' the former had been repeated eight Times, and the latter above twenty

E. Times

Times before, in the same continued Prayer. That there is no less than Forty eight Repetitions, in one short Prayer. And to all this I may sub-join, that besides the several Instances of the like Kind in the Liturgy, you always use what you call the *Lord's Prayer* (tho' as observ'd before, it is a new Form of your own making) several Times in the same Service; and upon some Occasions six Times in one Assembly; and when this happens, there are fifty four Repetitions used in the same Time of publick Worship. And how in all this you can escape the Imputation of vain Repetitions, it concerns you to inform us.

Our blessed Lord forbids us to *use vain Repetitions as the Heathen do; for they think they shall be heard for their much Speaking.* And I demand again of you, what is this much speaking of the same Thing for? Is it that you may be heard of God on Account of it, or is it merely trifling? If the former, they are *vain Repetitions* by the Sentence of Christ himself. If the latter, we have no Cause to be fond of your Service. As for your Pretence of exciting People's Devotion by this Means, the same Pretence may be always made, for the most vain Repetitions in the World. It might be made by the Priests of *Baal*; and it is actually made by the *Papists*, whom your Church condemns for *vain Repetitions*. But it is impertinently made by all; for to what, I beseech you, can it excite our Devotion, to say the same Thing over and over so very often, unless to make us devoutly expect to be heard for our much speaking the same Thing?

B. *You do as much reflect on the Holy Ghost, as on the Church; for in the 136th Psalm the same Words are repeated 26 or 27 Times. (p 46.)*

D. Is

D. Is there no Difference between Praying and Singing? Are they not several Parts of publick Worship? And can it be thought just arguing, that because we may use *Repetitions* in singing, therefore we may use *Repetitions* in Prayer, as frequent, and in the same Manner? That because it's proper to have a *Burden* to a Song (as is the Case of the 136th *Psalms*) that therefore it's proper to have a *Burden* to a Prayer too?

B. *Very fine, then according to you it's no Matter how many Tautologies or Repetitions are used, if they are but sung. We may cry, as the Papists, a whole Hour together, O Jesu, Jesu, Jesu, and all is well, if we do but sing it. (p. 47.)*

D. Well, but won't the *Repetitions* in the 136th *Psalms*, at least as well justify the Papist's *Repetitions* in singing, as your so numerous *Repetitions* in praying? How can it be urged with more Propriety for you than for them? Pray, Sir, shew me the Difference. They have at least this Advantage of you, that they imitate the *Psalmist* in making a Song of their *Repetitions*, which you do not, unless in your Cathedral-Worship. As for your Charge of their crying *Jesu, Jesu*, an Hour together, it is unjust; but were it true, what Reason can be given for forty eight (if not fifty four) *Repetitions*, in the same Service; that won't justify ever so many more?

But the worst of it is, that your Instance of the 136th *Psalms* don't come up to your Case. For there is no Prayer at all in that *Psalms*. If it be allowed you, that some of the *Psalms* are properly Prayers; yet that *Psalms* is not. Nor can you find any Example of such numerous *Repetitions* in any Prayers in the Bible, either in the *Psalter* or any

where else. So that the whole of your Argument can amount to no more than this, that because *David* did use many *Repetitions* in making a *Burden* to a sacred Song, which was not a Prayer; therefore you may use many more *Repetitions* than he did in your Prayers; and impose them upon us as necessary Terms of Communion.

B. *When you sing Psal. V. My King, my God, to thee do I pray. Do you then pray, or do you not? Answer directly, and use no Evasion.*

D. What is this to the Purpose? When we sing *Psal. cxxxvi.* where those *Repetitions* are used, we do not pray; and therefore your urging this is but a meer *Evasion*. It's no Instance at all of such numerous *Repetitions* in Prayer, which is the Thing complain'd of; and which you can never justify.

B. *You acknowledge, Christ made the same Speech three Times in the Garden; and repeated the same Words twice in one Breath on the Cross, My God, My God, and that in Prayer. (p. 49.)*

D. That is, Christ prayed three Times in one Night to the same Purpose, with considerable intervals between those Times of Prayer; and used the Name of God twice in his Prayer on the Cross. But what follows from hence? What's the Conclusion of these Premises? Put this Argument into a *Syllogism*; and see if you can bring out the Conclusion, therefore The Church of *England* does well in using the same Petition above twenty Times successively; and in using forty eight *Repetitions* in one short Prayer.

B. *Well,*

B. *Well, if we may ever depend upon your Word, you will give up your Cause, if we can shew Scripture Examples, for using the same Petition twice in the same Prayer: and what think you of Daniel's Prayer, Dan. ix. 17. O our God hear the Prayer of thy Servant, ver 18. O my God inclinethine Ear and hear, ver 19. O Lord hear, O Lord forgive, O Lord hearken. (p. 49.)*

D. Pray, Sir, where have I given you any such Word? Have I ever said any Thing like it? It seems you had now forgot the solemn Impressions you began with, that you must account for every injurious Expression. If I have said any such Thing as you charge upon me, pray direct me where to find the Passage; but if the Charge have no Foundation of Truth, but is wholly your own Invention, a Retracting is due both to the World and to me. But tho' I never said or tho't any Thing like what you insinuate; yet I did and do think, that *Daniel's Fervour of Affection*, breaking forth in the same Petition three or four Times in one Prayer, won't justify your imposing such a great Number of *Repetitions* upon all that you admit to your Communion, whether they have any such Fervour of Affection, to lead them into *Repetitions*, or not.

I shall conclude this Head, by earnestly requesting you to tell us plainly what *vain Repetitions* are, that it may be fairly put to the Tryal, whether the *Repetitions* we complain of, will agree with your Definition of *vain Repetitions*, or not; and whether you can find any *Criterion* by which these *Repetitions* can be distinguished from those among the *Papists*, which your Church calls *vain Repetitions*.

B. *The fourth Charge is, that the Church of England*

land offers the highest Indignity to the Oracles of God, by omitting to read a great Part of them, in Order to make Way for such fabulous Compsures as are in the Apocrypha. Now would not a Stranger, from this Charge conclude, that the Dissenters in this Country shew a greater Regard for the holy Bible than Church-Men, by reading more of it at their Meetings than we do at Church? And yet it's notorious, that here in New-England, not one in ten, if one in fifty, ever read a Chapter in the House of God. (p 51)

D. I have not a Word to say in Favour of the neglecting that Part of publick Worship, whosoever are chargeable with the Omission of such a plain and positive Institution of God. Our publick Formula's all require it; and they that live in the Omission of it, are only accountable for their Conduct.

B. *All the New-Testament, except the Revelations, is read in the Church in Course three Times every Year.* (ibid)

D. I would gladly know the Reason why the *Revelation* is not read. Is it because our blessed Lord Jesus Christ has pronounced concerning that Book, *Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the Words of this Prophecy.* Rev. i. 3.

B. *In the Old Testament there are 929 Chapters, of which the bigger Part by far are read, in Course every Year.* (ibid)

D. Both these Paragraphs are only true where publick Prayers are daily attended, which is comparatively but in few Places, either in *England* or in this Country. Where daily publick Prayers are attended,

attended, they are observed instead of Family-Prayer. And therefore the Comparison here should be, who read most of the Bible, the Church of *England* in their daily publick Prayers, or our People in their daily Family-Prayers; and then I'm sure the Comparison would not turn out to our Disadvantage. But the Difficulty still remains. Why are the other Parts of the Bible neglected; and the *Apocrypha* substituted in their Stead? Are there any Genealogies, any Repetitions of History, any Books of divine Inspiration, less worthy of the Church's Notice, than the wretched Legend of *Bell* and the *Dragon*, the Lascivious Feats of *Judith*; and the romantick Story of *Tobit* and his conjuring lying Angel? Must the Word of God himself give Place to such intolerable Fables as these are? As there are many good Things in the *Apocrypha*, so there are many good Things in the *Alcoran*; but inasmuch as there are many very bad Things in both, they neither of them deserve to be advanced to the highest Honour in the Christian Church. The false Doctrines, as well as false and ridiculous Stories in the *Apocrypha*, render it very unfit for a Substitute to the *divine Oracles*.

B. You ask, how you should know that we do not read the *Apocrypha* as the Word of God? I answer, by the Church's declaring in the sixth Article, that it's not to be read or applied to establish any Doctrine; but only for Example of Life and Instruction of Manners. (p. 52.)

D. I hope, your Church would not have the Example of *Judith*. nor *Tobit's* Angel, imitated by your People. Her Doctrines (I know) are contrary to lascivious, lying, and conjuring Examples. But let us consider the Case proposed. The Preface to

to the Common-Prayer-Book assures us, that *nothing is ordain'd to be read but the pure Word of God, the holy Scriptures; or that which is agreeable to the same.* In your Homilies, *Baruch* is sundry Times cited as the *Prophet Baruch*; and his Writings are called *the Word of God sent to the Jews.* * And the Book of *Tobit* is in these express Words attributed to the Holy Ghost. † *The same Lesson doth the Holy Ghost also teach in sundry Places of the Scripture, saying, Mercifulness and Alms-giving purgeth from all Sins &c.* For which is quoted *Tobit 4.* — It follows, *The wise Preacher the Son of Syrach confirmeth the same.* — *Ecclus. 5.* And is not this to give that Honour to these fabulous Compositions, that is only due to the Word of God? And don't you practically say the same Thing, by leaving out so much of the inspired Writings, to make Room for the Reading these Legends?

B. *You would humbly enquire, whether the Lord's Day never happens on the three last Days of September, or four first of October — The very first Kalender in the Book of Common Prayer, appoints Lessons chosen out of the old Testament, for every Lord's Day in the Year. (ibid)*

D. What then? Does not your *Kalender* appoint these Lessons out of the *Apocrypha* to be read, the three last Days of *September*; and the four first Days of *October* &c? And if these Days happen on the *Lord's Day*, you must read those appointed Lessons on the *Lord's Day*, or go contrary to the Order for that Day. If there be other Lessons

* Part. I. of the Hom. against wilfull Rebellion.

† Part II. of Hom. of Alms-Deeds.

appointed

appointed for the *Lord's Day*, these are (when that is the Case) appointed also ; and either both are to be read ; or your *Kalendar* is inconsistent with it self. Chuse which you please. It's true, that the first *Kalendar* is distinguished by the general Direction of *Lessons proper for Sundays* ; and *Lessons proper for Holy Days*. But your larger *Kalendar*, wherein these Lessons out of the *Apocrypha* are appointed, has no such Direction or Distinction.

B. I shall leave you to make your self Sport with what your Authors say is ridiculous in the *Apocrypha* ; and when you have satiated your self with that, you'll be prepared to strike in with the Deists, and ridicule such Stories in the Holy Bible as Samson's catching the Foxes, and Jonah living in the Whales Belly. (p. 53.)

D. And is there indeed no Difference between these ridiculous Romances in the *Apocrypha* ; and the sacred Stories you refer to ? Are the Histories of Samson's Foxes, and Jonah's Whale, as liable to Contempt and Ridicule, as the conjuring Tricks of Tobit and his lying Angel towards the Devil *Astrodus*, the horrible Forgeries of *Judith*, *Susannah*, *Bell and the Dragon* ? Are the Deists to be instructed, that the one is as liable to Banter as the other ? Who (I pray,) strikes in with the Deists, you, who give them such an Handle by this surprising Insinuation, or I, that implead the substituting such Follies and Falshoods, in the Place of the Word of God ?

B. Come we now to the Cross at Baptism, which you call a cursed Instrument, the principal Badge of P^{er}jury. (p. 53.)

D. I did indeed call the Cross whereon our
M Saviour

Saviour suffered, the cursed Instrument of his extreme Sufferings ; And the Sign of the Cross as used amongst the *Papists*, the principal Badge of Popery. But you your self know, that I have said nothing like what you here charge me with ; nor any where in the Book you oppose, called the *Cross at Baptism* a cursed Instrument &c. And it's a Pity you so often forget, what you pretended in the beginning to impress upon your Mind, that by your *Words* you must be justified ; or by your *Words* you must be condemned.

B. Here if I understand you, you have given up that Point, of the Sign of the Cross's being a Sacrament. (ibid)

D. Indeed Sir, you misunderstand me. I have not given up that Point. The Clause you find Fault with in my Sermon was this : *Since it is confessed on all Hands, that the Cross as abused by the Church of Rome has been one of their greatest Idols: shall the Church of England who abhor their Idolatry, give the Honour of a Sacrament to a popish Idol.* Now the only Question is, whether the Church of England does give the Honour of a Sacrament to the Sign of the Cross or not. The Church's own Definition of a Sacrament is this : *An outward and visible Sign of an inward spiritual Grace, given unto us, ordain'd by Christ himself as a Means whereby we receive the same, and a Pledge to assure us thereof.* The Church tells us in her Catechism, that there are two Parts in a Sacrament, the outward visible sign ; and the inward spiritual Grace. The same Church directs, that the Sign of the Cross shall be used in Baptism, in Token that hereafter the Baptized Person shall not be ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ crucified ; and manfully to fight under his Banner, against

against Sin the World and the Devil; and to continue Christ's faithful Soldier and Servant unto his Life's End. Now you must own, that both the Parts of a Sacrament are attributed to the Sign of the Cross. It is an outward visible Sign; and to confess the Faith of Christ crucified, to manful fight under his Banner, to continue his faithful Soldier and Servant, do imply inward spiritual Grace. And what can be wanting to a Sacrament, where there are all the Parts of it? Your Church tells us, that there are but two Parts in a Sacrament; and ascribes both these Parts to the Sign of the Cross. And are not all the Parts equal to the whole?

B. *The Essence of a Sacrament lies in this, that the visible Sign is appointed, as a Means whereby the invisible Grace is convey'd from God to Man; and as a Pledge to assure us, that God will give it to us, upon our duly using that outward Sign. But the Sign of the Cross is not pretended to be a Pledge from God to us to give us Assurance of any Thing he will do for us.* (p. 55.)

D. But if the Church of England does not only pretend, but in express Words determine, that this Sign is also a Pledge of Christ's Merits, will you then own, that she gives it the Honour of a Sacrament? Be pleas'd then to read your 30th Canon, in the latin Edition; and there you'll find it called *Tessera et Signum meritorum Christi*. A Pledge and Sign of the Merits of Christ. I think you'll own that the latin Edition of your Canons, was the first and authentick Edition.

If you still object, that this does not prove that this Sign is appointed as a Means whereby the invisible Grace is convey'd from God to Man: Let us see
M 2 whether

whether the Church of *England* has not her self determin'd that Cause also. Read then the same *Canon*, where you'll find, that Children were sign'd with this Sign when they were christned, to dedicate them by that Badge to his Service, whose Benefits beflowed upon them in *Baptism*, the Name of the *Cross* did represent. I think it must be allowed, if this Sign dedicates Children to Christ, and if it be a Badge of his Service; it is as much a Means to convey Grace as *Baptism* it self; and by this Account of it, as much a *Sacrament*, the divine Institution only excepted. It's true, that the Sign of the *Cross* is not a *Sacrament* instituted by Christ himself; nor was I so stupid as to object against the Church of *England*, the appointing a new *Sacrament* instituted by Christ himself. But what I objected was, that they have brought in by their own Authority, and imposed upon us this Rite, without any Institution of Christ, to which they ascribe the same Virtue and Properties, as to the *Sacraments*. And for ought I can see to the contrary, I have fully justified my Objection. — I have shewn that the Sign of the *Cross*, according to the Decrees of your Church, every Way answers your own Definition of a *Sacrament* in all it's Nature and Properties. It's by your own *Formula's* determin'd to be a visible Sign of invisible Grace, a Means to convey Grace, and a Pledge to assure us of it. And have I not Reason then to complain, that the Honour of a *Sacrament* is given to the Sign of the *Cross*? This Rite, of meerly human Institution, that has been prostituted to the most idolatrous Purposes in the Church of *Rome*, that has been a dreadful Snare to Multitudes of poor Souls, that has shed much precious Blood, and is a stumbling Block to very many of the best People in the Nation, is yet annexed to the *Sacrament* of *Baptism*; so that

wc

we must either submit to this new Ordinance of your inventing and appointing, or go without the Ordinance of Baptism in your Church. This is the State of the Case. And let the World judge, whether there is not just Cause to object against the imposing such Shackles upon Men's Consciences.

What Reason can possibly be given, why this Sign should not be treated as the *brazen Serpent* was by *Hezekiah*, and called *Nehushtan*? What Reason can there be, why this Sign which has been so much polluted and abused to an idolatrous Use in the Roman Church, should not be utterly abolished, as God has required that all the Remainers of Idolatry should be, *Numb. xxxiii. 52. Deut. vii. 5. 25. And xii. 3. Isa. xxx. 22*? What Pretence can be made why this Rite, which has done so much Harm, and can do no good, should be made a Term of Communion in your Church? Why should the cursed Instrument of our blessed Saviour's extream Sufferings, be had in such Honour among you? What Plea can possibly be made for the Sign of the Cross, that can't with the same Justice be used for all the *popish* Sacraments; and for all their Institutions and Impositions? Here Sir, I provoke you to try your Skill, in making this Comparison. Offer what Argument you will in Favour of this Usage; and I'm mistaken, if it can't with the same Propriety be urged in Favour of any of theirs. If you urge, (as before) that *the Scripture requires of us, that we express our inward Sense of God and Duty towards him, by such Actions as general Custom has made significant in like Cases*; They will tell you, that general Custom has made it significant of their inward Sense of God and Duty towards him, to picture God the Father in the Shape of an Old Man, our blessed Saviour in the Shape of a younger

younger Man upon the Cross; and the Holy Ghost in the Form of a Dove; to keep Images of Angels and Saints in their Houses; and a hundred more such Abominations. If you urge, that *glorying in Christ's Sufferings is a Duty*, they will tell you, that they have appointed five other *Sacraments* for that Reason; they cross themselves, upon every Occasion; they keep Crosses in their Streets, Houses and Churches; they perform all their Ceremonies at *high Mass* for this very End: And have as much Warrant for these Things from Scripture, as you have for your *Cross in Baptism*.]

B. *The plain English of your Reply is, that if the Scripture teaches aright, we must picture God in the Shape of an old Man.* (p. 58.)

D. No, Sir, this Consequence only follows upon Mr. Beach's Doctrine, that general-Custom is our Rule. The Scripture teaches no such Thing, that general human Customs are to be the Rule or Pattern, by which we are to express our Sense of God and Duty towards him. Nor do the Texts you cite in your *Vindication*; or any other in the Bible, say one Word of our observing the Rites you mention, because they are generally human Customs. If they are required by those Texts, (as you say they be) they are required by God's Authority; and not in Conformity to human Customs. In a Word, if general human Customs are a Rule in this Case; I would enquire, whether *all* general Customs, or only *some* general Customs? If *all* general Customs, then the *popish* general Customs are as much a Rule as any. If but *some* general Customs, shew us *what* Sort of general Customs they be, that we may know whether the Sign of the Cross comes into the Number. If you limit it to Customs ground-

ed

ed on *scripture Institution*, prove the Cross to be such, and we will use it.

B. You challenge me to shew that the Cross in Baptism was used in the three first Centuries. I shall do it. The Apostolick Constitutions Lib. 3. C. 17. saith, in Baptism the Water represents Christs Burial; and the Sign of the Cross represents the Cross. Tertullian, who lived in the latter End of the second Century, giving an Account of the Method of baptizing, says among other Things. the Flesh is washed that the Soul may be cleansed, The Flesh is signed that the Soul may be guarded. Again he says, The Devil apes Gods Service, in his Idol Mysteries, he baptizes those that believe in him, he signs his Soldiers in the Forehead &c.

D. The Apostolick Constitutions are very far short of Proof, that the Sign of the Cross was used in Baptism in the three first Centuries; for they could not be written earlier than the fifth Century, as Mr. Dalk (*Ide psendographis Apostol.*) makes manifest. And your Quotation from Tertullian is as little to the Purpose; for he had no View at all to the Use of this Sign in Baptism, in the Words cited by you, but to the common and ordinary Use of the Sign of the Cross; as appears from the very Passages you refer to, if the whole Discourse be considered. And it also appears from his particular Account of the Manner of administering this Ordinance at that Time. In which, though there be mention of several Rites superstitious enough, such as trine Immersion, Imposition of Hands, tasting of Milk and Honey, anointing with the blessed Uction &c. * Yet not a Word of

* De Baptismo. C. 6, 8.

the Sign of the Cross. In short, *Tertullian* tells us, that in the Beginning of any Business, going out, coming in, dressing, washing, eating, lighting Candles, going to Bed, sitting down, or whatever we do, we sign our Foreheads with the Sign of the Cross. † And why don't you do as in *Tertullian's* Time? Why don't you use Milk and Honey, Crism &c. at Baptism? Why don't you use the Sign of the Cross upon every Occasion? If his Authority be good, it obliges you to the Practice of these Things, which he certainly and plainly speaks of as used in his Time, much more than to the Use of this Sign in Baptism, whereof I think there is no mention in all his Writings.

B. Your next Charge is for Kneeling at the Communion.

D. The Debate between you and me principally turns upon this Question, Whether it can be proved from the Evangelists, that Christ and his Disciples did partake of this Ordinance sitting, in their ordinary Table-Posture? And does it not appear from *Luk. xxii. 14, 17.* that they sat down to this holy Supper? and from *Joh. xiii. 2, 4.* that Christ arose from Supper? Can you expect more express Proof of any such Point, than there is of this, that they sat at this Ordinance?

B. You make the Apostles that Night to eat but one Supper; when it is plain that they eat two, if not three distinct Suppers. — It is as evident as Words can make it, that after the first Supper or the Passover, Christ rose up and washed his Disciples Feet; and after

† *De Coron. C. 3.*

this sat down to Table again; and then they eat what is called the Sop, of which Judas partook. John xiii. 26. After all this Christ went to Prayer, and consecrated the Lord's Supper, from which they are never said to rise up; and therefore according to you they never sat down to it. (p. 62.)

D. If all this proves to be a Mistake, it's hopeful you'll consider better for the future, before you are so very positive. I do indeed make the Apostles that Night to eat but one Supper, and your groundless Imagination of two or three Suppers, flows from a sufficient Ignorance of the Subject you are treating of. We have no Account of their eating any Supper distinct from the *Passover Supper*, Part of which our Lord consecrated as a Memorial of his Death, to be kept in constant Use in the christian Church. "The Bread and Wine which our Saviour distributed at his last *Passover*, and appointed to signify and represent his Body and Blood, were not without the Extent of the paschal Supper; but within the Compats of it, and Rites belonging to it, only applied by him now, to a new evangelical Use and Signification." That this may be set in a cleared View, it may be proper to give you a few brief Hints, of the Manner of their celebrating the *Passover* Solemnity.

The *Passover* Table was furnished with Provisions of several Sorts, viz. Several Cups of Wine, bitter Herbs, unleavened Bread, and the Body of the paschal Lamb roasted whole, to which they added a thick Sauce or Sop called *Charoseth*. The chief Man of the Company, after they were sat down to the Table, in the first Place taketh a Cup of Wine and blesteth it, tasteth lightly of it; and gives it to the Company to divide among themselves: of this is the Account, *Luke* xxi. 17. Then

N

he

he taketh the bitter Herbs, and bleffeth them; dips them in the Sauce or Sop before mention'd; and eats about the Quantity of an Olive, in which all the rest of the Company imitate him; and this was the Sop of which the Evangelists speaks, *John xiii. 26.* Which instead of being a distinct Supper from the *Passover*, was the first Thing they eat at the *Passover*. The Institution whereof you find *Exod. xii. 28.* After this he takes the Bread, which was lightly cut, but not separated, breaks off a Peice of it, and lays the rest by till the Lamb was eaten; and eating Part of the Piece which he brake off, gives the remainder to the Company. Then he takes the second Cup of Wine; and the rest imitate him in drinking of it. Then they cut up the paschal Lamb and eat it, with the Bread that was laid by for that Purpose, Part of which Bread our Saviour consecrated as a Memorial of his Body; not after they were risen from the *Passover* as you suggest; but towards the Conclusion of it; and while they were eating it, as is attested by the Evangelists, *Matth. xxvi. 26.* and *Mark xiv. 22.* All this done, they take the third Cup, called *the Cup of Blessing* or *Thanksgiving* after Meat. And this third Cup after Supper, with which they concluded that Solemnity, our Saviour applied to a New spiritual Signification; and thus grafted this Gospel-Festival of the Lord's Supper, upon the Jewish *Passover*. *

These could be no Room for our Lord's rising up, washing his Disciples Feet, and maintaining a

* They that would see this more largely represented, let 'em read Gataker's *Harmony of the four Evangelists*; Godwin's *Moses and Aaron*, and Lightfoot on the *Passover*.

long

long Discourse with them upon that Occasion, sitting down again ; and then administering the Lord's Supper. For it's certain from the sacred Story, that this Ordinance was administered *as they were eating*, as *Matthew* expresseth it ; and *as they did eat*, according to *Mark* ; or *while they were eating*, as the Original in both Places should be rendred. And there is no Account that they ever rose up at all, till the whole Solemnity was over.

And if we look into the thirteenth Chapter of *John*, there is no such Thing there as you pretend. Not a Word of our Saviour's sitting down to any other Supper, after washing his Disciples Feet ; or any Thing that implies it : But only his sitting down as usual, in his ordinary Conversation. In the first Part of this Chapter, the Evangelist gives us the Narrative of our Lord's Conduct after that sacred Feast was ended, and they were risen up from Supper, which Narrative continues to the End of the 17 Verse. He then proceeds without any Connection with what went before, to give us another Story, which tho' prior in Time to the former ; yet is here transposed and told after it. The like to which is often found in Scripture ; and particularly in the very Case before us, both *Matthew* and *Mark* relate the Story of *Judas's* betraying Christ, before the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, when it's certain it was done afterward. Now this *Prolepsis* or Anticipation being allowed, there is a good Agreement between St. *John* and the other Evangelists : But according to your Representation of it, there is a plain and palpable Contradiction, which must by no Means be supposed.

Your Mistake is founded upon the Supposition of an immediate Connection between the 17th and 18th Verses of this Chapter. But be pleased to

read them, and see if they are at all united. *If ye know these Things, happy are ye if ye do them, I speak not of you all, I know whom I have chosen &c.* Did not Christ speak of all his Disciples, that they would be happy, if they did those Things that he had commanded them? — Could this be the Meaning of these Verses? No, certainly it could not. Whence it's evident, that since the *Sense* cannot be connected, the *Verses* ought not to be connected; and therefore, that all your Reasoning from this Supposition comes to Nothing.

In a Word, certain it is that our Lord with his Disciples did sit down at the *Passover*; and continued sitting at that Solemnity. How else did *John* lean on *Jesus's* Bosom? It is also certain, that while they were eating the *Passover*, our Saviour did consecrate the Elements in the *Lord's-Supper*; and that he did rise from the Table after Supper; and there is not the least Insinuation in all the Evangelists, that they ever rose at all during the Celebration of this Ordinance. I must therefore (by your Leave) again conclude, that I despair of ever seeing any Thing prov'd, by the most plain, positive, and intelligible Expressions, if this don't prove that Christ and his Disciples did partake of this Ordinance sitting in a Table-Posture.

B. *You and all learned Men know, that there is not a Word of their sitting in the Original; but they are said to ly, that is on Couches. But however, sit, or ly, or kneel, it is all one to you, if you can but amuse the common People.* (p. 61.)

D. The original Word in *Luke*, I grant, does sometimes, and indeed with greatest Propriety, signify to ly backwards, in the Form that Rowers do when they handle their Oars; and refers to the Table-

Table-Posture of those Times, which was sitting with their Feet behind them, leaning towards each other: But then the original Word in *Matth.* xxvi. 20 and in *Mark* xiv. 18. whatever you say to the contrary, does properly signify sitting at Meat, in the same Posture as they eat common Meals; and is again so used, *Mark* xvi. 14. So that your Criticism and triumphant Insult must both fall together.

B. *Our Kneeling is more like that Table-Posture; than sitting upright.* (p. 63)

D. A wonderful Assertion! An adoring Posture upon our Knees, is more like sitting at Table a little leaning, than sitting upright at Table, is like it. Was Kneeling ever used as a Table-Posture; or ever proposed in Scripture as a proper Posture at any eucharistical Feast? Whereas on the contrary, sitting at Table in such Feasts is approved by God himself, *1 Sam.* xvi. 11. *Ezek.* xliv. 3. And exemplified in the Case before us by our blessed Lord. And is not this sufficient Warrant for our Conduct?

To sum up this Debate; *Kneeling* at the Sacrament was brought in by the *Papists*, by Way of *Adoration* to the Elements, which they suppose *transubstantiated* into the very Body and Blood of Christ: and as used by them, is a most abominable *Idolatry*, to be abhorred by all good Men. And for my Part, I had rather imitate the Pattern set me by the Lord *Jesus Christ* and his Apostles, than write after so bad a Copy; whatever Declaration can be made, of retaining the Posture, and rejecting the *Idolatry*. In thus doing, I'm sure I am safe. And whatever Reflections you cast upon me, of symbolizing with the *Pope*, with *Socinians*,
or

or whatever else you please, must extend to the original Example, and ultimately terminate there. This I think to be worthy of your serious Consideration. To conclude, as kneeling towards any real or imaginary Representation of God, or heavenly Things, does incur the Guilt of Idolatry in God's Account, even when the Worship does ultimately refer to God himself; I do not therefore chuse to kneel before the Elements, which are Representations of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, lest I too much imitate Image-Worship, and countenance the Idolatry of the Papists; especially since Christ himself has given us a contrary Example, and Kneeling is not an appointed Posture for Meditation and ejaculatory Prayer, which are the special Duties to be attended at the Time of receiving the Elements.

B. *You had said, that Kneeling was brought in by the Papists. This I deny'd; and prov'd from St. Cyril and Justin Martyr --- that in their Time they used a Posture of Adoration. (p. 65.)*

D. You really prov'd Nothing from either of those Authors You did not so much as cite a Word from them; nor pretend to prove any more, than that they *stood on the Lord's Day; and came bowing to the Lord's Table.* And how that makes it evident that Kneeling was not brought in by the *Papists*, I must leave to others to determine. And I venture again to tell you, that if you'll prove, that Kneeling at the Sacrament was ever used in any Church, before the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* was brought in, I will acknowledge my Mistake as publickly as you please.

I am utterly unconcern'd about your Merri-
ment at that Saying of mine, that the Author of
this Feast is pleas'd to stoop to a friendly Famili-
arity

arity with his Guests; and is dealing with us as a great Monarch does by his mean Subjects, whom he invites to a Feast: He is suffering us to sit down with the King at his Table; and allowing us most near and intimate Communion with himself &c. Go on, Sir, if you please; Sport yourself and your Admirers with it as much as you can. And I shall yet acknowledge and adore his Condescension, in this glorious Instance of it.

B. Your next Charge is for admitting Sureties at Baptism; and here you say, They promise what none but God can perform. They promise that the Heart of the Child shall be changed, the Nature sanctified, and the Affections and Passions be under constant good Government. And are they God's! — No, Mr Dictator, there is Nothing like this in the Church. In making the Covenant at Baptism, the Sureties are only the Mouth of the Child. (p. 68.)

D. If I should allow, that Part of your Office does necessarily imply, that the Questions are proposed to the Infants themselves, and answered by the Sureties as their Mouths; how then this can be justified from being a meer Piece of Pageantry, I know not. For who gave the Surety Order and Authority to say in the Child's Name, that he stedfastly believes all the Articles of the Creed, that he desires to be baptized into this Faith, that he resolves to keep God's holy Will and Commandments &c. How does the Surety know this? Nay does he not know the direct contrary to all this? The Child being actually incapable of any such Beliet, Desire, or Resolution; that you must pardon me, if in this View of the Case I can find no Means to reconcile this Office to Truth and Sense.

B. Children

B. *Children are capable of entering into Covenant with God, as appears by Circumcision, and express Scripture, Deut. xxix, 11, 12. (p. 69.)*

D. True, they are capable of being dedicated to God; and thereby of being brought into a Covenant-Relation, Covenant-Privileges; and Covenant-Obligations. But all Talk of their personal Covenanting, is to me (I confess) altogether unintelligible.

B. *Very pretty; and much like a sober Divine! And may not a Quaker say the same to us all? How trifling, how ludicrous is the Baptizing of Infants? Baptism is a Seal of Faith and Repentance; but the poor Infant is so far from having Faith and Repentance, that he knows not what they Mean. (p. 70)*

D. A Quaker may very justly make this Objection, upon your pretence of personal and explicit Covenanting. And I confess, I know not what Answer can possibly be given to such an Objection. But then upon our Grounds of proceeding in this Case, there is no Room for a Quaker, or any Body else, to throw such Objections in our Way. The Infant has an undoubted Interest in the outward Privileges of the Covenant, by Vertue of the Parent's Covenant-Right. For the Promise is to you and to your Children, Acts ii. 39. — *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy, 1 Cor. vii. 14.* The Parent also has an undoubted Claim to dedicate his Children to Christ, and to suffer his little Children to come unto him, since of such are the Kingdom of Heaven. And what Handle can the Quakers or any others take from hence, for such Reflections as you speak of? May not a Parent put his Infant's Name into a Lease for Lands; and secure him the

the Privileges of that Lease when he comes of Age? And is not the Infant when he comes of Age, bound to fulfil the Conditions of the Lease, upon the Penalty of forfeiting his Interest in it? And why he may not as consistently bring his Children into the Privileges and Obligations of this Lease of spiritual Blessings, in the same Manner, and under the same Penalty, let any Objector give a Reason when he is able.

B. *Again you say* How came the Proxies to get the Child baptized without his Leave? *Witty still! but a fatal Blow to Infant-Baptism.* (p. 71.)

D. I said no such Thing; but you are forced thus to turn my Words, to make 'em suit your Purpose. I did say, and do still say, *How came the Sureties to be the Child's Proxies without his Leave*, and to profess and promise in his Name what he gave them no Power or Authority to promise for him? For tho' the Parent hath in himself a natural Authority, and is obliged by the Command of Christ, to dedicate his Child to God in Baptism: Yet the Child has not given, nor is capable of giving Authority to any Man, *in his Name*, to declare what his Faith is, what his Desires, Purposes, and Resolutions are. This yet appears to me an Affair most ludicrous and trifling.

I think, on a Review of the Case, you'll find that you have gain'd Nothing by forcing me upon a distinct Consideration of this Plea of yours; for it nothing at all affects what I had before urged in this Case: I did justly complain, that the Sureties promise what it's God's Prerogative to perform. For tho' they do speak in the Name of the Child, yet the Church does understand it as their own Vow on the Behalf of the Child, and expressly
O declares

declares in the Catechism, that **THEY PROMISE** and **VOW** three Things in it's Name, That it **SHOULD** renounce the Devil and all his Works, That it **SHOULD** believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith, That it **SHOULD** keep God's holy Will and Commandments &c. And the Case must be thus understood; or else (which is an Observation worth your minding) there is no Promise at all for the Child's religious *Education*, either by Parents or Sureties. The Sureties are obliged to this; or they are obliged to Nothing at all, on the Child's Behalf. This is their Covenant; or they are under no Covenant on Behalf of the Child: and consequently the Child has no Covenant-Right at all, either from its Parents or Sureties; and therefore no Claim at all to the Seal of the Covenant. Answer this consistently, if you can. It yet therefore appears, that what the Sureties promise, is beyond human Power to perform: And their speaking impertinently in the Name of the Child, will never give them Ability to do it.

B. I said, Here, the Sureties make no Promise of any Thing they will do for the Child, but only are his Mouth &c. To this, you knew, you could not reply: therefore you honestly leave out (Here) which though a small Particle, yet governs the whole Sentence. (p. 71.)

*D. I have taken some Pains to consult, what Advantage it could have been to my Cause to have left out that Word (if I had done so) that I might find out the Occasion of this Accusation: But I can't find out how that would any Way have affected the Argument between us. However, be that as it will, the Accusation is very surprizing: For that Word stands as fair and open to View in
my*

my *Defence*, as it does in your *Vindication*; but the Clause it belongs to is very exactly cited. Be pleased, Sir, to put on your Spectacles; and look steadily for the Word (*Here*) you'll certainly find it. (*Def.* p. 64) I've quoted it once; nor do you under that Head use it oftner. So that it is Mr. *Beach* who must take to himself all the Glory of the new *Figure*, and the *Mansful Triumph*, you speak of; and the Charge of *dishonest Tricks*, an *Argument of a desperate Cause*, recoils on your self.

As to your Cavils against that harmless Passage in my *Defence*, That *God has never given, never promised Assistance to any Man, in changing the Hearts, and sanctifying the Natures, and governing the Affections and Passions of others*; which, you in your *Appeal* say, is either a false and pernicious *Doctrine*, or else a *Piece of solid Nonsense*: I am willing to leave it to our Readers, without spending more Words about it. Let them judge, whether it be the same Thing, to be assisted, IN DOING THE WORK OUR SELVES, or IN BEING ONLY INSTRUMENTS in the Hands of the great *Workman*; as you say it is. Let them judge, whether it be the same Thing for you to assist your *Pen* in dictating this fine Discourse of yours, as to use it as an Instrument in your Hand to communicate your Dictates to others. If they determine, as you do, in the Affirmative, I depend upon their Decree in my Favour, that your *Pen* has been a little too angry. — Let them judge, whether *St. Paul* did any Way himself open Men's Eyes and change their Hearts; or whether *Christ* was the sole Efficient, and wrought this glorious Change by his own Almighty Power, only employing *Paul* as an Instrument, and blessing the Means used for obtaining that End. If *Paul* did not do the Work himself, he was not assisted in doing it; but was merely an Instrument in the
 Hands

Hands of Christ. If he did do it himself, he did do it by almighty Power; for it was an Almighty Work.

Upon the whole, you may observe, if you'll look into *Dr. Comber's Companion to the Temple*, which is generally allow'd to be a genuine Exposition of the Common-Prayer Book, That *his* Sense of the Promise of Sureties, in the Office of Baptism, is not very foreign from *mine*. He tells us, That Infants enter into the baptismal Covenant *no other Way but by having some to ENGAGE that they SHOULD stand to God's Terms*. He tells us, The Sureties *may very well PROMISE that the Child SHALL believe these divine Truths, since they were all revealed from Heaven &c.* — In expounding the Exhortation to Godfathers and Godmothers, he puts them upon a Review of what they have done, and says, *They have ENGAGED FOR a Minor unto Almighty God; — They are become SURETIES and BONDSMEN for this Child unto the Majesty of Heaven; — You have UNDERTAKEN* (says he) *that this Child SHALL renounce the Devil, believe in God, and serve Him.* [And the *Dr.* in his Discourse on the Office of Confirmation, speaks as if Godfathers *obtain'd a DISCHARGE from the Bonds they have entered, and so receive a great Benefit* themselves, when they bring their Charge carefully prepared to the Bishop for Confirmation] — Indeed the *Dr.* justly observes, That it is not in the Sureties *Power to give the Child Grace*: But then he seems to be of Opinion, That they are beneficial to the Child, as performing those Things for the Child, which are the necessary Conditions of obtaining the Grace of Baptism: His Words are expressly these; “*Infants may receive the good Things of Baptism BY THE FAITH OF THOSE WHO REPRESENT THEM.* He quotes that
Saying

Saving of *Rabanus Maurus*. — It is manifest that as Children draw those Sins from others which are remitted to them in Baptism, so also BY OTHERS they may believe unto Salvation. — So that (the Dr. add.) we ought to believe, till the Child be capable, the Faith of its SURETIES is so far accepted for it, as to entitle it to all the Blessings of the Covenant; and it is an excellent Charity of the Church to lend them Hands to receive such a Mercy, without which they must remain under the Power of Death” — I shall make no Reflections upon these extraordinary Lines: but suppose ’em to exhibit the Sense of your Church upon the Matter; For this Book of Dr. *Comber’s* is very much read and recommended among you as a most Authentick Commentary on the Church-Service, and as such is said to be put into the Hands of *Students* in the Universities at home very generally. Nor has there ever been any publick *Cōsure* passed upon these remarkable Passages, that I know of. Whether you condemn this *fine Divinity*, or not, we must wait to hear in your next.

B I come now to the Burial Office. I granted, that this Office implies that we have a Hope of the dead Person — But then I say, That Expression, in sure and certain Hope of the Resurrection &c. is only a Repetition of that Article of the Creed, We believe there will be a Resurrection. (p. 73, 74)

D. If there be other Passages in the burial Office, that do imply a Hope of the dead Person, how impertinent was it for you to single out this, and tell us, that this referred only to the general Resurrection; since the Charge might ly against your Office in full Force, if that were granted you? But why did you not answer the Evidence I offered you, that this very Expression does imply a
sure

sure and certain Hope of the Salvation of the most profligate Sinner, that dies a Member of the Church of England?

You must before God and the People declare at the Funeral of every one that dies in your Communion, That it hath pleased Almighty God of his great Mercy to take to himself the Soul of our dear Brother here departed; and that you therefore commit the Body to the Ground, Earth to Earth, Ashes to Ashes, Dust to Dust, in sure and certain Hope of the Resurrection to eternal Life through our Lord Jesus Christ. You must give hearty Thanks to God, for that it hath pleased him to deliver this our Brother out of the Miseries of this sinful World. You must pray God to raise us from the Death of Sin to the Life of Righteousness, that when we shall depart this Life we may rest in him [Christ] as our Hope is this our Brother doth. And what can be a stronger Declaration of the greatest Evidence of such a Person's eternal Salvation, than this is? Has God taken the Soul of the dead to himself? Do you heartily thank him for delivering your Brother out of the Miseries of this sinful World? Do you pray for the same Salvation for your own Souls, which you hope him possessed of? What Expressions can be thought of, that carry in them a greater Assurance of the eternal Happiness of the deceased, than these do; however the other Clause is understood?

But then it's also manifest, that you declare a sure and certain Hope of the Resurrection to eternal Life, of that very Body you commit to the Ground, Earth to Earth, Ashes to Ashes, Dust to Dust. Your Office does no more refer to the general Resurrection in that Clause of it, than to a general Body committed to the Ground, a general Earth to Earth &c. if there be any Sense and Connection in the Expressions.

B. *Because*

B. *Because the Office implies a Hope, therefore I say, we will not use it at the Funerals of those, for whom we can have no rational Grounds to Hope.* (p. 74.)

D. Have not you declared your unfeigned Assent and Consent to every Thing contain'd in the Book of Common-Prayer? Are not you sworn to canonical Obedience; and don't that oblige you to use that Office? Or have you a Dispensation in this Case? ---- Certain it is, that your Prayer-Book obliges you to use this Office for all, but those that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or that lay violent Hands on themselves. No Degree or Kind of Impiety, tho' it should be in the last Moments of a secure impenitent Sinner, will cut off any Member of the Church of *England* from this imaginary Privilege, except he be a Self-Murderer. And what Advantage, either to the dead or living, can possibly follow from your thus adventuring to address even God himself with such Declarations as these? What can have a greater Tendency to harden poor Sinners in a sensual Life, than to hear the eternal Salvation of such as themselves so positively declared? Ought we not to have a greater Awe of the glorious Majesty of the eternal God, than to declare in his immediate Presence, and to praise him for, the Salvation of such as have given no Evidences of their Title to that Salvation? If I had no other Objection against the Church of *England*, this Office alone would keep me from Conforming to that Church.

B. *You again charge us with pretending to be Gods, in taking upon us absolutely to pardon Sins. — And so you go on ranting and railing, when your Conscience told you, that we don't differ one Hair's Breadth about the Thing; but only you don't fancy the Word. You think*

think it should not be, I absolve in the Name of God : but would have it expressed thus, I declare God's Absolution. (p. 75.)

D. What a Bundle of Misrepresentations is here crowded together? Did I ever charge you *with pretending to be Gods*? Or is this a just Insinuation, from my arguing, that the pardoning of Sin is an incommunicable Branch of God's Prerogative? *Don't we differ one Hairs Breadth about the Thing*, when you endeavour to justify the Office, and I think I have fully proved that it is in all Respects unjustifiable, in both those that use it, and those that desire to have it used for them? Did I ever tell you, that I would *have it expressed thus, I declare God's Absolution*? No, Sir, There is no more Foundation for all this, than Mr. Beach's Apprehension, that this Way of representing the Case would serve his Turn best. I am still of Opinion, that it's a great deal too bold for any Man upon Earth (the Pope not excepted) to Authoritatively declare God's Absolution or Pardon to any one, whatever Profession he may make; and it is yet much bolder, to solemnly declare it in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that you absolve any Man from all his Sins. For as you cannot know any Man's Heart, whether his Profession of Repentance be sincere; and whether his Sins be pardoned: So God has given you no Authority to pardon his Sins, if his Repentance were ever so sincere.

You declare to the sick Person, that by *Christ's Authority committed to you, you absolve him from all his Sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*. Now I desire to know, where Christ has committed to you this Authority, to pardon Sins in his Name? Have you this Authority, or
have

have you not? If you have, I hope you won't condemn the *Papists* for claiming it: For why mayn't they pretend to it as well as you? Nor will you blame People for *purchasing* their Pardon of the Priest: for how can their Money be better expended? But if you have not this Authority, all your Explications are impertinent. — You do in the most sacred and solemn Manner assert, that you have this Authority committed to you by Christ; and you do in the Name of the adorable Trinity pretend to exercise it, in absolving the sick Person from all his Sins. And by what Explication is it possible to palliate this Pretence to pardon Men's Sins; but by declaring to the World, that you *say* one Thing, and *mean* another, even when you speak in the awful Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If you pretend to mean a *declarative* and *conditional* Pardon; yet you pronounce an *absolute* and *unconditional* Pardon, in as strong Terms as easily can be invented. — And by the Way, Has your Church ever given us any such Explication of her Meaning, as you pretend to, or given you any Authority to do it for her? Or indeed (if she had) would the plain natural Meaning of the Words bear it?

B. *Under the Law, the Priest's Declaration concerning the Leper, or his Judgment whether he was clean or unclean, was called a cleansing or polluting him, and a making him clean or unclean; tho' strictly speaking, the Priest did not make him leprous or not leprous, but only declared upon a just Examination and View, whether he was so or not. So the Ministers of the Gospel have that Authority committed unto them, to forgive or retain Sins, as the Priests under the Law had to cure Lepers. (p. 76.)*

P

D. Yes,

D. Yes, Sir, when you have the like *Capacity to judge*, that Men's Sins are pardoned, or not, as the Priests under the Law had to judge that the Leprosy was cleansed or not: When your positive Declaration of Absolution is a *Means instituted* by God himself for the obtaining a Pardon of Men's Sins, as the Priests Declaration was for cleansing the Leprosy: And when you have *Authority*, expressly given you by God himself, to make this Declaration *in his Name*, as the Priests had under the Law; there may be some Parity in the Cases. But in the mean Time, since all these Things are wanting on your Side, your pretended Parallel is but a wild Impertinency. — And whatever Comfort some Men may pretend to take from human Absolution, I can't think they are any nearer to Heaven by these Means: Tho' many Sinners are in Danger of being thereby brought into greater Security, harden'd in Presumption, and deluded with false Hopes of Happiness; while they hear the Priest solemnly declaring, *That their Sins are forgiven by God himself*, and think with you that *SUCH A DECLARATION, proceeding from the Mouth of one of those who are constituted ministerial Judges of particular Men's Repentance, is proper* EVANGELICAL ABSOLUTION. — A most wonderfull Piece of Divinity this! Upon which I must take Leave to return you one of your own Remarks, and say, "This is either a false and pernicious Doctrine, or else a Piece of solid Nonsense.

B. *This (i. e. absolve in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost) in Effect you do every Time you baptize a Person, or administer the Lord's-Supper.*
(p. 75.)

D. This I must leave with our Readers; for I
am

am not able to see any Appearance of Argument in it; and therefore can't Answer it. I can't see what Parity there is between pardoning Sins, and administering the Ordinances of the Gospel.

B. *When you authoritatively pronounce the Blessing upon your Congregation, you are as much a God, as we are, when we pronounce God's Absolution. (p. 76.)*

D. I suppose you mean, that there is no more Authority exercised or implied, in absolving Men from all their Sins in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, than in pronouncing the Blessing: Or in other Words, that there is the same Authority claim'd in praying God to bless the Congregation, as in pardoning their Sins. This also I must leave with our Readers: The bare stating the Case seems to me sufficient. Only by the Way, I would propose a Query or two. If pronouncing the *Blessing*, and pronouncing the *Absolution*, are understood by your Church to be equally *Authoritative*, Why may not the *Deacons* among you be allowed to use your Forms for the one, as well as the other? And if the *Priests* Declaration of God's Pardon be *proper Evangelical Absolution*, and such a *good Foundation of Comfort*, as you say it is, how unhappy are many Epitcopal Congregations in *England*, that have only a *Deacon* to officiate among them, who is not empower'd to pronounce the *Absolution*?

Now give me Leave to shut up this Dispute, by repeating to you the Sentiments of *Another*, in the following Letter from an anonymous Hand. ‡

‡ *London-Mag.* Aug. 1737.

P 2.

SIR,

SIR,

AS you are a rational and *consistent Protestant*, it must have often roused your Indignation to observe the Cheats put by *Romish Priests* upon the unwary Souls of Men. Some of these the Scripture calls *Sorcery*; they are a Kind of *Spiritual Magick*, or an Art of making Men religious, and of sending 'em to Heaven without any real Holiness or Virtue at all.

But is there nothing of *this same Sorcery* practis'd among us? As some of the brightest Ornaments of our Church have not only acknowledged some Things in it's Constitution and Forms would admit of Alteration, but have even wish'd and labour'd for it; and as we are once a Year taught to lament the *Want* of godly *Discipline*, and to pray that it may be restor'd; 'twill not, I hope, be thought Presumption, if, with the Frankness of an *Old Whig* and a *Free Briton*, I observe some Things in our Church, which carry too great Appearance of this *Spiritual Juggle* or *Scorcery*. What otherwise can we think of three of it's prescrib'd Rites, *Confirmation*, *Absclution*, and the *Burial* of the *Dead*?

By the *first* of these, all Persons baptized, when come to competent Age, and able to say the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the ten Commandmen's, and the shorter Catechism, are to be brought to Confirmation: The Bishop having ask'd, *Whether they renew their solemn Promise and Vow that was made in their Name at Baptism?* upon their answering, *We do*, declares in the most solemn and publick Manner, even in an *Address to God himself*, that he has *Vouchsafed* to regenerate these his Servants by *Water* and the *Holy Ghost*, and to give them the *Forgiveness* of all their Sins; and laying his Hands upon

upon the Head of each particular Person, *be certifies him by that Sign, of God's Favour and gracious Goodness toward him.*

Now this *Bishop* we are taught to look upon as the Ambassador of Jesus Christ; and a Successor of the Apostles, who had Power to remit Sins: And when they hear this venerable Person thus solemnly declaring that God *hath regenerated and forgiven them*; who can wonder, if they really believe themselves to be so, and upon these Grounds indulge a confident Security as to the Favour of God, and Happiness in a future World?

That the poor ignorant and unthinking Part of the People should be thus easily deluded, is not so strange: But that such learned, wise and pious Men, as our Rev. Bishops are, who know the Aptness of Mankind to deceive themselves by false Hopes, and the infinite Folly and Danger of their so doing; that *these* should thus contribute to lull them asleep, and without knowing their Hearts, or a due Enquiry into their Lives, declare them in the Presence of God regenerated and pardoned, is a Conduct truly surprizing, and not easily to be accounted for.

In the *Absolution of sick Penitents*, the sick Person being mov'd to make a special Confession of his Sins, if he feel his Conscience troubled with any weighty Matter, after such Confession the Priest shall absolve him (if he humbly and heartily desire it) after this Sort: *Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left Power to his Church to absolve all Sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great Mercy forgive thee thine Offences; and by the Authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy Sins, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

What and where is that Church, to which Christ has left this Power? Is it the Catholick and universal

universal Church, or any national or provincial Church? Or, is it every particular Society of worshipping Christians? In what Persons is it lodged? with the whole *Body of the People*, who, according to Scripture-Language, and the Doctrine of our own Articles, are properly called *the Church*; or with the *Ministers* or *Clergy*, who are never so called? In the former Part, 'tis said to be *left to the Church*; but in the latter the *PRIEST* claims it as *his Peculiar*; to which, when his Claim shall have been fully proved, his Character shall be confess'd *indelible* and *sacred*, and Incense and the Knee be offered him as the Representative of Christ upon Earth.

If Christ hath given Power to any *authoritatively* to absolve *those who are truly penitent*, he must also have given them Power to *know who are truly penitent*; else 'tis a Power to do just nothing: For till they *know* them to be truly penitent (*i. e.* till they can search their Hearts) they cannot *authoritatively* absolve them; and if they cannot do it till *then*, they cannot do it at all.

Is a *meer Confession* of Sin all the Gospel demands, in order to it's Forgiveness? Must it not be *forsook* and *broken off* as well as *confessed*? Are not the most debauched, when Sickness seizes, and Death is thought to approach them, wont to *feel their Conscience troubled*, readily to confess their Sin, to express great Sorrow, to vow Amendment if spared? But when the Danger is blown off, is it hardly ever seen that they return not to their Crimes with as mad a Gust as before?

Another Absurdity in this dangerous and delusive Form is, that tho' the Confession be but *special*, the Absolution is *general*. But, by what Logic? Or from what Scripture, is this Inference drawn,

drawn, that a Contrition for *some Sins*, shall obtain Forgivenness of *all Sins*?

Well — but the sick Man dies — he liv'd a vicious and debauch'd Life, was a known Drunkard, Adulterer but when his last Sickness came, he trembled at the Thought of Death — sent for the Priest, confess'd his Sin, and desired to be absolved: The Priest by *Authority committed to him* in the most solemn Form of Words, even in *the Name of the Father, &c.* pronounces and declares him absolved from all his Sins. The unhappy Person thus dead comes now to be buried. Here the Priest, in the Face of a vast Croud who knew the Man's wicked Life, solemnly declares, *That God hath taken to himself the Soul of this our dear Brother — gives him hearty Thanks that it hath pleased him to deliver this our Brother out of the Miseries of this sinful World — and prays, that when we shall depart this Life we may rest in him (Christ) as our Hope is this our Brother doth.* What can the attending Croud think of all this? If they think at all, it must be either,

First, that what the Priest hath said is *true*, and may be depended on as *the Word of God*, whose Ambassador he is supposed to be; and if so, *Remission* may be had in this World, and *Salvation* in the other, *without breaking off my Sins*: I shall have Peace therefore, tho' I go on to add *Drunkennes to Thirst*; and however vicious my Life be, may have hope in my Death that I shall *rest in Christ*, as the Priest tells me, *this our Brother doth.*

Secondly, If these Pretensions and Expressions be examin'd but by common Sense, they appear to be all a *solemn FARCE*, a *shocking and gross DELUSION*; a dangerous Encouragement to careless and immoral Living; subversive of good Order and Virtue upon Earth; calculated to advance the Power of Priests,

Priests, and to stupidity and enslave the Consciences of Men, There are Numbers of our wise Clergy who groan under these unhappy Forms, and sincerely wish them removed: Why *in the Name of God*, are they not removed? Or if this cannot be obtained, why are they not more zealously and openly disavow'd? Our Church is daily dishonoured and weakened by these Practices. Infidelity gains on it *here*, Popery *there*.

B. *I proceed to the tenth Charge, which is against Holy-Days. Here I observed, you keep human Holy-Days as well as we, and therefore I conclude you don't think it a Sin. — But you say, Tho' we have not Authority to make Time holy, yet we have Authority to set apart Time for holy Services. This Distinction is learned enough in all Conscience! Pray let me into this Mystery, and shew me how you can set apart Time for holy Service; and yet not make that Time holy. What Holiness is there in Time, but only it's being set apart from common to holy Services? (p. 77, 80)*

D. The clearing this Point will (I think) be a sufficient Answer to all your Reasonings in your Appeal, from the imagined Parallel between our observing Lecture-Days, occasional Fasts and Thanksgivings, and your observing all the *Holy-Days* appointed in your *Kalendar*. I shall therefore something distinctly consider the Case.

I did say, that *tho' we have not Authority from God to make Time holy; yet we have Authority to set apart Time for these holy Services* (i. e. such Services as he has appointed and has made it our Duty to attend) *when his Providence calls for it. Whatever religious Duties are performed by us in Obedience*

to God's Command, must be done in Time; and consequently there must be some Time set apart for their Observance, if they are attended at all: Whence it follows, that he who requires us to perform those Duties, requires us also to set apart Time for their Performance. The same Command (for Example) that requires Ministers to preach in Season and out of Season, requires them to improve some Time for the Discharge of that Duty; and therefore requires them to take some other Time to preach to the People, besides the stated Seasons on the Lord's Day. The same Commands that require occasional *Fasts* and *Thanksgivings*, require also that we occasionally set apart some Time to observe these *Fasts* and *Thanksgivings*, without which they cannot be observed at all. From which Considerations it appears (as I shewed you more largely in my Defence) That God has required us to observe *Lectures*, occasional *Fast-Days* and *Thanksgiving-Days*; And we have Authority from him to set apart Time for these holy Services. Tho' he has given us no Authority at all to make Time holy; or to consecrate any stated periodical Returns of Time, so that these holy Services will be necessary on Account of the Time. Such a consecrating stated periodical Returns of Time to special Services, is what I mean, and what the Scripture always means, by making Time holy. Thus under the leuitical Dispensation, their Sabbaths were holy, their New-Moons, their stated Feasts and Fasts were holy, only on the Account of the Consecration of a stated Return of Time for these holy Services. Upon the same Account also, the Church of England calls her Feasts and Fasts *holy Days*; because of their Designation in an annual Return, to the peculiar Purposes for which they are appointed. It's remarkable, that

Q

the

the occasional *Fasts* and *Thanksgivings* so frequently mentioned in Scripture, are never called *Holy Days*: nor are such occasional Appointments so called in the Church of *England*. And the Reason is, because the Services are not attended for the Sake of the Time: But the Time only observed for the Sake of the Services. Whereas on the Contrary, upon all the Times that are called *Holy Days*, the Services must be observed on Account of the Return of the consecrated Time, without any other special Call to their Observation. And is there no Difference in these Cases? Is there no Difference between attending required Duties, necessarily taking some Time to attend them; and making Time *holy*; or consecrating set Days every Year, for such Purposes as we are pleased to appoint of our own Accords? I think there is a very great Difference in many Respects, between your *Holy Days*, and our occasional Services; tho' ours as well as yours require Time for their Observation.

1. Because in our occasional Services we assume no Authority to *consecrate Time* at all: but leave that Prerogative of Heaven, where it ought to be left, in the Hands of God alone. We don't esteem any Return of Time more holy than other; but that alone which God himself has made so. Whereas you on the contrary consecrate stated Days in the Year, declare them to be holy, and oblige People to observe 'em in their yearly Return. But by what Authority is this done?

2. Because the *Duties* we perform on these Occasions, are such as God himself has *required*, as I shewed you before; whereas you consecrate Time for such Services as are *no where warranted, no where preceded or allowed* in the Scriptures. You can't (for Instance) pretend, that the Observation of any
Saints.

Saints-Days (much less, that the Observation of such a Number of 'em) is any where warranted in Scripture ; while, on the contrary, you your self allow, that occasional *Fasts* and *Thanksgivings* are required by God himself.

3. Because *we do not* (as you do) *impose a new Yoke on the Neck of Christ's Disciples*, instead of that which God himself has taken off. We don't observe *Days and Months and Times and Years*, lest the Gospel should be *in vain to us*, Gal. iv. 10, 11. We don't revive the typical Dispensation of *Holy Days*, which *was a shadow of Things to come, but the Body is of Christ*, Col. ii. 17. We can't imagine any Reason, why we should value our selves upon our *Liberty*, by being freed from the *Jewish Yoke of Bondage* (Gal. v. 1.) and yet impose a greater Yoke upon our selves.

4. Because *we don't* (as you do) *practically declare our selves unsatisfied with the Provision Christ has made for the thankful Remembrance of all the Instances of his redeeming Love*, which he has in common bestowed upon Mankind. Christ has appointed one Day in every Week to these Purposes ; he thought that sufficient, and we think so too ; and can't find any Warrant or Commission given to any Man, to appoint any other. He has indeed required us, to perform religious Duties of every Kind ; and consequently to take Time to perform them. We must set apart Time for special Services, such as *Fasts* and *Thanksgivings*, when his Providence on one Occasion and another calls for them. But he himself has appointed Time for the commemorating the common Benefits of his Redemption ; and has given no Man Authority or Commission to appoint any other stated Times on that Account. Which may serve for Answer to page 88th of your *Appeal*.

Q 2

5. Because

5. Because we dare not (as you do) take away the Liberty God has allowed our People; and take up above half their Time in Feasts, Fasts, and Holidays of our own instituting, which he has given them for their secular Employments.

6. Because we dare not go so far towards justifying the Papists in their worshipping of Saints and Angels, as you seem to do, in setting apart the same Days in a Year as they do, in (I know not what) Commemoration of those Saints and Angels: Because the Scripture expressly calls the Papists Saint-Worship, the Doctrine of Devils or Demons, 1 Tim. iii. 1.

These, Sir, are some of the Differences between your *Holy Days*, and our occasional Employment of Time in attendance upon special commanded Duties of Religion. And these Differences will be most clear and apparent to every one, that will give himself Liberty to think; notwithstanding all your sarcastical Fleers, and notwithstanding all your Attempts to make them every way parallel.

B. How could you make such a vile and horrid Representation, as tho' all were to be excommunicated, that did not keep above half the Year as holy Time? (p. 83)

D. Your Church has appointed the Observation, besides 52 Sundays, of 29 other *Feast-Days*, 52 *Fridays*, 12 *Ember-Days*, 3 *Rogation-Days*, 33 Days of *Lent* exclusive of the *Fridays*, *November 5th*, *January 30th*, and *May 29th*. All of which make up 184 Days. These the Church of England calls *Holy Days*, *Feast-Days*, and *Fast-Days*, and has appointed special Services for 'em all; besides a great Number of *Saints-Days* mention'd in the *Kalendar*, for which there is no special Service appointed.

appointed. Now your *sixth Canon* excommunicates every one that affirms, that he *may not with any good Conscience approve and use all your Rites and Ceremonies*. Where then is the vile and horrid Representation? Indeed, Sir, you would do well to consider a little better, before you indulge Passion and give Vent to such very wrathful Expressions.

B. *No Man on any of these Days is obliged to forbear Labour, any more than on your Lecture-Days.* (p. 82.)

D. Are not these *Feast-Days* or Days of Thanksgiving, these *Fast-Days* or Days of Abstinence, these *Holy Days*, appointed for every one alike in your Prayer-Book, without any Limitation? What then can you mean?—Unless it be, that it is in your Church's Opinion lawful to exact all your Labour, upon Days of fasting and thanksgiving, as the Prophet complains of another Church in the same Case, *Isai. lviii. 3.*

B. *You are mistaken when you say, that we have no higher nor better Example than the Church of Rome. Origen says, that in his Time the Church observ'd the Feast of holy Innocent. Tertullian speaks of the Birth Day of the Martyrs.* (p. 83.)

D. You don't tell us where to find these Quotations: but suppose 'em true, what is it to the Days you observe? What other Example, than the Church of Rome, can you find for the Observation of those Days kept in your Church?

B. *Our holy Days are no more Jewish, no more a Sign of our renouncing Christianity, no more a Yoke to our Shoulders, than your Holy Days.* (p. 88.)

D. Is

D. Is it no more *Jewish*, to keep *Easter, Pentecost &c.* that were originally *Jewish Holy Days*, & are as much abrogated as any of the rest of their Days; than to preach upon a Week-Day, or keep a Day of *Fasting* and *Thanksgiving* upon special Occasions? Is it no more a Yoke upon our Shoulders, to Consecrate above a hundred Days in a Year, than to set apart two or three Days for special Service, as Occasion requires? From whom did you expect Credit to this strange Assertion?

B. I come now to consider what you say of the Holy Days instituted *Esth. ix.* --- There is not the least *Lisp* of God's commanding this Feast, nay the Holy Ghost says expressly, that the Jews ordained it, and took it upon themselves and their Seed. (p. 84)

D. If these *Holy Days* were religious Feasts, which yet the Text says nothing of, they were appointed by *Mordecai* (*Esth. ix. 31.*) the supposed Penman of the Book of *Esther*, who was, for ought we know to the contrary, as much inspired in making this Appointment, as in penning the sacred Story. As for the Jews appointing these Days, it manifestly means no more than their agreeing to observe the Appointments of *Mordecai*; as appears from the Text now quoted, compared with verse 20th of the same Chapter. So that all Argument from hence must necessarily fall to the Ground. I will freely consent to the Observation of any *Holy Days* in your Church, that you can prove to be appointed by an inspired Writer of the sacred Scriptures of the New Testament.

B. Come we now to my second Instance, *Joh. xxii. 23.* I said. *Christ* was no Dissenter; but observed a human Holy Day, appointed long before by the *Maccabees*. --- You say, it can't be proved that *Christ* ever observed or approved

approved of that Feast. To which I reply — He knew, it was the Time when others presented themselves to keep the Feast at that Place. He at least gave them Occasion to think that he owned the Feast. — It's certain our Lord would have reprov'd the Observation of this human Holy Day, if it had been sinful. (p. 85)

D. Suppose that the Feast of Dedication was appointed by the *Maccabees*; I yet say, it can't be prov'd, that our Lord Jesus Christ ever approved of it. All that can be found in the Text, to build such a Supposition upon, is these Words, — *And it was at Jerusalem the Feast of Dedication, and it was Winter; and Jesus walked in the Temple in Solomon's Porch.* This is all that is said about it. All the Story in your Books, of Christ's coming many Miles to celebrate this Feast, and the like, is meerly your own Imagination. How do you know, that our Lord had any more Regard to the Feast of Dedication, than to the Winter, in his walking in *Solomon's Porch*? It is not easily understood, why the Evangelist there mentions it's being Winter, unless to insinuate the Reason of Christ's walking there. Accordingly Dr. *Lightfoot* so understands this Text. *He walked there because it was Winter, that he might get and keep himself warm.* * — But why did not our Lord reprove the Observation of this human Holy Day? Pray, How do you know that he did not reprove it, that he did not walk in the Porch for that End? But if he did not reprove it, it might be for this Reason; because it was no *Holy Day* at all. There is nothing in the Text that gives us any Evidence, that it was observed as a religious Feast; or that there was any Body in the Temple at that Time

* Vol. II. p. 578.

in Observation of that Feast, or any Thing like it. In a Word, all that can be proved from Scripture, is the bare Mention of the *Feast of Dedication*: all the rest is to be deduced by *innuendo*, which must be taken from you for good Proof of any Thing, that you are inclined to impose upon us.

B. *Your next Complaint is against our Bishops. Here you tell us, what great Feats you have done in your Writings against Episcopacy - To which I answer, Let another Man praise thee, and not thine own Mouth. (p. 89)*

D. This is a very unjust Insinuation. I observed, that it was impossible in so short a Compass to fully consider that Subject; and therefore referred you to what I had already written upon it, that yet remains unanswered. And I venture to do so again. And if you had taken Pains to have read what I have already published upon that Argument, you would have found no Room for one Word of what you have now advanced, in Favour of your darling Prelacy: You would have found every Colour of a Reason for the Necessity of a Prelacy in the Church now insisted on by you, particularly answered and refuted: You would have found the *Identity of Bishops and Presbyters* largely (and for what yet appears, unanswerably) proved. And to what Purpose is it to answer the same Thing over and over again? To what Purpose, to dispute with such an Adversary, that will take no Notice of the Answers given to his Arguments; but advance the same anew, as if they had not before been refuted?

B. *But why should we amuse People with the Talk of Presbyterian Ordination? My first Commission,*

I am very certain, when traced a little Way back, was derived from meer Laymen. (p. 92.)

D. I have taken some Pains to inquire into this Case; and have the following Account of the Matter of Fact, from a Gentleman whose Fidelity and Capacity I can depend upon. " Whatever certainly, Mr. Beach may pretend to in this Case, he is manifestly under a great Mistake. For tho' it be allowed, that there were in New-England two or three Lay Ordinations (and more I never heard of) yet they don't at all affect the present Ministry, in that it can't (I think) be proved, that any now in the Ministry, derived their Commissions (as he expresses it) from such, and only such, as were so ordained. As to himself, he was ordained by Mr. Shove, and others of equal Authority; Mr. Shove was ordained by Mr. Webb and others; Mr. Webb by Mr. Walker and others; Mr. Walker by Mr. Warham and others; and Mr. Warham was episcopally ordained in England. Besides there's no Doubt but that a Succession might be found for Mr. Beach, from Mr. Blackman and Mr. Denton, who were both settled in New-haven Colony, and both before their coming to America legal Ministers in England, the one at Halifax in Yorkshire, and the other in Leicestershire.

B. We can't join with you, because you have not a regular Mission. (p. 93.)

D. Surprising! For that Gentleman gives me this further Account. " I have been well inform'd, that Mr. Beach, since he embraced the episcopal Persuasion, has solemnly declared in the Presence of sundry Ministers, who he designed should

R

" he

" be Witnesses for him, and who took a Certificate of that Declaration in his Presence, which was approv'd by himself, That he did firmly believe, that the Ministers of our Persuasion in New-England are true Ministers of Jesus Christ, and will be accepted of him accordingly." Now, Sir, turn to Page 105th of your Appeal; and think how you would like your own Reflections, if retorted upon you.

B. You complain, because our People bear a vocal Part in the publick Worship. Here I can't but observe, how easily you turned off all those unanswerable Arguments for this Practice, that I gave you from Mr. Baxter. (p. 94)

D. Mr. Baxter is well known to have been on the Side of Nonconformity, both by his Writings and Practice. He has written largely against many of these very Things, that I am implending. And with what Justice you so often drag him into your Service, I cannot judge, without a Sight of the Books you refer to. Indeed I place but little Confidence upon any Man's Authority in a Case of this Kind; and Dr. Rule observes, "For Mr. Baxter's Authority, we lay little Weight on it; he hath his own singular Opinions, which neither Party do unanimously allow." But neither you nor I are so proper Judges, whether the Arguments you bro't from Mr. Baxter, or whatever other Arguments you were pleased to advance, are fully answered, or not. We have appealed to another Tribunal; and the World must judge between us. — I proved to you before from 1 Cor. xiv. that all Worship must be intelligibly perform'd. We must pray so that our Understandings mayn't be unfruitful ver. 14. We must pray with the Spirit, and the Understanding, ver.

ver. 15. We must pray so that he who occupies the Place of the unlearned may say Amen at our giving of Thanks; and understand what we say, ver. 16. We must pray so that others may be edified, ver. 17. And can you pretend that your Worship is intelligibly performed? When all speak together, can any Body know what is said by others? Can a Stander-by say Amen at your giving of Thanks, when he knows not a Word that's spoken? Can others be edified by such Service, which they understand nothing of? How then will your Responses agree with this Directory, which was purposely given to regulate our publick Worship?

B. You allow all the People to sing together, and why does not this make your Worship unintelligible? — The Psalms you sing, are Prayers as well as Praises; and if all the People may sing them, it's certain all the People may say them, for singing and saying are but two different Modes of speaking. (p. 94, 95)

D. How often must you be told, that *Praying* and *Singing* are two very different Parts of publick Worship, to be perform'd for different Purposes, and in a different Manner, that there is no just arguing from the one to the other? *Singing* does from it's very Nature imply an audible lifting up the Voice; and they that do not sing with an audible Voice, don't sing at all. Whereas *Praying* does not absolutely imply any more, than the lifting our Hearts and Desires to God; and may be perform'd acceptably without any Voice at all. And the whole Congregation may unite in *Prayer*, when there is but one Voice heard; but none of the Congregation can join in *Singing*, without united Voices as well as Affections. To which I may

R 2

add,

add; that publick *Singing* is every where exemplified in Scripture as being perform'd with the united Voices of the Congregation; but we have not one Example of publick *Prayer* thus performed. You have not a Precept or an Example in the whole Bible for your Responses; or for the People's bearing an audible vocal Part in the publick *Prayers*.

B. *The Scripture directs us to join our Voices, not only in Singing, but in saying our Prayers and Praise.* 2 Chron vii. 3. All the Children of Israel bowed themselves with their Faces to the Ground upon the Pavement, and worshipped, and praised the Lord saying, For he is good, for his Mercy endureth for ever. So Acts iv. 24. They all lift up their Voices with one Accord in Prayer. *They did not sing, but said, Lord thou art good &c.* (p. 96.)

D. As to the first of these Texts, it's only an Instance of the People's uniting their Voices in *Singing*: as appears from 1 Chron. xvi. 41, 42. where we find that *Heman, Jeduthun* and others were appointed to lead the Choir in performing this very Service; which was to be performed not only with the united Voices of the Congregation, but with Trumpets, and Cymbals, and musical Instruments. And the very foregoing Chapter is a particular Account of a long publick *Prayer* pronounced by *Solomon*, wherein no other of the Congregation bare any vocal Part at all. So that this makes nothing to your Purpose.

The second of these Texts, as it is rendered in our Translation, does indeed seem to favour your Cause. But if the Original be viewed, it will be found to be as impertinently urged as the other was. In the Original it is, *They lifted up a Voice to God*

God with one Heart. The Relative (*Their*) which gives the wrong Turn to our Thoughts, is not found in the Greek Text; nor has it any Claim to stand in the English, but from the Authority of the *Translators*. All that can be prov'd from this Text is, that they were heartily united in their Address to God: but there is not a Word of their using united Voices in their making that Address; Nothing of there being more than one Voice used in it. Much less is there any Thing of *ALL* lifting up their Voices, as you are pleased to represent it, very different both from the Original and our Translation.— Upon the whole, I ^{ever} challenge you to find any Thing in Scripture, like your *Responses in Prayer*, or any such unintelligible Method of praying to God as is found among you, when you all lift up your Voices together. W

B. *There is no Difficulty in this Matter. A Stranger, if he will but use a Book, or stand near to one who does, may read, or hear intelligibly every Sentence. (p.95.)*

D. The Apostle directs to the Performance of this Duty in such a Manner, that he that Occupierth the Room of the unlearned may say Amen, and understand what you say; and be edified with your Prayers, 1. Cor. xiv. 16, 17. as I observed before. But how can an unlearned Person that can't read, be helped by your Books to understand what you say, be edified by it, or say *Amen* to it, when the united Voices of the Congregation make it a confused and an unintelligible Sound? I think there is nothing more certain, than that your Practice in this Case is directly opposite to this Directory of the Apostle, make what Apologies you can in Favour of it.

B. *Before*

B. Before I conclude, I must return you my hearty Thanks for your most charitable Prayer for me in the Conclusion. You pray that the Blessing of many Souls ready to perish may come upon me, that these may be my Crown and Rejoycing in the Day of the Lord Jesus. But how strangely inconsistent is this with the rest of your Book, that throughout represents the Way that I am leading Souls in, as the certain Road to Hell? My Worship you say is vain; my Doctrine is Arminianism; and my Discipline none at all. (p. 105.)

D. Tho' I think I have proved, that all human Inventions and Impositions in the Worship of God are vain Worship; yet I hope I have never said, that all the Worship in the Church of England is vain Worship. I never denied, but that they have such Worship among them, as is not of human Invention. — And tho' I think the Arminians very much mistaken in the five Points debated between them and us; yet I never determined their Doctrines to be so subversive of the Fundamentals of Christianity, as to render an Arminian incapable of Salvation. But however, I may apply here what Mr. Chillingworth says concerning the Popish Errors; “The holding these Errors, though it did not merit, might yet occasion Damnation. — “Tho' a goodly Man might be saved with these Errors; yet by means of them many are made vicious, and so damned: By them, I say, though not for them. — “Besides, though the Matter of an Error may be only something profitable, not necessary, yet the Neglect of it may be a damnable Sin. — “Lastly, the erring from some profitable, tho' lesser Truth, may dispose a Man to Error in greater Matters.

As I said before, so I again say, that there may be such of each Party, that are Fellow-Members of

of the mystical Body of Christ, who should live in Love and Peace, and not *fall out by the Way*; for *they are Brethren*. We agree in the Profession of *one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism*; tho' we don't agree in one Ritual, and one Form of Worship and Discipline. I can't but think, that in the debated Points you are much in the wrong: but I don't charge you with *damnable Heresies*, or fundamental Errors. I dare not limit the Mercies of God to any Party, since we are all liable to Mistake and Error, while cloathed with Mortality. I hope such a Spirit of *Bigotry* will yet be confined to it's ancient Limits; and remain the Peculiarity of *Highb Church*. Let them, if they please, damn all the Protestant Churches, but themselves. Let them determine concerning all who want their Form of Episcopacy, that they have no Ministry, no Ordinances, nor ordinary Means of Salvation; and must at best be left to the uncovenanted Mercies of God. — But I, for my Part, will not only wish, but hope well, as to all those of every Party, that appear to *love our Lord Jesus Christ in Sincerity*; tho' I should think them mistaken in many Particulars. And from this charitable Sentiment of you, Sir, I yet pray for a Blessing on your Person and Labours; and hope to meet you, where there will be a happy Consonance and Agreement, in *Anthems and Hallelujahs, to Him that sits on the Throne and to the Lamb for ever and ever*.



F I N I S.

