A Defence of Moderate Nonconformity
Part II

by

Edmund Calamy

Layout © Quinta Press 2021

The numbers in square brackets in the running heads are the pages numbers in the original which sometimes go awry.

A

DEFENCE

OF

MODERATE NON-CONFORMITY.

IN

ANSWER

TO THE

REFLECTIONS

OF

Mr. *Ollyffe* and Mr. *Hoadley*

On the Tenth Chapter of the Abridgment of the Life of the Reverend Mr. *Rich. Baxter.*

PART II.

With a Postscript, containing an Answer to Mr. *Hoadly's Serious Admonition*; and some Remarks on a Letter of a Nameless Author, said to be a *Congregational Minister in the Country*.

By *EDM. CALAMY,* E. F. & N.

LONDON, Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst* at the Bible and *Three Crowns* in *Cheapside,* near *Mercers-Chappel*; *Jon. Robinson* at the *Golden-Lion* in St. *Pauls's Church-Yard*; and *J. Lawrence* at the *Angel* in the *Poultry*. 1704.

THE

PREFACE

HAving in the first Part of my *Defence*, Consider'd the Head of *Re-ordination*, about which there have been such warm Debates among the *Conformists* and *Non-Conformists* ever since the *Act of Uniformity* took Place, I proceed in this Second Part to the other Terms of *Ministerial Conformity*, I have compar'd the Sense of the Ministers who were Silenc'd, with the Representations of Mr. *Ollyffe* and Mr. *Hoadly*, and laid open the Grounds, upon which I judge the former preferable: And can say upon the whole, that I have not designedly over-look'd any Thing

of Moment, that has been suggested by those Gentlemen.

The following them from Point to Point through such a Variety of Particulars, is too Laborious to have been the Matter of my Choice, if I had not esteem'd it needful to prevent Complaints, either that things were not rightly taken, or distinctly understood: And that this should make my Work swell under my Hands, cannot appear surprizing to any, that observe how much of their Writings, I have by taking this Method, been forc'd to transcribe. But should any *Replies* make a Rejoinder necessary, I should go a much shorter way to Work,

I have a Third Part yet to follow, which in Answer to Mr. *Hoadley*'s Second Part, will contain a Vindication of our Fathers, for persisting in the Ministry after they were Silenc'd; and of the Reasons of their Adhe-

Adherents for encouraging them in it; and of the charitable Measure of those of them, who were for maintaining *Occasional Communion* with the *Church* of *England*, while they were forc'd into a *Stated Separation* from it. This is already well advancd, and I hope in a few Months may see the Light. I should have been Glad I must Confess, to have been more Speedy: But no Man that considers, how I am statedly Employ'd, can think my Delay needs any long Apology,

The Introduction, which I have prefix'd to this Second Part, should rather have been before the First; and had been so, had I then consider'd, as I have done since, how much the distinct Canvassing the General Principles, which each side goes upon, gives light to the several Particulars, on which the Dispute runs: But as it is, I hope it may be of use to give such as will be at the Pains

to peruse it, a clear View of the Central Point of the Controversie of the different Aims of the contending Parties; and of the Considerations, by which those who are concern'd, are severally most sway'd and influenc'd.

I have subjoin'd an Answer to Mr. *Hoadly*'s ADMONITION; and to the Letter of a Pretended *Congregational Minister in the Country:* And tho' I have left nothing, that I could think material in either of those Papers unconsider'd, I have yet avoided what I tho't might heat and exasperate: And shall only say, that if any, I have to do with, will but treat me with a like Temper, I shall never think I have any great Reason to Complain,

In a Letter from a Nameless Person, I have been lately Charg'd with Two Mistakes in the First Part of my Defence, of which I think

thank it not improper here to take Notice.

The Gentleman appears much disturb'd, that I should declare in *Page* 30, that, *after late happy Revolution, the* Dissenters *had Liberty granted them by Law, by the Three Estates of the Realm, King, Lords, and Commons*. As to which I shall only say, that if he'll either blot out the *Three Estates of the Realm*, and read it only, by *King*, *Lords and Commons:* Or if he'll blot out by *King, Lords, and Commons*, and read it only by *the Three Estates of the Realm*, he either way has my free Concurrence, and it will Answer my Intention in that Passage; which was not to enter upon a Political Controversie, but to intimate the firmness of the present Liberty of the *Dissenters*, which before was Precarious.

His

His other complaint is about the *Canons* of 1605. For in *Page* 26, I have this Expression. *By Vertue of these Canons (which were not Confirm'd by Parliament neither) some hundreds of Worthy Ministers were suspended and Ejected.* In which I should think, any Man might understand it to be my Meaning, that the Canon were not confirm'd by any Subsequent Act of Parliament. And I am so unhappy, as to run into the same fault again in this Second Part, for want of better Light, which yet I should be ready to borrow from any Man, that will lend it me. I hope, I may in this be pardon'd, if it be consider'd, not only that this hath been a common Complaint of the Sufferers by those *Canons*, from the Time of their first Appearance, that they should fall under them, tho' they had not a Parliamentary Confirmation; but that it hath been boasted by those, who were as likely to be acquainted with

with *the Rights of the Church* as any Men, that they neither had nor needed any such Confirmation. Tho' the former was over-look'd, as a Consideration of little weight, yet I should think the latter might deserve some Stress. In proof of it, I shall at present only refer to a Speech of Bishop *Hall*'s made in Parliament, in Defence of the *Canons* of 1641, in which are these remarkable Words. *I suppose it can never be show'd, that ever any Ecclesiastical Canons made by the Bishops and Clergy in Synods, General, National, Provincial, were either offer'd, or requir'd to be confirm'd by Parliaments: Emperours and Princes, by whose Autority those Synods were call'd, have still given their Power to the Ratification and Execution of them, and none others: And please to look into the Times within the Ken of Memory, or somewhat beyond it,* Linwoods *Constitutions, what Parliaments Confirm'd: The Injunctions of Queen* Elizabeth, *the Canons of King* James

were

were never tendred to the Parliament for Confirmation. Now if it is without a Precedent for Ecclesiastical Canons to be Confirm'd by Parliament, I hope it cannot give Offence, that I should intimate, that the Canons of 1603, wanted a Parliamentary Confirmation: And that they did so, I have more Evidence to produce, than is fit for a Preface.

I shall only add. That *I* have designedly suspended the Applying my self to the Second Edition of my *Abridgment*, till my *Defence* is finish'd: And take this Opportunity both of returning my Thanks to those, who have been so kind as to send me farther Materials well Attested; and also to renew my Request to any others, who are able either to rectifie Mistakes, or furnish me with Characters of any of the Silenc'd Ministers, to whom *I* have not been able to do Justice, that they would freely communicate parti-

particulars. I do this the rather, because I find a set of Queries (a Copy of which I have obtain'd, and of which I shall hereafter have Occasion to take Notice) most industriously spread about in some Parts of the Kingdom, with an intention to blacken the Memory of the Ejected Ministers; among whom, tho' some had their Blemishes, yet I am not afraid, when their Enemies have said the worst they can of them, to recommend the Body of them to Posterity, as *Persons of whom the World was not Worthy*.

The

The CONTENTS of this Second Part of the Vindication of the *Abridgment* of Mr. *Baxter*'s Life.

THE Introduction: *In which are Consider'd the various Pretensions to an* Imposing Power *in Matters Ecclesiastical; the Fleas by which it's* Exercise *has been most commonly justify'd; together with the* Measures of our Obligation *to a Compliance with it*, &c. Pag. 1, *&c.*

Abridgment, *Chap.* 10. Sect. III. *Of the* Assent, Consent, *and* Subscription *requir'd by the* Act of Uniformity, Pag. 95. *Mr.* Ollyffe's *Sense of the Terms of Conformity in General, consider'd*, p. 101, 102. *His* Rule *admitted, under certain necessary Limitations*, p. 103, *&c. An Historical Account of the various* Subscriptions, *that have been requir'd in the* Church *of* England, p. 106, *&c. Mr.* Ollyffe'*s and Mr.* Hoadly'*s Sense of the Declaration of* Assent *and* Consent *prov'd insufficient*, p. 116, *&c. The Sense of the* Legislators *about this Matter fairly clear'd*, p. 119. *A farther Elucidation of the* Assent *and* Content *requir'd*, p. 123, *&c. Dr.* Sherman'*s Publick* Recantation, *of his* Assent, Consent, *and* Subscription, p.127. *The famous* Dr. Swadlin *was not so singulat as he is represented*, p. 129.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* IV.. *Of the Doctrine of* Real Baptismal Regeneration, *as Assented to by*

by those of the National Constitution, p. 131. *Mr.* Ollyffe'*s Sense of that Matter consider'd*, p. 134. *And Mr.* Hoadly'*s also*, p. 140.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* V. *Of the Use of* God-Fathers and God-Mothers *to the Exclusion of Parents, as comprehended under the* Assent, Consent, *and* Subscription *requir'd*, p. 147. *Mr.* Ollyffe'*s Plea for* God-Fathers and God-Mothers, *according to the Usage of the* Church *of* England *consider'd*, p. 150, 151, *&c. Mr.* Hoadly'*s Suggestions upon this Head Answer'd*, p. 159, *&c. Some Remarks upon the* Questions *in the Office for Baptism*, p. 167.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* VI. *Of the Obligation to* deny *the Ordinance of Baptism to All without* Sponsors, p. 169. *Mr.* Ollyffe'*s way of Evading this Consider'd*, p. 171, *&c.*

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* VII. *Of the Obligation to Use* the Sign of the Cross, p. 179. *Mr.* Ollyffe'*s way of Evading this also Consider'd*, p. 183. *Mr.* Hoadly'*s Plea for the* Use *of the* Sign of the Cross *Answer'd*, p. 191.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* VIII. *Of the Obligation to reject all such from the Communion, as will not receive it* Kneeling, p. 197. *Mr.* Ollyffe'*s Plea for* Kneeling *at the Communion consider'd*, p. 200.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* IX. *Of the Allowing and Approving that Assertion, that* Bishops, Priests, *and* Deacons *have been Three Distinct* Orders, *even from the Days of the Apostles*, p.207. *Mr.* Ollyffe'*s Gloss upon this Matter Con-*

Consider'd, p. 209. *And Mr.* Hoadly'*s*, p. 211, *&c.*

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* X. *Of the Pronouncing all Sav'd that are* Bury'd, *except the* Unbaptiz'd, Excommunicate, and Self-Murderers, p. 217. *Mr.* Ollyffe'*s Plea upon this Head, and his softning Methods consider'd*, p. 220, 224, *&c. A Reply to Mr.* Hoadly'*s Suggestions upon the same Head.* p. 227, *&c.*

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* XI. *Of the Rule for finding out* Easter *Day*, p. 237. *That Rule with the Remarks made upon it by Mr.* Ollyffe *and Mr.* Hoadly *farther Consider'd*, p. 238. *Remarks upon Mr.* Wright'*s way to clear this Matter; by a Friend*, p. 241.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* XII. *Of the Publick Reading of* Apocryphal Lessons, p. 245. *Mr.* Ollyffe'*s Glosses upon this Matter Consider'd*, p. 247. *And Mr.* Hoadly'*s*, p. 250.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* XIII. *Of the Mis-translation of the* Psalter, p. 258. *The Vindication of it, by Mr.* Ollyffe, *and Mr.* Hoadly *Consider'd*, p. 259, *&c.*

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* XIV. *Of* Assenting *and* Consenting *to the* Damnatory *Clauses of the* Athanasian *Creed*, p. 253. *The Groundlessness of Mr.* Ollyffes *Insinuations upon this Head*, p. 264, *&c. Mr.* Hoadly'*s Suggestions consider'd*, p. 267.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* XV. *Of the Necessity of* Episcopal Confirmation *to Admission to Communion*, p. 268. *Mr.* Ollyffe *consider'd*

upon

upon that Head, p. 269. *And Mr.* Hoadly p. 270.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. Chap. XVI. *Of the* Oath *of* Canonical Obedience, a*s obliging the Clergy to be statedly Subject to the* Canons, p. 272. *Remarks upon Mr.* Ollyffe'*s Account of that Oath*, p. 274. *His comparing it with the* Oath *of* Abjuration *consider'd*, p. 276, *&c. And with the* Oath *of* Freemen *of* London, p. 281. *Our Sense of this Oath clear'd from the Absurdities which he charges upon it*, p. 285. *Mr.* Hoadly'*s Sense of this Oath consider'd*, p. 289, 290. *An Historical Account of this Oath, since its intrance into the Church*, p. 297, 298, *&c.*

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* XVII. *Of the* Canons *of* 1603, p. 307. *falsly Pag'd,* 337. *General Remarks on these* Canons, p. 308. *the 5th* Canon, p. 310. *Of the 6th* Canon, p. 311. *Of the 7th* Canon, p. 312. *Of the 8th*, *9th*, 10th and 11*th* Canons, p. 313. *Of the 27th* Canon, p. 315. *Of the 28th* Canon, p. 317. *Of the 32th and 57th* Canons, p. 318. *Of the 58th* Canon, *concerning the* Surplice, p. 319. *Historical Remarks upon it*, p. 320. *Of the 68th* Canon, p. 321. *Of the 72d* Canon, p. 324. *Of the 112th* Canon, p. 326. *Of the Three Last* Canons, p. 328. *The Case of a Minister as bound by this* Canonical Oath, *compar'd with that of a Justice of Peace*, p. 332, 333.

A farther Objection against this Oath, *taken from the* Chancellours Courts, *&c.* p. 338. *A Reply to Mr.* Ollyffe'*s Suggestions upon this Head*, p. 342. *And to Mr.* Hoadly'*s*, p. 348.

The

The Conclusion of the Remarks on Mr. Ollyffe, p. 350, 351, *falsly Pag'd*, 319, *With a* Serious Admonition *to him and his Brethren in Words borrow'd from Mr.* Hoadly, p. 353.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. Sect. XVIII. *Of Abjuring* the Solemn League and Covenant, p. 354. *falsly Pag'd*, 322. *A remarkable Matter of Fact relating to it*, p. 356.

Abridgm. *Chap.* 10. *Sect.* XIX. *Of the Political Declaration concerning the Unlawfulness of taking Arms against the King upon any* Pretence whatsoever, p. 357.

The Answer to Mr. Hoadly's *Admonition*, p. 365.

Animadversions on the Letter from the Congregational Minister *in the Country; with a Solution of his Difficulties*, p. 391.

ERRATA.

Besides a few Literal Slips, for which any Candid Person will make Allowance, the Reader desir'd to Correct the following Mistakes.

PAge 28. Line 5. dele *not*, p. 31. l. 26, for *and* read *of*, p. 51. l. 6. for *Conscience* r. *Convenience*, p. 78. l. 16. for *Xi* r. *Chi*. p. 126. l. ult. between *done* and *this* add *in*, p. 111. l. ult. add *be*, p. 156. l. 35. after *Godfathers* add *Faith*, p. 162. l. 7. r. *Persons*, p. 171. l. 10. for *with* r. *without*, p. 175. l. 26. add *of the* before *reality*. p. 241. l. 34. r. *Days*, p. 268. l. ult. for *esteemed*, r. *to esteem*, p. 286. l. 31. r. *Spelman and Linwood*, p. 296. l. 4. for *be* r. *be*, p. 302. l. 19 for *to* r. *by*.

THE INTRODUCTION.

I. THE Blessed God, whole *Kingdom ruleth over all,* hath an indisputable Right not only to give Laws to his Creatures about things intrinsically and in their own nature Good or Evil; but also to require whatsoever things he pleases, that carry in them no Repugnancy to his Divine Perfections; and particularly to his Goodness. The former we call *Natural,* and the latter *Positive Laws.* The former are founded on the Reason of things. The latter neither have, nor need, any other Reason than the Will of God. His Right in this Case is clear. For the absolute Dependence of his Creatures, proves his Autority uncontroulable: And yet it hath not been so generally Exercis'd in this way, as in the other. Our first Father *Adam* indeed was dealt with in this way, in a signal Particular Instance. He had a *Positive Law* given him in an easy thing for the Trial of his Obedience. And as to the *Jewish* Nation, (a Peculiar Divine Inclosure) many of their Ceremonial Ordinances appear rather *Arbitrary Prescriptions*, than founded on *Moral Reasons*; at least as far as they fall under our Cognizance. But the standing Method of the infinitely wise God in his Dealing with Mankind, hath been to govern them by a Rule so suite'd to their Understandings in all its Parts,

as that the apparent Reasonableness and Beneficial Tendency of the things requir'd should prove Motives to Obedience.

II. Whatsoever Power amongst Men some have over others, must be deriv'd either from *Natural Dependence, Social Compacts,* or a Particular *Divine Commission.* All comes Originally from God; tho' in different Ways, and through different Mediums. Power of each sort is fix'd and bounded by him from whom it Originally proceeds: And whensoever it passes those Bounds which he hath fix'd for it, either in the Commission given, or the Agreements made, or by the Circumstances of those who are concern'd in it, it becomes no longer properly due: And Submission to it is no longer a necessary Duty. Nay the refusing Submission is in such Cases often requisite for the securing common *Liberty*. Meer Arbitrariness is no Ornament to Power of either lost. The more Rational its Exercise is, the more cheerfully will it be comply'd with, by those whose Judgments govern their Practise, which should be the Course of all Reasonable Creatures: And at the same time, it will be so much the more Godlike. Some Humane Lawgivers indeed have made certain Constitutions, meerly with this Design to teach People to Obey the Laws: But where any sort of Power is statedly so exercis'd, it generally becomes burdensome and shall no longer be comply'd with, than Force constrains.

III. Of all sorts of Power, that over *Conscience*, is what the affirming Spirit of Man hath in all Ages been most fond of: And in no Case have Attempts been made that have fail'd more remarkably. For let Men claim it upon ever so specious Pretences, it is God's Prerogative there to give Laws; And whoso-

ever

ever Arrogate any such Power to themselves, manifestly appear in the Issue to invade his Province. *Conscience* is the Great Engine by which God hath maintain'd Religion in the World ever since he has had a Church in it. He hath committed the Conduct of it, to him whom he Provided as a Mediator for us in our Apostate State. Our Faithful Mediator hath taken the Charge upon him; is fully Authoriz'd, and every way Qualify'd for such a Province; and he manages it with great Tenderness, with unexceptionable Equity, and with a due Regard to those he has to do with. While Men often *bind heavy Burdens, and grievous to be born, and lay them on the Shoulders* of their Fellow Servants, tho' *they themselves not move them with one of their Fingers:* It may be truly said, that *his Yoke is easy, and his Burthen is light.* Under his Conduct we are safe, and may stand our Ground against all Pretenders.

Matt. 23. 4.

Mat. 11. 30.

IV. Our Blessed Lord had *All Power given him, both in Heaven and on Earth,* While he continu'd here below, he Determin'd all Matters of Faith and Practice, as far as he saw needful: Empowering his Disciples to Add such farther Regulations as were necessary for the full settling of his Church, upon such a Bottom, as that it might continue to All Generations: And for their Assistance herein, he gave them the special Conduct of his Divine Spirit. So that those Apostolical Orders and Prescriptions, contain'd in our sacred Records, that were design'd generally to take Place, and be of Lasting Use and Observation, may as safely be ascrib'd to our Glorious Redeemer, as if he had himself Publish'd them in the Days of his Flesh. And the Reason of it is plain. They were bottom'd upon an undoubted Autority of his Conferring.

Matt. 28. 18.

And when the same can be made appear in the Case of any of those Regulations or Constitutions that are usually term'd *Ecclesiastical*, it must be own'd that those Persons would flie in the Face of the Great Lawgiver, who refus'd Compliance: But till then, I can't see how they can be justly liable to a Charge of that nature.

V. Without all doubt Christianity would have flourish'd in the World exceedingly, had things been suffer'd to continue, as our Lord and his Apostles left them: And could Men but have been contented with the sacred Scriptures, as the Rule of their Faith, and Worship, and Discipline: But alas, it was not very long before they who profess'd to be the Followers of Christ, entertain'd a Fancy that they could improve his Settlement, by Alterations, Additions, and Amendments. They were for Coining new Articles of Faith, under Pretence of Explaining his Doctrine; for adding Ritual Observances, in order to the greater Ornament of his Worship, and for framing Canons and Ecclesiastical Regulations, in things unnecessary, under Pretence of Promoting the Peace of the Church. This *Mystery of Iniquity* was while the Eyes of the Apostles were scarcely clos'd; and long before the *Papacy* appear'd: But it exceedingly increas'd, as the Bishop of *Rome* prevail'd. He took upon him to Act as our Saviour's *Vicar General:* Tho' no Footsteps of his Office are to be trac'd in Holy Scripture. He tho't it equally necessary to supply the Defect of Divine Discoveries by his own Traditions; to cover the Nakedness of Worship, by a Variety of Decent Ceremonies and to improve those Plain Rules and Measures of Government, which are to be met with in our sacred Oracles, by numberless *Conciliary* Constitutions,

2 Thess. 2. 7.

stitutions, and *Pontifical* Decrees. And the seat length so increas'd, that the Christian World grew weary; and groan'd under their Heavy Bondage, Crying earnestly to God for Deliverance.

VI. Their Cries at last were Heard; and it pleas'd God, after various Attempts of the *Picards*, *Bohemians*, *Waldenses*, and *Albigenses*, &c. (now near upon two Centuries agon) in a remarkable manner to Spirit sundry of his Servants in these Western Parts, to Attempt a Deliverance of his Church from the Roman Usurpation and Tyranny; and by a *Reformation* to seek to recover our Holy Religion to the State it was in at first, when it came out of the Hands of our Blessed Saviour, and his Disciples. And their Success at first was great: But many things afterwards concurr'd to hinder their intended Progress. As to *Faith* indeed, it must be own'd a very Considerable Advance was made; and as to *Worship* also, flat *Idolatry* was purg'd away: But as to the *Ecclesiastical Regulations* and Additions, which before prevail'd, a Fondness of them had in several Countries taken such deep rooting, they, were so agreeble to that Desire of Power and Empire over others, which is natural to those who think themselves capable of a share in Government; and they were so confirm'd by Custom, which in all Cases is apt to sway a Major Part; that no Considerations could prevail for any great Alteration, excepting that the Power was in each Country taken from the Pope, and put into the Hands of the Civil Magistrate. In other respects, the Bottom continu'd still the same. But till the Holy Scripture will pass for the sufficient Rule or Law of Faith and Worship; and till it be agreed, that all Ecclesiastical In-

stitutions and Regulations, as well as the Power they are bottom'd on, be try'd by its Autority; it be must expected there will be a Number, that will still be earnest for a farther Reformation.

VII. As for our Saviour's Settlement, none need to be at a loss about it, that will but search the Scriptures. He hath fix'd the several Parts of Worship, and hath not as to them given any Mortals a Power to add or take away: But as for the Circumstances thereof, he hath left them undetermin'd. He hath fix'd Officers in his Church, whom he hath impower'd to Minister in Holy Things; and with whom he has intrusted the Care of his sacred Institutions: But as for the Method of their Management, he hath left it free to be vary'd, according to Times, Seasons, and Circumstances, agreeably to the General Rules of Scripture. That he hath left many things *Indifferent*, cannot be deny'd. Thus he hath settled two Sacraments: But as for the Circumstances of them, they may be vary'd, without any Danger. He hath required, that all that Profess to be his, with their Children, should be solemnly Baptiz'd in his Name: But whether that shall be, by Sprinkling, or Dipping, or Pouring, he hath not determin'd: No, nor at what Day, and Time, and Place, that Ordinance shall be Administred. He hath also fix'd it as a Rule in his House, that his Followers shall Thankfully commemorate his Dying Love by eating and drinking at his Table: But whether the Communicants shall take the Bread themselves, or receive it from others; whether they shall receive the Cup from the Minister, or from a Deacon,or from their next Neighbour; whether the Bread shall be Leavened or not and whether

ther the Wine shall be Red or White, Mixt or Pure, he hath no where Determin'd: Nor has he tho't fit (absolutely speaking) to declare, what shall be the Posture at this Ordinance; whether standing, or Sitting, or Walking, or Leaning, or Kneeling. In such things as these he has left his Servants at their Liberty. He hath plainly signify'd his Will, that Prayers and Praises should be publickly offer'd up in Consort to the Creator and Redeemer of Mankind; and that the Great Truths of our Holy Religion should be publickly made known, and expounded, and urg'd and press'd; and he hath appointed an Order of Men to Act as Officers in that respect: But the precise Time, the Manner, the Method, the Gesture, the Habit, that is to be us'd in this Case, he has left *indifferent*, provided the General Rules of the Word be but observ'd: And particularly, provided that as to Circumstances of this Nature, every Man be satisfy'd in his own Mind; and no Man judge another about them. Rom. 14. 5,13.

VIII. Our Saviour's Settlement being so plain, and attended with that Liberty for Different Sentiments and Usages, which is necessary in order to the General Prevalence of any Institution that is not back'd with Constraint and Force; it might reasonably have been expected, that those who pretended to a Superlative Reverence for him might have been contented. And 'twere well they had been so: But the Church had been so long us'd not only to a Rigorous Determination of Indifferent Circumstantials, but even to the Adding such Rites, as had not the least footing in the sacred Scriptures, and making them either Substantial Parts, or at least necessary Appendages of Divine Worship, that many whose Endeavours were highly

Laudable and exceeding Useful to the Church, as far as they went, were not to be perswaded herein to Alter the former Course; but tho't it eno' to lessen the Number of Ancient Impositions, and represented all those as needlesly Innovating, who were for returning back entirely to the Original Platform. And this has occasion'd Hot Debates ever since. The Points Debated have been Principally these two: Whether there be any Real Necessity of General Fix'd Regulations about the Circumstances of Divine Worship? And whether Unscriptural Ceremonies, Rites or Usages, may be warrantably impos'd, or comply'd with? These Questions are really Distinct. For tho' some *Circumstances* relating to the Worship of God, must be Humanely Determin'd, yet it by no means follows, that *Ceremonies* may or must be therefore Appointed. Tho' we may Determine in those things, which must be determin'd one way or other, or Divine Worship can't be kept up; yet from thence to Argue, that we may Add any thing that is new to that Worship, which was instituted by our Saviour and his Apostles, is neither Rational nor Christian Logick. However I shall rather choose to comprehend the latter under the former, than to enlarge by Considering them separately. And indeed, if I can make it appear, that even Circumstances (tho' they must be Determin'd one way or other) are not to be forcibly and rigorously Determin'd for all Living within such a certain Compass, I think no Man can refuse to, Grant me, that Unnecessary Additions are much less to be at all made, or Parts of Worship Added, tho' they should in themselves be comparatively minute and inconsiderable; and as to the matter of them undeniably Lawful.

IX. The

IX. The Question then to; be Debated is this: Whether there be any Real Necessity of General fixed Regulations about the Circumstances of the several Parts of Divine Worship? Whether it be requisite they should be Determin'd one way? Or whether it were not better that they should be suffer'd to continue in the State in which our Savior and his Apostles left them any farther at least than as each Worshipping Society agrees together for their common Convenience? Each side of the Question hath warm Advocates: And a great many Particular Debates arise in the Management of the Controversie. They who are for the Affirmative, go upon differing Grounds. For some do really apprehend it best, that even in those things which our Saviour has left indifferent, there should be fix'd Regulations in every Nation, back'd with inforcing Penalties. While others, tho' they had rather enjoy the Liberty which their Great Master has not deny'd them, yet apprehend that for the sake of Peace, and to prevent Disturbance, when such Regulations are once fixed, they are bound to a Compliance, if they cannot prove them Sinful in the Matter of them. These are two Hypotheses of Distinct Consideration. The one supposes a Power warrantably exercis'd in adding Particular Impositions to our Saviour's. General Settlement; nay, and will have their Brethren own it too, or else they are for discarding them: The other, without inquiring into the Power of Imposers, goes upon the Necessity of Compliance for the sake of Peace.

X. To begin with the Assertors and Justifiers of an Imposing Power, which they think warrantably exerted in things that are in themselves *indifferent*; the Capital Argument they Urge,

See Dr. *Parker*, Dr. *Good man*, and others.

Urge is this: That there is an absolate necessity of Order in the Church of Christ, and that a Liberty in Religious Matters would be attended with unavoidable Confusion. This is an Argument that has been extreamly applauded, and represented as unanswerable. I'll give it its full force, in their own Words. *There is* (say they) *an absolute Necessity there should be Order and Decency in the Publick Worship*; *but Order and Decency there cannot be, without the Determination of some Indifferent and Particular Circumstances: Because if every Man were left to his own Fancy and Humour there could be no Remedy against eternal Follies and Confusions.* And again; *Without such a Determination there could be no such thing as* Uniformity, *which so Beautiful in it self, so Honourable to God*, *and so Creditable to Religion; and the want of which is so Mischievous.* An Argument in which, after all the mighty Boasts that have been made of it, I must confess for my Part I can see no great strength. It runs upon *Decency*, and *Order*, and *Uniformity*, which are Words that have a Charming Sound indeed, but not Force eno' to fasten a Conviction, unless their Sense is clear'd, and the Truth of what is asserted is prov'd in the Sense that is Determin'd. As for *Decency* and *Order*, they are requir'd by St. *Paul*: But I cannot find *Uniformity* in his Directory, after the utmost Search for it. But what is the *Decency* and *Order* that he requires? Does it amount to more than the absence of Indecency and Disorder? Cannot Divine Worship be manag'd *Decently* and in *Order*, unless some, after Christ and his Apostles, have a Power to add what they may think wanting to make up the Beauty and Harmony of it? Can there be no Decency and Order, without Pompous Ceremonies, and an Uniformity

mity in them? Let the Apostclical Prescription be search'd and scann'd, and it will hardly be found to amount to more, than the avoiding Indecencies and Confusions: And by comparing the several Places together, where he hath Hints of this Nature, it will appear that *Charity* and *Forbearance* is the way to Order, and that *Pride* and *Imposition* was with him the Spring of Confusion. But that this Matter may be fully clear'd, I desire the following things may be impartially consider'd.

XI. 1. *Uniformity* it self, which is the avow'd Design of these Regulations, is not Necessary: And if so, tho' it were own'd that such Regulations would effectually Contribute to an *Uniformity,* (which yet is far from being self evident) it would not follow, that they were so necessary as is pretended. Peace and Brotherly Love is most certainly necessary, 'tis what all Christians are bound to maintain: But if it were not Consistent with Differences in circumstantials. What Age of the Church could avoid Condemnation? Can there be no Order in the Church, unless Men be of a scantling in their Judgments? No Brotherly Love, unless there be *Uniformity* in every Punctilio? What Evidence is there of it? Nay, how can it be prov'd, that so exact an Agreement is a thing possible, and attainable? Has God any where promis'd it? Or do they understand Humane Nature that expect it? Is it supposeable, that when there is amongst Mankind so great a Difference as to natural Capacities, as to the manner of conceiving Things, as to the make of their Minds, their Gust and Inclinations, their Way of Education, and the Company they most converse with, they should after all be bro't to jump in the same Sentiments and Practise,

Practise, in things own'd to be extra-essential? And if this be not a thing rationally to be suppos'd, I think they don't much consult the Credit of Religion, who represent it as Necessary. Where do we find a stress laid upon it, in those sacred Records which are our Standard? Nay, is not *Forbearance* in Minuter Things both as to Judgment and Practise there often urg'd, as an important Duty? How could this be, if *Uniformity* were necessary? Withal, the Beauty of the Universe to a well made Spirit, do's not appear one jot the less remarkable for its Variety: Nor is the Divine Wildom with reference to Man ever the less observable, for his having made Men of different Size and Stature. They that to pare off Unevenness and heighten Beauty, would go about to reduce all Men to a Size, would but make themselves ridiculous; nay, they would discover an Imperious and Tyrannical Temper, which Would make them with the Infamous *Procrustes* the Objects of general Abhorrence. Religion of all things detests any such Methods and they that discover a Fondness of them, shew themselves so far Strangers to its great Design. The Aim and Drift of our Holy Institution, is not to bring Men to an exact Agreement and *Uniformity* in all Particulars; but to diffuse among us a Noble Spirit of Love, and inspire us with such Moderation and Condescension, as that not with Handing a Diversity of Sentiments and Practise, we may yet carry it as Brethren, *and keep the Unity of the Spirit the Bond of Peace.* Men were not without different Apprehensions in the Days of the Apostles, nor was their Practise even then exactly alike. Some were for the *Jewish Rites*, and others against them: Some were for obtruding the

the Ancient Ceremonies upon their Brethren, and others for withstanding them: And a third Sort for complying Occasionally with them or forbearing them, as they were led by different Circumstances. We don't find the Apostles made one sort a Standard for the other, or urg'd *Uniformity*, so much as Condescension and Forbearance. Herein they are fit Patterns for us to imitate: And our treading in their steps, would be more for the Honour of God, and more for the Credit of Religion, and would tend much more to Order and Peace than a rigorous urging Uniformity. *A Mutual Agreement* (says the Celebrated Dr. *H. More*, in his Preface to the Mystery of Godliness) *in bearing with one an others Dissents in the Non-Fundamentals of Religion, is really a greater Ornament of Christianity, than the most exact Uniformity imaginable: It being an eminent Exercise of the flower of all Christian Graces and the best way at the long run to make the Church as Uniform as can justly be desir'd.*

XII. 2. Were Particular Regulations in Matters meerly Circumstantial, necessary in that Degree that is pretended, it would be hard to give a substantial Reason, why our Blessed Saviour should himself have made no Provision about them. Certainly the Gentlemen that lay such a stress on this Argument, can't pretend to be more sensible of the Necessities of the Church, or more forward to consult them, than he was. Had he been of their Mind, how easie had it been for him to have fixt such Determinations, as to all necessary Circumstances as might have universally taken Place. He not having done it, it looks as if he did not esteem it necessary, that it should be done. To say (with some) that such a Provision at first was impos-

impossible, because of the different Circumstances of Persons and Places, and the Changes that would be frequent in succeding Generations, helps not at all to clear the Matter. For there were none of these different Circumstances or succeding Changes, but what were within the foresight of our Blessed Saviour: And if he foresaw them, certainly we must have but a mean Opinion of his Concern for his Church, if we imagine he would not have fix'd general Regulations suiting all those Changes as far at least as was possible; leaving a plain Commission with full Power to some proper Persons, to make such Additions or Alterations, as were afterwards necessary from Age to Age. Till it can be made appear he has done this, it looks a little Odd for Persons to talk so much of Necessity in the Case; it seems Over-Officious in any under-Servants to appear so concern'd, about what the Master of the Family hath not tho't deserving of his Cognizance. We know that *Moses*, tho' he was but *faithful as a Servant*, was very Particular in the Settlement of the *Levitical* Oeconomy, not overlooking. the Minutest Matters: And can we suppose that our Saviour, who was *faithful in his own House as a Son*, would have given only General Rules, had any more been Necessary? Would he not have been as exact in Regulating his Church as *Moses* in settling the Service of the Tabernacle, had there been a like Necessity? Why can't we allow our Blessed Redeemer to be the Properest Judge of the Necessities, (nay, and real Conveniencies too) of his own Church? Are our Lord's Institutions defective, that we must Add to them? If so, where's his Fidelity to his Commission and Trust? Or, if they are not Defective, why can't we be con-

tent

tent with them as he and his Apostles have left them? Are we wiser than he? Who can deny that he, partly by himself, and partly by his Apostles, hath settled all things needful? Why then should Men contend for the imposing things not needful? Or are things needful now that were not so at first? Could this come to pass without his foreseeing it? Or could he foresee it, and not make Provision, by giving to some others a full Power to supply the Defects, that should appear in succeeding Generations? Was any clear Commission of this Nature ever produc'd from the Holy Scriptures? For my Part I am fully satisfy'd, that our Lord hath not only settled all things needful, to be universally setled; but all things that would be most for the Good of his Church and to own as much seems but a Piece of due Relpect to our glorious Redeemer: And therefore they appear to have too good an Opinion of themselves, who think they can improve his Institutions by their Additions.

3. 'Tis no easie thing to shew, why our blessed Saviour should leave more Power to any Mortals in what concerns Divine Worship, than in Matters of Faith. To make Articles of Faith, is by the Learned *Stillingfleet*, prov'd utterly unwarrantable. He says, That *the Pretence of the* Romanists *of a Power in the Church to define Matters of Faith, is Presumptious and Arrogant; being the highest Degree of Lording it over the Christian World*. And is not the pretending a Power in the Church authoritatively to prescribe Modes of Worship, and to add such Circumstances, as are neither needful in themselves, nor to be trac'd in our Rule, something Parallel? especially if we add a Lordly imposing them, with a Denial of Communion to

Rational Account of the Grounds of the Protestant Religion. Ch. 2. pag. 76.

Page 102

to those who are dissatisfy'd with such Additions? Again, says he to his Antagonist *T. C. If your Church had kept to the Primitive Simplicity and Moderation, and not offer'd to define Matters of Faith, the Occasion of most of the Controversies of the Christian World had been taken away:* Especially, if she (nor others in Imitation of her) had not offer'd to impose needless Ceremonies in Divine Worship, and needless Canons for Polity and Discipline in which as the true Primitive Simplicity and Moderation, has been as far from being kept to as in Matters of Faith, so have the Divisions thereby occasion'd been to the full as remarkable. To which I may add, that saying of Archbishop *Bramhall*, which is very agreeable. *The transforming of indifferent Opinions into necessary Articles of Faith, hath been that* infana Laurus, *or curs'd Bay-Tree, the Cause of all our Brawling and Contention:* Except only (I would add) such as have been caus'd, by the transforming *Indifferent Ceremonies,* and *Arbitrary Canons* and Prescriptions, into *Necessary Rules of Worship*, and *Discipline.* However from such Declarations as these, I draw this Argument. If there may be as great an Agreement among Christians, as really is necessary, in Points of Faith, without any Power lodg'd in the Church of adding to the Scripture Settlement, nay, or even *Defining Articles of Faith*, as Dr. *Stillingfleet* exprest it: it follows, that there may be as great an Agreement as to Worship and Discipline also, as is really necessary, without any *Humane Impositions* back'd with inforcing Penalties.

See his vindication of himself and the Episcopal Clergy, &c. p. 141,

XIII. 4. If it be really Necessary that the things which our Saviour hath left *indifferent*, should be fixedly determin'd for all the worshipping Societies in a Nation, why not for all the Churches

Churches in the Christian World? If *Uniformity* be so beautiful in a Christian Kingdom, it must needs be much more so in the Church Universal: And if it be so necessary, as to require positive fixed Regulations in one Case, why not also in the other? This is indeed but agreeable to the *Roman* Scheme. But why should we be so fond of the Principle it is bottom'd on, unless we'll be free to pursue it, in all its genuine Consequences? Methinks, 'tis unhappy to see *Protestants* giving the *Papists* an Advantage, when they may easily avoid it; and at the same Time charging the Doing so upon their Brethren, when they themselves are much more Guilty. The *Unity of the Church* is made use of by our Brethren, as an unanswerable Argument for the Necessity of Subjection to our Diocesan Episcopacy: And 'tis pleaded as strenuously by the *Romanists* (from whom they learnt it) for a Subjection to the *Papacy.* And so *Uniformity* is pleaded with us, as an Argument for the Necessity of a fixed Regulation of indifferent Circumstantials in all the Churches of a Nation: And 'tis pleaded as strenuously by the Adherents of *Rome*, for the Necessity of a fixt Regulation of such Circumstantials, in all the Churches in the Universe. Where shall we stop? Or how shall we exactly state the Difference? What greater Necessity is there, that all the Ministers in *England*, begin at a Time, wear the same Garments, and read just the same Chapters out of the Word of God; than that it be the like in *France*, *Holland,* and *Germany*, also; nay, and in all the four Quarters of the World? If it be pleaded, that it would be so difficult and inconvenient to fix one uniform Settlement in different Countrys, that it would be vain to attempt

it: 'Tis Reply'd, that no Difficulties ought to Discourage, if it be really *Necessary.* If Difficulties would ward off *Necessity*, there is Efficient Room for that Plea in a large Country, that comes under the Notion of a National Church: For the Particular Circumstances of all the Congregations in a Land are so various, that they cannot without great Difficulty, and manifest Inconvenience, come under an uniform Determination. But if there be *Necessity* in one Case, there is in the other: Or if the Difficulty of the thing takes off the Necessity in one Case, it does it in Both. It might also be farther argu'd, that if there be a Necessity of *Uniformity* in one Circumstance, there is so in all, unless a just Difference can be assign'd. If all Ministers must necessarily use the same Garments, read the same Chapters, and repeat the same Prayers *Verbatim* why is it not as necessary, they should all at once Preach from the same Texts too, and in the same Words? This would much heighten *Uniformity*, and be a great Additional Beauty to the Church, upon the same Principle.

XV. 5. The Worship of God may be perform'd Devoutly, Seriously, and Acceptably, without any general Determination of indifferent Circumstantials: And therefore such a Determination of them cannot be necessary. Among the Primitive Christians in the Days of the Apostles, and for some Time after, no stress was laid upon Garments, and Postures, in the Worship of God: No Ceremonies were impos'd upon all the Churches in a Country in Order to *Uniformity:* A Man could not go from one City to another, but he might observe different Ecclesiastical Usages: And yet I don't see any Reason to believe any other,

than

than that God was worship'd as devoutly, seriously, and acceptably among them in those days, as in Modern Times, when we are grown so nice and exact, for the sake of *Uniformity*. If indeed there were any thing requir'd in the Word of God, which could not be duly perform'd,without some general uniform Regulation of Particular Circumstances, it could not be deny'd to be necessary that such things be determined: But this would be vainly pretended. For the Circumstances to be Regulated, are either *Natural*, or *Religious*. As for *natural Circumstances*, which unavoidably attend all Actions, whether *Sacred* or *Civil*, they must be determin'd in the Case of every worshipping Society, (as we shall see in the Sequel) but there is no necessity the Determination should reach any farther. And tho' the Practice of those Worshipping Societies that are nearest to each other, should herein be different, it yet doth not follow, but that the Worship may be as Devout, and Serious, and acceptable in one such Society, as in another. But as for *Religious Circumstances*, i. e. such as can reasonably be suppos'd to contribute, to make Worship acceptable to God, or convey to us the Benefits thereby intended to be secur'd; they are already Divinely Determin'd. And how it can be necessary, that there should be any general Additional Regulations, when they cannot add any thing to the Worship, that would make it more acceptable to God, or more profitable to Men, generally consider'd, is hard to conceive.

XVI. 6. There is a Degree of *Liberty* to which our Saviour hath left all professing Christians so plainly intitled, that to violate and break in upon it, can never be truly necessary, ualess his Settlement proves inconsistent with

it self. The Apostle *Paul* requires Christians to *stand fast in the Liberty, wherein Christ hath made them free. There is therefore* (says Dr. *Barrow* on the *Pope's Supremacy*) *a Liberty which we must maintain, and a Power to which we must not submit.* Tho' some have here run into extravagant Notions, and pleaded for that as necessary to *Liberty*, which could do no other than issue in a general Confusion, yet it do's not therefore follow, but that there is a *Liberty* to which Christians have really such a Right, as that it can neither be invaded nor betray'd without considerable Guilt. Of this *Liberty*, I look upon this as no small Part that all professing Christians have a Right to all Gospel Ordinances, upon the naked Terms on which Christ hath left them to Mankind, in what Part soever of the World their Lot is cast: They have a Right to all Divine Institutions, without any Humane Additions. Now if any by Impositions (in things unnecessary) encumber that Communion with divers Clogs, which every Christian hath a Right to, without any such Confinements, (which is the way of those who are zealous for a general Determination of things indifferent for the greater Order and Decency) they violate this Christian *Liberty:* To do which cannot be necessary, unless Christ hath left something wanting that is conducive to the furtherance of the Salvation of his Followers.

Gal. 5. 1.

Pag. 124.

XVII. 7. Determinations of this kind have created endless Differences in the Church. The Judaizing Dogmatizers even in the Apostolick Age determin'd it necessary, there should be a Conformity to the Rites of the *Mosaick* Law: Others withstood them, not thinking it safe to yield. Thus was the Church divided even in its

its Minority. Could the *Judaizers* have been contented to take things as our Saviour left them, or to have follow'd the Direction of the Apostles, the Contention had easily been avoided. In the following Age, the Bishop of *Rome* was so peremptory about the Time of keeping *Easter*, that nothing would satisfie him short of Excommunicating all *Dissenters*. He spent his Zeal with all imaginable eagerness in the Quarrel, without once debating the Necessity of any such Solemnity at all, till he had set the whole Church in *East* and *West* in a Flame. By the same Right, the succeeding Popes bro't in a whole Lirry of Superstitious Observances, which those who were concern'd to keep their Purity and Integrity, tho't themselves oblig'd to oppose. And let the History of the Church be consulted from Age to Age, it will be found, that the imposing doubtful Terms of Union and Communion hath been at the Bottom of most of the Quarrels, that have been on Foot. And is not this then a rare Method to secure Peace? While some are zealous in imposing such Things, others apprehend themselves oblig'd to stand out; and no other can be expected: And of those that in appearance yield, some comply in one Sense, and others in another, is not this the heighth of Harmony? When therefore it is so evident, that fruitless Contention hath still been the issue of this Method, for any to say, that such Determinations are necessary for the Peace of the Church, is much one as to say, that a Bone of Contention must necessarily be thrown in, that so Peace may be the more effectually secur'd. Indifferent Things suffer'd to remain according to their Nature, were never the Occasion of Division: But indifferent Things

enforc'd by Laws, have ever caus'd Divisions in the Christian World, and ever will.

XVIII. *Lastly.* It is not an easie Thing to say, who hath the Right to fix such a general Determination of such Things as these, as is pleaded for. Had it been our Lord's Intention, that the Things he left *Indifferent*, should be afterwards positively Determin'd, so as to be generally obliging, throughout each District, Country, or Kingdom; 'tis hard to suppose, but he would have left it very clear, with whom he had intruded such an Autority. When and where did any wise Legislator ever appoint a Matter of such vast Concernment to those who were subject to him, as the making necessary Regulations in order to their Peace and Union, and express no more of it than Christ hath done in this Case? For where hath he given any Men any such Autority to impose Circumstantials, as that all within such a District. Shall be oblig'd to acquiesce and comply? The utmost that is pleaded, amounts but to a Passage or Two of Scripture, that had a quite different Aim and Intention, and which must be forc'd and wire-drawn, before they'll at all serve. the Purpose for which they are bro't. The warm Contenders for the imposing Power, at the same Time differ Strangely among themselves, about the Parties with whom it is Lodg'd: Some ascribe it to the *State*, and others to the *Church*; and 'tis to this Day undetermin'd. which of the Two shall carry it. Nay, they don't seem at a Point, but vary with different Seasons and Circumstances. Let the *State* but Humour them, and it shall bid fair for carrying the Cause: But if it be so unhappy as to give them the lead: Jealousie, then truly this Power is tho't safest in the Hands of the *Church*;

Church; that has the great Trust resign'd to it, and the *State* is left to shift for it self. However, the Difference on this Head is so considerable, that the Power it self may he very fairly Debated and Question'd, the Seat of which is so difficultly Assign'd.

XIX Several indeed on each Hand, (if we can but be content to take their Word) will assure us the Case is clear. The Right without all Doubt lays one side, is with the Civil Magistrate. It belongs to the Sovereignty, to have the ordering of all indifferent Religious Matters. *It being* (say they) *so clearly evident from the Experience of mankind, and from the Nature of the thing it self, that nothing has a stronger influence upon the Publick Interests of a Nature, than the well or ill management of Religion, its Conduct must needs be as certain add inseparable a Right of the Supreme Power in every Common-wealth, as the Legislative Autority it self, without which it is impossible there should be any Government at all.* These Men annex the Government of the Church to the Civil Power, or indeed drown the Church in the State: They seem to give the Magistrate a Power to manage the Worship of God at Pleasure; but we mistake them, if we think they mean he should keep it, if there appears any Danger, he should use it to the Disadvantage of the Uniform Settlement, of which they are so infinitely fond: No, no; they can then unsay all again; and tell the Magistrate to his Face, he must keep his Bounds; and not touch their Copy-hold upon his utmost Peril. There are others, (not less fond of their own *Shibboleth*) who being afraid of Tricks of State, represent the entrusting the Magistrate with such a Power, as a betraying the Church; which must say

they be Independent, or it can never be safe. By these the *Regale*, (*i. e.* the generally Acknowledg'd Right of Sovereigns in Matters Ecclesiastical) is inveigh'd against: as the greatest hardship imaginable, as the very Quintessence of *Popery*, tending to all Manner of Disorder and Confusion. The former was the Common Language of our Triumphant Ecclesiasticks in the Reign of King *Charles* the Second, as well as in the Reigns foregoing. The Latter was the Sense of some few formerly, and is grown Modish, since that Happy Revolution which bro't our glorious Deliverer King *William* to the Throne, and procur'd us our Present Settlement, in a *Protestant* Queen (whom God long Preserve) and a *Protestant* Succession; together with a *Legal Toleration* for *Dissenters*. I shall a little consider each of these Claims.

XX. As to Civil Magistrates, 'tis past Dispute, they cannot be unconcern'd Persons in the Religion that is profess'd in the Countrys that are under their Government. We find *David*, *Solomon, Asa*, *Jehosaphat, Hezekiah*, and *Josiah*, and other Princes among the *Jews* of Old very active in Religious Matters: Carefully improving their power and Autority, to engage their Subjects to obey the Laws of God, and to Discourage all Disobedience to them. It is also promis'd. *That Kings shall he nursing Fathers, and Queens nursing Mothers* to the Church under the New Testament. To be sure therefore, they must be oblig'd to do what in them lies for the Defence, Protection, and Propagation of true Religion; and cannot want a Power of contributing considerably to the promoting of Piety, Purity, and Peace: But it being committed to them by God, it must to be sure be limited: And it is well worth our while to enquire, what these Limits are. XXI.

Isai. 49. 23.

XXI. Searching for them, we may easily observe, that in all the Different Functions which the Subjects of a Civil Government can any way be call'd to, they are under the general inspection of the Superior Powers. Thus in all the Family Relations, of Husbands and Wives, Parents and Children, Masters and Servants, there are suitable Duties to be discharg'd; the Physician,the Husbandman and the Tradesman, have each a Different Occupation; and all in common, are under the Supreme Magistrate. 'Tis the like with Ministers and Christians who make a sacred Profession of a Joint-Devotedness to God, for certain Purposes Specify'd in his Revealed Word. But tho' in all these different Offices, the Civil Magistrate hath a Right of Inspection, and may warrantably call to an Account and Punish such as fail in their unquestionable Duty, as far at least as relates to the Common Good; yet it would be an intolerable Burden to him, and an insupportable Grievance to the Subject, to suppose the one I bound to give, and the other to receive, certain fix'd Measures in indifferent Circumstances, which either need not to be at all Determin'd, or are best Determin'd according to the Convenience of those concern'd, who are fittest to judge in their own Case. All indeed are bound in their respective Places to revere the Magistrate, as fix'd by God to be *a Terror to Evil-doers, and a Praise to them that do well:* And yet are not bound to take their Measures from him in all Matters really indifferent; no not tho' what he requir'd should not be flatly sinful. We have no need to have Recourse to the Civil Magistrate in Domestical Affairs, about the. number of set Meals; the Time of rising and going to Bed; the Instruction of our Children,

the

the Disposal of them in the World; the employment of our Servants, or the Food that shall be given them, or the like: In such things as these every Man must life his own Discretion; and so nothing be done to the publick Mischief, the Magistrate hath no concern to intermeddle. The Physician Administers the best Medines he can to his Patients; the Husbandman sows what Seed he thinks best and fittest in his Ground; and the Tradesman manages himself and his Affairs in his Shop, according to the best of his Skill, without consulting the State: And why then may not Ministers and Christians manage themselves in their several worshipping Societies according to the Word of God, which is their Directory, without Particular Order from the Magistrate, what Garment to wear, and what Ceremonies to use, when to Read, and when to Sing, when to Stand up, and when to Bow? Exact Particular Regulations are as little to be Accounted for, in this Latter Case as in the Former.

XXII. The Magistrate, 'tis true, is bound to consult the Peace and Welfare of his Subjects both in Civil and Sacred Matters. If the Several Heads of Families in their Domestical Capacity, or if Physicians, Husbandmen, of Tradesmen in their different Occupations, manage themselves and their Affairs in such a manner, as that they really are a common Nuisance; if their Methods be such as create Broils and Tumults, or are notoriously Detrimental to the Health, or Wealth, or Liberty of his Subjects, 'tis his Duty to interpose by way of Prevention. So also if Ministers or Christians, under a pretended sacred Profession, cherish or Spread Profaneness, and openly diffcurb the Civil Peace, it

is

is certainly his Duty to put a stop. But then the Hazard must be Evident and Notorious, that will reconcile such an Autoritative Interposition with Governing Prudence. For as it little concerns the Magistrate, tho' his Subjects are divided about matters of Physick of Philosophy, and some are are for *Alkalis*, and others for *Acids*; some for *Aristotle*, and others for *Descartes*; so neither has he any need to be concern'd at the Difference of his Subjects about the Apendages of Religion: And they have more Zeal than Wisdom, and more of Fire in their Tempers, than either of Religion or true Policy, that would perswade the Magistrate to interpose with Autority in the Case of Contests among his Subjects about indifferent Matters, in which the Essence of Religion is so far from being concern'd, that they cannot one way or other contribute to the making them either better Men or Christians, or Subjects.

XXIII. But to come to the Merits of the Cause. If the supreme Magistrate, and he alone, has the Power of Determining, the Circumstantials of Religion, and 'tis necessary he should Determine them, what a sad Condition was the Church in when the Magistrate was against it? It could not then have what was necessary: So that our Saviour must be Defective in his Care of it; which is absurd for Christians to suppose. Again; If the supreme Magistrate really has such a Power, and all under his Government are bound to aquiesce in the Exercise of it, if the things requir'd are not flatly sinful, I Query how he came by it? Naturally he could have no such Power: For his Make doth not necessarily distinguish him from other Men. He must then have it either by

Direct

Direct *Commission from God*, or by Vertue of that *Compact* which is the Foundation of his Government. If he hath a *Commission from God*, let it be shewn, and it will be presently yielded to; and there need not be no farther Controversie. 'Tis said. *Every Soul* is is requir'd to *be Subject to the Higher Powers.* 'Tis true; Obedience is our Duty, in all things that God hath *subjected to the Higher Powers:* But it does not thence follow, that Religion is so far subjected to them, as that Compliance with their Prescriptions becomes a Duty, tho' they have neither Necessity nor Expedience to inforce them: It does not follow, that they may settle Terms of Church-Communion, and that it is a Part of the Subjection that is due to them, for us to Acquiesce. The Text must have gone thus far, had it contain'd a full Commission in this Case. And he that pretends it does, would find himself hard put to it to prove his Assertion.

Rom. 13. 1.

XXIV. However, tho' a Plain *Divine Commission* in this Case could not be Produc'd, if yet it could be made Appear, that it is an Essential Part of the *Original Compact* upon which Civil Government as such is founded, that the Magistrate shall have such an Autority in sacred Matters, it is freely own'd it would deserve to be well consider'd. But even this is a Task that requires a more than Common Capacity. For when the several Fathers of Families at first resign'd their Natural Liberty, and join'd together in forming Civil Societies for the Common Benefit, that they should subject their Strength and Possessions to the Autority of those whom they fixt on for Rulers, was necessary for the Common Security: But it was not so necessary they should submit their Wills to their Sovereigns with respect to Religion.

gion. This is evident to any Man that considers the End of Civil Government; which is no other than the Procuring, Preserving and Advancing the Civil Interests of Mankind. Where these are Violated, the Magistrate is Arm'd with the Force and Strength of all his Subjects, in order to the inflicting due Punishment for the Common Security. But in Religion every Man is under a Superior Order, and Acting according to his Considence has none to Controul him, as long as the Civil Interests of Mankind (which lie in their Life, Liberty, Health and Property) remain Untouch'd. As for things that are in their own Nature *indifferent*, the Civil Interests of Mankind cannot require that the Magistrate should trouble the Church about them one way or other. It concerns not the Common-wealth (as such) what Ceremonies be us'd or omitted in Publick Worshipping Assemblies. No Advantage nor Prejudice can arise either way to the Lives, Liberties, or Estates of the Subjects, which it is the great Design of Civil Government to preserve and secure. The Magistrate therefore can have no Power to impose in such things convey'd by the Original Compact. Nay, I'le add. Every one by being a Member of a Civil Society has as clear a Right to be Protected in that Mode of Religious Worship, which he apprehends to be most agreeable to the Will of God (as long as the Civil Peace is not endanger'd) as in any Matter whatsoever.

See *The First Letter concerning Toleration* p. 8, &c.

XXV. But tho' this Boundless Power, which some in a Complement (tho' at the same time with a manifest *Selfish Design*) ascribe to the Magistrate, be Contested, there is still as

See an Essay, Concerning the Power of the Magistrate, and the Rights of Mankind, in Matters of Religion. Printed for Andrew Bell, 1697. *in Octavo.*

much

much Autority left him, with reference to the Concerns of *Religion*, as can reasonably be desir'd, of could answer any valuable End. Thus far then is Agreed: The Common and Obvious Principles of Natural Religion are to be guarded against manifest Contempt and Violation. All open Immorality and Profaneness is to be punish'd, as tending to the Ruin of Religion in General, and Civil Society at once. Such Writings as the Magistrate, after due Enquiry, believes to contain God's Revealed Will, He is to Preserve, Publish, and Recommend by all fit Means; tho' not to enforce the Acknowledgment of them by Penal Laws: And much less to make Additions to them. He may no doubt, or indeed ought, to provide the best Means he can. Legally and Regularly, for the more publick Opening and Applying them: As also upon Occasion to call together the most impartial and proper Persons solemnly to Consider important Controversies in Religion, and to offer their Deliberate Judgment thereupon, together with their Reasons, which he may make as Publick as he pleases; but not enforce Submission to them by Penal Sanctions. He should, no Question, take care, that in these or other Religious Assemblies nothing pass contrary to the Publick Good, or his own Just Autority. He may oblige his Subjects ordinarily to attend the Solemn Worship of God in the way they professedly choose, or against which they don't so much as pretend Matter of Conscience. When he finds, it agreeable to the Generality of his Subjects, and that they are Consenting by such as are Regularly intrusted to Act for them. He may or ought to settle a Legal Maintenance and Encouragement for a Publick Ministry, as a Provision for those, who would else get

none

none at all, or as bad as none for themselves; and also for that Generality of the Subjects, who are suppos'd to acquiesce in the Publick Provision. Here indeed the Magistrate should in Reason make the Terms of Admitting Ministers and Members, as large and free as will consist with the main Ends of Religion, which are indeed like to be best attain'd by making no more Duties or Sins than God has made. In short; all may be held by the Magistrate to the Discharge of their Acknowledg'd Duty, so far as it fairly falls under his Observation and Cognizance; and they are therein to be protected: But the Church, by Law establish'd and endow'd, is to be more specially inspected, in such way and by such means as agree with the General Rules of Divine Revelation, and may best reach all the Good Ends and Purposes design'd. They that not content with this, carry the Magistrates Power farther, do it in hopes of having it their Property, and using it as a support to their own Grandeur: But when they find such Hopes fail or abate, they can be aswell content it should be limited as their Neighbours. Nay, and when they have made a mighty Stir about the Necessity and Compliance with unnecessary Impositions, because prescrib'd by Autority, they leave the Government to shift for it self; and answer for its Impositions to God, Conscience, and the World. And in this respect a Celebrated Divine, even of the *Church of England* ⋆ hath charg'd. Dr. *Stillingfleet* himself, notwithstanding all his Invectives against Separation, with *Leaving our Rulers in the Lurch.*

⋆ *Protestant Reconciler, Part* I. *page* 3.

XXVI. And after all, if the Magistrate has a determining Power in Religious Circumstantials, if he thinks fit to abate the Exercise of it, the

the Subjects to he sure cannot then be Bound, to fall in with any Ecclesiastical Constitution of his fixing. If he is content to wave his Authority, give a *Toleration*, and leave People at Liberty, certainly they may safely make use of it, without any Disrespect to Him. And this I suppose is the great Reason, why the Autority of the Magistrate, has been less urg'd, to inforce a Compliance with our Ecclesiastical Establishent here in *England*, since a *Legal Toleration* has been granted to *Dissenters*, than it was before. But then on the other side, if the Magistrate has not the Determining Power as to Religious Circumstantials, about which some have made so great a Stir, Compliance with his Prescriptions in such things (barely because they come from him) cannot be a Duty; nor Noncompliance a Sin. For where there is no proper Power, there is no room for a Law: And where there is no Law, there is no Transgression. Had God indeed said any where in Scripture, I leave it to Rulers and Magistrates to Determine in all *indifferent things* relating to *Religion*, and to lay down Positive Rules of Worship, to which all must submit, if they are not unlawful; nay, were there any thing to be met with in our Sacred Canon, from whence this might reasonably be inferr'd to be the Mind of God, it were unreasonable not to comply: But till that can be clear'd, 'tis a vain thing to represent the refilling of Compliance, as a slighting of their Autority. For it can't be a fault to refuse Obedience, where the Autority of the Commander cannot be made out. Tho' Persons may in some Cases, upon other Accounts, be oblig'd to fall in with the things prescrib'd, yet it cannot be, because of the Autority of the Commander. And I think withal, it deserves

to

to be consider'd, that they who represent as a Damnable Sin, and then cry down all who refuse to comply with the Impositions of the Magistrate in Religious Matters, as grosly guilty, after all their Specious Pleas, make the Magistrate guilty of the Damnation of Multitudes which is no great Argument either of Respect or Tenderness.

XXVII. But let us see whether this Determining or Imposing Power may not do better in the Hands of the *Church*, with whom some much rather choose to lodge it. This is the Course taken in the 20th *Article* of the *Church of England:* 'Tis there asserted. *That the Church hath Power to Decree Rites and Ceremonies*, tho' how that Passage came into the *Articles*, is hard to say. ⋆ Mr. Rogers, in his Discourse upon this *Article*, says, *That the Autority of the Church to decree Rites and Ceremonies, is warranted by the Word of God; First, by the Example of the Apostles, who did ordain Rites and Ceremonies: And next, By the general and binding Commandment of God himself who will have every thing in the Church to be done to edifying, decently and in Order*, &c.

⋆ *'Tis observable, that King* Edwards's *Articles, An.* 1552. *have not that clause. Nor is it to be found in the Manuscript call'd* Synodalia *in* Bennet *Colledge in* Cambridge, *where there is an Original of the Articles, as they were subscrib'd. Nor is it in that Impression of the Articles, An.* 1571. *in which Year Subscription to the Articles was requir'd by Act of Parliament. But Dr.* Heylin *says, it was Printed in the Latin and English Impressions, An.* 1562. *and in all Impressions after the Year* 1593. *excepting dr.* Mocket's *Translation of the Articles, An.* 1617. *and another Impression, An.* 1636. *at* Oxford. *Possibly it might be inserted in some later Sessions of the Convocation, An.* 1562. *after the Subscription of the Members. This is the more probable, because it may easily be prov'd, that after that, the articles were in divers Places chang'd and alter'd.*

But this Proof I doubt won't go far. For as for the *Apostles,* whatsoever they did to bind the *Churches*, they did by special Divine Warrant: But their Example can never prove, that the Church hath the same Warrant in all Ages, Autoritatively to fix *General Regulations*, any more than their Practice can prove, that others who come after them, may add to the Canon of sacred Scripture. And tho' God requires, that all things be done to *Edification*, *Decently*, *and in Order* yet it does not follow, that the Church has an imposing Power. She may indeed recommend or dissuade, as she sees occasion: But it can never be prov'd from hence, that she is allow'd to Act Autoritatively in *indifferent* Matters or that she is able, by a Command, to make those things necessary to *Edification*, *Decency* and *Order*, which before the Command had not a tendency that way and yet much less, that she is impower'd to make Indifferent Ceremonies Terms of Communion. My Lord of *Sarum* also, in his Elaborate Exposition of the *Thirty Nine Articles,* is very sparing of Proof upon this Head. Indeed, as for the Power of the Church, which is Asserted in the Article, he rather takes it for Granted, than Proves it; and Dilates upon the Measures of Obedience: Saying, *That the only Question there must be Lawful or Unlawful. For Expedient or Inexpedient ought never to be bro't into Quesiion, as to the Point of Obedience, since no Inexpediency whatsoever can ballance the breaking of Order, and the Dissolving the Constitution and Society.* But, with submission, I think *Expediency* or *Inexpediency* necessarily comes into the Question, whether I ought to Comply with imposed Ceremonies, since they are pretended to be impos'd as Decent. And the Power and Autority, that is pretended for imposing

imposing them, being only the Power of imposing things that are for Decency, I must be convinc'd of their Decency or Expediency, which is the same thing, before I can be convinc'd that I ought to comply with them. Tho' *Lawful or Unlawful*, be the only proper Question in things that are Agreed to fall under the Autority of the Commander; yet till that appears, every one concern'd has a Right to enquire into the *Expediency* or *Inexpediency* of things requir'd, for his own Satisfaction. For tho' I may, in some Cases, *Lawfully* do what is requir'd of me, by those who have no Autority in such things to command me, yet if what is requir'd appears to me upon search *Inexpedient*, it would be hard to prove I am at all oblig'd. Nor is it a *Breaking Order*, &c. in such a Case to forbear: 'Tis rather a following the Conduct of Right Reason.

XXVIII. There are several things in this Case that need to be clear'd, before the Principle is well establish'd. It must be shewn who the *Church* is, that has this Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies. If we are there at a loss, the Principle is useless. It must in the next place be shewn, how the *Church came by this Power*. To say, *the Jewish Church exercis'd it*, therefore the Christian Church has a Right to it, will not hold. For the *Jewish Church* might exercise it, and not have a Right to it: And if so, the *Christian Church* might this way be argu'd into a great Irregularity. To say, that the Church must have this Power, because it is *necessary to Union and Agreemen, which is the thing that our Saviour has most solemnly and frequently enjoin'd*, is to use an Argument that is easily inverted. For it may upon as good Grounds be Asserted, that our Blessed Redeemer

hath convey'd no such Power to his Church, and therefore it cannot be necessary to that Union and Agreement, which he so solemnly and frequently injoin'd. Again, It must also be shewn what are the Limits of this Power. For if it is Arbitrary, and altogether illimited, it must necessarily be a Grievance, unless the Church that manages it be perfect and infallible. If it be limited to *Lawful* things only, what must be done, when the *Lawfulness* of the things injoin'd is question'd, because of their Absurdity and Indecency; which is no impossible supposition. But instead of clearing such things as these, we commonly walk in the Dark, which is a little odd. ⋆ We take things in Gross, without Particularizing. The Principle is usually taken thus: The Church may impose whatever is Decent: And the Church is Judge of what is Decent, tho' in the mean time, who the Church is, is not so certain.

⋆ *A certain Noble Lord took occasion once to declare in the House of Peers , that this 20th Article, stating the Autority of the Church, is very dark; and either contradicts it self, or says nothing, or what is contrary to the known Laws of the Land.—See a Letter from a Person of Quality, &c. in the* Collection of State Tracts. p.50.

XXIX. Some mean the Governors or *Bishops of the Church*. With them they lodge a Power of Determining *indifferent* things in their respective Diocesses: And if you won't yield to it, they tell you, there will be no end of Schisms and Divisions. An Argument that is the less forcible, I must confess, upon me, because urg'd by the *Romamsts* for their Infallibility; and miserably baffled by those that have oppos'd them. Others, by the Church, understand either the College of *Bishops*, or the Representatives of the *Church* in General Councils, or National Synods. They only are the proper Seat of this Power

Power in their esteem; and if you offer to refuse Obedience to their Canons and Injunctions, you are guilty of the same Crime with, *Dathan* and *Abiram*. But the Gentlemen that go this way, are generally so furious, that I hope their Followers are but few. I'le consider the first of these two Hypotheses closely and distinctly; and touch also upon the last.

XXX. The Principle then is this: That the Bishops of the Church have a Power of Determining indifferent things in Religion, in their respective Diocesses, so as to oblige all that inhabit in them, in Point of Conscience, to obey and comply. 'Tis Query'd, how they came by this Authority? 'Tis Reply'd, They have it, as they received the Care of the Church from their Predecessors. But if their Predecessors had no such Autority themselves, they could not certainly convey any to those that came after them. And therefore the Query returns. How came their Predecessors by such an Autority? If it be said, they had it from those in whose room they succeeded, and so upward; the Matter will at last issue here: That Bishops have their Autority, as they are Successors of the Apostles, which (I suppose) is the thing intended. But how far are they the Successors of the Apostles? Do they succeed them in the Plenitude of Apostolical Power, or in the infallible Divine Conduct, which attended them in all the emergent Difficulties of their Ministry? This would indeed be much to the Purpose: But I can hardly suppose that any will assert it. Wherein then do they peculiarly succeed them? 'Tis reply'd, *As they are oblig'd* (as they were) *to take the most effectual Methods for the Preservation of Order and Decency in the Publick Worship of God.*—— As they are *Judges of what*

Hoadly's Reasonableness of Conformity, Part I, p. 67.

Ibid.

conduces to this End:—And as they have *a Title to the Obedience of the People under their Care, in whatsoever does not contradict the Laws of the Society, by which they are all to be Govern'd.* But 'tis worth, our while to consider, how the Apostolical Commission runs, when we are enquiring after the Power,of their Successors. The Charge given by our Saviour to the Apostles runs thus: *Go, and teach them to observe all things, whatsocver I have commanded, you.* So that even the Apostles themselves were not impower'd to impose or require any thing, but what either Christ had himself commanded or what they should be led to, by the special Guidance of his Spirit. If then Bishops do succeed the Apostles, they must Act by the same Commission: But how can that Justifie their requiring things, as to which they can neither pretend, that *Christ has commanded them*, nor that they fix'd upon them under the *Conduct of the Holy Ghost?* Besides, we don't find that the Apostles requir'd any thing but what was *necessary:* And why should their Successors herein affect to go beyond them? When the Apostles were met together, to consult about healing a Breach, and settling the Church, they requir'd only *necessary things:* Things which Circumstances made necessary before they requir'd them: And it was because of that, that they insisted so much upon them. But it's widely different from this; for Bishops to make necessary, by their strict requiring and urging them, things which Antecedently were so far from any sort of necessity, that the best that could be said of them is this. That they were *Indifferent.*

Matt. 28. 19, 20.

Acts 15. 28.

XXXI. 'Tis pleaded. *It results from the Nature of all Societies, that the Governors of them* should

Ibid.

should have a Power of Orderings what seems to them most for the Beauty and Advantage of them, &c. But this needs Restriction. In meer Civil Societies, the Argument will undoubtedly hold good, as to supreme Governors; unless such a Power be excluded or limited in the Original Compact, on which such Societies are founded: But it does not follow, 'tis the same as to subordinate Governors. So in the Case of the Church, the supreme Governor, the Lord Jesus Christ, has most undoubtedly *a Power of Ordering what seems to him most for the Beauty and Advantage of it:* But as for subordinate Governors, they have no farther Power than he has been pleas'd to Communicate to them. *The Nature of such a Society* will not allow them any more. They are no farther *Judges of what may be for the Beauty and Advantage* of the Society, than he has made them so. The meanest Christian, till it can be made appear, that the fixing such Regulations in Matters *indifferent* is in their Commission, has a Liberty left him to judge for himself. Their judgment no farther binds, than as it is back'd either by Divine Autority, or by substantial Reasons. And tho' 'tis said, *It results from the Nature of all Societies, that the Governors should have a Title to the Obedience of the People under their Care, in whatever does not Contradict the Laws of that Society:* Yet in the Church, (where the Will of Christ is the Decisive Rule) none that take the Place of Governors are entitled to Obedience, any farther than as they can make it appear Credible to such as are under their Care, that what they recommend is really the Mind of Christ. And tho' when they obtrude their Regulations with inforcing Penalties, debarring from Christian Communion for want of Compliance, they

pretend they do not *contradict the Laws of the Society*; yet till such a Power be discover'd in their Commission from the Chief Governour of the Church, it is sufficient to evidence the contrary, that the new Terms are confessedly an Addition to the Scriptural Laws of the Society; and therefore in effect appoint, that notwithstanding Christ has fixt only such Terms, Persons shall not be admitted, but upon some farther Terms and those too such as in the deliberate Judgment of those upon whom they are obtruded, are esteem'd neither Necessary, nor Expedient, nor for their Edifcation. So that a better Plea than this must be produc'd for the *Episcopal Autority* in this Case, or it is impleaded.

XXXII. And indeed, as for those who do Assert a Power in the Bishops to determine Circumstantials for all in their Dioceses, so as that they should be bound to Acquiesce in their Determinations, it may very well be expected they should give good Proof of it. For it lies upon all that Assert, to prove: And the Proof in this Case should be Clear and Cogent, because the thing Asserted is important. For Men positively to affirm over and over that it must be so, signifies nothing till 'tis prov'd. To argue from their being Successors of the Apostles, will go but a very little way: For so are all Ministers of Christ. They are all impower'd by Commission from Christ, to teach what he has commanded them: And no Ecclesiastical Ministers of an higher or lower Rank, can prove that their Commission Authorizes them to make Laws to bind the Church in things *indifferent*, unless they can make it appear, that Christ has commanded them so to do. In other things, indeed they may give their

their Judgments, as Persons that have the Grace to be faithful: But their Judgments are no farther binding, than according to the Cogency of the Reason that backs them. And tho' a great stress is in this Case laid on the Pre-eminence of Bishops above other Ministers, yet it deserves to be consider'd, that that Pre-eminence depends either upon a Divine Settlement, or upon the Agreement of the Church, or upon Humane Laws. If it depends upon a Divine Settlement, it will easily be supposeable, that there may be something of a suitable Autority attending it: But this is yet to be prov'd. For tho' there was a Pre-eminence of some above others in the Gospel Ministry in the first Settlement of the Church, yet it do's not follow, that that Pre-eminence was necessarily to continue in all future Times: Nay, the contrary has seem'd rather probable to some Persons of Worth and Note in the *Protestant* Churches, from the withdrawment of those supernatural and miraculous Gifts, upon which that Pre-emince was founded. Suppose we then, that it has been agreed in the Church, that Bishops should in their respective Diocesses have the Power of determining Circumstantials, (tho' such an universal Agreement, is not altogether so evident as is pretended) it yet gives them no proper Autority so to do, unless it be prov'd to be the Mind of Christ that such things be uniformly Determin'd for all within such a Compass. And if the peculiar Episcopal Power depends upon Humane Laws, it would be hard to make it appear, that Christians are bound in Conscience to submit to their Determinations; till it is prov'd, that Humane Laws are capable of conveying such an Autority, without any thing of a Reflection on

Christ,

Christ, the great Lawgiver, of his Church. 'Tis urg'd. We must obey those that are over us in the Lord. And 'tis granted 'tis a Duty, as far as the Lord hath set them over us: Tho' not so far as it may please Men to let them over us. We are not at Liberty, but are plainly oblig'd to submit to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Gospel, which they who are the Ministers of Christ deliver to us from him, and produce his warrant for: But it do's not therefore follow, that we are oblig'd to submit to those Laws or Constitutions, by which they attempt to bind out Consciences in things *meerly Indifferent*; or that they are really authoriz'd or impower'd to make such an Attempt: It does not follow, either that they may exercise that Lordihip that is expresly forbidden, *Luke* 22. 25. or that we must necessarily yield to them if they do. While they keep to their Commission, we are oblig'd to regard them: But if they exceed it, as far as they do so, we are free. This is so evident, that some who have asserted a proper Legislative Power in the Church, have yet been forc'd to own, that when the Church do's any thing beyond her Commission, she do's no way oblige the Conscience, neither Actively nor Passively. And of these the celebrated Bishop *Jeremy Taylor* ⋆ is one.

Heb. 13. 17.

⋆ *Duct. Dubit.* p. 666.

XXXIII. But besides, the supposing such a Power in Bishops in their several Diocesses, is the way to create more Differencs than its likely to compose. For either it must be exercis'd with *Presbyters*, or without. If the Power be in the Bishop solely without his *Presbyters*, Peace may indeed be pretty tolerably preserv'd, but it will be in a way of Ecclesiastical Servitude; which will hardly be longer born, than

Necessity

Necessity Forces. Or if Bishops be oblig'd to Act in Conjunction with their *Presbyters*, so as that their Consent and Concurrence should be necessary to make any Determinations binding; We see by our late Contests, what room is left for Heats and Feuds, and how great a Flame a small Spark may kindle. And farther, either this Power is dependent on the Civil Magistrate, or it is not. If it depend on the Magistrate, the Bishop has only the Name, while the Magistrate has the thing. For he that can warrantably controul, hath unquestionably the greater Power in the things that are subject to his Controul. If it be Independent on the Magistrate, 'tis *Imperium in Imperio*, the very thing that is so much dreaded; and it threatens endless Feuds. And what shall be done, suppose the Bishop of the Diocess is of one Mind, and the Civil Magistrate of another? Bishop *Taylor*† indeed carries it clearly for the Prince; but others go another way. What if the Bishop will have Salt and Spittle in Baptism; Holy Water for Purification; at the entrance of all: Churches, *&c*? And pleads that the People are bound to obey him, as long as the Things requir'd can't be prov'd unlawful or forbidden? While in the mean Time the Civil Magistrate declares, that he will have his Subjects disturb'd, with no such trifling Ceremonies? Which must carry it? If the Magistrate is listen'd to, the Autority of the Bishop becomes contemptible: And if the Bishop be comply'd with, the Magistrate (whose Displeasure is likely to be.soonest and longest felt) is certainly incens'd. Or let us suppose several Bishops in the same Country to have different Sentiments, and a Fondness of various Modes of Worship, what becomes of Uniformity?

† *Duct. Dubit. B.* 3. Ch. 3. *p.* 567.

Uniformity? Suppose we here in *England*, that such Men as Bishop *Goodman* of *Gloucester*, and Bishop *Cartwright* of *Chester*, Bishop *Barker* of *Oxon*, and Bishop *Crosis* of *Hereford*; or but the Two Archbishops *Laud* and *Williams*, should have us'd their Autority to spread their different ways of Worship to which they were themselves most inclin'd; *Uniformity* had presently been at an end. Tho' really it looks but oddly for Men to argue from the inherent Power of the Bishop, in defence of such a Constitution as ours in *England*, which leaves him but little spiritual Power in his Hands to boast of: And if the Civil Magistrate would be content to let it shift for it self, and stand upon its own Bottom, without any Act of Uniformity to support it, I doubt that little would soon be lost.

XXXIV. But instead of clear Proof of the Principle Contested, we have a mighty Argument drawn from the Inconsistency of those who contest it. As if the Bishops must therefore have Power to determine Rites and Ceremonies for all in their Dioceses, because they who deny them that Power, neither agree with themselves nor with one another. But suppose the Charge true, where lies the Consequence? What if some of the Ministers ejected In *England* for Nonconformity, could have comply'd with some Impositions while they inveigh'd against others? do's it therefore follow, that the Bishops have an imposing Power, which was the thing to have been prov'd? When therefore Mr. *Hoadly* tells them, that after all their Exclamations against *Impositions and New Terms of Communion, many of them would have join'd with the Bishops in imposing and prescribing some things*; he only Shifts the Scene,

Part I. p. 67.

Scene, and Attempts to prove them guilty of a gross Absurdity, instead of proving the Episcopal Autority asserted. However I'll consider his Argument as far as it goes: Tho' I think 'tis rather a Prejudice, than a proper Argument. This then is the Charge: Many of *You* Ejected Ministers *Grant, That the Governours of the Church may impose a Liturgy, and prescribe the Time for performing Religious Offices, for you would join with them in these Prescriptions, and would not separate from the Church in order to witness against these Impositions. Now* (says he) *we cannot but wonder how you could possibly agree with one unnecessiary Imposition, and yet argue from such Principles against others, as lie directly against all as well as some.* Which Charge contains a positive Assertion of a Matter of Fact, advanc'd without Proof. The Persons aim'd at are not Nam'd. But I'le suppose, he meant the Managers of the Conference at the *Savoy*; not being able to guess at any other Persons he could have in his Eye. 'Tis plain to all, that take the Pains to read their Papers, that they were Men of Moderation: and so fearful of the Mischiefs that would attend fresh Divisions, that they were full of Zeal in pursuit of Healing Methods. Had they in this Case gone too far, and been over-seen, some Allowance might have been made for Circumstances. It do's not follow, that they are herein to be imitated. Had they unhappily betray'd their Principles, do's it follow, that others must do so too, or how do's it appear that they would? But that the Fact is true, that these Gentlemen did betray their Principles is deny'd. 'Tis on the contrary asserted, that the Managers of that Conference, did openly disown the Autority of the Bishops

Page 74.

Page. 78.

to

to settle or keep up any; Impositions in the Church in things *indifferent*. And this I'le not only Assert, but prove: And could do the like also, in the Case of those who were afterwards concern'd in the Endeavours us'd in the Reign of King *Charles*, for Accommodating Matters by *Comprehension*, if it were needful.

XXXV. Abundant Proof in this Case may be drawn from the Transactions about these Matters after the Restoration of King *Charles*, before the Passing of the *Act for Uniformity*, which have since been Printed: So that any Man may judge of the Truth or Falshood of the Charge bro't in. In the first Address of the Ministers (who were afterwards Ejected) to the King, they told him indeed. That they were *satisfy'd in their Judgments concerning the Lawfulness of a Liturgy*[a]. But besides other Limitations, they insisted on it. *That it might not be too rigorously imposed*[b]. And as to *Ceremonies*, they declar'd, That they were *willing to be Determined by Autority*, (*i. e.* the Civil Autority, as appears from all their Papers) *in such things as being meerly Circumsantial, are common to Humane Actions and Societies, and are to be Order'd by the Light of Nature? and Christian Prudence according to the General Rules of the Word, which are always to be observ'd*[c]. But they earnestly desir'd, *That Kneeling at the Sacrament might not be impos'd on such as scrupled it; and that the Use of the Surplice, and Cross in Baptism, and Bowing at the Name* Jesus, *rather than any other Name of his, might be abolished; and that Innovations in Ceremonies might for the future be prevented; that so the Publick Worship might be free, not only from Blame, but from Suspicion.*[d] And afterwards, in the Exceptions against the Book of *Common Prayer*, which they deliver'd in to the Commissioners on

[a] See *Baxter*'s Life in Folio. p. 234.
[b] Ibid. p. 235.
[c] Ibid. p. 235.
[d] Ibid. p. 256.

on the other side, speaking of the forementioned *Ceremonies*, they thus exprest themselves: *We cannot but desire, that these Ceremonies may not be impos'd on them, who judge such Impositions a Violation of the Royalty of Christ, and an Impeachment of his Laws as insufficient: But that there may be either a total Abolition of them, or at least such a Liberty, that those who are unsatisfy'd concerning their Lawfulness or Expediency, may not be compelled to the Practice of them, or Subscription to them: But maybe permitted to enjoy their Ministerial Function, and Communion with the Church, without them*[e]. And tho' they were for Reforming the *Common-Prayer Book*, and could have been contented ordinarily to have us'd it when Reform'd, yet, even then, they were against the Imposing it! Of which he that peruses their Earnest *Petition for Peace*, then presented, can hardly remain unsatisfy'd. Nay, the very State of the Case, as it stood between the *Ministers* and the *Bishops* in that Conference, will give any Man that considers it sufficient satisfaction. For the *Ministers* were Defendants against their intended Impositions. They were upon Commanding their Compliante, or they should be excluded the Constitution. They desir'd them to prove their Autority from God to make such Impositions: They urg'd them to shew how they came by their Power and frankly told them, That *if they refus'd, they gave up their Cause*[f]*:* And yet they could not hear any Proof alledg'd. Nay, Mr. *Baxter* in particular, defin'd any of the Commissioners on the other side, to prove from Antiquity, that ever any Prince did impose one Form of Prayer, or Liturgy, for *Uniformity*, on all the Churches in his Dominions; yea, or upon any one Province or Country under them: Or that ever any Council,

[e] Ibid. p. 320.

[f] Ibid. p. 336.

Council, Synod, or Patriarchs, of Metropolitans, did impose one Liturgy on all the Bishops and Churches under them[g]. And in their Reply to the Answer of the Bishops, to their Exceptions against the Book of *Common Prayer*, they tell them in so many words, That *they might as well think to make a Coat for the Moon, as to make a Liturgy, that should be sufficiently pitted to the variety of Places, Times, Subjects, and Accidents, without the Liberty of intermixing such Prayers and Exhortations, as Alterations and Diversities require*. And afterwards they have these words: *Is it not Work eno' for us and, to obey the Laws that Christ has made? Why made he none for Postures, and Vestures, and Teaching Signs, if he would have had them*, &c? *If he had but told us, that he left any Officers after his inspir'd Apostles, for the making of Ceremonies, or New Laws of Worship, or Teaching Engaging Signs for the Church, we would as gladly understand and obey his Will in these things, as you*. These things I mention thus particularly, not as if I at all suppos'd, that had these Gentlemen gone too far, we that came after them were therein bound to agree with them: But that indifferent Persons may the better Judge, whether they can be fairly charg'd, with yielding to the Imposing Power of Bishops; which was the thing mainly Contested.

[g] Ibid. p. 340.

See the Papers that pass'd between the Commissioners at the *Savoy*: Printed in Quarto, An. 1661. page 69.

Ibid. p. 81

XXXVI. Let us then see the Argument drawn out in its strength. As far as I can take it, it stands thus: *You Ejected Ministers would have join'd with the Bishops in the imposing some things: And therefore they had Autority to impose some things*. 'Tis reply'd: It neither appears, that the Ministers would have join'd with the Bishops

Hoadly. Part I. page 67.

shops in imposing things that were not antecedently necessary: Nor if it did, would the Autority of the Bishops to impose such things, be thereby prov'd and clear'd. Or let us take the Argument as he himself has stated it, thus: *If the Bishops have Autority to prescribe in One then in Another*. It is granted, if both the One and the Other be within their Commission; otherwise not. But I should have expected it to have been prov'd, that they had a Power to prescribe and impose what is not antecedently Necessary or Expedient in any Case, before it should be attempted to draw an Argument from one Case to another, which could not be likely to contribute to Conviction. But that we may the more plainly discern the strength. of his Reasoning upon this Head, when he was aiming to prove *the Autority of the Bishops to prescribe the things which are so grievously complain'd of*, I'le venture to put my self into the very Case which he proposes. I'le suppose my self one that could use the *Common Prayer*, if it were alter'd, (I won't say, *as I would have it*, but) so as to leave no just Ground of Scruple to a Consciencious Person, either as to the Matter, or Form of it: But it does not therefore follow, I should think it *Lawful to join with those Governors who impose one*, if by that he means, owning their Autority rigorously to impose it. For tho' I might comply ordinarily to use a Form, yet I must have more Light, before I could yield, that any are Authoriz'd by God to tie me up to it; and hinder me from endeavouring to suit my self to that Variety of Occasions that offer, as Circumstances may require. Well then, what does he infer from hence? Why the Case is this: If I can comply with a *Form of Prayer*, he thinks I that way as much

Page 68.

exclude Persons that scruple all Forms, as if I comply'd with the *Ceremonies*, I should exclude those who question'd the Lawfulness of them. I take the Hint: And for that Reason should be loth so to oblige my self to a Form, as that I should not be left at liberty to omit it, if I were call'd (tho' perhaps it might not be the matter of my Choice) to Officiate in a Congregation, the Generality of which were against all Forms. And this Answers all the Particulars of the *Parallel* he draws. Suppose therefore I am free ordinarily to use the Reform'd *Common Prayer Book*, in the Office for Baptism: He says. *Whoever will not have his Child Baptized with such Prayers*, as are there contain'd, *is as much excluded*, *as he that scruples to have it Baptiz'd, because the Sign of the Cross is us'd after Baptism*. Very well Hinted. And for that Reason, tho' I could ordinarily use a Reform'd Liturgy, yet I should desire to see more Cogent Arguments than I have yet met with, before I could be prevail'd with, so to bind my self to the Use of any Form of *Baptism*, as should oblige me to refuse *Baptism*, where the life of that Form is scrupled. And I say the like for any particular Form, for the *Holy Communion* also. And by this means I think I escape the Danger of those Clamours, which Mr. *Hoadly* mentions, and that with much more ease, than, as far as I can perceive, any Man can do, according to the Prelent Settlement.

Pag. 69, 70.

XXXVII. And as for the Time of Administring the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*, on which Mr. *Hoadly* so freely dilates, tho' I look upon Noon to be ordinarily the most proper Season, yet I know of no Autority of the *Governors of the Church* to appoint that Time, exclusively of any other, for all the Worshipping Societies in

Pag. 71, 72, 73.

in a Nation. In many Places, the Evening may be more convenient. When any Worshipping Society really finds it so, I see not what Right any Bishops or Church Governors have to debar them of that Liberty of Consulting their own Conscience, in so indifferent a Matter, which Christ, the Head Governor of the Church, has left them. Nor is there any ill Consequence arising hence, that is comparable to what would follow upon the other Supposition. For let a serious Christian, who apprehends the Evening the most proper Time, apply himself to a Minister, who ordinarily Administers the *Sacrament* at Noon, he need not call him off with Contempt, as one unfit to be communicated with: If he cannot prevail with him to acquiesce in the Time which has been Agreed on in the Worshipping Society which he belongs to, 'tis but referring him to another Minister, with whom he may receive at his own Time. If there happen to be none such within a convenient Distance, it may perhaps put him to some Trouble: But that's no just Reason of his being deny'd his Liberty. And if we take the Matter thus, the Complaint which Mr. *Hoadly* has pleasantly transferred from the Posture of *Kneeling at the Sacrament*, to the Time of the Administration of it, becomes needless and groundless, and indeed ridiculous. And yet I can't say but there would be room for such a Complaint, were all Ministers so bound up to any One Time, as that they could not Administer the *Sacrament* at another Season, in Compliance with the Scrupulous; (especially if there were a Number of them:) but must rather all with one Consent leave them to live without that Ordinance, than comply with their Weakness. But after all; that *Bishops have Autority*

Pag. 74, 76.

to prescribe things antecedently necessary, under the highest Penalty; and to make them Terms of Communion, and demand Obedience, is yet to be prov'd.

Pag. 78, 79.

XXXVIII. 'Tis urg'd on their behalf, That *they have Order'd nothing, but what, if all would seriously comply with, is certainly for the Good of the Church:* And therefore *they have done their Duty, and cannot be charg'd with Sin.* As if it would justifie an Usurper, that his Administration was manag'd for the Good of the Community. To be sure in any Case, that will make Power much the more tolerable: But how 'twill prove a Right, I cannot see: Nor can Mr. *Hoadly* himself discern it, in the Case of Ministers amongt the *Nonconformists*, who had not what he calls a *Regular Ordination.* Supposing therefore All our *Episcopal* Impositions were highly Beneficial, it does not follow, they are impower'd for them by their Commission. But that they are so Beneficial, is not self-evident; and therefore should have been prov'd. 'Tis easie *to name* more than *One ill Consequence* of Compliance with such Arbitrary Prescriptions of the *English Church:* But since One he intimates will do; I desire it may be consider'd, that this would cherish an Imposing Spirit, which is still growing, where-ever it is indulg'd to; and which hath prevail'd so long in the *Church of Christ*, that it hath quite defac'd it; and made it so unlike the true *Primitive Church*, that it can hardly be known, if Judg'd of according to the best Description of it. This is a Consequence, that in my Apprehension tends to a Mischief, much greater than the Good that could be suppos'd to result from a General Compliance. And yet farther; Were the things requir'd as Beneficial as is Pretended, *the Disproportion of the Penalty* is Unaccountable. To say, *The Gover-*

nors

nors of the Church can injoin nothing; if this be insisted on, is only fairly to desire to be excus'd from Proof of the Autority contested. For that they can injoin any thing that is antecedently unnecessary and inexpedient, under the Penalty of Exclusion from *Christian Communion*, is the thing deny'd: 'Tis particularly deny'd, that their enjoining *this particular Time*, or *this particular Liturgy*, in so rigorous a manner, as not to allow for a Variety of Circumstances, is to be justify'd. And an Argument is drawn from the Disproportion between the suppos'd Crime, and the Penalty. An Argument, not to be Answer'd by unprov'd Assertions. If Church Governors *are oblig'd to resist Irregularity, Disorder, and an ignorant Contempt of all Autority*; so are they also, say we, to avoid imposing things unnecessary, and destroying Peace to assert their Autority. The Excluding Persons the Communion of the Church by unwarrantable Impositions, is so far from being a *Fence against Disorder*, that it is it self a very great Disorder, and the Bane of Charity: And they that suffer under such an Exclusion, have the satisfaction of a Court and Judge to appeal to above, where they may upon good Grounds hope to be Acquitted, tho' they are here Condemned. And if they but Act in the Integrity of their Hearts, they need not fear, but that will another Day redound to their Honour, which is now charg'd, upon them as *their Weakness*.

Pag.79.

Pag. 80.

XXXIX. I add farther, if Bishops and Governors of the Church had not sufficient Autority at first to fix such Impositions, as are complain'd of; much less had their Successors just Reason to retain and insist upon them. For, by woful Experience, looking back they might perceive the Mischief they had done; the strange

Pag. 84, 85, 86.

Divisions, and uncharitable Heats and Feuds they had creeated: What Snares they had prov'd to many Pious Persons; What Matter of Joy to our common Enemies, the *Papists*; and what a Cutting Grief to many Upright-hearted *Protestants:* How many Useful Ministers had, upon their occasion, been worry'd suspended, and excommunicated, to their Impoverishment and Ruin; and the depriving of many Thousands of Souls of their Valuable Labours: To what Hazards and Dangers, Church and State had been thereby exposed; and what Hindrances they had been to Unity and Peace; Neither could they reasonably expert any other for the future. And therefore, if after such fair Warning they would return to those Methods, which would draw Violence after them towards those who ought to be suffer'd to live in Peace, they might well think they would be Chargeable with the Dismal Consequences. So that if they in this Case argu'd as Mr. *Hoadly* represents, their Plea was Unaccountable, Groundless, and False. They could not, in Consistence with Truth, have laid. That *many of the Dissenting Ministers would have with their Autority*, in any of the Impositions complain'd of. They knew the contrary. For they call'd upon them, with great Earnestness, to prove *their Autority*; and till then, openly refus'd Compliance. They had no ground to say. That in order to a Coalition, they must *give up their Liturgy, and all Liturgies*; since the ordinary Use of the Liturgy, when amended, was offer'd; provided the Subscription, and the Rigorous Imposing it, and the Oath of Canonical Obedience, was but wav'd; which was no more than King *Charles* hiniself offer'd in his Declaration. That they should *assert their Autority*

tority by retaining their Impositions, they might indeed say; but they had done it with much more Advantage, had they first prov'd, that they receiv'd it as a Trust from Christ. To say, that by their stiff adherence they should *testifie against unwarrantable Separation*, was ridiculous; when they had as good Assurance given as the Nature of the Thing would bear, that by but waving a few Things, which they could not so much as pretend they were oblig'd to insist on, on the Account of any real Necessity or intrinsick Goodness, they might have prevented the Separation that follow'd: So that they forc'd the Ministers upon a Separation to secure the Peace of their Consciences, instead of testifying against it, in that way that might justly have been expected, from Persons suitably concern'd for the Peace of the Church. Neither could they this way really *check,* no they would rather cherish, *Principles which bro't Confusion and Disorder into this Church and Nation*. For the Principles which by Experience had prov'd so Ruinous, were not the Aversion to Impositions, and earnestness for a farther Reformation; but an imaginary Infallibility and real Persecution: Which tho' the very Quintessence of *Popery*, had deeply infected our *Protestant* Hierarchy in those Days; and flew at all, till they flung both Church and State into the most dreadful Convulsions that could be conceiv'd. And a little fore-sight would have help'd them to have Discern'd, that instead of *resisting,* they were much more likely this way to promote: the *Designs of evil Men*, who made use of their warmth and Fire; as a strange Advantage to them in their Endeavours *to overturn the whole Constitution*: Of which some of them were at

Page 87.

last convinc'd, when it was too late to have prevented it, had not a wise and merciful Providence, in ways that were little tho't of reliev'd and sav'd us.

XL. It appears from the Premises, that the Principle of the *Episcopal Power*, to make Things indifferent. Terms of Communion, may very safely he rejected till better prov'd. But there being a considerable Negative Argument against this Power, drawn from the 14th Chapter of the Epistle to the *Romans*, Mr. *Hoadly* has attempted to weaken it: And yet after his utmost Assaults, it remains firm and strong. Church-Governors are in that Chapter requir'd to receive *Dissenters*, and use forbearance, and not make Matters that were indifferent the Occasion of Censure or Contempt and much less, Exclusion from Communion: They are forbidden to Command such Things, any further than might stand with an hearty Reception and brotherly Communion. If so; this pretended Episcopal Power vanishes. This is an Argument so forcible, that there's no evading it, if the Fact asserted be but clear'd: And therefore various Ways have been taken to give it a different Gloss and Turn. But when they have said all they can, the Text do's not limit the Injunction at all, and therefore we should not. As for those that will limit it to Persons and Times, let them shew that the Text designs those Limitations, if they expect to be regarded. However several have discover'd their good Will in the Case. Some have said, that the Discourse in this Chapter refers to Private Persons, and not to Governors. But if it be the Duty of Private Persons, so to bear with the Weak Christians mention'd, notwithstanding their different Judgments,

See the Protestant Reconciler, Part 1. Chap. 4.

Judgments, as not to Censure them, or refuse Communion with them, it must be the Duty of Ecclesiastical Governors much more, because of their greater Concern to promote the Peace of the Church, in order to which the Forbearance, that is here press'd is represented as so necessary. It has been pleaded by others, that this Precept of Forbearance, was but *a Temporary Provision.* But methinks, it is liable to the Apprehension of any Man, that of all the Times that could be pitch'd upon for the urging this Forbearance, that was the unfittest, when they had the Apostles at Hand, and might freely repair to them to receive Direction as Occasion requir'd. They had a Plenary Autority sufficient to warrant all their Injunctions: So that there was less Reason for this Forbearance then, than at any Time since. And besides 'tis observeable, that the Reasons with which it is enforc'd, are of a Moral and Perpetual Obligation. This forbearance is therefore urg'd, because *God receives* the Parties concern'd, they are *Brethren; Christ dy'd for them*; &c. which Reasons have equal Strength in any succeeding Age, as in the Time particularly referr'd to. Such Forbearance therefore will ever be a Duty. Others have labour'd to limit the Extent of this Duty. The Apostle says, A weak Brother is to be *receiv'd, but not to doubtful Disputations:* And some have given this Gloss: He is to be inform'd of the Lawfulness of what is impos'd, and if he is afterwards unsatisfy'd, he is to be rejected, not as a *Weak*, but a *Stubborn* and *Obstinate* Person. But this Gloss overthrows the Text. For the Apostle represents him as a Brother, tho' he remains unsatisfi'd; and presses the owning and receiving him as such; He tells us, he is to be

tolerated,

tolerated, and not contended withnor disturb'd with Disputes about Things in themselves neither necessary nor expedient.

Part 1. p. 88.

XLI. But Mr. *Hoadly* takes a new Way to Evade the Argument, and says, That *it is very unfair to apply, what St.* Paul *says in one Case, to Cases not at all Parale to it. He speaks of such groundless Scruples, as were fix'd in the Minds of some Persons by the Religion they profess'd, before their Conversion to Christianity: Such groundless Scruples, and such Differences of Opinion and Practice, as are perfectly consistent with their joining together in one uniform Manner of Publick Worship; and of Persons, who for what appears were perfectly dispos'd to agree in the same Customs*, &c. But certainly a Case may be something Paralel, without agreeing in all Circumstances. Let it then be observ'd, that the Apostle here speaks of different Sentiments and Practice, without any discernable regard to the rise of the Difference and without any consideration of the Degree of their Consistency or Inconsistency with the uniform Observation of Publick Customs. Without laying any Stress on such Particularities as those, he inculcates Forbearance, and forbids a rigorous imposing of things Indifferent, where there was a diversity of Apprehenhon concerning them. There's not the least Intimation, that if People came by their Scruples in such a way, or would thus far comply, they were to be forborn; otherwise not: But the Command is of this Import: Which way soever these honest People came by their Scruples, and how much soever they differ from you, in things really indifferent, forbear them, receive them, embrace them as Brethren, and don't attempt to impose upon them; for it could not be justify'd. But says he, *The Apostle* Paul *was not*

Page 89.

against

against Prescriptions, relating to the Behaviour of Christians at the Publick Worship. Who thinks he was? And yet it do's not follow, that all have Autority to make like Prescriptions, who may have an inclination. We know very well that he hath given some *General Prescriptions*: viz. That all things be done *Decently*, and *in Order*, and *to Edification*, &c. And as for *Particular Prescriptions*, we are sensible he was Essiciently Authoriz'd; and, that he had the special Conduct of the Divine Spirit to direct him, in such things as were design'd for the life of the Church in all Ages: But that others who have not the same Conduct of that Spirit, may therefore of their own Heads, impose what they think good upon the Disciples of Christ, under the specious Pretence of *Order* and *Decency*, by no Means follows. This is plainly here forbidden. That he Ordred, *that Women hould be silent at Publick Assemblies; and that they should be* Page 90. *veild in the Church*; and, *that the Prophets who had any thing reveal'd to them wait with tience, and observe a due Order in their speaking? &c.* is readily agreed: But then it is to be observ'd, that neither were these things properly Indifferent, nor did he act without plain Autority. These were things not properly Indifferent. They were things that were really Expedient: They were founded on Moral Reasons. They were also inforc'd with an Apostolical Autority that was well Attested- And if this be well consider'd, there will appear no room for an Inference, that therefore *Ordinary Church Governours* may warrantably, under the Pretence of *Decency* and *Order*, prescribe things *indifferent*, so as to Exclude such from *Communion* who refuse *compliance.* St. *Paul* has in this Chapter plainly interpos'd with his Apo-

Page 91.

Apostolical Autority, against such a Practice. When therefore Mr. *Hoadly* so positively declares, *That St.* Paul *no more this Chapter of Scruples relating to mens Behaviour, at Publick Assemblys, than he tho't of Contradicting himself:* He would have done his Cause good Service, had he prov'd that it implies a Contradiction, to suppose the Apostle should elsewhere give Particular Prescriptions about the Circumstantials of Divine Worship, being duly Authoriz'd thereto, and having a special Assistance of the Holy Spirit to direct him and yet should in this Chapter forbid others, who had not the same Autority or Assistance, to break in upon the Peace of the Church with their unnecessary Injunctions, to the causing such to be rejected, as ought to be receiv'd and own'd as Brethren. But till then, he rather exposes himself by such Insinuations, than the Argument drawn from this Chapter, against the Imposing Power, of which he seems so fond. *The Lawfulness of laying down Rules and Prescriptions about the Behaviour of Christians at Publick Assemblies*, need not however be Disputed; it need not be argu'd from the *Example of St. Paul*; For let the Autority of the Regulator be evidenc'd; or such Reasons be bro't for *the Rules laid down*, as are really cogent; or supposing they are Matters dubious, and not decided by Scriptural Autority; let Liberty be left to such as are unsatisfy'd, without Censure or Rejection, and we easily Agree. The Question is not, Whether Modern Church-Governors may not give their Advice, and Offer *Rules* and *Measures* back'd with as strong and cogent Reasons as the Matters will bear? But the Grand Question is this, *Whether when the Rules and Prescriptions laid down, are only about things profess'd to be Indiffe-*

rent,

rent, and not inforc'd with any Moral Reasons, they may Warrantably be so impos'd, by such as cannot prove they have a like Autority with the Apostles, as that such as scruple them and refuse Compliance, should instead of being forborn and receiv'd, be deny'd the Benefit of Christian Communion? This Question we apprehend is in this Chapter decided wholly on our side. That *Prescriptions must be* wholly *laid aside, if they come to be scrupled as unlawful*, is not indeed here asserted for they that are satisfy'd in them, are at Liberty still to follow them: But if it is not plain in this Chapter that they are so far to be laid aside, as not to be urg'd on Persons dissatisfy'd, or insisted on to the *hindrance* of Christian Communion, it will be hard to understand this or any other Part of Sacred Scripture. And if the rigorous imposing of one indifferent Rite or Ceremony be here declared unlawful, it will easily be acknowledg'd, that the imposing other Rites or Ceremonies, (be they who they will that were forward to concur in them) would be equally unwarrantable.

Page 92.

Page 93.

XLII. Mr. *Hoadly* here interposes with a Pleasant Instance. He says St. *Paul prescrib'd that Women shhould be silent in Publick Assemblies, meerly because it was Decent:* I should hardly say *meerly* for that Reason; because, I believe, the Particular Command of his Master might be another Reaaon. The Bishops also (he says) *prescrib'd Kneeling at the Communion, meerly because it was Decent:* I could hardly say *meerly* here neither, because 'tis plain they had a Design this way, to shew their Autority, which ought not to be excluded Consideration. *Suppose now* (says he) *some Women should have been so weak, as to have tho't it unlawful to have obey'd that Injunction of* St. Paul's, *thinking they were con-*

Page 94.

constrain'd by the Spirit to speak, and. judging their Silence to be a Crime, would you produce this 14*th Chapter to the* Romans, *to prove that St.* Paul, *was against preferring or retaining any such Rule, or that these Persons were to be received, and not Censur'd?* The Gentleman hath the liberty of his own Suppositions; tho' really this is pretty Remote from the Purpose. He might easily have suppos'd the Answer would be in the Negative; and there is very Good Reason it should be so: For Women thus dispos'd, would have refus'd Subjection to the Plain Commands of Christ, coming directly from him, thro' the Hands of his own Apostles, which to be sure could not be justify'd. But when Bishops rigorously Prescribe, *Kneeling at the Communion*, or any other Ceremony, which our Lord hath left indifferent, so as to refuse the *receiving* here requir'd, if there be not a Compliance, the Case much varys; and this Chapter directly confronts them, and therefore, I think, I may urge it to very Good Purpose. The Apostleship of St. *Paul* was abundantly attested, and his Faithfulness to his Commission many ways evidenc'd. Finding him then so positively requiring, 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. that Women should keep silence in the Church, and again repeating it in so Autorative a manner, 1 Tim. 2. 12. *I suffer not a Woman to teach:* I thereupon conclude, that he receiv'd this Command from him who gave him his Commission. And that the rather, because in another Case (which was at that time important) I find he only gave his Judgment, without pretending Autoritatively to determine. The Case I refer to, is that of *Virginity*; as to which he makes this Declaration, 1 Cor. 7. 25. *I have no Commandment of the Lord: yet I give my Judgment, as one that hath obtain'd*

Mercy,

Mercy of the Lord to he Faithful. And he adds in the last Verse, *I think also that I have the Spirit of God.* His Different Carriage in these two Cases plainly intimates, that he had a Command in the one, and not in the other. Now if Persons wont comply where there is a Command of Christ, nothing can influence them; nothing can excuse them. And till Ordinary Church Governors can as to what they prescribe, assert a like Divine Warrant with St. *Paul*, for his Order of the Silence of Women in the Church, I should think they had better imitate his Carriage in the other Case, as to the matter of Virginity: 'Twere much better they should give their Judgment, and leave every one to Judge for himself; which would put an End to the Controversy. But if instead of this, they will take upon them to impose as Autoritatively as St. *Paul* in the other Case, without a like warrant. His Example will do them no Service. Nay this very Chapter of his Condemns them, as refusing to receive their Brethren upon the Account of their not complying with such things, as they are here forbid to Command and impose upon them.

XLIII. And if fair Reasoning won't upon this Head suffice for Conviction, the Practice of others is hardly like to go far. The mentioning therefore of the Practice of the *Independents* and of Mr. *Baxter*, in the Case of Impositions, might very well have been forborn. For tho' both the one and the other should have overshot themselves, it does not follow, but that Persons may warrantably complain, when they have things impos'd upon them by such as have no Right to do it. But should I say nothing to the two Cases referr'd to, I might possibly be charg'd with an unpardonable Omission. As to

p. 96.

to the *Independents* therefore, I have this to say, that there are many of them not liable to his Charge. If any of them do make an Agreement to any Covenant but what is Necessary to the being of a Christian, a Term of Communion, I must Confess, I could never be their Advocate. For the Practice is Unscriptural. Nothing is to me more Evident, than that all who soberly profess an Adherence to the Baptismal Covenant, have a Right to all the Ordinances of Christ, in any Church, in any part of the Earth where their Lot is Cast. And this I know (and could prove if need were) to have been the sense of several, who have gone under the name of *Independents.* And tho' it were to be wish't, that some of them were less forward to encourage that among themselves, which they condemn in others; yet I must Declare, I cannot but think there is a wide Difference between a strictness in the Admission of Members to the Lord's Table, in order to the engaging them to all possible Seriousness; and the obliging Persons, when admitted to Communion, to comply with things that neither have any thing of Religion in them, nor the least tendency to promote it; as also between agreeing on measures for themselves in a particular Congregation, and prescribing measures to others. Should he call this a *Courting* these Gentlemen *with a Brotherly Affection*, it would little affect me. I am as free to declare against an imposing Spirit in any that separate from the National Constitution, as in those who belong to it: And yet I have a Brotherly Affection left, for those of the one and the other sort. I won't join with one, in what I separate from the other for: But will rejoice in any Indications that appear of an Abatement of former Rigours in any number

p. 97.

ber of either.——And as to Mr. *Baxter*, tho' I were unable to justifie him in what has occasion'd Mr. *Hoadly*'s Censure, yet can I not discern that needless Impositions would thereupon be ever the more justifiable. But were the Case well weigh'd, I can't tell whether it would appear so highly Blameable as it is represented. That Excellent Person did indeed refuse to gratifie a Particular Gentleman, who insisted upon having the Sacrament Kneeling, and at a distinct time from the rest of the Parish. But how far did he refuse receiving him? He did not deny him a Liberty of going else-where, where he might have had that Ordinance in his own way. He did not himself refuse to give it to him *Kneeling*, (tho' that was a different Posture from what was us'd in his Congregation) if he would but hear his Reasons first against it, and see whether they would not satisfie him. And if he insisted on it, that he should first own him for his Pastor, and submit to Discipline, (which, by the way, consisted of no other things than what all Parties concur'd in as agreeable to the Word of God) he yet fell far short of the Gentlemen of the *Church of England*, who require a Compliance with their Terms of Communion upon their own Word, before they make them appear to have any footing in the Word of God. But be that as it will, let some among the *Independents*, nay let Mr. *Baxter* himself (as much as I Honour his Memory) do what they will, it still remains a firm Principle, till better disprov'd, that unscriptural Impositions are unwarrantable. They are so alike in all Parties. And tho' a great Hit hath been made about a Peculiar Right of each Bishop in his Diocess, yet unless I could bring better Proof to support it, than has as yet been al-

ledg'd by its most Zealous Defenders, I should really be asham'd to plead for it. And since the giving them a Right to demand Obedience to their unnecessary Impositions, is in effect an impowering them to make Men Schismaticks at their Pleasure, I should think the defending of such a Power, no Argument of an Extraordinary Christian Temper.

XLIV. But what if we lodge this determining Power with General Councils, and during the Interval of such Councils, with the governing Part of the Universal Church, *viz.* All the Bishops in a Regent Colledge, governing the Christian World *per Literas Formatas?* This is the Scheme of the two Celebrated Primates, *Laud* and *Bramhall*, and of Bp. *Morley*, Bp. *Gunning*, and Bp. *Sparrow;* as also of Dr. *Heylin*, Dr. *Saywell*, Mr. *Dodwell*, and others. A Proper Scheme eno' to reconcile the *Church of England* with the *Galilean Church*; but never Calculated to secure or Promote a Scriptural Reformation. It tends to advance his *Holiness* the Pope of *Rome* to the Patriarchate of the West; but will by no means contribute to the securing the Rights of our Lord Jesus Christ, as Head of the Church. It is liable to all the Objections which have been mention'd before against the Pretentions of Particular Bishops in their repective Diocesses; and to many more: Of which this, is none of the least, that it plainly sets up a foreign Jurisdiction, against which the Nation is solemnly Sworn. ⋆

⋆ See Mr. *Baxter*'s Treatise against the Revolt to a Foreign Jurisdiction, *Oct.* 1691. Dedicated to Arch-bishop *Tillotson*.

XLV. If then the Church has that *Power of decreeing Rites and Ceremonies*, which is asserted in our 20th Doctrinal Article; The Right of framing such Decrees must, at last, lie in the Church Representative of this Nation, met in Convocation. And this is indeed the way of some

some; who assert, that a Convocation binds in Ecclesiastical, in the same manner as a Parliament does in Civil Matters. But the Arrange Debates that are yet on foot on this Head, would make it very odd to fix here, till they are come to a Final Decision. How is a Convocation the Church Representative, when not only the Laity are wholly Excluded, (and the Prince and Parliament among the rest, who are certainly a very valuable part of the Church) but the Parochial Clergy are put off with a smaller number of Voices than the Cathedral Dignitaries? How can that Assembly truly represent the Church of Christ in a Nation, that entirely shuts out all but such a particular Party, to which the Church of Christ cannot be confin'd, by any but Bigots; Persons that have more Zeal, than either Knowledge or Charity? But let it pass for the Church Representative; Whence comes it to have a Legislative and Coercive Power in Religious Matters? If it can make Laws that are binding, it must be either by Vertue of a Commission deriv'd from. Christ; or by the Grant of the Civil Magistrate; or by Vertue of the Consent of those whom they represent. As for a Commission from Christ, the great Law-giver of the Church, there is none appears. The Grant of the Civil Magistrate, can convey no more Power, than he is himself intrusted with; which has been before consider'd. And to make this the Foundation, instead of promoting Order, creates Confusion, if the Magistrate should either deny, or revoke the Grant; or so limit it as to make it useless; Or there should be a Debate between the Convocation and the Prince, concerning the inherent Power of the one, and the Prerogative of the other; which is a thing may

be very easily suppos'd. And if the Consent of those who are represented be the proper Foundation of the Power of a Convocation, then those who are not represented in it, are free: And let but all such be excus'd in Fact as well as Obligation, and a Convocation may take its own way, and go as far as it can, and not do much Damage. Those who have none to represent them in such an Assembly, are upon this Supposition, at Liberty to Judge for themselves. Tho' what is requir'd be *Lawful*, if yet according to the best Judgment they can frame of things, it appears to them *inexpedient*, the Judgment of a whole Convocation, has no Autority to oblige them. But between a *Parliament* and a *Convocation*, there is this vast Difference. An Act of Parliament, (when not manifestly against the Publick Good) binds all the Subjects by Vertue of the Original Constitution, on which the Civil Government of the Nation is founded: Whereas we have the Original Constitution of the Government of the Church in our Sacred Records, without any Intimation of such a Power belonging to a Convocation, or indeed any Representers of the various Members of which the Body of the Church is made up. And withal; I think what was suggested by the Episcopal Divines after the Restauration of King *Charles*, in Answer to the first Proposals of the Ministers of *London*, in Order to Peace, deserves to be consider'd, *viz*. *That the Final Resolution of all Ecclesiastical Power and Jurisdiction into a National Synod, seems to be destructive of the Royal Supremacy, in Causes Ecclesiastical.*

Baxter's Life in Folio. p. 244.

XLVI. The Ministers of Christ without doubt may and should meet together in Synods for Unity and Concord; And by Agreement, they

they may bind up themselves in things of mutable Determination, when Circumstances evidently require it: They may tie themselves to their proper respective Duties; and Animadvert upon and Censure Neglects: And they may by their Grave Admonitions and Exhortations, enforce the known Laws of Christ, on all that are under their Care: But that Synods have a Right to Exercise any Proper Power and Legislation, should be prov'd by those who assert it. Lawyers, Physicians, and Merchants meet together about the Affairs of their respective Functions, and so do Ministers: And as the Determinations in which the Debates of the Former issue, are inforc'd by the Consent of the Parties Concern'd, upon Evidence that they tend to the Common Good; so must it be good Evidence alone that can be expected to prevail for a general compliance with the Determinations of the latter, upon any other bottom, unless where the plain Laws of Christ deliver'd in the Scriptures are inforc'd. Tho' to be sure it will become particular Persons when they differ from such Bodys, to suspect themselves, and be the more strict in their Enquiry. If there were any proper Power in an Ecclesiastical Synod, to inforce any Determinations not plainly contain'd in Scripture, 'twould certainly be in a general Council: And yet the *Church of England* has determin'd in the 21st Article, that such Councils *may err, and have sometimes err'd, even in things Pertaining to God*. If so, we cannot necessarily be bound to Acquiesce in their Determinations. The Apostles indeed when met in the Council at Jerusalem might with a very good Warrant say, *it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us:* And when any others after them can do so too, they may claim a like

Acts 15. 28.

regard. But when it is undeniable, that that may seem good to an Ecclesiastical Synod or Convocation, with which the Holy Ghost has no Concern, the Autoritativeness of that Council in its Determination, is no Warrant for others in an affected Imitation.

Dr. *Burgesses* Rejoinder to the Reply to Dr. *Mortons* General Defence of Three Nocent Ceremonies. p. 75.

XLVII. The Grand Plea is taken from that Apostolical Rule, *let all things be done Decently and in Order*, 1 Cor. 14. 40. *And let all things he done to edifying*, ver. 2 'Tis own'd, that' this is *the only place in the New Testament, by which Divines conclude, that a Power is given to church*, (met in Convocation) *to constitute such Rites as shall be needful to Edification, Decency, and Order because is commanded to see that all things be so done: Which, in respect of the varietyof Persons, Places, Times, Occasions, and Opinions of Men cannot be so done, unless in those things she may lawfully make and repeat certain Laws or Consttitutions thereabout*. But 'tis much this Power which is of such mighty Consequence, should have but one place in all the New Testament to support it. And if this be *the only place* to be met with to that Purpose, I should expect it to be very plain and clear, so as that any that should question whether this were the real intention of it, should easily be prov'd to be Litigious Cavillers: And so as that any that should abuse it to the encouragement of an Exorbitant Power, might be easily Confronted. But is it so in this Case? This Passage of Sacred Writ, is bro't up at every turn by the Advocates for the *Church of England*, and it is urg'd as strenuously by Cardinal *Bellarmine*,* to establish the whole Popish Service, and the Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*. And if the Right of judging of the tendency of Ceremonies to *Edification*, *Decency* and *Order*, be in the Church,

* Bellarmin. *de effect. Sacram.* L. 2. C. 31.

Church, I can't see why the Cardinal had not as much Right to urge the Place, as the Advocates of our Church. 'Tis hence inferr'd, that the Apostle doth grant *general Licence and Autority to all Churches to Ordain any Ceremonies that maybe fit for the better serving of God.* But before this Reasoning can have any force, in Particulars, it must be made appear, that these and these Ceremonies, which are requir'd by a Church Representative or Convocation, are *fit for the better serving of God.* And if the Judgment of the Church be sufficient to Evidence this, it must be so in the *Church of Rome*, as well as in the *Church of England:* And so all the Papal Superstitions are effectually supported. But if Christians are left at Liberty to Judge for themselves in things not determin'd one way or other in Scripture, then is this place in vain produc'd in Proof of a Power to Decree Ceremonies in the Church Representative: For when a Convocation has done its utmost, each private Christian has a Right to Judge for himself as to the Canons it frames, nay 'tis his Duty to judge of them: Aye and to reject them too, if upon due Examination he finds they would enforce things that are not Decent, orderly, and Edifying, or meer Humane Inventions; whereas the Apostle had his Eye on the well-ordering of things, which were really of Divine Appointment.

XLVIII. But after all, it is pleaded by some; That tho' there may be difficulties attending the ascribing the Power of determining Circumstantials in Religion, either to *Church* or *State* separately, yet when both agree, the Case is plain: We are then inexcusable if we don't comply, provided we are not able to prove the things impos'd as to the matter of them sinful.

But if neither Church nor State really has this Power separately, 'twould be hard to prove they acquire it by joining their Forces together. But since this is pretended, I think it ought to be shewn, how they derive it from Christ; How far it goes, and where it stops. It ought to be shewn how they derive it from Christ. For Social Compact will not lay a Foundation for this mixt sort of spiritual Power to bind the Conscience, the regulating and giving Measures to which, was one great Design and Intention of the Sacred Scriptures. And if this Power really comes from Christ, we may well expect to find something of it in that Sacred Volume, And we are indeed there told, (as has before been mention'd) that we must *be subject to the Higher Powers for Conscience sake*; and that *we must obey them that have the Rule over us in the Lord:* But still if the Prince and the Bishop, the Parliament and the Convocation join together to require, what God hath neither subjected to the former nor submitted to the Rule of the latter, an Obligation to Obedience is wanting. And if we are not oblig'd, we are at Liberty: Besides; How far does this mixt Power go, and where does it stop? Suppose I should yield in three or four Ceremonies, because I can't prove them in themselves Unlawful; How know I, but in time, I may be requir'd to comply with thirty or forty; till the Decent Ceremonies that are added, at length come to spoil the spirituality of my Religion? If I yield to Pray constantly, (notwithstanding the frequent change of Circumstances) by a Form in the Desk, what Assurance can be given me, I mayn't be requir'd ere long to do the like in the Pulpit? Nay and in my Family too? But if our Lord has not requir'd, that such matters should be

be uniformly Determin'd, either by Church or State separately, or by both jointly, (which I think I may justly suppose, after the foregoing Disquisition, till suitable Proof is offer'd) I see not but I am at Liberty to Order my own Actions in Divine Worship, as seems to me best; most agreeable to the Sacred Scriptures, and the Nature of the several Ordinances of Divine Worship; and most to my own Advantage and Satisfaction.

XLIX. How far indeed Persons are oblig'd to a Compliance in such things as are not sinful, for the sake of Peace, is a material Enquiry: Tho' I must confess it seems very hard, that it should be so much insisted on, that the Regard to Peace should be on one side only. For if the Peace of the Church be really an invaluable Blessing, Superiors should as well shew they esteem it such, as recommend it as such to inferiours: They should shew their regard to it, by tenderness in imposing, where there is no Necessity requiring; s well as the others shew their regard to it, by their complying, where they have not weighty Reasons to hinder them. While this is wanting, to recommend Peace so warmly to the injur'd Parties, whom our Saviour has exempted from needless Impositions, favours more of the Politician than the Christian. But whether the Church, or the State has that regard to Peace that it ought to have, yea or no; I'll easily grant every Christian is in his Place bound to be tender of it. But still there is something, that must take Place of it. For *the Wisdom that is from above, is first Pure, and then Peaceable.* Whence it is naturally inferr'd, that the first Care of all Christians (and therefore to be sure of Ministers) should be for *Purity*; and that, that is prefera- James 3. 17.

ble

ble to *Peace*, tho' to be fought and pursu'd in a *Peaceable* Way. Besides, it has a most absurd appearance, to have the Peace of the Church represented, as depending upon Things unprofitable. And yet farther, if a Compliance with some such things be requisite for the sake of Peace, who can say where we shall stop? Must we for Peace sake comply with all Things that are requir'd, that are not in themselves sinful? If so, we may not only have the fevereft Part of the *Jewish* Yoke reviv'd, but it might be made much more insupportable, by the vagrant Fancies of such as take Delight in shewing their fruitful Invention and Autority. Or if the Obligation reaches to some Things only; 'twould be hard to fix just Limits, and give Reasons for them when we have done. Let us suppose, that as some for the sake of Peace require a Compliance with the Order for using the *Surplice* as an Emblem of Purity, the *Cross* in Baptism as a Dedicating Sign, and the Posture of *Kneeling* at the Lords Supper in token of Reverence, and for *avoiding of such Prophanation as might otherwise ensue*, as the *Rubrick* has it; so we should be requir'd by others upon the same Account to fall in with other Ceremonial Practises; are we oblig'd? What if as Mr. *Baxter* puts the Case ⋆, Ministers were requir'd to Preach with a Helmet on, to signifie the Spiritual Militia; to read always with Spectacles, to signifie their want of Spiritual Sight; or to come continually to Church with Crutches, to signifie their disability to come to God of themselves, would Compliance still be a Duty for the sake of Peace? As ridiculous Things as these have been bro't into the Church. St. *Austin* tells us of some that were for Cheese to their Bread at the Lord's Table: And we have heard of

⋆ *See his five Disputations of Church Government and Worship*, pag. 430.

of others that have been for eating a Paschal Lamb, in remembrance of that Lamb of God that has been sacrificed for us: And who can then say how far the most odd Practices might in Time come to be tho't proper, *to stir up the dull Mind of Man by way of Remembrance?* Let us suppose the *Romish* Ceremonies, in Baptism, in solemn Festivals, in Consecration of Churches, in Exorcizing, *&c.* to have been continu'd among us, must all have been unpeaceable, that had refus'd to have comply'd? That would have been strange. That would make the vagrant Fancy of Imposers, the Standard of the Peace of the Church. The only Relief that is pretended is this: *That they go beyond their Autority, when they introduce vain, senseless, indecent Ceremonies, or abundance of any sort, to be a trouble and burthen, rather than a Grace and Beauty to Publick Worship.* A pleasant Fancy! As if any would own the Ceremonies they introduc'd, were vain, senseless, or indecent, troublesome or burthensome. 'Tis not to be expected, that any Imposers that have common Sense should be so inconsistent. The *Church of Rome* no more owns that, than the *Church of England:* And the Latter can't plead more earnestly upon the Head of Peace than the former. The Nature or Number of the Ceremonies obtruded, will still admit of some plausible Pleas in the Apprehension of the Fond Admirers of them, who eagerly impose them. If we are bound for the sake of Peace, to comply with whatsoever is impos'd that is not sinful, and they must determine whether the Ceremonies bro't in, are *vain* or profitable, *senseless* or reasonable, *indecent* or ornamental, *burthensome* or easie, then are we wholly at their Mercy. And if our Saviour has not

Hoadly, Part I. page 83.

not left us upon so precarious a Bottom, We must find out some other Bounds to that regard, which is due to the Peace of the Church, than the Lawfulness or Unlawfulness of the Things impos'd can afford us.

L. It deserves also to be consider'd, How little Evidence there is, that that Peace of the Church which all. are bound to Consult, depends upon a Concurrence in the same Opinions, and a uniform. Practice, as to Niceties and Formalities. 'Tis every Man's Duty to live peaceably by his Neighbours: But not in Order to it, to rise and go to Bed, to eat and drink, just at the same Time, and in the same manner as they do. Every one ought to live peaceably in the Family he belongs to: But it do's not therefore follow, that he must continually laugh and frown, and make his Honours, and change his Garb and Posture, according to the Humour of the Matter of the Family, or else he must be run down as an unpeaceable Fellow, and unfit for all Conversation. Neither can I be bound to be of a Mind with the Publick, in every Punctilio, to shew my peaceable Temper. When Things neither necessary in themselves, nor rendred expedient by Circumstances, are barely recommended by Autority, but left at Liberty, a peaceable Temper will be inclin'd to study Compliance, if the Harm appear not greater, than the Good that will follow; or if they are not barely recommended but inforc'd, if they are, not in themselves sinful, an occasional Compliance sufficiently discovers a peaceble Disposition; while constant yielding might have sundry ill Consequences attending it. I'll grant indeed, tho' the imposing may be unwarrantable, yet it do's not therefore necessarily follow, that every sort of Compliance is sinful:

ful: (for different Measures of Light, in that respect produce a mighty Difference) And yet neither is the refusing to obey necessarily sinful. If it be said, that it is but a bad sign for Persons to refuse small Things for the sake of the Peace of the Church: 'Tis Reply'd, that 'tis no Argument of any great Value for that Peace, for Persons to endanger it, by needless Impositions, or the justifying of them. And the smaller the Things are that are requir'd, the more inexcuseable is such Assuming: Which yet is really no small Thing, in as much as it is an Incroachment on the Autority of the great Legislator of the Christian Church; from which, tho' those who barely comply, endeavour to excuse themselves, it may yet deserve their serious Consideration, whether their encouraging such an incroachment on the great Legislatour, can be justify'd; and whether their Compliance is not a real Encouragement; and such an Encourgement too as would have prov'd a Temptation to a farther Progress in. a way of Imposition, if some had not had the Courage to oppose and stand out. And this Consideration will appear yet the more forcible, if what has been before suggested, as to the Difference between Circumstances and Ceremonies be duly heeded. If it be not necessary in order to the discovering my peaceable Temper, that I comply in the constant using so much as the Gesture of *Kneeling* at the Lord's Table, or dipping in Baptism, which are but Circumstances of those Religious Actions, it is much-less necessary in order to the same End, that I comply with such Impositions as are pure Innovations upon the several Parts of Divine Worship, as the Scripture has settled them. For as to the Mode of Administring

and

and Partaking of the Two Sacraments, our Saviour has left us at Liberty, but that he has left us a like Liberty to fall in with plain Additions to either Sacrament, is not so evident. Thus, the Sign of the Cross is a meer Humane Invention. When any one is Baptiz'd, he may either be dipp'd over Head and Ears, or have the Water pour'd or sprinkled upon him; and the Ordinance is not only as valid one way as another;but 'tis evident, it must be administred in some one of these Ways. But can any Man say so of the Sign of the Cross? What Necessity is there, that the Cross should be made like the *Greek Tau* T, which some say is its true Form; or like their X which others prefer, or like the Letters *Rho* and *Xi* inferred one within another, thus ☧, for which a Third Party contends, saying, that this was the Form in which it appear'd to the Emperor *Constantine.* Alas! There is no Necessity of making it at all: The thing one Form or another is in this Case a pure Humane Fancy: So neither is there any Necessity at all in this Ordinance, of God-Fathers, either professing Faith and Repentance, or desiring to be baptiz'd in the Name of the Child. 'Tis a meer Addition to the Institution. If any require me in such things to comply with them for the sake of Peace, they do more than overstrain their Autority in fixing what the great Lawgiver has left indifferent, for they alter the Institution by their Addition, and in effect. Desire me to renounce the Purity of the Ordinance that Christ has fix'd in his Church, for the sake of Peace; that is, least they should be out of Humour with me, because I wont do as they would have me, for when it is scann'd, that is all that it amounts to. And if I cannot manifest my

self

self Peaceable, without that Degree of Pliableness as will make Men of an imposing Spirit easie, I can make no other of it, than that for the sake of Peace I must be a Slave to their Humour; which, I must confess, I could not forbear thinking a very great Unhappiness.

LI. But 'tis farther urg'd, that tho' the imposing Power be dubious, yet a Separation may be sinful and Unreasonable, as well as Mischievous, because of its breaking Peace, and destroying Love: And that nothing can Vindicate a Separation, but a Proof of the utter unlawfulness of Obedience and Submission to the things impos'd: For, that Persons are bound in Conscience so far to regard the Peace of the Church, as to do whatsoever they Lawfully may do for the healing Divisions. 'Tis reply'd, tho' it has an Appearance of being a fair Concession in the Objecters in this Case, to suppose the imposing Power Dubious, yet is it a Concession, in which we, who refuse Compliance, can by no means concur with them. We can't allow it to be Dubious; we are assur'd 'tis unwarrantably pretended to, 'tis flatly sinful to disturb the Peace of the Church with unnecessary Impositions. Being (as far as we can Judge) upon good Grounds clear in this, our Separation, till our Position is disprov'd, is strictly justifiable, as it is a Publick disowning that imposing Power: Nay, considering how much the Pretention to this Power is riveted by Custom, and confirm'd by a repeated stiff Refusal of Abatements, 'tis the only way of disowning it, that can be of any Significance: And 'tis a way of disowning it, which the Imposers have made Necessary, by requiring us if we come in to the Publick Constitution, to come under Engagements that amount to such an owning of that Power,

Power, which we are satisfy'd is unwarrantably pretended to, as we cannot agree to, without plain Violence to our Consciences. And if such a Separation breaks the Peace, the Fault lies in those who have thus made it Necessary, and continue this Necessity be they who they will. 'Tis not Necessary for us in our own Vindication to prove the things requir'd simply Unlawful: 'Tis eno' if we can prove that that compliance with them which is requir'd of us is unlawful. We cannot but count it strange, that this should be represented as so absurd, when there are so many Lawful Things, which it would be unlawful for us to bind our selves to, for a Constancy. Thus a Man may lawfully hear a weak Preacher: But to oblige himself to Autority, to hear no other, would be sinfully to ensnare himself. A Child may comply with his Parents in taking now and then an innocent Diversion: But if they would require him to spend the greatest part of his time in it, neither their Command, nor his pretending to aim at Peace by a Compliance with them, would excuse him from Guilt. And thus St. *Paul*, to discover to the *Jews* his Peaceable Disposition comply'd with them in their darling Rite of Circumcision, which was not simply unlawful in a particular Instance, in the case of *Timothy:* But had he bound himself constantly to the use of that Legal Ceremony, we may easily collect from his Writings, that instead of duly consulting the Peace of the Church, he had betray'd its Liberty; instead of doing his Duty, he had subverted the Gospel. When Men then tell us we are bound in Conscience to do whatever we lawfully may do, for the healing Divisions, they ought to consider, not only whether the things requir'd be in

in themselves Lawful, but also whether the Compliance with them, that is requir'd, be Lawful. If the things requir'd be in themselves Lawful, we may indeed be bound in Conscience to discover that it is our Sense of them, that they are so: Bu if that Compliance with them, that is requir'd, be Unlawful, we are bound in Conscience to discover that we esteem it so, by refusing it: Neither can St. *Paul* be justify'd in the Case mention'd, upon any other Supposition. For any to pretend to heal Divisions, by an Unlawful Compliance with things Law fill, is in the strictest Sense, a doing Evil that Good may come.

LII. Mr. *Hoadly* seems disturb'd, that some among us Dissenters, who he apprehends look upon the *things prescrib;d in the Church to be Lawful*, don't our selves comply *with these Prescriptions, and endeavour to convince others, that they ought to do so too*. To which an easie Answer offers from the Premises. Tho' some among us perhaps may look upon the things prescrib'd to be as Lawful, as Circumcision was in the Days of St. *Paul*, we yet dont *comply* in that sort or Degree he desires we should, because we are convinc'd that so to do, would be as really unlawful, as it would have been for that Apostle constantly to have apply'd that painful Rite to all his Gentile-Converts. Neither can we endeavour to convince others, till we are herein convinc'd our selves. But that we must therefore *inveigh against Governors, and add Life and Strength, to the unreasonable Scruples of others; and patronise those who separate upon groundless Prejudices, and with gross uncharitableness*; and run-down *an Antority, which we our selves, Ac-*

Part 1. *p.* 81

knowledge in the Church upon other Occasions, &c. is an Insinuation that discovers not either the Charity or the Candour, of which he desires to maintain the Reputation, and which has appear'd upon some other Occasions.

LIII. But why may not I shew my peaceable Disposition in communicating Occasionally, with those, a Total Compliance with whose Impositions I judge Unlawful, without being chargeable with Hypocrisie? My Aim is visible; I don't seek to conceal it; nor is there any need I should: I would shew my Charity to them, tho' I dare not own their Autority, or encourage their encroachments. Why should I for this be Evil spoken of? Did I think the things requir'd sinful as to the matter of them, I should not dare to yield to any Communion in them: But when I only think them in themselves inexpedient, sinfully impos'd, and therefore unwarrantably so comply'd with, as would be to the Prejudice of a farther Reformation, which all ought earnestly to desire and aim at in their several Places, in a Regular and Peaceable way; why may I not shew my Charity to them, by giving them sometimes my Company? As for my Principle, I keep to it firmly. For tho' I am sometimes with them, yet by my Stated Separation, I discover my Dissatisfaction with the Bottom they stand on, and my Sense of the unlawfulness of my Acquiescing in it. Neither do I betray this Principle, by owning sometimes by my Presence in their Worship, that the things they have added are not in themselves Unlawful, tho' unwarrantably impos'd: For it appears from what has been said, that these two may be very consistent. But for any to say,

say, that if I am with them at all, I must be with them always; is as if a Man should tell me, that if I can once to shew my self Sociable, and to shew that I don't count the Food Poisonous, eat of a certain Dish of Meat, which some are extremely Fond of; I must have it at every Meal, or I shall shew my self an unpeaceable and disorderly Man. But where's the Consequence? If I tho't the eating of such a Dish Unlawful, I would never tast it: But however, tho' it be Lawful, yet it mayn't be so agreeable to me. Perhaps the frequent use of it might prejudice my Health, and spoil my Appetite, and at the same time encourage those who herein think fit to prescribe to me, to proceed in other things to deprive me of that Liberty, to which God and my Rational Nature have given me an undoubted Right. And therefore tho' a Law should be made, that I must never fit down to Table, but I must eat of such a sort of Food, I don't know that I am oblig'd to regard it. I may perhaps eat it now and then, to shew that I am willing to have a fair Correspondence with these Gentlemen that are so fond of it: But I won't eat it always, not only because 'tis less agreeable to my Constitution than other Food, but also that I may shew these Gentlemen, that I know of no Right they have to impose upon me. But for any to tell one thus dispos'd, that if he can at all eat this sort of Meat, he must do it always, that he mayn't create Disturbance, by differing from his Neighbors, who are resolv'd to give him no rest, if he won't Humour them, in doing as they do; that if he can bear the Tast of it, he shall have it at every Meal; or that if he won't eat it, it shall be cramm'd down his

Throat and that if he refuses, he shall have hard Names given him, and be look'd upon as unfit for any Publick Favour, and unworthy any Respect in the Common Wealth: This certainly would be very hard Measure; and whatever fair Glosses were put upon it, it would neither recommend the Food to general Esteem, nor conciliate any Respect to those who were for using such Violence, in a case where every Man loves, and has a Right to Liberty.

LIV. As far as I can Judge, I am neither by what has been hitherto suggested, pleading for Disorder and Confusion, neither has the Principle I go upon any tendency to it. I hope there is room sufficient for all the Order and Harmony in Ecclesiastical Matters that is Necessary, tho' the imposing Power that has been so much talkt of, be laid aside; and tho' all have that Liberty continu'd to them, which our Saviour has left them. To give every particular Person indeed a Liberty to bring his own Fancy and Humour into Publick Worship, would he strangely ridiculous: And to suppose the Necessary Circumstances of Worship, not determin'd for each worshipping Society, would occasion endless Confusion. But tho' it be own'd Necessary that time and place, and some other Circumstances, without which Divine Worship could not be kept up in Publick, must be Determin'd for each worshipping Assembly: Yet it does not therefore follow, that 'tis Necessary there should be a like Uniform Determination of such Circumstances, for many such Societies and much less, that 'tis Necessary that all the Circumstances of Worship should be fixedly Determin'd for any. The more Latitude

titude is left, the less danger will there be of Disturbance, and the more likelyhood of Peace. But, that each worshipping Society must determine for it self, what it finds Necessary to be determin'd, is with me a fixed Principle. I say not, that they *may decree Rites and Ceremonies:* I think for them we may be satisfy'd with the Regulations of Scripture: But as it is Evident even by the Light of Nature, that 'tis the great Duty of Mankind to meet in Society for Divine Worship, so is it the same way to be Evidenc'd that every Company of prosessing Christians that agree to do so, have a Natural Right to Order the Circumstances of their own Worship, in a subserviency to the Common Good, under the Limitations, and with the Restrictions laid down in Scripture. As each particular Church may determine, who of those that are in the Ministerial Office, shall Officiate among them in that Capacity, so is it fittest also it should be settled by agreement at what time, and where, they'll meet in order to Worship: How long time they'll spend in it; and in what Order (as far as the sacred Scriptures have not determin'd) the several Duties of it shall be manag'd: Whether they shall Sing with Reading or without; whether the Lord's Supper shall be Celebrated at Noon or at Night, and the like. They who are upon the place, and best know the particular Circumstances out of which the expediency of a Determination of such things as these one way or other arises; they who see Conveniencies and Inconveniencies that may arise on either side, are certainly the most competent Judges in the Case. To take the Instance of *Time*, which is as obvious as any. 'Tis plainly Necessary, that there should

be a Determination concerning it. If the time for Worship be not fix'd. People cannot know when to come together. This therefore must be settled. A certain Day is fix'd in Scripture for Publick Worship: But the time of that Day that shall be spent in this Worship, is left undetermin'd. A general Law as to this time won't Suit all in a City, and much less in all the particular Churches, in a Thousand Miles Circuit. It may be manifestly more Convenient in one place to have the Lord's Supper at Noon, and in another at Night. And therefore in this Case 'tis plain, 'tis fittest that each Congregation judge for it self.

LV. How far the Power of each Congregation to determine Circumstauces goes, is a material Enquiry. As to which, it is easie to be observ'd, that if they have any such Power, it must extend to all those things the Determination of which one way or other, is ordinarily Necessary or Expedient. But as for things which there is no Necessity of Determining at all, they were better left at Liberty. This I take to be the Case of the Posture at the Lord's Supper. I can't see the Necessity why any Congregation should determine for the Posture of Sitting, so as to exclude such as rather choose to Kneel, or the contrary: Nay, I don't think this could be justify'd. For this were a pretending to confine, where our Saviour has left Liberty: 'Tis a proper making Terms of Communion, for which the great Legislator of the Church has not impower'd them. There is indeed a great Difference between Persons determining for themselves, that they will use certain Ceremonies that cannot be prov'd Unlawful,

full, and their having such Ceremonies impos'd upon them by others, who have no Right: And yet I am so sensible that it is the Duty of all worshiping Societies to leave the Communion of the Church open to all that offer, upon the naked Terms of the Gospel, that I dare not undertake to justifie such an Attempt in any particular Church. What others may be able to do, I cannot Judge till I see their Arguments.

LVI. If any represent this as a meer *Independent* Scheme, they are at their Liberty. For my part, Words and Names affect me little, when I am once satisfy'd in the Grounds I go upon. But whatever Name is given it, that which much Confirms me in my Adherence to this Principle, is this; that it secures to all. their undoubted Rights. It neither breaks in upon the Pastoral Office, nor upon each private Christians Judgment of Discretion: It neither excludes Synodical Assemblies or abates their, Usefulness; nor does it lessen the Autority of the Magistrate; which is more than I can discern can justly be asserted of any other Method. Let but this Principle stand, that each worshipping Society must Determine for it self in all Necessary Circumstances, and each private Christian has his Judgment of Discretion left untouch'd. For he is no way oblig'd to comply with any Determination of a Circumstance, which he really Judges not Necessary to be Determin'd. The Pastoral Office also remains uninvaded. Each Pastor is still free to pursue his Commission, to teach whatever Christ has Commanded, and to preserve the Purity of his Sacred Institutions. Synods still have their life,

in a way of Consultation, Admonition and Advice to repress Disorders, determine Differences, and regulate by Consent such things as are of common Concernment. And as for the Magistrate, he is still left *Custos utriusq; Tabulæ*, and in the full Exercise of all that Autority with which Christ has intrusted him for the good of the Church. And if the Magistrate see fit to manage his Part in reference to the Church by Superintendents or Bishops, I know of no solid Arguments either from Reason or Scripture, to discourage submission to them, provided they impose not upon Conscience. Tho' I think such Persons would be more properly Archbishops than Bishops.

Hoadly. Part I. pag. 62.

LVII. But 'tis said, *that this particular Time and Place in exclusion to all others are not absolutely Necessary; and some honest Men will pretend they are shut out from Communion by imposing them.* It is reply'd, that tho' no one particular and Place can be pretended to be absolutely Necessary, (excepting the *time* of the Lord's Day, fix'd by Divine Appointment) to the exclusion of others, yet that some particular Time and Place be fix'd on is absolutely Necessary, in the Case of each worshiping Assembly of professed Christians. Supposing then, that *time* or *place* were so fix'd by Agreement in such a Society, as that any *honest Men were shut out*, tho' it might bear hard upon them, and be attended with real inconvenience, yet does it fall far short of the mischief that would inevitably arise from general Regulations, fixing Terms of Communion. For there's a great deal of difference between not being able. Conveniently to Communicate' with this particular Congregation,

gation, because of the unsuitableness of their time of Worship to Persons Circumstances, or the distance of the place of Meeting from their Habitations, and an exclusion from all worshipping Assemblies at once, by the National Constitution. A Man whose Circumstances won't well allow him to Communicate Ordinarily at Night, is not properly shut out from Communion by that Christian Society, that finds the Celebrating the Lord's Supper at that time, most for their Convenience: But his Circumstances making that Inconvenient for him, which is Convenient for them, naturally Direct him rather to join with some other worshipping Assembly, whose time is more suitable as to which none has any Right to debar him of his Liberty. It must be granted indeed, there is nothing but what may be abus'd: But 'tis eno' if this is not liable to so many or great Abuses, as any other Method or Supposition, Which to me is plain.

LVIII. Neither is all Pollibility of a *National Church* this way excluded. For by a *National Church* I can understand nothing else, but a Confederation of the several particular Churches, which are under one and the same Civil Government, for the joint promoting Purity and Peace, by their acting in Concert. Now such a *National Church* as far as it is desireable, may be compass'd upon the Principle advanc'd. I say, as far as it is desireable, because there is a sense in which a *National Church* appears to me neither Necessary nor Desireable. For I am not asham'd to own it my Real Judgment according to my present Light, (tho' I am free to alter upon, good Evidence) that it were much

much better, more for the Credit of Religion, more for the Advancement of Christian Charity, and a more likely Method to promote the true Peace of the Church, for each.worshipping Congregation in the Land, to manage it self in an entire Independency, than to have a *National Church* of one sort or other with *Penal Laws.* The plausible Pleas of Uniformity, and Decency, urg'd on the contrary side, are with me far from overballancing the real Damage to Charity, which the *Penal Laws* that might be design'd to support either an Episcopal or a Presbyterian, or any other Constitution, necessarily draw after them. And this appears to me the more likely to hold and bear Scanning, because I find it has been the common Sense of all, when it might reasonably be Suppos'd their Judgments were most free; and when they have not had Power and Interest, and a Prospect of Preferments to biass and warp them. It cannot be deny'd, but that each Party, when uppermost, has been more or less for Assuming and Imposing. And for that Reason, I think 'tis the less safe to trust any with such a Power for the Future. 'Tis too great a Venture for Wise Men to run. But the great Ends of a National Confederation may be reach'd without it. If each Christian worshipping Society have the ordering of their own indifferent Circumstances by Consent: If each Acts in concert with all the Worshipping Societies in the Nation: If Communication is maintain'd between them, by the choosing of Deputies, first for smaller and then for larger Districts: If they meet together in each, as often as is generally judg'd Convenient; and if they agree together in such Meetings about Mat-

Matters of common Concernment: If the Civil Magistrate hath an Inspection over all, and if nothing of a Civil Nature be touch'd upon in such Meetings, without his Consent and Approbation: I can't see, but this Method would as far secure a *National Church*, as is necessary to any valuable Purpose.

LIX. But upon the whole, that we who stand out, and refuse to fall in with the present National Constitution, may not be tho't so unreasonable as some represent us. I'll make a fair Motion. Let us but have good Evidence upon a few Heads; an Evidence proportion'd to their Weight and Importance; and that will support the Conscience that is so usual and common with the Gentlemen that are so zealous for Uniformity, and I dare undertake for a considerable Number, that they'll be bro't to a Compliance. Let it in the first Place be clearly prov'd from Scripture, that our Saviour has given a Commission to any to six general Regulations in his Worship, besides Necessary, or at most Expedient, Circumstances. We may very well expect the Proof of this should be *Scriptural*; because, if there be any such Commission from Christ, it must be known by Revelation. We may very well expect also, it should be *Clear*, because there is so much depends upon it. Let the Bounds of this Commission be plainly fix'd and limited; so as that it may be known when 'tis: us'd Regularly, and when 'tis exceeded. And let the Persons to whom this Commission is given, be describ'd in their necessary Qualifications; so as that we may be able to say, these are they that are thus impower'd; but as for any others, they

are

are meer Pretenders. And since it is so warmly Asserted, that Ecclesiastical Regulations are to be obey'd, let it be shewn distinctly what those Ecclesiastical Regulations are, that are to be obey'd, and what Obedience is due to them: And let it be prov'd, that such Obedience is a Duty.

LX. What the Ecclesiastical Regulations are that are to be obey'd, is first to be consider'd. 'Tis senseless to Debate about a thing, of which we have not a distinct Idea. We may well desire Light in this Case, because the Gentlemen we are concern'd with, are not themselves agreed about it. Some say, they are the Laws of the Civil Magistrate about Sacred Matters that are to be obey'd: Others, that the Orders of the Bishops in their respective Dioceses are chiefly to be obey'd: Others, that the Regulations of the Church Representative in each Country, (according to the Laws thereof) are the Primary Object of Obedience: And others, that none of all these so firmly bind, as the Canons of a General Council, representing the Church Universal. They have all their Reasons. And each sortment exposes the weakness of the Reasons of others. And they who sedately weigh what is alledg'd by all, may perhaps be shrewdly Tempted to fall in with none of them. And yet they will have it, that they are well agreed, because they can hide their Difference under a common Expression; saying, that Things indifferent in the Church are to be comply'd with; and Ecclesiastical Regulations to be obey'd. In the next Place, the Obedience to be given to these Regulations is to be consider'd. Let it be shewn how far it is

to

to go, and where to stop: Whether we are to obey in things Lawful tho' inexpedient, notwithstanding, that the Apostle seems so evidently to advance a contrary Principle, when he cries out, *All things are Lawful for me, but all things are not Expedient.* Let it be shewn, where the Judgment both of Lawfulness and Expediency lies: And whether He that Commands, or He that is to obey, is to pass the Judgment: And what must be done where they differ. If Superiors are to Judge, Let their Right be well Evidenc'd and let it be consider'd, whether Inferiours won't be bound to a blind Obedience. If Inferiours are to Judge, Let the Necessity of their judging uniformly be Evidenc'd: And let the Obedience that can be expected from them be fairly stated, supposing that they Question, whether the things their Superiours require, are Lawful; or are satisfy'd of their Inexpediency. And then as for the Proof, that such Obedience, as is demanded, is a Duty, let it be Direct, rather than meerly Consequential: Or if an Argument is drawn from the Consequences of the refusal of Obedience or one side, let the opposite Argument from the Consequences of yielding such an Obedience, be weigh'd also on the other side: And since this Obligation if real, must arise from the Will of God, let that be evidenc'd in a Degree of Plainness, that may bear some Proportion to the Degree of Positiveness with which it is Asserted. Let it be prov'd, that Order, Harmony and Peace, are overthrown, or so much as Damag'd, upon Supposition each Worshipping Christian Assembly, regulates its own indifferent Circumstances: And that true Unity might not be as effectual-

1 Cor. 6. 12.
1 Cor. 10. 23.

ly

ly promoted by a voluntary Concert of these Worshipping Assemblies, acting by their Deputies in Matters of common Concernment, as by the most pompous Uniformity. Let it be prov'd, that this Method which will equally suit any Form of Civil Government upon Earth, is inferiour in Worth and Excellence, to an Ecclesiastical Constitution, which is applauded by its greatest Admirers, as suited to one form of Government only: Let these Things be clear'd by sedate Reasonings, and solid Arguments, abstracting from Prejudices and Prepossessions; and it will be found we are open to Conviction. Let this Method be taken, and it will sooner Work upon us, than the most subtle Insinuations or the warmest Invectives.

A

A DEFENCE OF Moderate Non-Conformity.

PART II.

[Taken out of the Tenth Chapter of the Abridgement of the Life of the Reverend Mr. *Richard Baxter*.]

"II. THEY were requir'd to de-
" Clare their *unfeigned Assent*
" *and Consent to all, and eve-*
" *ry Thing contain'd and Pre-*
" *scrib'd in and by the Book of*
"*Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sa-*
"*craments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the*
"*Church, together with the Psalter or Psalms of*
"David; *and the Form or manner of Making,*
"*Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests*
"*and Deacons*. And they must also (and
"that *ex Animo*) Subscribe these Words:
"*That*

Sect. III. *Eleuherii* (i.e. *Hickmanni*) *Apologia pro Ministris in Anglia Nonconformistis*, Page 14, 15.

Baxter's Plea for Peace, p. 207. His English Nonconformity stated

"*That the Book of Common Prayer, and of Or-*
"*daining Bishops, Priests and Deacons, contain-*
"*eth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God;*
"*and that it may lawfully be used: And that*
"*they themselves would use the Form in the said*
"*Book prescrib'd, in Publick Prayer, and Ad-*
"*ministration of the Sacraments, and no other.*

and argu'd. Page 23. *And* Troughton's *Apology for the* Nonconformists, *Page* 56.

"The Act of Uniformity requir'd, that this
"Declaration should be publickly made by
"Word of Mouth, by All that would keep
"their Places, on some Lords Day before
"*Aug.* the 24th, 1552. And by All that af-
"terwards were presented to any Ecclesiasti-
"cal Benefice, within Two Months after they
"were in Actual Possession of it. And the
"Subscription was as peremptorily requir'd,
"as the Declaration. But they could not
"herein concur for Two Grand Reasons.

"1. Because very few of them could see the
"Book, to all Things in which they were to
"declare their Assent and Consent, before
"the Time limited by the Act was expired.
"For the Common Prayer Book with the
"Alterations and Amendments, (for so
"they are call'd, how deservedly I enquire
"not) made by the Convocation, did not
"come out of the Press, till a few Days be-
"fore the 24th of *August*. So that of the
"7000 Ministers in *England*, who kept their
"Livings, few except those who were in or
"near *London*, could possibly have a sight of
"the Book with its Alterations, till after they
"had declar'd their Assent and Consent to it.
" This was what honest Mr. *Steel*, and many
"others

"others of the Nonconformists warmly com-
"plain'd of, in their parting Sermons, when
"they took their Farewell of their People at
"the Time of their Ejection. And whatever
"it might seem then, when Persons were in
"a manifest Heat; at a Distance, it appears
"such a hardship, as that it is rather to be
"wondred, that so many could Act in so
"weighty a Matter, upon an implicit Faith,
"than that such a Number should in such
"Circumstances stand out. But,

"2. When they had opportunity to peruse
"the Book, they met with several Things there,
"which after the strictest search they could
"make, appear'd to them not agreeable to the
"Word of God: For them under this Appre-
"hension (which it was not in their Power
"to alter) to have gone to declare their Sa-
"tisfaction, that there was nothing contrary
"to the Word of God, and nothing but what
"they could both Assent to (as true) and
"Consent to (as Good and to be used) and to
"have Subscrib'd this with their Hands, had
"been doing Violence to their Consciences,
"and attempting at once to impose upon God
"and Man.

"They could not but observe the Compre-
"hensiveness of the required Declaration.
"There must be not only *Consent* but *Assent*
"too: And that not only to *all in General, but*
"*to every Thing in particular contain'd in, and*
"*prescrib'd by the Book of Common Prayer.*
"Words could scarce be devis'd by the Wit of
"Man more full, and more significant†, where-
"by they might testifie their highest Justificati-

† *A Letter from a Minister to a Person of Quality, shewing some Reasons for his Nonconformity.* A loose Sheet, Page 1.

"on and Commendation of every Point and "Syllable, every Rite and Ceremony, every "Matter and Thing contain'd in the whole "Book, and in every Page and Line of it. "A Man might almost be tempted to imagine, "that the Framers of this impos'd Declara- "tion and Subscription, had had this Book of "*Common Prayer* dropping down among them "immediately from Heaven, and that they "lookt upon it as nothing else but a continu'd "Oracle from first to last: And that they were "of the mind of the famous Dr. *Swadlin*, who "speaking of the *Publick Service* very roundly "Asserts*, *That there was not a Tittle of it, but* "*it was by the Dictate of the Holy Ghost*. That "Gentleman was not only pleas'd to Assert "this, but he tho't fit to prove it too. His "Argument is so admirable for its peculiarity, "that I cannot forbear transcribing it. Of all "the Offices in that Book, he fastens on that of "*Matrimony*, and particularly on the first Pray- "er in that Office; which beseeches Almighty "God to bless the Couple to be Married, as "*Isaac* and *Rebecca*, whence he thus argues. "*This Prayer was dictated by the Holy Ghost to the* "*Composers of the Common Prayers, or made by* "*those Composers without the dictate of the Holy* "*Ghost, but not by them without his Dictate, there-* "*fore by his Dictate to them. If by them without* "*Him, then they would have made it according to* "*humane Reason: And so have said, Bless them O* "*Lord, as thou didst bless* Abraham *and* Sarah, "*or as thou didst bless* Jacob *and* Rachel; *and they* "*had humane Reason for it; for Abraham was Gods* "*first Friend,* Jacob *was Gods great Favourite.* "*But says the Holy Ghost, not so, nor so: But let* "*it be, bless them as* Isaac *and* Rebecca, *and there* "*is no humane Reason for this, but a Divine Reason* "there

* *See his Anniver-Sary Sermons on the* 30*th of* January, *partii cularly that* Ann. 1656.

"*there is, and that is this*; Abraham *had his* Ha-
"gar *in* Sarahs *Time, and his* Keturah *afterwards.*
"Jacob *had his* Leah, *his* Zilpah, *and his* Bilhah.
"*but* Isaac *had none but his* Rebecca: *And there-*
"*fore says the Holy Ghost, let it not be, bless them as*
"Abraham *and* Sarah, *bless them as* Jacob *and* Ra-
"chel: *For then People may be apt to think they may*
"*have many Wives at once, if not some Concubines:*
"*But let it be, bless them as thou didst bless* Isaac
"*and* Rebecca. *Let them know, one Man should*
"*have but one Wife, especially at one time*: A little
"after, he adds, *certainly therefore, blessed are*
"*they which die in maintaining that Service Book,*
"*which can without Contradiction, Father the Cere-*
"*monies of it upon the Holy Ghost.* This it must
"be own'd is plain Dealing. But the poor *Non-*
"*conformists* had not that Spirit of Discerning,
"which such clear sighted Gentlemen were fa-
"vour'd with. If they must have *Forms of Pray-*
"*er*, they desir'd they might be *according to hu-*
"*mane Reason*, and not father'd upon the Holy
"Ghost without better pretence to Inspiration.
"Their seeing some make a plain Idol of the
"*Common Prayer Book*, rendred them the less
"fond of it. Such a Declaration as was requir'd
"of them concerning it, was in their Appre-
"hension as much as could be desir'd or done,
"concerning the Book of God, the Bible it self.
"Yea, they Question'd, whether many a sober
"Man might not have scrupled, to declare so
"much concerning any Copy of the Bible now
"extant in the World, there being hardly any
"one to be found, but what may have such
"fault and slips, as may make an unfeign'd As-
"sent and Consent to every Tittle, a matter of
"rational Scruple. But as for the *Book of Com-*
"*mon Prayer*, &c. They found such Marks of
"humane Infirmity, in the frame and contex-

"ture, and the particular Offices of it, that "they durst not make the Subscription and De-"claration requir'd, till they could receive Sa-"tisfaction, with Reference to sundry Excep-"tions they had to bring in, which appear'd "to them of great Weight and Consequence.

Of Assent and Consent.

Under this Head I desire it may be observ'd, that Mr. *Hoadly* is silent as to the first Reason Assign'd by the Ejected Ministers for their refusing the *Assent*, *Consent*, and *Subscription* requir'd. Which is the more remarkable, because wherever the Case as represented was in Fact true, it must be own'd an incredible hardship. For with what Reason could it be expected that Men should *Assent* and *Consent* to all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer; and *subscribe* to the agreeableness of the whole of it to the Word of God, when they had not seen it? Which was the Case of many of them on the 24th of *August* 1662, by which time they were in that manner to Conform, or the Law ejected them? Mr. *Ollyffe* indeed takes notice of it, and owns ⋆ it a Hardship: But says, that one yet living in their Parts, who then Conform'd, denies the matter of Fact as to himself, and such as liv'd near him: For that they had a Copy of the Amendments and Alterations sent them from *London*. Possibly that might be a peculiar Favour; which is the more likely, because I have it under the Hand of another, who is yet living, who was ejected in a place some-what nearer *London* than *Buckinghamshire*, that he had not the like Priviledge. Nay he says, that even in *Middlesex* very few places receiv'd the Common Prayer Book, till a Week, a Fortnight, three Weeks or a Month after Bartholomew Day. As for Written Copys of the Amendments, they were

⋆ p. 6.

were so liable to Abuse and Mistakes, that 'tis dubious how far they might be safely depended on. So that, at best, in this Respect, the Ministers who were silenc'd, were under a mighty hardship.

The Second Reason of their refusing the *Assent*, *Consent,* and *Subscription* that was requir'd, cannot, I think, be gain-said by any Man, upon the Supposition laid down, *viz*. that they met with several things, which after the strictest Search, appear'd to them not agreeable to the Word of God, in that Book which they were requir'd to approve off, both by Subscription and verbal Declaration. While this was their Apprehension, (be it right or wrong) they could not with safety give their Approbation. I don't perceive that this is deny'd. Whether they had Reason for this Apprehension is the thing in Question. It was the Question when the Act for Uniformity took Place, and is so still; and this Question I am ready fairly and amicably to Debate.

Why Mr. *Ollyffe* should be for *waving the Consideration how far any of the ejected Ministers did agree with Mr.* Calamy *in their Apprehensions of the Terms of Conformity*, *or how far they did well or ill in their refusal of them*, is not easie to say; Especially when I have given their Reasons out of their Writings, and many times in their own Words: And this for the Satisfaction of Posterity, that they might have a summary of their Plea. With his good leave this can't be wav'd, if he has my real sense in the Plea I drew up for them: Tho' really, I know not that he has as yet seen my full sense of the Terms of Conformity. Sure I am, that I no where intimated, that all contain'd in the 10th Chapter of the Abridgement had my Approba- pag. 4.

tion. I did indeed thus far declare my Sense; that I look'd upon that 10th Chapter as containing the *Stable Principles of Nonconformity.* Notwithstanding which 'tis a very possible thing I may in several Particulars differ in my Sentiments from the Opinions of the ejected Miniiters, which I have historically Reported: which I look upon very consistent with a firm Adherence to their main Principles; which have been the same among those of the Puritanical Stamp, from the first Reformation to this Day, notwithstanding the great change of Circumstances, in different Reigns and Periods. So that if there be any debate between him and me, it must be this: Whether the Ministers who were Ejected in 1662 Acted upon Principles of Conscience, yea or no? If they did not. I'le own he may fall with some Advantage on us who succeed them. But if they did, and this can be made Appear, it will be no hard Task to shew how the Principles we Act upon, are the same; and will justifie us as well as them.

But Mr. *Ollyffe* will have it, that in the Representation I have given of the Terms of Conformity, I go by this Rule, *that we are put the worst and hardest Construction upon the Words of the Subscriptions and Declarations, and the things Subscrib'd to, that they will possibly bear.* Methinks he might believe his own Eyes, that if they, who put this Construstion, that is excepted against, did Act by this Rule, it touches those very Persons for whom he Professes so great a Veneration; whole very Words he so often finds produc'd. However, if it will be any Satisfaction, I'le freely go thus far with him: If the Ejected Ministers really did Act by the Rule he mentions, they dealt otherwise by their

pag. 14.

Neighbours then they would willingly have been dealt withal themselves. But whether they did so or no, still remains a Question. In Opposition to this Rule (which I'm as free to declare against as Himself) he Advances another, in these Words: *That it is most reasonable, and the Duty of every Christian, to put the best and most candid Construction upon the Declarations, Subscriptions, and things Subscrib'd to, that the Words will properly and fairly bear: And that it is a great Evil, and highly unreasonable, when the words will admit of a double Sense (neither of which is by Law or Custom Determin'd) for any one to choose the worst, and most exceptionable.* Which Rule of his I'm free to admit with some Limitations. Provided, (1.) He'l grant me, that the *end of the Law* is mainly to be regarded when we affix a Sense to it. Uniformity I find to be the end of that Law, by vertue of which so many Worthy Ministers were Ejected. The thing mainly aim'd at was this: That there might be one and the same Practise in such indifferent Matters as the Church had tho't fit to Determine, in all the worshipping Assemblies in the Kingdom. To me it appears needful, that each Branch of the Law be interpreted consistently with this its main Design: Nor can I apprehend why either Candour or Charity should be pleaded for a different Method of Procedure. And if there be Two Senses, that which most favours Uniformity, ought to stand and carry it; as being *the Sense which the Words will most properly bear.* (2.) I farther expect it should be granted me, that the *Sense of the Legislators* be taken in, (as far as it can be safely Collected) when we are pretending to interpret a Law, that is design'd to Regulate our Practice. Neither can I conceive we are so

much at a loss about this in the Case of the Act for Uniformity, as that we have any Reason, to Despair. For if we consider but the several supposed Inconveniencies to the Constitution, which the several Parts of that Law were design'd to obviate; the Temper, Spirit, and Design of those who had the Ascendant in that Parliament in which it was fram'd; and the Method of Administration in pursuance of it ever since we shall find more Light may be gain'd, than at first might be imagin'd. But the Gentleman aforesaid, is pleas'd to Assert, that *the sense of the Imposers is impossible to be known*. That I Confess is a little hard. He says, *as to things confuted of by great Bodys of Men, as two Houaes of Parliament, or two Houses of Convocation, it is to be presum'd that in compsing and passing such Offices, Articles or Declarations, the several Members had differing Sentiments, each Man abounding in his own Sense*, &c. If this will stand, I think we have an unanswerable Argument of the Unfitness of Declarations and Subscriptions compos'd by such Bodys of Men to Anawer the end propos'd. As for the Settlement fix'd by the Uniformity Act, it was expressly appointed to *root out discord in Opinion, and establish Agreement in Religion:* But if those concern'd in the making of the Law had their differing Sentiments, each Man abounding in his own Sense, then may others also comply with them in Appearance, and yet abound in their own Sense too: And if so, we are but where we were at first: And what need was there of all this Bustle? We are as far from a real Agreement as ever. But if the Major Part of both Houses of Parliament had not been of a Mind,^ and in Particular had not been against confining the Subscription and Declaration to the

pag. 18.

pag. 17.

the meer Use of the Common Prayer Book, *&c.* we had had that matter upon a Debate between the two Houses, so fully settled, as that there had been no room left for Hesitation, as we shall see presently. Nay, it was that firm Perswasion of those who then had the Power in their Hands, that such Persons as were against the imposing of things indifferent, or for a bare using them while they had *no Heart or Will to the Continuance of them*, were better out of the Church than in it, that carry'd the *Act for Uniformity*, which otherwise had not pass'd.

Once more I have yet this farther Expectation, that it be allow'd to be the Wisest Method, that in Matters, which upon search appear dubious, we follow that side of the Doubt that is freest of Hazard. Which is so common a Rule among Casuists, that I hardly suppose it will, in the general, be Contested, whatever may be Objected against its Application to Particulars. These things being allowed, Mr. *Ollyffe*'s Rule is admitted.

Charity (he says) *obliges us to put the best Construction on Words and Actions*. 'Tis granted. But then this Charity has its Bounds. I can't apprehend it any part of the Charity that is due to Governors, to suppose or imagine they intended to leave me at Liberty, when they not only declare their intention to bind me up closely to such a Particular Way and Method, but make me formally bind my self therein to comply with them. pag. 15.

He Confirms his Rule, from the Necessity of *Allowance in the Case of all Subscriptions,* which I have no inclination in the general to Contest. All Humane Composures will have their Imperfections: And if so, I think it is but Reasonable we should allow for them. Nay, I can join Ibid.

in

Part 1. pag. 43.

in with Mr. *Hoadly*, in declaring, *that I cannot but account it a thing of very ill Consequence, and a piece of publick Disservice, to deal very hardly with* Declarations *and* Subscriptions, *to stretch them beyond what the Original Design of them, or the Words in which they are express'd, will fairly and honestly bear, in Order to make them appear as rigid and unreasonable as possible.* But then I must add, I cannot but take it for as great *a piece of Publick Disservice*, so to soften Publick Declarations and Subscriptions, as to tempt People to multiply Engagements, with a tacit reserve for a sort of Liberty, which those Engagements were design'd to debar them off. I'm afraid this hath been a Snare to many.

Mr. *Ottyffe* lays a mighty Stress upon the Subscription of the Nonconformists to 35 of the 39 Articles, in order to their being capable of the Benefit of the Act of Toleration: In this he intimates, we could not comply, if we did not put *the best Construction on the Articles that the words will bear.* Upon which occasion I shall not stick to declare, that finding Subscriptions so apt to create Debates instead of composing them, I care not how few of them I meddle with. The freer I keep my self, I reckon I am so much the safer. But when I do Subscribe to any Humane Composure, I do it only to the Substance, and what appears to me the Design; and I am very ready to put the best Sense upon any Phrases that are seemingly harsh, that the Words will bear, and which is not other ways precluded: And I'le own that a like Method is but reasonable, as to the Terms of Conformity. But then, as I would never Subscribe the Articles if I did not think them fairly reconcileable to Truth; or would give my Sense in matters that were dubious before I

pag. 15.

Subscrib'd

Subscrib?d them; (which by the way, many of us did:) So neither would I bind my self to compliance with the Terms of Conformity, if I were not satisfy'd in every Particular to Act agreeably unless room were left for a Dispensation, which is what I cannot observe.

He very pleasantly will suppose, that I had forgotten that we Non-conrormists had Subscrib'd the Articles. But had He acted according to his own Rule, of *interpreting Words in the most favourable Sense*, He'd have spar'd that insinuation. For tho' I from Mr. *Baxter* and others, bring in an Objection against: the *Damnatory Clauses of the Athanasian Creed*, which *Creed* is Subscrib'd to in the 8th Article; yet he might, without the least stretch, have been so so favourable as to have suppos'd, that I look'd upon those *Damnatory Clauses* as not belonging to the Subscription. And I here give it him under my Hand, that had I not been satisfy'd as to that, nothing would have prevail'd with me to have Subscrib'd that Article. And does Mr. *Ollyffe* really think there is no Difference between the Creed, *the Catholick Faith*; and those Damnatory Clauses that are as the Hedges of the Creed? Is there not an express Distinction made? After the Prefatory Introduction, it is said, *The Catholick Faith*, *is this*, &c. That Faith, we throughly Receive. But certainly this is somewhat different, from being oblig'd by an *unfeigned Assent and Consent* to use this Creed, with its Introductory and Conclusory Sentences, in the Worship of God: Which will hereafter be Consider'd. Ibid.

And what tho' we have also Subscrib'd the Third Article? Are we therefore inconsistent? J profess I discern not the Consequence. We are told, that the *Cambridge* M. S. has a Clause that

that intimates, that by *Descending into Hell* in that Article, we are to understand *Descending into the Hell of the Damned.* But I can't see, that we need go to *Cambridge* for the Sense of that Clause. For he that by *Hell* understands the *Hades*, (which is the very Word us'd in the Creed) sufficiently acquits Himself. Now, that our Lord took Possession of the *Hades*, and afterwards kept the Key of it, is plainly intimated to us, *Rev.* 1. 18. Tho' we translate it, yet I should think it were more properly rendred, *the State of separated Souls.* Which being observ'd, Mr. *Ollyffe*'s Remarks on this Article with an Eye to us, quite loose their force.

But the *Assent* and *Consent*, and *Subscription*, which are under this Head touch'd on, are a Principal Part of the Debate. And therefore they deserve to be distinctly Consider'd.

I begin with the *Subscription.* As to which Mr. *Ollyffe* declares, that he *does not find that this is much contested.* And Mr. *Hoadly* tells us, that *ye never heard that this was esteem'd any considerable difficulty.* This, to me, shews the Necessity of joining History and Argument together, without which frequent Mistakes will be unavoidable in a Debate of this Nature. I shall therefore Beg Leave here to look back, and give a short Historical View of *Subscripttons* in *the Church of England*, which will make us the better acquainted with the Ecclesiastical Scheme, and the fitter Judges of several Particulars that belong to it.

pag. 20.
Part 1.
pag. 41.

In the Days of King *Edward* VI, there were Contests and Debates about the Habits, Rites, and Ceremonies; but I can't find, that any Subscription was requir'd, to the Book of Common Prayer, the Articles of Religion, or any thing else. The Liturgy was for the most part us'd

us'd; and what was matter of Scruple, was omitted. And had every one been left at Liberty, to omit what was against his Conscience, or to alter as there might be Occasion, the Troubles which afterwards ensu'd might have been avoided. But at length an entire Subjection to Ecclesiastical Impositions was agreed on, or no Quarter was to be obtain'd. And there has been an Attempt to Advance farther and farther, and make the Confinements straiter and closer from one time to another, very observable; till after the Restauration in the Year 1660, foon after which the finishing Stroke was given, which produc'd that Perfection, as hath made many to think any farther Amendments needless. But this was a work of time: And we may observe several Gradations.

1. The First *Subscription* that was requir'd, was only to the *Articles* of Religion, drawn up and agreed to in the Convocation in 1562. All the Members of that Convocation were first requir'd to *Subscribe*; and all the Clergy afterwards: Tho' there was neither Law nor Cannon for it. This was refus'd by the Famous *John Fox* the Martytologist, who declar'd he would *Subscribe* to nothing but the New Testament, in the Original. Generally however, it was at first readily agreed to. But such Changes and Alterations were afterwards made in these Articles, that many even of the Body of the Clergy refus'd to *Subscribe* them a second time, in the Convocations in 1566 & 1571.

2. In 1564 a *Subscription* was requir'd to the *Advertisements*, or at least to the *Protestations*. For this Year came forth *the Advertisements, partly for the due Order in the Publick Administration of the Sacraments; and partly for the Apparel of Ecclesastical Persons*. Among these *Advertisements*

vertisements there were Eight *Protestations*, to be made. Promis'd and Subscrib'd by them that should hereafter be admited to any Office or Cure in the Church, or Place Ecclesiastical. Upon this Occasion Mr. *William Whittingham*, Dean of *Durham*, wrote a large Pathetical and Argumentative Letter to the Earl of *Leicester*, desiring him to interpose with the Queen, that they might not come forth, or not be Executed. In this Letter he tells him, "That the "great things pleaded on the behalf of the "things injoin'd was their indifferency: But "says he. He that will perswade this, must al-"so prove, that what is requir'd tendeth to "God's Glory, consenteth with his Word, edi-"fieth his Church, and maintaineth Christian "Liberty: Which conditions and Circum-"stances being wanting, the thing which by "Nature otherwise is indifferent, doth degene-"rate, and become hurtful. But whatever He and others could suggest against it, hinder'd not the strict urging of this Subscription: And Mr. *Thomas Sampson*, Dean of *Church Church Oxon*, was depriv'd for refusing it. And it is scarce supposable; that a Man of his Ability, Usefulness and Interest, should fall alone.

3. In 1571, The Parliament, to stop farther Rigors, made an Act requiring the Clergy to Subscribe to those Articles only, that concern'd the true Christian Faith, and Doctrine of the Sacraments. And this Subscription past smoothly. This Act was design'd, by the Parliament, to put an end to the severity of the Bishops: But it was far from answering the End intended. For,

4. That

4. That very Convocation which sate at the same time, made a Canon to oblige to a Subscription to all the Articles, as well those relating to Rites and Ceremonies, Order and Polity, as those that concern'd the Christian Faith, and the Doctrine of the Sacraments. And this was refus'd by many, because of what was added in Art. 20. and because of the 34th, 35th, and 36th Articles.

5. In 1573, A Subscription was requir'd by Arch-bishop *Parker* and several other Diocesans, to 3 or 4 Articles of this Tenour.

1. I acknowledge the Book of Articles agreed upon by the Clergy of this Realm, in a Synod holden *An. Dom.* 1562, and Confirm'd by the Queens Majesty, to be Sound, and according to the Word of God.

2. The Queens Majesty is the Chief Governor next under Christ of this *Church of England*, as well in Eccleliastical as Civil Causes.

3. I acknowledge, that in the Book of Common Prayer, there is nothing Evil or Repugnant to the Word of God, but that it may well be us'd in this our Christian *Church of England*.

4.1 acknowledge, that as the Publick Preaching of the Word in this *Church of England* is Sound and Sincere, so the Publick Order and Administration of Sacraments, is Consonant to the Word of God.

These were the most common Heads then requir'd to be Subscrib'd. But they were vary'd in several Diocesses. For each Bishop added what he tho't Good to the particular Form he sent to His Clergy. The Articles which those Three Noted Persons Mr. *Dearing*, Mr. *Greenham*, and Mr. *Johnson*, were call'd upon to Subscribe.

scribe, which I have Consider'd and Compar'd, differ'd in several things one from another.

See Fuller's *Church-History: Book* 9. *pag.* 170.

6. In 1583, A Subscription was requir'd to those commonly call'd *Whitgift*'s Articles, which were these following.

1. That the Queen had Supreme Authority over all Persons Born within her Dominions, of what Condition soever they were; and, that no other Prince, Prelate or Potentate, hath or ought to have any Jurisdiction, Civil or Ecclesiastical, within Her Realms or Dominions.

2. That the Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordination of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, contained nothing contrary to the Word of God, but may lawfully be used; and that they will use that, and none other.

3. That the Articles of Religion agreed on in the Synod holden at *London* in the Year of our Lord 1562, and Published by the Queen's Autority they did allow of, and believe them to be Consonant to the Word of God. Or as others express it, that he acknowledged all and every the Articles therein contain'd being in number 39, besides the Ratification, to be agreeable to the Word of God.

This was much more universally prest than any former Subscription, and it created great Troubles. The Puritans were generally free to Subscribe the first Article and the third, concerning the Doctrinal Articles of the Church according to the Words of the Statute: But they stuck at the Second; and they, who have succeeded them have done so ever since. They dust not Subscribe that there was nothing contain'd in the Book of Common Prayer, and of Ordination, contrary to the Word of God. Upon Occasion of the urging this Subscription, there

there were a great many Petitions and Supplications from the Ministers in the several parts of the Kingdom to the Arch-bishop, and to the Lords of the Council, several of which I have seen and perus'd: But they availed little. A considerable number were Ejected for their refusal. They amounted to 60 in *Suffolk*; 64 in *Norfolk*; 21 in *Lincolnshire*; and 38 in *Essex*; as I find asserted in a valuable Manuscript, relating to those times now in my Custody: And we may very well conclude there was a proportionable number in other Countys.

It must indeed be own'd, that by special Favour, some Particular Persons had their Subicriptions qualify'd. Thus for Instance, I have seen a Form of Subscription Sign'd by 15 Ministers of *London?* bearing Date, *Feb.* 13. 1583. It ran thus,

"The Persons' under-written do Subscribe "in this sort. First, They do acknowledge "Her Majesty to be Supreme Governor of the "Church of *England*, in Manner and Form as "in the First Article is Ministred unto us. "And for the *Book of Common Prayer*, we are "content to use it for the Peace of the Church; "or if we be found offending in any Part "thereof, to submit to the Penalty of it. "Thirdly, We do consent wholly to the *Book* "*of Articles*, agreed upon by the Archbishop "and Bishops, for so much as concerneth "and *Sacraments* therein.

But all this while, a Subscription of this sort, tho' so many were by the *Episcopal Power* ejected for refusling it, was not, as I can find, requir'd by Law or Canon: But,

7. In the Convocation in 1603, a Canon was made that requir'd a Subscription to these 3 Articles. In *Canon* 36, after the Recital of

the fore mention'd 3 Articles to be subscrib'd, these Words follow. *To these 3 Articles whosoever will Subscribe, he shall, for the avoiding all Ambiguities, Subscribe in this Order and Form of Words, setting down both his Christen and Sir-Name*, viz. [*I* N. N. *do willingly*, & ex animo, *subscribe to these 3 Articles above-mention'd, and to all things that are contained in them.*]

After this *Canon* (tho' I can't find it was confirm'd by Act of Parliament) this Subscription was urg'd with yet more Vehemence than before; and many more were Silenc'd for refusing it. Some few indeed had still Particular Connivance, upon their Reading the Greatest Part of the *Common Prayer*, and avoided Subscribing: But they were comparatively very few. Many all along the Reigns of King *James* the First, and King *Charles* the First, for omitting some Rites and Ceremonies Prescrib'd in the *Common Prayer-Book*, were harrass'd and worry'd in the *High Commission* and other *Ecclesiastical* Courts; as may be seen in the History of those Times at large.

And this is the very Subscription which is to this day requir'd. Several Hundreds of Pious Ministers have been worry'd and ejected for refusing it, and yet Mr. *Hoadly* says, *he never heard it was esteem'd any considerable Difficulty*.

8. At Last, to Crown all, and for the surer Work, this *Subscription* must be back'd with a Verbal Declaration of *Assent* and *Consent*, that so no room might be left for any Persons in the National Settlement, that could not yield to Compleat Conformity.

Let's observe then the Progress in this Affair Step by Step.

In King *Edward*'s Reign, if a Minister Preach'd Sound Doctrine, and liv'd Regularly, and us'd the

the Common Prayer, he was Subject to no Molestation. 'Twas the same also in the beginning of the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth.* But afterwards this would not do. You must give the Church good Security of your Compliance with Her Autority. A beginning is made in Doctrinal Matters. The Convocation requires, that the Articles be Subscrib'd. Well wont that do? No, a Liberty of Practice in things indifferent, tho' allow'd by the Apostles, could not seem tolerable to their Successors. An exact Conformity as to the Celebrating the Communion, and also as to the Apparel that was Order'd must be formally agreed to, by all that should be allow'd to Officiate in *the Church of England*. When this created Stirs, the Parliament interpoles, and Passes an Act, obliging to a Subscription to the Doctrinal Articles, but to nothing farther: Neither to the 20th Article, that Asserts the Autority of the Church, nor to any of the rest, which contain'd matter of Scruple, to such as insisted on a farther Reformation. But the Convocation were not content with what the Parliament gave them. They must have more, or the Design is spoil'd. They soon after made a Canon, obliging to Subscribe all the Articles without Exception. Nay in a little time the whole Common Prayer Book must be Subscrib'd, all must be engag'd by their Hand-writing punctually to use it, and it must be own'd, to contain nothing contrary to the Word of God. Many refus'd and were Silenc'd. Some few were allow'd to Subscribe with their own Restrictions and Limitations. But it being oft Complain'd, that this Subscription was a meer stretch of Episcopal Autority, requir'd neither by Statute nor Canon, the Convocation, in 1603 enforc'd it by a Canon, which was

strictly pursu'd in the Reigns of King *James* King *Charles* the First, except in the Case of a very few, who thro' particular Favour were Conniv'd at. At last when King *Charles* II. was Restor'd, even the Subscribing *ex Animo* to the use of the Common Prayer, and no other would not do: But every Minister must publickly in the House of God, Declare his *unfeigned, Assent and Consent* to all and ever thing contain'd and prescrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer, &c. And now there wants but one Step more; and that is This: Let all that Officiate in the Establish'd Church, be bro't under an Engagement, (which it is well known was once atttempted) never to yield to an Alteration of any of the Rites and Ceremonies now in Use; and that would be a yet more effectual Purge to rid the Church of the encumbrance of those who are not of a Temper sufficiently Submissive.

Page 20. I now Appeal to Mr. *Ollyffe*, whether this *Subscription* has been *much Contested* or not. If he'll be at the Pains to trace it from the first time of its being requir'd, down to this present time, he'll find it has been Contested, and refus'd too, by Men as Eminent for their Piety and Usefulness, as any this Nation has produc'd. Pag. 11. But he and his Neighbors it seems *must tell me, that it doth not follow that the Terms of Conformity were Sinful and Unlawful, because such Good and Holy Men acrupled them*. Very well. But I hope he'll allow this to be as good an Argument on one side, as the Conformity of so many Persons of Worth and Eminence, or of the Majority, is on the other side. And that the rather, because the one sort Swam against, the other with the Stream: The one sort had a Prospect of Hardships and Sufferings, the other of temporal Emoluments tho' I will not say, they

they made them their main End, when yet they might be sway'd insensibly thereby. Let him grant me but this, and I have as much as I aim at.

However, if this *Subscription* hath not been so much Contested of late as formerly, 'tis only because the Debate about *Assent* and *Consent* (which comprehends the other under it) hath made a Particular insisting on it the less needful. For if I can *unfeignedly Assent and Consent* to all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer, &c. I think I should be very unreasonable to refuse to Subscribe *ex Animo* to the use of the Book. But if the Demand of *Assent* and *Consent* were wav'd, he'd soon find, that this *Subscription* was as much *Contested* as ever; and that even by those who have no Enmity to Stated Forms as such, but reckon they might have their use in the Church of Christ.

But about this *Assent* and *Consent* we are not Agreed. We are told by Mr. *Ollyffe*, that they are *Law Terms:* And that *the Laws use those Words promiscuously to mean the same thing*. 'Tis added, that an *absolate Assent and Consent* is not requir'd: 'Tis eno' if there be a *Respective and Comparative Assent and Consent:* i. e. *if Persons judge it more eligible to use the Common Prayer, and the injoined Rites and Ceremonies*, &c. *than lose the Legal Opportunity of exercising their Ministry*.——And tho' this *unfeigned Assent and Consent* is to be declared to all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer, *&c.* yet this, we are told, is continually Asserted to be understood only of *all things injoined to be Uss'd and Practis'd by them who make the Declaration*. And for this it is urg'd, that the Declaration is thus express'd: contain'd *and* prescrib'd; not contain'd *or* pre-

p. 21, 22.

Page 23.

scrib'd. So that if things be contain'd, but not prescrib'd, the Assent and Consent does not reach them. And 'tis added as a farther Proof, that the verbal Declaration, is in the Act for *Uniformity* Usher'd in with these Words: That every one shall publickly Declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent [to the Use] of all things contain'd and prescrib'd, in these Words and no other. Mr. *Hoadly* herein agrees; and adds; *that the Act does not leave us at Liberty, if we would never so fain, to make this Declaration in our hard Sense; for it requires us not to do it, but to give both* Assent *and* Content *to one thing, even the* [*Use*] *of this Book*. And afterwards: *The Declaration of* Assent *and* Consent, *cannot possibly be extended to any thing but the* Use *of this Book*.

Part 1. Page 37.

page 43.

This is indeed very Positive: But let us Suspend our Censure till the Matter is Canvast, which (I think) is but an equitable Demand. Let the following things be but fairly Consider'd, and then let any indifferent Person Judge, whether the Conformists or the Non-Conformists, in this respect, go upon the firmest and the safest Grounds.

1. Then, 'tis well known, and appears from the foregoing short Historical Narrative, that the constant *Use* of the Forms prescrib'd, was requir'd long before this *Act for Uniformity* was fram'd. It was particularly requir'd by the Subscription injoin'd by *Can.* 36. of the Convocation in 1603. And if this verbal Declaration aim'd at no more than a bare *Use* of the Book, it is scarce supposable so much stir would have been made about it. If it be said, that this additional verbal Declaration, was to engage all Ministers in the Establish'd Church to use all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd

scrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer, without omitting, changing, or altering upon any Occasion as had before been usual: I must desire it may be remembred, against we have Occasion for it, in the process of this Debate. But tho', I must Confess, I'm apt eno' to believe that this might be one design of this Declaration, and of its being so strongly worded, (& that the rather, because the High Commission, which before us'd to keep People in Awe was no longer allow'd;) yet I can't apprehend, that this was all that was intended: And I cannot but look upon it, as a most gross Reflection upon the Framers of it to suppose it. Certainly they were sagacious eno' to be aware, that many would understand the Words they us'd in this Declaration, as looking farther than a *bare Use* of the Forms prescrib'd: If then, they were still for adding this Declaration, without aiming at any Thing farther than the *Use* of the *Book of Common Prayer*, what other Notion must we have of them than this, that they aim'd at dividing the Church under Pretence of Uniformity. This cannot be esteem'd an unbecoming Reflection, upon this Supposition. But,

2. The Legislators themselves have declar'd against this Sense; and therefore I can't see, how the affixing it is either Fair or Candid. To put all out of doubt (says Mr. *Baxter* ⋆) since this Act, the Parliament made another Act; to which while Proviso's were offer'd, the whole House of Lords sent it back to the House of Commons, with this Proviso, *That those that declar'd Assent and Consent to all and every Thing,* &c. *should be oblig'd to understand it only as to the* Use *of what was requir'd of them, and not as to the Things in themselves consider'd.* The Commons refus'd this Proviso; and the

⋆ *See his Life in Folio*, page 427.

Houses had a Meeting about it, in which the Commons deliver'd their Reasons, against that Exposition. of the Declaration: And in the end, the Lords did Acquiesce in their Reasons, and consented to call out the Proviso. So that the Parliament have expounded their own Words; They say, that the End of the Declaration is not Answer'd, by Persons understanding it only as to the of what is requir'd: And for any after this to take upon them, to interpret that Declaration only of the of the Common Prayer Book, and plead Candor, and Equity, and Charity for so doing, and say 'tis. not possible to give another Sense; is neither respectful to the Legislators, nor a Credit to the Cause, which is this way endeavour'd to be supported. A Friend of Mr. *Ollyffes*, hath herein pleaded for him. *Tho*' says he) Mr. *Baxter saith*, *The Commons rejected that Clause, sent to them from the Lords, yet there no necessity to conclude from thence, that the Reason thereof was, because the Parliament intended that the Declaration should mean more than a Consent to Use the Service. But the true Reason may be very well conceiv'd to be this; that the Matter was so plainly exprest and limited already in the Preamble to the Declaration, and in other Places in the Act, as also in the very Form of the Words in which the Declaration is made, that there was no need to insert those Words into the Declaration it self*. What this Gentleman may mean by the *inserting those Words into the Declaration it self*, I cannot say. Mr. *Baxter* mentions not any Proposal of that Nature. The altering the Declaration, was not the Thing propos'd or Debated, but the true Sense in which Persons should be oblig'd to make it. Say the Lords, Let it be eno' for the Assenters and Con-

A Letter to the Reverend Mr. John Ollyffe, *touching the Declaration of Assent and Consent*, &c. *Page* 5.

Consenters, to understand only the of the Book in this their Declaration: Let this satisfie as the true Sense of it: Let them be esteem'd as answering the Law, if they come but thus far. No, say the Commons, by no Means. They were against that Exposition of the Declaration. Certainly this could not be, because no other Exposition could be given of it. The Lords Proposal imply'd, it was dubious. Their Motion was bottom'd on the Debate, concerning the Sense of it. The Commons refuse to concur with them. They are against their Exposition, they meant something farther: And draw over the Lords to their side; and so in effect both Lords and Commons declare, that to understand the Declaration of Assent and Consent only as to the *Use* of what was requir'd, was not eno' to Answer the Law, or the Design of the Legislators. This being a Point of great Moment in this Debate, I have made strict Enquiry into the Matter of Fact, and have receiv'd an Account, which may be depended on as Authentick. The Case was this: *July* 18. 1663, A Bill was sent up from the Commons to the Lords, intituled, *An Act for relief of such Persons as by Sickness, or other Impediment were disabled from subscribing the Declaration in the Act of Uniformity, and Explanation of Part of the said Act.* At the second Reading in the House of Lords it was committed. Some Alterations and Amendments were made by the Committee, and a Clause added of this Tenor: *And be it Enacted and Declar'd by the Autority aforesaid, that the Declaration and Sabscription of Assent and Consent in the said Act mention'd, shall be understood only* at to the Practice, and Obedience to the said Act, *and not otherwise.* This Additional

Clause

Clause was agreed to by a Majority: But, 12 Lords protested against it, as *destructive to the Church of* England, *as Establish'd.* When the Bill was sent back to the Commons, they desir'd a Conference, which was yielded to by the Lords. The Commons vehemently declar'd against the Amendments and Alterations of the Lords, and the Additional Clause, and it was openly declar'd by one of the Managers on the Part of the House of Commons, that *what was sent down to them touching this Bill, had neither Justice, nor Prudence in it.* When the Conference was over, the Lords Voted an Agreement with the Commons, and dropp'd the Additional Clause before recited. I shall make no farther Reflectious on this Matter. This Account comes to me for Genuine in such a way, as I can depend upon it. And if any Man can obtain leave to Publish what stands in the Journal of the Lords concerning it, this Account I am inform'd, would be found fully confirm'd.

Part I. *p.* 38.

This being consider'd, Mr. *Hoadly*'s instance from Dr. *Bates* and others, who took the *Oxford Oath*, appears no way Parallel. He tells us, they swore they would not endeavour an Alteration in the Goverment, either in Church or State, upon a Publick Declaration of the Lord Keeper, that it was *unlawful Endeavour* that was meant. Upon which he thus argues: That if it were reasonable upon the Autority of a single Person to confine the Word *Endeavour* to *lawful Endeavour*, it is much more warrantable upon the Autority of the Act it self, which requires this Declaration, to apply both *Assent* and *Consent*, to the Use of the Book. I Answer, the Lord Keeper was Authoriz'd by his Place, to give an Interpretation of the Law,

Law, or otherwise he had hardly ventur'd upon it: And if he might warrantably affix a Sense, much more may Lords and Commons, affix a Sense to their own Laws. And if they have done it in any Case, by particular Debate, for any to pretend to give a softer Sense, at the best is over Officious: If any will Act upon a different Sense, and encourage, and perswade others so to do, they must answer for it to God, and their own Consciences; but for my Part, I am at a loss for their Warrant. But,

3. There is that in the Act for Uniformity it self, that plainly Confronts the Sense given by these Gentlemen, and do's not well allow of applying the Declaration barely to the Use of the *Common Prayer Book*, &c. What is Asserted, is indeed thus far true; the Declaration of Assent and Consent is in the Act usher'd in with these Words: *That every one declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent to the* Use *of all Things contain'd* and *prescrib'd*, &c. And yet, when the Case of *Lecturers* is afterwards dilated on in the same Act, the Matter is express'd very differently. 'Tis then requir'd, that every such *Lecturer*, should publickly and openly Declare, his *Assent unto*, *and* [*Approbation*] *of the said Book*. And a few Lines after, it is requir'd that after open and publick Reading of Common Prayer, every such Person should before the Congregation, *declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent unto*, *and* [*Approbation*] *of the said Book:* Why *Lecturers* should be more hardly put to it, or more closely confin'd than *Parsons* or *Curates*, I cannot say. But if their Case was the same. *Approbation of a Book* seems to be more than a bare *Use* of it. The Common Prayer was for the most part us'd by the Old

Old *Puritans*, who yet would never have declar'd their Approbation of the strict Imposition of it. If it be said, an Approbation is requir'd of such Things only as are to be us'd, 'tis answer'd, that an Agreement to use such Prayers as were liable to no just Exception, (upon which Condition several were before admitted into, and kept in the Church) had been much easier to some, than the declaring their *Approbation* of the whole Book, and all its Rites and Ceremonies, which without any Force at all might seem to them to allow the justifiableness of requiring Compliance with them, as a Term of Admission to Sacred Ministrations: Which is a thing might be scrupled by Men of no inconsiderable Latitude. And,

4. Tho' there appears in the Act no Foundation at all for the Distinction between an *Absolute* and a *Comparative Assent and Consent*, as Mr. *Ollyffe* has explain'd it; yet, even a *Comparative unfeigned Assent and Consent* to the Use of all things prescrib'd in the Common Prayer Book, must Necessarily imply a Satisfaction in the Truth and Warrantableness of all things prescrib'd there to be us'd. He that unfeignedly *Assents* and *Consents* to the Use of all the Forms prescrib'd, had need be satisfy'd in the *Damnatory Clauses of the Athanasian Creed*; which are as much to be us'd, as the Catholick Faith it self. He had need be Satisfy'd to say of every one to be interr'd, that he *hopes he rests in Christ*, &c. And the like is to be said as to the *Apocryphal Lessons*, and all the other things, which were scrupled by the Ministers, who were Ejected. For Persons to give an *unfeigned Assent and Consent*, that they may get into the Establish'd Church, and yet be as much dissatisfy'd with such Things, as those, who for

that

that Reason, kept out of the Church, is what I must Confess, I cannot hitherto understand; tho' I would judge Charitably of those who think they do.

But let us particularly Consider the Words in which this Famous Declaration runs. I, *A. B. do here Declare my unfeigned and Assent and Consent to, all and every thing contain d, and prescrib'd in and by the Book Intituled, the Book of Common Prayer*, &c.

1. It must be an *unfeigned* Assent and Consent. This Word *unfeigned* looks as if it had a Retrospection to former Times, when Persons Prosecuted in the High Commission and other Ecclesiastical Courts, comply'd to use such things as they reckon'd unwarrantably impos'd upon them. Many of the Old Puritans us'd the *Surplice*, the *Cross,* and *Sponsors* in Baptism, and *Kneeling* at the Communion, *&c.* because they did not look upon them as sinful in themselves, and without them they could have no possibility of Service. But they were earnestly desirous of their removal: And this forc'd Compliance was their Burden; which they complain'd of upon all Occasions. The Excluding Persons of this Temper was manifestly aim'd at in the Settlement in 1662. Neither were they who were upon the Secret, and who had the framing of this Declaration, backward to own as much upon Occasion. Such as could only *Use* the things Prescrib'd, but did not approve them, they look'd upon as *feigning* a Compliance in which they were not Hearty.* As far as I am able to Judge this is so far from being forc'd, that it is extremely Natural. As to the bare *using* prescribed Forms and Ceremonies, *Feigning* could signifie nothing: No guard was there needful. Their Practice would betray

* *There was a certain Ejected Minister, that us'd pleasantly to say, it was one Syllable made him a Non-Conformist: and that was the Syllable* Un *in* Unfeigned; *for if that had been left out, he could have Conform'd as well as any of his Neighbours:*

betray them if they did not keep their Word. There could be no room for *Feigning*, unless it respected an *Approbation* of the Rites and Ceremonies to be us'd. Mr. *Ollyffe* indeed says, *A Man may make a feigned Declaration or of his Assent when he does not really do it.* 'Tis granted he may do so, if the Approbation of the things Assented to be intended: But if (as is pleaded) the *Ufe* of such things be all that is aim'd at, such a *feigning* would expose instead of relieving; it would soon be discover'd by their Practice; But I hope Mr. *Ollyffe* won't be angry with me if I frankly declare, that I should never give my *unfeigned* Assent and Consent, in the Worship of God, to what I had *no Heart nor Will to the continuance of:* Nor should I have any Heart to encourage or press others to an *unfeigned* Agreement to such things, as I had my self after such a Declaration, *done all I could to remove.*

Pag. 2.

2. There must be both an *Assent* and: a *Consent.* A *Consent* is suppos'd to have gone before. For the Subscription is an Engagement to use the Common Prayer. What need of the *Assent* if that implies no more? 'Tis said, they are *Law Terms*. Suppose they are, yet when the Legislators will put them into my Mouth, and I must be oblig'd to use them with Solemnity in the House of God, I think I may very well enquire whether I am able to use them, according to the most proper, and at the same time most Common and Usual Sense of them. They are indeed *Law Terms*, as being us'd in Law: And so are most *English* Words: But they are not Terms peculiar to the Law, as *Messuage, Chattel*, *Fee Simple*, &c. We have no need to go to Law Lexicons, to learn what *Assent* and *Consent* mean. We all know what is meant by those

those Words in common Discourse. It's said, *both words are of the same import in Acts of Parliament.* Be it so: Yet the *Assent* and *Consent* of the Majority of Lords and Commons, implies their Approbation of the thing enjoin'd and prescrib'd by the Law to which they so *Assent* and *Consent.* But be it as it will as to that, when I'm to make the words mine, I think, I can't be charg'd with forcing or draining, if I take them according to their common import: And so I am sure they are different. Neither is the Instance of the *Oath of Abjuration* produc'd by Mr. *Ollyffe* at all Parallel. 'Tis true, there are several Words there us'd, *viz. I do sincerely acknowledge, profess, testifie, and declare;* But in this Case there can be no difficulty. For all the World agrees, that *truly*, and *sincerely*, and to *acknowledge*, and *profess*, *testifie*, and *declare*, were words of the same Import. They are so in common Discourse, when we would give any Man an Assurance: But this cannot be said as to *Assent* and *Consent*, which all the World knows are Different. Pag. 22.

3. This *Assent* and *Consent* must be *to all and every thing:* The whole and each Part: *That is contain'd and prescrib'd in and by the Book of Common Prayer*, &c. That is, say these Gentlemen, so *contain'd* as to be *prescrib'd.* I have no Heart to stay upon the Critical Difference between contain'd *and* prescrib'd, and contain'd *or* prescrib'd: (A Nicety, which I am perswaded the Legislators were not aware of:) But I think it is easie to be observ'd, that there is a Difference between *contain'd* and *prescrib'd* in the *Subscription*, and therefore I think its but Reasonable to suppose, that it should be the same in the *Declaration* also. For the Second of the Articles to be *Subscrib'd* is this: *That the*

the Book of Common Prayer, &c. [contains] *nothing contrary to the Word of God:* 'Tis added, *That it may Lawfully* [*be us'd*] *and that they will use that and no other.* So that all that is *contain'd* in the Book of Common Prayer is to be approv'd as agreeable to the Word of God, by the *Subscription*, as well as what is to be *us'd:* And it would be some-what Strange, if the verbal Declaration should not amount to as full an Approbation as the Subscription. All I shall add is this: If the *Assent* and *Consent* was only to be given to what is *prescrib'd*, the Word *contain'd* had much better have been left out; because it tends to Confound. That the Common Prayer Book *contains* more than it *prescribes* no Man can deny. Had then the *Assent* and *Consent* been confin'd to what was *prescrib'd*, this Difficulty had been remov'd: But when I must *Assent* and *Consent* to every thing *contained* and *prescrib'd*, without being at all chargeable with forcing Words, I think I may very well require good Assurance, that such *Assent* and *Consent* would not be interpreted, an approving of every thing *contain'd* in that Book, as well as what is *prescrib'd*.

And therefore I must needs say, upon the coolest Consideration of the whole Matter, I don't see, that either Mr. *Ollyffe*, or Mr. *Hoadly*, have any such Cause of Triumphing over the Ejected Ministers upon this Head, as they seem to imagine. For supposing it to be an Hyperbole in the Gentleman whom I quoted, who says, that *Words could scarce be devis'd by the Wit of Man more full and more Significant*, &c. Suppose I should own it to be a possible thing to have express'd a Cordial Approbation of the Contents of the whole Common Prayer Book more fully than is done this Declaration; yet

it

it does not follow, that the Sense these Gentlemen put upon it, is so *clear*, so *natural*, so *unforc'd*, and *fair*, as they represent it. At best 'tis dubious and ambiguous. And if the *Use* of the prescribed Ceremonies be all that was meant by the *Declaration*, 'tis express'd very oddly and darkly; and it rather looks as if they who fram'd it were desirous to leave room for Hesitation, than to be distinctly understood by all concern'd. Tho' by the way, Mr. *Hoadly* need not have call'd that, *my Comment*, which if he had consulted the Person I Cite, in the Margin, he would have found I express'd entirely in another Man's Words. Part 1. pag. 30.

But because Mr. *Ollyffe* seems to Question *whether, excepting* Dr. Swadlin, *I know of any one Conformist in* England, *that ever made the Declaration in the Sense we put upon it*; I shall, for his Satisfaction, give him a known Instance in the County of *Essex*. 'Twas Dr *John Sherman*, Parson of *Bradwell*, who, *April* the 3d 1664, made a Publick Recantation of his *Declaration* and *Subscription* before a large Congregation. Any Man that Reads it, will easily see, in what Sense, he made this *Declaration* and *Subscription* upon his Conforming. I'le be at the Pains to Transcribe the whole of it; excepting his Reasons that back'd it, which are too large to be here inserted. It was thus express'd; Pag. 20.

'Whereas I have some-time heretofore openly 'in this place, declar'd before you, my *Unfeign-* '*ed Assent and Consent to all and every thing con-* '*tain'd and preferred in and by the Book of Common* '*Prayer*, &c. I do now Acknowledge my self to ' have done rashly and inconsiderately in so do- 'ing: And do therefore, here, before you all, 'Declare my *unfeigned Renouncing* and *Recanting*, 'that my former Declared *Assent and Consent*

'*to all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd* in 'that Book. Because, tho' I still highly ap- 'prove of that Book for a great part thereof, 'and shall continue to use it, both openly in the 'Church, and privately in my Family, and to 'Conform to most of the Rites and Ceremonies 'of the Church; yet upon second tho'ts, I have 'found some things *contain'd and prescrib'd* in that 'Book, which I cannot *Assent* and *Consent* unto: 'Somethings being very offensive and dange- 'rous, other some untrue and sinful. Besides, 'that it seems to me an Honour too high for 'any Book but the Book of God, the Sacred 'Scriptures, to have unfeigned Assent and Con- 'sent given to all & every thing contain'd and 'prescrib'd therein: As if any Humane Writ- 'ing (especially of such Bulk & variety of Con- 'tents as this) might be presum'd to be with- 'out Errour and Mistake, throughout, and in 'every particular matter and thing thereof. 'And whereas also, I have Subscrib'd a certain 'Declaration and Acknowledgment, and after 'Subscription read it openly before you, I do 'now renounce & recant my said Subscription, 'and my Reading that Declaration & Acknow- 'ledgment Subscrib'd: Yet as to the Particu- 'lars thereof, only of Conformity to the Litur- 'gy of the *Church of England*, as it is now Esta- 'blish'd by Law; and that only as extending *to* '*all and every thing contain d and prescrib'd therein.*

Mr. *Ollyffe* may hence see, that Dr. *Swadlin* was not the only Man, who in Conforming to the Establish'd Church, yielded to the *Subscription*, and *Declaration of Assent and Consent*, in that Sense, in which the Ejected Ministers tho't themselves oblig'd to refuse them. And if they will do him any Service, I don't doubt, but I may have more Instances for him, by that time he comes to need them. But

But there is one thing at which Mr. *Ollyffe*, (1.) and Mr. *Hoadly* (2.) both, are extremely disturb'd: And that is, at my Quoting Dr. *Swadlin* upon this Head, and mentioning his Opinion, *that the Common Prayer Book was dictated by the Holy Ghost*. Mr. *Hoadly*, in Particular, is very Smart. Mr. *Ollyffe* tells us from *Wood*, that the Doctor was, in a manner Distracted: in which I can easily believe him, tho' no other Evidence could be given, than the Passages cited out of him. And Mr. *Hoadly* says, *That such Stories tend to vilifie and ridicule the Common Prayer Book, and to set us at an irreconcilable Distance from one another.* But why so angry Gentlemen? If the Dodtor was in a manner Distracted, I hope it can't be laid upon me. And if such a Passage be a ridiculing the *Book of Common Prayer*, why was not the Author censur'd, and his Book (in which there are a hundred as ridiculous Things as those I quoted out of him) suppress'd? For my Part I must declare, I can't see any mighty tendency such Stories have to set us at a greater Distance. I should rather apprehend, that if the extravagant Flights of some in Commendation of the *Common Prayer Book*, and of others in decrying all Forms of Prayer, as Antichristian and Unlawful, were more freely expos'd, it would sooner bring Men of Temper together, than set them more asunder.

(1) Page 13.
(2) Part 1. p. 33.

I could tell them of several other Passages, something agreeable to this of Dr. *Swadlin*, but for the present. Two shall Content me. The first is in the Learned Dr. *Beveridge*, his Discourse *of the Excellency and Usefulness of the* Common Prayer, which he extols in the highest degree; and afterwards observes, *the extraordinary Prudence, as well as Piety of our First Reformers*,

Page 46.

formers, who first Compiled the Book of Common-Prayer, so exactly conformable to the Word of God, and that Apostolical Canon [Let all things be done to edifying.] *This* (says he) *I cannot but ascribe to the same Extraordinary Aid and Assistance from God, whereby they were afterward enabled to suffer Perfection, yea, Martyrdom it self for his sake, and so to Confirm what they have done with their Bloud.* This carries the Matter pretty high.

The other is a Writer for the Church, who hath cry'd up the Liturgy to that height, as not to stick to say. *That the Wit of Men and Angels could not mend it; and that it is a suffcient Discharge of the Minister's Duty but to read it*⋆. This I call *Idolizing*. Mr. *Ollyffe* asks, *What if Men have made an Idol of Conceiv'd Prayer, must we therefore reject it?* I answer. No, by no means. But I think the life of that Word [*Idolize*] might be allow'd me in the Case, when such a Man as Dr. *Pocklington*, in his *Sunday no Sabbath*, charges the *Puritans* with *Idolizing the Sabbath*; and tells us, *That they look'd upon it as an Image dropt down from Heaven:* And that it was *the great* Diana *of the* Ephesians, *as they us'd it.*

⋆ *Abbot against Church forsakers. Page* 13.

As for Mr. *Hoadly*'s Motion, that they may hear no more of *stretching their Consciences in this Point*; I am not aware, that it is needful: For I don't know that they have heard of it at all from me. I pretended not to Charge those that have in this way given their *Assent* and *Consent:* I can freely leave them to God and their own Consciences. All I aim'd at was to shew, what they had pleaded in their own Defence, who refus'd it when this Act took Place; and that they acted upon Principles that may be justify'd. And upon comparing both sides together, every Man must judge for himself.

Part I. *Page* 41.

1. The

"1. The Subscription and Declaration re-
"quir'd, they found would take in the Do-
"ctrine of *Real Baptismal, Regeneration*, and
"*certain Salvation* consequent thereupon.
"And that, whether the Persons Baptiz'd
"were qualified Subjects of Baptism, yea, or
"not; It would be an Approbation of the
"Rubrick at the End of the Publick Office for
"Baptism, where 'tis said, *it is certain Gods*
"*Word, that Children which are Baptiz'd, dying*
"*before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly*
"*saved*. It would have been well, if they
"had quoted the Place; for the Dissenting
"Ministers freely confess'd their Ignorance,
"that they knew of no such Word in Scrip-
"ture: it would also be an Agreement, to
"use constantly after Baptism that thanksgi-
"ving; we yield thee Hearty Thanks, most
"merciful Father, that it hath pleas'd thee,
"to Regenerate this Infant with thy Holy
"Spirit. Now when they should be oblig'd
"to Baptize all Comers, without a Liberty of
"refusing the Children of *Infidels*, or the most
"scandalous Sinners (provided they had but
"Sponsors) to bless God presently as soon as
"the Office was over, for regenerating them
"by his Spirit; and lay it.down as undoubt-
"edly certain, that they were sav'd if they
"Dy'd, this was what their Light would not
"suffice for; and therefore till then, 'twas
"their undoubted *Duty* to avoid Concurrence.
"For who can so much as Question, Whether
"or no, it would have been a Sin in them, to
"bless God with Confidence for what they
"did not believe was Real; and to lay that
"down as undoubtedly certain from Scripture,
"of which they saw not there the least Foun-
"dation. They found the Children of the

"wickedest Parents (of Whores and Adulte-
"rers living openly in all notorious Sin, and
"wholly without God in the World).Bap-
"tiz'd without Scruple: And many or them
"dy'd foon after Baptism: Now how could
"they pretend to be fare by the Word of
"God, and pall all Doubt that all such went
"to Heaven, when God so Positively declar'd
"in the Second Commandment, *That he would*
"*punish the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the*
"*Children unto the Third and Fourth Generati-*
"*on?* This at least might make the Matter
"dubious to them. Suppose a Christian King
"should conquer a Country of *Pagans*, or *Ma-*
"*humetans*, or *Jews*, or compel all their In-
"fants forthwith to be Baptiz'd, and some of
"them immediately expire, at least before
"the Commission of actual Sin, is the Salva-
"tion of all such Sure, and past all Doubt;
"And this to be made out, and clear'd by
"the Word of God? Is it in the Power of
"Man to make Infants sure and certain of
"Salvation? It is in the Power of Man to kill
"a poor Infant, and to choose his Time for
"doing it. Many Whores murder their Babes
"before Baptism, and they might as well do
"it immediately after, and so assuredly (up-
"on this Hypothesis) send them to Heaven,
"whither they shall never come themselves,
"without bitter and sorrowful Repentance.
"And so might the aforesaid King and Con-
"queror (after he by Baptism had given
"them their sure and unquestionable Passport
"for *Paradice*) even in Charity and Kindness
"immediately cut the poor Infants off, and
"so without any farther Hazard, give them
"Possession of Eternal Bliss. But our Mini-
"sters could not tell how to apprehend, that

"any

"any Mortals had such Power over Souls, as "this would amount to.

"It hath been pleaded by some in this "Case to mollifie the Objection, that the as-"serting of a Baptismal Regeneration, was "what was mainly intended; and that herein "they had the Concurrence of many of the "most Celebrated, Reformed Divines, and of "many even of our own most admired Wri-"ters to which they had this obvious Re-"ply: That the Thanksgiving after Baptism, "mentions *regenerating with the Holy Spirit*; "which carries the Matter farther then the "Sign, and seems to denote the thing signi-"fy'd, as actually given to each Baptiz'd Per-"son. Besides, the Sense of the Church in "this Point is fufficiently clear'd by the Of-"fice for *Confirmation*, in which the Bishop "who Officiates, in his first Address to God, "expresses himself thus. *Almighty and ever-"living God; who hast vouchsaf'd to regenerate "these thy Servants by Water, and the Holy "Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of "all their Sins*, &c. This said with Reference "to all Comers (as to which 'tis well known "there is very little Care) gives ground to "all Concern'd to think themselves sufficient-"ly Regenerated already; and to apprehend, "That the Church doth not think their aim-"ing at any farther Regeneration needful, "when once they are Baptiz'd and Confirm'd. "This was a thing that appear'd to our Mini-"sters of such dangerous Consequence, that "they durst not concur in it, or any way ap-"prove it, for fear of contributing to the "hardening of a Multitude of vain, loose, "careless, secure Creatures in a fatal mistake "about the safety of their State; neither could

The Let-ter from a Mini-ster to a Person of Quality, shewing some Reasons for his Nonconformity. page 3,4. Corbets *Remains*, p.174. *Short Survey of the Grand Care of the prejent Ministry*, pag. 15. Baxters *Non-conformity Stated and Argu'd*, pag. 48. *His Plea for Peace*, pag. 169. *His Defence of the Plea for Peace*, pag. 16, *and* 137. *at large.*

"they see how they could Answer for it to "God another Day.

* P. 26. Of *Baptismal Regeneration.*

* In this Paragraph, which Mr. *Ollyffe* will have to be bottom'd upon a Mistake, I refer to Three Things. The Rubrick at the end of the office for Baptism; the Thanksgiving in the Office immediatly after Baptism; and the Office of Confirmation as referring to Baptism Preceding. Take them altogether, and they discover, that Laxness upon the Head of Baptism, as a Regenerating Ordinance, as may prove a Temptation to many, to think that Ordinance a sufficient Passport for Heaven, and that the bare Receiving it, is an abundant Evidence, that Persons are the Children of God, as much as they need desire to be so.

As to the *Rubrick*, he says, *it is no part of what is prescrib'd for Use, and therefore neither Assent nor Subscription reaches to it.* As to which, any Man may judge for himself from what has been said: But I have heard of several Gentlemen in the House of Commons, that were fond eno' of the Church, who exclaim'd against it; saying, if it were requir'd of them, they could not Subscribe it. Sir *Lancelot Lake*, One of the Knights for *Middlesex*, Son to one of the Secretaries of King *Charles* I. and that had two Bishops for his Godfathers, I have been inform'd, was One. This looks as if they tho't the Subscription reach'd it. But if the *Rubrick* is not to be us'd, the Thanksgiving is, and the Office for Confirmation to sure approv'd: And

And both are bottom'd upon the Doctrine of Real Regeneration as a Necessary Attendant of Baptism, which Good Men might very well Scruple.

But Mr. *Ol.* will Argue about the Rubrick: And because I said, the Dissenting Ministers knew of no such place in the Bible as it referr'd to. He mentions a place, *viz. Mark* 10. 14. But leaves us as far to seek for Proof as we were. The thing Asserted in the Rubrick is, that *it is certain from God's Word, that which are Baptized, dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly sav'd.* Now the Question with those that Scruple this, was not whether it was possible for such to be sav'd? No, nor whether their Salvation were a thing hopeful? But whether it appear'd undoubted from the Word of God, that if they were Baptiz'd and dy'd before they commited actual Sin they were certainly Sav'd? This was the thing they demur'd about: Now to this he replies, that it appears from the Text Cited, that some Children are undoubtedly Sav'd. He is Angry that the Ejected Ministers should understand it of all Children: And chafes at a mighty Rate.—— I shall only return him this: That he need not Pelt at Axioms before they are bro't to him; and if he will Understand only *some Children* as meant by that Rubrick I can't help it: But if such as are Distinterested, understand that Rubrick otherwise than the Silenc'd Ministers, I should think it Strange.

He intimates, that nothing more is express'd in the Thanksgiving referr'd to, and in the Office of Confirmation, than is express'd in the Articles, which the Non-conformists have Subscrib'd, as well as those who have Conform'd.— Now the Words of the Article are these: *Baptism*

P.31,32.

tism is not only a Sign of Profession, but is also a Sign of Regeneration or New-Birth, whereby as by an Instrument, they who receive Baptism rightly, are Grafted into the Church, and the Promises of the forgiveness of Sins, and of our Adoption, to be the Sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly Sign'd and Seal'd. Upon which Mr. *Ol.* adds thus: *Here all the Phrases excepted* against, *viz. being regenerated, and adopted*, and this by *the Holy Ghost, and the having forgiveness of sins, are all exprest to be meant of Sacramental Signing and Sealing of them: So that no Scruple seems to be left.*— But hold: As in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we know there is no such Connexion between the Sign and the thing Signify'd, but that many may now Eat and Drink in the Presence of the Lord, and yet be at last disown'd: So neither is it to be justify'd, that we should use such a Method of Expression as to the other Sacrament of Baptism, as should tend to encourage Persons to rest in the outward Administration, without due Care about reaching that inward Purity of which it was intended to be a Badge. This is the great Exception in this Case. And here the Article is Clear, and the Common Prayer Book Blame-worthy.

Ol. Def. p. 28, 2p.

'Tis Pleaded, that the Scripture uses the same Expressions as the Common Prayer Book upon this Head. For that Baptism is call'd the *Laver of Regeneration*; and we are said to be *Wash'd* and *Purg'd:* And the Children of a Believing Parent are said to be *Holy*, &c. *and in the same Sense as we understand the One may we understand the other.* I shall take my Reply from Bp. *Burnet*, ⋆ who thus Expresses himself. *The* Ends and Purposes of Baptism are Two, *The one is, that we are admitted to the Society of Christians, and to all the Rights and Priviledges of that Body,* which

⋆His Export. of the 39. Articles, *pag.* 302.

which is the Church.——A Second End is, Internal and Spiritual. Of this St. Paul *speaks in high Terms, when he says, we are saved by the washing of Regeneration,* Tit. 3. 5. *He also, else where, makes our Baptism to represent our being dead to Sin, and bury'd with Christ, and our being risen and quicken'd with him. This is the inward Effect of Baptism. It is a Death to Sin; and a New Life in Christ in imitation of him, and in conformity to his Gospel. The former does indeed belong to to Baptism; It makes us visible Members of that Body into which we are admitted by Baptism; but that which saves us in it, must be a thing of another Nature. This is not to be believ'd to be of the nature of a Charm, as if the very Act of Baptism carry'd always with it an inward Regeneration.—Here* (says he) *we must Confess, that very early some Doctrines arose, upon Baptism, that we cannot be determin'd by. The Words of our Saviour to* Nicodemus *were expounded so, as to import the absolute Necessity of Baptism in order to Salvation.—Another Opinion that arose out of the former, was the mixing of the outward and inward Effects of Baptism: It being believ'd that every Person that was born of Water, was also born of the Spirit; and that the renewing of the Holy Ghost did always accompany the washing of Regeneration.*—Which Opinion he folldly refutes from 1 *Pet.* 3,21.

Now this latter Opinion, the Consequences of which are very Pernicious, our Ejected Ministers look'd upon as favour'd in the Common Prayer Book, tho' not in the Articles: And that it is favour'd in the Common Prayer Book, I cant see how any can deny, that will but compare that Passage in the Thanksgiving immediately after the Celebration of Baptism, *We yield thee hearty Thanks most merciful Father, that it hath pleas'd thee to Regenerate this Infant with thy Holy Spirit*; with the 2d.

Answer

Answer to be given by every Child according to the Catechism; *My Godfathers and Godfathers in my* Baptism [*whercin I was made a Member of Christ, the Child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.*] Especially if he will add hereto, the Passage in the Office for Confirmation, to be us'd with reference to all, who being Baptiz'd in their Infancy, can when they are grown up, say the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and Ten Commandments, &c. *Almighty and ever living God: who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy Servants by Water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their Sins.*

In short then, the Complaint made, is not that the Phrases us'd in the Common Prayer Book upon this Head are blameable, for they are *Scriptural*, (tho' indeed we may find fault with the using Scriptural Expressions in such a manner as shall carry them besides the Scripture Sense, which is the Case in *Biddle*'s Catechism:) But the Grievance is, that they are so promiscuously apply'd, as to encourage many to think, that they are accepted by Vertue of their Infant Dedication in Baptism, without laying that Stress upon the *Answer of a good Conscience* in such as are grown up, as is Necessary to keep it from being a meer empty Ceremony.

pag. 29. Mr. *Ollyffe* says, that a *Sacramental Baptismal Regeneration* is therein imply'd. This is not deny'd: But the Question is, whether such Expressions should be us'd, as it may easily be foreseen, will be likely to prove a Temptation to think, that that is all the Regeneration that is needful. And tho' he wonders an Objection should be made against that Clause in the Office for Confirmation, *Thou hast given to them for-*
pag. 30. *giveness of all their Sins*; yet I think he'd have very

very little Reason, if he did but Consider, of what sort of Persons that is often spoken. When a parcel of Lewd Boys are offer'd to be Confirm'd (a thing not uncommon) that Expression is us'd. And hearing that God has forgiven them all their Sins, they presently apprehend they are in a safe State and when they are call'd to an hearty and unfeigned Repentance, and told, that they must be Born again; be Born of the Spirit as well as of the Water, or they can never see the Kingdom of God, they'll very freely deride you. However, that Baptism is for the Remission of Sins is granted; and that Remission of Sins is Seal'd Conditionally to all: And this we think Persons when they grow up should be minded of: And rather be put upon performing the Conditions on which the Blessings of the Covenant were made over to them than at all encouraged to expect Remission of Sins and the consequent Blessings, without a suitable Care about their Conduct. In short, all that Mr. *Ollyffe* can make of the Matter, is this, that *inward Spiritual Regeneration is the thing signify'd in Baptism; and the Sign is called by the thing signify'd*, and whether this is to be allow'd without due Explication in Publick Offices, that are design'd for promiscuous and common Use; whether a Method so likely to be ensnaring to many (who are naturally apt by Baptism to justle out Repentance, and to substitute Parental in the stead of Personal Dedication) be to be *Assneted* and *Consented* to is the Question. The Ejected Ministers apprehended this would have pernicious Consequences: Nor can I see, that what Mr. *Ollyffe* has suggested disproves it.

Mr.

Part 1. *p.* 45,46.

Mr. *Hoadly* is somewhat Larger. He vindicates the *Rubric* excepted against: And Pleads, *That Baptism admits Person into a State of Favour with God; and that if they Die without having done any thing to put them out of this they shall he sav'd.* But then he confines it to such as are *duly Baptiz'd and admitted into the Church according to Gods Will:* And adds, *That we can never prove the Words to be incapable of this Sense, or that any other was ever intended, or so much as tho't of by those who plac'd them here.* To this I shall give the Reply of Mr. *Baxter* in his own Words. ⋆ For the New Clause of the Salvation of Baptized Infants as certain by the Word of God, *the Scruple were the less, if it were confined to the Infants of true Believers: But our Church admitteth of all Infants, even of* Infidels *and* Heathens *without Distinction, if they have but God-Fathers and God-Mothers; and the Canon enforceth Ministers to baptise them all without Exception. And when in our publick Debate with the Bishops, I instanc'd in one of my Parishioners that was a professed* Infidel, *and yet said, he would come and make the common Profession for his Child for Custom-sake: Dr.* Sanderson *the Bishop of* Lincoln *answer'd me, that if there were God-Fathers, it had a sufficient Title; which Bishop* Morley, *and others of them confirm'd. Now these God-Fathers being not Adopters nor Owners, we cannot see it certain in Gods Word, that all those are sav'd, whom they present to Baptism: No, nor when ungodly and hypocritical Christians present: For how can the Covenant save the Child, as the Child of a Believer, which saveth not the Parent as a Believer himself: So that while unmeet Subjects are Baptiz'd, we cannot subscribe to this Assertion.* And afterwards speaking of the Limitation, that is endeavour'd to be affix'd

⋆ *See his Life in Folio*, pag. 428

fix'd to this Rubric, he adds: [Children, Baptiz'd, dying before actual Sin] *is equal to* [All Children Baptiz'd.] *Your Consciences must tell you, that if you limit it to some only, you cross the Sense of the Compilers of the Liturgy. I am sure, Dr.* Gunning *who bro't it in, hath publicity express'd his Sense, for the Salvation of all such Infants.* Whether he will adhere in this Point, to Mr. *Baxter* or Mr. *Hoadly*, the Reader must choose for himself.

But it being intimated, that a Text of Scripture was wanting to prove what was yet asserted to be undoubtedly certain by the Word of God; Mr. *Hoadly* thus expresses himself. *Indeed, if you demand such a Text of Scripture for the Salvation of some, whom you say, our Church admits to. Baptism, as you produce for their Damnation, we acknowledge we shall never be solicitous to produce one.* But what becomes of this Piece of Wit, if there was no Text at all produc'd for the Damnation of Infants? No Sir, we are not so forward to damn Persons as that comes to. We are for giving the Mercy of God its full Latitude and Compass: And yet think there's a great deal of difference, between a positive Dooming any to Hell, and a giving them a certain Passport to Heaven. How the former can be inferr'd from the Denial of the latter, I am yet to seek. I do indeed here mention, the Threatning Clause of the Second Commandment, wherein God declar'd, that he *would punish the Iniquities of the Fathers upon the Children, unto the third and fourth Generation*; which was often urg'd on this Occasion by the Ejected Ministers: But it was not cited as a Proof of Infants Damnation; but as an Argument, that we had not a positive Certainty, as to all that were Baptiz'd, and taken out of the

Page 46.

the World in their Infancy, that they were accepted of God unto Salvation. For if God in some Cases was so displeas'd with Posterity, as that upon the Account of the Sins of Progenitors, he would not admit them so much as into the Congregation of his People for some Generations (as in the Case of Bastardy. *Deut.* 23. 2.) How do's it appear, that the Application of the outward Seal of the Covenant, would certainly have entitled to the spiritual Blessings of it? And if God under the New Dispensation of his Covenant, renounces Communion with some on the Account of peculiar Provocations, how can it be certainly clear'd from Scripture, that he accepts their Posterity upon their being Baptiz'd? If we may argue probably in the Case from the Mercy of God, yet that will not amount to a positive Scripture certainty. For tho' it be own'd, that *God do's not determine the future State of any Person, by the Behaviour of another:* Yet still, where Parents forfeit the Blessings of the Covenant for themselves, and their Children too; that God will return them to their Children, upon their bare Admission to Baptism, is not so evident as not to be fairly questionable: And they who are positive in asserting it, should give good Proof of it.

pag. 47.

But Mr. *Hoadly* flies high upon the Cases suppos'd in this Article of my Tenth Chapter. *He is at a loss what to say*; and *utterly surpriz'd*. If he'll accept my Help towards the Abatement of his Disturbance, I'm free to give it. I'll only call in the Help of a Remark of Dr. *Comber*. 'Tis this, That *either all Baptiz'd Children are really accepted of, or none are*. That I may do the Doctor no Injury, I'll repeat his Words as they stand connected, and then draw

Ibid.

my

my Argument from them. Speaking of the Thanksgiving after Baptism, and that Passage in it that has been above recited, he tells us, St. *Ambrose* mentions a Parallel Passage, in use in his Time, *The Priest* (says he) *spoke to the Person Baptized in this Manner:* God the Father Almighty, who hath regenerated thee, by Water and the Holy Ghost, and forgiven thee thy Sins, &c. *Which* (says he) *shews, that the Antients did not Question the Effect of the Sacrament, no not in Persons of Age, until their future Conversation declared they had broke their Covenant: How much more then* (says he) *ought we to believe this, in the Case of Infants, who can put no impediment to the Grace of God, and are all alike, so that either all or none receive these Blessings*. Mr. *Hoadly*, I'm apt to thinks was hardly more surpriz'd at any of the Suppositions produc'd under this Head, Out of one of the Authors cited in the Margin, than I should have been at this Passage of Dean *Combers*; had I not apprehended, that the Expressions us'd in the *Common Prayer Book* would have born him out; and that he had really hit on the true Principle on which they were bottom'd. If all Children are alike, and the Parental Interest in the Divine Covenant makes no Difference, then Baptism as Baptism, the meer outward Ceremony, by vertue of the Divine Institution, and that Grace which inseparably and unalterably attends it, is sufficient to secure the Salvation of an Infant, dying such. And if this will hold, then will the forc'd Baptism of the Children of a conquer'd Country of *Pagans* or *Mahumetans*, be as available for Salvation, as the most regular Baptism in a Christian Country: And whereas, 'tis more than a Thousand to one, that such with whom

Dr. Comber'*s Companion to the Temple*, p. 609, 610.

Christianity is the meer effect of Force in their Infant State, will, when they grow up, return to the Superstitions and Impieties of their Progenitors; it were to them an Act of Kindness for a Conqueror immediately to dicpatch them. It would to them be an Act of Kindness, tho' in such a Conqueror an Act of great Barbarity: Because, tho' he satisfy'd his Bruitish Lusts, he would yet send them safe to Heaven, whither in all likelihood they would otherwise never have come. And this way I think, the result will in short be this: That as far as it is in a Persons Power to dispatch Baptiz'd Infants, 'tis so far in their Power, to send them safe to Heaven; where there is Reason to fear not one of many Baptiz'd Persons that live to Maturity, ever come. Nay, I'll go on (seeing he puts the Cases) a good Christian bringing his Child to Baptism secures its Salvation also, provided it be but so Happy as to Die an Infant: Aye, and a Feaver that carries it out of the World, is instrumental in securing its Salvation too, provided it come in Infancy. And I don't see how this is avoided, if Children are therefore certainly sav'd because Baptiz'd, and the Case of all is alike.

While Mr. *Hoadly* therefore takes leave to inveigh against such sort of Objections as unaccountable, I hope he'll give me leave to make use of his own Words, and say; That 'tis this fondness of all Rites, Forms, and Ceremonies, that have been customary; aye, and even unwary and obnoxious Expressions too; *The stress that seems to be laid upon them, and the Study with which they appear to have been fought for, that make some in the World so apt to suspect, and so forward to declare, that no Agreement can ever hop'd for.*

As

As for what follows in Mr. *Hoadly* relating to the Nature of Baptism, I refer him to my Lord of *Sarum*'s Exposition mention'd above. Tho' he can't distinguish between a *Regeneration,* and *a real Regeneration*; yet I hope he both can, and for the future will distinguish, between the Application of the outward Sign, and the real reaching of the Blessings signify'd: I hope he may take from that Learned Prelate, what would not so well go down when it came from us; that the outward and inward Effects of Baptism are not to be mix'd. And tho' he tells me, *he do's not separate the washing of Regeneration, and. renewing of the Holy Ghost*, Tit. 3. 5. Yet I hope he'll distinguish between *the putting away the filth of the Flesh and the Answer of a good Conscience.* And I cannot but hope, that what so Reverend a Father of his Church suggests upon that Head, that is before referr'd to, may abundantly satisfie him. I must do him the Justice indeed to own, that he do's add, that he do's not in this Case *separate* between *washing* and *renewing*, *in speaking of the whole Christian Church.* But I remember also, that we are speaking as to Particular Persons; and so is the Head to be all along understood. For tho' there are some, in whom the *outward washing* is never attended with a *real renewing*; and so it becomes a meer outward Ceremony: Yet that both *washing* and *renewing* are not separated in the Case of others, is not Question'd. pag. 49.

Tho' what is offer'd under this Head is really very little to my Relish, I yet can freely believe, that Mr. *Hoadly* herein wrote his Mind at that Time: But as much as he would willingly be tho't to out-do the *Non-Conformists* in Charity, *he can hardly perswade that we believe as we speak, when we say*, that we are pag. 50.

afraid to concur, *for fear of contributing to the hardning of careless Men in the Opinion, that they are regenerate, and need no farther Care.* Herein I can only speak for One: And if he will Credit me, here give it him under my Hand, that that is my present real Sense. For tho' I'll freely grant; that the letting Persons understand, that all the Blessings of the Covenant were in Baptism made over to them, and are assuredly theirs, provided they live agreeably to that Sacred Bond they then came under; is *a Perswasive Argument to the greatest Care and Diligence:* Yet to encourage them in confounding the *outward* and *inward* Effects of Baptism; and to perswade them, that the *washing of Regeneration*, and *renewing of the Holy Ghost* are inseparable is to bolster up many in Security whom the Scriptures brand, and to tempt them to be satisfy'd with being *Nominal* without due Care to be *real* Christians.

So to do, is not an imitating St. *Paul*, but an unhappy running Counter to his Design. His speaking glorious Things of all profess'd baptiz'd Christians in general (at a Time by the way, when the *outward* and *inward* Effects of Baptism went together much more generally than in our Days) was to encourage them by the reviving Prospect of what was certainly bestow'd on God's Part, provided they were true to the Engagement made on their Part: And this is a strong Argument for *Care* and *Diligence:* But how it can be said to be the same. When all promiscuously, because Baptiz'd, are assur'd of the Blessings of Baptism; when it is well known, that many so assur'd, are not faithful to the Engagement they then came under, I am not aware.

In

In short, tho' this Office was *Fram'd, for a-Christian Country*, yet it should suppose, that too great a part of the Inhabitants of it, have only the names of Christians. For my part, I'm far from charging it as *a fault on the Church, to allow Baptism in extraordinary Cases, upon a solemn undertaking the Good and Christian Education of a Child*; and yet I can't approve the encouraging this Notion, that a Real Regeneration is needless in a Baptized Person. And tho' Mr. *Hoadly* does not know, that Baptism may not, According to the *Church of England*, be deny'd to the Children of *Atheists*, *Jews* and *Infidels*; yet I suppose He knows, that if Sponsors are provided, a Man cannot Answer for his refusal in the Ecclesiastical Courts. And so I dismiss this Head. pag. 51.

"2. This Assent, Consent, and Subscripti-"on, was among other things to the use of "*Godfathers and Godmothers* in Baptism, to the "Exclusion of Parents. Sect. V.

"This they Esteem'd Sinful; not only be-"cause it justled out the Parents Right to de-"vote their Children to God in Baptism, which "is the thing upon which the Administration "of that Ordinance to Infants was primarily "Founded; but also, because it opeird a wide "Door to the Prophaning of one of the most "Awful Solemnities of our Holy Religion: In "as much as Godfathers and Godmothers are "neither requir'd to be chosen with due Care "and Caution; (and in the Case of many Per-"sons, 'tis really impossible to procure any "Serious Undertakers;) nor are they ty'd "to bring the Children of Christians only, "nor only such as they take for their own, but "without any difference, may bring the Chil-

"dren of any *Atheists* or *Sedducees*, *Jews* or *In-*
"*fidels* at Pleasure, without taking any farther
"Thought or Care about them. Withal,
"these Godfathers and Godmothers Personate
"the Child as believing in Christ, and re-
"nouncing Sin; and that without any Au-
"tority for it, either from any natural Right,
"or positive Law. And the Ordinance of
"Baptism will seem to be put upon that in-
"sufficient Bottom, by any one, who sedate-
"ly compares the Office for that purpose, with
"the Church Catechism.

"For the Promise of the Godfathers and
"Godmothers in the Child's Name, is in both
"Represented as the Foundation of Baptismal
"Dedication, and the Ground of the Claims
"of the Benefits and Blessings thence arising.
"Now our Ministers sensibly found, that this
"would not bear Scanning. In the Church
"way this Ordinance is so manag'd, as if the
"Godfathers Faith were Beneficial to the
"Child, and not the Parents: When as God
"requires no Faith or Repentance of Infants,
"but only, that they be the Seed of Penitent
"Believers, and Devoted to him as such: This
"also was an Offence to many. And then they
"found, that Godfathers and Godmothers
"were generally bro't to the *Font*, to avouch
"a great Untruth, and make themselves ob-
"noxious to Lying and Perjury in the Face of
"God and the Church. For Experience shew-
"eth, that what Appearance soever there is
"of Solemnity at the Engaging in such a Pro-
"mise, yet they never (or very Rarely) per-
"form it. Some of them never see the Child
"more after the Christning Day, nor ever en-
"quire more after it. Yea, tho' they Solemn-
"ly Engage on the behalf of the Infant, yet
they

"they hold themselves rearlly Bound to no-
"thing; but look upon all as a meer Ceremo-
"ny and Compliment. Suppose a Parent should
"afterwards Challenge his Gossips, and say;
"you promis'd when you stood Sureties for
"my Child at the *Font*, to call upon him to mind
"his Duty, to hear Sermons, *&c.* and to see
"him well instructed in the Rudiments and
"Principles of Religion but you have not
"done it, and through your Neglect, he doth
"not hear Sermons, he is not Catechiz'd, he
"does not Renounce the Works of the Devil,
"but is in the High-way to Ruin, notwith-
"standing your Engagements? What would
"be the Answer of these Persons to the Pa-
"rents of the Child, but this? Should we
"look after him or you? Whose Child is he,
"yours or ours? He is your own proper Charge,
"notwithstanding our standing at the *Font*;
"He is commited to your Trust, and there-
"fore, if he do otherwise then Well, for lack
"of your Care, the Blame will be yours, and
"his Blood will be upon your Head as the on-
"ly Criminals. And indeed hardly any thing
"can be more obvious to Observation than this,
"that the Blame is not laid upon Godfathers
"and Godmothers if Children be not well
"Disciplin'd and Educated, neither do they
"Blame themselves, or shew any Confluence in
"this matter; altho' 'tis Evident, that if they
"perform not their Covenant to the utmost of
"their Power, they break their Faith: On
"which Accounts, they durst not, by any
"means, *Consent* to Encourage so Corrupt a
"Custom. ★ What

★ Baxter's *Nonconformity Stated and Argu'd*, p. 57. *His Plea for Peace*, p. 167. *His Defence of the Nonconformists Plea for Peace*, p. 26. *The Letter from a Minister to a Person of Quality, shewing some Reasons for Nonconformity*. Corbet's *Remains*, p.156. Baxt. 2d. *True Def. of the meer Nonconf.* C. 12. p. 167.

Of the use of Godfathers and Godmothers,

What is here suggested as to the Custom of *Godfathers and Godmothers*, as it is manag'd in the *Church of England,* has been the Sense of many ever since the Reformation; who have not been against cautionary Undertakers for the Education of such Children as are Baptiz'd; but have reckon'd the bringing in *Covenanting Sponsors* over the Parents Heads, to be a gross Corruption. Mr. *Ollyffe* however, is pleas'd to Charge me with *loading* this Practice, *with divers odd Misrepresentations*, *that I may expose a Rite*, *in which the Protestant Churches are so generally agreed*. I must again remind him, if they are *Mis-representations*, they are none of mine, as they stand in my Abridgment; they belong to those Worthy Gentlemen of whom, upon some Occasions, he gives so good a Character. And if the *Rite, that they are against*, be what the *Protestant Churches are generally agreed in*; 'tis a little Strange this could never be discern'd by those of us, that have been abroad, and seen, and observ'd their way and Method. But I doubt it is rather desir'd, that we might seem to agree with them, than apprehended, that there is a real Conformity. That the Protestant Churches abroad have *Witnesses* at Baptism, who are to mind Persons afterwards of their Baptismal Covenant; nay, that they have *cautionary Undertakers* for the Education of the Baptiz'd, upon Supposition either of the Death, or the neglect of Parents; nay, that some Eminent Persons have given their Judgment for such undertakers, in Case of the unfitness of Parents to Educate their young Ones, cannot be deny'd: But as for *Covenanting Sureties*, that Act as Parties in the Fæderal Stipulation, in order to the securing the Blessings of the Covenant to Baptized Infants, the Foreign Churches know

pag. 32.

nothing

nothing of them, and it had been happy if the same also could have been said of the *Church of England.*

It being objected, that this justles out the Parents Right; Mr. *Ollyffe utterly denys, that Parents are excluded, or justled out by the Use of Godfathers, but* (says) *their Right is Secur'd, and their Benefit Consulted thro' the whole.* He says, that Godfathers are *Witnesses of the Parents Faith and Profession; and Sureties to the Church, that the Children shall be bro't up in the Profession of the true Religion.* And He need not ask *what hurt Parents can receive by this?* For it is freely yielded him, if this were all, there would be no just Ground of Complaint. But the Grievance is, that these Godfathers and Godmothers, according to the Method of the Church, are taken in as Parties, in the Fæderal Stipulation, between God and the Party Baptiz'd, which is not easie to be Accounted for. It is otherwise indeed in the Office of Baptism for such as are of riper Years: There they are expresly call'd *Witnesses:* The Parties Baptiz'd are told *they must Promise*, &c. in the Presence of *these their Witnesses:* And in the Address afterwards to the Godfathers and Godmothers, they are told, that *these Persons have promis'd in their Presence:* And against this, there is no just Objection. But in the Office for the Publick Baptism of Infants, the Godfathers and Godmothers, are told, that *the Children have promis'd by them their Sureties.* And this is very different from the former. *Witnesses* all admit: And *Sureties to the Church* for the Education of Infants are very desirable: But what is this to *Sureties, by whom Children Promise faithfulness to the Baptismal Vow*; while the Parents stand by for Cyphers. This is the Corruption com-

Page 33.

page 34.

complain'd of, not only by the Ejected Ministers, but by many, even in the *Church of England*: And I'm sorry that such a Man as Mr. *Ollyffe* should set Himself at all to Plead for it.

I have a better Opinion of Him, than to suppose he heatily approves of the Canon, that saith, *the Father shall not be urg'd to be present*. That looks as if the Godfather, who at best, is but the *Substitute*, were more Necessary in this Affair, than the Parent, who is the *Principal*. But tho' this Canon is no *part of the Liturgy Subscrib'd to*, it yet is the Sense of the *Church of England Representative*, met in Convocation; and not certainly to be made light of, by those that own the Autority of such an Assembly, in *decreeing Rites and Ceremonies*, according to *Art.* 20. Its a poor Evasion for him to ask me, *whether I think the Presence of the Father is of Necessity to the administration of Baptism?* I Reply; 'tis so requisite, where it can be had, that I know none, but the other Parent can supply his Place, in proper Covenanting with God for the Child: But if he mayn't *be urg'd to be present*, 'tis a Sign more stress is laid on the Surety, than on the Father. If he mayn't *be urg'd to be present*, 'tis a Sign, his Covenanting for the Child is not reckon'd needful: For otherwise, nothing but absolute Necessity would be a Dispensation for his Absence. But let us suppose a Minister of the *Church of England*, when a Father gives notice of the Baptizing his Child, *to desire his Presence*, as Mr. *Ollyffe* says he may do; the Father may refuse it, and tell him he has nothing to do there; He can't, by the Canon, *he urg'd to be present*; He has some Friends or other that will Answer for his Child, and when that is done, will have

no

no farther Concern: A Minister in such a Case must be forc'd to rest contented. And finally; tho' the Sponsors are chosen by the Parents, (who yet are, generally, necessitated to take such as they can get, not cuch as they would choose) yet are they still excluded from the Solemn Stipulation in the Ordinance of Baptism, which is devolv'd on their Substitutes: So that tho' they may be Present, yet they are not allow'd what is their proper Work and Office; and this is the Exclusion complain'd of; and hard to be justify'd. And till Mr. *Ollyffe* can justifie to his Superiors the allowing Parents to Covenant for their own Children at the *Font*, whether he will agree to it or no, they are Excluded. Pag. 35.

But whereas it was farther Objected, that the way of the Church in using Godfathers, *seems to put Baptism on an insufficient*, Mr. *Ollyffe* very roundly *cannot think, that I can believe my self in this Assertion.* I can't, however, herein say he is very injurious; because I am not aware that I had given my own Sense in the Matter: But why they, who made this Objection, might not believe that there was abundant ground for it, I must profess, I can hitherto see no Reason. Why should they not? The Reasons are these. Because, *the Right of the Children to Baptism is Antecedent to the Choice of Godfathers: And Baptism is declared full and sufficient without them.* But I can find no force in these Reasons. For tho' it be own'd, that *the Right of Children to Baptism is Antecedent to the Choice of Godfathers*, yet it does not therefore follow, but that they, who make Godfathers the Covenanting Sureties, put Baptism on a wrong Bottom. Their Antecedent Right is, either *from their Parents* or *from the Church.* If

from

from their Parents, Why is their Baptism bottom'd on the Covenanting Engagement of the Sureties? In the first Address to the Godfathers, there is this Passage; *Wherefore after this Promise made by Christ, this Infant must also faithfully, for his part, promise by you, that are his Sureties, (until he come of Age, to take it upon himself) that he will renounce the Devil and all his Works*, &c. This plainly supposes this Promise by the Covenanting Sureties to be that on which the Benefits of the Covenant are suspended: Without it, no Assurance can be given, that *the Promise made by Christ* will take place. And in the Catechism there is no regard at all in the affair of Baptism to Parents, or their Covenant Interest in the Divine Favour, as affording the true Foundation of their Obligation to devote unto the Lord their Infant Seed: This is wholly over-look'd: and all the Stress is laid upon the Godfathers and Godmothers. The Child is told, that they, when he was Baptiz'd, *did Promise and Vow Three things in his Name*; without any farther Account, how he came to be Baptiz'd. They *Engag'd* for him, and so he stands *Bound*. This is a wrong Bottom; when the Right to Devote him, and consequently to Bind him lies in the Parent or Proprietor at least: Neither can he transfer that Right, if Himself be capable of Acting according to it.

Or let us suppose the Church to have a Right to offer such Children to Baptism as have no Parental Right, (which is what I am not dispos'd to call into Question) yet to have the Admission of such ascrib'd to the Covenanting of their Sureties for them, still appears *an insufficient Bottom*. Unless it could be Evidenc'd, that such Covenanting of the Sureties, gave the

the Infants an Interest in the Covenant between Christ and his Church, which I cannot but Esteem a groundless Fancy.

And as for the other Reason, *viz*. That *Baptism is full and sufficient without Godfathers and Godmothers*, it will come to be consider'd under the next Head.

But Mr. *Ollyffe* will have it, that *I confound the Childs* Obligation *to the Terms of the Covenant, with the Godfathers* Declaration *of it before the Congregation:* And therefore undertakes to *set me Right*. Which is a very kind Office, for which I am Thankful. I should be glad to see the matter well clear'd. In order to it, he gives me to understand, that *the Ground and Foundation of Infant Baptism is twofold*. 1. *On God's Part, His Gracious Promise to Believers, and their Seed, by which he comprehends their Children within the Bond of his Covenant*. 2. *On the Part of the Children, their Obligation to the Terms, and Conditions of the Covenant. This is consequens on the Former, the Covenant being mutual*. Well, this being granted, what follows? Why *the Office of Baptism supposes the Child's Right on the Account of the Covenant of Grace, extending to Believers and their Seed, and accordingly is intended to Represent and Declare the Stipulation and Promise on both Parts; what God Promiseth to the Baptiz'd, and the Baptized Promise again to God*. But I would gladly know how the Office of Baptism can *suppose the Child's Right on the Account of the Covenant of Grace extending to believers and their Seed*, upon Supposition the Child is not the *Seed of Believers.* Would not this be an *insufficient Bottom?* He goes on: *The Minister Authoriz'd by the Lord, Represents his Divine Majesty, declares his Promise*, &c. As to which there is no difficulty. *Then the Godfathers, Authorized by the Parents, Repre-*

Pag. 35.

Pag. 36.

represent the Children, Act in their Name, and declare the Promise that the Children are bound to. Here let it be observ'd, the God-Fathers, not only declare the Children *Bound* whom they *represent* in Baptism, but they actually bind them. And therefore in the Catechism it is so put. Qu. *Dost thou not, that thou art bound to believe and do, as they have promis'd for thee?* Answ. *Yes verily.* If the Children are *bound by their Promise*, there is more than a *Declaration* in the Case. And besides, Children being then considered as a Part of their Parents; as it is thro' them that the Children have a right to the Blessings of the Covenant, so 'tis they that are to put in their Claim to them; 'tis they that are to bind them to the Duties of the Covenant: Neither can I perceive any warrant for them to *authorise* Substitutes herein to Act for them. But when, instead of Parents Covenanting for their own Children, and binding them to be the Lords; here are Substitutes that have no Right to bind them, and they Covenant for them; and the Children as they grow up, are taught that they are bound by their Promise; and this Promise and Vow of theirs in their Name, is in the Office represented, as that on which their Interest in the Blessings of the Covenant is suspended: I cannot see, how Mr. *Ollyffe*'s endeavours at all clear the Matter, or prove, that this Affair stands upon a right and a found Bottom.

And tho' it should be own'd, that there is not now that unanswerable *Pretence of the God-Fathers being beneficial to the Child* as formerly; yet there is still more than can be justify'd. In the former *Common Prayer Book*, when *Faith and Repentance* were said to be *requir'd of Persons to be*

be Baptized? and it was Query'd, *How Infants then were Baptized?* 'Twas answer'd, *Because they perform them by their Sureties.* This was a plain affirming, that the Sureties Faith and Repentance was theirs. But now 'tis alter'd and said, *because they Promise them both by their Sureties*. Which as it is a plain affirming, that the Promise of their representing Sureties, is the Foundation of their Infant Baptism: So it at the same Time (when the Answers made by the Sureties are Personal; *I do believe, I will endeavour to obey:*) Leaves room for a Supposition that these Promises of theirs, supply the Place of actual Faith and Repentance: And so they have been by many represented. Dr. *Comber* ⋆ is very express. *We ought* (says he) *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.*

⋆ *In his Companion to the Temple*, p. 595.

In short then, I return this Gentleman his own Words. *How far preconceived Notions may hinder* Mr. Ollyffe *from Underfunding this, I cannot tell: But whosoever sedately compares* the Office of Baptism, with the Catechism, *must needs see, what is said to be very clear.*

Lastly, To the Objection of the Prophanation, to which this Practice of God-Fathers and God-Mothers as manag'd in the *Church of* England opens a Door: He Replies, *'tis nothing but Mistake and Misrepresentation.* Glad should I be it were so. But here the World must Judge: And will do so, let one side or the other say what they will. He owns indeed, *That there is too great carelessness God-Fathers as well as in Parents, as to Baptiz'd Children:* And I'll as freely own as he can desire me, that I don't doubt, but some God-Fathers have been more careful in the Education of

p. 38, 39.

some

some Children they have stood for at the Font, than many Parents: I have no doubt of the Truth of what he cites from the Reverend Dr. *Bray:* But still, that this keeping up of God-Fathers and God-Mothers in the way of the Church, is one great Occasion of the general Prophanation of this Ordinance, I am fully satisfy'd. But lays Mr. *Ollyffe*, our *Assent and Consent to their* Use, *hath no manner of Reference to other Mens* Abuse *of this, or any other Part of their Work.* A poor Excuse is something better than none. He would do well to consider, whether it is in his Power to do any Thing towards the preventing an *Abuse*, when he once Consents to the *Stated Use*, in the way of the *Church of* England. Can he oblige the Parents, (nay, tho' he has a Canon to back him, that requires all Sponsors should receive the Sacrament) to bring so much as sober Persons to be God-Fathers and God-Mothers? Can he refuse to admit the lewdest Persons in his Parish, to stand for their Neighbours Children; and Answer for his Refusal when he has done? Nay, if he were fix'd in one of the Out-Parishes in *London*, where there are a sort of Men, a Part of whose Livelihood arises from their gain, by standing God-Fathers for those who are not otherwise provided, could he keep off such? Nay, could he allow a sober Parent to Answer for his own Child, rather than a loose and careless God-Father? If not, to say that the *Abuses* are Personal, is meer trifling. And tho' such a a Man as Mr. *Ollyffe* may speak his Heart, when he says *he disclaims and abhors them*, yet it may be Query'd, Whether he did his Duty in putting it out of his Power to any Purpose to oppose them? And whether he is not charge-

Page 40.

able

able with encouraging a corrupt Custom? And whether by favouring a Substitution of God-Fathers in the room of Parents, He do's not contribute to the Support of all the Abuses,that have been this way introduc'd? This may at least deserve his Consideration. Tho' he is pleas'd to say, *I am too large and free in my Accusations*, I charge him not. And yet to give my real Sense, the notorious Scandals in the Church upon this Head, would have justify'd as much freedom as is us'd in my *Abridgement*, had it been purely my own: However when I represented the Sense of those, for whom Mr. *Ollyffe* and his Neighbours profess so great a Respect, and that in their own Words, it falls out unhappily, that they wound their own Friends thro' my sides which yet would be a small Matter too, if they did no damage to Truth, by attempting at all to extenuate, what really cannot be Palliated.

Pag. 39.

But I pass to Mr. *Hoadly*. He *complains*, that the Matter *is not fairly and truly represented, but exprest so as best serves to raise and encrease the Aversion of the People to the Church*. As to which, I am content that others judge. Instead of proving his Charge, He presents me with a let of Queries, as upon the Head of *Ordination*. Tho' the Solution might be fetch'd from what I have return'd to Mr. *Ollyffe*, yet I shall Reply distinctly to his Queries as they lye. And shall put the Answer in my own Name, as designing it should contain my own Sense.

Page 52.

That *Parents are* (according to the Method of the Church) *to provide the Sponsors*, is not to be denied: But that they in this way *properly themselves devote their Children by Baptism. to God,* is what I cannot discern; at least, 'tis what the Church takes no Cognizance of. That

'tis *as much their own Act and Deed, as: if they had no Sponsors*, I deny. For if they had no Sponsors, a solemn explicite Covenanting for their Children would be requir'd: Whereas I doubt not, but Sponsors are provided by Multitudes, that know nothing of the Covenanting Part; that think such Sponsors are only to undertake for the Education of Children; nay, and I doubt, there are Multitudes that go not even thus far: But look upon the whole as a customary sort of Ceremony, a Formality to help the Nurse and Midwife to a spill from the Gossips, and the Infant to a small Present. And this I think I may in a great Measure, charge upon the Office of Baptism. For tho' it is true, the Charge upon these Gossips is very serious, yet is there no due Care taken in the Office to clear this Matter as to the Covenanting Part; and to make it appear, by what Right the Baptized Infant becomes bound by. the *Sacramental Transaction* at the Font. Without all Question, *any Christian may engage himself solemnly for the good Education of another: And his willingness* may give *a Right sufficient to do it*, with the Parents Consent: But it is not another Person's promising to take Care of the Education of my Child if I should Die, that I except against; if that is insisted on for the more abundant Caution, it may do well: But another Mans Personating one-while Me the Father as dedicating my Child to God; and another-while representing my Child as believing, and engaging a sincere Obedience; this is what I cannot understand. I see not what Right any Man can have to this. It seems to me altogether Foreign to the Institution. That *the Parents own Act (where there are Parents) in Offering the Child to Baptism, and providing the Sponsors*,

Page 53.

Sponsors is suppos'd in the Office, I cannot gainsay: But that it is there at all suppos'd, that the Act of Dedication to God is properly theirs, I cannot discern: If it were, the Parents would certainly be admitted to the Engaging Part, and the undertaking the Care of the Education of the Infants Baptiz'd, would be signify'd to be the only thing devolv'd upon the Godfathers. That therefore *the Faith of Parents is the suppos'd Ground according to the Church, of the Child's Baptism in all Ordinary Cases*, to me is far from being clear. For I know not how to reconcile this with the Canon, which says, *that no Parent shall be admitted to answer as Godfather for his own Child.* And what that Consideration which Mr. *Hoadly* has added, *that the Country is Christian*, signifies, I cannot say. For tho' I have Latitude eno' to suppose the Church may have a Right in a Christian Country, to Baptize Infants, whose Parents have no Right to offer them to God in Baptism, (as in the Case of Bastards suppose, and. the Children of Persons Excommunicated, *&c.*) yet where the Parents have a Right, I think it ought to be clearly insisted on; and where any are admitted to Baptism upon the Right of the Church, I think the Form and Method of Management ought to be different; and if it be not, we shall inevitably run into Confusion. And Lastly Tho' *the grossest Abuse of an Institution*, that has a Divine Original, *it not a sufficient Argument against the Institution it self:* Yet where an Institution is *purely Humane* and is ordinarily so manag'd as to interfere with what is *really Divine,* tho' it might be of use if duly regulated, I cannot forbear looking upon my self as oblig'd to Declare my self against it, till that Regulation is fixt, which shall keep the

Divine Institution safe upon its true and proper Bottom.

But since he goes on. I'le freely follow him. *Tho' the Parents are to provide these Sponsors*, I must yet Declare, I think we have good Grounds to urge, *that they are not required to be chosen with due Care*: Because the unfittest Person that could be pitch'd on for Godfathers, if Presenting themselves under that Notion at the *Font,* cannot safely be refus'd. And tho' it be true, that the Care in this Case *to ill be proportionable to the Care and Concern the Parents themselves have for their Children*; yet I think it very far from being proportionable to the Care which the Ministers of Christ ought to take, to keep his Ordinances from becoming Ludicrous. *If Parents* indeed *have no Concern*, it may seem not very likely, *that the matter will be mended by admitting the Parents, without the Sponsors*; And yet it may be much mended, supposing the Ministers of Christ, without being forc'd to Act over-hastily, have a liberty of close Dealing with the Parents, in Order to the making them sensible of their Duty to their Children, before they admit them to be Baptiz'd. Possibly it may be said, the Minister in the *Church of England*, is not debar'd this Liberty: But under Favour, I would desire to know, suppose a Parishoner refuses any such Parly, and yet insists on having his Child immediately Baptiz'd, as presented by Godfathers of Notorious ill Fame, *&c.* How a Minister can justifie his refusal.

For my Part, I have perus'd the *Canons* Universally, both those that are *useful*, and *those that are liable to Exception*; and tho' I cannot find near so many of the Former sort as I should have tho't I might have expected, in the

Case

Case of a Church, whole Purity and Perfection is so much applauded; I yet could not overlook that part of Canon 29, which requires, that none be admitted as Godfathers and Godmothers, *before they have receiv'd the Holy Communion.* And I read it with Pleasure, and should be glad it were observ'd. But Mr. *Hoadly* himself has very much abated my Satisfaction, by furnishing me with a Query, which dashes all my Hopes from that part of the *Canon.* For when he comes afterwards to speak of the *Canons*; he puts this Query, *Are they not such as are generally disus'd, and that disuse not Clandestine, but known, and Conniv'd at by all in Autority?* Truly this I find to be the Case of this part of this Canon. Therefore I think his Answer must take place: *If they be, they concern not the present Ministers.* All that I can say, is. I'm sorry for it. For methinks 'tis odd, that sundry of those Canons that are most liable to Exception should still be binding and those that might be most useful, should be vacated by disuse. In this Case, I think I may justly say, *due Care is not taken*, because the most unqualify'd, cannot be refus'd. *And that a wide Door is open'd to the profaning this Solemnity*, is as Evident, as it is, that the Sponsors very commonly come to stand for Children at the *Font,* out of Courtesie, and in Civility, nay and sometimes they are hir'd to it; without any discernible regard to the Fæderal Nature of the Ordinance, and the Seriousness it requires: And afterwards, (as Dr. *Combert* has observ'd.) ⋆ *They shake off the Charge again, and assign it over to the Parents.* And if Mr. *Hoadly* is so *short-sighted*, as not to *discern* this, I am sorry for it: But, that *it more tends to the profaning this Ordinance, than the Administring it without Sponsors*, is plain from hence,

Part 1. *p.* 157.

Page 54.

⋆ Companion to the Temple. *pag* 612.

hence, that more Persons contract Guilt. If a Father when seriously admonish'd, trifles in this Solemnity, 'tis very sad: But if he not contented to Sin alone, calls in others, who have as little Sense of Divine Things as Himself, to come and act as Parties concern'd in so great a Solemnity, & trifle with him; (and what else can be expected from such Persons?) And they must, in return, do the like for him, upon the same Occasion; the prophaneness this way mightily spreads, and the Guilt is extremely heighten'd. Again; I think I am not *taxing the Church with justling Parents out of their Right*; when if they are fit and willing, they are not allow'd to be the Express Covenanting Parties in that Solemnity, as I am firmly perswaded they ought to be. And withal; tho' the *Faith of the Parents* should *in Ordinary Cases, be the ground of the Administration of this Rite* of Baptism *in a Christian Country*, yet when I find that that is comparatively overlook'd, and the Right of the Church to substitute Covenanting Sureties in the room of Parents, (as well where they are fit as where they are most unfit) is so much insisted on, I see not where the Fault lies in charging this upon the Church as an irregularity. And when these Sureties, that are introduc'd, are not only to promise a due Care of the Education of the Children Baptiz'd, But also to promise Faith and Obedience in their Names, I think I have good Reason to enquire. By what *natural Right* or *positive Law*, their thus Covenanting in their Names is warranted: And I should be glad to have Satisfaction in it. And as to the *arguing from the Carelesness of Godfathers*, *against the use of them*; I would not be mistaken. I am entirely against the Use of *Godfathers* as *Covenanting Sureties*, with

with reference to Faith and Obedience; But Godfathers as Sureties to the Church for the Pious Education of such Children as cannot so safely be trusted with their Parents, or as have no Christian Parents, I readily approve. But then I think it lies upon the Church to insist upon having good security in the Case. And while any Persons that offer are admitted for security; it becomes so trifling a Ceremony, that I think it were better laid aside. But as for Ministers owning their Ministerial Obligations, or Baptiz'd Persons, their Baptismal Obligation, there is no Parallel between their Case and that of Godfathers and Godmothers; any farther than this comes to; that to allow Periods that are known to be unlikely to set themselves to Answer such Obligations, (as long as they are so) with a seeming Solemnity, to pretend to take them upon themselves, is a real bringing them, *to avouch a great untruth in the Face of God and his Church*. But tho' the positive Proof of the Sincerity of other Persons, is difficult in one Case or in another; yet to allow those to take upon them the Ministerial Calling, who betray a profane and careless Spirit as to all Sacred Matters or to allow those publickly to take upon themselves their Baptismal Engagement, who manifest an unconcernedness either about the Blessings design'd that way to be secur'd, or the Duties to which they were to be that way bound; or to allow those to be Publick Undertakers for the Christian Education of Baptized Infants, who are known to have no fear of God before their Eyes; these are things I must desire to be excus'd from at all Encouraging; for I could not do it with a safe Conscience. Pag. 56.

If it be *hard* to intimate, that the Method of Godfathers *encourages Parents in a neglect about their Children*, I should be glad if Observation discover'd there were little or no Reason for it *That the Church* cannot *take off any part of their Duty from Parents,* I am very sensible: But that our Church is defective in her Publick Office, in impressing their Duty upon them, is what many that have not wanted Respect for Her, have complain'd of. And. that she *has more effectually provided for their Children's Advantage,* is sooner said, than prov'd. If *Good Parents can't take Advantage from this Institution to be unnatural and careless of their Children*; 'Tis because they are *Good*, and for that very Reason, they need not this Institution; they would be sufficiently Careful without it: And the Church needs not demand such Security in their Case. For the Sense of their Duty, will make them Faithful while they Live, and Careful to make suitable Provision when they Die. And as for *bad Parents*, tho' *they would have been as careless without Godfathers*, yet when the Church; admits the security they produce as sufficient, who can say, that this won't, nay that it often don't prove a Temptation to them, to think that their Neglects may the more easily be dispens'd with. But, that *their Children would have been in a much worse Condition without Godfathers*, is far from being Evident: For bad Parents seldom procure Godfathers and Godmothers that are better than themselves. While Mr. *Hoadly* then, *bewails the little regard many Godfathers have to the serious Part of their Office*, I must desire him to give me leave to bewail the gross Corruption which is this way crept into the Solemn Ordinance of Baptism, which according to the Ecclesiastical Constitution, Ministers can do.

little or nothing to rectifie in their respective Cures. And tho' *there are some Godfathers are so sensible of their Obligations, as to omit no opportunity of doing their Duty*; Yet while these are so few in number, (and there remains no Hope, as matters stand, it will be otherwise,) He must excuse me, if I don't think they'l much Credit the Institution. Besides; The Questions in the Office for Baptism, deserve some particular Remarks: They are not easily to be Accounted for. They are either design'd for the Infant or for the Godfather. The Infant ask'd whether *he will be Baptis'd* cannot Answer: And to suppose the Godfathers to *desire to be Baptiz'd* is meer Trifling. *Musculus* ★ says, that this Custom of Interrogating Infants is absurd, that it cannot be defended. Questions were indeed in former Ages put to such as were of Years upon this occasion: And those Questions were, afterwards drawn to the Baptism of Infants, either by the Negligence or Superstition of the times that follow'd. The Learned *Spanheim* † says, that this *Mimical Profession of the Sponsors, which is ascrib'd to the Infant, will scarce be found to have taken place before the 8th or 9th Age, when Superstition prevailed*. And were there any thing to be found in the Common Practice of the Dissenters, as odd, or unaccountable, as this of putting Interrogatories to the Sureties, to be answer'd as in their own Persons, on the behalf of the Infants Baptiz'd, I doubt not but we should have it vehemently Exclaim'd against. I have some Reason to believe this Custom hath confirm'd several in their Aversion to Infant Baptism: And cannot but wonder to find so many great Men pleading for it, and endeavouring to defend it; especially when so little is said to support it. Mr.

★ *Loc Commun. Tit. de Baptismo.*

† Vide Ejus Expetitum Judicium Supet Dissidio Anglicano. Op. Tom. 2. p. 1289.

Mr. *Corbet* ⋆ has express'd himself very Judiciously upon this Head. *That form* (says he) *of speaking to the Infant by the Sureties:* Dost thou Renounce, *&c. dost thou Believe, &c. wilt thou be Baptiz'd, &c. wilt thou Obediently keep, &c. and the taking several Answers from him by the Sureties, is not a form of Words expressing ones being devoted or bro't in to God's Covenant by another, but of ones own professed actual Believing, desiring, and Vowing. If it be said, this is spoken of the Sureties in the Childs Name, and 'tis a declaring of what the Child undertakes by his Baptism. I Answer, the Child is not capable of doing any thing in the Case, and the Child doth not and cannot undertake any thing by another as in his name; To say the Infant does these things Passively, and that he doth passively accept the Covenant, is that which I do not understand. I grant, that Baptized Infants are under a Vow of Dedication to God, but not a Vow made by Themselves, but by those whom God hath Authoriz'd to Dedicate them, and by which they are bound, much as by a Vow actually made for themselves when they are capable.*

⋆ *See his Remains. pag.* 156.

In short; I am not averse to Bishop *Sistillingfleet*'s Distinction, of admitting so me Children to Baptism in the Right of their Parents, and others in the Right of the Church. But then I think the way of Management, and the Office ought to see different, in the former Case Godfathers are not so Necessary: In the latter they are requisite. Not to pretend to Covenant for them; but to give the Church Security for the Education of the Infants so admitted. And then there ought to be due Care, that the Security be good; and such as may be reasonably depended on: In which Case, the having recourse to a Canon that neither has nor can have any Effect, while all that offer themselves

selves must be admitted, is far from, giving Satisfaction to any but those who are extreme willing to be Satisfy'd. And I think the Particular Interrogatories should be reserv'd for grown Persons; and no Questions be put to the Godfathers, but about their willingness to look after the Education of the Child.

Sect. VI.

"This *Assent*, *Consent*, and *Subscription*, would "have oblig'd the Ministers, to have deny'd "the Ordinance of Baptism to such as had not "Sponsors, altho' they had a real Right to "that Ordinance, and to be thereby Solemn-"ly Recogniz'd as Born Members of the Vi-"sible Church. Some have herein Question'd "the Reality of the Obligation but as far as "appears upon very weak Grounds. For the "*Canon* Subscrib'd, obliges in Express Words "to use the Form prescrib'd and no other: "And the *Rubrick* declares, there shall be for "every Male Child, to be Baptiz'd, two God-"fathers and one Godmother; and for every "Female one Godfather and two Godmothers. "Consequently all that would Officiate in the "Establish'd Church, must by verbal Declara-"tion and Subscription, bind themselves ⋆ to "deny Baptism to all Children of Godly Pa-"rents, that have not Godfathers and Godmo-"thers, even tho' the Parent be ready to do "his own Part, Professing his Faith, Dedi-"cating his Child to God, and promising a "Religious Education. "Such

⋆ *Some it must be own'd have herein given them-selves a Latitude; but how far they could justifie it, would be a pretty close Enquiry. I remember in Mr.* Henry's *Life, there is a Passage which deserves noting upon this Occasion. One of the Parishioners of Dr.* F. *of* Whitchurch, *desired him to give way, that his Child might be Baptised by another without the Cross, and Godfathers, if he would not do it himself. He refus'd both; and by a Letter return'd this Answer.* For my part, (*saith he*) I freely profess my Thoughts, that the strict

strict urging or indifferent Ceremonies, hath done more harm than good: And possibly had all Men been left to their Liberty therein, there might have meen much more Unity, and not much less Uniformity. But what Power have I to dispense with my Self, being now under the Obligation of a Law, and an Oath? *And he Concludes,* I am much griev'd at the unhappy Condition of my Self, and other Ministers who must either lose their Parishioners Love if they do not comply with them, or else break their Solemn Obligations to please them: *This freedom and openness was certainly more honest, tho' join'd with a seeming Stiffness, than Persons pretending to dispense with themselves, when under the most Solemn Bonds.*

"Such an Agreement our Ministers appre-
"hended Sinful. They durst not causelessly
"deprive Souls of visible Christianity, much
"less damn them for want of an Humane un-
"necessary if not corrupt Invention. They
"durst not make a Covenant to Rob Christ and
"the Church of visible Members for nothing;
"and consign those over to the uncovenanted
"Mercy of God, whom he (they well knew)
"was ready to accept for his: And so con-
"cur in setting the Will and Advice of Man
"against Christ, who said, *forbid them not*; and
"was angry with those, *who forbad them to come to*
"*him.* And it seem'd to them very odd, that the
"same Persons should be so forward to deny
"Baptism to Poor Infants for want of a Forma-
"lity, when yet they apprehended it would
"give them a certain Assurance of Salvation,
"as hath been hinted. before. One of them,
"thus Expreaaes himself upon this matter:
"*Shall a Minister dare to withold so much Good*
"*from, and endeavour so much Evil to, the Souls*
"*of poor Infants in denying them their Christen-*
"*dom, meerly upon the Account of some Accesso-*
"*ries, and scrupled Accidents invented and im-*
"*pos'd by Man, and not at all of the Essence of*
"Bap-

"*Baptism it self? Besides the impiety and irre-*
"*ligion of such a process, the Minister (according*
"*to his own Faith) would be most Cruel and Un-*
"*merciful in so doings and deserv'd, if possible,*
"*to be Unchristned himself again, and turned a-*
"*mong Cannibals, as one more deeply Dipt and*
"*Baptized in their Barbarous inhumanity than any*
"*of themselves: And yet if he be a true Son of*
"*the Church, and punctually observe his prescrib'd*
"*Rule, he must not Baptize any Infant with God-*
"*fathers and Godmothers, whether it be Sav'd or*
"*Damn'd.* This was what our Fathers could
"not Swallow or Digest. ⋆

⋆ Baxter's *Noncon-formity Stated, and Argued*, pag 69. *His Plea for Peace*, pag. 174. *Defence of the Plea for Peace*, pag. 30. *The Letter from a Minister to a Person. of Quality*, &c.

Of denying Baptism, to such as have not Godfathers and Godmothers.

Under this Head, Mr. *Ollyffe*, Asserts himself to be at Liberty to Baptize Children without Godfathers and Godmothers, and so thinks he has Answer'd what was suggested.

⋆ The Ground He goes upon is this. The *Subscription*, is to the Use of the *Form prescrib'd and no other*, i. e. (says he) *no other than what the Common Prayer Book prescribes.* Now *there is in the Common Prayer Book, a Form to Baptize without Godfathers*, viz. *The Form for Private Baptism: which is order'd to be us'd, when there shall be any great Cause or Necessity; or when need shall compel: And of this the Minister is left to be judge. And that if Godfathers, cannot be gotten, or Persons do immoveabley Scruple them, this is a great Cause and Necessity.* And he adds, *That the bringing such Children afterwards to the Church with Godfathers, is not enjoin'd; 'tis only commended.*

⋆ *Pag.* 40.

Pag. 41.

So unwilling am I to bear hard on any Man, that if this would hold, I should be heartily Glad. But having Scann'd it, I'm afraid it won't

won't. And I shall freely give the Reasons and Grounds of my Fear.

That the Rubrick, which requires that all should be *warn'd, that without great Cause and Necessity they procure not their Children to be Baptized at home in their Houses*, refers to danger of Death by Sickness, tho' it be not expresly nam'd, appears to me Evident, from two Circumstanees.

1. It is requir'd in the Rubrick, that immediatly follows, that in Case of such a Private Baptism, *The Ministers say the Lord's Prayer, and so many of the Collects appointed to be said in the Form of Publick Baptism*, [as the time and prefect *Exigence will suffer.*] By this Rubrick Mr. *Ollffiye* will have it, *the Minister is impower'd to lengthen the Office for Private Baptism as he sees Good, out of the Office of Publick Baptism:* But he overlooks the Limitation, added, *as the time, and present Exigence will suffer.* In Private Baptisms, of his sort, in compliance with such as scruple Godfathers, he is not straitn'd for *time*; He cannot pretend it. That plainly supposes Sickness, tho' it is not express'd. And the Sickness that may make Private Baptism Necessary, may be of a different Nature: A Child may be ill, and not in Danger of immediate Death. It may be so ill, as may make the *deferring Baptism till the first or second Sunday*, according to the Expression in the first Rubrick, something Hazardous, and yet there may be no danger of present Death. Or it may be in a Convulsion Fit, and so in danger of Expiring every Moment. In the former Case there may be *time* for some Enlargements; but not in the Latter. And thus far the matter is left to the Ministers Discretion. He is empower'd to judge whether or no there be danger of present Death or only hazard of delaying till the Sunday and so may accordingly enlarge

or

or contract, *as the time and present Exigence will suffer.* This I take to be the Natural Construstion, without the least straining. And any other Sense, is unnatural and forc'd, as far as I can judge.

2. In the Rubrick that follows, it is said, *if the Child, which is after this sort Baptized*, [*do afterwards live*] *it is expedient that it be bro't into the Church*, &c. I'd fain know why this Expression (*if the Child do afterwards Live*) should be us'd if Sickness or danger of Death, was not the Cause of the Necessity of Private Baptism. And I profess I can't see how this can be evaded without quibbling: Besides; the Minister is by the Rubrick only left Judge, as to the Cauie of deferring Baptism, and not as to the Baptizing at home, *&c.* I expert Mr. *Ollyffe* will still say, this is Misrepresentation. I'le therefore give him the Sense of others. Dr. *Hammond* will certainly be own'd to be as considerable a Man as most the Church has had, and as fit a Judge in these Matters. *For Private Baptism* (says he) *that which our Liturgy prescribes is, that all possible Care be taken, that all Children that are to be Baptiz'd, be bro't to Church, and not without great Cause and Necessity Baptized at home in their Houses. And yet when great need shall compel them so to do, then an Order of Admimstring it is prescrib'd, such as in Case the Child die, it may not be deprived of the Sacrament, and in case it live, it may as publickly be presented, and with Prayer receiv'd into the Church, and pronounc'd to be Baptized already, which is equivalent as if it had been Baptized in the Publick. The clear confest ground of this Practice, is the desire of the Church not to be wanting to any, the meanest Creature, in allowing it that which Christ hath given it Right to, and to encourage and satisfie the charitable desires of Parents,*

Dr. Hammond's Works. *Vol.* 1. *p.* 375.

rents, which [in danger of inftant Death] *require it for them.*

p. 584, 585. Dr. *Comber* is another Eminent Person of the Church whose *Companion to the Temple*, is generally allow'd to be an Authentick Exposition of the Common Prayer Book, and is therefore as such put into the Hands of the Scholars in both the Universities very generally. He speaking of *Private Baptism of Infants in Cases of Necessity*. Grafts it upon that Principle, that *there can be no Salvation in an ordinary way without Baptism. Upon the stock of this Principle* (says he) *grew that great Care*, (among the Ancient Christians) *that no Person might die unbaptiz'd, in so much, that it was allow'd*, in danger of Death, *to Baptize the Sick, who had not past thro' all their Preparations, provided they should Answer more fully if God restor'd them. The like care hath our Church taken of little Children. For tho' she require*, (according to Can. 59 of the 6th Council of *Constant.*) *that they should be speedily and publickly Baptiz'd in the House of God, yet in cases of Extremity, she admitteth of that which is done in private Houses, even without Ceremony, upon Condition there may be added more of the Solemnity afterwards, when it is published in the Church; and that it may not be neglected, we are taught*, that [it is certain, by God's Word, that Children Bap-- tiz'd, dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly saved.]

p. 296.

And I find Bishop *Sparrow* in his *Rationale of the Common Prayer* is of the same Sense.

pag. 12. I hope Mr. *Ollyffe* won't tell me in this as in another Case, that I must not think *the Opinion of some great Men, especially if hot Contenders for the Impositions, should determine in this matter.* For I don't know one that has attempted Publickly to explain the Sense of the Church, that herein concurs with him. But

But there is yet another thing, which to me seems Strong and Cogent. I can hardly suppose the Church would have given this single Instance of her regard to tender Consciences, and not have taken Notice of it. Had it been usual with her to have taken this Method; had she left Particulars to the Discretion of her Ministers, for fear People should be injur'd, by being tempted to do Violence to their Consciences; were there but any clear Instance of this kind, that could be produc'd, it would be the more Credible, that it might be so in this Case, tho' there be no Hint of that Nature: But when no such Instance can be produc'd; when throughout the whole Settlement the Principles of Submission is inculcated both on Ministers and People, if they can't prove the things *unlawful*, without any allowance till Persons are satisfy'd they are really *Lawful*; when in all other Cases the Ministers are ty'd down, without leave to relax on the Account of the Scruples of their People, or abate the smallest Ceremony, for the ease of their Consciences, the supposing it should be otherwise, in this Case of Godfathers, looks more like an Evidence of the Pretenders desire than Reality of the thing.

And it is to me a farther Evidence, that the Choice of Private Baptism in the stead of Publick, is not left to the Discretion of the Minister, except in the Case of apparent hazard to Life or Health, because the Service Book represents this Private Baptism as *incomplete*. Not so *incompleat* indeed, as to *Essentials*, as that the actual Baptizing with Water should be repeated: To prevent any Surmize of that kind, 'tis positively declar'd in the,Rubrick, *that the Child so Baptized, is lawfully and sufficiently Baptiz'd, and ought not to be Baptized again:* But 'tis so far

incompleat, that a farther Addition is *Expedient*. For 'tis added; *yet nevertheless if the Child which is after this sort Baptized, do afterward live, it is expedient, that it be bro't into the Church:* And a Form is subjoin'd, in which *Godfathers and Godmothers* are added; with the Sign of the Cross, as in the Form of Publick Baptism. And whereas Mr. *Ollyffe* says, *this is only commended not injoin'd:* I am at a loss for his *Criterion* to distinguish between what is *commended*, and what is *injoin'd*. For there is *shall* in this part of the Rubrick, as well as in all the rest: And the addition of the Word *Expedient*, &c. seems rather to be a condescending Declaration of the Reason of the Command, than a leaving the thing mention'd to be us'd or omitted, at Discretion. And when the Church is pleas'd so far to stoop as to give the Reason of what she Prescribes, I should think that this instead of weakning, much strengthen'd the Injunction.

pag. 41.

But what he adds, is a most Pleasant Turn. *When* (says he) *the Child* (that was Baptiz'd in Private) *is bro't to Church, if it be Baptized by the Minister of the Parish, nothing more is mention'd, than that the Minister should certifie the Congregation, that the Child was before Baptiz'd*. And does Mr. *Ollyffe* really believe, the Form that is added, (which makes such Provision of *Godfathers* and *Godmothers*, and the of the *Sign of the Cross*, for those, who were before in hast Baptiz'd in Private) was only design'd to be us'd in case the Child were so Baptiz'd by another besides the Parish Minister? Or if that be his Real Sentiment, can he give a Reason for it? And shew why when a Neighbour Minister Baptiz'd a Child in his Parish in Private, Godfathers and Godmothers and the Sign of the Cross, should be

be requir'd to be afterwards added in Publick But when he himself did the same thing, he should be excus'd? I doubt he'd be hard put to it.

However, in compliance with his Desire, I have read over the Office of Private Baptism, and yet can't say, that I look upon that which he calls *my Rhetorical Harangue*, as so liable to Censure, as he Represents it. Whether it will hold or no, 'tis none of mine: 'Tis enough if they whose Plea I was endeavouring to convey to Posterity, have made Use of it: As to which his consulting the Authors Cited in the Margin will soon give him Satisfaction. But I must needs say, If Baptiz'd Infants, dying in their Infancy are held to be certainly sav'd; to deny them Baptism for want of the Formality of Godfathers and Godmothers is very hard. And yet this has been often done. 'Tis what the generality of the Conforming Clergy have all along tho't themselves oblig'd to: And they who Baptize without Godfathers and Godmothers, (except in Case of Sickness) are reckon'd but half Conformists.

But Mr. *Ollyffe* says, that *the Supposition* here gone upon, *viz.* That Ministers are not at Liberty to omit Godfathers, meerly because they are scrupled by their Parishioners *hath not the least Ground whatsoever.* And here I leave the Reader, nay I leave the Conforming Clergy in general, to judge between him, and the Ejected Ministers. pag. 42.

But as to the Marginal Note concerning Dr. *F.* of *Whitchurch*, I should have tho't it worth Mr. *Ollyffe*'s while, to have given it a *a distinct Answer*, even tho' it had been *a Digression:* For tho' there are Cases in which such Godfathers and Godmothers as the Canon requires are hard

to get, yet unless the Constitution affords a Dispensation, for omitting them, 'tis hard to say what Warrant Particular Ministers have to dispense with themselves. As to Sponsors that are not Communicants, they are so common, and so universally obtain, that a Man must be Singular that should demur upon admitting them, and would scarce be able to defend himself. But to wave Sponsors, because they are Scrupled, is in this instance to supplant that Uniformity, which the Act of Parliament was design'd to settle.

In 1582, Mr. *Ezekias Morley*, Preacher at *Walsham in the Willows*, in the Diocess of *Norwich,* was indicted at the Assizes; for that when he Baptiz'd a Child, he varied the prescribed Form: And said, Do *you*, for dost *thou* forsake the Devil, *&c.* and will *you have this Child Baptiz'd in this Faith?* For *wilt thou be Baptiz'd in this Faith?* And the Judges committed him to Prison. Which certainly would have been animadverted on, if the least discretionary Variation had been justifiable by Law.

The Bond to exact Conformity, is certainly much stronger now, than it was then. Nor was Dr. *F.* under any different Obligations from Mr. *Ollyffe*; only he tho't his Obligation stricter than Mr. *Ollyffe* will allow it. And thus far he was Commended, and is still; that when he tho't himself confin'd, in this as well as in other Points, to keep up an exact Uniformity, he would not yield to an abatement in Practice, in Compliance with the request of his Parishioners, tho' he would have been glad to have had the Obligation bated him. And for my part, I am so far of his Mind, (without designing Offence to Mr. *Ollyffe*, or any Man else,) that if I had bound my self *in the general* to Uni-

for-

formity, I should not think my self at Liberty *in Particulars*, at least, unless I had the Dispensation of my Diocesan. And this Mr. *Ollyffe* is so far from having, that the Bishop of his Diocess, has publickly declar'd his Dislike and given a contrary Charge to his Clergy. ★

★ *See Bp. of* Lincoln's *Visitation Charge*; pag. 13.

That Mr. *Hoadly* is of the same Mind, I connot say: Tho' it seems to look this way, that he passes this matter by, on which Mr. *Ollyffe* lays such a stress; and only justifies the Imposition of Godfathers and Godmothers, among Terms of Communion. And what he says upon the Head of Impositions has been consider'd in the Introduction, and need not be here repeated.

Part I. p. 56, 57.

"4thly, This *Assent* and *Consent*, and *Sub-*
"*scription*, oblige to Sign the Infants in the
"Administration of Baptism with the Transi-
"ent *Sign of the Cross*, and to deny Baptism
"to the Children of such as refuse it.

"As for the using the *Sign of the Cross*, in
"Baptism, some were much more against it
"than others: But the generality of the Si-
"lenc'd Ministers regarded it as a *Sacrament*
"superadded to that which our Blessed Lord
"had instituted. For there is *an outward visi-*
"*ble Sign* a transient Image of a *Cross*, made
"by one that acteth as a Minister of Christ,
"and receiv'd in the Forehead by the Baptiz'd.
"The *thing Signify'd* is both the work of Re-
"demption purchasing Grace, and the Grace
"given as the Fruit of that Purchase. *Can.* 30.
"Thus Expresses it. *The Holy Ghost by the*
"*Mouths of the Apostles, did Honour the Name*
"*of the Cross so far, that under it he comprehended*
"not only Christ Crucified, but the Force, Effects,
"and Merits of his Death and Passion, with all

"*the Comforts, Fruits and Promises which we re-*
"*ceive or expect thereby. The* Church of Eng-
"land hath retain'd still the Sign of it in Baptism
"*following therein the Primitive and Apostolical*
"*Churches, and accounting it a lawful outward*
"*Ceremony, and honourable Badge, whereby the in-*
"*fant is* Dedicated, *to the Service of him that*
"*died on the Cross, as by the Words of the*
"*Common Prayer Book may appear.* Which
"Words are these: *We Receive this Child into*
"*the Congregation of Christ's Flock, and do Sign*
"*him with the Sign of theCross, in token that he*
"*shall not be ashamed to confess the Faith of Christ*
"*Crucified, and Manfully to Fight under his Ban-*
"*ner, against Sin, the World and the Devil, and*
"*to continue Christ's Faithful Servant and Soldier*
"*unto his Lives End, Amen.* So that the thing
"Signify'd, is Christ Crucify'd with the Bene-
"fits of his Cross. And the Image of the
"Cross is appointed to *work* this *Grace*, by
"way of exciting Signification. And it is ex-
"presly made Mans *covenanting Sign*, by which
"he bindeth himself to Fidelity; engaging,
"that *he will not be asham'd to confess the Faith*
"*of Christ Crucify'd*, &c. All Covenant Duty
"that is Requir'd on Man's part is hereby pro-
"mis'd: And the Canon Declares, it is a *De-*
"*dicating Sign*. So that it seemeth a Sacrament
"of Mans, added to that of Christ. And tho'
"it be a Bond only on Man's part, and have
"nothing in it of an Assurance on God's part,
"which is what hath been often Reply'd; yet
"taken so, it seems no small Reflection. For
"it looks as if Baptism, as Christ had Appoint-
"ed it, were esteem'd a Bond not sufficiently
"Firm and Strong, and therefore needed some
"Addition, whereby Men might be ty'd the
"faster to Him, and bound the more firmly to

their

"their Duty. Our Fathers, who knew any "thing of this kind would be resented by an "Earthly Prince, could not understand upon "what just Grounds we might presume to make "more Bold with the Great Law-Giver in the "Christian Church. And tho' in the Form of "Words us'd, the *Sign of the Cross* is said to be "*in token* he shall not be asham'd to Confess "the Faith of Christ Crucify'd, yet the gene-"rality are apt to Understand it, as if it had "been said, that *in Vertue and Power of this* "*Sign* the Person Baptiz'd should not be asham'd "to Confess the Faith of Christ Crucify'd; "but should Fight Manfully under Christ's Ban-"ner against Sin, the World and the Devil. "Now they durst not Concur in giving even an "Occasion (knowingly) of such a Misunder-"standing to the Vulgar and Injudicious.

"Tho' Christians in the Primitive Times "might make Use of the *Sign of the cross*, yet "the very same Reasons which might put them "upon that Use with a Reference to the *Hea-*"*thens*, should in the Judgment of the Silenc'd "Ministers, have mov'd us now wholly to dis-"use it, with Reference to the *Papists*. Pro-"fessors then Sign'd themselves with the *Sign* "*of the Cross*, to distinguish themselves from "the *Pagans*, who Scorn'd the Cross, with "every Sign and Token of it: And with Pa-"rity of Reason they tho't we should forbear "now so doing, to distinguish our selves from "the Idolatrous *Papists* who superstitiously "Adore the Cross, foolishly Signing themselves "with it upon every Occasion, thinking them-"selves no good Catholicks without so doing, "and putting no little hope and Confidence in "it, to Free and Protect them from all Evil, "and to furnish and invest them with all good.

"Now that they might Witness their Dislike "and Detestation of the Vanity of the *Papists* "herein, they could not unfeignedly Assent "and Consent to the Retaining of this Sign.

"But their Offence at it was much the more "heighten'd, in that the life or Neglect of it, "was not left to the Ministers Discretion, but "wheresoever it was refus'd Baptism was to "be deny'd. For the Subscription that was "requir'd, expresly oblig'd to *use no other Form*, "(therefore to be suire not in the Office of "Baptism) than that in the Book. And the "Form or Baptism there inferred, Could not "be used by one who omitted the Cross. They "could not herein agree, because they found, "that such a Promise and Covenant as was "requir'd always to Use that Sign in Baptism, "was a consenting to the altering the Terms "of Christ's Covenant, and Sacrament, and to "contradict one of his Fundamental Laws. "Baptize, saith Christ, all that are made Dis-"ciples; all that Repent and Believe. No, "saith the *Convocation*, Baptize none that are "propos'd, tho' they have all that is Necessary "to make them Disciples of Christ, unless they "will take the Transient Image of a Cross, "for their farther Obligation. Here was a "mamfest Encroachment upon the Kingly Pow-"er of our Saviour, in making New Terms of "Communion, which they durst not Concur "in: A turning the Keys upon those whom "they knew Christ was ready to Receive: And "a Positive rejecting such as he required them "to Baptize. And this (as light as others "made of it) was in their Esteem a Sin of "an high Nature, and so would be their con-"senting to it also. ★ Mr.

★ Baxter's *Nonconformity Stated and Argued*, pag. 72,75. *His Plea for Peace*, pag. 116. *His Defence*

Defence of the Plea for Peace ,pag. 39. *The Letter from a Minister to a Person of Quality, shewing some Reasons for his Nonconformity*. Corbets *Remains*, p.150. Troughton'*s Apology for the* Non-Conformists, *page* 35. Alsop'*s Mischief of Impositions*, pag. 86. *Baxter*'s *Second True Defence of the meer* Non-Conformists, *Chap*. 10. page 153. *Eleutherii* (i. e. *Hickmannii*) *Apologia pro Ejectis in* Anglia *Ministris*, page 102.

Mr. *Ollyffe* hath the same way to evade the Obligation to a constant life of the *Cross*, as of *God-Fathers and God-Mothers*. He won't believe that he is oblig'd. *A Minister omitting any part of the prescrib'd Offices and contemptuously*, he owns *doth lay himself open to Censures: But that a Minister cannot use a Form, where upon urgent Reasons, without scandal, he omits one small Part; or that by such Omission he breaks his Subscription, to use no other Form*; He cannot understand: Nay, he thinks I'm *the first Man that ever Asserted it*. But what says the Law? It runs thus: *To the intent that every Person within this Realm, may certainly know the Rule, to which, he is to conform in Publick Worship, and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of* England. *Be it Enacted, That each Minister shall be bound to say and use the Morning Prayer*, &c; *and shall openly and publickly declare his unfeigned Assent and Consent to all, and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd in and by the Book intituled the* Book of Common Prayer, *and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*, &c. It is hence obvious to any Mans Observation, that the Act of Uniformity aims at obliging all to a Conformity to the *Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*, as well as to the Use of the *Forms* in the Liturgy: And therefore the Assent and Consent is to *Rights and Ceremonies*, as well as to *Forms*; and according to

Pag. 43. *Of the Sign of the Cross.*

pag. 44.

to Mr. *Ollyffes* own Concession, that *Assent* and *Consent* is to be Extended to every thing so contain'd as to be prescrib'd; (which is the Case of the *Cross in Baptism*) and how after all this it should be left to the Ministers Discretion, whether he'll use or omit it, I must confess. I'm wholly at a loss. But sure says Mr. *Ollyffe*, he may *upon urgent Reasons, and without Scandal omit such a Matter as the Cross?* I Reply, the Constitution of our Church knows no urgent Reasons, but present danger of Death. Every Man is responsible that omits the least Ceremony. He can't *without scandal* omit a Ceremony positively prescrib'd: For that is either a setting up his own Judgment, in Opposition to that of the Church; or a bending the Publick Settlement (than which nothing can be more inflexible) in compliance with the Scruples of his Parishioners. If the *Subscription* herein leaves any Latitude, (which I must: confess I cannot discern) the *Assent and Consent* takes it away again, and allows not of an Omission of the smallest Ceremony. As for what he repeats as to the Office of Private Baptism, where the Sign of the Cross is not prescrib'd, I refer to my Answer under the foregoing Head, as to God-Fathers and God-Mothers. And tho' he is pleas'd *again to call me to Repentance, for exaggerating Expressions grounded on unproved Assertions*; yet I shall coolly let him pass with this Request: That for the Time to come he'll avoid such Flights for the sake of Religion; if not, for the Credit of the Cause he is engag'd in. For when those things are charg'd as Crimes, which upon search have another Aspect; and Men are call'd to Repentance before a just Foundation is laid for their Conviction; it may prove a Temptation to

many,

many, to think the more slightly of the Call of Ministers to Repentance, and despise the Cause that is supported by such Methods.

But Mr. *Ollyffe* can't satisfie himself without defending the life of the *Cross*, notwithstanding that for his own Part, he seems as willing it should be laid aside, as us'd. I'll consider his Reply, to what the silenc'd Ministers objected. He says, that *the Use of this Sign is not in Baptism, but after it.* Be it so, it makes no mighty Difference, if it equally excludes the Children of Persons who are dissatisfy'd. pag. 44.

But whereas 'twas objected by several. *That the Cross seem'd a Sacrament, superadded to that which our Blessed Lord hath instituted*; He says, 'tis *a heavy Charge, but manifestly unjust:* And thereupon flies out and charges the gross Ignorance, that many live in as to the Nature of Sacraments; nay, and the *Socinian* Errour too, that has dwindled Sacraments to meet Signs, upon this Notion: And whether this Charge (upon Men whose Piety and Worth is elsewhere so much applauded) be not more *heavy* and more *manifestly Unjust*, than the other, let any indifferent Person Judge. pag. 45.

Well: *He'll prove to all unbyass'd Persons, that no one thing proper to a Sacrament is ascrib'd to the Use of this Sign in the Church of* England. And I'll follow him. *Three Things*, he says, *are proper to Sacramental Signs.* 1. *That they be Signs from God to Man, of what Grace he will give or promise.* 2. *That they be a Means appointed to receive this Grace, and sanctify'd to that End. And* 3. *That they be a Pledge or Seal to the worthy Receiver, that the Promise shall be made Good.* For my Part I'll frankly own, that the Word *Sacrament* being manifestly of Humane Rise, I am not for laying that Stress upon it one way or ano- pag. 46.

another as some may do. The Sense affix'd to it is Arbitrary: And when Persons frequently use it, in different Senses; Controversies may be easily multiply'd, but they are not much to my Edification. However, when Persons tell us distinctly in what Sense they understand the Word, we may be the better able to judge, how far according to their Notions, any thing is made a *Sacrament* among them. But then this cannot be deny'd, that one and the same thing, may have nothing in it of a *Sacramental Nature*, according to one set of Notions which may bid fair for being a complete *Sacrament*, according to the Notion that others entertain of such a sacred Solemnity.

Pag. 47. *It is never pretended by the Church of* England (says Mr. *Ollyffe*,) *that the Cross is any Sign from God to Man of any Promise made by him: But it is a Sign from Man to Man, notifying what the Congregation expects from the Baptized Person.* In this I confess, I am not so clear. For tho' the Words in the *Common Prayer Book*, might possibly be fairly eno' reconcil'd with this Notion, yet I can't say the same of several Expressions in that *Canon*, which was design'd to explain this Matter, upon Occasion of which this Gentleman so much insults. For 'tis not only there said. That *the Holy Ghost by the Mouths of the Apostles, did Honour* [*the Name of the Cross*] *so far, that under it he comprehended not only Christ Crucify'd) but the Force, Effects, and Merits of his Death and Passion, with all the Comforts, Fruits, and Promises which we receive or expect thereby:* But 'tis also added under the next Head; *and this Use of the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, was held in the Primitive Church, as well by the Greeks as the* Latins, *with one Consentr and great Applaufe; At what time if any had op-*

Can. 30.

pos'd

pos'd themselves against it,they would certainly have been censur'd as Enemies of the Name of the Cross and conseqttently of Christ's Merits, the Sign whereof they could no better endure. Mr. *Ollyffe* need not *go a side and half off* for this latter Passage, for 'tis in the same Page with the former. And since *the Sign of the Cross* is here said to *be the Sign of the Merits of Christ*, I think what he asserts cannot hold, that it only *notifies, what the Congregation cxpects from the Baptized Person*, and not what *God Promises*. For if the Cross be a *Sign of Christs Merits*, it represents that on which all the Promises of God are bottom'd. 'Twould be a poor Shift to say, that this is spoken concerning the *Primitive Church*, when it is so expresly added in the latter Part of the Canon; that *the Church of* England *hath retain'd still the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, following therein the Primitive and Apostolical Churches:* Plainly insinuating, that tho' they differ from the *Popish* Church, yet the *Church of* England has the same Sense of this Matter as the *Primitive Church*; which is *Connexion* sufficient, tho' Mr. *Ollyffe* was not aware of it. But to put it out of all Question, that more was hereby intended, than *the notifying what the Congregation expects from the Baptiz'd Person*, 'tis farther added, that the Church of *England accounts this a lawful outward Ceremony and honourable Badge, whereby the Infant is* [*Dedicated*] *to the Service of him that dy'd upon the Cross*. And if it be a *Dedicating Sign*, at the same Time as it is *a Sign of the Merits of Christ*, it looks as if it were intended to carry in it, something of an Assurance, that an Interest in the *Merits of Christ thereby signify'd*, was convey'd to him, who by this Sign was solemnly *Dedicated to his Service*. It is a Sign from Man to

pag. 48.

to God, as it is a *Dedicating Sign*; and from God to Man, as the *Merits of Christ* are thereby signify'd, and those Promises ratify'd, which God only can fulfil. This is natural, tho' the Word *Sacrament* or *Sacramental*, should be intirely dropp'd.

Pag. 49.

But (2.) Mr. *Ollyffe* farther Asserts, that the Cross *is not pretended by the Church of* England *to be any Means ordain'd for the partaking of Grace, nor is any Efficacy or Virtue ascrib'd unto it, or any use thereof*. And it having been objected from Mr. *Baxter*, that *it was appointed to work Grace by way of exciting Signification*, he strangely Triumphs, *and challenges me to Name one single Person, of any tolerable Understanding, for these hundred Years past, that ever so tho't or said*. I hope he won't lay stress upon the very individual Words, but will yield it sufficient to all intents and purposes, if I can produce him the same in Sense express'd by others of his Church; and upon that Condition, I accept his Challenge; and refer him to Dr. *Comber*, in whom he will find these Words, when he is explaining Sign of the Cross. *It is a shame to follow such a Leader, with a faint Heart, or to fly from these happy Colours, when we have so good Assurance, that if we keep close to them* [in this Sign] *we shall overcome the Cross doth shew our Captain died for us, and therefore it doth* [incite] *us to follow him unto the Death, striving against Sin*. If this amounts not to what Mr. *Baxter* advanc'd upon this Head, I'm wholly at a loss for the Sense of it. Why Mr. *Ollyffe* should fix just a hundred Years in this Case I can't imagine, unless it were to exclude Mr. *Hooker*, who is so generally Cited with the Character of *Judicious*; who is herein directly against him. But I shall cite his Words, notwithstanding they

Page 50.

Companion to the Temple, p. 606.

they were written above a hundred Years ago. Speaking in Vindication of the Sign of the Cross he calls it, *That Holy Sign, which bringeth forthwith to Mind, whatsoever Christ hath wrought, and we vowed against Sin. It cometh hereby to pass, that Christian Men never want a most effecttal, tho' a silent Teacher, to avoid whatsoever may deservedly procure shame.* In my Apprehension, this is the very same thing that Mr. *Baxter* asserted, at which Mr. *Ollyffe* is so Angry. And it is the more remarkable, because Dr. *Hammond* writing a good while after upon these Matters, refers to what was said by Mr. *Hooker* upon this Head, as fully Satisfactory ★ so that we may reckon we herein have his Sense, and Mr. *Hooker*'s together. Let any Man consider this, and then Judge, whether the Ground of Mr. *Baxter*'s Objection upon this Head, was as Mr. *Ollyffe* pretends, *contrary to the good Rule of Charity and Justice at first laid down.* But,

Eccl. Pol. Book 5. pag. 248.

★ *See his Works*, Vol. 1. p. 370. *Sect.* 29.

3. He says, *The Cross is not a Seal or Pledge of Grace.* But whereas it was Objected, *That it is made a Bond on Mans Part, and the Canon declares it a Dedicating Sign; and it looks as if Baptism were not esteem'd a Bond sufficiently firm, but needed some Addition whereby Men might be ty'd the faster*; He says, the Canon declares, *That the Sign us'd, doth add nothing to the Vertue and Perfection of Baptism, nor being omitted doth detract any thing from the Vertue of it.* And if this were adher'd to, methinks a Minister should be able to answer for the neglect of this Ceremony: Which yet if we judge by past Ecclesigastical Proceedings we may very well Question. But however, tho' it should not be asserted to be absolutely unwarrantable, for us upon Occasion, significantly to express our Sense of our Engage-.

Page 50.

page 51.

Engagements to be the Lords, (which is the Thing Mr. *Ollyffe* contends for) yet to fix such a Ceremony, as but an Appendage to a Divine Institution, requiring a Compliance with it from others, does not therefore instantly become warrantable; no nor a Compliance with it neither. And tho' *an Earthly Prince would not resent it, if his Loyal Subjects having taken the Oath of Allegiance, should afterwards by fitting Actions, declare, that they have done so, and were not asham'd to own it*; yet if a number of them pretending to a Power over the rest, which He never gave them, should require all that take the *Oath of Allegiance*, at the same time to use such an outward Sign, in token of their Obligation by it; or else they should not be allow'd to Swear *Allegiance*, or be look'd upon as Subjects; I am apt to believe it would be resented highly both by Prince and Subjects; by the former as an invasion of his *Perogative*; and by the latter as an Encroachment upon their *rightful Liberty*.

pag. 51.

If a *Dedicating* and a *Declarative* Sign be all one, as he Asserts, the Convocation express'd themselves very unaccountably. And if he refer to Bishop *King* for farther Evidence upon this Head, I hope I may, without Offence, refer to Mr. *Boyse*, in Answer to him.

pag. 52.

But for the closing Reflection, I think verily it might have been spar'd. For I can see no Reason in the World for his Boast in these Words; *in this Case there seems to be no difference amongst all the Understanding Subfcribers to the use of this Sign:* When it is so well known, that some of that Number think themselves oblig'd to use it continually; while others reckon themselves at Liberty to omit it, to satisfie the Scrupulous: As also, that some are warm for the exciting Use of this Sign, which with others comparatively is little set by. As

pag. 54.

As to Mr. *Hoadly,* we have not a word from him as to any such Liberty, as Mr. *Ollyffe* pleads for, to omit the *Sign of the Cross*, upon any Occasion, not Particularly specify'd in the Liturgy: And as for the imposing it, he Treats not of it Distinctly; yet he also thinks fit to consider the Objections I had advanc'd from others, without any Signification of my own Sense upou the matter.

It was objected, *Tho' in Form of Words Us'd, the Sign of the Cross is said to be* [*in Token*] *he shall not be asham'd to confess the Faith of Christ Crucify'd, yet the generality are apt to understand it as if it had been said, that* [in Vertue and Power of this Sign] *the Person Baptiz'd should not be asham'd to confess the Faith of Christ Crucify'd but should Fight Manfully under Christ's Banner, against Sin, the World, and the Devil. Now the Ejected Ministers durst not concur in giving even an Occasion (knowingly) of such a Misunderstanding to the Vulgar and Injudicious.* Upon this Occasion he is very Warm: And cries out, *what end of our Differences can we ever hope, such Methods are taken!* Why what's the matter Sir,? He intimates, that *when there is no Reason against a thing, what is acknowledged to be unreasonable, is made an Objection against it.* That's hard, I must confess; But then the Query is, who are Guilty? 'Tis more easie to insinuate, that the Ejected Ministers are herein chargeable, than to prove it. Which of them own, that there is no reason against the *Sign of the Cross*, against which they have all along so freely Objected? And where do they acknowledge, that that is unreasonable, which they object against it.

Part 1. pag. 58.

For my Part, I'm as free to declare as Mr. *H.* that if they had *no Reason against* the Sign of the Crors, they were *unreasonable to object against it:*

And they were egregiously so, if they made that an Objection against it, which at the same time, *they acknowledg'd to be unreasonable:* But Mr. *H.* intimates at the same time, that that Sense, which the generality are said to put upon the Words us'd upon this Occasion, is *a Sense which it is impossible they should be meant in.* With him 'tis impossible for those words *in token the Person shall not be asham'd*, &c. to have this for their meaning: That *in Vertue and Power of this Sign, he shall not be asham'd*, &c. And does Mr. *H.* really think it impossible for Persons to apprehend this to be their Meaning? I'd fain know how much short of it, what is before Cited out of Dr. *Comber* and Mr. *Hooker* falls? I am so far from herein agreeing with him, that by the Representation of those who have taken most Pains in explaining *the Sense of the Church*, I should take that to be the true, real, and intended meaning. When therefore this is call'd a *Misunderstanding* it refers not to the Sense of the Words, but a Mistake in the Reality of the Thing. The Ejected Ministers fear'd, the Baptismal Use of the *Sign of the Cross*, in the way prescrib'd, would prove a Temptation to many, to ascribe Vertue and Power to that *Sign*; which they durst not Encourage; because of the unhappy Consequences. And now what's all this to *Occasional Communion*? What relation is there between refusing to *Assent and Consent* to the constant use of the *Cross*, for fear others should be tempted to ascribe too much Vertue and Power to it; and the *concurring in Occasional Communion*, *while some injudicious Persons have misunderstandings about it.* The Connexion is but odd. And what follows is yet more so: He very pleasantly adds, *While you use our Service thus, we imagine you have done it some Credit, by granting as you*

you here, do, that they are injudicious Persons, who can understand by the words here us'd, that any Grace is suppos'd by the Church, to be wrought by this Sign or the Use of it, &c. Let him make his best of it. All that I shall say, is this: Had I been aware he would have given my Words such a Turn, I would have express'd my self thus; *Now they durst not Concur in giving Encouragement knowingly, to such an Erroneous Conceit, as that of the Power and Vertue of the Cross, among the Vulgar and Jnjudicious.* This he may be assur'd was my Real meaning: And in this, the Successors of the Ejected Ministers, do also agree with them. They are therefore against the *Use of the Cross*, beeause it Encourages so many to ascribe Vertue meerly to the *Sign* of it, attending upon Baptism; and the more so, because they find so many Men of Learning and Eminence running that way, as well as the more Vulgar and Injudicious. Pap. 59.

Whereas it was farther Objected, that the adding the Cross to Baptism, *looks as if that Ordinance as Christ has Appointed it, were esteem'd a Bond not suffciently firm and strong, and therefore needed some Addition, whereby Men might be tied the faster to him, and bound the more firmly to their Duty:* He Answers, The Church is herein clear, who has Declar'd, *that Baptism is Compleat without it.* If so, 'tis the more unaccountable, that Ministers should be Suspended and Silenc'd, barely for omitting it; Of which, I could give a great many Instances in former Times: And who can say, they will never be reviv'd? But he adds, that there is the like Objection against *Prayers at Baptism*, or *the Addition of the least Circumstance to the Primitive Irtstitution. It may be said, that this looks as if Baptism as Christ had appointed it, were esteem'd*

not sufficient to intitle the Infant to the favour of God, &c. And does Mr. *H.* really apprehend, that Praying to God for his Acceptance of an Infant when it is Dedicated to his Service, in the way he has requir'd, is as Real an Addition to the Institution, as the Signing it with the *Sign of the Cross?* Did not our Lord himself Pray at the other Sacrament of the Supper, and thereby teach us, that Prayer was a fit and requisite Attendant of such a Solemnity? Are we not bid to *Pray always*? And can it be deny'd, that that Precept extends to all Cases, in which a Dependence upon the Divine Blessing is fit to be recollected? And is not this a Case of that Nature? And are we not told, that the Creature is *Sanctify'd by the Word of God and Prayer?* 1 Tim. 4.5. And if it be so in the Case of Food, is it not rather more so, when any Creature of God is set apart from a Common to a Sacred Use, as Water is in the Ordinance of *Baptism?* And when we find Prayers accompanying all Oblations, can it be an indifferent thing whether they accompany the Offering a little one to God, as a part of his Right? Can any thing of this Nature be pleaded in the Case of the life of the *Cross*? If not, 'twas to little purpose for him to say, *you know* Baptism *is sufficient without one prayer, and yet this is no* pag. 60. *Objection to you against the Use of Prayers at such a Solemnity*. To speak freely, I can't conceive *Baptism* without Prayer. I can't conceive a Parent with any thing of Concern devoting his Child to God in Baptism, without lifting up his Heart to God, begging his Acceptance. It Is possible there may not in a particular Case be time for the verbal uttering a regular and well formed Prayer, according to the nature of the Solemnity; and yet the Baptism may be *Suf-*

ficient

ficient: But a mental Prayer at least, or what is tantamount to Prayer, is in my Apprehension Necessarily imply'd in the Act of Dedication. And therefore, tho' *Baptism may be Sufficient* without the verbal uttering of a regular Prayer, *yet this is no Objection against the Use of regular and well form'd Prayers at such a Solemnity*, where there is Opportunity for them. And when he can shew a like expediency of using the *Cross* when there is time for it, as we can do of solemn Prayer? and can make it Evident, that the Nature of the Ordinance of *Baptism*, implies and requires one as much as the other; this Hint may possibly prove of some Use; but not till then.

It being farther Objected, that the Cross, *seems a New Sacrament added to Christ's*; He pleasantly Harps upon the Word *seems:* And since he's so fond of such turns. I'le add, that he *seems* to me to forget how easily they may be retorted upon him. But what he replies under this Head, is Answer'd before, in my Return to Mr. *Ollyffe*.

Whereas the Ejected Ministers were therefore the more against the *Sign of the Cross*, because of the Idolatrous Use the *Papists* had made of it, Mr. *Hoadly* does not *think it a sufficient Reason for the total Neglect of it, that we may witness our dislike, and detestation of the Vanity of the Papists.* As to which, I must say, if the Use of it had been of Divine Original, I should have freely Concurr'd with him: But when there is no room for any such Plea, I think it makes a great Alteration, pag. 64.

For tho' where an Institution really is *Divine*, and so has in it either Necessity or Expediency, it would give them a *great Advantage against us, if in reforming from them, we should not only reject*

and condemn the abuse of that thing, but the thing *it self, meerly because they use it after a Superstitious manner:* Yet where the Custom had its rise from Man, was Originally a precarious Fancy, and has neither Necessity of Conveniency belonging to it, if they have grosly abus'd it, I think we may very safely discard it; Nay, to do it would be our Wisdom. I know of no *great Deformities* or *Irregularities* the Principle thus limited either has been or can be *the Cause of*. I think it ought especially to take place in this Case, because it has not only been *us'd by the Papists in a* grosly *Superstitious manner*, but *it is likely to be even now abus'd* among us; and is so by many. On which Account, 'tis rather *Humour* than *Reason*, that makes Protestants so fond of retaining it. And if the Arguments bro't against it, do not shew, that it may not *Lawfully be us'd*, yet I think eno' has been said by many, to prove, that it cannot *Lawfully be impos'd*; and, that when it is impos'd, it may be very warrantably refus'd; and that our Ejected Ministers are justifiable, in refusing to bind themselves, by a Subscription, and verbal Declaration, to the stated Use of it.

Upon the whole, tho' I don't think the Controversie about this Ceremony, whether it is of a Sacramental Nature or not, to be of that importance as many have done, on either side; yet I think it unwarrantably impos'd. I cannot, I must Confess, look upon it as any other than a Weakness to lay any great stress on the use of the Sign of the Cross; when Learned Men cannot, to this Day, agree in the true and proper Form of the Cross. I am withal herein much of Bishop *Taylor*'s ★ Mind, *viz*. That *a Symbolical Rite of Humane invention to signifie what it does not effect and then introduc'd into the Solemn Worship*

★ *Duct. Dub. Book* 3. *Chap.* 4. *p.* 668.

Worship of God, is so like those vain Imaginations and Representments forbidden in the Second Commandment, that the very suspicion is more against Edification, than their Use can pretend to. And tho' I won't Censure those that use it yet I so far insist upon my Liberty, (which I know no Mortal that has Power to debar me of) that I could not Satisfie my self to come under an Obligation statedly to use it. For tho' I won't say 'tis to all unlawful to use it, yet to deny Baptism to Infants whose Parents Scruple it, is an unspeakable Hardship, and not to be justify'd. And thus far I under this Head heartily, and as far as I can Judge, with very good Reason, Concur, with the Ministers who were Ejected.

"5. This *Assent*, and *Consent*, and *Subscrip-* Sect.VIII.
"*tion*, would oblige them to Reject all such
"from the Communion, as would not Receive
"it Kneeling.

"That it would have herein Oblig'd them
"is plain, in that the Canon forbids Ministers,
"upon pain of Suspension, to give the Sacra-
"ment to any that do not Kneel, which Ca-
"non explains the meaning of the Rubrick in
"the Liturgy, and intimates that, *give it to*
"*them Kneeling*, is equivalent to, *give it only to*
"*such*. It was indeed Asserted by the Dispu-
"tants on the Church side at the *Savoy*, that
"the Liturgy *only requir'd it should be given*
"*Kneeling, but did not forbid the giving it to*
"*others*. But it was generally contradicted by
"the other Commissioners, and particularly
"those, who were upon the Secret. Indeed
"this would be to set the Liturgy, and the Ca-
"nons at Variance, whereas they are really all
"of a piece.

"Thus to exclude, all that should refuse "Kneeling at the Communion, was what they "could not Consent to: Because it was a "making New Terms of Church Communion; "a contradictng Christ's appointed Terms, "which require all Christians to Receive each "other in Love and Concord, and not to "doubtful Disputations: A depriving Christ's "Members of their Right; an Usurpation up- "on Mens Consciences and a tearing the "Church by dividing Engines. Even those of "them who could not charge Kneeling as sin- "ful, and who could themselves have com- "ply'd with it, were yet afraid of excluding "others upon such an Account as that, by Rea- "son it was far from being a Necessary mat- "ter. And withal Persons might have very "good Reasons to be backward to yield to the "altering of that Posture that was used by our "Saviour in the Administration, and to be Shy "of seeming to Symbolize with Idolaters, in "using that Posture which is well known to be "used by the *Papists*, with an intention of "*Adoration*, as to the Elements which, tho' "disclaim'd by the *Church of England*, is yet "apt to be misinterpreted. Suppose a Man "should, upon searching Church History, find "that the Posture of Kneeling at the Com- "munion was never requir'd in the Church, "till the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* was "Establish'd; this alone, (tho' he should have "nothing farther to Allege) might be a va- "lid Reason for his being shy of that Posture: "But for Ministers to enter into any such "Combination, as to be oblig'd to tell such a "Man when Offering himself to Communion; "Truly, Sir, while you are under this Scruple, "tho' I may pity; you for your Weakness, yet

"I can't own you for a Christian; this they "tho't hard: And the more so, in that equal "Care was not taken to keep off from the "Communion, Persons evidently unqualify'd, "and unworthy, either thro' Ignorance or Im-"morality; unless by such a Method as was "likely to do more Hurt than Good.

"This of being bound to Reject from the "Communion, such as durst not Receive it "Kneeling, was the only Point Canvass'd in "the *Savoy Conference*. The Ministers Asserted "this to be Sinful: And they not only Assert-"ed it, but advanc'd in Proof of it such Rea-"sons as these. Because it would be an Oblig-"ing them to deny the People the Communi-"on on the Account of their not daring to go "against the Practice of the Apostles, and the "Universal Church for many Hundred Years "after them; and the Canons of the most Ve-"nerable Councils: Because it would be an "Obliging them to deny the Communion, to "such as the Holy Ghost had requir'd them to "Receive to it: Because it was an imposing "on the Church, things antecedently unneces-"sary, upon the highest Penalty, *viz.* Exclud-"ing from Communion: Because it was a "crossing that Great Rule of Charity, *I will* "*have Mercy and not Sacrifice:* And a using "that Power to Destruction, which was given "to be us'd to Edification. ⋆ He that desires "to see these Reasons pursu'd and drawn out, "may Consult Mr. *Baxter*'s Life in *Folio*, Page "346, 347. and 360, 361.

⋆ Baxter's *Nonconformity Stated & Argued*, pag 77.

Un-

His Plea for Peace, page 182. Corbets *Remains,* page 149. Troughtons *Apology for the* Nonconformists, *page* 37. *Eleutherii* (i. e. Hickmanni) *Apologia pro Ejectis in Anglia Ministris* page 91. &c.

Of kneeling at the Communion. Pag. 54.

Under this Head, Mr. *Ollyffe* distinguishes between *Imposers* and *Submitters* as to the Ecclesiastical Settlement. And that they differ in many Respects, I am very Sensible but that what comes from the Former, *is nothing to the Purpose*, as to the Latter, I cannot agree. For if I submit to *Impositions*, out of regard to the Autority of *Imposers*, I should think my self oblig'd to regard their Sense of those Impositions.

Whereas 'twas objected, that Persons might have Reason to Scruple Kneeling at the Communion; because it was *an alteration of the Posture us'd by our Saviour*; He intimates, that that Posture is *alter'd by every Church:* But because it might be so easily reply'd, that our Saviour us'd a Table Posture, which therefore it might be expected should still be retain'd; He requires proof, that our Saviour us'd a Table Posture in the Administration. Herein he goes beyond Mr. *Hooker*, who denies not that our Saviour sate at this Ordinance, but says, ⋆ *He did that which Custom and long Usage had made fit: We, that which fitness and great Decency hath made usual.* All that I can lay, is this; if he that will consider and compare the Account given by the Four Evangelists, does not with the generality of Learned Men, that have handled that Argument, look upon it as the most probable, that that was the Posture He us'd, it would be a vain thing to Argue with him about it. As for Mr. *Ollyffe*'s Argument against it, I must Confess its Peculiar. *We find,* says he, *that after the Passover was ended, and before the Administration of our Sacrament*, he gave Thanks; *Now we cannot at all believe, that our Lord (who always shew'd such Reverence in Prayer, during his Humiliation) did Pray in a Table Posture: If then we*

Pag. 55.

⋆ Eccl. Pol. B. 5. p. 264.

we suppose him to Stand up or Kneel at Prayer with his Disciples, the Gesture was alter'd from a 'Table Posture; and that he return'd to it again, we have not the least Evidence from Scripture or Reason. And what if I should say there is good Reason to believe it, because it was a Feast that he was instituting, at which a Table Posture was not only proper, but among the *Jews* was always usual? And what if I should give it as another Reason, that the Apostle *John* leaned upon our Saviour's Breast, at the Sacramental Supper? A thing that is not conceivable, if he was not then, in their usual Table Posture. These Reasons are abundantly sufficient, in a matter that is only propounded as probable. But whether they be Cogent or no, is not material in the present Argument: They are eno' to the Purpose for which they are bro't, if they may incline any serious Persons to Scruple another Posture, which is sufficient Reason against agreeing, that that other Posture should be strictly impos'd. As for *Symbolizing with the Papists*, in the Posture of *Kneelings* he thinks there is nothing in it, when the Rubrick has so fully clear'd it: And suppose I grant him that that is strain'd too far, when the Posture of Kneeling is thereupon represented as materially Sinful. It does not however follow, but, that this may be a very good Argument against encouraging the imposing of Kneeling, that it hath been abus'd by the Papists to Idolatry: Especially if he'l take in what was added, *viz.* that *the Posture of Kneeling at the Communion, was never requir'd in the Church, till the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was Establish'd.*

But

But 'tis the encouraging the imposing of *Kneeling*, on which the Stress is laid, rather than on the Use of that particular Posture. And 'twas the encouraging this Imposition, which our Ejected Ministers were afraid of. Mr. *Ollyffe* intimates to us it was a groundless fear. They reckon'd they were bound to reject such as would not Receive it Kneeling: He could have clear'd the matter to them. But How? it was positively Asserted by the Commissioners, at the *Savoy*, where the matter was closely debated, that *give it to them kneeling* in the Rubrick, was equivalent *to give it only to such.* And because it was intimated, that this was particularly *the sense of those that were upon the Secret*; he very honestly tells us, that he and his Neighbours, *are of those whose Souls never entered into their Secret*. I verily Believe him. The odd Interpretations they put upon many things, so little to the Gust of those who have generally had the Ascendant in the Church, is a sufficient Evidence of it. And being they are not in *their Secret*, 'tis pitty they should Support them in their Methods, and be their Drudges to defend their Cause, upon Principles which they will not own; while they sit still all the while, in hopes, that when they have lur'd unwary People into the Net, they shall have the Advantage of it; and yet at long Run, instead of thanking them for their Service, or giving them a Reward, they'l be likely eno' when Opportunity offers, to give them to understand, that they have betray'd their Cause. But Mr. *Ollyffe* pleasantly turns off short, by saying, *We see Doctors differ*. They do so, in most things. And is nothing therefore certain? But he supposes the Commissioners at the *Savoy*, therefore gave that Sense to the Rubrick, because of the

pag. 57.

the Canon, which *forbids Ministers, upon pain of Suspension, to give the Sacrament to any that do not Kneel.* And there is no doubt of it. For they tho't this Canon explain'd the Liturgy; and the Ministers whom they Ejected, could not but be sensible that it did so. But this, lays Mr. *Ollyffe*, we deny: For *the Rubrick needs no Explanation, but the Canon hath added something more.* To which I reply, that I think the Rubrick did need Explication, and if the Canon did add something more, 'twas by way of Explication; and twas added by way of Direction to all that came into the Constitution; and that by *the Church of England Representative*, who according to that Constitution has Power to make any such Explications, when they seem needful.

That the Rubrick did need Explication, I think I can easily prove. In the *Common Prayer Book*, set forth in King *Edward*'s time. *An.* 1549, this was a Rule given; *As Touching, Kneeling, Crossing, holding up of Hands, knocking on the Breast, and other Gestures, they may be us'd or left, as every Man's Devotion serveth, without Blame.* ⋆ This Rule was afterwards left out, and the Rubrick in the *Common Prayer* ran thus; *Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and next deliver it to other Ministers if any be Present, and after to the People in their Hands Kneeling.* And thus it continu'd *once of* in the Days of Queen *Elizabeth.* So that in *Divine* King *Edward's* Days People were left at Liber- by whether they would Kneel at the Communion or not: But in the Days of Queen *Elizabeth*, tho' Kneeling was Ordinarily requir'd, yet some were dubious whether it might not be warrantably and safely wav'd: And the Convocation in 1603, in the beginning of King *James's*

⋆ *See* Hammon L'Strange, *his Alliance of Divine Offices*, p. 313,

James's Reign, to put it out of all Doubt determin'd, that *no Minister, under pain of Suspension, should give the Sacrament to any that did not Kneel*. Explication was needful in this Respect; because it might seem dubious whether upon the Omission of that Rule in King *Edwards Common Prayer Book*, all were oblig'd to Kneel: But when the Revisers of the Liturgy after King *Charles*'s Restauration, took the Rubrick as they found it, varying very little, and saying, *and after that to the People also, in Order, into their Hands, all meekly Kneeling*, they plainly suppose the Canon to remain in Force, and to pass for an Explication: And why it should not be allow'd for as good an Explication of that, as the other Canon of the *Cross in Baptism*, I cannot imagine. Had those then Commission'd to make Alterations had any other intention, without doubt they'd have reinserted the Moderate Rule forementioned, which left this and other Ceremonies indifferent, as they did some other particularities out of King *Edward*'s *Common Prayer Book*. As for those of them, who at the *Savoy Conference* express'd their Sense otherwise, they only intimated their Desires and Wishes, in which they were over-rul'd by the Major Part; who taking the Canon for an Explication, I think it ought to pass for such with them, that will embody themselves in that Constitution. Mr. *Ollyffe* need not then have *minded* me, that 'tis *the Assent to the Common Prayer Book we are upon:* For I was very Sensible of it: And therefore express'd it accordingly. And cant see how our Ejected Ministers, could have *Assented* and *Consented* to the Use of the *Common Prayer Book*, and all its Rites and Cere-
page 58. monies, without obliging themselves to reject such as would not Kneel, and herein several of his

his Brethren Concur. I'le mention one in stead of many, and he is one with whom perhaps Mr. *Ollyffe* may have some Acquaintance. *It cannot* (says Irenæus Junior) *but press hard upon the Hearts and Consciences of many Faithful Ministers of the Church, upon the highest Pains and Penalties it can inflict, to be forc'd to deny Children their Bread, to expel and drive them away from the Lord's Table,, be their Conversations never so agreeable to the Gospel, meerly for their Nonconformity to a Rite, which the Imposers themselves abstracted from their Autority, allow to be indifferent.* And if he refers us to the Canon, as to the *Cross in Baptism,* we may with the same Reason refer him to the Canon about *Kneeling*; and yet leave him full Scope, to say, what he has Occasion for, in another place about the Canons in general. To talk of a *Ministers weighing things when he is in danger of Suspicion*, for admitting Persons to the Sacrament without Kneeling; and *Consulting his Bishop*, &c. is in this Case meer trifling. For if this is a part of that Uniformity which it was the Design of the Law to Establish, (and if it were not, there can be no room for a tho't of Suspension) And if it be the Sense of the Church, that requires *Kneeling,* that all should *Kneel*, and *this,Kneelings* requir'd by the Church, be one of the *Rites* and *Ceremonies Assented* and *Consented* to, then must the *Declaration* and *Subscription* made in Compliance with the *Act for Uniformity*, be an Agreement to exclude such as refus'd *Kneeling*; which our Ministers durst not Concur in.

pag. 15.

As for Mr. *Hoadly*, He says he finds *nothing alledg'd* in my Abridgement *against Kneeling at the Communion*, but rather a great deal for it. 'Tis a Wonder Mr. *Ollyffe*, could not find it too. Tho' really I should take it for a Favour, if

Part 1. pag. 66.

if Mr. Hoadly in his Next, would let me know where it is that he finds so much in my Book, in Favour of this Ceremony because, for my own Part, I profess my self at a Loss for it. But I observe He doth not in this Case any more than as to the other Ceremonies, plead with Mr. *Ollyffe* for the warrantableness of Omission upon Occasion. Nay, instead of that, he justifies the imposing such Ceremonies, which is consider'd in the Introduction: And so if Mr. *Ollyffe*'s Distinction be good, between *Imposers* and *Submitters*, he as properly belongs to the former Class, as Mr. *Ollyffe* and his Neighbours to the latter.

My own Sense of this Matter, in short, is this. The Posture in the Communion, I take for an indifferent Thing. I know of no Divine warrant any can Produce, that gives them Autority to lay such Stress on any outward Circumstance, as to refuse to admit those to the Communion, who refuse to comply with it. And therefore, tho' I should rather *Kneel*, than live wholly without the Lord's Supper, if I could not have it otherwise; yet if I can help it, shall think my self oblig'd to be Cautious of any Action that may be liable to be Interpreted as an owning such an Autority. And tho' if a serious Christian should prefer *Kneeling* before any other Posture, I know not by what Autority I could prohibit it yet to confine my self to Administer the Ordinance to none but *Kneelers*, (Which as far as I can Judge, is the Intention of our Ecclesiastical Constitution) I cannot agree to it: Because it is an Encroachment upon Mens Consciences, and an undue Confinement of an Ordinance, which our Lord has left Free and Open to all his Followers. Nor could I do it as an instance of Obedience where I see no just Autority to require it. 6.

"6. This Assent, Consent, and Subscripti-
"on, would be an Allowance and Approba-
"tion of that Assertion, that *Bishops*, *Priests*,
"and *Deacons*, are three distinct Orders in the
"Church by Divine Appointment: For in
"the Book of Ordination, which was as much
"to be Assented and Consented to, as the
"*Common Prayer Book* it self, It is Asserted,
"*That it is evident to all Men diligently reading*
"*the Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that*
"*from the Apostles Time, there have been*
"*Orders in Christs Church, Bishops, Priests, and*
"*Deacons, as several* Offices. And indeed the
"whole Book of Ordination is bottom'd upoii
"that Supposition as its Foundation.

"Now many of the Ejected Ministers were
"Conscious to themselves, that they had di-
"ligently read the Holy Scriptures, and con-
"sulted ancient Authors, and yet they could
"not see Evidence of Three *Orders* and *Offi-*
"*ces:* And therefore to have yielded to that
"Declaration and Subscription, which would
"have imply'd the contrary, had been gross
"Prevarication. They also thought, they had
"good Reason to believe, that *Calvin, Beza,*
"and many more of the first Reformers and
"that such Men as *Blondel, Salmasius, Robert*
"*Parker, Gersom Bucer, Calderwood, Cartwright*,
"*John Reynolds*, *Ames, Ainsworth*, and many
"more such eminent *Protestants*; who had
"quite different Apprehensions of this Matter,
"had diligently read both the Scriptures and
"the Ancients, as well as their Neighbours.
"Neither could they see any Reason to be
"Confident, that such Men as *Selden, Stilling-*
"*fleet* (at that Time when he wrote his *Ire-*
"*nicum*) Bishop *Edward Reynolds*, and, many
"others, who tho't the Scripture instituted

"no Particular Form of Government, had "been altogether unconversant either with "Scriptures or Fathers. Nor did they think "it Necessary to run down such a Man as "Arch-Bishop *Usher*, as a Novice in either, "tho' he often profess'd it his Sence, that "Bishops are not a different *Order*, but a dif-"ferent *Degree* in the same Order. Nay, they "found, that even the *Church of England* was "formerly of another Mind, as may be seen "in the Canons of *Ælfrick* to Bishop *Wulfine*,* "which Conclude, there were but Seven Ec-"clesiastical Orders, and that the *Bishops* and "*Presbyters* are not Two but One. And "Bishop *Stillingfleet* prov'd, as they tho't, by "Sufficient Evidence, that Arch-Bishop *Cran-"mer*, and other Reformers of the *Church of "England*, were of that Mind; and held, that "there was no difference in *Order* between,a "*Bishop* and *Presbyter*, but only in degree. "With what Conscience then could they have "yielded to such a Subscription and Declara-"tion, as would represent it as their Sence, "that *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, were Three "distinct Orders all along in the Church, while "they tho't they had good Reason to appre-"hend the Contrary, and good Company in "that Apprehension.† Under

* Spelmanni *Concil. Vol.* 1. p. 575, 576. *Septem. Gradus, Constituti Sunt in Ecclesiâ. Primus* Hostiarius; *secundus* Lector; *tertius* Exorcista; *Quartus* Acolythus, *Quintis* Subdiaconus; *Sextus* Diaconus; *Septimus* Presbyter. *Haud pluris Interest inter Missalem* Presbyterum & Episcopum, *quam quod Episcopus constitutus sit ad Ordinationes conferendas & ad Visitandum seu inspiciendum curandumque ea quæ ad Deum Pertinent, quod nimiæ, credetetur Multitudini, si omnis* Presbyter *hoc Idem faceret Ambo Siquidem* UNUM. *tenent* EUNDEMQUE ORDINEM, *quamvis dignior fit illa pars Episcopi. Non est alius* ORDO *constitutus in Ecclesiasticis Ministeriis*, &c.

† Baxter's *Plea for Peace*, pag. 194.

Under this Head Mr. *Ollyffe* tells us, ⋆ we must *distinguish between owning the Three Orders of* Bishops, Priests, *and* Deacons, *continued in the Church from the Apostles Time*; and *the owning this Assertion*, [*That it is Evident to all Men, diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and; Ancient Authors, that there have been these Three Orders in Christs Church, even from the Apostles times.*]

⋆ Page 59. Of Asserting of Three distinct Orders; Bishops, Priests & Deacons.

1. *He Acknowledges, that the* Assent and Consent *doth contain an Allowance of those distinct Orders of* Bishops, Priests, *and* Deacons *from the Apostles time.* By which, I suppose, He means an Agreement in this Notion, that there have been Three distinct Orders ever since the Days of the Apostles; which was what our Ejected Ministers could hot Dilcover, nor consequently *Assent* and *Consent* to. 'Tis true, the *Commissioners, at the* Savoy, *never spake a word for the Abolition of Episcopacy:* Nay, many of them would have preferr'd a Moderate Episcopacy to an exact Parity in the Ministry: But, that they must therefore be able to own, that there had been *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons*, as Three distinct Orders in the Church, from the Days of the Apostles, by no means follows: And why then should Mr. *Ollyffe* think it so strange, that the *Moderate Non-Conformists* should demur upon it. They may reckon Episcopacy Antient, & yet not so Antient; or they may think it probable, some of them, that it may have been in the Church soon after the Death of the Apostles, and yet not look upon it as a thing so certain, as that they should *Assent* and *Consent* to it at their Entrance on the Ministry, or coming to Officiate in a New Place. As for the Arguments of Mr. *Baxter*, referr'd to by Mr. *Ollyffe*, they rather seem to me, to prove the Lawfulness of Episcopacy, and the Convenience of if

upon some Accounts, than its having been in the Church ever since the Days of the Apostles. The first Passage Cited out of him, is no Proof of Three Orders: For it only Asserts, *that the Seventy Disciples were under the Twelve Apostles, and so that our Lord settled a Superior Rank of Ministers*. And this may be own'd, where Three distinct Orders from the Apostles Days are Questioned. In the other Passage Cited, the same thing is again Asserted, with this Addition that *all the Churches for many Hundred Years had Episcopal Government:* But neither can I discern how it therefore follows, that the Churches had Bishops and Two Orders more, even from the Days of the Apostles. If he intended, by these Quotations to let us know, Mr. *Baxter* had a Value for some sort of Episcopacy, 'tis well eno': But if he inferr'd, that therefore He or others might *Assent* and *Consent* in so dubious a Point, in which the Learned are so much divided, I see not the Consequence. But then,

pag. 60.

pag. 61.

2. As to the Assertion, that it is Evident to all Men reading the Holy Scriptures and Antient Authors, that there have been these Three Orders so long in the Church, He says, *the Ministers were not call'd to Assent to it:* For that *this is no part of what is to be us'd*. And as to this, every Man must judge for himself, by comparing what is said on one side and tother, about the *Assent* and *Consent* requir'd, in general. But to come off at last with a confounding *Order* and *Degree*, between which the Learned World have all along distinguish'd, hath no good Face: 'Tis a Sign a Man is a little put to his Shifts, and is at a loss for good Proof of the Three *Orders* he has *Assented* and *Consented* to. May not

pag. 62.

pag. 63.

not Bishops and Presbyters be *the same Order in Preaching, and Administration of the Sacrament's; but another Order in Acts of Jurisdiction, as Ordination* &c? No, Sir, by no Means, (as far as I can judge) as long as in the one and in the other, they act by the same Commission: Neither does what is alleg'd from Scripture, Assert any thing to the contrary.

However, I desire it may be observ'd, that Mr. *Ollyffe* owns, that all that would Officiate in the National Constitution, must by *Assent* and *Consent* own, that there were Three distinct Orders of *Bishops, Priests,* and *Deacons* from the Apostles Days: Which being granted, tho' the other part of the Hardship should be abated them tho' they should not be oblig'd to agree in this, that it must be Evident to all that read the Scriptures and Antient Authors, that thus it was in Fact, there yet remains, what to a Wise, and Good, and Learned Man, may be just matter of Scruple. Tho' to speak the plain Truth, He that himself owns, that there have been Three distinct Orders in the Church from the Days of the Apostles, and does it upon sufficient Conviction; does in effect Declare, that this is a thing Evident to such as read the Scriptures and Antient Authors, from whence he is suppos'd to have had his Own Conviction: So that this makes no great difference.

But Mr. *Hoadly* is disturb'd, that it should be intimated, that an Allowance and Approbation of the Three distinct Orders was requir'd, as if they had been *of Divine Appointment. This* (says he) *you add your selves.* And let any one judge, whether without Reason. For if there were Three such distinct Orders, even from the Days of the Apostles, they must be *Divine* Part 1. p. 104.

Appointment. But if Men will apprehend, that we Dissenters are of so peculiar a make, as *to take Pleasure in representing, and understanding everything in the way which to us carries most difficulty along with it; we cannot help it*; any more than we can, that others seek to Vindicate their Church with plausible Glosses, which won't bear being examined. He seems to Wonder *it should be matter of difficulty, that the Three Orders are spoken of as several Offices:* Which as far as I can judge, neither was, not is the Difficulty; but rather how to prove, that there were from the First, Three distinct *Orders*, and *Offices*, as is Asserted.

P. 105.

In Answer to the Difficulty, he says, *the Assent and Consent refer to nothing but the Use of the Forms prescrib'd in Publick Ministrations: And that the Subscription being only to this Effect*; that the *Book of Common Prayer* containeth nothing contrary to the Word of God, 'tis eno' that nothing *can be produc'd out of the Word of God, to which this Sentence* (concerning the Three distinct Orders) *is contrary*. To which Assertion of his, I oppose Mr. *Ollyffe*'s Concession; who declares as before; Page 59. *It must be acknowledg'd that the* Assent and Consent *doth contain an allowance of those distinct Orders of* Bishops, Priests, *and* Deacons *from the Apostles time, as the whole Book of Ordination goes upon that Foundation*. And I leave it to the Reader to judge between them two: And I'le farther add, that the third of these Orders, *viz. Preaching Deacons* were unknown in the Apostles Days. Preaching was not then a part of the Office, as now. And therefore *Oecumenius* upon the 6th Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles frankly owns, that the *Deacons* of his time, (who were much like ours) were quite different from those

p. 106.

those Establish'd by the Apostles, and an Order quite another thing than the First.

His other Answer is this: That *supposing the* Assent and Consent *did extend to it, yet the Objections against it seem very hard and unreasonable.* I might tell him (as he does me in another Case,) if they do but *seem* so, 'tis well eno': But I cant tell why they should *seem* so. When it is said, *it is Evident to all diligent Readers*, that there have been Three distinct Orders from the Apostles time, if I agree to it, it at least implies, that I am Convinc'd of it, by as good Evidence as the nature of the Thing will bear: And that I have the Concurring Sense of the Generality, and the most Learned Protestant Writers. If I am dubious about it my self; or have only probability to alledge in proof of it, which must be strengthen'd by unprov'd Suppositions, I should hardly say, 'tis Evident to all Diligent Readers. The Case that is alledg'd is not Parallel. For I hope I can prove by better Evidence, *that our Savior existed before: he was born of the Virgin Mary*, than has yet been given in proof of Three distinct Orders from the Days of the Apostles: And if my Proof is better, I may warrantably be more free to Assert, that it is *Evident to diligent Readers*. But as usual as such Forms of Speech are, that *such a thing is Evident to all Men, or a plain Truth*, I think they don't become Bodies of Men in Publick Declarations, where the Proof is so slender, as it is for the raising the Antiquity of the Three Orders as high as the Apostolick Age. To agree to a thing, that is well Evidenc'd, tho' as great Men as those mention'd were against it, is not the matter of Scruple: For what signifie *Calvin*, or *Beza*, or *Blondel*, or *Salmasius*, or *Cartwright*, or *Selden, or any* p. 107. p. 108.

others, if Truth be plainly in the other Scale? And yet where a matter of Fact is depending, 'tis hard to require a Man should declare, *that is Evident to all diligent Readers*, which has been contested by as Diligent, and impartial Searchers into Antiquity, as any the Protestant Churches have afforded. For take the matter as Mr. *Hoadly* has represented it, and strip it of *the manner of Expression*, (on which so great a Stress is not laid as that Gentleman would seem to imagine) and the difficulty still remains: How could these Ejected Ministers agree, that *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons have been in the Church, from the Apostles Days*, which they never saw fully prov'd? It is an easie thing to say, that it has been clear'd but not so easie for others to *Assent* to it, who were convinc'd of the contrary. And to represent those Learned Men, who were of the opposite Sentiment, *as imagining themselves under an unhappy Necessity to contradict ahd obscure a plain Truth*; is only to tempt those who adhere to them, in their turn, to represent the Zealous Patrons of the Hierarchy, as unhappily byast by the too prevailing motive of Interest, in their so much extolling that Evidence, which when Scann'd, appears so defective. Let Arch-Bishop *Usher* be extoll'd: The Ejected Ministers could Concur: And as its well known, offer'd to have submitted to his *Reduction of Episcopacy*. But neither that nor any of his other Writings that I have hitherto perus'd, pretend to Prove, Three distinct Orders from the Apostolick Age. And tho' *Bishop Pearson and others follow'd*, yet Bishop *Pearson* came not out till after the Ministers were Silenc'd; and what to say to the *others* I know not, unless they had been mention'd. And tho' Mr. *Chillingworth* (for whom I Confess my Respect

p. 109.

spect rises high) might perhaps say what our Author Reports, yet I have that Opinion of him, as to believe, had he liv'd to see Mr. *Baxter*'s Disputations concerning Church Government, he would hardly have tho't a fuller Answer to Dr. *Hammond* had been needful. But of these things Men will take a Liberty to judge according to their several different Sentiments; and I know not why they should be debarr'd it by cramping Declarations. That Episcopacy was Antient, has not been contested by many call'd *Pesbyterian*: Mr. *Baxter* in particular has oft and warmly Asserted it but, that there must therefore have been Three distinct Orders from the First, by no means follows. Nor can I gather from Mr. *Baxter*'s Words, that that ever was his Sense, tho' Mr. *Hoadly* says he can. p. 110, 111.

Mr. *Hoadly* here is not over fair in citing Mr. *Baxter*. He so far indeed agreed with the Episcopal Party, as to think they had Reason on their side, in Asserting, that *there was a Superiority in the Primitive Church over fix'd Bishops or Pastors* (which by the way with him were all one, tho' Mr. *Hoadly*, to serve his own Purpose, mentions only the word *Pastors*, and leaves out *Bishops*.) *maintain'd by the Apostles and Evangelists, and other general unfix'd Church Officers.* Which ineffect was no more than this, as Mr. *Baxter* oft explains himself, that there were in the Primitive Church, *Arch-bishops*, and Proper *Bishops* of Pastors: But his Notion of them widely differ'd from what is meant in the *Church of England* by *Bishops* and *Priests*. And this appears from his forementioned Disputations of Church Government, His Treatife of Episcopacy, and his other Writings on this Head. *And as to fixt Bishops of particular Churches,*

Churches, Superiour in Degree to Presbyters, (which are widely different from the fore-mention'd Superiours over fixt Bishops or Pastors) he agreed, *that tho' there was nothing savouring them in Scripture, yet the Reception of them in all the Churches was so early and general, that he was free to admit them, and resolv'd never to oppose*. I desire the Reader may here observe, that tho' Mr. *Baxter*, as expresly puts in his Caveat, as he could well be conceiv'd capable of doing, that there was nothing in Scripture, that favour'd Bishops above Priests in the Sense of the *Church of England*, he is yet drawn, in by Mr. *Hoadly* in this very Passage, as Asserting, that it was *Evident to all reading the Scriptures*, *that there were such Bishops and Priests*, *from the very days of the Apostles*. But still as early and general as Mr. *Baxter* tho't *Bishops* Superiour in Degree to Presbyters, were in the Church, Mr. *Hoadly* would find it a hard Task to bring any thing like a Proof from him, that there were *Bishops*, *Priests,* and *Deacons* in the Sense of the *Church of England*, from the time of the Apostles. If he thinks otherwise, he may try at his Leisure. Tho' when he has done, we are but where we were. For if He or a Hundred Men Asserted it, I humbly conceive, they can never Prove what is here declar'd to be *Evident to all diligent Readers*. And therefore herein I cannot but Profess my self entirely of the Mind of the Ejected Ministers. However, thus far I agree, Let it but be prov'd, that *Bishops*, *Priests*, and *Deacons* from the time of the Apostles, had the distinct Powers, now Assign'd them; by the Church, and if any afterwards Cavil about the Term that shall be given them, and whether they shall be call'd Three *Orders*, *Offices*, or *Degrees*, they are needlesly Litigious. Be-

Sect. X.

"Besides these, there were other Things, "which tho' by some possibly less regarded "then the former, were yet such as they could "not *Assent* and *Consent* to, without having "Reason and Conscience fly in their Face.

"1. They could not Consent to pronounce "all Saved, that are Buried, except the Un-"baptiz'd. Excommunicate, and Self-Murde-"rers. The Words in the Office for the Bu-"rial of the Dead are these: *For much as it* "*hath pleased Almighty God of his great Mercy,* "*to take unto himself, the Soul of our dear Bro-*"*ther here departed; and afterwards. We give* "*Thee hearty Thanks, for that it hath pleased* "*Thee to deliver this our Brother out of the Mi-*"*series of this sinful World. And again, That* "*we may. Rest in him, as our Hope, this our* "*Brother doth.* This they could by no means "approve of. For tho' they own'd themselves "bound to judge according to the utmost "bounds of Charity concerning all, yea, even "those with whom they would not change "Souls, nor be in their Condition after Death "for Ten Thousand Worlds; yet positively "and peremptorily without all Limitation or "Discrimination, to say and avouch concern-"ing everyone whom they Bury'd, *That God* "*in great Mercy had taken his Soul*; viz. *by* "*Death out of the Body, and taken it to himself*; "this was beyond their Faith, and they found "nothing like it in the Gospel, which speaks "altogether in another Language to and of "Impenitent Sinners, it is past Contradicti-"on, that Thousands are cut off by Death in "the midst of their Sins, Drunkenness, Who-"ring, Swearing, *&c.* without any Sign of "Repentance from first to last, so Living and "so Dying: Now how can it be said, *That* "*God*

"*God took away such Persons out of this World*
"*by Death in Mercy, in great Mercy?* In as
"much as, at the same Instant, they were ta-
"ken away from all possibility of Future Re-
"pentance and Amendment of Life. They
"tho't in such Cases it might rather be fear'd,
"*That God took them away in Wrath*; provok'd
"by the long Abuse of his Patience, and their
"own Impenitency. Yet nevertheless, the
"Priest must not only say. That God took a-
"way all such Persons *in Mercy, a great Mer-*
"cy but also positively affirm, *that God took*
"*them to himself*; i. e. into Heaven. Where-
"as the Scripture saith expresly, that neither
"Adulterers, nor Fornicators, nor Drunkards
shall ever go to Heaven: Yet hereby must
they have oblig'd themselves, in perfect Op-
position, when they Bury'd any known Adul-
"terer. Fornicator or Drunkard to declare
"and avouch, that his *Soul was assuredly gone*
"*thither*. They could not see, how Charity
"would excuse dangerous Errors and False-
"hood. By this Means, they saw they should
"be necessitated to pronounce many *Saved* at
"the Grave, whom in their Pulpits and Wri-
"tings, they tho't themselves oblig'd to Con-
"demn. They should hereby be in Danger of
"speaking falsly for God, misrepresenting his
"Word, and hardning the Uingodly and Pro-
"phane in their Hope of coming off safe at
"Last, altho' they persisted in their dissolute
"and licentious Course. Now they durst not
"Damn a known Adulterer, Fornicator,
"and Drunkard, while he was Living, and
"yet save him when he was Dead. Nor yet
"again, could they *commit his Body to the*
"*Ground, in a sure and certain Hope of a Happy*
"*Resurrection unto Eternal Life*. Which Words
"must

"must necessarily be spoken with Reference "to the Person then Interred, in as much as "they are the Continuation of the foregoing "Declaration: *viz. Gods taking his Soul to him-* "*self.* Besides it follows (which puts it out "of Doubt) in the last Collect or Prayer, "*That when we shall depart this Life we may Rest* "*in him*, (*viz.* Christ) *as our Hope, is this our* "*Brother doth.* Now they tho't it were easie "to foresee sundry Cases, in which they would "be so far from having any sure and certain "*Hope of a Happy Resurrection unto Eternal Life* "*and Salvation*, that there would rather be a "*sure and certain Fear of a doleful Resurrection* "*unto Eternal Death and Damnation.* And "withal, it seem'd to them to be but a wild "and fanciful sort of Charity in these Men, "that they should have such Hopes, as to "Persons dying under such gross Sins, as Mur- "der or Adultery, Rebellion or Blasphemy "without Repentance, while yet many of "their Consciences were too tender to allow "the Office to *Dissenters*, because they were "hopeless Schismaticks.

A Letter from a Minister to a Person of Quality, shewing some Reasons for his Non-Conformity. Baxter's *Non-Conformity Stated and Argued*, page 83. *His Plea for Peace*, page 187. Corbets *Remains*, p. 161.

Of the Burial of the Dead.

When I observe, what is suggested by both my Animadverters upon this Head, I can't forbear pittying those that are in an Eccleliastical Pound: To me it has an odd Appearance to find them boast, this they can do, and there they are not oblig'd, and thus far they are at Liberty, and I know not what; when all the while 'tis visible to all indifferent Standers by, that they are encompass'd with a high Rail, which keeps them from advancing one way or other

other beyond Bounds, unless they either Climb over the Rail (which will Tempt the Lord of the Mannor to make it higher for the Future,) or have the Door open'd to let them out. But he that loves a Pound, and applauds it, and prefers it before Liberty, e'en let him have his Choice say I; but then let him give me my Liberty, and not tempt me to renounce it, to come and take part with him in his Pound.

The Office for the Burial of the Dead is a Part of the Eccleslastical Enclosure: And the Gentlemen so commend it, that one would think they were hugely fond of it; and yet when all's done, they say they are not confin'd. Let them but stick to any thing, and we shall know where to find them. This. Service requires great Charity to the Dead in Ministers; 'twere well the Ministers would shew some of it to the Living.

The Grand Objection of our Fathers was this; they durst not oblige themselves, to pronounce all Sav'd that are Bury'd, except the unbaptiz'd. Excommunicate, and Self-Murtherers. To which Mr. *Ollyjfe* Answers, *They*
pag. 63. *were never put to it, nor were those who Conform'd neither.* If this can be made appear, then they were strangely mistaken, to think they were in a Pound, when there was not the least Rail to keep them in, or restrain them of their Liberty. But the Proof is put upon me; I am ask'd, *by what Word or Passage of the Liturgy*
pag. 64. *they would be oblig'd and necessitated* to Use the Office, in the Case of such as were liable to just Exception? I Reply, the End of the Law was *Uniformity*: For the securing of that End, all that came into the Constitution were to subscribe, that there was nothing in all the *Common Prayer Book contrary to the Word of God*; and

and if so, nothing, but what they would use in all Cases, in which it appear'd the Design of the Constitution it should be us'd: And, that there might he no Difformity after this Subscription, all were to *Assent* and *Consent* to use every thing Prescrib'd, *&c.* Now this Office for the Burial of the Dead is not barely *contain'd*, but so *contain'd* as to be *prescrib'd*; 'tis inserted to be us'd, except in Case of want of Baptism, or Excommunication, or Self-Murther: The Rubrick by putting in that Exception confirms a Prescription in all other Cases; not leaving the least room or Scope, for the Ministers Discretion to bring in any other Case supposeable. And least after all there should be any Doubt remaining, the *Convocation* in 1603, *the Church Representative* comes with a Canon, requiring, *No Minister to refuse to bury any Corps, that is bro't to the Church or Church-Yard, in such Manner and Form as is prescrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer. And if he shall refuse it, except the Party deceased were denounced Excommunicated* Majori Excommunicatione *he fall be suspended by the Bishop of the Diocess from his Ministry, by the space of Three Months.* And if after all this Men will pretend to come, in to the Constitution, and give all possible Assurances of their Submission to it, and yet pretend either to Wave this Office in any Case not excepted; or to change and alter it, as if the Matter were left to their Discretion, they act not fairly. They use such manner of Dealing with the Church, as would not be allowable between Man and Man; and which themselves could not pretend to justifie, but by affixing a different Sense to the Things than is usual in other Cases. But this Passing with these Gentlemen for a *Misrepresentation*, I'll

Can 68.

I'll take the freedom to tell them a Passage, which I have from Two Persons of Note and Worth yet Living, who had it directly from that Excellent Person, the Late Archbishop *Tillotson*. The Passage was this. That Great Man taking an Occasion, in a Publick Sermon to speak of the *Dissenters*, was so frank as to own, that they had forrie plausible Objections against some Parts of the Common Prayer. This at that Time made a mighty Noise and it was not long before Archbishop *Sancroft* sent for him to Reprimand him for it. Dr. *Tillotson* did not fly back and cry *Peccavi*, but stood to what he had Asserted. The Arclibishop ask'd him, which Parts of the Common Prayer Book, he meant, when he said that the *Dissenters* had plausible Objections against them. He freely mention'd in the first Place, this Office for the Burial of the Dead. Upon which the Archbishop being open to Conviction, freely yielded; telling him, he was so little satisfy'd with that Office himself, that for that very Reason, he had never taken any Pastoral Charge. I leave it to these Gentlemen to make their Reflections, and in the mean Time shall consider their Suggestions tho' I should think, if no more were added, thus much might serve to justifie the Ministers who were Ejected, as to this Head.

Pag. 65. Mr. *Ollyffe* mentions the Canon, but. asks, *What is this to the Assent, and Consent to the Liturgy?* I Reply, when the Church in Convocation has explain'd her Sense, as to any Part of the Liturgy, if a Man don't turn a Convocation into a meer Cypher, I think he's oblig'd either to give his; and *Consent* in their Sense, or not to meddle at all with it. Let him then if he pleases, *Take his Horse and ride out of*

of Town, as he mentions, (tho' by the way, I should rather have chosen to ride away from the Subscription than from my Compliance with it afterwards) when a Corps is offer'd, over which he can't be satisfy'd to use the Office; and let him ride to his *Diocesan*, and see whether he can justifie himself in thus turning his Back upon his Work. If he's pleas'd with this Method, and it answers his End, I dm far from grudging at his Satisfaction: But he must give us leave to think our Own Condition more Eligible, who are never at that rate put to Our Shifts; & who are free to Act according to our own Light, without having any to impose upon us; Or if he'l rather stay at home, and leave out that part of the Office that he Scruples upon such an Occasion, We must leave him to his *Diocesan*, to whom he's Accountable, But when he tells us *he is peremptorily forbid to use the Office over Persons dying openly Impenitent*, he must excuse us if we can't fall in with him. To the Judgment of his *Dean*, whom he Cites in this Case, I oppose not only the Canon, but the Judgment of the two great Persons mention'd above, who were successively Arch-bishops. Tho' I think it were eno' if there were only the Canon. For when that says expresly, that *the Minister is not to refuse to use the Office for Burial, except the Party were denounc'd Excommunicate*, Excommunicatione Majori,] for any Man to pretend to say, he may still refuse it, in the Case of a Person that was not sententially Excommunicated by an Ecclesiastical Judge, is but the setting up his own Sense in Opposition to that of a whole Convocation.

pag. 66.

pag. 67.

Pass we then to the Office it self, and lets try Mr. *Ollyffe*'s *softning* Methods. But by the way, tho' I can easily allow for Personal slips that need *softning*; yet if I were of a Church, that is applauded as the Best and Purest on Earth, I should think it a Reflection upon it, to own that its Offices, (after their amendment has been so earnestly desir'd for so many Scores of Years) do still need *softning*. Well then 'tis Query'd, how a Minister can say as to many that are offer'd to Christian Burial, that *he hopes they rest in Christ?* Mr. *Ollyffe* Answers, *it is Evident there are several Degrees of Hope: and the Minister may, by a Proper Accent on his Words, express a lower degree of Hope as to some, as well as a higher as to others*. But how many are there die, of whom, according to Scripture, there is no *Hope?* And the representing the least degree of *Hope*, in whose Case is highly dangerous to By-standers? And suppose a Man endeavour to vary his Voice, and so to signifie the different degree of his *Hope*, how can he be certain he's taken rightly, and does not Minister to the Deceiving of others, who may think their own Case *hopeful*, since that of others was so, whom they knew to be as bad or worse than they? Or if it be discover'd by his Voice, that his *Hope* was but low, is not that likely often to prove Offensive to surviving Relations? And were it not much better for a Minister to say nothing of his *Hope* concerning the generality of such as die, than to run the hazard of Offence or Mischief one way or other? 'Tis farther Query'd, Suppose it be a Loose-Liver, that is gone to his Long Home, without any Sign of Repentance, How can a Minister *give Thanks for his Deliverance from the Miseries of this sinful Life?* 'Tis Answer'd, *we ought in all things to give Thanks*,

Thanks. 'Tis undoubtedly true; and yet as it sounds Harsh to hear a Man giving Thanks for the departure of a near Relation, of whose Happiness, in a Future State, there is no discernible ground of Hope; so is it also odd for a Minister to give Thanks for that as a Deliverance from present Miseries, which it may be very justly fear'd, is an entrance upon those Miseries which are infinitely greater. Again, 'Tis Query'd, how a Minister can say in the Case of a careless Wretch, who appear'd to all, that knew him, to have no fear of God before his Eyes, that he *commits his Body to the Ground, in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to eternal Life?* 'Tis reply'd, that *this is not spoken with reference to the Person interred*. And as an Evidence of it he says, that *a Resurrection* was in this place after the Restauration turn'd into *the Refurrection*; which I had over-look'd. I grant I was not aware of it. But he says, *it is a very agreeable Sense to commit a Body to the Ground, in sure and certain Hope of that great Article of our Faith, the Resurrection of the Body*, viz. *of the Resurrection in General, and of our own Resurrection in Particular*. 'Tis reply'd, tho' there lies no Objection against it, when a Pious Person is interr'd yet suppose we, the Party, to have been a notoriously Vitious Person, it grates upon a sensible Mind to commit his Body to the Ground in sure and certain Hope of our Resurrection. For what Relation hath our Hope to their Case? Tho' they should to perpetuity lie rotting in the Grave yet we, if the true Followers of Christ, should be rais'd to Life: And to an Eternal Life, in a Blessed Sense, which none of the Wicked will reach to, tho' they also shall have an Everlasting Durations Once more, 'tis Query'd, how a Minister can

pag. 68.

say as to every Man that dies in his Parish, that *it hath pleas'd Almighty God, of his great Mercy, to take unto himself the Soul of his dear Brother departed?* He Answers, *there's a twofold taking of Souls to himself. The one a receiving them to himself to live and dwell with him. The other a summoning them to himself to be judg'd by him to their Eternal State.* Which he proves from Scripture. Well, but is it not easily suposable, that many a careless Wretch hearing his Minister say of those, who were his Companions in Wickedness, as they die, one after another, that *God has taken them to himself*; he should by this means be harden'd? And should not this be avoided, even tho' the Expression were capable of a sound Sense? But supposing a wicked Wretch to be *taken by God to himself*, so as to have his everlasting State unalterably fixt, how can this be said to be a *great Mercy?* 'Tis
pag. 69. Answer'd, 'tis *a great Mercy* in as much as it prevents farther Sin; and 'tis a Mercy in as much as Men are to stand before a Just and Righteous Tribunal, *&c*. Poor Shifts! For is it not still a Judgment for Men to be cut off in their Sins, and sent from under Overtures of Grace into certain remediless Damnation? I profess, I Wonder that any Mortal should not be asham'd of such an Evasion! And therefore I can't think it strange,that he should be so sensible of the weakness of his Pleas as to return to his
pag. 70. first Answer; but whether or no that will serve, is left to the Reader to Judge from the Premises.

The grand Objection against this Office lay here; that it was so worded as that it seem'd to encourage careless Livers to presume upon Mercy at the last. In Answer to it, Mr. *Ollyffe* refers to the *Doctrine* of the *Church*. But be that

as

as it will, if its *Forms* and *Offices* are so Express'd as to have a dangerous Tendency towards the encouraging presuming Sinners, that can be no Security. That it is so as to this Office, many that have been in the Church have freely own'd; and 'tis amazing it has not been alter'd. To say, that it *supposes Discipline*, is a poor Excuse. If that would have solv'd the Business, the Use of this Office might have been forborn till the *Discipline*, it supposes, was restor'd, and then the Objections of the Ejected Ministers, under this Head, would have been Answer'd; but otherwise, they appear to unprejudic'd Persons very strong and considerable.

But let's turn to Mr. *Hoadly*, and see how he Pleads upon this Head. His beginning is extremely Fair. He says, *He won't trouble us or himself with searching out some possible sound sense in which some of the Passages in this Office, which we excepted against may be understood.* I think verily 'tis the wisest way. He goes on; *Could I show you, that God may be said to take even a very wicked Man away in Mercy, and that we may give him Thanks for it in a just Sense, yet I do not love to go against the first Design of such Publick Forms.* I Confess, I think it. ought to be the like with all that Conform. *After all* (says he) *tho' those Expressions might possibly be us'd of Persons of whom we had not the least Reason to hope well*; (which is odd and harsh) *yet these words*, [*as our hope is this our Brother doth*] *in the last Collect, can in no Sense be apply'd to such. It must therefore* (he says) *be own'd, and it is too plain to be deny'd, that in the case of Men cut off in the midst of Notorious Sins, Drunkenness, Adultery, Murder*, &c. *this Office is wholly improper*: Therefore he moves, that by the Care of the Church, the ground of the Objecti-

Part 1. pag. 112.

P. 113.

on maybe taken away. I thank him for this. But after all these kind Words, he must vindicate the Office. And First. As for that Clause, *For as much as it hath pleased Almighty God, of his great Mercy, to take unto himself the Soul of our dear Brother here departed*, &c. He thinks himself oblig'd to vindicate it, notwithstanding he had intimated but a little before, that he would *neither trouble himself nor us with searching out for some possible sound Sense of it.* However, upon second Tho'ts, he clears it from *Eccl.* 12. 7. and thus Argues: *If the Spirits of all Men may in a sound Sense be said to return to God, then it may also be said in a sound Sense, that God takes to himself the Spirits of all Men when they die.* But when it is such a way of taking as is signify'd to be *a great Mercy*, 'tis hard to apply it to all that Die which makes a great difference between that Text of *Solomon* and this Passage in the *Common Prayer Book*, tho' Mr. *Hoadly* says, *the same Objections lie against the manner of Expression in both.* But secondly: He must also plead for *the committing the Body to the G round in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection unto eternal Life*, &c. Nay, and supposing it to be the Body of a wicked Man too, he thinks it very justifiable, *for Christians to commit it to the Earth, not as Men who believe the Bodies thus laid in it shall remain there for ever; but as Persons fully perswaded, that there will be a Resurrection of the Bodies of all Men at the last day; which he is sure is the true Interpretation of the Words.* But *here*, he says, *he finds these words* [a happy Resurrection], *put instead of* [the Resurrection] *for what Reason, he cannot certainly tell.* All that I can tell him for his Satisfaction is, that I not only found it so represented by some of the Dissenters, but even by some of their own

p. 114.

Church

Church too; One expresses himself thus: ★ *Why should we then be tho't unreasonable, if we Scruple to declare, that the Person who hath liv'd a dissolute and prophane Life, departing hence without any Demonstration or Evidence of his Faith in Christ, and Repentance to Salvation: To declare, I say, that we have a sure and certain hope, that such a one should be rais'd unto Eternal Life? there being far greater Reasons to fear, the Resurrection will be to Damnation; according to what St.* John *saith*, 5 Joh. 29. They that have done good unto the Resurrection of Life, and those that have done Evil to the Resurrection of Damnation.

★ See a Plea for Abatement in matters of Conformity. By *Irenæus* Junior, a Conforming Member of the *Church of England*. in Qu. 1693. p. 37, 38.

It being further intimated, that this Passage *of a sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to Eternal Life*, must be spoken with Reference to the Person Interr'd, because it is a continuation of the foregoing Declaration, *viz. God's taking his Soul to himself*; and also, because of what follows in the last Collect, *That when we shall depart this Life, we may rest in him*, (viz. Christ) *as our Hope is this our Brother doth*: He wholly drops the former of these two Considerations, (*for what Reason I cannot certainly tell*) and exclaims pretty freely upon Occasion of the latter. He replys, *that the using of this word* (Hope) *in the last Prayer is so far from putting this out of doubt, that it does not so much as make it Probable: Nay there not being other Evidence for this, it appears to him rather to prove the contrary*. Let indifferent Persons Judge, say I. The Office seems all of a Piece, from the first beginning of the committing the Body to the Ground. 'Tis the same as to the wickedest Man living, as it is to as the most Pious in the Whole Parish. It is first declared, *that it hath pleas'd Almighty God to take unto himself the Soul*

p. 116.

of our dear Brother departed, and therefore his Body is committed to the Ground, in sure and certain Hope of the Resurrection unto Eternal Life. Presently afterwards *Almighty God* is address'd to, as one *with whom live the Spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the Souls of the Faithful are in Joy and Felicity*; and under this Notion *Thanks* are given him, for *delivering the departed Brother out of the Miseries of this sinful World*, &c. And in the next Prayer, 'tis begg'd, that *when we shall depart this Life, we may rest in him, as 'tis hop'd this our Brother doth.* Who sees not, that in this Office all along, there is a particular Reference to the Party Deceas'd; and that all the general Hints are design'd to have an Eye to his particular Case? Or at least will be so interpreted by Standersby? On which Account certainly, if no more could he said, Expressions likely to do so much Mischief ought carefully to be avoided. The Words in the *Burial at Sea*, are indeed less liable to Objection in this Respect; and so is the Office for Private Baptism less exceptionable than that for Publick; and yet I can't say, that we can certainly interpret the one by the other and much less, that a Minister has Liberty to Exchange the one for the other, to avoid Objections, But after all, I'm little concern'd in this Affair, For supposing Mr. *Hoadly*'s Sense be admitted as to this Passage, There's eno' from his, own Concession left, *to make this Office* wholly improper, to be us'd in the Case of many that are Translated out of this World to another. Which being own'd, if the Ejected Ministers would upon Conforming have been generally oblig'd to use it, they had good Reason to be Positive in their Refusal. But this is what the Gentleman Questions: Nay he attempts to prove the contrary. He

p. 117.

He says, *He verily thinks, that a Minister in the* Church of England *is under no Obligation to use the Expressions which are the ground of this Objection, in such Cases as are mention'd, over notorious impenitent Sinners: Nor ever likely to suffer the least inconvenience for omitting them.* He says, *He designs not by this to teach any Persons to play with what ought to he sacred amongst Christians; or to make light of Declarations and Subscriptions:* (this certainly aims at some Body but | pretend not to say who:) And he adds, that *if what he says* (in this Case) *cannot be demonstrated to be perfectly consistent with all the Obligations a Conforming Minister is under, he renounces it. Well* then, we are to expert a *Demonstration*, that such as Conform are not oblig'd in the case of notorious wicked Persons, to use the Expressions in this Office that are Scrupled. 'Tis a fair Undertaking: Lets see how the Performance Answers. P. 117.

His Demonstration is supported by Two Principles. The first is this: That *the Omission of these Sentences, in such Cases, is not contrary to the Original Design of the Church, in prescribing this Form, but more agreeable to it than the using them.* For the Office supposes *Discipline*, &c. I know 'tis commonly said; and there is a Publick *Wish* there were such a thing as *Discipline:* But when the Use of this Office is not suspended till this *Discipline* is restor'd, and when the Convocation without any visble regard to that *Discipline*, hath threatned every Minister with Suspension, who refuses to Bury any Corps that is bro't to the Church-Yard, in the very Manner and Form. Prescrib'd in the *Common Prayer Book*; (which, by the way, implies there must be no Omission or Variation) I must Confess, I cannot see how a Minister can be at Liberty. pag. 118.

Since

Since then he asks me, *to what part of Vow is he False, who either denys the Office to those of whose Acceptance with God there cannot he the least Hope, or omits the Expressions which render the Office improper?* I reply, I cannot lo distinctly say, what he may mean by falseness to his Vow; But I think he neither Acts agreeably to, his *Subscription*, nor his *Declaration of Assent and Consent*. For when he has Subscrib'd *ex animo*, that there is nothing in the *Common Prayer Book* contrary to the Word of God; and, that he will use it; which is tantamount to his using it without any Variation; He refusing to use this Office, breaks his Subscription by which he was engag'd to the contrary; and in effect vilifies the *Common Prayer Book*, by representing it as contrary to the Word of God, if he should use it in this Case, for which there is there no Exception allow'd. And when he has before a whole Congregation, (according to the Command of the Act for Uniformity) *declared his unfeigned Assent and Consent to the Use of all things in the said Book contain'd and prescrib'd*, for him to Act as if this Office was excepted, or any Expressions in it, when they are as much *contain'd* and *Prescrib'd* as any others whatsoever, is really little less, than *a making light of Declations*, which is the very thing Mr. *Hoadly* declares he would not teach. And seeing he further puts this Question: *Can the Canon, which respects this, he suppos'd to Command the use of this Form, any otherwise than as it was design'd by the Church?* I add, that the Canon, not making the least allowance for any exempt Cases, except such as were excepted in the *Book of Common Prayer*, plainly intimates, that it was the design of the Church, the Office should be us'd Promiscuously. When he further asks, *did any*

p. 119.

of

of their Governors ever insist upon Obedience to the Letter of this Canon in such Cases? I Answer, they may do it when they Please. And they have done it in Cases as liable to Exception as this. As for his saying, that *if they did insist upon it, he would venture any Penalty rather than obey; because his Conscience would not let him say, that he hop'd the dead Person rested in Christ, when there cannot be the least ground of Hope*; I think him highly to be commended for it: But must needs say, I should apprehend it better not to come under an ensnaring Bond, than to break it afterwards to satisfie my Conscience. For as to his other Reason of refusing to Use the Office in such a Case, tho' it were insisted on, *viz. because he could not reconcile such an Obedience with the Obligations he was under to the Church*, it might very well have been spar'd. For his Obedience, would be much more reconcileable with his Obligations to the Church than his Refusal: And his Refusal, (after such Obligations to the Church) could only be justify'd by his Regard to Conscience, and his Obligation to the. Supreme Governor. As for his other Question, which he has thus worded; *Did it appear, that it was the design of this Church, and of the Governors of it, to Oblige those, who Minister in it, to declare in Publick, that they hope common Swearers, Drunkards, Adulters, Murtherers*, &c. *dying without any sign of Acceptance with God, rest in Christ; what Man who had the least sense of Religion could Conform as a Minister?* I think he has express'd it hardly. However, I'le Answer, that I am far from thinking Conforming argues there is no Sense of Religion, while a Man in his own Practice goes upon true Principles of Conscience: And yet it is so much the common Practice, without Controul,

to

to use the same Form as to all that die promiscuously; and it does so evidently appear by the Canon, that it was the design of the Church and its Governors it should be do, that I can't understand Conforming, with an intention either to vary it or wave it; or (as some have Express'd it, to let up for a *Pope* in the Parish, and) send some to *Heaven*, and others to *Hell*. As I can't see that a Minister has a proper Liberty of excluding the most unqualify'd from the Lords Table, but is bound to take all Comers; and let the most disolute Person in his Parish come to take the Sacrament to Qualifie him for an Office, if he should refuse him, it will bear an Action; And as in the Case of Baptizing, a Man can't refuse any Child Born in his Parish, if offer'd to be Baptiz'd, according to the Form in the *Common Prayer Book*, without running apparent hazard if Complaint be made: So in this Case, I can't see, that 'tis left to the Minister at all to judge as to the Qualifications of the Persons Deceas'd; but he's to use the Office promilcuously, upon pain of Suspension. Whatever the Church Design'd, this is the Nature of the Constitution. Did the Church design to encourage all manner of dissolute Persons to take the Sacrament? 'Tis a very fair Question. And an Argument lies on which side of the two soever it be determin'd. If the Church did design to encourage them to come to the Lord's Table, even in the height of their Wickedness,what inconsistency is there, in supposing the might design to encourage others to entertain hope concerning them, if they dy'd in the same Condition? For certainly 'tis not to be suppos'd any Church should admit such to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, as she could encourage no hopes concern-

ing

ing in Case of Death. Or if the Church did not design to encourage such in coming to the Lord's Table; How comes it, that Ministers cannot Answer to their Governors, for refusing such? But be it as it will, as to that, where's the Demonstration Promis'd? Thus stands the Argument: Conforming Ministers cannot be oblig'd to Use the Office for Burial as to all Promiscuously; because the Church could not design to oblige them. 'Tis Reply'd, the Church actually has oblig'd them, and therefore could design it; and they can't answer for their Neglect; they lie at their Diocesans Mercy as to Suspension, or rather, are at the Mercy of the Lay Chancellour; and therefore, to be sure, must be oblig'd.

And if the Demonstration be not clear'd by this first Principle, I doubt the second, that is bro't to back it, will give it but little force in the Case of the Ejected Ministers, with whom he is suppos'd to be Arguing. For what signifies it in their Case to plead, that *some Conforming Ministers, will not allow this Office to Dissenters, under the Notion of Schismaticks?* By mentioning this, you tell us of one unjustifiable thing as a Plea for another. But how does this prove, that they, who fall in with the Constitution, are not oblig'd to use this Office, as to profligate Sinners? Suppose some, who can *strain at a Gnat and swallow a Camel*, reckoning the Dissenters worse Sinners than either *Drunkards* or *Adulterers*, shall freely use the Office in the Case of the latter, while they refuse it to the former; does it therefore follow, that others are unoblig'd to use it as to either? But says Mr. *Hoadly, if this Office may he deny'd to any, certainly to these*; meaning profligate Sinners: 'Tis very certain; And there's force in his Argument

p. 120.

gument as it stands in Opposition to some high-flown Blades, whose Zeal is more level'd against those who comply not with the Laws Ecclesiastical, than against those who most visibly violate the plain Laws of God: But it hath not the least force in the Case of the Ejected Ministers, who could not perceive, that if they had Conform'd, they could have been excus'd from using the Office over all that were offer'd to Christian Burial.

So, that I think verily. Mr. *Hoadly*. upon this Head has gone too far. I applaud his Zeal in being against declaring his Hope as to the Deceased, in cases where there is no Hope; therein I heartily Concur with him: I have the same Apprehension with him, that this Office is very improper to be us'd in the Case of many that are offer'd. But, that a Minister, in such Cases, is free either to wave or alter the Office I cannot Discern; I am herein of the Mind of the Ejected Ministers most fully: And therefore must Declare, that till this Office were either alter'd, or Liberty was left as to the using or forbearing it, according to different Circumstances, (which yet I should be very unwilling to have left to my management, because of manifest Inconveniencies;) This alone would effectually keep me from Conforming, tho' all things else, were accommodated to my Satisfaction.

N. B. The Bishops and Doctors that met at the Bishop of *Lincolns* in *Westminster*, in 1641. about Alterations, were for altering the Phrase in this Office, [in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to Eternal Life] and putting it thus: [knowing assuredly that the Dead shall rise again.]

2. They

"2. They could not Consent to a false Rule "for finding out *Easter* Day. In the Com- "mon Prayer Book there is a Rule for find- "ing out the moveable Feasts and Holy Days. "*Easter Day* (on which the rest depend) *is* "*always the first Sunday after the first Full Moon,* "*which happens next after the one and twentieth* "*Day of* March: *And if the Full Moon happens* "*upon a* Sunday, Easter-Day *is the* Sunday *af-* "*ter.* The frequent falsity of this Rule may "be seen by consulting the Common Alma- "nacks; and by comparing it with the Table "that follows afterwards in the Common "Prayer Book, to find out *Easter* Day for "ever. So that here was a Book to be As- "sented and Consented to, that was inconsi- "stent with it self. How could they *Assent* "and *Consent to all, and every thing contain'd* in "this Book, when they found in it among "other Things a Table, and a Rule that "Clash'd, one determining this to be *Easter* "Day, and another another Day. If the Rule "be true, the Table is false. If the Table "be true, the Rule is false. And they tho't "it a grievous Case, that they must be turn'd "out of their Livings, because they could not "Assent to both; tho' in many Years, they "were directly contrary to each other. Tho' "this in it self was but a Trifle, yet for Per- "sons to be obliged to Consent to that as true, "which in many Cases they knew to be false, "was no small hardship.

Baxter's *Nonconformity*

Stated and Argued, pag. 81. *His Plea for Peace*, pag. 160. *His Defence of the Plea for Peace*, pag. 81. *The Peaceable Design: Being a Modest Account of the Nonconformists Meetings, with some Reasons for their Nonconformity*, Oct. 1675. pag. 26, 27.

Whe-

Of the Rule for Easter *Day.*

Whether this Rule holds or not, is a Matter with me of small Account. If it do's hold I'll grant, it was a mistake in the Ejected Ministers to object against it. And if it do's not hold, I think 'tis not for the Credit of the Church, to keep it in the Common Prayer Book.

That it was *frequently false*, was asserted by the Ministers Ejected. Mr. *Ollyffe* says, that he and his Neighbours *suppose it depends upon some little turn of a Minute or Two, between Two Days in which the Moon changeth, in which there seems great Difference and Uncertainty amongst skilful Astronomers.* Be it so; it is therefore certainly not very fit, that this should be made a Rule for the keeping up Uniformity nor is it to be pleaded for, as such. *That it frequently fails* (he says) *is utterly deny'd.* As to which any Man may make a Judgment by comparing. But, *may we not* (says he) *Consent to use a good Rule that generally holds Good, because in a Revolution of Scores of Years, it hath been found to have some Exceptions?* 'Tis Reply'd; there is no Danger In *consenting to use a good Rule*, that generally holds good if that be all that is requir'd to he *consented to:* But to require a Man to *Consent* to this, that *Easier Day is* [always] *the first Sunday after the first Full Moon*, &c. if it be only so [sometimes] or if it ever fails, is hard and unreasonable. And to urge Scripture in this Case, as Mr. *Ollyffe* has done, appears to me a real Abuse: For tho' Figures in Common Discourse with Relation to Matters of Fact were ever allowable; and the Scriptures as well as other Writings abound with Instances: Yet thence to argue for Mens consenting to a Rule as certain, which it is confess'd do's sometimes fail, would if done by a *Dissenter*, I doubt not, be counted just matter of Reproach

pag. 70.

pag. 71.

and

and Censure. And, I must needs say, to find Mr. *Ollyffe* at every turn endeavouring to support the Ceremonies, and obnoxious Parts of Conformity, by Citations from Scripture, neither tends, as the World is generally dispos'd, to heighten that Veneration for those sacred Writings, which it ought to be our Common Business most studiously to Support; nor do's it look like one, that has *no Heart, nor Will to the Continuance of the Impostions.* Page 2.

Mr. *Hoadly* says. *He should not doubt, to shew, that supposing this Rule false, a Man may with a very safe Conscience both, declare his Assent and Consent, and Subscribe*; but he not having attempted; to shew it, 'tis hard to say how far his Ability in the Case extends. But he says, he'll *omit this for a better Reply*, *which if it is found to have Truth in it, must for ever remove this Reason for Nonconformity.* For my Part I'm heartily contented, nay should rejoice that not only this, but all other *reasons for Nonconformity were remov'd:* For as soon as ever it ceas'd to be *Rational*, I can undertake for a very considerable Number, that they'd in that very instant be as ready to Desert it, as others could be to desire it of them. The Answer then is this: This Objection is *wholly upon a Mistake. The Rule neither contradicts the Table in the Common Prayer Book*, *nor the Common Almanacks*, *which agree with the Table.* This is what any Man may judge of by ocular Inspection; and therefore positive Assertions one way or other turn to no great Account. For the Readers Satisfaction, I'll here give him a View of the Seven Last Years mention'd in the Table of the Common Prayer Book in 60, *&c. According to the Rule*, and *according to the Calculation* of the *Table*, and our *Common Almanacks.* Part 1. pa. 122.

Years.	First *Full Moon* after the 21st of *March.*	*Easter* Day according to the *Rule.*	*Easter* Day according to the *Table*, and our *Common Almanacks.*
1694.	*March* 31.	*April* 1.	*April* 8.
1695.	*April* 19.	*April* 21.	*March* 24.*
1696.	*April* 7.	*April* 12.	*April* 12.
1697.	*March* 27.	*March* 28.	*April* 4.
1698.	*April* 15.	*April* 17.	*April* 24.
1699.	*April* 4.	*April* 9.	*April* 9.
1700.	*March* 23.	*March* 24.	*March* 31

* *Full Moon was this Year the 20th of* March, *which makes the Variation so considerable.*

Any Man tha:t should judge by this short Scheme, would conclude that this Rule misses, oftner than it hits; and that therefore there's no Dependence upon it: And that it is very unfit to be laid down as a Rule by a Church, that lays so much Stress on Uniformity. But Mr. *Hoadly* says, *The Thing is this, we judge of the Moon by the Common Almanacks, which are there set down according to the Reformation of the Kalendar; and the Rule speaks of the Moons, as they are to be found in our own Kalendar, according to the Account in Use before that Reformation, when this Rule was first settled.* That we judge of the Moon by the Common Almanacks is true; and if the Rule speaks of Moons in a different Sense, I think it is not fit to be any longer a Rule; becaule its Language is no longer intelligible. However he will have it, *The Rule is true, if we understand it aright.* I can't tell whether it be or no: I'm for standing by the Moon in the Heavens: And let the Moon in his Calendar, or according to his Rule shift for it self. But be it as it will as to that, it

pa. 123

cannot

cannot be a Rule to find *Easter* for ever, when it depends upon a way of Calculation, that is not now any longer in Use: And therefore 'tis not fit any stress should be laid upon it. For my part, I'm for standing by the *Moon in the Heavens*; and let the Moon in Mr. *Hoadly*'s *Calendar*, or according to his Rule shift for it self.

But some of our Brethren being dispos'd to Triumph upon this Head; I shall here subjoin some more Particular Remarks, sent me by a Worthy Friend, which, perhaps, may give some Satisfaction to Candid Enquirers.

'In what Mr. *Hoadly* has Suggested, very 'Briefly and Darkly about the difference of 'the *Moon in the Calendar*, and *in the Heavens*, 'he seems to have had his Eye upon that way 'of solving the difficulty about *Easter*, which 'has been lately discover'd, and is at length 'somewhat farther Open'd and Publish'd by 'Mr. *Wright*, in his *Postsript* to a Book Inti-'tul'd, *A short View* of Mr. Whiston's *Chrono-'logy of the Old Testament*, &c. Whether Mr. '*Hoadly* were not then so fully Master of the 'New Invention, or did not so intirely de-'pend on it as a just Answer to the Objection 'made to the *Rule for finding out Easter for ever*, 'I know not, but however, Mr. *Wright* migh-'tily Triumphs over Mr. *Baxter* and his Dis-'senting Brethren for a *great piece of Ignorance*, 'which yet appears not to have been peculiar, 'but common to them with his Conforming 'Brethren, and perhaps himself too, till of 'later Day, this New Light has broke out, 'by the help of which they (and perhaps we 'henceforth) may know how to look for *Easter* 'in the *Common Prayer Book*, and not in the

'Almanacks only. And yet possibly, 'tis not 'altogether so clear, whether we may not look 'for it in Vain, in the Rule for finding out '*Easter* for ever. Sure I am, We might, if 'that Rule had been given any where else al-'most but in the *Common Prayer Book*; but see 'the Arrange Force and Vertue of that Book 'by the help of good Management; it can, it 'seems, transubstantiate a Rule, which is, in 'itself, a plain and convicted Falshood into a 'justly measur'd Truth; and, which encreases 'the Wonder, can do it by the help of another 'Falshood; and as two Negatives make an Af-'firmative, so these two Rules, which are seve-'rally False, being Artfully put together, com-'pose betwixt them one true Rule for the 'finding out of *Easter*: Yet I am afraid, we 'must not still venture to go on and add the 'finishing Stroke in these Words *for ever*; 'lest the World should happen to continue be-'yond Expectation, and the superannuated 'Direction should begin at last to faulter. For 'by the like Reason, as the *Authentick Cycle of* '*Nevo Moons* (as Mr. *W*. is pleas'd to call it) 'does now confessedly fall too late for the true 'New Moon (the Faithful Witness in Hea-'ven) Four Days and some Hours, must it not 'in a sufficient Tract of time, cease to be *our* '*certain* Rule for *Easter?* And of this Mr. *W.* 'Himself, seems to be aware, when he well 'and warily says, that it yet is *our certain* Rule, 'but not that it would be the certain Rule for 'finding out *Easter for ever*, how long soever 'the World should last: But our Author may 'indeed safely presume, he shall not live to see 'it fail, nor any of his Contemporaries; yet 'it may bear a Question, whether we may As-'sent to that as a true Rule *for ever*, which

'must

'must fail if the World should continue till 'the present and growing Errour of Four 'Days and odd Hours is enough advanced, or 'should however unhappily so misplace the 'New Moon, as to carry its full Moon out of 'due Compass. And may we then take our 'Oath (as Mr. *W*. says) that *Easter* Day falls 'exactly according to the Full Moons, that are 'to direct us to it, unless he means to limit 'it to *us*, who are now living, and how fair 'that is without speaking more plainly out, 'let the World Judge; when as [us] must be 'understood according to common Usage in 'like Cases, Us and our Posterity, or rather 'Us and others in all succeeding Ages.

'This Author's Solution of the difficulty 'seems to Center here, that the Rule is to be 'Understood, not absolutely, as if it stood 'alone, but as it is supposed to stand. related 'to the first Column in the Calendar of the '*Common Prayer Book*; and this he would have 'us to believe, because, that Rule (he says) 'was Establish'd by the *Council* of *Nice*, toge-'ther with an Authentick Cycle of New Moons 'for the constant keeping of *Easter* throughout 'the World. Not to Dispute either the mat-'ter of Fact, or his Inference from it, that the 'Rule is related to the Cycle, and was, at least 'then, to be understood of the Full Moons 'pointed out by the New Moons, which were 'to be learnt from the first Column of the Ca-'lendar there remains, however, this very 'material Objection to his reasoning from the 'Sense and Design of that Council, that then 'the Full Moon shew'd by the Calendar, and 'in the Heavens were all one, and consequently 'the Councils meaning in that Rule, was what 'Mr. *Baxter* and his Dissenting Brethren

'apprehended, *viz*. *Easter* Day. was to be
'reckon'd the first Sunday after the first Full
'Moon [really so in the Heavens] after the
'21st of *March*. And if the Council thought,
'that because the Calendar and the Heavens
'did then, and were like long to agree, that
'they would always do so, all I can say, is.
'That the Council might be better Divines
'than Aftronomers, and certainly were no
'more infallible than those Fathers who con-
'demn'd the Opinion of the Antipodes for an
'Heresie. But I have that Perswasion of the
'Honesty and Integrity of the Council, as to
'perswade my self, that had they liv'd to see
'their Authentick Cycle vary from the true
'New Moon, they would have thought it at
'least good Manners to correct the first Co-
'lumn of their Calendar, and to have rectify'd
'it by the Moon in the Heavens, and not have
'left their Supposed Full Moon to contend with
'the real One, which should be follow'd in
'Understanding the Rule; or else, that they
'would have so far alter'd the Rule, as to have
'told us plainly, that by the Full Moon, they
'did not Design, that in the Heavens should
'be always Understood, but, that when that
'should Vote for one *Easter* Day, and the Full
'Moon shew'd (tho' but conaequentially from
'the New) by their Calendar should bespeak
'another, this latter ought to have the pre-
'ference. Had our Parliament, or Learned
'Convocation pleas'd to have done either of
'these. We had not been left to an almost ine-
'vitable Danger of Understanding the true Full
'Moon, when as it seems, we should have
'taken that or another false one, as occasion
'requir'd, and the Calendar, as we are now
'at last told, does direct. But how should

poor

'poor Mr. *Baxter* and his Dissenting Brethren, 'who had studied more their *Bible* than the '*Common Prayer Book*, be aware of this Impor- 'tant Mistery; when if they could have seen 'any occasion to enquire what Full Moon was 'intended in the Rules, the Parliament and 'Convocation both would most likely have 'Answer'd, what should be meant but that, 'which every Body may see in the Heavens? 'Nor does it look fair to Understand it of the 'Moon pointed out by the Calendar, but up- 'on the Supposition of the *Council* of *Nice*, 'that it afterwards would, as then it did, and 'more ordinarily does fall in with the Full 'Moon in the Heavens, or so near it however, 'as to make: no difference in the fixing of *Easter* 'by it. And after all, if the Lame Rule, tho' 'thus help'd out by a Lame Calendar, should 'not be capable of holding out to the end of 'the World; Can we Solemnly *Assent* to it as 'a Rule for the finding out of *Easter for ever*, 'without opening a Door, and giving too 'much colour to Mens making too Bold with 'Truth on many other Occasions where their 'Interest is concern'd?

Sect. XII.

"3. They must Consent to Read Apocry- "phal Lessons in the Publick Churches, which "they could not agree to, because of such fa- "bulous Legends of *Tobit* and his *Dog*; *Bell* "and the *Dragon*; *Judith* and *Baruch*, &c. "These they found were not only to be Read "wholly and intirely, Morning and Evening "Two Months together, but all of them un- "der the Notion and Title of *Holy Scripture*. "For so in the whole Lump together, they "are stiled in the *Order*, without any Note of "Discrimination to make a distinction between

"one and the other: In the mean time, while "in the same *Order*, (as appears by the *Ca-* "*lendar*) some Books of the Sacred Canon are "wholly left out, and never to be Read: Some "of them within a very little; some of them "but half to be Read, and many of them "mutilated and Curtail'd as to several Chap-"ters.

44 This was what they could not, by any "means, approve of. For tho' they could "freely own there were many valuable things "in the Apocryphal Books with all their "Faults, yet could they not have such a de-"gree of Respect for them, as to think them "fit to be Read in Churches in the room of "the Holy Scriptures. They were herein "Confirm'd by finding even the most Cele-"brated Bishops and Doctors of the Church "owning there were many Relations inferred "in them, that were False and Fictitious. And "they were afraid of contributing to the mis-"leading of a great many weak and ignorant "People, (of which there are but too many in "the Nation) to fancy them of equal Autho-"rity with the Holy Scriptures; of which "there is therefore the more Danger because "in the Order of Reading the Lessons, the "Title of Holy Scripture, and *Old Testament* "is given to the *Apochrypha.* ★

★ Baxter's *Nonconformity Stated & Argued*, pag. 86.

Mr. *His Plea for Peace*, page 166. Corbets *Remains*, page 139. *The Letter from a Minister to a Person of Quality, shewing some Reasons for his Nonconformity*. Troughton's *Apology for the* Nonconformists, *page* 31. *Eleutherii*: (i. e. *Hickmanni*;) *Apologia pro Ejectis in Anglia Ministris*, page. 50. &c.

Of the Apocryphal Lessons

Mr. *Ollyffe* here says, that *there is nothing to imply a Prescription of these Apocryphal Lessons, but, that they are found in the Calendar.* And is not that eno' where there has been *Assent* and *Consent* given to every thing contain'd and prescrib'd in the *Book of Common Prayer?* Is not that Calendar introduc'd thus: *The Order how the rest of the Holy Scriptures* is Appointed *to be Read.* If it be *Appointed* it should be read thus, then I should think the Method of the Calendar for reading the Scriptures, (and the Apocryphal Lessons among the rest) was so *contain'd* in the *Common Prayer Book* as to be *prescrib'd.* And if the *Apocrypha* be at the same time *prescrib'd* to be read, in an *Order how the rest of the Holy Scripture is appointed to be read*; Methinks the Danger is Obvious, that some may be tempted to reckon the *Apocrypha* a part of Holy Scripture.

pag. 72.

Mr. *Ollyffe* Answers, *It is common in all Speech, for the lesser and meaner, to go under the Denomination of the greater and better Part.* An Answer, I must needs say, which favours not of that peculiar Respect for the Holy Scriptures as I should have expected from a Man of his Character. I grant however, that his Rule takes place commonly eno' in things of the same kind; but where they are of two different Kinds; especially where the difference is so great as between Books Divinely inspir'd, and Books that have all the marks of Humane frailty, 'tis hard, 'tis dangerous to allow the same Denomination of *Holy Scriptures.* But he adds, *That the Church in the Sixth Article, by the Holy Scripture, understands only the Canonical Books.* And what then? It may still tempt many to equal the Apocryphal Writings with the *Canonical Books*, when they find them Appointed to be Read as Lessons in Common

Common with the Scriptures; and that by an Order, Entitul'd, *An Order how the Holy Scripture is to be Read*. He says farther, that *tho' there might be some Particular Reasons, why the Compilers might let the Apocryphal Lessons stand in the Calendar, which might be peculiar to that time, and now forgotten, yet might they not intend them to be read in Churches:* Which I take to be all one as if he had told us, he would have defended them in this Case, had he but known how. But he mentions a Passage, in the Preface to the 2d Book of *Homilies*, which intimates, That *a Minister might change a Chapter of the* Old Testament *for one of the* New, *if he tho't it more to Edification*, &c. To which I Reply, that tho' there was Liberty left at first in this and many other Respects; (as particularly as to the Use of the *Cross* in *Baptism*, and *Kneeling* at the *Communion*, as has been before observ'd) yet afterwards, the Confinement was made straiter. That it was so particularly in this Case, appears by *Canon* 14, in which 'tis declar'd. That *all Ministers shall observe the Orders, Rites, and Ceremonies, prescrib'd in the Book of Common Prayer, as well* [*in reading the Holy Scriptures*] *as in saying of Prayers and Administration of the Sacraments*. So that he, that wont follow the Order there laid down, for reading the Holy Scriptures, had better keep out of the Church, than attempt to come within its Enclosure, as matters now stand.

pag. 73.

If Mr. *Ollyffe*, after all, wont *grant, that the Order is to read them*, 'tis much at one to me. I leave him to his *Diocesan*. But for him to say, *perhaps Mr.* Calamy, *may here have Subscrib'd as far as any Conformist in the Land*, is a little rash. He Quotes upon me the 6th Doctrinal Article, in which, after the enumeration of the *Canoni-*

cal Books of the *Old Testament*, these Words are added: *And the other Books*, (*as* Hierom *saith*) *the Church doth read for example of Life, and instruction of Manners; but yet it doth not apply them to to establish any Doctrine*. But with his good Leave, 'tis one thing for the *Church to Read* the Apocryphal Books; and another thing to appoint and approve *the reading of them in the Church*. The Church may read them, that is, allow of the Private Reading of them among her Members: But, that she may *appoint the reading them publichly in the House of God*, is far from being agreed to by those, who Subscribe the Articles; who only assert matter of Fact. St. *Jerome* (as the Canon intimates) does allow the Church to read Apochriphal Books: But the Publick reading them in the Church, is forbidden by the Council of *Laodicea*; which, by an express Canon, ⋆ delivers the Catalogue of the *Canonical Books*, as we do, decreeing, that these only should be read in the Church. Now the Canons of this Council, were afterwards receiv'd into the Code of the Canons of the Universal Church: *So that* (in the Opinion of My Lord of *Sarum*) *we have here the concurring Sense of the whole Church of God in this matter.*

⋆ *Can.* 59, 60.

Exposition of the 39 *Articles of the* Church of England. *p.* 89.

But how can he say, *perhaps Mr.* Calamy *may have Subscrib'd as far as any Conformist in the Land?* Does he think I ever Subscrib'd, that there was nothing in the *Common Prayer Book* contrary to the Word of God? Or, that I, this way tacitly approv'd of all the Apocryphal Lessons prescrib'd in the *Common Prayer Book* as agreeable to the Word of God? This, in my Apprehension, he has done: But for my part, I intend not to do it in hast.

His

Pag. 74.

His *Hints in the Close*, are not more Momentous than what went before. For what, tho' *the Calendar hath only the Holy Scriptures for Lessons on the Lord's Days*; does it therefore follow, that it may set by the Sacred Scriptures for *Apocryphal Lessons* on the Week Days? And should what he says be true, that *if a Holiday, having an Apocryphal Lesson fall on the Lord's Day, that Minister well deserves the neglect of Diligence in his Office, who shall wilfully lay aside the Lord's Day Lesson, and choose an Apocryphal one:* Then I think it will follow, that the Church deserves Censure in that it has wilfully laid aside any part of the Holy Scripture, choosing the Apocryphal Books instead of it. And when he adds, that *every Minister, being a Preacher, when he begins or ends an Apocryphal Lesson, may tell the People in what words he sees good, that it is Apocryphal, and thereby prevent all Abuse*; He brings to my Mind the Story of the Minister, who in former Times read the Book of Sports as he was Order'd by Autority; and when he had done, read also the fourth Commandment; and then very fairly told the People, that they had distinctly heard the Command of the King, and the Command of God, and he left it to them whether of the two they would Obey.

Part 1. p. 124.

Mr. *Hoadly* very frankly tells us, he won't *go against his own Judgment so much, as to plead for the retaining any one thing in the Publick Service, that is, justly suspected to be fabulous.* I Thank him: And yet he Queries; *Is it unlawful. to read any Books in the Church, in which there are very many Useful and Excellent things, as well as some few Relations suspected to be Fabulous?* Favourably stated I Profess. Why mayn't I as well give it a different turn, and state it thus?

Does

Do's he think it fitting, or for the Credit of our sacred Records (for which 'tis hard to have too high a Veneration) that by a fixed *Order for Reading the Holy Scriptures*, Apocryphal Books, in which tho' there are some useful and valuable Things, there yet are so many impertinent and trifling, as well as notoriously fabulous Relations, should be preferr'd (as to the Reading for Lessons in the Publick Churches) to such Books as are universally own'd to be Canonical? Should those Books, that oft pretend to speak *in the Name of the Lord*, while those that penn'd them were real Strangers to *Inspiration*; be preferr'd before Books own'd to be written by Holy Men, *as they were moved by the Holy Ghost?* When he has answer'd my Question, 'twill be Time eno' to think of answering his. He further asks, *Whether it is unlawful to tell a suspected Story in the Pulpit?* And argues, that if that be not unlawful, neither can it be so, to read Apocryphal Chapters: To which I have only this to say, that neither the one nor the other can have my Approbation. To his Considerations, I oppose contrary Considerations, as more momentous; and tending more effectually to clear the Matter. Let it then be consider'd, that tho' the Church hath in her *Articles*, declar'd the Distinction she puts between *Apocryphal* and *Canonical* Books,yet by her Practise, in joining them together in one rank as Publick Lessons, she takes a Method to abate that peculiar Veneration for the Canonical Books, that ought to be most carefully heighten'd. And tho' *no Chapter of the Apocrypha is appointed to be read in the Service on Sundays*, yet on other Days many Chapters are appointed, in the room of much more Venerable Writings. And tho'

there

there is *in those Apocryphal Books, some excellent Lessons and Instructions, such as it is good for the People to be acquainted with*; there yet are other Passages also, at which 'twill be hard to keep their Countenance; and others that directly interfere with the known Word of God. And as *highly as they have been always esteem'd in the*
pa. 125. *Church*, it was forbidden by the *Council* of *Laodicea* (as famous as most Councils in the Ancient Church) that they should ever be read in Churches. And what tho' *Lessons are appointed out of the New Testament*, at the same Time as these Apocryphal Chapters are to be read; are they for that ever the more fit to be yok'd with Canonical Writings? If he can't think we *Judge it a Sin, to read these Writings in the Publick Service of God*, who can help it: Possibly some may, and some may not. But as for *dividing the Church under this Pretence*, 'tis a groundless Charge. For they are the Dividers, who impose, or justifie the imposing.

Things unnecessary.

pa. 126. He seems to wonder, that any *can suppose, the Church should read these Books under the Notion of Holy Scripture*, when she has declar'd her self so expresly in her Articles. 'Tis granted, the Article is plain: And yet still the *Common Prayer Book* is exceptionable. And it's not impossible, for a National Church, whose peculiar Constitution is meer Humane Contrivance, to be *inconsisient with it self*, in more Things than one. 'Tis not pretended, that the *Apocrypha* is any where expresly call'd the *Holy Scripture*. And yet when 'tis appointed to be read, by an Order, that is stil'd. *The Order how the rest of the Holy Scripture is appointed to be ready*, I hope without Offence it may be said, that Order is not justifiable. 'Tis a meer shift

to

to say, the Apocrypha is not nam'd. For we have the Thing, tho' not the Word. 'Tis nam'd in effect, when it is said in that Order, *And to know what Lessons shall he read every Day, look for the Day of the Month in the Kalendar following, and there ye shall find the Chapters, that shall be read for the Lessons both at Morning and Evening Prayer. And to find in the Rubric the first Lesson, said to be a Lesson out of the Old Testament, while some of the first Lessons are out of the* Apocrypha, makes, the Matter so much the worse. To say, that *an exact niceness was not at all necessary* in this Case, is very odd. I should think the *exactest niceness necessary* in any Case, where an exact Uniformity was rigorously insisted on. And if the Ejected Ministers and those who succeed them, must for thinking this deserves some stress, be represented as *very severe indeed, find strongly inclin'd to find fault*; I cannot but think it hard; and an Indication of a greater Aversion to Reformation, than can well be reconcil'd with that *peaceable Temper*, and *forwardness for Abatements* that is sometimes profess'd. pa. 127.

When it has been said by the Ejected Ministers, that *these Apocryphal Books are read in the room of Holy Scripture, and that Canonical Books are omitted, curtail'd, and mutilated*, I can't see but 'tis strictly justifiable. These are not Phrases to Prejudice, but the real Truth of the Case. If such Phrases *leave a strong Impression* 'tis well: For they Answer their End: But what should hinder this from being *fair and reasonble* (if it be in any Case so, to give a true Representation of the Methods of the Church) I cannot imagine. That the Reader may judge in this Case, I'll add an Account, of what is omitted in the Common Prayer Book of the

Canonical

Canonical Books; and what is added out of the Apocryphal.

'Tis not a small, but very considerable Part of the Old Testament that is omitted to make room for the *Apocrypha*. The Kalendar has left out, the 10th, 11, and 36th Chapters of *Genesis*. In *Exodus*; it has left out Part of Chapter the 6th, and the 24th, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40th Chapters entirely. 'Tis the like with the 17 first Chapters of *Leviticus*; As also the 21st, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 27th Chapters. The 10 first Chapters of *Numbers* are omitted: Together with the 15th, 18, 19, 26, 28, 29, 33, 34th Chapters of the same. The 23d Chapter of *Deuteronomy* is pass'd by; And from the 10th to the 23d Chapter of *Joshua*. But as to the 2 Books of *Chronicles* they are entirely discarded. The 2d, 8, and 10th Chapters of *Ezra* are left out; and the 3d, 7, 11, and 12th Chapters of *Nehemiah*: The 30th of *Proverbs:* And the whole *Song of Solomon*. And in the Prophesie of *Ezekiel*, the 1st, 4, 5, 8, 9, to, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33d Chapters. And as for the New Testament, tho' all the rest of it is appointed, yet as to the Book of *Revelations*, it had been entirely discarded, had it not been for St. *John*'s Day; on which the first and 22d Chapters of that Book are appointed, and *All Saints* Day, when Ch. 19. is appointed to ver. 17. But as far all the rest they are wholly pass'd by.

In all, there wants but one or two of Two Hundred Chapters of the Canonical Books that are omitted: Too large a Part methinks of those inestimable Writings, to be reflected on; by its being insinuated, as if there were none of

of all these but what were *improper, and unintelligible; such as are of very little Concern to the Christan People; wholly out of their reach: Of little Advantage, either to the informing their Minds in any important Matter, or to the raising of their Devotion*. Herein I must confess I think Mr. *Hoadly* has exceeded. I cannot but much prefer the modefty of Mr. *Mason*★, who has thus express'd himself upon this Head. *Neither is it our meaning to advance the Apocryphal which we read, above the Canonical, which we read not: For all Canonical being the sacred Oracles of God, have incomparable preheminence of Excellency; yet nothing doth hinder but that something in it self of far lesser excellency, may be familiar for Popular Capacity*. But if those Canonical Parts of Scripture that are omitted, are incomparably more excellent than the Apocryphal Chapters that are substituted in their room, I think it may pass for a good Reason, against that Substitution, that it will tempt People to prefer in their Estimation, what they find the Church prefers in her Publick Service; which we find has actually been the Case.

Pag. 128.

★ *See his Sermon upon the Authority of the Church*, &c. *Preach'd in the* Green-Yard *at* Norwich *the Third Sunday after* Trinity, 1605. pa. 27, 28.

In their stead, we have in the *Kalendar*, Apocryphal Lessons appointed for Two whole Months together. The Book of *Tobit*, except the 5th Chapter. The Books of *Judeth, Wisdom*, *Ecclesiasticus* (except Chap. 26.) *Baruch*, and the *Idol Bel, and the Dragon*. And some Parts of the same are appointed also, as proper Lessons for Holidays. And to have it asserted, that *many of these Apocryphal Lessons are truly of more Use, and more to the Edification of the People, than* [*any*] *of those Chapters which are omitted*, deserves a severer Censure than I am willing to pass upon it. 'Tis not indeed to be wondred at, that they they who are of this

Mind should be zealous for reading them, while they omit the other: But the Ejected Ministers had different Sentiments; and why then should they be herein impos'd upon?

And tho' it be call'd *a poor Insinuation, that the People are led by, to think the Apocryphal Books of equal Autority with the Holy Scriptures*, yet as *Poor* as it is, I think verily it ought to have its weight with considerate Persons. For whatever Difference is asserted to be between the Canonical Books and Apocryphal, when the People find them not only bound up together in their Bibles, (an unhappy Custom, which were much better laid aside) but requir'd jointly as Lessons in Publick Worship, under the Title in the *Rubrick* of Lessons out of the Old Testament; and when they are directed to them, by an Order, that is stil'd, *an Order how the Holy Scripture is to be read*; especially, when such a Man as Mr. *Hoadly* shall assure them, that *the Apocryphal Lessons that are prescrib'd are truly of more use, and more to the Edification of the People, than ANY of those Canonical Chapters which are omitted*, I think it is a great Temptation to many to go too near equalling the one with the other: And that especially, when it is not one of many of the Common People, that ever read the Articles to set them right. He says, *we cannot prove this*; that this
pa. 129. has been a Temptation to any, and that he *never knew, nor heard of an Instance*. But if he has not, others have. I can tell him of one who no longer ago than in that surprizing Storm of Wind, for which the Last Year was so remarkable, being under great Concern, and deeply affected, took a Bible, saying, that he would read a Chapter in Scripture, and was for reading the *Apocrypha* under that Notion:

A Minister present, telling him of his mistaken Apprehension, he declar'd to him, that he took the Apocrypha to have been as truly the Holy Scripture, as any that was bound up in his Bible.

He that would see the Reasons at Large against the reading of Apocryphal Lessons as order'd by the *Church of England*, would do well to Consult *the Abridgment of the Reasons of the Ministers of* Lincoln *Diocess*; being an Apology for themselves and their Brethren, that refuse the Subscription and Conformity that is requir'd; Printed in 1605. And the *Second Part* of the *Defence of the Ministers Reasons for refusal of Subscription and Conformity to the Book of Common Prayer, Printed in* 1608.

This was one thing that was particularly insisted on in the Conference at *Hampton Court*. Dr. *Reynolds* urg'd this as a Reason against Subscription, ⋆ that the *Common Prayer Book* injoin'd Apocryphal Lessons to be read in, the Church, albeit there are in some of those Chapters Appointed, manifest Errours, repugnant to the Scriptures, of which he gave Instances. The Bishops and Doctors could not disprove him: But the *King* said, *he would have some of the Apocrypha read: Else* (said he) *why were they Printed?* A most admirable Argument! But in the Year 1641, when the Arch-bishop of *Armagh*, the Bishop of *Lincoln*, Dr. *Prideaux*, Dr. *Ward*, Dr. *Browmvrigg*, &c. met at the Bishop of *Lincoln*'s in *Westminster*, among other things, in which they desir'd an Alteration, they mention'd this for one, that they would have *Lessons of Canonical Scripture, in the stead of the Apocrypha*. And yet when the Ministers in 1661, desir'd but thus much, they could not be gratify'd, tho' their Desire was express'd with

⋆ *The Summ of the Conference before the King's Majesty. Printed.* An. 1604. p. 59.

pag. 61.

Baxter's *Life in Folio. p.* 318.

great Modesty. *In as much* (say they) *as the Life in Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto Salvation, to furnish us throughly unto all good Works, and contain in them all things Necessary, either in Doctrine to be believ'd, or in Duty to be Practis'd; whereas divers Chapters of the Apocryphal Books, appointed to be read, are charg'd to be in both respects, of dubious and uncertain Credit: It is therefore desir'd, that nothing be read in the Church for Lessons, but the Holy Scriptures of the* Old *and* New Testament.

Vide Expetitum Judicium Super Dissidio Anglic. Op. Tom. 2. *pag.* 1288.

I shall only add, that the Learned *Spanheim*, in his Censure on our present Debates in *England*, declares, that these Apocryphal Lessons may be justly reckon'd *Relicks of the Papistical Superstition*. And, that *whatever Plea is drawn from the* African *Custom in the time of* Augustine, *or from the reading of some of the Apocryphal Books as Ecclesiastical, yet were not all Publickly then read, as are at this Day; nor are all the Practices of that Age to be imitated; some of which, afterwards, caus'd great Abuses: And it was by this Practice, that these Books at length became Canonical.*

§. XIII.

"4. They must Consent to the Mistranslati-
"on of the *Psalter.*

"The *Psalter* is particularly mention'd in "the verbal Declaration requir'd of every In-"cumbent. It must be *Assented* and *Consented* "to, as having nothing in it contrary to "the Word of God. To this they could not "Agree, because they found several Mistran-"slations in the Old Version of the *Psalms*; "which was indeed more Accommodated to "the *Septuagint*, than to the Original *Hebrew*. "In *Psal*. 105. 28. Our Psalter reads the Words "*thus, and they were not Obedient to his Word:*

"Our

"Our Bible reads them. *An rebelled not* "*against his Word*. Thus therefore they Argu- "ed. One particular contain'd in the *Book of* "*Common Prayer* is the Translation of this "Text. But if the Translation be true in the "*Psalter*, it is false in the *Bible:* And if it be "true in the *Bible*, it is false in the *Psalter*. "How could they give their *Assent*, that they "*Rebelled*, and *rebelled not?* 'Tis the like in "some other Cases. Now they could not Ap- "prove of that *Psalter* as entirely agreeable to "the Word of God, in which they found sun- "dry plain Mistakes.

Mr. *Ollyjfe* says, the Ejected Ministers were not requir'd to Consent to the Mistranslation of the *Psalter*; they were only *to Consent to the use of the Psalter*, (*supposing that to be so*.) This is what I am not for contending about: Tho' if in our last Translation of the *Psalter* we have not improv'd, 'tis hard. And if our New Translation be better than the Old one, 'tis hard to be oblig'd to the constant Use of that which is the worst. But he *conceives, that there is no Order for the reading the Old Version, in our Ordinary Parish Churches*. For tho' the *Declaration* mentions the Psalter, yet it is only be- cause it makes a part of the Title Page, which runs thus.——*Together with the Psalter or Psalms of* David, *pointed as they are to be said or sung in Churches*, which he says, *seems to limit this Translation to the places where they are sung or. said according to those Points:* And he Declares, he *sees not*, *but a Minister is at liberty, to choose which he pleases*, Old or New. But without all Question, the *Psalter* mention'd in the Title Page, is the *Psalter* Bound up with the *Common Prayer Book:* And when a Man hath *unfeigned-*

pag. 75. *Of the Mistranslation of the Psalter.*

pag. 74.

ly Assented and Consented to the *Use of that Psalter*, How he can be at Liberty to exchange it for the other, I can't Understand. He seems himself, to doubt the sufficiency of this Answer, in *acknowledging, that it is not home to the present Purpose*; and therefore 'tis needless, that I should further insist upon it.

Pag. 76. As to the place often Cited by the Ejected Ministers, *viz. Ps.* 105. 28. where the Old Version has it, *They were not Obedient to his Word:* The New; *They rebelled not against his Word:* He owns them *contradictory, if spoken of the same actions, Persons, and Time*; but says, they are not so, if we consider the different Aspects of the two Translations. *If they are spoken of* pag. 77. Moses *and* Aaron *they were not disobedient to his Word: If of* Pharaoh *and his Host, they were not Obedient to his Word.* And this cannot be contested. He says, *it may possibly be past my skill to determine, which Translation is best.* I'll suppose it to be so; I think therefore, there is the less Reason why any should pretend to oblige me to determine one way or other. He adds, *if we must not consent to the use of a Translation till we can reconcile all the Difficulties in the several readings, 'tis a sad Case.* 'Tis granted. But this was not the thing that the Ejected Ministers stuck upon. They apprehended the last Translation better, and therefore knew not why they should be oblig'd to use a worse. And they tho't it was hard to say, there was nothing in that *Psalter*, that was a part of the *Common Prayer Book*, contrary to the Word of God, when they could not tell but there might. For as to the place mention'd, tho' 'tis not easie to say, which is the Sense, yet to be sure but one can be so; and if but one be true, the other is false; and that which is false, is contrary to the

the Word of God: And supposing it but possible for there to be any slip, (which can't well be deny'd) they tho't it a great Hardship, to declare there was none such. To use that *Psalter* is one thing: But to use it as in nothing contrary to the Word of God, while there is the least uncertainty, is not to be justify'd. And this was the thing they were against.

It was indeed, as he says, mention'd by way of Objection. That *the Old Version of the Psalter was more accommodated to the Septuagint, than the Original Hebrew*. He Answers, That *this very Septuagint Translation was made use of by the Apostles and Evangelists*. Which is readily granted him. All that he can gather thence, (upon Supposition we have the same Septuagint unchang'd, which it would perhaps be past his Skill to prove) as I conceive, is this: That that Septuagint Translation may be us'd. Which I know none of the Ejected Ministers that Question'd. The only thing they debated was, whether the Psalter, which was Translated from that Translation, (and that as we now have it) might be agreed to be us'd, as exact and *in nothing contrary to the Word of God*. He doth not himself infer from hence, that *the Septuagint is to be preferred before the Hebrew*; this he calls *an Extreme the other way*, and says, '*tis no less a strange extreme to think, that it may not he us'd by us*. But as to this latter Extreme, I know none guilty of it. He need not have bro't then Dr. *Collins*'s Autority to prove, that the Old Version might be us'd, because all the Ejected Ministers (as far as I could ever discern.) were of the same Mind, and all agree in the Passage Quoted from him; (except in the Mistake about the Epistles and Gospels, which Mr. *Ollyffe* hath rectify'd). For my own part, pag. 78.

I'm sure I so entirely agree with the Doctor, that I cannot more distinctly express my Sense than in his Words. *To this Day the Psalms in our Service Book are according to* Tindal's *and* Coverdale's *Bibles:* [Which should make us wary in our Censures of that Translation] *tho' we see Reason in many things to Dissent from it. Only we having a more correct Translation Establish'd by Autority, why (for the avoiding the Offence of less knowing People) we have not made use of that, but retained a Translation not undertaken by any Publick Autority; and confest to be more imperfect, is what I cannot, nor account my self oblig'd to Account for.* If thus much will satisfie Mr. *Ollyffe*, he and I are easily agreed. But I can't tell how to think it a part of the Honour due to Martyrs, to think them infallible.

Part 1. p. 130.

Mr. *Hoadly* after a like attempt with Mr. *Ollyffe*, to clear the Passage particularly referr'd to, comes to the real Objection of the Ministers, who were Silenc'd, which was *the declaring there was nothing in the Psalter contrary to the Word of God*, and he lightly touches it; but as far as I can Judge, leaves it altogether Unanswer'd. He says, *That our English Translation of the Bible is not the Word of God, any farther than with respect to the main and substantial Parts.* For my part, I should not care so to express my self; tho' I verily believe, that all he aim'd at was, that *it is not free of all Defects.* And therein I agree with him. As also, that *the same may be said of all Translations.* Nay, I can go on with him in what he adds, as to the uncertainty of the Copies that are now Extant in the Original Languages, as to the true reading, in some parts of the *Bible*, which are of no great and general Concern: And am not backward to own to him, *that in many such places*

as

as this, of Psal. 105. 28. *we cannot say the Hebrew must Necessarily be interpreted thus, and no otherwise*, and that there is no Contradiction between the two Places, understood of different Persons, as has been noted before: And yet after all, since he owns, that *the Subscription* would have *oblig'd* the Ministers to say, *that there is nothing contrary to the Word of God in this Tranddtion*; I think they had good Reason to demur upon it, before they complyd. For tho' it is true, that *there are many things requir'd to the proving a Translation, contrary to the Word of God*; yet it is hard with Solemnity to declare, that such a Translation is not contrary to the Word of God; Nor can I see upon what Foundation such an Assurance can be bottom'd. So that the Difficulty still remains. p. 130, 131.

"5. They must *Assent* and *Consent* to St. "*Athanasias* his Creed. In which Creed there "is this Expression, *which Faith except every one* "*doth keep whole and undefil'd, without doubt he* "*shall Perish everlastingly*. This to our Fathers "seem'd very harsh. Tho' they approv'd of "the *Creed* in general, as heartily as their Bre-"thren, and esteemed it an excellent Expli-"cation of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, yet "could they not look upon themselves as so "far call'd to Judge other Men, as to conclude, "all certainly Damn'd for ever, that are not "so well skill'd in that Mystery, as not to be-"lieve every word there written. One of "the Articles of the *Creed* is this; *the Holy* "*Ghost is of the Father, and the Son*. In this "Article the Greek Church hath differ'd from "the *Latin*, and held that the Holy Ghost pro-"ceeds from the Father only. And it is by con- §. XIV.

"sequence

"sequence imply'd, that the *Greek* Church "must be held undoubtedly Damn'd, which "was an uncharitable Censure, in which they "durst not Concur. Withal, some of the "Ejected Ministers, (as well as.many of those "that Conform'd) considering the Goodness "of God, *&c.* were of so large and extensive "a Charity, as to apprehend, that whosoever "walkt Sincerely up to his Light, with a gene-"ral Repentance for his unseen Errours, was "in a State of Acceptance with God, by Ver-"tue of the Covenant made with Fallen *Adam* "and *Noah*, &c. Now such thought it unrea-"sonable to be forc'd to Renounce so much "Candour as this amounted to, till they saw "more Reason alleg'd than they could meet "with on the behalf of this Principle: *That* "*whosoever did not punctually believe the* Atha-"*nasian Creed, must undoubtedly Perish.**

* *The Peaceable Design*, pag. 14, 15. Baxter's *Nonconformity Stated and Argued*, pag. 145. *His Plea for Peace*, pag. 191. Corbet's *Remains*, pag. 145.

Of the Athanasian Creed.

pag. 79.

Here Mr. *Ollyffe* is transported beyond all Bounds, with this Disadvantage, that what he says recoils upon himself with the greater Force, as is usual in such Cases. *Now* (says he) *must we seriously ask Mr.* Calamy, *whether he will stand to this* (meaning the exception upon this Head) *or no.* I as seriously Answer him Yes. He goes on, *Does he, upon second tho'ts, stand to it, that they cannot Assent to this Creed throughout?* To which I Answer also in the Affirmative; Assuring him, both, that 'tis true in Fact, that the Ejected Ministers were generally of that Sense; and that I therein heartily Concur with them: And if he can prove what he

he Asserts, that the Ejected Ministers, and I with them, *did agree to the damnatory Clauses of this Creed, in plainer and fuller words than the Declaration amounts to*, and that without any added Limitation, I'll freely yield him the Cause, that he contends for; and must own we are here unreasonable Complainants. But if he cannot, I'll leave the Reader to draw his Inferences, without suggesting any thing to prepossess him. All his Proof is in those Words. *The Declaration only respects the Assent to the use of it: But the 8th Article that has been Subscrib'd is this: That this Creed ought* [*thorowly*] *to be receiv'd, for it may be prov'd by most certain Warrant of Holy Scripture*. I Reply: That supposing *the Declaration only respects the Assent to the use of this Creed*, it yet takes it, as it is in the *Common Prayer Book* with its Appendages: And this was the thing our Ministers Objected against: But the 5th Article, tho' it intimates, that *the Creed ought thoroughly to be receiv'd*, yet it does not necessarily follow, that it takes in the Appendages. For I may *thoroughly receive* the Substance of that Ceed, and yet abhor the *damnatory Clauses*. This has been own'd by several of the *Church of England* themselves. And, that it is not devis'd to serve a present turn, may appear from hence; that this very Sense of the 8th Article was given in by many of us as an Explication of our Subscription, before we could be Satisfy'd to Subscribe. And particularly, Mr. *Baxter*; who upon this Article, has this Gloss.

Art. 8. The Three Creeds, viz. Nice *Creed*, Athanasius *Creed*, *and that commonly call'd the* Apostles *Creed*, *ought* [*thoroughly*] *to be receiv'd and believ'd* [Ominino.] Expos.

Richard Baxter's *Sense of the Subscrib'd Articles of Religion*. p. 6. *Printed for* Benjamin Cox *in Ludgate-street*. 1689. Qu.

Expos. *Rightly Understood*, viz. 1. That by [*God of God, very God of very God*] be not meant two Gods. 2. Nor the *damnatory Clauses* taken for part of *Athanasius's* Creed, tho' they be part of the Liturgy *Assented* and *Consented* to.

And now we are willing to return Mr. *Ollyffe* bis Pity: Sure the *Reader will pity him for writing thus loosely Hand over Head, and taking things thus upon trust, without ever examining them*, &c. What need was there (good Sir) of this Insulting? And when you were in the next Page, coming in with a Distinction, why that poignant piece of Wit upon me, (*Mr.* Calamy *will Answer with us now he knows that he has it!*) I hope you did not think I Subscrib'd in my Sleep. Why must you Flout at me, and insult me at such a rate with *Ifs* and *Ands?* Why *if he knew what he did when he Subscrib'd the Articles?* Why should he make an *If* of it? Or why should he suppose *I saw with other Mens Eyes, in what I own or in what I condemn?* That's a Crime I think verily never to be charg'd by a Conformist upon, a Disenter. For there is a sort of Ductile Obsequiousness (abstracting from a search into the Grounds and Reasons of things and their Prescription) that is common with the Former, to which the latter is a Stranger. *Dissenters* may be ductile too, perhaps under the Conduct of such as they Respect: But 'tis far from, being so common. But I'll check my self, tho' I have fair Scope, in Respect to so good a Man.

pag. 80.

Tho' the Gentleman, hath taken the Pains to teach me how to Distinguish; for my part, I have no Heart to give him Thanks. He must *apply the damnatory Sentences* as he sees Good. I have nothing to do with them: Nor do I

ever

ever intend to meddle with them. If he delights in Quibling, he may take his Course. I mention'd not the word *punctually* as supposing it in the Creed; Nor was I ignorant, that the Word was σῶαν and not ὁλὴν But I hope the next time he so freely passes his Censures, he'll take more care of the Grounds he goes upon: least he exposes himself, instead of those he deals with. p. 81.

Mr. *Hoadly* fastens upon this Expression: That the Ejected Ministers *esteem'd this Creed an excellent Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity. You mean*, says he, *agreeable to the Word of God and to Truth*. 'Tis own'd, if it be rightly understood: *From whence* says he) *I argue, If this Explication be true and agreeable to the Word of God, then it is a good general Proportion, that whosoever does not believe it, shall be condemn'd at the last Day*. But this I am far from being clear in. For tho he says, that *this is only the same thing in other Words*; yet I must Confess, to me, it appears widely different. I may own a great many Truths, as agreeable to the Word of God, and yet not think an explicite Belief of them necessary to the Salvation of all Persons in all Capacities and Circumstances. And when he afterwards compares this matter with that great and essential Point of *Faith in Christ*, I cannot concur with him. For tho' the Scripture is plain, that *whosoever believeth not in Christ* (reveal'd to them) *shall be condemed*, yet it neither is so, nor warrants our being so, as to all other Truths; till it can be made appear, that they are of equal Necessity with this. When he *moves* therefore, that I would make the same allowance in one Case as in the other: I am at a loss for his Reason. For I must Confess, I make a mighty difference between Faith in Christ

Part 1. p. 132.

p. 133.

Christ as a Saviour, and the belief of some Particular Doctrines which he hath Reveal'd; of which I am apt to make an estimate, from the influence which they refpectively have upon Practice; and besides, the Words in the *Damnatory Clauses* of the *Athanasian* Creed, don't seem so capable of bearing such an Allowance, as the Passage of Scripture mention'd. For my Part therefore, I must declare my Self against the Damnatory Clauses of the *Athanasian* Creed in any Sense.

And I find the Learned *Spanheim* of the same Mind.* Nay, I agree with Mr. *Hoadly*, that *the Doctrine of the Trinity would be better secur'd, and this very Account of it better received, without such Sentences, than with them.*

* *Vid expetit. Judic. Sup. Dissid. Anglic. Op.* Tom. 2. *p.* 1270. pa. 134. Sect. XV.

"6. They must *Assent* and *Consent* to this "Rubrick, at the End of the Office for *Con-* "*firmation*, that *none shall be admitted unto the* "*Holy Communion, until such time as he be Con-* "*firm'd, or be ready and desirous to beConfirm-* "*ed.*

"Now tho' many, of the Ejected Ministers "were very desirous to have *Confirmation* Re- "stored, and tho't it would be exceeding use- "ful, if manag'd with a becoming Gravity and "Seriousness, yet to deny Persons the Com- "munion for refusing to be Confirm'd in the "Episcopal way, was what they knew, not how "to Justifie. They found it was a Thing "scrupled by many Persons: And were their "Scruples just or unjust, while the same Per- "sons were willing to own their Baptismal "Covenant understandingly and seriously be- "fore the Church, and their own Pastors; "and to know those that Labour'd among "them, and were over them in the Lord, and "esteem'd them in Love for their Works sake, "and

"and to be at Peace among themselves, they "they durst not for scrupling this *Diocesan* "Ceremony cast them from the Communion "of the Church of Christ. And therefore "they durst not declare their Approbation of "the Order that requir'd it, nor *Assent* and "*Consent* to it, nor Subscribe, that it is not "contrary to the Word of God. *

Baxter's *Nonconformity stated and argu'd*, page 97, *&c.*

"These were the Reasons, which they Al- "ledg'd, and Printed, and Publish'd, for their "refusing that *Assent*, *Consent*, and *Subscripti-* "*on* to the Book of *Common Prayer*, and all, "and every Thing therein contain'd, which "was a second Thing straitly requir'd by the "*Act of Uniformity*.

Of Episcopal Confirmation.

Under this Head Mr. *Ollyffe* seems not to have taken the Difficulty of the Ministers, who were Ejected. It did not lie here, that they were Enemies to *Confirmation*, as it was a Publick Profession of an Adherence to the Baptismal Covenant, *&c*. Or that they would pretend to refuse Church Communion to those who laid the main stress in Confirmation, upon the Blessing of a Bishop, Superior to the Presbyters: But their grand Objection lay in this, that they could not see any Reason to lay any such stress upon *Confirmation* in the *Episcopal Way*, as to deny Persons the Communion for want of it; which seems to be the Language of this Rubrick, in which Mr. *Ollyffe can find no fault*; and which he says he would *not Part with for a great deal*. The Parting with *Confirmation*, (the Benefits of which, if it is duly manag'd were many) was not desir'd. But the Ministers not being clear in this, to refuse to admit any Man to the Lord's Table, because he had not been Confirm'd by a Bishop, were loth to hamper themselves by any such Declaration, or

pag. 82.

or Subscription, as should have oblig'd them to have made this Rubrick in that Respect, the Rule of their Conduct. Mr. *Ollyffe* says, that '*tis eno', that the qualify'd Persons do desire Confirmation in the Substance of it.* And it mustc be own'd, that suits the way of Expression well eno': For it Answers the Rubrick, *That a Man be Confirm'd, or ready and desirous to be Confirm'd.* Now says Mr. *Ollyffe*, Persons may be *desirous of Confirmation, who yet by some things scrupled in the Office, may be hindred from obtaining it, and so are to be admitted to the Lord's Table.* If his *Diocesan* be contented with this Gloss, I have no Reason to be dissatisfy'd: The less, because in the same way he hath a Fetch, that will bring off us Ministers as to our Orders; which when we are so hard put to it, is no small Obligation. For as a Person desiring Confirmation, tho' he goes without it, may be a welcome Guest at the Lord's Table, if he only wanted it thro' some Scruples as to the Attendants of it; so may a Minister, who desir'd Episcopal Ordination, tho' by Reason of some things scrupled in Conformity, he could not receive it, be sufficiently empower'd for Gospel Ministrations. As the One is to be own'd as a Christian, so the other as a Minister.

pag. 83.

Mr. *Hoadly* cries out, this is *a great Grievance indeed! That all who are to be admitted to Communion, should be oblig'd solemnly, before the Bishop, to own their Baptismal Covenant; and to have his Prayers, and the Prayers of the Congregation for them!* I Reply, 'tis not pretended it is a *Grievance* to those who are satisfy'd in the Management of this Matter; and yet there is that room for Dissatisfaction among Serious and Pious Persons upon this Head, as will make it a *Grievance* to have their Admission to Communion

Part 1. pa. 134.

munion suspended, till they are Confirm'd by a Bishop: Neither can it be otherwise, till it is fairly shewn, by what Warrant these Words are us'd in the Collect for that Service: *On whom after the Example of thy Holy Apostles we have now laid our Hands*, **To Certifie them by this Sign of thy Favour, and gracious Goodness towards them.** The admitting the Use of this Passage, may very justly be *scrupled by a serious Christian*; and that without either *Weakness* or *Prejudice.* That this Matter may be *manag'd gravely and seriously*, is not deny'd: pa. 135. Nor can it, that 'tis too commonly otherwise. For how many are *Confirm'd*, who tho' they can *say* the *Creed, Lord's Prayer*, and *Ten Commandments,* and *Answer* the Questions in the *Catechism*, yet understand them no more than so many Parrots, and have as little Understanding of the Baptismal Covenant, when Hands are laid, as when Water was powr'd upon them? However, suppose this Comrrion Abuse rectify'd, I can't say with Mr. *Hoadly*, that there is nothing in this Affair, but what *a Christian ought to Comply with:* For I am not able to, prove it the Duty of every Christian, by the *Sign* of Imposition of Hands in Confirmation, to receive a *Certification of the favour and gracious Goodness of God towards him.* And till I could prove this, I see not by what Warrant I could require this of him, as a Term of Communion. And tho' he thinks fit, to repeat his Assertion, that the Ministers *could have join'd in imposing some Things upon the People, which would have excluded many scrupulous Persons from Communion*; yet he must give me leave to take it for an unprov'd Assertion, till it is better evidenc'd. For the Thing all along insisted on, has been this; that indiffe-

rent Things should be left in their Indifferency, and not impos'd. This was the main Point in the *Savoy Conference*, and in the Debates about a *Comprehension*; and I believe will be so in all Times to come.

Thus I have done with the Business of *Assent* and *Consent*, and proceed to the other Heads insisted on.

Sect. XVI.

"3. They were also Requir'd to take the "Oath of *Canonical Obedience*, and Swear Sub-"jection to their *Ordinary*, according to the "*Canons* of the Church.

"In the form of Making, Ordaining and "Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, "this Question is requir'd to be put to Priests, "and Deacons, at the Time of their Ordina-"tion. *Will you reverently obey your Ordinary,* "*and other chief Ministers, to whom is committed* "*the Charge and Government over you; following* "*with a glad Mind and Will their godly Admoni-*"tions, and submitting your selves to their godly "*Judgments?* The Answer to be return'd is, "*I will do fo, the Lord being my Help*. An Oath "also is administred to the Ordain'd, of this "Tenour; I *A. B. Swear that I will yield* "*True and Canonical Obedience to the Bishop of* "N—— *and his Successours in all lawful and ho-*"*nest Things*.

"Herein they could not comply for the "Reasons following.

"1. Because, as all Obedience hath an Es-"sential Relation to the Laws and Mandates "of those whom Persons are bound to obey, "so the Canons of the Church, settled in its "several respective Convocations, are the "stated Laws of the Ecclesiastical Government: "And therefore the *Oath of Canonical Obedi-*

"*enc,*

"*ence*, which hath a Reference to these stated "Laws or Canons of the Church, appear'd to "them to carry in it a plain Obligation to "comply with them, and submit to them, "in their stated Practice, where they had not "a Dispensation. And tho' the Obedience, "that is in this Case sworn, he limited to "*Things Lawful and, Honest*, yet it is evidently "suppos'd and taken for granted, that the "Canons which are in Force do require no "other than such Things, without leaving "Persons at Liberty, which Canons they'll obey, "and which they'll refuse: Which was a La-"titude, which they had not found any Bi-"shop in the Land free to allow to any of "their Clergy. So that, tho' in the Oath "there he a Limitation in Words, yet they "plainly saw it was only to be extended to "*future Commands*, While an Obligation to "comply with the Things *antecedently* re-"quir'd by the *Canons* as *Lawful and Honest*, "was suppos'd and taken for Granted: For "certainly, the Church Representative in its "several Convocations, could not by those, "who profess so great a Reverence for all "its Dictates, be suppos'd to require Things "of any other Stamp or Character. Now "perusing the *Canons*, they could not be sa-"tisfy'd, that many of the Things therein "Requir'd, deserv'd that Character: Nay they "were not Convinc'd, but that many Things, "by those *Canons* requir'd to have been the "Matter of their constant Practice, would "to them have been *Unlawful* and *Dishonest*; "and therefore they durst not come under any "such ensnaring Obligation.

Of the Oath of Canonical Obedience &c.

Mr. *Ollyffe* tells us, that this is *a* Head of yet Oath of greater *Mistakes and Misrepresentations*. If so, I agree with him, 'tis fit they should be rectify'd: And I shall be freely open to Conviction: But where an *Oath* is concern'd we had need see to it, that the Bottom we stand upon be firm and safe. As for the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, I must Confess, I look upon it as a thing which to this day much wants to be consider'd and clear'd. And I should have been glad if the Gentlemen I am concern'd with, had better consider'd its Rise and Foundation. However, what they have suggested must not be overlook'd. If the *Grammarians*, and *Lexicographers*, and disinterested *Ecclesiastical Writers*, might be allow'd to determine the meaning of *Canonical Obedience*; I'm past doubt they'd describe it as an *Obedience to a Spiritual Superior, according to the Canons of the Church:* And yet, when I added something to that Purpose, to explain the word *Canonical*, Mr. *Ollyffe* is offended at my *Ambiguous Words*; and says, *I put them in to serve a strange Purpose*. Good Sir, not so Angry. The *Purpose* I intended to serve, was only to explain the word *Canonical:* This can be no *strange Purpose* to one that does not love Obscurity. If it does not explain it, or gives a wrong Sense of it, 'tis justly liable to Exception: However, I think, *according to the Canons of the Church*, might have been allow'd as an explication of the Word *Canonical*, till a truer, better, or clearer Sense of that word had been given; which will hardly be done in haste. If there be any Ambiguity, it lies here: That it is not Obvious to every Understanding, what *Canons* are now in Force, and how far they are so: But still, what Course soever we take to get that matter clear'd, I should expect

pect it would be allow'd, that *the Oath of Canonical Obedience* does oblige to obey the *Ordinary*, according to such *Canons* as are yet in Force, as far as they are so, provided the things they require be not unlawful: For if this ben't the intention, 'tis both absurd in it self, and utterly contrary to the Antient Use of the Word, for this *Oath* to be term'd *Canonical*.

Mr. *Ollyffe* owns himself *prejudic'd against this Representation, in that he cannot meet with any one Person that ever had such a thing in their Tho'ts, or at least that ever publish'd such a Supposition, till* Mr. Baxter's Nonconformity Stated and Argued, *came out in the Year* 1689. That's strange. Did all till then think that the word *Canonical* in the Oath signify'd nothing? Certainly that cannot be I suppose he had not seen the Bishop of *London's Episcopalia*, which was Printed in 1686. If he had, I hardly think he'd have come with this Insinuation. He next Confutes me out of Mr. *Baxter*, or rather seeks to Confute Mr, *Baxter* from himself. To which I can only say, if that Excellent Person saw occasion to change his Mind, (which has been common with the best of Men) I know not why any should grudge him the Liberty which they would not be deny'd themselves.

P. 68.

pag. 87.

The last tho'ts however, we commonly reckon best. Now, in the last place, (that I know of) where he has given his Sense of this matter he thus expresses himself. *The Reasons* (saith he) *why the Oath of Canonical Obedience is Scrupled by the* N. C. *are these: Because they take the Power it self to which they are to Swear to be specifically Evil, and against the Word of God; they dare not Swear Obedience to Bishops, least they take the name of God in vain; Scandalously approve of Usur-*

Large Life, Fol. pag. 435.

p. 426. *tion in, Christ's Kingdom, encourage Usurpers in insolent Novelties and Corruptions.* And when, 'tis pleaded (as now by Mr. *Ollyffe*) that the Oath is only taken *in Licitis & Honestis:* He Answers, That the Obedience must be according to the Canon; which is their in *Licrtis & Honestis.* And if Mr. *Ollyffe* was really so much offended with Mr. *Baxter*, for changing his Mind as to the Relation of this *Oath* to the *Canons*, he'd have done well to have signify'd it to him in his Life time; which had he done, I am past doubt he would have found, that that *Great and Good Man* (as he is else where pleas'd to Stile him) could have given him very considerable Reasons for it.

pag. 88.

His next Answer is a Blealant Turn. He gives it us in these Words. Mr. Calamy's *Acusation in this matter turns in full force upon himself, and upon those whom he pretends to be for; and he can no ways extricate himself from force of it, but in the same way he must* (says Mr. Ollyffe) *us out too.* That's pretty much I must Confess: I'm sure, if it be so, I am far from being aware of it; and shall not be able to rest till I get the matter clear'd. But how was it, that I came into this Snare? Why truly Mr. *Ollyffe* is so Charitable as to believe I have taken the *Oath of Abjuration*; which at the same time as it binds to a Submission to the *Succession* Legally Establish'd; is *also an Oath of Allegiance to Queen* Anne, which *Allegiance* is an Obligation to *Legal Obedience*; And therefore hath a Reference to the Stated Laws and *Canons* of the Church as well as of the State, which therefore by that *Oath*, I am bound to comply with, This Mr. *Ollyffe*. seems to, take for a good Argument; or at least for as good an Argument of my Being bound by the

Oath

Oath of abjuration, to a Submission to the *Canons* of 1603, as what I alledg'd from Mr. *Baxter*, was of his being bound to a Subjection to those *Canons* by his *Oath of Canonical Obedience*. Had I not Reason to believe He was a true *English-man*, and a hearty lover of his Country, and his Religion, I profess, I should be shrewdly tempted to take this for a Banter on the *Oath of abjuration*, by which we are Sworn to the Protestant Succession. For any to pretend, that that those who take that Oath are Sworn to the *Hierarchy*, and to those *Canons* by which it is Establish'd, and advanc'd to such a height, is in reality to discourage many of Her Majesty's good Subjects from taking the *Oath*; which I am confident there are multitudes would stiffly refose, did they apprehend there was any ground for such a Gloss. For which Reason, (if there were no other) I should advise Caution for the future upon that Head. He hath himself fram'd an Answer for me an Answer of such a Nature, as he tho't would suit his own End: That is extricate himself as well as me: He says, that I should *presently* yield to his Argument, and Answer, *the Oath obliges us to observe the Queens Laws, so be it they be Lawful and Honest*. Whereupon he takes up my Words, and says, *an Obligation to comply with the things Antecedently requir'd, by the Laws as Lawful and Honest, is suppos'd and taken for granted*. And thereupon he concludes, that *the same Canons* that are objected against, *will grind me*; that I *must, by my Oath, Consent to all the Excommunicating Canons*, &c. And if I demur, he desires I would *explain the Obligation, that the Oath to the Queen lays me under*, and the Answer he thinks will serve his turn.

pag. 89.

pag. 90.

For His Satisfaction, I'll shew him how I extricate my self, from any concern in his formidable Argument. The Clause in the *Oath of Abjuration* which he refers to, is this: *and I do Swear, that I will bear Faith and true Allegiance to her Majesty Queen* Anne. The *Faith* and true *Allegiance* I have Sworn to bear to my Soveraign, I take to be no other than *an hearty contributing in my Sphære, to the Defence and Support of her Person, Crown and Dignity, under the of the Laws of the Land*. I am far from looking upon my *Allegiance* Sworn to refer to all the Laws of the Land And in taking *the Oath of Abjuration*, I only bound my self to those Laws, which provide for the Defence and Support of the Person, Crown, and Dignity of my Sovereign, (whom God long Preserve) and for the protestant Succession after Her Decease, if she dies without Issue. And if I am herein mistaken, I should be glad to be set right: And that the rather, because I am apt to think this is the most common and prevailing Sense, of such took the *Oath*, with an intention to make Conscience of observing it. Were it the intention of an *Oath of Allegiance*, to bind all that take it to obey every Law of the Land, then must every Person, that is under such an, be oblig'd to be acquainted with all our Laws, that he may not break his *Oath* thro' Ignorance: Nay farther, whoever breaks any Law (tho' in the most inconsiderable and trifling matter) would be chargeable with violating his *Allegiance*. Put who ever Asserted either of these? If this were the Case, every Man must of Necessity be a *Lawyer*; and whoever broke a Law, (tho' it were but about a pecuniary Business) if he were not a down-right *Traitor,* must at least guilty of an *High Misdemeanour*. But so

far

far is this from being true, that I can appeal to Mr. *Ollyffe* himself, whether he is not satisfy'd, that we have many Laws which He and I are so far from being Sworn to, by swearing *Allegiance* to Queen *Anne*, that we are not concern'd, so much as to read them, or have any Acquaintance with them? And whether there are not other Laws, the Breaches of which we are not oblig'd in Conscience so much as to detect? If so, how can the *Allegiance* Sworn refer to all the Laws? If it be Query'd, how far then I look upon my self as Bound by other *Statute Laws* of the Land, which my *Allegiance* is not concern'd in? I Answer, I fetch my Obligation to them, from our happy *English Constitution*, which is such, as that the Laws bind us by Vertue of our own Content, given by our *Representatives in Parliament, Acting according to the Trust repos'd in them, for the good of the Community.* Now the Canons of 1603, about which our Debate is, I cannot find were ever Consented to in a Parliamentary Way; and therefore not only bind not by Vertue of the *Allegiance* Sworn, but don't so much as bind by the *Consent of Representatives.*

As to the Statute Mr. *Ollyffe* refers to; *viz.* 25. *H.* 8. *C.* 19 I have perus'd it; and observe, that it empowers 32 Commissioners to Revise former Canons *Provincial* and *Synodal*; it retrains the Clergy from pretending to make or execute Canons without the Royal Assent and Licence; and it Vacates all Canons that are contrariant or repugnant to the Royal Prerogative, or the Customs, Laws, or Statutes or this Realm: But I cannot find, that *it Establishes Canons* (as Mr. *Ollyffe* Asserts) *that have the Royal Assent, so be it they are not contrary to any Statute Laws of the Land.* For, that would make

make that Parliamentary Consent (to ratifie such Canons) needless, which yet our *Lawyers* generally Represent as absolutely Necessary. Or if that Act should have gone so far, (as Bp. *Stillingfleet*, with some others, I know affirm it does), it is plainly superseded by another since; *viz*. 13. *Car*. 2. *Cap*. 12. Which as it Vacates the Canons made in the Year 1640. (tho' they had the Royal Assent) so does it also free the Subjects from an Obligation to *any other Laws or Canons, not formerly Confirmed, allowed, or enacted by Parliament*. By this time I hope Mr. *Ollyffe* will own, I am extricated out of his Labyrinth. For tho' by taking the *Oath of Abjuration* I have (as in Duty bound) Sworn *Allegiance* to Her Majesty Queen *Anne*, yet that *Allegiance* refers not to the whole Body of our Laws, but to those that are design'd for the *security of Her Person, Crown, and Dignity*, which by Vertue of that *Oath*, I think my self oblig'd Conscientiously to observe, and I hope always shall. As for the rest of the Laws, I'm free from an *Oath*; and if the Legislative Power be therein warrantably exerted, I look upon my self bound to Obedience by Vertue of the Consent of *our Representatives in Parliament:* But as for the *Canons* or *Ecclesastical Laws*, I have no Concern in them, they have no Relation to the *Allegiance* I have Sworn; the Parliament never ratify'd them; and I am no more oblig'd to regard them, than if I liv'd in another Country.

And can Mr. *Ollyffe* extricate himself as easily? I doubt not. Does he own no more Spiritual Power in his *Ordinary*, and in *the Church Representative met in Convocation*, by his *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, than I do, by the *Oath of Abjuration?* Is he no more oblig'd to obey his

Church,

Church exerting her Power in *decreeing Rites and Ceremonies*, when he has Sworn Obedience in such things; than I am, who disown such a *Power*, and have only Sworn *Allegiance* to my *Civil Sovereign?* Can he plead the want of a Parliamentary Sanction to Confirm the Canons in his own Excuse; when he has Sworn to Obey his Ordinary *Canonically?* And can he be at a loss, what that *Canonically* properly means, when he finds the Canons of 1603 refer'd to, in most of the Visitation Discourses of the Bishops to their Clergy that are Extant? Or to keep to his own instance: Does he think I'm as much bound *to keep Lent*, as he is to Excomunicate one of his Parishioners for want of paying his Fees in the Ecclesiastical Court, when he is requir'd by his Ordinary? Or can he imagine, that I'm as much oblig'd *to hear Morning and Evening Prayer in my Parish-Church*, as he is by *Can.* 28. to refuse Communicants, that might be inclin'd to come to him from Neighbouring Parishes? I profess, I should reckon such Queries as these Ridiculous, if he had not forc'd me upon them. pa. 90.

But he passes from the *Oath of Abduration*, in which *Allegiance* is sworn to the Queen, to the Oaths which are taken to subordinate Governors. And instances in the Oath of a *Freeman* of the City of *London*, who Swears *he'll a Obedient to the Mayor and Ministers of the City*. And here he would have me *tell the Citizens of London, that* [since Obedience hath an essential Relation to Laws, *&c.*] *unless they can Swear to all the Acts of Common Council (which are the stated Laws of the City) that have been made these hundred Years past, they must not take the Oath of a Freeman*. And then he gives me to Understand, I should be *Laught at* for my Pains. pa. 91.

If

If it may be any Satisfaction to Mr. *Ollyffe*, I can tell him, that I have been lately, with some freedom, Addressing my self to the *Citizens* of *London* (in as large a Body as one in our Sphere can be suppos'd capable of applying to them from the Pulpit) upon this Head of *Oaths*, and I gave them my thot's upon the *Freeman's Oath*, and can't find it was at all esteem'd Ridiculous. I told them, that when *Freemen* Swear to be *Obedient to the Mayor and Ministers of the City, and to maintain and keep the Franchises and Customs of the City harmless, in that that in them is*; the Sense of the imposers is plain. 'Tis to oblige all that have the Benefit of the Freedom of this Noble City, to pay due Respect to the Magistrates of it, and to keep the By-laws that are made from time to time, that are consistent with the Laws of the Land; and to adhere to, and support those Priviledges which have been granted by sundry Charters, or which arise from Antient and immemorial Customs; the right of determining which is by several Charters lodg'd with the Mayor and Aldermen. That this Oath obliges Freemen to keep the *By-laws* of the City, if not inconsistent with the Laws of the Land, I suppose Mr *Ollyffe* himself could not deny. I would then desire to know, supposing that the *Lord Mayor*, *Aldermen*, and *Common Council*, (to prevent the inconvenience arising from the unacquaintedness of the Citizens with the By-laws they are to obey,) should agree together upon a Body of Laws for their life, Collecting them out of former Acts of Common Council, and Antient Customary Practises, with additional suiting the Circumstances of the present time; and should publish this as a standing Rule for the Citizens; would not Mr. *Ollyffe* think

think that when after this, they were call'd to take this Oath, it behov'd them to consider this Body of Laws; and rather forbear the Oath than take it, if their Conscience could not allow them to obey them? This I take to be the case as to the Oath of *Canonical Obedience*. The *Church of England* Representative, did in 1603, out of Antient Canons Provincial and Synodal, collect a Body of Canons, which with such Additional as seem'd to them most fit, they Publish'd to the World, as the Standard of Ecclesiastical Obedience; and tho' many Convocations have sate since that time, they have never tho't fit to alter their Rule no not the Convocation in 1689, tho' the Sovereign Authority of the Nation, in their Commission told them, that *the Book of Canons was fit to be review'd and made more suitable to the State of the Church:*) but those Canons are still left as a Standard, by which all Ordinaries are to try those who Swear Obedience to them. In this Case, I think Mr. *Baxter* had good Reason to represent all that take the Oath of *Canonical Obedience* as bound to these Canons: And to intimate, that those, who did not intend to be so, had better forbear the Oath. But the Case of *Freemen of London* is considerably different from this. As to many of the immemorial Customs and By-laws of the City, they have no opportunity of knowing them, till a particular occasion draws out Orders concerning them. Their By-laws are changeable; and often alter'd from Year to Year. And it to all intents and purposes Answers this Oath, if Freemen are ready to comply upon notice from their Governors, that Obedience in these things is expected from them. But if it should ever happen, that the Magistrates of the City,

should

should Publish such a Collection of their By-Laws, as a standing Rule for the Citizens; as the Canons of 1603 are of the Laws Ecclesiastical, I should think the Citizens would be as much oblig'd by their Oath to that Body of Laws, as the Clergy are to the Canons by their *Oath of Canonical Obedience.* Neither am I afraid, that those Citizens, whom Mr. *Ollyffe* seems so displeas'd with for approving my Performance, should know that this is my Sense. I bless God, I both *do and dare speak to Citizens of* London, or any Men Living, whom I have concern with as a Minister of Christ, with openness and freedom: Nor will I *use divers Weights and Measures*; nor Charge others (whom I should be apt to blame for such a Censure on my self) with so base a Practise, unless I have good Reason for it. But he that looks upon his own Sense, as *the Sense of all Mankind*, will take a Liberty: And 'twere unreasonable to deny it him, if he had to do with none, but such as are destitute of common Sense: Tho' if that were really the Case, while they were upbraided for their Weakness, I should think their Honesty might be left free from Aspersion.

pag. 92.

After these Two Answers, he propounds some Absurdities, which will be more easily dispatch'd. However, the Expression he uses is not mine; *viz.* That *the Oath of Canonical Obedience is to swear to the Canons.* I had said indeed from Mr. *Baxter*, that this Oath hath a Reference to the Canons, as the Rule of the Obedience sworn to the Ordinary; and carries in it an Obligation to comply with them: It may be, that is all he means by *swearing to the Canons*, and thetefore I stay not upon it; only beg

pag. 92,

beg leave to keep to the Expressions I had before us'd.

The first Absurdity he charges this Notion with, is this: *It would be an equal, binding him, that takes the Oath to all the Bishops who are equally concern'd in the Canons, whereas it only respects the Bishop of the Diocess in which the Minister Lives.* But here I am to seek for the Consequence. For why is He that swears, he'll obey the Bishop of *Lincoln* according to the *Canons*, oblig'd by that Oath to obey the Bishop of *London?* Tho' one has as much a right to demand it in his own Diocess as the other; yet I don't see, but the peculiar Regard to the Bishop of the Diocess which a Minister Lives in, is as much preserv'd, if the Oath refers to the Canons, and obliges to obey according to them, as if it do's not, so that he is more afraid than hurt in this Case.

His next Absurdity, which he says *is worse,* is this: *It would not only bind Men to the Canons of* 1603. *but to Multitudes of others in former National and Provincial Synods, which are still by the Act declar'd in force, so far forth as they are not contrary to the Laws of God, and this Realm: The like may be said of the Canons of General Councils, at least of them that are own'd in this Land. It would require Ten Years Study of the Canon Law, to have any tolerable Acquaintance with the Laws, that he would suppose us sworn to.* This it must be own'd is hard, but the hardship arises from the Nature of the Constitution, and not from this Explication which he opposes. He refers me to Bishop *Stillingfleet*'s Ecclesiastical Cases, which I have carefully perus'd. I find that Learned Bishop freely asserting, That *our old Provincial Consitutions are still in force, so far as they are not repugnant to the Law of the Land.* pag. 17.

And

And if they are in force, there must be an Obligation upon the Clergy to comply with them, when they are call'd upon. And if it be absurd, to suppose them oblig'd to an Obedience to Laws, which in 10 Years Time they could hardly have any tolerable Acquaintance with; I can't help it, their Constitution must Answer for it, if Bishop *Stillingfleet* has given a just Account of it. For according to him, Bishops have Two Rules to proceed by: *The Word of God, and the Ecclesastical Law of the Realm.* The First of these Rules is plain and clear. As for the Second, he says, *That the Episcopal Authority is not deriv'd from any Modern Canons or Confutations of this Church, (altho' due Regard ought to be shew'd to them) but from the ancient common Law Ecclesastical in this Realm, which still continues in force.* He gives several Instances of this Nature in these Discourses; and among the rest mentions *the Ordinary Jurisdiction of the Bishop over the Clergy of his own Diocess.* He says, 'Tis *as Ancient as Christianity among for the Clergy to give an Account of their Behaviour at their Visitations, and in Case of Contempt, or other Misdemeanors they were to proceed against them, according to the Canons of the Church.* Meaning those Ancient Canons long before 1603, which Mr. *Ollyffe* is so willing to shake off, and so backward to take 10 Years Time in the Canon Law to get Acquaintance with: Tho' really the perusal of *Lindwood*, and the Canons of 1603 might suffice; which may be dispatcht in much less Time than 10 Years space. And he afterwards proves from 25 *Hen.* 8. c. 19, 21. *That such Canons as have been receiv'd and allow'd by Ancient Custom, make a part of our Laws, and continue to oblige, provided that they be not repugnant to the Kings Prerogative, nor to the Laws,*

Duties & Rights of the Parochial Clergy, pa. 9. & pag. 48.

p. 234.

p. 245.

Statutes

Statutes and Customs of the Realm. WhicH things I mention, that Mr. *Ollyffe* may the better discern, that to suppose the *Clergy* of *England* oblig'd to the Ancient as well as Modern Canons, is no such monstrous Absurdity, as he is willing it should pass for. Tho' really for my Part, it would to me be much at one to hear a Man argue, that it cannot be so monstrously absurd, because they are thus oblig'd, or that they can't be thus oblig'd because it is absurd. For I can hardly tell how to suppose any thing more absurd, than to hear *Protestants* applaud and extol a Constitution, that is founded upon a bottom wholly *Popish*.

His next Absurdity is this; that to suppose the *Oath of Canonical Obedience* to refer to the Canons, *would be to render the Limitation in the Oath useless and ridiculous*, when it is sworn they will obey *in all Things lawful and honest*. But where the Consequence lies I cannot discern, For supposing there are several Things in the Ancient *Canons*, that are still in force, provided not repugnant to the Laws of the Realm, which yet are neither *Lawful nor Honest*, and that many that take this Oath may be of that Mind, I can't see how that *Limitation* can be *useless and* pag. 93. *ridiculous*. I'll suppose it a *peculiar tenderness in the Framers of this Oath*, or rather in the Alterers of it at the Time of the Reformation, *to express the Limitation, to prevent Cavils in some and Scruples in others*: I think it was yet no more than was necessary, when there was such a Heap of Canons in force, that were liable to so many just Objections, that were made in the Time of the Papal Darkness and Superstition. Suppose the Limitation of the Oath to *Things Lawful and Honest* were *useless and ridiculous*, if apply'd to the Canons that have pass'd in the se-

veral Convocations since the Reformation, (which yet will not easily be granted) it do's not therefore follow, that it is so as to those that went before and therefore neither is this such an Absurdity, as need to frighten a Rational Man from this Sense and Interpretation.

I profess I'm free according to Mr. *Ollyffes* hopes, to allow him and his Brethren, *The same Candour and Justice in the Understanding this Oath and Promise, as I give and take in others the like Nature*. That which I am against, is taking a Method to make Oaths ludicrous. If they grant, that by this Oath they *own the Bishops Jurisdiction and Governemnt, as truly as the Citizens do that of the Mayor*; they must grant, that this Oath has as real a Reference to the *Canons of the Church*, as the *Oath of a Freeman* has to the By-Laws of the City; and if it has, then they are as much oblig'd by their Oath to be Subject to the former, as a Freeman is by his Oath to be subject to the Latter. And if so, the Debate upon this Head will be reduc'd to a very narrow Compass. For as I can't suppose, that his Oath can oblige him to things that are not *lawful and honest*; so I think 'tis no great Credit to the Church to have one pleading for Conformity to it, who takes it for granted that sundry of the Canons, that have pass'd in the several Convocations since the Reformation, and that belong to the Standard of the Ecclesiastical Government, are excluded by that Limitation.

pag. 94, 95.

Upon the whole he says, the utmost that can be meant by the Oath of Canonical Obedience lies in these Two Things, (1.) *In paying, a Regular and Legal Obedience to the Orders of the Bishop of the Diocess, as far forth as they are judg'd agreeable to the Laws of God, and the Realm:* (2.) *That*

(2.) *That if any Thing is Commanded, that presses on the Conscience, and a Relaxation cannot be gain'd by Petition, there shall be a patient Submission to the Penalty.* I Answer, That *Canonical* and *Legal Obedience* is all one, I can by no Means grant: But I shall leave others to Judge of it, when they have consider'd what I have to say, as to the Rise and History of this *Canonical Oath.* Farther, if those, who take this Oath, swear to pay Obedience to the Commands of the Bishop of the Diocess, as far as they are agreeable to the Laws of the Realm; and if (as Bishop *Stillingfleet* over and over asserts) the ancient Provincial Constitutions, as well as Modern Canons, that are not repugnant to the Law of *England*, are to be esteem'd Laws of the Realm; then they in effect by taking this Oath Swear, that they will obey the Bishop according to the Canons, which is the very Thing oppos'd. And Lastly; as for a patient Submis sion to the Penalty, I think Mr. *Ollyffe* is too hard, to make it a Part of the Oath: And I believe he'd be of that Mind himself, if he should ever come to be in the unhappy. Condition a Clergyman was in, not many Years since; of falling under Eccleliastical Censure, for resisting to give the Sacrament to a notoriously loose and scandalous Person. For tho' he might in such a Case be forc'd to a Submission to Censure, if his Ordinary taking Cognizance of the Case should Charge him upon his *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, to give such. a one, the Sacrament, and he refuse it: Yet I can hardly think, he would be bound by his Oath to be so patient under it; as presently to cease from his Ministry, if in such a Case requir'd.

To come to Mr. *Hoadly.* He charges me with Two Mistakes in the very drawing up this

Part 1. pag. 136.

this Article. (1.) In inserting those words, [according to the Canons of the Church] which are not in the Oath. 'Tis Granted: But, that the word *Canonical* does not imply as much, should have been Evidenc'd, to prove the Mistake upon me. He then Pleads for the Verbal Promise, which were unexceptionable if not limited to a certain Sense by the Oath that came after: But 'tis against that the Objections lie. (2.) He says, I *speak, as if*
p. 137. *no one could be Ordain'd in the Church of England, without taking the Oath of Canonical Obedience., which is not true*, &c. I reply: That Persons were oblig'd to take the *Oath of Canonical Obedience* at the time of their Ordination, I never tho't, much less affirm'd: And on the other Hand, that no Bishop can justifie the Ordaining without a *Title*, which *Title* implies an Obligation to take the Oath to the Bishop, in whole Diocess it lies; I suppose Mr. *Hoadly* will not contest. And therefore to talk or *Ministring in this Church as far as he could without taking this Oath*, *rather than divide the Communion of Christians*, is only to entice Persons into the Church; with a Prospect of what they cannot reach in Hopes when they are once in, they may be perswaded to be satisfy'd to do as their Neighbours.

But let us see Mr. *Hoadly*'s Sense of the Mat-
p. 138. ter. He thinks *the Oath cannot be interpreted any otherwise than thus*: [I Swear, that I will yield such an Obedience as is Due, according to the Laws of Christ's Church, from an inferiour *Presbyter* to his *Bishop*, &c;] which yields what Mr. *Baxter* mainly Pleaded for, unless Mr. *Hoadly* means something different from Antient and Modern Ecclesiastical Canons, by *the Laws of Christ's Church*, which he mentions. But he

he goes on, and says, *its plain from the Reason of requiring this Oath, that it refers, and. can refer to nothing but what this one Bishop shall see fit to require*. Which is thus far true, that a Clergy-man is not Bound to observe *Canons*, which he himself dislikes, if his Bishop does not call upon him: And yet neither is it to be so far extended, as if it were wholly at the Bishops Pleasure, what shall be requir'd of his Clergy; for he's as much oblig'd by his Oath to his *Metropolitan*, as his Clergy is by their Oath to him as their *Diocesan*. If then the Oath does refer *to what the Bishop shall see fit to require*; 'tis within such a compass only; meerly within the compass of the *Canons*; to which the Bishop is as much oblig'd in his higher Sphere, as the Clergy-man in his lower Capacity. He adds; That *the last Words* [in all Lawful and Honest things] *refer to all the Injunctions of the Bishop, and do suppose, that every injunction he lays upon you may possibly be unlawful and dishonest*. But as long as the Bishop is in his Commands as much confin'd to the Canons of the Church, as the Clergy-man in his Obedience; and each by vertue of an Oath; 'tis a little hard to suppose all his Injunctions may be unlawful and dishonest. And for Mr. *Hoadly* to say, that these words *Lawful and Honest*, *refer as well to the injunctions in Cases which the Canons reach to*, *as to Cases which they reach not to*; seems to argue a forgetfulness or what he said a little above, *viz*. That in this Oath Men Swear *an Obedience, according to the Laws of Christs Church*. For if the. Bishop may require Obedience of his Clergy *according to the Laws of Christ's Church*, and yet each of his injunctions in such matters may he *unlawful and dishonest*, then are the *Laws of Christ's Church*, according to which Obedience is Sworn,

a very unsafe Rule, and very unfit to come under Consideration in a Solemn Oath. And supposing it granted, that tho' I took this Oath, yet I my self *am Judge of the Lawfulness and Honesty of every Command* of my Diocesan; yet when I know that the Rules by which their Ecclesiastical. Authority is ordinarily exercis'd, are ensnaring, exorbitant, and unjustifiable; and am at a loss for their Warrant, either from Reason or Scripture, to bring me under such an Oath, I think I may very justly desire to be excus'd. As to what he adds; that *this Oath can refer to none but future Commands*; I hope he'll give me leave to demur upon it, when he himself has in so many words own'd, that the Oath refers to Obedience, *according to the Laws of Christ'sChurch:* And therefore I think it must refer to them, which are already fix'd; tho' the Bishops Personal Commands concerning them be future to the taking of the Oath. When he afterwards tells me, *he would gladly know in what words we would rather promise Obedience to a Bishop*; I freely Answer him, that if the State thinks fit to settle Bishops as Inspectors of Ministers; it must give them Rules to proceed by; which will be the more acceptable for being Scriptural: But as for promising Obedience to them in any Words, any farther than the Scripture goes before us, we desire to be excus'd.

p. 139.

p. 140.

As to the Case he puts (by way of Illustration) with reference to the City, I think I have sufficiently answer'd it before: And yet shall add, that when he can make it appear, that the Bishops have by Law a like determining Power as to the Laws Ecclesiastical, as the Lord Mayor and Aldermen have granted them by several Charters, as to the determining of

p. 142, 143.

immemorial Customs, which Freemen and City Officers are by Oath bound to preserve, the two Cases will then be more fully Parallel. I say farther, that he who by Oath binds himself to give Legal Obedience to the Lord Mayor, is as really Sworn to the By-laws of the City, as a Clergy-man to the Canons of the Church: That as such an Oath to the Mayor, would not bind a Citizen to any thing he apprehended to be unlawful, (as indeed no Oath can bind to what is unlawful) so neither can the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, bind a Clergy-man in a like Case: That a Citizen may honestly take an Oath to the Mayor without knowing all the By-laws, which the Government has never tho't fit to reduce into a Body; and yet that it little becomes a Clergy-man, who has abundant Opportunity of perusing both the Antient *Provincial Constitutions*, and *Modern Canons,* (which are the Stated Rules of Ecclesiastical Obedience) to take the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, either without being acquainted with them; or upon Supposition he thinks Compliance in many or even most of the Cases specify'd to be unwarrantable: And yet once more; that tho' neither a Citizen nor a Clergy-men, can properly be depriv'd of a Judgment of Discretion; (tho' in some Cases there is a more visible allowance made for it than in others) yet that both the one and the other would do more Prudently and Christianly to forbear the Oath, upon Supposition that many of the Laws, they would be thereupon requir'd to obey, were such as they knew before-hand they could not in Conscience comply with. By these Declarations, I think, I have manifested my self *as willing to put a true* Interpretation on the one P. 145.
Oath, as on the other: And therefore at the

same time clear'd my self from his Charge of prevaricating; which I won't retort, tho' I have, fair Scope. I shall leave his Harangue in the Three following Pages untouch'd; as reckoning, that his own calmer Tho'ts, may-convince him he was a little over-heated: He afterwards says, he'll compare the two Senses of this Oath together; and leave the Reader to judge concerning them. For my part, I must declare, that to take the Oath in his Sense, would to me be unwarrantable; and I can't see but that after all his Heat, he yields the main thing Contended for. For when he thus Glosses on the Oath, *I do Swear, that I will yield a true Obedience to this Bishop and such a sincere, ready, and submissive Obedience, as by the Laws of the Church, is required of a Presbyter to his Bishop*; He seems to me very plainly to grant, that he that takes this Oath is bound to *Obey*, according to the Laws or *Canons of the Church*, when call'd upon by the Bishop. Now to be bound by an Oath, to obey according to the Laws and Canons of the Church, is a greater degree of Respect than we think due to them; and the main thing that we object against. And if this be Necessary; if this Oath would bind us to such and Obedience as is requir'd by the Laws of the Churth: We think we may justly refuse it, till they that require it, shew their Warrant to demand it from us. And tho' Mr. *Hoadly* is Angry, that it should be still'd *Egregious Dissimulation to take this Oath with a reserve; to demur upon the Commands afterwards given*; Yet I'm apt to think he would have trod more softly, had he duly observ'd, how that Expression was worded. For it was confin'd to *the standing Rule of the Ecclesiastical Administration*. Now to keep to his own Words; for Persons to

p. 146, 147, 148.

p. 153.

p. 154.

p. 155.

Swear

Swear that they'll yield such *a sincere ready and submissive Obedience*, [to the Bishop of the Diocess] *as by the Laws of the Church is requir'd of a Presbyter to his Bishop*; and yet afterwards, when those very *Laws of the Church* come by the Bishop to be urg'd upon them; for them to plead the unlawfulness of the things requir'd, and that in matters which they might easily foresee, that the Bishop was empower'd, and was likely to urge upon them; if he thinks *Dissimulation* too hard a Word, he may give it what name he pleases: But he must not be angry if we look upon it as a weakness, which we don't care to be guilty of our selves, or encourage in others.

After all, what would this Gentleman have? He owns *Obedience is due from a Minister to the Canons*, in so many Words: But then he says, *not by this Oath, unless they become the Commands of his Bishop:* Let it be granted him. Be it so, that the Oath does not oblige to obey the Canons, unless the Bishop Commands it. But then he's himself not at Liberty, but oblig'd also by his Oath to his Metropolitan, to require Obedience according to the Canons: Well then, when he Commands to obey any Canon, I hope the Oath Obliges: Will this do? No not yet: He adds, further, *nor then any absolute Obedience:* Well, let that also be agreed him. An ablblute Obedience is not due to any Mortal. Still, unless he can prove the things requir'd unlawful, I hope he is bound to Obey: Sure this will do? No not yet; for he adds, *Not by this Oath:* What does not this Oath oblige him to the Canons, when they come to be the Commands of the Bishop? Why should he say and unsay? Does not he know what to stick to? Why (says he) *that is the thing we are now considering:*

sidering: It is so: And I add, that is the thing that but now was granted. Nay, and he must grant, it, if taking the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, he swearing *such a sincere, ready, and submissive Obedience, as by the Lewes of the Church is requir'd of a Presbyter to his Bishop*; which is his own Gloss. Why then should he run backward and forward? But I can easily pass this by, on the account of his Frankness in the Words that follow, which are these: *Whoever designs to Officiate as a Minister in any Church, certainly Acts not fairly and honesty, if he do not first satisfe his Conscience about the lawfulness of Obedience to such Rules and Prescriptions as have been laid down and agreed upon by the Governors of this Church, for the regulating the Behaviour of all that Minister in it, and resolve to obey them.* I desire no more under this Head, than what is contain'd in this Concession, and easily to be inferred from it. For if this will hold, then it follows, that we ought not to take this Oath till *we are satisfy'd in our Consciences about the lawfulness of Obedience to those Rules and Prescriptions, which, were laid down and agreed upon by the Governors of this Church, in* 1603, *for the regulating the Behaviour of all that Minister in it; and can resolve to obey them them:* Now this is what we are not come to, and dare not therefore take this Oath; and we conceive we should not act *fairly. and honestly* if we should: And tho' others do take this Oath, (which is design'd to give the Church Assurance on this behalf) while yet they are not *satisfy'd in their Consciences as to. the Lawfulness of Obedience*, &c. We conceive they, don't act *fairly and honestly* or in other words may be charg'd with *Dissimulation*. Every thing that I aim at follows from hence a Necessary Deduction of Consequences.

But

But 'tis farther added, that *the Rules Prescriptions he is to satisfie himself about, can be only such as concern his own Behaviour and Conduct in his Office.* I won't stick out for this neither, provided he be oblig'd to be satisfy'd in the Canons, that are the stated Rules of Ecclesiastical Procedure, as far as they do or may concern him. And this by an inspection of Particulars will be found to take in fjar the most: For there are few but will affect a Clergy-man more or less. As to what he farther Observes about the *present Time*, and *the Rules* or Canons, *to which Obedience is now requir'd*, I agree, 'tis fit to be taken into Consideration; provided he will observe, that, it was concerning the time when the Ministers were Ejected in 1662, that I was speaking; when Clergy-men were generally called upon (and could expect no other) to obey sundry Canons, which have been since much dis-us'd. Which is what will be consider'd under another Head.

But since I find both Mr. *Ollyffe* and Mr. *Hoadly,* a little Confus'd about this matter, without attempting to trace things to their first Rise and Foundation, which would give a great deal of Light, and prevent many Debates; I shall venture (if I may do it without Offence) to give an *Historical Account* of the *Oath.of Canonical Obedience,* since its first entrance into the Church, down to the present Time. I shall not indeed confine my self to the *Oath* of *presbyters* to their *Bishops*, but shall take in the *Oath* of *Bishops* to their *Metropolitan*, and of *Metropolitans* to the *Pope*; which all stand upon a like Foundation; and have bro't in an intolerable Servitude into the Church, where Freedom was intended to be secur'd and preserv'd.

In

In the first and purest Ages of the Church of Christ, if a Man upon Examination appear'd Qualify'd as the Apostolical Rule requir'd, and his Labours were desir'd by a Society of Christians, He was freely Ordain'd by the Successors of the Apostles, without coming under any Bond or Obligation, saving a Promise to fulfil the Ministry committed to him, with Fidelity, Diligence, and Care: The insisting on which Promise is sufficiently warranted by the Sacred Scripture. But in the times which Succeeded, divers Heresies starting up in the Church, it grew Customary for Persons upon their Admission into the Ministry to Subscribe to the Consession of Faith of the Council of Nice, and the three following Councils, touching the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, and touching the Person and the two Natures of Jesus Christ, and other Controverted Matters. And the Canons of divers Synods and Councils, which met together upon sundry different Occasions, growing at length sufficiently numerous to make a Body of Ecclesiastcal Discipline, it was tho't requisite, that all belonging to the Clergy should be subject thereto, and engage to be subject to their Superiors, and to conduct the Souls committed to their Care, according to them. Till at last the Bishops of *Rome* claiming to their own See a Spiritual Prerogative, Bound all Metropolitans to a Subjection to their Decisions, which were summ'd up in the Canon-Law and these Metropolitans in like manner bound all their suffragan Bishops; and they their Clergy in their Respective Dioceses by an Oath, to be subject to the Canons of Councils and Decisions of the See of *Rome* which continu'd till the Reformation: At which time the Oath was indeed some-what alter'd,

alter'd, and diminish'd, (in this Realm, where the Old Foundation was preserv'd) but continu'd in Sense, and as to its general Design the same, excepting that the Royal Prerogative, and the Laws of the Land, were substituted in the room of the *Papal Power*, and the Decisions of the *Roman See:* But still the Laws and Canons, to which by this Oath a Subjection was sworn, remain'd the same, any further than they thwarted the Royal Prerogative, or any Laws of the Land. So that he that will trace this Matter from the beginning will easily see, that it has been all along design'd, that this Oath should bind Men to a Subjection to Ecclesiastical Cannons; and it must be concluded it is so to this Day, unless better Reasons be given, than have been as yet produc'd. I shall take the Pains to illustrate this Matter by a Deduction of Particulars.

In the Third Council of *Carthage*, An. 397. 'twas decreed, *Can.* 3. That when any Bishops or Clerks were ordain'd, they should have the *Decrees of the Councils* read by their Ordainers in their Hearing, that they might not be able to plead Ignorance of them.

Tom. 3. *Concil.* p. 483.

In the Fourth Council of *Carthage,* An. 419. The first Canon is very exact and particular, as to the Examination of Persons Ordain'd Bishops. They were to give a distinct Account of their Faith upon sundry Heads of Religion mentioned: As about the Trinity; and our Saviours Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, and Ascension; about the Holy Scriptures, about their own Resurrection, and a Future Judgment: And then follow,other minuter Matters. Enquiry was made, whether they Condemned Marriage; or were against second Marriages; or against eating Flesh; or against communicating

municating with reconciled Penitents: But no *Promise* was exacted as to other Canons; much less was any *Oath* requir'd.

The Fourth General Council, *An.* 451. requires, that all the *Canons* that had been made in the foregoing Synods, be generally *observ'd.*

Tom. 11. *Concil*, p. 493.

In the Third Council of *Orleans*, An. 538. the 19th Canon appoints, that all Clerks, that would not do their Duty according to the *Ancient Canons*, should be depos'd, till they had given their Bishop Satisfaction: And Can. 33d. of the same deprives all Bishops, that should not *observe the Canons* of this Council, not only of their Episcopal Character, but even of the Communion of Saints.

Ibid. pag. 620.

In the Fourth Council of *Orleans*, An. 541. it was ordred Can. 6. that Parish Priests should receive from their Bishops the Rules and *Canons* that were necessary for them; that neither they, nor their People might from thence forward plead Ignorance of such Things as were Decreed, *&c.*

Spalatensis de Repub. Eccl. Lib. 3. Cap. 5. §. 45, 46.

As to Bishops, they at first made a *Profession of their Catholick Faith*, when they were Consecrated, as an Evidence they agreed with other Bishops of the Church; and they some time after confirm'd it with an *Oath:* Which was afterwards turn'd by *Metropolitans* to an *Oath of Obedience.* And therefore *Baronius* ⋆ takes Notice, that towards the Year 600, there was a Petition presented to *Maurice* the Emperour by the Bishops of *Aquileia*, in which they hint their being bound to their *Metropolitan* by an *Oath.*

⋆ *Ad.* An. 590.

Tom 15. *Concil*, p. 290.

The Synod of *Chalons* upon *Soan,* An. 650. requir'd in the second Canon, that the *Canons* of former Councils should be *inviolably observ'd* by all.

And

And the Fourth Council of *Toledo*, Can. 27. and the Council of *Merida*, Can. 4th. carry'd the Matter yet farther.

But in the 11th Council of *Toledo*, An. 675. the 10th Canon is very express and full. *Altho' all that are engaged in Holy Orders are bound by* Canonical Rules, *yet it is expedient* (say the Fathers), *that all who have any Ecclesiastical Promotion, should give Security, that they will keep their Promise or Vow on that behalf. For what is expresly promised.* N. B. *is usually more regarded, than what is only imply'd and suppos'd. And therefore* (say they) *it has seem'd good to this Holy Council, that whoever is admitted into Ecclesiastical Orders, should before his Admission bind himself by a Writing under his Hand, that in the. Sincerity of his Heart he'll keep the Catholick Faith, live justly and piously, and in no wise contradict the* [*Canonical Rules*;] *and in all Things give due Honour and Obedience to his Ecclesiastical Superiors. This* the Learned *Stillingfleet* ★ says, *is the first mention we meet with of any Oath of Canonical Obedience, taken by Men in Orders.* In which tho' I can't agree with him, yet I think we have here a plain Intimation of the Original Design of this Oath, whenever it was first introduc'd.

Ibid. pag. 521, 522.

★ *Defence of Archbishop* Laud pag. 490, 491.

But after the Year 700, the Popes of *Rome* having succeeded in divers Encroachments, were for obliging the Bishops to take an *Oath of Fidelity* to them. *Boniface*, their *German* Apostle, set the Pattern. He took an Oath, by which he made himself an entire Vassal to the See of *Rome*, in the Time of Pope *Gregory* the Second. The Form of his Oath is given us by *Baronius*.† And 'tis said, that this Pope *Gregory* ordain'd 150 Bishops in several Places, whom he did engage with the same Oath.

† *Ad* An. 723. *N.* 4.

Af-

After this they went on apace: The inferiour Clergy were so much the more firmly bound to their immediate Superiours, by how much the more straitly they were bound to the Pope: And therefore in a *German* Council, *An.* 742. under the Conduct of this *Boniface*, 'tis decreed in Can. 3. that all Parish Priests should be subject to their Bishop, *according to their Canons*. And Can. 5. that every Bishop in his Diocess should manage himself *according to the Canons*. To the same Purpose is Can. 4. of the Council of *Soissons*, An. 744. And in the Council of *Cloveshow* here in *England*, it was decreed that that the *Canons* and Laws of the Church should be read over every Year, in a Synod, that they might recover their Force. And indeed, whoever will be at the pains to compare, will find all the Canons of Foreign Councils upon this Head, adopted to the *English* Church in those Days, and taking Place without controul; some few Things only excepted.

Tom. 17. *Concil*, p. 416,

Ibid. pag. 458.

The Obedience of the Clergy to their Bishops *according to the Canons*, is also earnestly inculcated, in the Council of *Verneuil*, An. 755. Can. 8. in the *Capitular* of *Charles* the Great, *An.* 779. and those that came after. Particularly in one. He gave a most solemn Charge to all his Clergy, to obey their Bishops in all things *according to the Canons*.* And the like may be seen in many Councils in the following Times, which it is needless to repeat;

* *Tom.* 20. *Concil*, p. 270.

But there is one ancient Canon I must not omit: 'Tis the 13th of the Council of *Chalons*, An. 813. which forbids the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*. The Words of it are these. *In the mean Time we are inform'd of certain Brethren, that they force those whom they are about to Ordain to Swear, that they will do nothing against the Ca-*

Ibid. pag. 395.

mons,

nons, and be Obedient to the Bishop that Ordains them, and that Church in which they are Ordain'd: Which Oath, because it is Dangerous, we with one Consent forbid all to have any Concern in. These Gentlemen may observe, that those who sate in this Council had the same Apprehension with us of the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*; and that they were as much against it as we, as thinking it a dangerous thing. Here we our selves pay *Canonical Obedience*.

Ibid. p. 395.

Morinus has Publish'd 16 of the most Antient *Latin Rituals* he could meet with, of the Ordination of Bishops and Priests; in many of the former of which a general Promise is inserted of Obedience to the *Metropolitan*, but no mention of an *Oath* to the *Roman Sea*. But in the 11th Ritual (which he believes to be about 700 Years Old; and which not improbably might be drawn up in the Days of Pope *Gregory* the 7th, who in matters of this Nature out-went all his Predecessors) the Elect Bishop hath the two following Questions, among others, put to him. ⋆ Quest. *Wilt thou reverently receive, teach and keep the Traditions of the Orthodox Fathers, and the Decretal Constitutions of the Holy and Apostolick See?* Answ. *I will.* Quest. *Wilt thou bear Faith and Subjection to* St. Peter, (*to whom the Lord gave the Pewer of binding and loosing*) *and to his Vicars and Successors?* Answ. *I will.* And to *Faith and Subjection* they afterwards added, *And Obedience in all things according to the Authority of the Canons.* At length, in the *Roman Pontifical*, the Oath came to tie thus Express'd.

⋆ Morinus de Sacris Ordinat. *Part.* 2. *pag.* 263.

I N. *Elect of the Church* N. *from this Hour forward, shall be Faithful and Obedient to* St. Peter *the Apostle, and the Holy* Roman *Church, and our Lord the Pope* N. *and his Successors, that shall enter Canonically*, &c. I shall help them to retain and *defend the* Roman *Papacy, and the Royalties of* St. Peter *against all Men; saving my own Order*, &c. *I shall take care to preserve, defend, increase, and promote, the Rights, Honors, Priviledges, and Authority of the Holy* Roman *Church of our Lord the Pope, and his Successors*, &c. *The Rules of the Holy Fathers, and the Decrees, Orders, or Appointments, Reservations, Provisions, or Mandates Apostolical, I fall observe with all my Strength, and make them to be observ'd by others*, &c. And thus it continu'd down to the Reformation.

So that in the *Roman* Church, thus stands the Case. Every *Pope* Solemnly binds, himself, at his Entrance, to preserve inviolably the *Canons and Constitutions* of his Predecessors. So doing, he thinks he may with the more Reason oblige all Primates and Metropolitans to take an Oath of Obedience to himself, *according to the Canons of the Church*. A *Metropolitan* thus Bound, is for binding his suffragan Bishops to Subjection to him in the same manner. And *Bishops* having a desire also to exercise Domination, and contribute what they can to uphold the Reverence of the *Antient Canons*, bind their Clergy in the same *Oath*, which they demand of them, either at their Ordination; or when they give them a License to Officiate in their Diocess. And thus the same *Oath* binds all in the *Hierarchy* from top to bottom.

At the time of the Reformation here in *England*, an upper Link of this Chain was broke. The Oath to the *Pope* was Scrupled by the *Metropolitan*

tropolitan of *Canterbury*. *Cranmer* would not take it without a Protestation, that he conceiv'd himself not bound up by it in any thing, that was contrary to his Duty to God, to his King or his Country. And this he repeated Three times in Publick.; And when Dr. *Parker* came afterwards to be Consecrated Arch-bishop of *Canterbury,* he dropp'd the *Oath to the Pope altogether,* and only took the Oath of the King's Supremacy, and against the Power and Authority of all Foreign Potentates. *Hooper* would gladly have broke another Link of this Chain, and have been excus'd from the *Oath of Obedience to his Metropolitan:* But he was overrul'd. And the Chain is now the same as ever, putting only the Prince in the room of the room of the *Pope*, excepting the few alterations the Law has made. As then the *Pope* was bound by Oath to keep the Laws of the Church, and Arch-Bishops were bound by an *Oath* to him, and Bishops to them, and to them the inferiour Clergy: So now, The Sovereign Swears *to maintain and preserve to the Church all CANONICAL Priviledges*. The Arch-bishops Swear, that our Sovereign, *is Supreme Governor of this Realm*, &c. *As well in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Things or Causes, as Temporal*, &c. *That they renounce and forsake all Foreign Jurisdictions*, &c. *and that to their Power, they will Assist and Defend all Jurisdictions, Priviledges, Preheminences and Autority, United and Annext to the Imperial Crown of this Realm*. The Bishops Swear, *that they will yield all due Reverence and Obedience to their Archbishops, their Metropolitical Church, and their Successors*. And the inferiour Clergy, that *they will yield True and Canonical Obedience to their Bishops, and their Successors, in all Lawful and Honest Things*. So that if in this *Church of England*,

Mason de Minist. Anglicano. p. 154.

as the National Constitution, the *Oath of Obedience*, ever referr'd to the *Canons,* I think it must do so still. And that it was intended it should do so, is also farther Evident from hence, in that in the Ecclesiastical Canons, which were publish'd in *Scotland*, in Concert with the Clergy of *England*, Chap. 2. §. 10. it is thus Orderred*: No Person shall hereafter be receiv'd into Holy Orders, nor suffered to Preach, Catechize, Read Divinity, Minister the Sacraments, or execute any other Ecclesiastical Function, unless he first Subscribe, to be Obedient to the Canons of the Church.*

Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical. *Qu. Aberdeen.* 1636.

Without farther Reflexions, I shall only add, that whereas the two Gentlemen I am concern'd with, have taken the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, the one to the Bishop of *Lincoln*, and the other to the Bishop of *London*, it so falls out, that their Respective Bishops have so far discover'd their Sense, in this matter, to the World in Print, that any may discern they intended by administring the Oath to them, to bind them to Obedience according to the Canons. As for Mr. *Ollyffe*, I am mis-inform'd if he was not under an *Oath of Canonical Obedience* to Bishop *Barlow*; Now that Bishop told Mr. *Shepperd* before many Witnesses, that *if he had not in all Points Conform'd according to the Canons of the Church, he was forsworn, and had broke his Oath of Canonical Obedience.* ⋆ Mr. *Hoadly*, I doubt not hath taken the *Oath of Canonical Obedience* to the Bishop of *London*, who in his *Episcopalia*, speaking of the *Canons*, tells his Clergy, *they have Sworn to observe all such Injunctions.* † Which things I leave to their mature Consideration; and perhaps it may require some tho'ts to reconcile sundry Expressions of theirs concerning this Oath, with the Sense

⋆*See* Shepperd's *Considerations on* Bennet's *Defence of his Discourse on Schism.* pag. 32.
† *Episcopalia.* p. 8.

Sense of their *Diocesans*, who Administred it to them.

"Whether they had any Reason or not for thus Scrupling Conformity to the *Canons*, according to the Demand of this Oath of *Cano-* "*nical Obedience*, let any impartial Person "Judge, when I have briefly let before them "the *Canons*, to which they Scrupled to yield "Conformity, with their Objections against "them. ⋆

Se. XVII. *Of the Canons of* 1603.

"By the fourth Canon, *Whosever charges the* "Book of Common Prayer, *with containing any* "*thing in it, that is Repugnant to the Scriptures,* "*he is to be* ipso facto, *Excommunicated, and* "*not restor'd but by the Bishop of the Place, or* "*Arch-bishop, after his Repentance, and Publick* "*Recantation of such his wicked Erroour.*

⋆ *The Learned Reader may here consult the Learned* Spanheim's *Censure of the Canons.* Op, Tom. 2. P. 1280. &c.

"They could not bind themselvs to Con- "form to this Canon, because, tho' it should "be allow'd to be an Errour to bring such a "Charge against the *Book of Common Prayer*, "yet could they not see that it must therefore "be an Errour of that Magnitude and Wick- "edness as to deserve *Excommunication*. If "all, that have worse Errours than that can "be suppos'd to be, must be presently Excom- "municated, the Church would remain but "thin. Besides, they could not but Esteem it "a great abuse of *Excommunication*, to have it "thunder'd out against any Persons before they "were heard to speak for themselves, or told "of their Sin, and called to Repentance. *Ex-* "*communications* of this kind they durst not "Publish when Commanded, for fear of of- "fending Christ, and injuring his Servants: "And therefore they durst not Promise or. "Swear, that they would do it. And as for

"those, who would throw the Blame in "such a Case upon the Command of Superi- "ours, they appear'd to them to open a Door "to the Execution of any Injustice or Villany "in the World, supposing Autority should in- "pose with Command. ★

★ Baxter's *Nonconformity Stated & Argued*, p. 106. *&c.*

Not to mention other more Antient Provincial Canons that might be insisted on; This is one of the Canons that Mr. *Ollyffe* says, inferior Ministers *have manner of concen in, as no ways relating either to them or their Ministry.* Which is a little Strange: For what, tho' *it contains no Express Order or Command*, it yet lays the Foundation of a Command to publish an Excommunication of the breakers of the Canon, which a Minister may be requir'd by his Ordinary to Publish by the Oath he has taken. And with Mr. *Ollyffe's* good Leave, *This was not only the meaning of the Author of* [Nonconformity Stated] but my meaning too; who laid the stress of the Objection here; that *Excommunications of this kind they durst not publish when Commanded, and therefore durst not Promise or Swear they would do it.* So that I freely leave it to the Reader to Judge, whether I have *mistaken the State of the Case, and the Sense of my Author*, as he would make People believe, or he has mistaken me: Let any Man judge whether he was not in hast to say, I do not *so much as mention that*, in which my words are so express.

pag. 96. 97.

pag. 98.

But to come to the *Criteria*, which Mr. *Hoadly* has affixt. I take this Canon, to be one of those that *Concern* an Inferiour Clergy-mans *own Behaviour and Conduct in his Office.* For he may be call'd upon to publish Excommunications against the breakers of it. Whether

Part 1. p. 156.

ther a Clergy-man is not *suppos'd by the Governors of the Church to be oblig'd and ready to obey* this Canon, I leave it to him to judge. I don't perceive it has been properly *repeal'd by any subsequent Laws*; tho' Mr. *Ollyffe* asserts it has. For if the Church had before the Toler ration Act, a real Right to Excommunicate the depravers of her Offices, and contemners of her Liturgy, I can't see but she has so still. And it the Church had Power to make that Law without the State (as it actually did) then I don't see why it mayn't have an equal Right to continue it without regarding the State. Nor is the Canon of that Nature, as that *Obedience cannot be perform'd at this time*, as well as formerly: Neither can I perceive there is *such a general Disuse as is Connived at by all in Auto rity:* Or at least, if there be a disuse, the Canon may be at any time reviv'd at the Pleasure of Superiors. And therefore I conclude in Mr. *Hoadly*'s Words; that this Canon is *now suppos'd to be in force, and every Minister suppos'd to be ready to comply with it, and oblig'd to do it*, when call'd upon. p. 157.

Or whatever it is at this time, (when we are so Happy as to have the Bench of Bishops generally fill'd with Persons of so great Moderation) that there was a great Disposition both in Arch-bishops and Bishops to have this Canon strictly executed when the Act for Uniformity took place, (which is the time I had especially under Consideration) I suppose neither Mr. *Ollyffe* nor Mr. *Hoadly* will Contest. And what was, then, may be again. Should the Canon be dormant, it may be reviv'd at Pleasure.

"By the fifth Canon, *all those are to* Ipso "facto *Excommunicated*, &c. who affirm any of "*the Thirty Nine Articles agreed upon in Con-* "*vocation in* 1562, *to be Erroneous, or such as he* "*might not with a safe Conscience Subscribe to.*

"They could not bind themselves to Con- "form to this *Canon*, for the same Reasons as "they scrupled Conformity to that foregoing. "And withal, they found the words of several "of the Articles liable to Exception; and some "of them of small Moment and Dubious. They "could not see the Warrant of that Authority "Ascrib'd to the Church in the Twentieth "Article. *They knew of no Charter Christ had* "*given to the Church to bind Men up to more then* "*himself hath done.* Neither could they esteem "every thing that is true, an Article of the, "Creed, or Necessary to Church Communion; "so that all, that Dissent, must be presently "cast out. Besides, they found, Bishop *Jeremy* "*Taylor* overthrowing the Ninth Article about "*Original Sin*, and Dr. *Hammond* Refining up- "on the Fourteenth Article, and denying the "Seventeenth; in which they had many Fol- "lowers, who were all by this Canon to be "*Ipso facto* Excommunicated. Which was a "thing in which they durst not Concur, as "easily foreseeing, that this would make the "Articles an Engine of endless Strife and Di- "vision.†

† Baxter's *Noncanformity Stated & Argued,* pag. 109. &c.

What I have said as to the Former Canon may be equally apply'd to this; and therefore shan't again repeat it: Saving, that I desire Mr. *Ollyffe* to observe, that if the inferior Clergy may be call'd on to publish Excommunications according to this Canon, they are nearly concern'd in it: And Mr. *Hoadly* to take Notice,

Notice, that this Canon is io far from being *repeal'd*, that it is rather Confirm'd by the Act for Toleration; by Reason that even the *Dissenters* are call'd on by that Act to subscribe the Articles.

"By the Sixth Canon, all those are *ipso fa-*
"*cto* to be *Excommunicated, that should affirm,*
"*that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of*
"*England are Superstitious, or such as being Com-*
"*manded by lawful Authority, Men who are zea-*
"*lously and godly Affected, may not with a good*
"*Conscience approve and use them, or as Occasion*
"*requires, subscribe unto them.*

"In this *Canon,* the Church seem'd to them
"to assume to it self a most exorbitant Power,
"by laying so great a stress upon every one
"of its Ceremonies, as presently to excom-
"municate Persons, that should but represent
"any one of them as unwarrantable. Much
"more could not have been said as to the Ten
"Commandments, or any Articles of the
"Creed. But besides, the Ejected Ministers
"did esteem the Things abovemention'd to
"be unwarrantable, and therefore could not
"agree to Excommunicate themselves, and
"such as concurr'd in the same Sentiments
"and Apprehensions with them.

Mr. *Ollyffe* may observe, I have here again hinted the Publishing those Excommunications, which; he says I *never mention'd:* And Mr. *Hoadly* may take Notice, that if some at Helm in the Church are. for letting these Canons lie asleep, there are others, that are earnestly desirous they should be awaken'd: And that it is hard to give Assurance to any Man that takes the Oath, that Obedience in such Cases as these will not be hereafter requir'd of him. But however 'tis as to that, they who were Eject-
ed

ed in 1662. had good Reason to expect if they Conform'd, to be herein hard put to it.

"By the Seventh Canon, *All those are* ipso "facto *to be Excommunicated, that should 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 re-* "*pugnant to the Word of God.*

"Tho' some of the Silenc'd Ministers could "have gone farther than others, in submitting "to Diocesan Episcopacy, yet take that Form "of Government in the Compass of it ac- "cording to this Canon, and they found it "full of Corruption. The Pastoral Power, "which was lodged by Christ in the Ministers "of their respective Congregations, was over- "thrown; and the *Power of the Keys* put into "improper Hands: And that Bishops should "govern the Church by others, in a secular "Manner; even by Laymen, who do that in "their Name which they know nothing of; "could not in their Judgement be reconcil'd "with the Word of God. And therefore they "durst not bind themselves to *Excommunicate* "all such, as should pass but such Censures "upon the frame of the Ecclesiastical Govern- "ment, as it really deserv'd. ★

★ *Idem, Ibid.* page 112.

The same Remark has Place here, as under the Head foregoing. Mr. *Ollyffe* indeed, says, *That all these Excommunicating Canons are repeal'd by the Act of Toleration.* How repeal'd? Has the Church no longer Power to excommunicate upon such Occasions? I have read the Act, and can't find any thing to that Purpose. It is indeed there said, that no Persons should from that Time forward be prosecuted in any Ecclesiastical Court, for, or by Reason of their Nonconforming to the Church of *England*. But

pag. 94.

'tis

'tis hard to fuppole, this deprives the Church of any Power that is agreeable to Scripture. But as 'tis reckon'd an unanswerable Argument, when we *Dissenters* are assaulted, that if we were Schismaticks before the Act of Toleration, we are so still: So I think 'tis as good an Argument, that if the Church could warrantably, and agreeably to the Divine Rule and Order, Excommunicate upon such Occasions before this Act, it may do so still. For an Act of Parliament can never make an Ecclesiastical Act, that is agreeable to the Gospel Rule invalid. And besides, it is hard to suppose a Parliament should repeal Canons, which no Parliament (as I know off) ever made binding as Laws upon the Subject.

"By the Eighth Canon, *all those are* ipso "facto *to be Excommunicated, who should affirm,* "*that the form and manner of Making and Con-* "*secrating Bishops, Priests, or Deacons, contain-* "*eth any thing in it repugnant to the Word of* "*God.*

"Tho it should be suppos'd, there were "nothing amiss in this Book of Ordination, "yet the belief of its Innocency could not in "the esteem of the silenc'd Ministers be justly "deem'd a Matter of that moment, as to be "necessary to Salvation; or that Persons should "be cast out of the Church for the want of "it. They could not therefore take an Oath, "whereby they should enter into a Combina- "tion of that Nature, as should make them "liable to be charged with the unhappy Con- "sequences. ★

"By the Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Ca- "nons, *such as separate themselves from the Com-* "*munion of the Church of* England, *and such as* "*own those separate Societies to be true Churches,* "*are*

★ *Idem, Ibid.* page 114, &c.

"*are all to be Excommunicated, and only restor'd*
"*by the Arch-Bishop.*

"Canons of this kind they durst not swear
"Subjection to, because they thought them
"very uncharitable. If a weak mistaken Chri-
"stian may be a,true Christian, tho' faulty;
"supposing it granted, that they who separa-
"ted from the Church of *England*, and such
"as adher'd to them, really were in an Error,
"yet could they not see how their Errors
"could be look'd upon as comparable to those
"of the *Papists*, who yet are so far favour'd
"by many of the Prelatical Party, that the
"*Roman* Church they belong to, is own'd to
"be a true Church. Neither can it with any
"Ground be affirm'd, that the Ignorance, Er-
"ror or Corruption of such *Seperatists* is half
"so great, as is discernable in the *Muscovites*,
"*Greeks*, *Abassines*, *Coptics*, *Jacobites*, *Nestori-*
"*ans*, and *Armenians*; who yet are commonly
"confess'd to be true Churches. The greatness
"of the Errors of those that separate from the
"Church of *England*, cannot make them cease
"to be true Churches, when Churches much
"more Erroneous are own'd to be true. Nei-
"their can their being gathered and main-
"tain'd without the Consent of the Ruler,
"presently incapacitate them from being true
"Churches: For he that would Condemn
"them upon that Account meerly, must with
"the same Breath disown all the Churches of
"Christ, which were in the World for some
"Hundreds of Years: Who were all in com-
"mon in that Condition. The Silenc'd Mini-
"sters tho't it very fit to leave those to them-
"selves, who were so confin'd in their Charir
"ty; as thinking it their Duty to embrace all
"those as Brethren, who *fear'd God*, *and*

"*wrought*

"*wrought Righteousness*, and to esteem all those "as true parts of the Church of Christ, among "whom there was the true Christian Faith "and Worship, how different soever their "Particular Sentiments or Modes might be, "or what Failures soever might be amongst "them, that were confident with an honest, "upright Heart and Life. *

* *Idem. Ibid.* pag. 116.

Tho' I here mention the Reasons why the Ejected Ministers dislik'd the Substance of these Canons, and do the like under some other Heads, yet it is thus to be understood, that for these Reasons they durst not bind themselves to Publish when requir'd, the several Excommunications, which such Canons threaten'd.

"By the Twenty Seventh Canon, *No Mi-* "*nister is wittingly to Administer the Cup to any* "*but to such as Kneel*, &c.

"To this they durst not Swear Subjection for "the Reasons mention'd before, under the "Head of *Assent and Consent*.

Id. Ibid. p. 116.

Mr. *Ollyffe* here says, that this Canon must be Obey'd, where *any one refuses to Kneel out of Contempt and Design*. I Answer: That they, who are fond of the Ecclesiastical Autority, and Zealous for the Rights of it, are very apt to Interpret every little Neglect, as Contempt. He asks, *who ever knew, any Bishop, in our Days, require the casting of a humble Scrupulous Person from the Communion, for the sake of a Gesture?* I Reply; I should think it Natural for every Bishop to do so, who may have given himself a Liberty to inveigh against all, that out of Scrulosity forbear Compliance with any of the Injunctions of the Church, as Schismatical, Contenti-

tentious, and unruly; which he well knows, has been the Case of several. But supposing things are so bad, as that a Suspension comes, Mr. *Ollyffe* says, *He must patiently bear it*. I don't know where the *must* lies; unless it can be made appear to be a Man's Duty to bind himself to such ensnaring Canons. But when he knows before-hand, that this Canon he may be call'd upon by his Bishop to keep, and he is bound to it by his *Oath*, I should think it were wiser to forbear the Oath, than expose himself to a Necessity of such Patience. To say, that *no Government can be so compleat amongst Men, but Circumstances may be imagin'd, in which a Conscientious tender Man may be under hardship by the Laws*, does not abate the Difficulty: It is a Plea, that may be urg'd for any sort of Irregularities. But why, because all Governments are imperfect, I must therefore come under an Obligation to act by Rules, which I can't justifie, for my part I cannot imagine. And for Mr. *Hoadly*'s Satisfaction, I'll add, that this 27th Canon, *concerns a Clergy Man's own Behaviour and Conduct in in his Office:* And I suppose he won't deny, that it is *such as he is suppos'd by the Present Governors of the Church, to be oblig'd and ready to obey*, when he recollects, that it is one of those particular Canons which his Diocesan told his Clergy, they were *Sworn to observe*. ⋆ I know nothing of any *Repeal*; And as to *Disuse*, I suppose it can't be pretended, when his Diocesan hath so publickly given his Sense, not many Years since. But whether he hath (as he intimates) *prov'd it very Lawful both for the Ministers to pay Obedience to this Canon, and for their Governors to require it*, is left to the Readers Judgment.

p. 100.

Part 1. p. 156, 157.

⋆ *Episcopalia*, p. 8.

"By

"By the Twenty Eighth Canon, *Ministers* "*are Requir'd to refuse Communicants coming from* "*other Parishes.*

"To this they could not submit, because in "some Cases the Receiving of Communicants "from other Parishes might be a Duty. As "particularly if the Incumbent were Vicious, "or Scandalous, or Divine Ordinances were "so managed, as is inconsistent with the Edi-"fication of the Parishioners. For them in "such Cases to have refused to receive Per-"sons to Communion with them, would, in "their Apprehension, have been grosly. un-"charitable. ★

★ *Ib. Ibid.*

Mr. *Ollyffe* says, *This Canon is exprest with greater Latitude, and seems to lay the Injunction upon Church-wardens.* 'Tis true, the Canon says, *they must Mark as well as the Minister*; but still the stress of the Canon lies on the Ministers Care, when they have given him Information. If Mr. *Ollyffe can see no great difficulty a Prudent Minister can be in from this Canon*, 'tis to himself: But it does not therefore follow that none else can. And tho', *if in some rare Cases there should happen such a hardship*, it Satisfies him, that *the Minister must shew his Submission to the Bishop by Petitioning or suffering*; Yet he must give others leave to think it both wiser and safer to avoid coming under any Obligation, than to run a hazard of being so hamper'd.

pag. 100.

Mr. *Hoadly* may also take Notice, that this is another of the Canons expresly mention'd by his Diocesan, ★ which he looks upon his Clergy Sworn to observe: And he urges it upon his Clergy with some warmth, ★ by several Reasons. But whether Mr. *Hoadly* has *prov'd it Lawful both for Ministers to pay Obedience to it, and for*

★ *Episcopalia*. p. 8.

★ *Ib.* p. 15. page. 157.

for their Governors to require it, may deserve second Tho'ts; as also how the little regard to it, that is commonly to be observ'd can be justify'd.

"By the Thirty Eighth Canon, *a Minister* "*repenting of his subscription, or afterwards omit-* "*ting any of the prescribed Forms or Ceremonies,* "*is first to be suspended, and then Excommunicate, and then deposed from the Ministry.*

"This they Apprehended might, in many "cafes, be to consent to call a Man out of the "Church, for being Conscientious: To which "they were afraid to Submit, least they should "contribute to the Silencing some of those, "who as much deserv'd encouragement as any "Persons whatsoever.†

† *Id. Ibid.* pag. 118.

Mr. *Ollyffe* has nothing in particular as to this Canon; as supposing it Vacated by the Act of Toleration, which is not so Evident, as not to admit of a Debate. But neither Mr. *Hoadly* nor he can be insensible, that it was as likely to be insisted on, as any in the Body of the Canons, in the Year 1662, and afterwards; which was the time Particularly refer'd to.

"By the Fifty Seventh Canon, *All that go* "*for Baptism for their Children, or the Communi-* "*on for themselves from their own Parish, because* "*the Minister is no Preacher, to another Parish that* "*hath a Preaching Minister, are suspended and* "*after a Month to he Excommunicated.*

"To this they could not submit, because as "they apprehended there was much more need "of driving the People to Preaching-Ministers "than from them. And tho' they did not "esteem the Sacraments Null, When Admini-

"stred

"stred by ill qualify'd Ministers, yet they could "not but look upon it as sinful, either to "harden an ignorant and Scandalous Person, "that had intruded into the Office of the- "Ministry in his Prophaneness, or to encou- "rage People that need better, in being con- "tented with such a Minister.

Id. Ibid. p. 119.

"By the Fifty Eighth Canon, *every: Minister "saying the Publick Prayers, or Ministring the Sa- "craments, or other Rites of the Church, was re- "quir'd to wear a Decent and Comely Surplice with "Sleeves, to be provided at the Charge of the Pa- "rish, and, that under pain of Suspension.*

"The Surplice as a Symbolical Vestment was "what they found many Learned and Excellent "Ministers had in former times been against: "And it was so small a matter, of so little real "Necessity or Use, and the great Things to be "ey'd in the Exercise of a Gospel Ministry, "depended so little upon it, that even those, "who would rather have submitted to it, than "have been depriv'd of the Publick Exercise of "their Ministry, yet durst not Concur in the "Suspension of others, who were more Scru- "plous of it than themselves, upon that Ac- "count, as they must have done, if they had "Subjected themselves to this Canon.

Id. Ibid. p. 121.

Mr. *Ollyffe*★ seems disturb'd at my calling the Surplice requir'd by this Canon, *a Symbolical Vestment*; he says, it means no more.than *a Garment signifying Purity*. 'Tis granted; but till it can be prov'd such Garments are needful, I think they should neither be impos'd by Ecclesiastical Canons, nor pleaded for as impos'd. But he says, *there is not the least Intimation in the Canons or Rubricks, that it hath any signification at all put upon it; or that it is any more than a distinctive Garment*. What then; 'Tis Represented as such, by most

★ P. 101.

(not to say all) of the Writers on the Church side, that have pleaded for it; And. if it be but a *distinctive Garment*, methinks such a stress should not be lay'd upon it, as that Persons should be oblig'd to Use it, under pain of Suspension. That it is unlawful as a *distinctive Garment*; I Asserted not: No, nor suppose it should be own'd to signifie Purity and Beauty: And yet I should be loath to bind my self by an Oath, to the constant Use of it, if I could digest all the other parts of Conformity.

There was no distinction of Habits in the Primitive Times. This is Acknowledged both by *Salmasius*; and *Petavius*.* It does not indeed therefore follow, that a distinction of Habit for meer Decency and Order is to be disapprov'd; But it might be expected the Consideration of it might Curb Men in their Impositions in matters of this Nature; and keep them from Censuring others for a bare Disuse. And yet more Men have run a mighty length upon this Head. Dr. *Ames*, when he was in *Christ's College* in *Cambridge*, could not satisfie himself to wear the Surplice. Upon which Dr. *Carey* arguing,with him, amongst other things urg'd upon him, that Passage in *Rom.* 13. *But put you on the Armour of Light:* That is, (said he) a *White Surptice*. And Mr. *Fisher* (who, by the way, is recommended by as valuable a Man as Bp. *Hall*, as one very fit to satisfie the Scrupulous) says the Surplice is significant of Divine Alacrity, and Integrity, and the Expectation of Glory. And Bishop *Taylor** says, it signifies *Purity* and *Truth*. This signification of it, with the Imposition of it, has made many against it. *Peter Martyr* refus'd to wear it at *Oxon*; and so did sundry others in the Days of *Edward* VI. But in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, a mighty stir was made about it;

* *See* Stillingfleet's *irenicum*. p. 64, 65.

* *Duct. Dubit.* B. 3. cap. 3. pag. 641.

it; and many were depriv'd for not wearing it. Mr. *Axton* was one. The Bishop of *Litchfield* (who at last depriv'd him) had several Conserences with him about it; of which Conserences I have seen and perus'd a Copy in Manuscript. In One of them, the Bishop ask'd him; *What! will you leave your Flock for the Surplice?* Says he, in Answer, *but Nay, will you persecute me from my Flock for a Surplice?* A Query, to which it were difficult to give a satisfactory Reply. Not to mention others; Mr. *Gowton* also was Suspended on the same Account. When he was before the Bishop, he told him, by what he could perceive, if a Man had the: Eloquence of *Chrysostom*, and the Learning of *Austin*, and the Divinity of St. *Paul*, if he would not wear the Surplice they would put him out: The Bishop Answer'd, that if St. *Paul* were there, he would wear a Fools Coat, rather than be put to Silence. ⋆ Where Persons are of this Mind, 'tis not to be wondred if they make Light of such a Canon as this: But as for those, who know no Autority any have to threaten Suspension upon a failure in so small a matter, tho' they may not reckon a Compliance absolutely unlawful, they may yet refuse to bind themselves by an Oath to Obedience, consistently with their own Principles; and with a due regard to Peace and Order too:

⋆ *See the Register*, p. 399.

"By the Sixty Eighth Canon, *Ministers are* "*required to Baptize all Children without Excep-* "*tion, who are offer'd to them for that Pur-* "*pose.*

"Tho' some of the Silenc'd Ministers were "much straiter in their Notions about the "*Qualified Subjects of Baptism* then others? yet "they were generally against Submission to

"this Canon, because not convinc'd, that the "Children of all Comers, (as of *Atheists* sup-"pose, *Infidels*, *Jews*, *Hereticks* or *Blasphemers*; "who might, upon occasion, be offer'd as well "as others) were so far in the Covenant of "Grace, as to have a Right to a Solemn Inve-"stiture in the Blessings of it. And till they "were convinc'd of this by clear Proof, they "esteem'd it too great a Domination over "Mens Faith, to command Obedience in this "Point upon pain of Suspension. And they ap-"prehended swearing Obedience herein, to be "a consenting in Effect, to the profaning of "one, of the modt Sacred Institutions of our "Religion.

Id. Ibid.
* p. 102.

That this Canon (says Mr. *Ollyffe* *) *doth not extend to the Children of Jews and infidels, is as certain, as that Mr.* Calamy. (he should have said Mr. *Baxter*) *is unjust in supposing it.* But when the Canon refers to all, *excepting such* only *as were denounc'd Excommuninate*, [Excommunicatione Majori] *for some grievous and notorious Crime*, (which exception Confims the Rule in other Cases) he would have done well to have proved the Children of *Jews and Infidels* excluded by that Exception, before he had represented the supposition mention'd as so *unjust*, let it come from who it will. He say, *a Minister is not bound to Baptize the Children of a neighbouring Church:* Which is granted him, because of Another Canon: *Much less* (says he) *of such as are not within the Pale of the Visible Church.* And I'm afraid he'd not find it easie to prove, that any are not within the Pale of the Visible Church, (according to the present Constitution) where Godfathers are provided. He says, '*tis the Church in such a place which is the Ministers Charge*, 'Tis true, and I don't see how he can refuse to

own,

own, that all the Children born in that Place belong to that Church, if Sponsors are but provided. He adds, *Nor is there any Difference herein, between the Practise of* Conformists *now, and of the* Non-Conformists *when they were in their Places, some few excepted, who were* Independents. 'Tis granted, that an over great Niceness upon this Head, is what the Ejected Ministers were generally fearful off, while they were in Publick Service: But yet, they were at Liberty to refuse to Baptize the Children of those Parents, who were either known not to be Christians, or to be grosly scandalous; which is not left by the present Constitution, nor by this Canon. And tho' he mentions Mr. *Baxter* in this Case, yet he might have remembred what is mention'd before; *viz*. That in the *Savoy* Conference, He mention'd to the Commissioners, one of his Parishioners, that was a profess'd *Infidel*, and yet said, he would come and make the common Profession for his Child, for Custom sake. Dr. *Sanderson* Bishop of *Lincoln*, answerd, that if there were God-Fathers, it had suffcificient Title: And Bishop *Morley* and others of them Confirm'd So that tho' Mr. *Ollyffe* says, *That he believes a Minister may live* 60 *Years, in the largest Market Town in* England, *and not have a Child offer'd to Baptism born of Two such Parents*, as Mr. *Baxter* would object against; yet fere's an Instance from Mr. *Baxter* of one that offer'd, in a far less space of Time. The Consideration of *Circumcision* indeed *in the Jewish Church* (as he well hints) may be of use to rectifie the narrowness of some Mens Spirits upon this Head; and yet is no Justification of this Canon. All the Relief he at last can give in this Case (if it comes to extremity) is this; *If a Case happen whererin*

His Life in Folio. pag. 428.

pag. 103.

he judgeth it unlawful, he must humbly represent it to the Bishop; and if he cannot comply, nor be releiv'd, he must be suspended. But I should think it much better to disclaim the Canons, than to run the hazard of being charg'd with a breach of Oath, for refusing to obey one, where it may easily be fore-seen such a Difficulty may arise. As for what he *could tell me of the Queens Laws* it affects me not: For the Reasons I have mention'd before.

I have nothing to suggest to Mr. *Hoadly* upon this Head, but this: That this also is one of those Canons, which his Diocesan has warn'd *his* Clergy, to be strict in observing. ★

★ *Episcopalia*, pag. 3.

"By the Seventy Second Canon, *Ministers* "*were debarred, the Liberty of keeping Private* "*Fasts upon any Occasion, or so much as being* "*present at them, without exposing themselves to* "*Suspension the first Time. Excommunication the* "*second Time, and Deposition the third Time.*

"The Silenc'd Ministers, for their Part, "could not but esteem those to be unworthy "of that sacred and honourable Function, who "were not to be trusted to Fast and Pray "with their People, as Occasions might re-"quire, while the Law was open to punish "all Abuses. And taking this to be a part of "their Office, they could no more renounce "it than the Liberty of Preaching the Go-"spel, when any where the Necessity of Souls "Requir'd it. †

† *Idem*, *Ibid*. pag. 122.

Mr. *Ollyffe* charges me with *misrepresenting this Canon, by leaving out all that which should explain it.* I can positively assure him I had no such Design; but only aim'd at Brevity: And tho't the Sense of the Canon plain to any Man that reads it; and so plain, that I hardly expected a Man of his Temper would have tho't

it

it capable of such a Gloss, as he has put upon it. He represents it as a fault, that I left out the Word *Solemn:* And says, *That when the Canon says, that no one shall appoint any solemn Fast, it doth not at all intermeddle with what Persons do in their Closets or Families.* No? That's strange, when the Canon says expresly, *That no Minister shall without License*, &c. *appoint or keep any solemn Fasts, either publickly, or in any private Houses.* Don't *private Houses* take in their *Families?* Again, he reckons it a *greater Omission*, that I have left out that the Canon forbids Fasts, *other than such as by Law are, or by publick Autority fall be appointed:* And he thereupon tells me. *That the allowed Times of Fasting by Law and publick Autority do so frequently return, that there can be no possible need, that a Minister should appoint any other*, and he refers me to *the Table in the Common Prayer Book.* But Arch-Bishop *Grindal* and some Dignitaries of the Church, as well as the Puritans in his Days, did think that there was not only *possible*, but *real need* of more solemn Days, than that Table refers to. According to his Representation, he has indeed put a very proper Question, *of what Use is this Canon?* A Question however, that I before tho't needless. But as for his Answer, 'tis a little surprizing. He says, the Canon *must forbid the Indicting Fasts for seditious Ends and Purposes.* Ay, ay, such Seditious Meetings as *Grindal*'s Prophesyings were. To these the Canon directly refers: For it says, *Neither shall any Minister not licens'd, presume to appoint or hold any Meetings for Sermons, commonly term'd by some, Prophesies or Exercises, in Market Towns or other Places.* I profess I'm heartily sorry to find such a Man as Mr. *Ollyffe*, intimating *there can be no possible need* of Meetings of this Nature, or

pa. 104.

pa. 105.

or that they are for *seditions Ends and Purposes*; this is the Language of another *Clan*; but I tho't little understood by His Fraternity. I don't Wonder to hear the *Christ Church* Men cry, that *in Sermons on Week-day Lectures many Absurdities tending to Schism and Sedition are injected into the Minds of the People*; but to have; such Language from *Dunton* and *Kymbel* in *Bucks*, and the neighbouring Parts, is a little surprizing. As for the Business of *Possession* or *Obsession*, that comes in but by the by: 'Twas the other was principally ey'd and aim'd at. And in short, if he's fond of this Canon, he must entirely disclaim the Old *Puritans*.

Vox Cleri, page 26.

"By the 112th Canon, *The Minister jointly* "*with the Parish Officers is requir'd every Year,* "*within Forty Days after Easter*, to exhibite to "*the Bishop or his Chancellor, Names and Sur-* "*names of all his Parishioners, which being of the* "*Age of Sixteen Years, did not receive the Com-* "*munion at* Easter *before*.

"With this Canon, agrees the Rubrick "which is inserted in the *Common Prayer Book*, "it the End of the Office for the Communi- "on; which requires *every Parishioner to com-* "*municate at the least three Times in the Year,* "*of which* Easter *to be one:* And if they refuse "after Presentation, they are to be Excom- "municated, and are liable to be Confin'd in "Goal till they die, by Vertue of the Writ, "*de Excommunicato Capiendo*.

"In this the Silenc'd Ministers durst not "comply for fear of the Consequences. If in- "deed they could have any hopes of forcing "their Parishioners by a Goal out of Igno- "rance, Unbelief and Ungodliness, they'd "have thought it a very charitable Work: "But while the due and necessary Qualificati-

"ons

"ons were wanting, they did not know, but "in forcing them to the Sacrament, they might "force them upon Sacriledge and Prophane-"ness, to their Damnation and Ruin. With-"al, they knew this to be a Course, whereby "they should distract those Persons with Ter-"rour, who are conscious of their unfitness; "or those Melancholy-Christians who under "Temptations, tremble for fear of taking "their own Damnation. In a Word, they "were convinc'd this would fill the Church "with such as ought rather to be kept away; "occasion the casting of Holy Things to Dogs; "prevent all possibility of Discipline, and "be a Bar to that Purity, which is a great "Design of Christianity. ★

Mr. *Ollyffe*† here Queries, Whether the Prosecution and Excommunication of all that don't Communicate, at *Easter,* is the *necessary Consequence*, of giving, in their Names to the Bishop? I Answer, that it is plain it was design'd by the Canon, that it should be the Consequence; and our Fathers have found that it actually was the *usual Consequence*, and I think that is eno', tho' it was not *a necessary Consequence*. As for the *forcing* these People so presented *to the Sacrament, to Prophaneness and Sacriledge*, that this has been too often done, I suppose he himself can't deny: But tho' (as he says) *I know, that Ministers are bound to repel the Scandalous from the Lords Supper, if they should offer themselves*; yet that they are *allow'd* to do so, by our Constitution, I profess I do not know. For I believe, Mr. *Ollyffe* would find it hard to defend himself, if he should repel one from the Lord's Supper tho' ever so scandalous, who was bound by Law to come there, to qualifie himself for an Office. But to

★ Baxter's *Nonconformity stated and argu'd*, pag. 147. Corbet's *Remains*, pag. 150.
†P. 105.

make

make an End, he says, That *if it proves sinful, he is not bound by any Promise*, which is granted him: And yet it do's not follow but he might do ill, in making such a Promise, as if kept would draw him into Sin.

"Omitting the Rest, the Three Last Ca-
"nons, related to the Autority of Synods:
"And by them *all were to be Excommunicated,*
"*who should affirm, that a Convocation summon'd*
"*by the King's Authority, was not the true Church*
"*of* England *by Representation: Or that the Ab-*
"*sent as well as Present, were not to be subject to*
"*the Decrees of such an Assembly, in Causes Ec-*
"*clesiastical when Ratify'd by the Kings Authori-*
"*ty: Or that their Canons and Constitutions were*
"*despicable*, &c.

"These Canons, they could not oblige
"themselves to submit to, because of the un-
"certainty, and dubious, and disputable Na-
"ture of the Masters contain'd in them, which
"they (upon that Account) could not appre-
"hend to be fit Grounds of so high a Censure
"as *Excommunication.* That a Convocation
"was the *true Church* England *by Representa-*
"*tion*, seem'd to the Silenc'd Ministers very
"justly Questionable, not only because the Lai-
"ty (whom they tho't a Part of the Church)
"were altogether Excluded; but also, because
"the Clergy were far from being therein
"fairly represented. ⋆ As? to the Force of
"the Canons of such Convocations upon Ab-

⋆ *The Worthy Bishop of* Sarum *in his Late* Reflections on a Book concerning the Rights of an *English* Convocation, *Page* 10. *Justifies their Demur as to. these Cannons in this Respect, when speaking of a Convocation, he hath this remarhable Concession:* It cannot be call'd a true Representative of the Church, tho' it be now a Legal one. In the Lower House, there are of the Province of *Canterbury,* 20 *Deans* or more, who pretend to sit there: There

"sent

"sent Persons as well as Present, they appre-
"hended that it depended upon the Parlia
"ment, whose Ratification they look'd upon
"as Necessary, in Order to their having any
"Force or Significance at all. But tho' they
"should be mistaken in Points of this Nature,
"which they tho't had not been so strictly en-
"quir'd into, but that they would very well
"bear Canvalling † it seem'd to them strange-

are as many *Proctors* from *Chapters, and* 60 *Archdeacons* and about 38 Clerks chosen by the Clergy. So that the *Deans* and *Chapters* who had their Authority at first by *Papal* Bulls, and have now their Exemptions and Jurisdictions continu'd to them only by a Proviso, in the Statute of 25 *Hen.* 8. have more Interest in the Convocation then the whole Body of the Clergy. These are all made either by the King or by the Bishops. The 60 *Arch-Deacons*, are all of the Bishops Nomination, and their Authority is of a late Date, and but a Humane Constitution. All this is besides the Interest that the Bishops have in making the Returns of two only out of all those who are chosen in the several *Arch-Deaconries* of their Diocese; so that the Inferiour Clergy can in no sort be said to be equally represented there. *What Pleasure so ever some angry Zealots might take in any things that might bear hard upon so great Ornament of their Church, there are no unprejudiced Persons, but think his Lordship deserves much better Treatment, than Canon* 139 *if executed, would afford him.*

† *Either they were herein in the right, or it hath been to very little Purpose, that we have had so marry Writings, (and many of them bulky too) lately Publish'd upon this Matter, and that with warmth and eagerness. And really it seems to disinterested Standers by pretty remarkable, that after such stiffness in averting the Churches Authority, as to Ecclesiastical Matters, it should at last remain a Contraversie where this Authority is to be Lodg'd. 'Tis in the King says Dr.* Wake, *as it was heretofore in the Christian Emperors, and indeed in all Christian Princes, till the* Papal *Usurpation. The same says Dr.* Kennet: *I beg your Pardon Gentlemen, says Dr.* A. *That is a Method that would subvert the Fundamental Rights and Liberties of the Church and Clergy of* England. *It would bring in Slavery into the Church, which will quickly spread it self into the State too. A Convocation hath an inherent Right of framing Ecclesiastical Canons, as it is an Ecclesiastical Synod. Each Party hath considerable*

"ly

Abettors, and the latter Gentleman, who undertook the Defence of

"ly and needlesly severe, that an Excommu-
"nication must presently be thundred out a-
"gainst them. And as to the Credit and Re-
"putation of the Canons, of any such. Ecclesi-
"astical Synod's or Convocations, they could
"not help. conceiving, that that depended.

the inherent Right of the Convocation, hath since received considerable Preferment, as a Reward for his Service. Hereupon the Lord Bishop of Sarum *in his Reflections, Page* 7, 8. *Makes this observable Remark*. It hath pass'd (*saith he*) generally among the Clergy, that Ecclesiastical Matters could only be judged by Persons deriving their Power immediately from God: And as the Clergy have their Commission from him, so it was a receiv'd Doctrine, that the King likewise had his Power from God, and that therefore the Church was to be govern'd by the King and the Convocation; and the Book of Canons, being ratify'd only by the Regal Authority, seems to give such Authority to this, *that a Man ought to be mildly Corrected*, if it should prove to be a Mistake. It could never be thought Parliaments were *Jure Divino*; so it was a Consequence suitable to their Principles, who put our whole Ecclesiastical Constitution on the bottom of a Divine Right, to shut this within the Hands of those, who they believ'd acte by a Divine Commission, I (*says he*) was never of this Mind. I always thought that the King was no other way *Head of the Church*, then as he was the Head of the State, with whom the Executive Power is Lodg'd and who is, the Head of the Legislative, in Conjunction with the great Body of his Parliament. But this Author knows, how much the Doctrine he advances was condemned, and by whom not long ago: Therefore a little more Temper were but Decent, if he tho't fit to find fault with it. *And a little before speaking of Dr.* A*'s Maxim*, That the Supremacy is not singly in the King, but is Lodg'd with the whole Legislature, *he thinks fit to make this Declaration*; I Confess, I was always of this Mind; but I remember among whom this passed not long ago, for little less then Heresie. *Now 'tis left to any one to Judge, whether it is not odd and unaccountable, that we should have had so fierce a Contest here in* England, *ever since the Reformation about the Ecclesiastical Authority, and that among them, who have been screwing it up to the utmost height and vigour against their poor Dissenting Brethren (who could not see things in their Light) there should after all be a stiff Contention where it is*

more

"more on their agreeableness to the Word of "God, than on the Commendations given "them by the Enacters and their Admirers. "But that the Church, to whom our Saviour "had so often recommended mildness and gen- "tleness, should be but a Word and a Blow,

to be lodged? Doth it not fare with this Ecclesiastical Authority

here in England: *As with the pretended* Infallibility *in the* Roman *Church? The* Papists *will have it, that they have an* Infallibility *among them somewhere, but where to Lodge it they cannot agree: Some will have it lie in the Pope, others in a general Council, others in both jointly. So our Donns will have it, that there is a mighty* Ecclesiastical Authority, (*to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and settle and promote Uniformity*, &c.) *somewhere or other amongst them; but where to Lodge it they are not to this Day agreed. Some Place it in the King, others in a Convocation, and others in the Three Estates of Parliament, Kings, Lords and Commons, with or without a Convocation. And have not Sentiments in this Respect as much varied in our Church, with Times, Seasons, and Circumstances, as they have in the* Romish Church, *about their darling Infallibility? And is it not manifestly hard, that Canons should remain in force, whereby those are to be Excommunicated, who are not clear about the Authority of a Convocation, when 'tis even at this Day acknowledged by* Contenders *on both sides, that the Rights and Powers of an* English *Convocation have been but little enquired into? Doth not that Enquiry, which hath been so warmly pursued, naturally lead to a further Enquiry into the true Nature, and Extent of that Ecclesastical Authority, which our Blessed Lord the great Law-giver of his Church hath Lodg'd in any Hands whatsoever besides his own? For might it not easily be suppos'd, much should have been taken upon trust, and many Mistakes committed, about the Nature and Extent of such Power, as about the Hands in which it is Lodged? Could we but see as much Pains taken upon this Head, as there has been upon the other, we could not but hope for a good Issue. Till then, we think both our Fathers, and we are very fairly justifable in refusing Submission to Canons, in framing which it is. questionable, whether the Actors did not overshoot their Authority. However to use the Bishop of* Sarum's *Phrase, we cannot but think*, that a Man ought to be mildly Corrected, (*not* Excommuncated) *for being cautious and wary in Things of so dubious a Nature, tho' it should ap-*

"and

pear, upon a particular canvassing of his Sentiments, that he was under a Mistake

"and come with the highest Censures, where "perhaps there might be only a mistake, but "no malignity, this the Silenced Ministers "esteem'd not only acting without a Warrant, "but unsuitable to a true Christian Spirit, and "therefore could not swear Submission.

Baxter's *Nonconformity Stated and Argued*, Page 123.

Id. Ibid. page 33.

"It hath been pleaded by many, that the "Oath of *Canonical Obedience*, doth not oblige "to approve of all that is in the *Canons.* To "which they answer'd, that in their Judg-"ment, the Case of a Minister, was much the "same as that of a Justice of Peace. Tho' a "Justice of Peace be not bound by his Oath "to approve of every Law of the Land, yet "he is bound to execute all of them by his "Place, when he is called to it.* So also a "Minister taking the Oath of Canonical Obe-"dience, is bound to execute the *Canons*, and "particularly those Canons where Excommu-"nication is denounc'd, when call'd upon by "his *Ordinary*: It hath been farther pleaded, "that many of these Canons are disus'd and "so vacated; like many Laws of the Land, "that are grown out of use. To which the "Reply is easie: That many of the Canons "before-mention'd and objected against, can-"not so much as be pretended to be disus'd; "and many of them were much less disus'd at "that Time, when the Ministers were Eject-"ed, than they have been at some times since: "But still so long as there is neither any Pub-"lick Declaration given, that might help to "distinguish among those Canons (which "were all Enacted by the same Authority) "which

"which were yet binding, and which super-
"annuated nor a Liberty of judging in the
"Case left to Private Ministers, so long this
"Plea appears without any Force. For let
"any of them appear ever so much disus'd,
"if the *Ordinary* thinks fit to interpose with
"his Authority for the reviving them, the
"Oath obliges to Submission.

Mr. *Ollyffe* here says, That the Case of a Minister is not the same with that of a Justice of *Peace, nor any thing like it.* That it was entirely the same, was not a asserted; but that it is something like it, I think cannot fairly be deny'd. *A Justice of Peace* (says he) *besides his Oath of Obedience to this Queen, takes an Oath to put her Laws in Execution and this essential Difference.* Whereas for my Part I can herein discern no essential Difference. For in like manner a Clergyman solemnly Promises at the Time of his Ordination, that he will *reve rently obey his Ordinary, and other chief Ministers, unto whom the Government and Charge is committed over Him.* And then afterwards (as I think I may say has before been clear'd) He takes an Oath of obeying the Bishop in whose Diocess he fixes, according to the Canons which is as real an obliging himself to put those Laws in Execution (as far as they are.to be executed by him) as is either the Oath of a Bishop to his Metropolitan; or the Oath of a Justice, upon his accepting a Commission. But (says he) *this Oath is not like the Justices Oath, but like that which every Subject takes to his proper Governour.* I should rather say, it is like both in different Respects. As far as it binds to an Execution of the Canons upon Equals and Inferiors, 'tis like the Oath of a Justice of Peace: But as it binds to this under the Direction of

pag. 107.

of:the Eccleslastical Laws, 'tis like the Oath of a Subject to his proper Governor. And tho' he will not allow, that *the Instance of Denouncing Excommunications is to my present Purpose*, yet he must give me leave to be of another Mind, till he disprove it.

Part I. pag. 150.

Mr. *Hoadly* also herein Concurs; and says, That *the Case of a Minister in this Matter is not the same with that of a Justice of Peace; unless the Oath a Justice takes be an Oath of Obedience to the Future Commands of one particular Person, under whose Inspection He is to execute his Office: And unless the Obedience be limited to lawful and honest Things, and a Liberty left him of demurring upon the Commands of his Superiors.* As for the first of these Instances, I grant there's a Dissimilitude: But tho' the Oath of a Justice hath not that Reference to the Inspection of any particular Person, as the Oath of a Clergy-man has to that of his Bishop; yet as far as fixed Laws are to be executed, their Case agrees. But the other Instance, I look upon as needless; for in that there is no real Difference; since the *Obedience* of a Justice of Peace *is* as really *limited to lawful and honest Things*, as that of a Clergy-man to his Bishop. If it is express'd in one Oath, it is necessarily imply'd in the other, and indeed it must be so in every Oath; as that Excellent Casuist Bishop *Sanderson* has clearly prov'd. He then asks me, *Whether I really think, that a Justice binds himself to execute every particular Law of the, not publickly Abrogated, when called to it.* I Answer, to an unlawful or dishonest Thing, he cannot be properly bound: But I should think he had much better refuse his Commission, than seem to bind himself to what he could not justifie his acting in; But as to the Parallel he

afterwards

afterwards runs in the Case of a Justice, there's one thing he has overlook'd, which makes a mighty difference. The Commission of a Justice is Arbitrary; may at any time be withdrawn at the Pleasure of the Prince, or thrown up by himself; if it prove Burdensome: And then the Obligation of the Oath ceases. Whereas the Ministerial Function is undertaken for Life; and that Ordination Promise of Submission to the Ordinary binds, as long as the Function continues: And the Oath of *Canonical Obedience* must bind as long, as Persons continue in the Exercise of that Function: For tho' a Man may be disoblig'd as to one Bishop, by removing out of his Diocess into another; yet he there is forc'd by the Bishop of the Diocess he removes into, to come under the Obligation of the same Oath, which he can't get free from, as long as he continues in the *stated* Exercise of his Ministry under the National Establishment.

But, he says, (still speaking of Justices of the Peace) *none of their Superiours would let them openly explain their meanings and say, These Laws I will Execute, and these I will not.* Nor is. it so Necessary in their Case, as in the Case of the Ecclesiastical Laws. For the Ground of our Statute Laws is unspeakably Clearer, than that of our Ecclesiastical Laws. Besides, if a Justice does not Execute the Statutes as it was expected, (besides the particular Penalty affix'd in Cases wherein the Government is peculiarly Hearty, as was formerly seen in the Case of Dissenters) The utmost Hazard he runs is of loosing his Commission; which when it would prove ensnaring, cannot by a Wise Man be esteemed a Damage: But in a Clergy-Man's Case the Penalty of Disobedience to particular Orders, (even tho' he questions the Lawfulness. pag. 151.

of Obeying them) is the loss of Living and Livelihood; nay the sending a Mah to the Devil by Excommunication. In this Case, I think, it may with much more Reason be insisted on, that a Man have liberty to Explain himself, that he may not be Ensnar'd and Ruin'd. He goes on, and says, *They* (meaning Justices) *Act Sincerely and Honestly, in taking such an Oath, if they satisfie their Consciences as to those Laws, which they themselves may probably, in the present State of things be cull'd and requir'd to Execute.* Far be it from me to deny it: But then Mr. *Hoadly* knows very well, *that whoever, designs to Officiate, as a Minister, in any Church, Acts not fairly and. honestly, if he do not first satisfie his Conscience about the Lawfulness of Obedience to such Rules and Prescriptions, as have been laid down and agreed upon by the Governors, of the Church, for the regulating the Behaviour of all who Minister in it, and.resolve to Obey them.* And this, I think, is a fair Parallel, which was the thing contested. But then (says he), *supposing this Oath of Ministers to be parallel to that of Justices, you are oblig'd either to show, that a Justice binds himself to the Execution of every, particular Law abrogated (which you cannot do) or to make the same Allowances for Ministers as you can do, upon Occasion for others, and not to think harder of them than you usually do of others.* To give my free Tho'ts; 'tis with me of small Account, whether the Ministers Oath be like that of Justices of the Peace or not. Mr. *Baxter* did indeed Assert it; and if it won't hold, I don't see how I am responsible. And yet I don't see, if it be at all Parallel, it must be so in all Respects, when there are many obvious Cases, in which there is a very discernible difference. Some have been already hinted, and more might easily be Assign'd.

sign'd. A Law may be Dubious, and then I can't say, a Justice is oblig'd to Act, even tho' he has the Sense even of my Lord Chancellour: But as to the Sense and extent of the Obligation of Ecclesiastical Laws, a Clergy-Man is bound, by his Oath, to take his Measures from his Diocesan. This makes a great Difference. And yet, after all, I am free to make considerable allowance for Ministers that take this Oath of *Canonical Obedience:* I can allow, that they are not oblig'd to Obey any particular Canons,) that are not agreeable to them, till they are call'd upon by their Ordinary: I can allow, that they are not at all oblig'd, in the sight of God, to things which their Ordinary may esteem Lawful and Honest, if they have contrary Apprehensions of them; even tho' they may, upon this Account, be represented as Contumacious; tho' in this Case, I can't see, that the Constitution hath made sufficient Provision for their Judgment of Disctetion, which is the very thing that was intended by our Fathers, when they complain'd, that they had not in these Cases a Judgment of Discretion left them. I can farther allow, that if when they are call'd upon to any thing that they are perswaded is unlawful and dishonest,they rather quit their Livings than comply, they are not justly chargeable with violating their Oath; they are rather to be Pity'd than Upbraided: But I can by no means allow, that an Oath is as justifiable with Reference to the Laws of the Church, as with Reference to the Civil Laws of the Land; or when such an Oath is impos'd, that they consult their own Peace, or the good of the Church, who take it, intending to neglect sundry Canons, which they know (or might know, if they would) their Diocesans design to

oblige: them strictly to observe. And should any Consequences arise from hence, that might grate upon any other Order, 'tis not in my Power to help it.

"2. Another Capital Reason, why they "scrupled taking the Oath of *Canonical Obedi-* "*ence*, was, because they found the Episcopal "Government manag'd by Chancellours Courts, "(which were kept in the Bishops name indeed, "while they in the mean time were not suf- "fered to Act in them) where Laymen Exer- "cise the *Church Keys*, by decretive *Excommu-* "*nications* and *Absolations*. They found the "word *Ordinary* mentioned in the Oath, would "admit of divers Sences. That it not only "meant the Bishop of the Diocess, but the "*Judges* in their Courts. This is the Sence "given by *Cousins* in his Tables, and by all "Civilians. And as for the *other Chief Mini-* "*sters* added in the Oath, or to whom Subje- "ction was to be Sworn, they saw not how less "could be thereby meant, than all the "*Deacons*, *Officials*, *Comissaries*, and *Surrogates*, "with the rest of the Attendants upon those "Courts.

"The Silenced Ministers durst not bind "themselves by Oath to a Submission of this "Nature, for fear of concurring to overthrow "the *Pastoral Office*. They could not think the "Administration of the Sacraments proper and "peculiar to Pastors, if the Keys were not so "too. For the most proper life of the Keys is "in a way of judging, who is to be admitted to "Sacramental Communion, and who debar'd "it. If only delivering the Elements, and not "judging to whom, be proper to the Pastor, "then is, he to see with other Mens Eyes. Now "it

Id. Ibid. pag. 34.

"it was their fixed Apprehension, that in a "matter of so great Moment and Conse-"quence, it was their Duty to see with their "own Eyes, and not Act Blind-fold: And "that our Lord Jesus Christ had invested all "that were Pastors with that measure of "Power, which was Necessary, in order to the "securing the direct ends of their Office. Such "Power, its true, might be abused, and there-"fore they were not (as some have charged "them) against being accountable in case of "such an Abuse: But then they at the same "time apprehended, that an Appeal in such a "Case, would be much more properly lodged "with a Synod, (whose having a fixed Presi-"dent or Bishop, would not have disgusted the "generality of them, especially if he were "chosen by the Synod it self) or with a meet-"ing confuting partly of Ministers, and partly "of Deputies from the Neighbouring Churches, "than with a set of wrangling Lawyers, whose "concern in such matters, they look'd upon as "irrational as well as unscriptural; and whose "Management of them was more likely to be "Calculated for their own Profit, than the "Credit of Religion, and the Purity of the "Church.

"As for the Provision made by the *Rubrick* "before the Office for the *Communion* in the "Common Prayer Book, *viz. That when a Mini-"ster keeps anyPersons from the sacrament, he should "within Forty Days give an Account to the* Ordi-"nary, *that he might proceed against them accor-"ding to the Canons*; they could not acquiesce in "it, because dissatisfy'd as to the Grounds upon "which these *Ordinaries* (whether they were "meer Laymen, simple Presbyters, or Dioce-"sans) appropriated the Cognizance of mat-

"ters of this Nature to themselves, which in "the Judgment of Common Sence was more "proper for those that held the opportunity of "Personal Inspection, than for meer Strangers. "They were also confirmed in their dislike of "this Method of Proceednre, because of the "Difficulty, Tediousness, Vexatiousness, and "Expensiveness of it; because of the number "that must be accus'd if the *Canons* were fol-"lowed; because of the great hindrance it "would be to them in their Ministerial Work; "and in a word, because of the impossibility of "keeping up any *Real Discipline* in such a way. "In which they were much Confirm'd by Ob-"servation and Experience. ⋆

⋆ *The Church Party themselves have not been insensible of Corruptions in this respect. Amongst others, Bishop* Burnet, *at the close of his Excellent History of the Reformation Notes*, That there was one thing (*we could heartily wish there were no more*) yet wanting to compleat the Reformation of this Church, which, was the restoring a Primitive Discipline against Scandalous Persons, the establishing the Government of the Church in Ecclesiastical Hands, and taking it out of Lay-hands, who have so long prophan'd it, and have exposed the Autority of the Church, and the Censures of it. Chiefly *munication*, to the Contempt of the Nation; by which the Reverence due to Holy Things, is in so great a measure lost, and the dreadfullest of all Censures, is now become the most Scorned and Despised. *Abridgment*, *pag.* 367.

"And as to the submitting of the Determin-"nations and Injunctions of these *Ordinaries*, in "which they had not by this Oath and Cove-"nant so much as a Judgement of Discretion "left them, they durst not engage, or bind "themselves, for fear of approving Sacrilegi-"ous Prophaneness. For if it be so for meer "Laymen uncall'd and unqualified, to Usurp "the other parts of the Pastoral Office, par-

"ticularly

"ticularly the Administration of the Sacra-
"ment, (as it is generally esteem'd) then they
"conceiv'd it must be so too, for them to
"Usurp the Power of the Keys. And if the
"Bishops took it for Usurpation in *Presbyters*,
"to take upon them to exercise Power in this
"Case, as supposing it proper and peculiar to
"themselves, they could not see, why they
"should not judge it much more so in Lay-
"men.

"As for Excommunications and Absoluti-
"ons, they look'd upon them as very weigh-
"ty Matters, and durst not agree to trifle in
"them. If the Bishops could trust their Con-
"sciences with their Chancellors, and leave
"them to pass Sentence in their Names, with-
"out. ever hearing or trying the Causes de-
"pending; and suffer them to Excommunicate
"Persons for them, tho' they knew not on
"whom they pass'd that heavy Censure, nor
"why they did it, it was to themselves as
"the Ministers could not Understand it, so
"neither could they, help it: and they were
"not Responsible for it: But when they
"brought these matters home to their own
"Door, and requir'd of them, that they also
"should trust their Confciences in the same
"Hands, they desir'd to be excus'd 'till they
"were better Satisfy'd in the Point. They
"could not yield to receive and publish their
"Excommupications blindly, least they should
"he chargeable, with their irregularities and
"Abuses; And be the Instruments of Mo-
"lesting, Worrying,and Ruining, as Religi-
"ous Persons perhaps, as any in their Parishes.
"Nor durst they consent to publish the Abso-
"lutions of Notorious Debauchees, who have
"given (it may be) no other Proof of Repen-

"tance of their Crimes, besides paying the "Fees of the Court. These things they well "knew expos'd the Censures of the Church to "Scandal and Contempt, and therefore they "were unwilling to give an helping Hand. *

* *Id. Ibid.* p. 105.

"And to take luchan Oath as this of *Cano-* "*nical Obedience*, and make such a Covenant "with a Reserve to themselves, afterwards to "demur upon the Commands of the *Ordinary*, "when agreeable to the standing Rules of the "Ecclesiastical Administration; or make light "of the *Canons*, which were design'd to be the "standing Rules of their Obedience, before "they were Repealed or Superseded; they "could not look upon as any other then Egre- "gious Dissimulation: And therefore they "thought it much safer to wave this Oath al- "together, and keep themselves free from any "such ensnaring Bond.

Mr. *Ollyffe* here seems to think he has a great Advantage, because the *Promise* and *Oath* are consider'd Promiscuously, as making up but one Engagement to a Subjection to the present Ecclesiastical Constitution. *The Oath of Canonical Obedience'* (says he) *has not the word Ordinary, nor Chief Minister in it.* 'Tis true: Any Man that reads may see as much. But when the Ordination Promise hath both; and it is so Evident, that that Promise is both Explain'd and Confirrm'd by the subsequent Oath, the Mistake, I hope, cannot be of any mighty Moment. But Mr. *Ollyffe* seems to Question whether *Oath* or *Promise* bind to a regard to the EcclesiasticalCourts. He owns however, that by *Ordinary*, not only the Bishops, but the Judges of these Courts are meant by the *Civilians*; but he says, *'tis Evident, 'tis not so us'd in this Promise, because it is ex-*

p. 107.

p. 108

prefly

presly distinguised from the other Chief Ministers. Possibly this may seem Evident to him, when it may not be so to another. For tho' the *Ordinary* he distinguish'd from the *other Chief Ministers*, yet the word may refer to the Lay-Chancellor, who Acts as the Bishops Deputy, as well as to the Bishop himself, upon Supposition, that by *the other Chief Ministers* the Archdeacons be meant, as he apprehends: That *these Arch-deacons are Lay-men*, I never (as I know of) imagin'd. As for his other Argument, that *we find not the word us'd in any other Sense, than for Ministers of Christ in the whole Book of Ordination, or of the Liturgy of which it is a part*; suppose it true, I think still, the *Canonical Sense* of a *Canonical Promise and Oath* is not liable to just Objection; nay is most proper. And why he should be disturb'd at the representing *Obedience, as owing not only to Laymen*, *but to the very Attendants on those Courts*, I cannot see; when it is thro' their Hand the Orders of the Bishop pass, to which they are oblig'd by their Oath to be Subject. But he says, for their parts *they are willing to follow the Godly Admonitions even of Lay-men*, *whether Chancellors and Officials in one Court*, *or Judges and Justices in another:* They did ill to go into such a Constitution as ours if they were not: But 'twill be well, if they are not hamper'd in Process of time, as many have been before them: For in the Eccleslastical Courts, (and with the Civil I meddle not, for they stand upon another bottom) all those pass for *Godly Admonitions*, which are agreeable to the Canon Law, as far as it remains uncontradicted by the Law of the Land. In all such Cases, to be bound to Obedience, upon Order, is an Engagement, I should think; not very desirable, nor to be Boasted of. He

Pag. 109. He in the next Place considers, *How far* Ministers *are oblig'd to submit to the Determinations* of these Courts. And here he Asserts, that *no Part of the Pastoral Power is taken from Ministers that Christ hath given them.* This Mr. *Corbet*, to whom he refers me, Asserts not that I can find. He says indeed, the Pastoral Power is conferred in the Church of *England:* But that it is not taken away by the Ecclesiastical Constitution, as to the Exercise of it, in sundry Instances, he Asserts not. He would have spar'd the Reflection that follows, upon the *Silenc'd Ministers, who took the Oath Allegiance, notwithstanding, that the Law refrain'd the Exercise of their Ministry almost in all Points*, had he well consider'd the Nature of that Oath, which has been before consider'd. He pleasantly adds; *yet did we never reproach them with owning that Government by Oath, which thus restrains them:* Which might pass for a Kindness in these Gentlemen, if they could but prove, that the Silenc'd Ministers, as much own'd the Government in its Restraints upon them, as the Conforming Clergy are bound to do, by the Constitution.

Pag. 110. But do's Mr, *Ollyffe* really think, that there is no Duty requir'd of a. Minister in the Discharge of this function, in which. he is cramp'd and hinder'd by the National Constitution? His arguing; would seem to intimate as much. For my Part I should rather term it a Ministers Duty, than his Power, to keep Persons notoriousfly Scandalous from the Lords Table: And perhaps it might be less offensive. Are the Ministers of the *Church of England* at Liberty to Act in this Case? He refers to Mr. *Baxter* for Proof, and he do's indeed assert, what, is cited out of him: But then in the some Page, he has

has these Words; the Canons sinfully limit the Exercise of. their Power, (the Cause of our Calamities.) And indeed, all that it was to his Purpose there to assert was this; that there were no such defects of Pastoral Power in the Ministers of the Church of *England*, as should need to hinder Men from joining in the Parish Worship. But tho' this be granted, he elsewhere with freedom complains, of their being wofully hamper'd and fetter'd.

'Tis true, 'tis well known. *That the Rubrick Commands to keep off all notorious ill Livers*, &c. And 'tis as well known, both that a Minister is liable to an Action for refilling to give the Sacrament to the most scandalous Person, when it is necessary to qualifie him for a Place; and that there's no justifying in the Ecclesiastical Courts the Exclusion of the most notorious ill Liver, if he can but secure the Favour of the Chancellour; no not tho' the Parish Minister should be so happy as to have his Bishop concurring with him. If Mr. *Ollyffe* thinks such Things as these are to be extenuated or Pleaded for, I can only say I'm sorry for it. He might very well have spar'd his Question, *Who can think it desireable, that one Minister liable to many Infirmities, should be left sole Judge in a Matter of this Importance?* For he knows, 'twas not the desire of Mr. *Baxter* or his Brethren. They were free for Appeals; to prevent Partiality and Injustice: But not to Courts, where such Things were made Matters of gain; and such debates were to make up a Livelyhood. And tho' he is so strangely Modest, as not *to think himself fit for such a Work*; yet really I must beg leave to have that Opinion of Mr. *Ollyffe*, as to think him a fitter Man to judges who of his Parishioners ought to be kept

Pag. 111.

kept from the Sacrament on the Account of Immoralities, than the Chancellor of the Diocess; and how mean soever his Apprehensions may be as to himself, I scarce Question, but he has as good tho'ts of his Neighbours as this amounts to. And tho' he pretends to differ from me, *in thinking the Cognisance is not so fit for Neighbours as for Strangers*; yet upon Supposition he had told a lewd Parishioner of his, that till he gave some Sign of Reformation, he durst not deliver the Lord's Supper to him, and he reckon'd himself injur'd and hardly dealt with, and was thereupon for Appealing, I am apt to apprehend, he would himself rather choose to refer this Matter to the Cognizance of some Clergy-men in his Neighbourhood, than to the Lay-Chancellour: And he would soon get over those weighty Considerations he hath added upon this Head. Or if he rather chooses to ride some scores of Miles, and give Attendance upon the Chancellor and his Servitors, and try it out with his Parishioner, which of the Two can spend most Money to carry the Cause; let him have his Liberty say I: Only let him not be angry with his Brethren, if they think they can spend their Time better; and are not fond of such a Method, which has no great Tendency to spread or promote Religion.

Pag. 112.

But says Mr. *Ollyffe*, the *appeal is to be lodg'd with the Bishop:* 'Tis true, the Appeal must be made to him for Form-sake; but His Chancellor has the Power, and he cannot Act without him: And let the Minister appeal to the Bishop, and he approve his Proceeding, if the Parishioner appeals to the Eccleliastical Court, and get the Chancellor on his side. He may defie both Minister. and Bishop too; and the Clergy-man concern'd shall sooner incur Suspension,

on, than he can gain the Approbation of the Court for his Proceedings. And therefore I rather think the Chancellor to be the *Ordinary* intended, than the Bishop. For he can Act in such Matters without consulting the Bishop; and when the Bishop hath been consulted, and given his Sense, he can reconsider it; and give a different Sense: And his Determination shall stand in Law, tho' different from the Bishops: And a Minister shall be liable to Suspension for refisting Compliance; nay to Excommunication, if he is Contumacious. If so, tho' I drop the Notion of Power, of which I have no great fondness, I don't see how a Minister can discharge his Duty. Methinks it should not be forgotten, that when a certain Bishop heard of a Cause corruptly manag'd, he came into the Court to rectifie it; and his Chancellor very fairly and mannerly bid him be gone; for he had no Power there to Act any thing: And therewith pulls out the Patent that was Seal'd by his Predecessor in that See, which frighted the poor Bishop out of the Court. ([a]) And we have also a like Instance in Bishop *Bedel* ([b]). For my Part, I am not asham'd to own, I had rather have no other Government, than single Congregations may have within themselves: Than have the Government in the Hands of the Courts Ecclesiastick, as it really is in the Church of *England*. And tho' Mr. *Ollyffe* will have it, *That they are not bound to follow blindly the Determination of these Courts*, yet as long as there is no relief against their Determinations, tho' ever so different from the Gospel Rule, I think he manifests not that concern for Reformation, that might be expected from him, at all to vindicate them. However, since he is so fond of their Method, and is for having *Matters*

(a) *Naked Truth*, Pag. 64.

(b) *See that Bishops Life, written by Bishop* Burnet, Page 88.

Pag. 113.

Pag. 115.

ters of Fact in such Cases *try'd by the Lawyers*, We Envy him not his Satisfaction. But when he himself owns, *That a Minister is not oblig'd, to denounce by solemn Sentence, a Person Excommanicate, whom he thinks in his Conscience not Guilty*, tho' *the Court has decreed it*; I think he in Effect owns, that he has but hamper'd himself, when he gave those who are enstrusted with the Ecclesiastical Administration, the Advantage of urging him with his Promise and Oath in the Case. And tho' he says, *a Minister at this Day, that carries it with Prudence and Humility, is in no great Danger*; yet we know it has been otherwise, and may be so again. 'Twas otherwise after 1662; and the Ministers that were then Living might easily foresee it would. But tho' the *Danger* should not be *great*; yet if there be any Danger, 'tis hard for a wise Man to run himself into it; and I should think he would have the less Comfort in that Danger, when he remembers that he bro't it upon himself, by his own Promise and Engagement; which upon this very Account, can difficultly be justify'd.

Pag. 116.

Pag. 116.

Mr. *Hoadly* also is pretty warm on this Head. He says, *Let the Case he never so bad, and my Representation of it never so true, this Oath obliges you to no Obedince, but what, you your self think Lawful*, &c. But with his good leave, if the Oath be an Engagement to obey the Bishop according to the Laws or Canons of Christs Church; and the Execution of these Laws and Canons according to which the Bishop is to be obey'd, be in the Hands of these Courts, then are these Courts to be comply'd with; and he that did not intend to comply with them therein, had better not have taken the Oath. And this I speak from *my Conscience*, to which the Gentleman

Part 1. Pag. 151, 152.

tleman Appeals; and that after I (according to his desire) have *look'd over again the Passages* he refers to. 'Tis true, the Oath can't bind in things unlawful; that no Oath can properly do: But if it do but seem to bind to things that are Unlawful, I doubt it would be hard to prove it Lawful to take it. He says however, that he does not deny *but it is possible, Men may suffer some Inconvenience for refusing Obedience in some Cases*. Very softly put! 'tis possible, once p. 153. in an Age perhaps, there may be be *some Inconvenience*; as of a Suspension, or Excommunication, or so: Many yet living can remember, when a Minister in the Church was suspended, for not burying a Corps in his Surplice, when the Surrogate bid him do it at the Grave. And. such a thing, I suppose, may happen now and then; but that's not all: I shall take leave to put a Query in another Strain is it possible there should be any other than great Corruptions in such Courts as these, and great Hardships upon the most Conscientious Ministers? And I could give him Instances even. in King *William*'s Days, (to look no farther back) but, that I am unwilling to offend some yet living. But, that which seems to disturb him most, is this: That mention should be made of *their acting Blindfold*. Let the Case then be consider'd, and let an indifferent Person Judge, how far things fall short of it.

A Minister at his Ordination, is engag'd by Promise, to be subject to those concern'd in the Administration of the Ecclesiastical Government: And coming in process of time, to have the care of the Souls of such a Parish committed to him, that the Church may have farther security he'll be an Obedient Son, he must Swear to Act in his Cure under the inspection of the

the Bishop of the Diocess. As for the Bishop, tho' he has the name, of the Ecclesiastical Administration; yet the thing is really in the Hands of the Lay-Chancellor: So that in the Sense of our Constitution, acting under the Bishops Inspection is following the Orders of the Court, in which the Lay-Chancellor Sits as Judge. To this Court, properly belongs the Judgment of all matters of Government in this Minister's Parish: And when this Court makes Decree's, be they right or wrong; agreeable to the Scripture or not, the Minister must Obey, or he must be Punished in the Degree, which the Canon Law requires, as far as it is not contradicted by the Law of the Land. He is liable, to be suspended, either barely *ab Officio*; or both, *ab Officio & Beneficio*; or Excommunicated as well as suspended according to the nature of his Disobedience. Now for Ministers, in things, which our Blessed Saviour has properly subjected to their Cognizance, to be thus bound by the. Decrees of others, according to the Constitution, is as great an Obligation *to Act Blindfold*, as reasonable Creatures are capable of in any Case. By which it is not meant, that it is really a becoming or justifiable thing in them, either to put out or shut their own Eyes; But, that the Constitution has done as much to force them to it, as it can well be suppos'd could be done.

And here I must take my Leave of Mr. *Ollffe*, who has not tho't fit to proceed any farther, in considering the Reasons of the Ejected Ministers.. He renews his Charge at Parting, of my *taking things by the worst handle*, as to which, I think what has been suggested under the several Particulars may be sufficient for my Justification. Tho' the truth of it is, he is so

p. 117.

frequent

frequent in. his Exclamations; and so particular in his Accusations at every turn, that he is too Officious for the generality of our Modern Readers, who love to have some Defects left to their own Observation, without being pointed to every thing as with a Fescue. At last he comes to the Head of *Kindness*, where, I think verily we are able to vye with him and his Neighbours. *Why* (says he) *must we now he treated so unkindly, as to have our Solemn Actings* p. 118. represented in such strange Colours, &c. Truly Sir, here was no unkindnest to you intended. For we Honour your Persons; we value your Labours,and heartily pray God to Succeed them; and yet cannot but say, that for us to take your Method, would be little to our Satisfaction. But he having given me so Grave an Admonition, upon the whole, I think I must not pass it by. *We cannot but Beseech and Admonish him* (says he) *as a Brother in the Lord, to consider* pag. 84. *whose Work he hath been doings and whom he Gratifies by these Mis-representations of us. He knows the Ministry of* England *to be set for the Defence of the Gospel at this Day against* Deists, Socinians, *and a numerous Company of Blasphemous Adversaries of all Religion; and he might easily guess, that what words he puts into their Mouths against us, by this way of Discoursing, they will be sure to use against all Religion as Priest-Craft, and against the Ministry in general, or as they express it, Priests of all sorts.* In Answer, I can assure Mr. *Ollyffe* and his Brethren, that I have consider'd the Matter with all the Seriousness I was able: And the more I consider, the more I am convinc'd, that the covering the gross Defects of the present Constitution, is far from being for the Honour of God, or the Credit of Religion: I am still farther satisfy'd, that what I have done, is

the Bishop of the Diocess. As for the Bishop, tho' he has the name; off the Ecclesiastical Administration; yet the thing is really in the Hands of the Lay-Chancellor: So that in the Sense of our Constitution, acting under the Bishops Inspection is following the Orders of the Courts, in which the Lay-Chancellor Sits as Judge. To this Court properly belongs the Judgment of all matters of Government in this Minister's Parish: And when this Court makes Decrees, be they right or wrong; agreeable to the Scripture or not, the Minister must Obey, or he must be Punished in the Degree, which the Canon Law requires, as far as it is not contradicted by the Law of the Land. He is liable to be suspended, either barely *ab Officio*; or both, *ab Officio & Beneficio*; or Excommunicated as well as suspended according to the nature of his Disobedience. Now for Ministers, in things, which our Blessed Saviour has properly subjected to their Cognizance, to be thus bound by the Decrees of others, according to the Constitution, is as great an Obligation *to Act Blindfold*, as reasonable Creatures are capable of in any Case. By which it is not meant, that it is really a becoming or justifiable thing.in them, either to put out or shut their own Eyes; But, that the Constitution has done as much to force them to it, as it can well be suppos'd could be done.

And here I must take my Leave of Mr. *Ollyffe*, Who has not tho't fit to proceed any farther, in considering the Reasons of the Ejected Ministers. He renews his Charge at Parting, of my *taking things by the worst handle*, as to which, I think what has been suggested under the several Particulars may be sufficient for my Justification. Tho' the truth of it is, he is so

p. 117.

frequent

frequent in. his Exclamations; and so particular in his Accusations at every turn, that he is too Officious for the generality of our Modern Readers, who love to have some Defects left to their own Observation, without being pointed to every thing as with a Fescue. At last he comes to the Head of *Kindness*, where, I think verily we are able to vye with him and his Neighbours. *Why* (says he) *must we now he treated so unkindly, as to have our Solemn Actings* p. 118. represented in such strange Colours, &c. Truly Sir, here was no unkindnest to you intended. For we Honour your Persons; we value your Labours,and heartily pray God to Succeed them; and yet cannot but say, that for us to take your Method, would be little to our Satisfaction. But he having given me so Grave an Admonition, upon the whole, I think I must not pass it by. *We cannot but Beseech and Admonish him* (says he) *as a Brother in the Lord, to consider* pag. 84. *whose Work he hath been doings and whom he Gratifies by these Mis-representations of us. He knows the Ministry of* England *to be set for the Defence of the Gospel at this Day against* Deists, Socinians, *and a numerous Company of Blasphemous Adversaries of all Religion; and he might easily guess, that what words he puts into their Mouths against us, by this way of Discoursing, they will be sure to use against all Religion as Priest-Craft, and against the Ministry in general, or as they express it, Priests of all sorts.* In Answer, I can assure Mr. *Ollyffe* and his Brethren, that I have consider'd the Matter with all the Seriousness I was able: And the more I consider, the more I am convinc'd, that the covering the gross Defects of the present Constitution, is far from being for the Honour of God, or the Credit of Religion: I am still farther satisfy'd, that what I have done, is

but a piece of Justice to our Fathers, who have gone before us, and our Posterity, who are to rise-up after us: I am but the more assur'd, that those charges upon the present Constitution are well Grounded, which are attempted to be evaded as Mis-representations; by those who are themselves charg'd for their pains as Mis-representers, by the *true Sons of the Church:* I am but the more Confirm'd in my Adherence to Non-conformity, as the Cause of Truth and Charity. Should any thing I have said be abus'd by the open Enemies of all Religion, I must Confess I should think it very unhappy: But am not aware it can justly be charg'd upon me as my Fault. And I can freely leave it to all indifferent Persons to Judge, who give most encouragement to run down Religion as *Priest-Craft*, they who from Scripture, Reason, and Experience, Argue against great and visible Corruptions, in order to their being Redress'd, when Divine Providence shall offer a favourable Opportunity; or they, who vindicate unwarrantable Impositions, while they *have no Heart or Will to the Continuance of them, but have done all they can to remove them:* And who are so Zealous to make Proselytes of their Brethren, while yet they so earnestly disclaim *a stiff Adherence to the things in Debate*. In the mean time, I think, I may justly pretend to as great a Veneration for the *Ministry* in General, and the *Ministry of England* in Particular, as any Man whatsoever: Tho' I must needs own, I think nothing would so much secure their Credit and Success, as that unscriptural Methods being laid aside, we should keep close to our Rule in the pursuit of Holiness, Truth, and Peace, which he that searches Hearts knows is the Summ of my Desires upon this Head. Could

Oll. p. 2.

Ep. Ded. pag. 4.

this

this be compass'd, I don't apprehend we should have any need to fear all the Enemies of Religion, were they ever so numerous: And therefore they that hinder this, (be they who they will), as for as they do so, they are the Persons, that give them their great Advantage.

I shall take the freedom to return Mr. *Ollyffe* and his Brethren, *a Serious Admonition* in the words of Mr. *Hoadly*, which I hope they will admit with a Brotherly Respect.

But however; this be (says he) *I am sure it is not Reasonable nor Justifiable for Persons to Conform as Ministers to a Church, in which there are Laws laid down for their Behaviour in their Office, and these Laws Neither abrogated nor disused with connivance: To Conform, I say, as Ministers to such a Church, without a resolution of obeying these Laws, For this is not* open and fair; *it is a patting a* Deceit *upon the Governors, who to be sure doubt not but that all who offer themselves to the Ministry, are satisfyed in, their Consciences of the lawfulness of acting according to these Prescriptions. And it looks not* Sincere, *for Men first to offer themselves to the Ministry in this Church, which is in effect, to profess, that they are ready to Conform to such of the Canons as relate to their Behaviour, and, are now in force, and afterwards to Act as they think fit, without regard to these Canons. First to make a shew of Obedience to these Laws, and after this act Clandestinely till they are found out and Censur'd, and then to think it enough to submit to the Penalty, which they must do whether they will or no. The Law was certainly made to be obey'd, and the Penalty was not added to intimate, that any might take their Choice, whether they would Conform, to the Law, or submit to that; or as if it were an indifferent thing to our Governours, whether we these to Obey or to Suffer.* Part 1. p. 157.

I shall make it my Request to them, not only that they'll consider this Passage, which I take to be of weight; But, that they will be so Candid as to suppose, that others, whose Sentiments differ from theirs in the matters debated, may Act upon such Principles, as will justifie them to their own Consciences at present, and to the Great God hereafter; Which if they'll but admit, it will be hard to give a Reason, why a Brotherly Affection, and a Friendly Correspondence, should not be cultivated and kept up between them.

Se. XVIII

"IV. They were also requir'd to abjure the "*Solemn League and Covenant.* For the Act for "Uniformity, oblig'd all Ecclesiasticks before "the Feast of St. *Bartholomew*, 1662, to Sub-"scribe a Declaration in these Words. I, A. B. "*do Declare, that I do hold there lies no Obliga-"tion upon me, or any other, from the Oath "commonly call'd the Solemn League and Cove-"nant, to endeavour any change or alteration of "Government, either in Church or State: And, "that the same was in it self an unlawful "and impos'd upon the Subjects of this Realm, "against the known Laws and Liberties of this "Kingdom.*

"Tho' many of the Ministers, who were "Ejected, had not taken this *Covenant*, and "more of them were all along against the im-"posing it, yet would not their Consciences "allow them to yield to such a Renunciation "as this, for which a Parallel can hardly be "found in any Age. They were convinc'd, "that altho' a Vow should be sinfully impos'd "and sinfully taken, it yet binds in a matter "that is Lawful and Necessary; and they " found this was the Determination of the most "Cele-

"Celebrated Casuists. Part of this Covenant
"they were convinced was both Lawful and
"Necessary, and therefore they could not de-
"clare Persons free from all Obligation by it,
"without violating the Rights of Conscience.
"Every Man's endeavouring in his proper
"Place and Sphere to alter Church-Govern-
"ment, as far as he was convinc'd of its be-
"ing Faulty, appear'd to them a matter of
"Duty; and a thing to which that Covenant
"so far oblig'd all that took it, as that all the
"Princes and Prelates in *Christendom*, could
"not give a Dispensation in the Case. But
"for every one in Holy Orders to determine
"for all in three Kingdoms that took the Gove-
"nant, that they were no way Oblig'd by it;
"they esteem'd an unpresidented Instance of
"Assuming. They remembred, that King
"*Charles* himself had taken it in *Scotland*, with
"all possible Appearance of Seriousness and
"Solemnity, and therefore durst not hazard
"that King's Soul by concurring in so Lax a
"Publick Casuistical Determination, as should
"confirm him in the Belief, that he was o-
"blig'd to nothing by the *Covenant*, as far as
"what it contain'd was Lawful: Nor could
"they see, how they should have been able to
"answer it to God if they had. It was plead-
"ed, the *Covenant* was against the Laws of
"*England:* Be it so; yet they could not find
"it so much as Pretended, it was against the
"Laws of *Scotland:* And therefore, tho' it
"had been own'd, that it had not oblig'd
"Men here in *England*, yet they could not see
"what warrant they had to determine it should
"bind none in the Kingdom of *Scotland:* But
"in short they durst not run the hazard of
"tempting the King himself, and Thousands

"of his Subjects in the Three Kingdoms, to "incur the Guilt of *Perjury*; or of hardning "them under that Guilt by Declaring they "were no way oblig'd by Covenanting, what "could not be made appear to be unlawful. "The Ministers would have been free to have "Subscrib'd, that the Covenant bound no Man "to be false to the Government they were un-"der, or Rebellious against the King, or to "endeavour to alter our Monarchy, or de-"prive the King of any of his just Rights and "Prerogatives; They would have given their "Hands, that they would never endeavour to "change any part of Church Government, "which Christ had instituted for Continuance, "or, which had a tendency to contribute to "Purity, Peace, or Order; nay, they would "have abjur'd all Attempts to introduce any "sort of change in the Ecclesiastical Settlement "in a tumultuous and illegal Way: But far-"ther they durst not go, for fear of contri-"buting to a National Guilt. ★

★Baxter's *Nonconmity Stated and Argued*, pag. 125. *His Plea for Peace*, pag. 208. Corbet's *Remains*, pag. 167. Troughton's *Apology for the Nonconformists*, pag. 58. *The short Surveigh of the Grand Case of the present Ministry*, pag. 23.

P. 117. Mr. *Ollyffe* says, he *lays asside the consideration of this, because it is taken away, by Law*. But it was not so, in the Case of these Ministers, whose Plea I was abbreviating. Mr. *Hoadly* also *confines himself to the present Times*; and so has wholly wav'd the *Covenant*, which prov'd a great hindrance to many in the times I was speaking of. I shall not therefore add any thing farther upon this Head, unless it be a remarkable Passage, which comes to me well attected, which may help to shew, how easily many times

Part 1. pag. 3.

Persons

Persons are drawn in, to do as their Neighbours, taking things by the Great, without due Consideration. The Passage was this. A certain *Kentish* Gentleman finding himself declining thro' Age, look'd over a considerable Collection of Papers he had by him, which he had for many Years been making; and divided them into two Heaps; intending one for the Flames, and the other for the use of Posterity. Being thus employ'd, he was visited by the Minister of the Parish, who enquired the Reason of his thus dividing his Papers, which the Gentleman freely told him. It so fell out, that a Copy of the *Solemn League and Covenant* before it past the two Houses, presented it self among the rest to the Clergy-man's View. The Gentleman told him, that that was a very valuable thing, when it came to his Hands. The Clergy-man desir'd the perusal of it, saying, that he had never yet read the *Covenant*. The Gentleman told him, that was very Strange; when he had in express Terms renounc'd it, and declar'd to all the World, that it oblig'd none that took it. Which was a thing he was so little aware of, that the Gentleman was forc'd to fetch his *Common Prayer Book*, and turn him to the Declaration in the Act of Uniformity, for his Conviction.

I am satisfy'd in the truth of, the Fact; and leave others to make their Reflections.

Sect. XIX.

"V. Besides the Oath of Allegiance and *Su*-
"*premacy*, all in Holy Orders were by the Act
"of Uniformity, obliged to Subscribe another
"Political Declaration or Acknowledgment
"of this Tenour; I *A. B. do declare, that it*
"*is not lawful upon any Pretence whatsoever, to*
"*take Arms against the King; and that I, do ab-*

"*hor that traiterous Person of taking Arms by*
"*his Authority against his Person, or against those*
"*that are Commissionated by him.*

"Tho' the Silenc'd Mlnifters were as free
"as any for the Oath of Allegiance, and rea-
"dy to give the Government any Assurance,
"that could be desired of a peaceable *Subjection*;
"yet they were not for Making, and Subscri-
"bing this Declaration, for fear of contribu-
"ting to the betraying of the Liberties of
"their Country. For being sensible, that it
"was very possible for the Law, and the Kings
"Commissions to be contrary to each other,
"they esteem'd it the Duty of *English-men* as
"free People, to adhere rather to the former
"then the latter; but could not discern how
"the so doing could be reconcil'd with this
"Declaration. They were told, that a *Writ*
"being upon a Publick Occasion sued out,
"and coming to the *Sheriffs* Hands; if any Per-
"sons should oppose the Execution by the
"Kings Personal Command or Commission,
"and the *Sheriff* should raise the *Posse Comita-*
"*tûs* upon them, he herein acted by the King's
"Authority. For, *the King's Authority is*
"*all one as by the Law, or in the Name of the*
"*King, according to Law*. Seeing therefore,
"the Sheriff of a County might Act against
"Opposers in such a Case, notwithstanding
"their Commission, the Law bearing him out,
"they could not see upon what Grounds the
"Position design'd to be renounc'd by this
"Declaration, could be represented as *Traite-*
"*rous* and to he *abhorr'd*. They could not see
"why a Nation should be so felicitous about
"Laws for its Security, if a Chancellour, who
"keeps the King's Great Seal be above them
"all, and may by Sealing *Commissions* cast them
"off at Pleasure. Withal, to exclude all Ex-
"ceptions.

"ceptions, in such a Declaration as this, by a
"Clause of that Nature, *not on any Pretence*
"*whatsoever*; seem'd to them to be a Destru-
"ction of Property, a sacrificing all that was
"dear and valuable to the Will of the Prince,
"and the Lusts of his Courtiers, by disabling
"Men to defend their Lives, Liberties, and
"Estates, when attack'd by such as pretended
"to be Commissionated. It seem'd to them
"very harsh, that upon Supposition the *Pa-*
"*pists* should either by Power or Surpize have
"gotten the King at any Time into their
"Hands (as the Duke of *Guise* once dealt
"with the *French* King) and have prevail'd
"with him for fear of his Life, to grant Com-
"missions under his Hand and Seal destructive
"to the Church and State, that the Nation
"hereupon must be inevitably Ruin'd, and
"King and Kingdom lost by such Commissi-
"ons, which none should dare to oppose:
"This appear'd to them so gross, that they
"could not swallow it. They were so weak
"as to esteem *Self-Defence* a Part of the Law
"of Nature; and to think that the Body of a
"Nation have by that Law a *Self-defending*
"*Power* against their notorious assaulting Foes:
"But it was their Comfort under this their
"Weakness, to have so good Companions, as
"the Noble Old *Greeks* and *Romans*, Philoso-
"phers, Oratours and Historians; the Anci-
"ent Bishops of the Church, and Christian-
"Clergy in the Primitive Times; the *Popish*
"Casuistical Writers, and the most celebra-
"ted Writers of Politicks, whether *Papists* or
"*Protestants*; the most celebrated Modern Hi-
"storians, Civilians and Canonists; particular-
"ly such Men as *Thuanus*, *Gothofred*, *Barclay*,
"and *Grotius*; together with such eminent
"Persons

"Persons even in the Church of *England,* as "Bishop *Bilson,* Bishop *Jeremy Taylor,* and Mr. "*Hooker*, herein concurring in the same Opi- "nion with them; and they had more Mo- "desty than at one dash to run down all these "as deceived, and in the wrong. ⋆ "And in Reality, after all the Cla- "mours of their Insulting Bre- "thren, they were very well satis- "fy'd, that they who were most "forward for this Declaration, "and most fierce and eager in Run- "ning down and Exposing those "who scrupled it, would not keep "to it, if at any Time they found. "Things were come to Extremity; "as the Event verify'd. For after all the "Noise that was made in all Parts of the Na- "tion, of the Traiterousness of the Position, "of taking Arms by the Kings Authority, "against his Person, or those Commissionated "by him; and of the unlawfulness of doing so "in any Case whatsoever, a Time at length "came upon the Landing of a certain Person "call'd the Prince of *Orange*, when in order "to the securing Religion, Liberty, and Pro- "perty, all Ranks and Qualities both of Cler- "gy and Laity, finding Room for a particular "Exception (where they would before allow "of *no Case whatsoever*) ventur'd to join with "a Foreign Prince whom they had call'd in "to their Assistance, against the Person of "their Sovereign King *James*, and those who "were Commissionated by him. And as for "the poor Ejected Ministers, who endur'd such "hardships for refusing this Declaration, they "came off with this honourable Testimony "from impartial Spectators, which will be gi- "ven

⋆ *Baxter's Nonconformity Stated and Argued,* Page 134. *Short Surveigh of the Grand Case of the present Ministry,* Page 20. *The Peaceable Design, or Modest Account of the Nonconformists Meetings,* page 39, *&c.*

"ven them by Posterity, tho' it should be "grudg'd them by the Present Age, that by "that Refusal of theirs, they in their several "Places and Stations help'd as much as in them "lay, to Pave the way for that late glorious "Revolution, to which we owe all our pre-"sent Happiness, and all our future Hopes; "while the Promoters of this Declaration and "all that adher'd to it, could Contribute no-"thing in the Case, without bidding Defiance "to their most darling Principle; the Prin-"ciple which for Twenty Years together "had made the Pulpits Ring, and the Press "Groan.

"It must be own'd, that these Two Last "Points, of Renouncing the Covenant, and "Subscribing the Political Declaration against "taking Arms *in any Case whatsoever*, have not "for some Time been insisted on, with such "as enter the Ministry in the Establish'd "Church. The Former was fixed by the Act "but till 1682, and then it dropt of Course. "The Latter continu'd till our Late Revolu-"tion, and then (as it was high Time) was "Superseded.

"For such Reasons as these, the Ministers "who were Ejected durst not comply with "the Act of Uniformity, and fall in with the "National Establishment. Hereupon they have "been generally aspers'd, and blacken'd with "all imaginable Freedom. But this must be "acknowledg'd after all; that if they err'd "in this Matter, it was for fear of Erring "and therefore they deserv'd Respect rather "than reproach, because they acted like Men "of Integrity, according to the Light they "had. Some of them were more influenc'd "by some of these Considerations than others "were

"were; but all put together gave them abun-
"dant Satisfaction in quitting their Livings,
"when they found they could not keep them
"with the Peace and Safety of their Consci-
"ences. Tho' in Reality it is own'd by the
"best Casuists, that if but one thing, which
"after Search and Enquiry they apprehended
"to be sinful, had been made necessary to their
"continuing in their Places, they had been
"bound to have left them. Here were a great
"many Things, which they saw not how
"they could yield to, without Sin: And
"therefore they forbore. There were none
"of them, but would have yielded to what
"would have been sufficient to have made
"them Ministers, in the Apostles Days or af-
"ter: But the Yoke now impos'd was so hea-
"vy, that neither they nor their Fathers
"were able to bear it; and tho' their Fathers
"had been for many Years complaining, yet
"was it made heavier nows than ever it was
"before.

Pag. 117. The *Declaration* against *taking up Arms,* is pass'd by, by Mr. *Ollyffe*, because he says, 'tis *taken away by Law.* But the Question was, Whether this *Declaration* might be safely Made or Subscrib'd by our Fathers, while the Law requir'd it. Upon which he refers me to Mr. *Corbet*'s *Enquiry into the* Oxford *Oath.* That Mr. *Corbet* and sundry others of the Ejected Ministers took the *Oxford Oath*, is well known: But that the far greater Part of them refus'd, as also notorious. That Mr. *Corbet* acted like an Honest Gentleman in Publishing the Reasons and Grounds he went upon, I readily grant. They were not however Satisfactory to others. And why my giving the Reasons of them who refus'd, should be call'd a *Misre-*

presentation

presentation too, I can't imagine. But it seems, the Gentleman had another Reason to refer to Mr. *Corbet*'s *Enquiry*; *viz.* because of his four Equitable and Charitable Rules, which he there laies down, which he tho't might be of use to him: For my Part, I agree to his Rules: *viz.* That we must give that Sense to Words that they'll bear in their Ordinary Signification; according to the intent of the Law, agreeably to Reason and Equity, and in Conjunction with other Laws of the Realm; neither am I aware, that I have in any of the Matters before treated on, adher'd to the Sense of the Ministers who were Ejected, in Opposition to Mr. *Ollyffe*'s Sense, any otherwise than consistently with this General Rule.

Mr. *Hoadly* also passes this by without any Notice. He do's it, upon a Pretence of bringing the Controversie to its present State, of which he is hugely fond. That he that way thinks he has an Advantage, is with me past Question. But when I was considering the Matter at the Time when the Ministers were Ejected, it could not be expected I should pass this over; which I am well assur'd kept many from Conforming. It is true, we have now no farther Concern with this Matter and I cannot but esteem it a Happiness we are freed from it: But I should have tho't, he that undertook to prove the Reasons of the Ejected Ministers not sufficient to justifie their *Non-Conformity*; I should not have over-look'd any of them: Nor can I esteem it a sufficient Evidence, that they might not be justify'd in their refusing to Conform, when such an ensnaring Political Declaration was impos'd upon them; that it is now no longer impos'd, and we may Conform without it.

How-

However, whether the Body of the Ejected Ministers had not Reason to refuse this Declaration, the Subscribing which was a Term of Ministerial Conformity; and whether the Sequel has not fully Justify'd them in that their Refusal, I leave to the Judgment of any indifferent Persons, who will be at the Pains to compare the Reasons of both sides together.

FINIS.

THE POSTSCRIPT TO Mr. *HOADLY*.

SIR,

I Perceive by your *Admonition*, (which came safe to my Hands) that you were fearful least by some things that were suggested in the *First Part* of my Defence, People should be prejudic'd against what you had to Advance in our Controversie: And that *this* was it, that *chiefly induc'd you to Represent* Matters to me in that Publick manner, least the Cause of Truth should suffer, Had I sought any Advantage that way, which I profess I am not in the least aware of, I hope you must own you are now got far beyond me; since there has been so much longer time between the coming forth of your Admonition, and my taking any Publick Notice of it, than there was between the appearing of the first Part of my *Defence*, and its being follow'd with your *Admonition*. By this time, I hope the Prejudice, at which you appear so concern'd, may be sufficiently worn out; and the contrary Prejudice, hath had as fair Scope as a Reasonable Man could Desire, to become Riveted and Confirm'd.

Admon. pag. 48.

Confirm'd. Now then let us see on what Terms we stand.

I cannot hut esteem it a most unhappy thing to have Controversies so manag'd, as to issue in Personal Brangles. 'Twas my fear of this has kept me thus long Silent. Had I been as hasty in my return, as you in your *Admonition*, I doubt we had sooner expos'd our selves, than done the Publick any Service, or bro't any Credit to either side of the Cause in Debate. But I am in hope this delay may have abated the Danger. I take this Opportunity however, to thank you for the Pains you have taken with me, and the occasion you have this way given me to elucidate some Matters, which may need farther clearing. For your Satisfaction, that I have endeavour'd to profit under your *Admonition*, I here send you some Remarks upon it: In which you have rather a Specimen of what might be said, than a distinct return to all Particulars; on some of which I touch but lightly, for fear of *breaking in upon your Temper*, as to which you have given me such fair Warning.

Admon. pag. 52.

Admon. pag. 8.

Your first Charge against me is this: That *my Defence is taken up in what is of no Relation to the Cause between us; and that many things are bro't into it, which may help to obscure the Controversie, and prejudice Men against the Establisht Church*. To which I plead *not Guilty*, under the favour of this Remark: That as for *the Cause between us*, I apprehend it no other than this, *Whether Moderate Non-conformity be justifiable?* Neither can I conceive how any thing that tends towards the Proof of this, can *obscure the Contraversie:* Or how if a true stating matter of Fact, should *prejudice Men against the Establisht Church*, I am liable to have that charg'd upon me as my Fault. But I follow you to *Particulars*, which usually affect more than *Generals*. Your

your first Instance under this Head, is in the Two Sentences prefix'd to my Defence, which had I been in your Case, I should hardly have taken any Notice of. You *wonder what could induce me to place them in the Front of thy Book:* Pag. 9. You represent them as utterly unaccountable, &c. While I think I have much more Reason to wonder at your Resentment. Pag. 10. The true Reason (since you must have it) of my taking that Method was this. I found Mr. *Baxter* Cited in the Title Pages of both your Books, in a way, that I apprehended you would not approve of in another: His Sayings with reference to the *Sectaries*, being apply'd to all the *Non-Conformists*; or so put, as to Tempt others to make that Application. And by my citing those two Noble Passages of my Lord of *Sarum* and the Learned *Pufendorff*, I design'd to let you see, how easily Insinuations of that Kind might be retorted. So that of all Men, I think this needed not to have been a *Stumbling Block* to you, who set me the Pattern, and by your Example first put it into my Tho'ts to take a Method to which I otherwise had no Inclination: Tho' I have us'd it I hope fairly, without wresting, or misapplying the Passages cited. Pag. 13.

Your second Instance is in my being so *solicitous to draw in all the unnecessary Aggravations I could think of.* As to which I shall only say, that as far as I can Judge, neither Mr. *Ollyffe* nor Mr. *Hoadly* there fall short of me. However, let you or I say what we can, on our own behalf, Standers by will Judge as they see Cause: And to them I think verily 'tis out best way to leave it. *Ibid.*

Pag. 15. Your third Instance, is my talking so often of *Catholick Christianity* and *Union upon Scripture Terms* and my frequent Caveat against *making more necessary to the making a Man a Member of the Church, than what is necessary to the making him a Christian*. But of all things, I should think you might there leave the my Liberty; and not think much that I have frequent recourse, to what I own is a Fundamental Principl of my *Non-Conformity*. Whatever you may apprehend, *I profess to follow* none, in any unnecessary Impositions. Whoever have been *Guilty*, or may yet be so, I bless God that for my Part I am hitherto free, and by his Assistance hope to keep my self so, for Time to come. I can leave others the Liberty of their Sentiments; but cannot say that I desire a *National Establishment* with unscriptural Additions. You need not Caution me against *Prophecying*; for I have no Inclination that way: And yet I hope I may be allow'd as Occasion offers to Advance a probable Conjecture as well as my Neighbours. I know of no peculiar *Principles* I have. As far as I can Judge, I have the generality of my Brethren concurring with me, in the Principles I advance. You may plainly see the Bottom we commonly go upon, in the *Introduction* to this Second Part of my *Defence*, which I offer to your Perusal. But when we talk of *Union upon Scripture-Terms*, our Notion differs from Yours. We do not give that Name *to a Compliance, in what is acknowledged to be materially Lawfull*; nor can we think such a Compliance will have that Name ascrib'd to it, by such as take due Notice of that Maxim of St. *Paul:* viz. *All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient*. An Union upon Scripture

Pag. 16.

Terms,

Terms, we think must leave those things free, the determining which one way or other is not there at all Directed: And make nothing necessary to Communion, which is there left absolutely Indifferent. To insist on this is so far from *amusing the World*, that it is a proposing the only Bottom, that will be firm and lasting. How you should in this Case be offended I cannot conceive; unless it should anger you that I differ from you; which is what I would not give my self leave to suppose: Because you cannot be insensible, that that is what I have as good a Right to, as you have to differ from me.

Your fourth Instance is in the *many Pages* of my Book, which are of *no Concern to you*. But suppose you have that Apprehension, I can't see that it therefore follows that others will agree with you, in thinking they have *no Relation to the Cause between us*, if they suggest any thing which may contribute to the *Justifying of Non-Conformity*. But as long as you are free to pass by, whatever is of no Concern to you, and at Liberty to leave it as you find it, I can't see you have any hurt done you, or the least Cause of Complaint. Had the Answering your Objections been my only Aim, I should have taken one Method; when as while the Justifying *Non-Conformity* to the Publick Establishment was the Thing intended, I tho't another more Eligible. And can't see why I have not a Right to choose for my self. Give me leave to say it again: The Question I am pursuing, is this: *Whether Moderate Non-Conformity to the Present Establishment be Justifiable?* If you rather choose to start another Question,you may pursue it as you please. But then, if I make good the Affirmative of the Question as I State it, in Pag. 17.

Opposition to what is advanc'd by you, or Mr. *Ollyffe*, or others, I can't help it, if you will reckon your Self unconcern'd. That *Acting as an Historian*, and so giving Light in the Debate, by a right Representation of Matters of Fact, is the proper way to *justifie Non-Conformity*, is what I have long been fully convinc'd of. Nor can I as Matters stand, see any way of *composing our Differences*, unlesls the Rise and Ground of them be understood, and a due Distinction made between the *Aggressors*, and the *injur'd Parties*. When my Civil Rights are notoriously invaded, I may in some Cases Compound, for the sake of my own Peace and Ease, or when such a Composition may be for the real Benefit of my Family: But when it appears, after various Essaies towards such a Composition, that they who have *depriv'd me* of my Civil Rights, not only insist upon their own Justification, but will yield me no equitable Terms; but I must comply with their Humour, or else they'll bear me down with a high Hand, and Triumph over me, because they make a greater Figure in the World than I do: In this Case, I think it high Time to lay aside tho'ts of Compounding: I'll carry my Cause to Chancery; and there I'll state my Case, and clear Matter of Fact as distinctly as I can; trying whether I can that way recover my Rights. If this *revives mutual Jealousies, and incenses one against another*, all must agree the Fault lies in those who detain my Right from me, and not in me, who by an equitable Method seek to recover it. Your not *apprehending horn my Historical Passages will help us in our present Debate*, only shews, that you and I differ in our Judgment. But I should think we may do so, and yet be good Friends. I can't see,

Pag. 18.

why

why you might not allow me to Act according to the best Light I have; and that especially in a Case, where I have the Satisfaction of so general a Concurrence with me.

But why should my *Dilating on the Fathers* in the first Part of my *Defence* seem so strange to you? The true Reason of it was, because as you very well know all that follow your Scheme at length resort thither: Scripture failing them, they fly to Antiquity. In shewing, how little Ground there is for such a Dependence upon Antiquity in this Case, as is usual and common (among our Brethren of the *Church of England*, as well as among the *Romanists*) I apprehended I might save both my self and others some trouble in the Debate. You your self have here given me fair warning, when you tell me *you think you can demonstrate that in the Primitve Times, the Administration of Ecclesiastical Affairs was in the Hands of Bishops, who had* Presbyters *subject to them*, &c. And when in other Places you bottom Episcopal Ordination upon Ecclesiastical Usage. Your Proof here must have been from the Fathers: And therefore I think it tends to shorten the Debate that I have shewn before hand, how little that sort of Proof would contribute to a real Conviction of any Necessity in order to Acceptance with God, or the serving those spiritual Purposes which are most to be ey'd. And if herein, and in some other Cases too, I have *taken a wider Compass, than a bare Reply to my Animadverters made necessary:* I can't see why I should be liable to Censure; nor can I as yet find in my Heart to repent of it. For I must Confess when I read any Controversial Writings, I love to see not only such Objections Answered as have been started, but others

Pag. 19.

Pag. 20.

also that may be advanc'd in the prosecuting of the same Debate. If you herein differ from me, I believe you are pretty peculiar in your Sentiments.

And thus I think I have sufficiently clear'd my self from your first capital Charge: And. therefore I proceed to the Second, under which you Accuse me of *unhandsome Treatment*, *unkind Censures* and *Misrepresentations of your Design and Manner of Writing*. As to which I can in the General only say this that I little expected such a Charge, as not being Conscious to my Self, that I had done any thing to deserve it. I did indeed stile you my *Catechist*, but design'd not the least *Contempt* in it: And had I apprehended it liable to that Interpretation, I would have forborn it. I own also I did now and then wish you *more Charity*, and if you would not be offended, I would tell you I do so still: But 'tis without any Disesteem of your other valuable Abilities. For my Part I I cannot forbear thinking it a Kind and a Brotherly Wish, nor can I see why you should so much resent it. I know not how to think him past improving in *Charity*, who for want of a Nicety, disowns a Number of Ministers whom God hath qualify'd for considerable Service in his Church, and who want nothing which the Sacred Scriptures represent, as necessary to Acceptance with him in that Office; and who would not have been rejected either by Christ or his Apostles. But at the same Time, I can easily distinguish between a Man's *Temper and* his *Principles*. Tho' I have not the Happiness of any Personal Acquaintance with you, I yet can so far depend upon the Report of those that have, as to believe you a Person of so Friendly a Disposition, that you are

Pag. 21.

Pag. 22.

Pag. 23.

are as Genial in your Respect and Brotherly Affection, as your Principles will allow you: While I have known others of larger Principles much stinted in their Brotherly Kindness, by the sowrness of their Natural Tempers. And when I told Mr. *Dorrington*, that what he advanc'd *was short even of Mr.* Hoadly'*s Charity*, I referr'd to your *Principle*, and not to your *Temper*. His Principle led him to represent those who date under the Ministry of the *Dessenters*, as *Defeated of the Ends and Benefits of a Ministry:* While your Principle still left room for supposing, that God might make *allowance for the Honesty of well-meaning People*. By intimating then, that his Principle left less room for the Exercise of Charity than yours, I rather intended to express my Preference, than to attempt to turn *your Charity into a Proverb*. And yet your Principle at the same Time, leading you to Censure those for undertaking the Ministry and continuing in it, who want nothing requir'd in Scripture in order to their Acceptance with God, or usefulness among Men, I cannot but think it hinders that Extensiveness in *your Charity*, to which your Temper would incline you. In a word. He seems to send all to the pit of Hell, that are under a Dissenting Ministry; and therein is short even of that Charity, which your Principle will allow you to Exercise; which yet I esteem Scanty eno' in all Reason for a Man of so frank a Temper, so open in Convention, and so well acquainted with Men and Things, as I take Mr. *Hoadly* to be. I profess this was all I aim'd at: And if my manner of Expression had not a due Aptness.to convey this Sense, upon Second Tho'ts, when I have assur'd you this

Pag. 24.

was all I aim'd at, I am perswaded you will rather reckon it my unhappiness, than my Fault. For my Part, I don't at all doubt, but the Account you have given, of your self is true, when you say you have as *dissuasive and extensive a Charity as can be*; *i. e.* as can be reconcil'd with your Principles. And on the other Hand, I no more *esteem it a Part of Christian Charity, for any one to frame his Principles so as to approve of all the Actions of honest and understanding Men*, than you do. And yet I must needs say, I think it unhappy for a Man to imbibe betimes, and be deeply impress'd by such Principles in Religion, as tend to Cramp and Limit that Charity and Affection, to which a generous Temper would otherwise incline him. I cannot agree with you, that *Charity hath nothing to do in impartial searches after Truth.* For as God has declar'd, that he will have *Mercy and not Sacrifice*, so I think that Man is most likely to be successful in the search for Truth, who looking upon *Charity* as *the End of the Commandment*, is thereby inclin'd to make allowance for any such Diversity in Sentiment or Practise, as is consistent with a cordial Love to God and Man. Charity may and should so influence our Minds even in reference to Principles, as to give us a strong Suspicion of those Notions which bear hard upon Men of Conscience and Judgment, and must therefore put us upon the most severe Examination thereof, with Minds duly prepar'd to admit of sufficient Evidence to the contrary, tho' it should not amount to an enforcing Demonstration, so as to leave no room for Cavils. And if Charity ought even to turn the Scale on the favourable side where the Matter is doubtful, much more should it dispose and incline us to accept of a

Pag. 25.

moderate

moderate over-weight on that side: And it ought thus to influence us not in reference to this or that Party only, but towards all Neither can I in particular Agree, that *Charity hath nothing to do in an Enquiry after Regular Ordinations:* For so long as your *Enquiry after Regular Ordinations* runs farther than the Scripture-Platform, and proceeds to the regulating of modern Practise, by the Customs of the Times that succeeded the Apostolical Age, I think *Charity* highly requisite to prevent your laying such a stress upon Ecclesiastical Custom, as would nullifie our Ministry and Churches, which at least appear not to be disallow'd by the Scriptures. A Man may indeed be *Honest, and judge as he himself sees Reason*, in preferring Episcopal before any other Ordination: And yet if he is so severe in his Principle as to hold what he prefers as most eligible, to be so far necessary as that no other sort of Ordination is Valid; or if he lays such a stress on the Episcopal Character, as to reject the Ministrations of those whose Orders were not confirm'd with it; He may be justly suspected of a want of Charity. For he is by a Nicety cramp'd in his Affections towards those whom he ought to embrace as Brethren, and he puts a slight on those whom the chief Governor of the Church will be as ready to own and approve as himself, or those of his own Way. And that this is your Case appears very plainly from your declaring, that you *cannot Acknowledge* Persons Ordain'd by *Presbyters*, tho' wanting.in nothing requir'd in Scripture, to be *approv'd of God, in setting apart themselves for the Ministry*; and from many other Hints to the same Purpose, However, that you have *disclaim'd the Invalidity and Unprofitableness of all the Ministrations* of these

Pag. 26.

Part I. Pag. 8.

Admon. Pag. 28.

these Men *to the People*, I am very sensible, and you know have taken, particular Notice of it. Herein I look upon your Temper, as having fix'd a charitable Limitation to a rigid Principle: And I am not without Hope, that the same Temper may in Time carry you yet farther in the limiting your Principle; unless you have better Scriptural Evidence of the Necessity of the Concern of a Superiour Bishop in Ordination, than has been as yet produc'd.

Pag. 26. Whether you or I have the more *Catholick Spirit*, is what I have no Inclination to Dispute: But whether my Principles don't leave room for a more extensive Charity than yours will allow you, I leave to the Judgment of indifferent Persons, upon comparing both together. I do indeed say as well as you, that *a Regular Ordination is to be sought for*; but then I mean a Scriptural Ordination: Whereas you an this Case join Ecclesiastical Custom with the Scripture as your Rule. I do also own, that *God doth not approve Irregular Ordinations*, i. e. such as the Scriptures don't warrant: But you by the same Expression mean, that he does not approve,of such Ordinations, as are not exactly agreeable to the most prevailing Ecclesiastical Usage. Now since it may admit of a fair Debate, what is necessary to a *Regular Ordination* in the Sense of Scripture, tho' for my own Part, I am clear as to a *Ministerial Investiture*, and could not have been satisfy'd without it, yet I am free to make Allowance for those, who cannot see that so clearly in Scripture, as I think I do: And if I find God making use of the Ministrations of those who camp into the Ministry in a way different from my self, for the spreading of serious Religion, and beating down the Kingdom and Interest of the Prince of

of Darkness, I for my Part dare not Censure them as not call'd to he Ministers, even tho' I might not be satisfy'd my self to-take their Method.

But how you can represent me as espousing Mr. *Dodwell*'s Principle, *That the Benefit of Spiritual Administrations depends upon the Autority of him that Administers*, I cannot imagine. This I think I have as much Reason to resent, as you have any one Thing you have mention'd, be it what it will. That there is little Reason indeed to expect, that God should own those whom he had not sent and that 'tis unlikely he should give as much Success in their Work to those whom he had not design'd for the Ministry, as those whom he had given a Commission to, is I must confess my firm Perfwasion: But that the want of an outward Formality in the conferring Autority shall exclude from Benefit; or that God sends none into the Ministry, but in such a particular Way; so as that such as are not under a Ministry of this or that particular Form, must be left to the uncovenanted Mercy of God (which I take to be the distinguishing Principle, of Mr. *Dodwell* upon this Head,) is what I am as remote from thinking as any Man Living. And it is because your Principle appears to me to tend towards this, that I am the more against it. I am not indeed for *charging all the hard Consequences of a Doctrine upon the Person who teaches it*. I am perswaded you have more Charity, than to hold the Conclusion which Mr. *Dodwell* draws from your Principle. And yet I cannot discern that I act at all unbecomingly, in willing that the same charitable Temper may by its Prevalence put you upon close Re-examining a Principle, from whence that uncharitable Con- Pag. 29.

Conclusion so naturally follows. And this I am the more Confirm'd in, because I am perswaded, that if your Principle was not so stiff, your Temper would be so far from inclining you to look upon the admitting of well qualify'd Persons (who only are pleaded for) into the Ministry among the *Dissenters*, in a scriptural Way, as a *Bar to Union*, that you would much rather rejoice in it, as tending to the keeping up *pure and undefil'd Religion*, among those who are dissatisfy'd with the National Establishment; among whom Religion would certainly suffer much, and an Accommodation (should the desirable Season for it ever offer) be prevented, were they for want of such Provision, to fall into the Hands of illiterate Mechanicks, altogether unfurnish'd for that sacred Work and Office.

Pag. 31.

As to the *Manner of Writing*, it generally differs according to the different Genius of the Writers. I can freely there leave you to pursue your own Inclinations: And cannot find that any besides your self think me at all severe in my Reflections. Any Thing that I tho't might seem to favour of Contempt, is what I can truly say I endeavour'd to avoid. Tho' I must confess, the representing a number of as valuable Ministers as ever this, or perhaps any other Nation has been bless'd with since the Days of the Apostles, as no Ministers; and that tho' it was own'd they were many of them well qualified for their Office, and succeeded in it to the unspeakable Benefit of many Souls, is what would have justify'd some warmth. But I really check'd my self, instead of taking any Liberty, that I tho't could by indifferent Persons be judg'd at all unbecoming. Perhaps you may look upon what you, have said upon

Pag. 32

that

that Head as very tolerable: But you limit must give me leave to have other Tho'ts.

As for the Business of *Occasional Communion*, I must acknowledge I tho't you harp'd upon, it very often; and return'd to it as frequently, as if you were singularly pleas'd with the Subject; and tho't you had there a mighty Advantage over us. But you will have it, that *you gave no hard Words.* Let any Man Judge by that one Passage, where you say. *Nothing can raise more endless Scruples in your People than Occasional Communion, with a Church from which you have made a formal Separation. They have been fill'd with Amazement and Uneasiness, and have not known which way to turn themselves, and perhaps have been induc'd by it to stretch their own Consciences a little, and furnish themselves with Distinctions, against they should have Occasion for them.* I believe most People will take these for more *hard* and *bitter Words*, than many of those you so much exclaim against, when you find me making use of them.

Pag. 33.

Part I. Pag. 26.

But since you are pleas'd to make me so frank an Offer, that *if I will shew you in all that you have Written, any hard and bitter Language, any Thing that tends to incense and inflame; any thing bro't in for* Fashion's *Sake, or for* Wit's *sake, or for* Railery; *any thing but what you had just and fair Occasion for saying, you will repent of it, and revoke it, and alter it;* because you would *willingly have your Book as perfect as possible*; tho' this is more than I should have mov'd for, or insisted on, yet since you are so frank and open, I offer a few Things to your Second Tho'ts.

Admon. Pag. 37.

Whether it was for the sake of *Wit* or *Railery*, or for *Fashion-sake*, or any Reason distinct from all of them that you bro't the Two Passages in your Title Pages, out of Mr. *Baxter*

against

against the *Sectaries,* you best know: But I think the Pattern you have set me will allow, me to Query, whether you really think the Case of all the *Dissenters* suited by those Passages? If you do, I think I need seek no farther for something that tends to *incense* and *inflame:* If you do not, what *just and fair Occasion* could you have for mentioning them? Either way, your Promise of *revoking and altering* will come upon you: And that the rather, because you have so smartly Animadverted on your Neighbour, for but doing something of the same kind, in Imitation of You. When you say in your first Preface *We who seriously Conform as Ministers to this Church, cannot be willing to be Accounted, what no Christian ought to be; and cannot be Content to sit down and suffer our Practise to be represented as a Complication of the blackest and the most unpardonable Crimes*; do's not this tend to *incense?* And that needlesly too, when you know we make such Allowance for different Degrees of Light among several Persons? Or what *just and fair Occasion* I pray had you, for insinuating in the same Preface, that my Abridgment had *been recommended to the People even from the Pulpits?* Had you said, from the *Press*, there had been something in it: But certainly, a Distinction should be made between the *Press* and the *Pulpit.* Can you tell any one Pulpit in *City* or *Country*, from whence any thing of that Nature was dropt? I can tell you of several Pulpits where it hath been freely inveigh'd against: And if you can't tell me of one where it has been recommended, I think you must warn all your Readers entirely to expunge that Passage, before your Book can be pretended to be *as perfect as possible.* And was it not a little *hard and bitter*, and do's it not tend to incense, for

you

you to tell the Ejected Ministers, that *you can hardly perswade your selves that they believe they speak?* ⋆ Could you lay any thing much worse of any Men? Is this like one that has *avoided whatever might offend, as far as it was possible.*

⋆ Part I. Pag. 50. *Admon.* Pag. 36.

Again, what *just and fair Occasion* had you for representing any Persons, as Pleading that *the Time of celebrating the Communion was never determin'd to the Morning, till the Doctrine of Transbstantiation was establish'd?* This has been. Pleaded with good Reason, as I intimated as to the Posture of Kneeling: But can you suppose it capable of being Pleaded, as to the Season of Administration? And if not, how can you say, that you have *exposed and ridicul'd no Argument?* And is it not a little *hard and bitter* for you to say. That *the Dispute between the* Dissenters *and* You, *is not whether there shall be any Impositions or no, but whether they shall be such as Ours or Yours?* Can you reconcile that with Truth, if you consider the Proposals either of the Commissioners at the *Savoy*, or of those who treated afterwards in the Reign of King *Charles* the 2d, about a Comprehension? If not, I think this must be mollify'd, before you can expect *your Book* would be *as Perfect as is possible.* Thus were it easie (had I so much Leisure, and did I think it would countervail my Pains) to draw out as long an *Admonition* as Yours, and make it evident, that after all Your Caution, you have given *Occasion* eno' *for Censure*, had I been dispos'd to take it; or could it yield me any Satisfaction to Dilate upon it.

Part I. Pag. 73. *Admon.* Pag. 36. Part I. Pag. 102. *Admon.* Pag. 37.

And that you mayn't think Your Second Part wholly free, I'll Point you to Three Passages there also, out of many that I might produce of the same Kind. I refer it to you as the fittest Judge, whether it was for the *sake of*

Wit

Wit or *Raillery*, that you have made such a formal Speech, when you take upon you to Personate an *Ejected Minister.* ⋆ Can you reconcile such Language with their known and avow'd Principles, and the Circumstances of those Times? If not, I think I may with much more Reason than you had, say as you in another Case, that this is *rather Banter than Argument.* And is it not a little *hard and bitter*, has it not a tendency to *incense* and *inflame*, whether it was *for Fashion sake*, or for *Wit's sake*, or *Railery*, that you should charge the Dissenting Ministers in General, as *not caring* that the People who adhere to them, *should be sensible what it is they leave*, when they leave the *Church* of *England?* Is not this Passage a manifest Evidence, that you *have upon occasion step'd aside to Censure, or inveigh against your Neighbours?* And what say you to that Passage, where you tell the Dissenting Ministers, that they have *written for many Years with such a Concern against* the Church of *England, that they could hardly write with more against the* Church *of* Rome *it self?* Is this like one that has *avoided whatever might offend, as far as it was possible?* But I am really tir'd with this sort of Work, and shall proceed no farther, unless you give me fresh Occasion and shall leave you to discharge your Promise at your Leisure.

⋆ Part II. Pag. 17.

Part I. Pag. 149.

Part II. Pag. 44. *Admon.* pag. 36.

Part II. Pag. 120.

To go on then to the next Ground of your Disturbance; I find 'tis this: That I have given such an *Account of your little regard to Peace and Union*. If it will be any Satisfaction to you, I can assure you, I should be glad to find your regard to it so great, as might give me Reason to unsay what I have said, but it do's not yet appear. I grant you own, that *there may be Alterations made, for the Perfection and Advantage of the Church*; *that the Burial Office may be alter'd,*

Admon. Pag. 38.

terd, and the Damnatory Sentence in the Athanasian *Creed omitted*; *and that no National Constitutioh can he so Perfect, but that something may be added to it*, &c. And yet I see not what a great many such good Words amount to, as long as the Power to impose Rites and Ceremonies is so strenuosly asserted; and the making Terms of Communion so stiffly adher'd to. There the Heart of the Controversie lies: And if this must be acknowledg'd by all that fall in with the Constitution, particular Concessions will prove comparatively insignificant. If the Things now imposed, are not left indifferent as they were by King *Charles* his Declaration, in 1661, Twenty such Amendments would leave us but where we were. Had I seen you inclin'd that way, I should have forborn what you appear disturb'd at upon this Head: But while this is wanting, nay the contrary Disposition so oft discover'd, I see not that I have done you any Injury at all. Wonder not that I should say the contrary Disposition is oft discover'd; for really you have interspers'd some such Passages, as in my Opinion quite Overthrow your seeming readiness in other Places, to yield to Abatements. Thus you tell us, that *the Goverhours of the Church have by Publick Declarations prevented, and an all the Objections that the scrupulous are apt to entertain against their Impositions*. If so, what need can there be of Amendments? Or why should you yield to them? Nay you tell us, that *the Govemours of the Church have order'd nothing but what if all would seriously comply with, is certainly for the good of the Church*. And if so, how can you yield to Alterations, without being against the good of the Church? If every *Pin* in the Taberna-

Part I. Pag. 77.

Ibid. Pag. 78.

cle be in your esteem for *the good of the Church*, then can I not see how you could part with any one of them, tho' Union might be the Consequence.

Admon. Pag. 46.

Neither, can I see, any Reason you have to be so much disturb'd, that I should intimate, you had *said nothing to that great Difficulty, I propos'd* concerning the Multiplication of Ceremonies, whenever our Superiours should be so dispos'd. For tho' you tell me, you have *expresly consider'd it*, I must yet profess to you, I can find no Solution of my Difficulty. My Objection was this: *That upon the same Reasons as the Bishops impose the Cross and Surplice, they might bring in abundance of the Ceremonies of the Church of* Rome. And after all you have said to this ⋆, the Difficulty remains untouch'd. You say indeed, *this* Objection *will lie against the Imposition of every Thing not absolutely necessary.* Let us suppose it, and what is the Consequence but this; that we ought therefore to be the more Cautious how we at all give way to an Imposition, that is not *absolutely,* or at least circumstantially *necessary:* Which was the very Difficulty that was urg'd. Any Compliance in this Case is therefore the more hazardous, because if we yield at all, there's no knowing where we may stop. To say we may stop at what is *unlawful* but not till then, leaves a wide Field open, and won't answer the Difficulty at last. For there are several of the *Popish* Ceremonies that have been Discarded, that are no more *unlawful* as to the Matter of them, than the *Sign of the Cross*, or wearing a *Surplice.* You have therefore devis'd other bounds; but upon search they'll be found such, as still leave the Go-

⋆ Part I Pag. 82, 83.

Governours of the Church, an unlimited Power of imposing, any farther than their own Discretion bounds it. You say indeed, they are not to introduce *vain, senseless, indecent Ceremonies; or abundance of any sort:* But as long as it depends upon their Pleasure, and it is left to them to judge what Ceremonies are *vain, senseless*, or *indecent,* and what number would be too great an Abundance, Inferiors having nothing to do but submit, (without enquiring into their Reasons) what Satisfaction can be given us, that sundry *Popish* Ceremonies that were at first laid aside, may not in process of Time be tho't as Rational and as Defensible as those which we have retain'd? To talk of our *Complaining when the* Church *of* England *do's this*; is only to post-pone the Difficulty, and not to Solve it. For as long as it may come to this, we may rationally look out for our own Security. And suppose it were own'd, *a Separation could not be justify'd* by this alone; yet it neither follows, but that a Separation might be justify'd by this in Conjunction with other Things; nor do's it follow, but that this taken by it self, may justly be a discouraging Consideration as to falling in with that Constitution, under which you cannot make it appear we can be safe from farther *Popish* Impositions, whenever those who were at Helm might be so dispos'd. To ask, *how it follows*, *that if Bishops can impose two Ceremonies*, *they may Twenty*, is only an attempt to evade the Difficulty, without removing it. And a vain attempt it is; for if they may impose whatever *seems to them most for the Beauty and Advantage of the Society, and they are Judges of what conduces to this End*, as you declare, then if they Part I. Pag. 67.

have that Notion of Twenty Ceremonies, that they would be for the Beauty and Advantage of the Society, they may as warrantably impose them as Two. And therefore I can't see any, need you had to be so extremely Angry, at my Historical Account of *High Church* and *Low Church*; my Thred-bare Repetition of Dr. *Hickman*'s Distinction of Spirits, and Dr. *Guntiing*'s desire of more Ceremonies, and other inch like Passages which were produc'd as a probable Evidence, that there have been some in the World (and I don't know, but there may be some of the same Temper yet in being) that have wanted a convenient Opportunity of adding farther Impositions, rather than a sufficient Inclination. And after all had I been to have advised you, unless you could have advanc'd something to the Purpose towards the removal of this Difficulty, I would have tho't it better to have taken no farther Notice of it. Nor will it in my Apprehension be at all Prudent for you to return to it any. more, unless you can solve the Difficulty: Which if you can but do, your Church will be more oblig'd to you than to any one I can meet with, that has gone before you in this. Controversie.

Admon. Pag. 50.

Admon. Pag. 46.

You pleasantly tell me, that the *Representations and Accusations* you have instanc'd in, and my Denying, that you have said any thing to the Difficulty last mention'd, of which you have spoken so plainly and professedly; is as great a Demonstration that I had not carefully read your Two Books, as any I could give that I had done so: And you add, *you are sure you may say, that lesser Arguments than these have passed, amongst good* Criticks, *for a sufficient*

Proof

Proof that such a particular Book had never been perus'd by such a particular Man. But it is unhappy to be *over Critical.* Did I herein affect to imitate you, I might by the same Rule, pretend to demonstrate, that you had not your self ever read over what you had written, after you had written it; since you give such a Character of your Performance, as is directly contradicted, by so many Particulars mention'd above. Upon which Consideration I think I may reasonably expect, either that your Demonstration should be dropt, or mine be own'd equally strong.

As for *Publick Reparation*, it is sufficient, if I am ready to give it, where it is due. I should think in our Case, a ready forgiveness as to any Thing, which notwithstanding all our Care, may be dropt in the Prosecution of the Debate, that might not be strictly justifiable; and the cherishing on each side a Friendly Temper, the best way that can be pitcht upon. For my Part, I'll go as far as I think you or any Man could reasonably desire. You tell me, that *I have deceiv'd some into an ill Opinion of you.* If I have, I can safely assure you, 'tis not only more than I design'd, but also more than I know of. But if any Persons from what I have said, have been led into an ill Opinion of you, I take this Opportunity to desire them to. lay it aside. For I declare to you, (and you have free Liberty to assure all whom it may concern) that I have a very good Opinion of you; and don't at all Question, but you Act according to your Judgment in pursuit of the Principles you have embrac'd, and that with as much Charity and Temper, as they and Pag. 47.

your Prudence together will allow you. But as for the *altering my way of Writings* I know not how to gratifie you in that: Because the way I have fallen into, is that which in my deliberate Judgment appears most likely to reach my End, *viz.* the *Justifying Non-Conformity*, and therefore I hope you'll excuse me. If you will hereupon count me a *formidable Adversary*, I cannot help it. But in the mean Time give me leave to assure you, I neither am your *Adversary*, nor intend to be so. I am Heartily engag'd in the same common Cause with you, against the avow'd Enemies of our Religion and Nation, and the secret Enemies to the *Protestant* Succession as by Law establish'd. At such a Season as this especially, I can't bear the tho'ts of being an *Adversary* to any, that I am satisfy'd are Hearty in the same Interest. Tho' therefore we should after our utmost Pains on each side, continue to differ in our Sentiments, about the Power of Church Governors, and the measure of the Obligation of Inferiors, and such like Matters; yet for God's sake, let us have so much regard to the Publick, as not to be *Adversaries* to each other; especially when our Circumstanees are so Critical, and our Agreement is so firm, in things that are both many more in Number, and of much greater importance, than those wherein we differ.

Pag. 48.

Pag. 52.

To, your *Postscript*, I have only this to say, that as you may State the Question as you please for your self, so I hope may I. My Sense upon that Matter you will see sufficiently laid open, in my Introduction to this Second Part, which I offer to your Consideration. Possibly you may count that a *Digression* too: But: for my

Pag. 53.

my Part, I count nothing a Digression that tends to give Light in a Controversie that is depending; nor do, I write for the sake of an Answer to this or that particular Person, but that Truth may be beat out by a free Ventilation. Tho' you are pleas'd often to limit me, and give me Directions about the Method I must take, and to what Bounds I must confine my self, *&c*; yet I leave you full Liberty to take your own Method, which you think most proper to Answer the End, which I am so Candid as to believe you as truly Design as my self, *viz*. to serve the Cause of Truth. I must indeed Confess, I cannot but think a little regard to the natural Course of this Controversie, might have induc'd you to have spar'd great Part of Your *Admonition*, if not the whole. For you well know I did not begin with you. I had no Eye to you, nor to any particular Persons whatsoever in the Account I drew up of the Reasons all edg'd by the Ejected Ministers for their Non-Conformity. You undertook to shew the Invalidity of these Reasons for the Justifying them and their Adherents. And the Aim of my Reply is to shew, that they were Valid and upon what Grounds I esteem them so, not only notwitstanding what you have alledg'd to the contrary, but also, notwithstanding whatever I have yet met with alledg'd by others, that appears to make the most against them. In this Case, I think I have an indisputable Right to take my own Method, and hope I may be allow'd; it for the future, without any Offence to you to whom I would not willingly give any needless Disturbance.

Upon the whole I assure you, I have that Cordial Respect for you (which has been not a little heighten'd by a late Performance,* generally ascrib'd to you, which I cannot but much applaud) that I here give it you under my Hand, that if there were any thing in this Second Part, that I tho't would have been needlesly grating, I would have expung'd it: And I can lately say, that Success in your Ministerial Labours, an extensive Usefulness in any Station for which God may Design you; and all desirable Prosperity, is as Heartily wish'd to you, as to himself,

* *The Letter in Vindication of the Bishops.*

By, Sir

Your Friend and Brother,

(If you allow it)

E. C.

Animad-

Animadversions on the Anonym-*mous Pamphlet*; *Entituled*, A Letter from a Congregational Minister in the Country, to Mr. *Calamy*, Occasion'd by his Late Book; Entitul'd, *A Defence of Moderate Non-Conformity*.

FRom the first Perusal of this Letter, I tho't it *Mysterious.* It seem'd odd to be assaulted by a *Congregational Brother*, when it was so evident, that in my Defence of *Non-Conformity*, I had kept such a Latitude as could not give those of that Perswasion any just Offence: And yet odder to find so much Concern at the same Time in the Letter, that I should treat them in so Brotherly a manner. It look'd strange, there should be so much Ignorance of the Principles and Practcise of those of the *Congregational Way*, in one that pretends so much Zeal for it: And yet stranger, that so peculiar a Concern should be discover'd for the Credit of Mr. *Headly*, and that I must be so angrily threaten'd by One of such a stamp, with whom I had no Controversie, if I did not carry it more obligingly to that Gentleman, whom I was not sensible I had done any Thing to disoblige. I tho't it a little peculiar, that my *Congregational Brother* should be afraid of his Name, when

Writing

Writing against one who did not shun the Light: And yet more so, that instead of the Name of his Bookseller I should only find *J. Nutt*, upon the Title Page, which all that are acquainted with the Method of the Press, know to be a common Blind, when a Man affects, or thinks it for his Interest to remain undiscover'd. Why so much Secrefie tho't I? If a *Congregational Brother* apprehended I had injured him or his Cause, I should have tho't I might have had some warning before a Blow: At least I might well have imagin'd I should have heard of the Disgust of some of that Perswasion: But instead of any Thing of that Nature, I found several of them so kind and generous as to give me their Thanks for my Performance. However, if it had been one of that Way, whose Temper and Sentiments were a little peculiar, I should have tho't the Author might in a little Time have been discover'd, by some Means or other: But instead of that, some that have been reported the Authors, have either by Letter or Word of Mouth given me Assurance of their knowing, nothing of the Matter, and of their utter dislike of the proceedings of their Pretended Brother. Nay, I have not so, this very Day, so much as met with or heard of one; of that Way, but what have discover'd their Concern at the Letter, and, their dislike of it. This heightens the Mystery. My Brothers, being *in the Country*, don't much mend the Matter. For if he were so, he must either bring his Sheets to the Press himself, or make use of a Frjend to look after, the Press, and to apply the same of Mr. *Nutt*. Either way,.'tis pretty much no Intelligence could be gain'd; especially, when no Reason offers, why so much Secrefie should be affected.

Neither

Neither could I forbear wondring, how a *Congregational Brother* should come to jump so much in his Sentiments with Mr. *Headly*, and happen just to fasten on those very Things which he was the most disturb'd at and be so gracious with that Gentleman, as to Interest himself with so much warmth, in the particular Concern of his Admonition. I should have tho't a *Congregational Brother* might at least have given me as good Words as Mr. *Hoadly* But in lieu of it, he falls mightily in with him against me. Do's Mr. *Hoadly* charge me with favouring, not only those who have Popular Ordination without any Ecclesiastical Officer, but those also who have only an inward Call? (1) So do's this Gentleman; who personating one that had only Popular Ordination, tells me, that such and such Passages, not only Favour such as he was, but even those who think an inward Call sufficient. (2) Do's Mr. *Hoadly* accuse me of espousing Mr. *Dodwell*'s Princiciple? (3) So do's this Letter, in which I am charg'd with not coming short of Mr. *Dodwell*'s uncharitableness. (4) Which is so peculiar a Fancy, that I could not but take the more notice of it. Is Mr. *Hoadly* disturb'd at my calling him a *Catechist?* (5) How naturally do's the author of the Letter Harmonize, when he exacts a Promise of me, not to call him in a way of Jeer my Catechist? (6) Is Mr. *Hoadly* disturb'd at the manner of my Writing my Defence? (7) So is this Gentleman. (8) In these, and a great many other Things there is such a Correspondance, between Mr. *Hoadly* and this Gentleman, that I think verily I may lay to my nameless Friend, as Mr. *Hoadly* to me in another Case,* that He cannot give a greater Demonstration, that he was a

(1) *Adm.* Pag. 26.

(2) *Let.* Pag. 5.

(3) *Adm.* Pag. 29.

(4) *Let.* Pag. 21.

(5) *Adm.* Pag. 22.

(6) *Let.* Pag. 22.

(7) *Adm.* Pag. 50, and 52.

(8) *Let.* Pag. 39.

* *Admon.* Pag. 46.

a *Congregational Minister*, than such an Agreement is to the contrary. I think I may say (as he) that lesser Arguments than these have passed amongst good *Criticks* for a sufficient Proof, that such a particular Book had never been written by one of such a particular Denomination.

And after all, if he be a *Congregational Minister*, He not only has quite laid aside that Phraseology which is common with all their Writers upon *Church Order*, and the various Questions that fall under it; but he differs from their most celebrated Writers in the most material Points he insists on. He strangely forgat himself most certainly, when he talks *of performing any Office of a Priest*. A sort of Language, which I'm perswaded would not be us'd by any of that way in *England*, with an Eye to a *Gospel Minister*. Again, He calls Mr. *Hoadly* [Philistine] and so applies that to him, which I meant of the Devil, that *Infernal Fiend*. And this is hard to be reconcil'd with that Complaisance towards him, that is us'd upon other Occasions, unless it was put in as a Blind to make some other Things the less taken Notice of. And several Things are dropp'd in the Letter, that look like one that design'd to strike a Heat if he could, between those whose Interest: as well as Duty it is to Act like Brethren: In which I can't allow my self to suppose any *Congregational Brother* that at all understands himself, would have any Hand. But be he who he will, he pretends to be so well acquainted with me, as to be able to tell Stories of me.* Methinks 'tis Pity he did not tell them, because the Stories might by their Cifcumstances have help'd me to trace the Author. But it seems I must wait for them.

Let. Pag. 8.

Let. Pag. 16.

* Pag. 19.

Truly

Truly they'll be worth waiting for; because they are to prove, that my Principles are *so Roman Catholick, as to allow me to believe Contradictions to be true.* That will be a Discovery indeed! But any one that reads this Gentlemans Letter, will find him charging so many things as Contradictions, that are easily reconcil'd by one, that is not determin'd he will not be satisfy'd; and discovering such an Inclination to fasten on any thing, that might but seem to expose me to the Censure of contradicting my self, that I am not afraid of any great Credit his Stories will obtain, unless he lets his Name to them; and then their Credit will depend upon Circumstances. Pag. 20.

But as a Comprehensive Answer to this Gentleman, I must tell him, that as far as this Letter discovers him, he do's not understand his own Principles, and therefore is a very unfit Judge of the Principles of other Men. He calls himself a *Congregational Minister*, and yet contradicts the Body of the Writers of the *Congregational Way*, in the things which he most insists on, and entirely falls in with the *Brownists*.

The main Principle the Letter goes upon is this: That Ministerial Ordination is needless: Which I shall briefly shew is entirely opposite to the Current Notions of those of the *Congregational Way.*

Mr. *John Cotton* will be here allow'd by all a Place in the Fore-front, because none more zealous for that way than he; nor did any take more Pains to settle it. He in a Book of his,* which he Publish'd in 1644, and which is the more remarkable, because it was Prefac'd by Dr. *Goodwin* and Mr. *Nye*, has this Passage. *We are far from allowing that Sacrilegious*

* *Of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Power thereof.* Pag. 6.

ous Usurpation of the Ministers Office, which we hear of to our Grief to be practis'd in some Places, that private Christians ordinarily take upon them to Preach the Gospel publickly, and to administer the Sacraments.

Mr. *Hooker*, who was.one of Mr. *Cotton*'s Seconds, thus.gives his Sense. ⋆ *When the Churches are rightly confirmed and compleated with all the Orders and Offices of Christ, the right of Ordination belongs to the Teaching Elders.* And he calls it a *Frenzy*, to say that an *Unordain'd Person may Baptize.*

⋆ *Survey of Discipline*, Part II. Pag. 76.

The Platform of Discipline drawn up by a Synod' at *Cambridge* in *New-England*, and settled in 1649. in Ch. 9. Declares, *That Church Officers, are not only to be chosen by the Church but also to be Ordain'd by Imposition of Hands and Prayer; with which at the Ordination of Elders, Fasting also is to be join'd.* And they quote in the Margin these Texts, *Acts* 13. 3. and 14. 23. 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. and afterwards they add, *In such Churches, where there are Elders, Imposition of Hands in Ordination is to be perform'd by those Elders.* And they quote, 1 *Tim.* 4. 10. and then add; *In such Churches, where there are no Elders, and the Church so desire, we see not, why Imposition of Hands may not be perform'd by the Elders of other Churches.*†

† *Cotton Mather's History of* New-England, *Book*, 5. Pag 29.

After the Settlement of this Platform, there were Debates on foot upon sundry Heads, and this among the Rest: But in a Meeting of several of the Ministers of those Parts at *Cambridge* for Consultation, they thus deliver'd their Sense. *The Imposition of Hands in the Ordination of a Church Officer is a Rite not only lawful to be retain'd, but it seems by a Divine Institution directed and requir'd: So that altho' the Call of a Person to Church Office, may not become null*

null and Void, where that Rite may have been, omitted; yet we cannot approve the Omission of it. A Ceremonial Defect may be blame worthy. And afterwards [*Most unexceptionable is the, Imposition of Hands by a Presbytery:*] *But more exceptionable by a Fraternity. the Word of God mentions the former expresly; but not the latter in the New Testament. And in as much as in Ordination there is an Acknowledgment of Admission into an Order, it is but reasonable that some, who are in some Order of Church Power should give it.* ⋆ *They were such Hands as* Titus'*s that were left to Ordain Elders. They were such Hands as* Timothy'*s, that were to make over Church, unto faithful Men, able to teach others*, etc.

N. B.

⋆ *Ibid.* Pag. 49.

Dr. *Owen* is herein as express as any Man.† *Unto Officers of the Church* (says he) *are requir'd, Election of the People, submitting themselves unto them in the Lord, and the solemn setting them apart by Imposition of Hands.* And afterwards, *That Church Order is defective, that wants the Symbol of Authoritative Ordination*; viz. *Imposition of Hands.*

† *Enquiry into the true Nature, power, & Communion of Evangelical Churches; with the true Nature of a Gospel-Church*, Pag. 83, 85, 139.⋆ *Chap.* 2.

In the *Heads of Agreement*, Assented to by the *United Ministers*;⋆ the Matter is thus express'd. *After a Person is chosen by the Brotherhood of that particular Church, over which he is to be set, and he accepting, he is to be duly Ordain'd, and set apart to his Office over them; wherein 'tis ordinarily requisite that the Pastors of neighbouring Congregations concur, with the Preaching Elder or Elders, if such there be.* This being so directly contradicted by the Author of this Letter, I think I may safely gather, that if he be a *Congregational Brother*, he never Assented to these *Heads of Agreements.*

Finally

Finally Mr. *Firmin*, who was well known to have been of the *Congregational Way*, says, *That as to the Question about Ordination, it is so clear in several Texts of Scripture, how it should be perform'd, and the Practise of the best, not all the Churches since theApostles Times, hath been accordingly with Impostion of Hands, that* (says he) *I have wondred any Man should scruple it.* ★ And in the Tract that follows, he strenuously Proves from Scripture, that even a Person right-qualify'd for the Work of the Ministry, is not duly separated to the Office, unless there be the Interposition of Teaching Elders (where such can be had) with Fasting and Prayer, and Imposition of Hands.

Preface to his weighty Questions discuss'd, Pag. 2.

So that if this be a *Congregational Brother*, who represents Ministerial Ordination, as so unnecessary, and so unscriptural, in this Letter. He may easily discern, he do's not less differ from those of his own Way, than he do's from me.

And this might I think suffice for an Answer. But being desirous to satisfie any that are willing to be satisfy'd, I shall consider the Difficulties he has propos'd in his Letter, and Shew they are not so unsolvable, as the Author Seems to have imagin'd. Waving his Reflections, (his Aim in which could be better guess'd at, if his true Character, were certainly known) I shall propound the Difficulties he has Started (in which there is a great deal of subtilty discernable) in a way of Query, and give a brief Solution. And I do this the rather, as apprehending it may be of more Use to others, than to the Author of the Letter.

Quest.

Quest. 1. If St. *Paul* was furnish'd with full Apostolical Power without any Humane Ordination, why may it not be the like with others? If he was sufficiently call'd by an outward Voice, why may not an inward Call to the Ministry be now sufficient? And why may not Persons in our Days be as much oblig'd to be obedient to an heavenly Impulse, as he to the Vision? *Let.* Pag. 6,7.

Answ. I refer to the *Provincial Assembly* of *London* for a Reply. ⋆ I say with them. *They that are immediately call'd to the Ministry are endu'd by God, either with the Gift of Miracles, or with some other Testimony of the Spirit, by which they are enabled to give Proof of their immediate Call.* This was St. *Paul*'s Case: And therefore we find, *he calls the Power of working Miracles a Sign of his Apostleship*, 2 Cor. 12. 12. Let those then, that boast of an heavenly Impulse in this Case, *And say they are call'd by God to Preach as the Apostles were, shew the Signs and Tokens of their apostleship, as the Apostles did let them shew the Gift of Miracles, or of Tongues, or of foretelling Things to come, or some supernatural Prediction, that such as they should be sent into the World; or at least some rare and extraordinary Work of God, that so the World may believe that they are in Truth sent by God.* And afterwards, *Tho' the Apostles themselves were call'd immediately by God, yet they did not wait till others that should succeed them in the Work of the Ministry, were chosen also immediately by God; but they themselves ordain'd Ministers, and gave Order to* Timothy *and* Titus *about the Way and Method of electing and ordaining Elders,* ⋆ *Jus Divinum Minist. Evang.* Pag. 116. Pag. 119.

which we are assur'd they would never have done, if the immediate Call had. not ceas'd together with their Persons, &c. But let us suppose Persons to have an *inward Call* to the Ministry as an Evidence that it is real and genuine, and not a Delusion, 'tis requisite they have suitable Abilities. If they have, there is no need to Plead an extraordinary *heavenly Impulse:* And if they have not, the pretending to such an *Impulse* will be no Justification to them. Common Sense, (as well as the sacred Scriptures, and the Universal Practise of the Church) intimates, that those who have been faithful in the Ministerial Office are the fittest to judge of such Abilities: But if Men will judge for themselves, without regarding that Apostolical Maxim, *That the Spirits of the Prophets are Subject to the Prophets*; if they will fancy an *heavenly Impulse*, and under the Influence of it, apply themselves to sacred Work which God hath not qualify'd them for, they must Answer for it another Day: And as far as it is evident, they are really unqualify'd, Ministers and Christians are furnish'd with a Satisfactory Argument that their pretended *Impulse* is but a Delusion.

Let. Pag. 8, 9.

Quest. 2. Why mayn't some Preach all their Days without Ordination, as well as Candidates for some Years? And if such unordain'd Candidates are empower'd to Preach, why not also to administer Sacraments?

Jus Div. Min. Evang. Pag. 113.

Answ. I here also refer to the *Provincial Assembly* of *London* as before. *There is a great Difference* (say they) *between a Private Man's Preaching that never intends the Ministry and a Proba-*

Probationer's Preaching that intends the Ministry and preacheth by way of Trial. In the Old Testament there were Prophets, and Sons of the Prophets, that were train'd up in the Schools of the Prophets. These Sons of the Prophets did Prophesie by Way of Trial and Exercise, 1 Sam. 19. 20. 2 Kings 2. 3. 1 Kings 20. 35, 36. Our Candidates that are like them, *are not allow'd to Preach*, *without Approbation and License*. Herein they are like Volunteers in an Army, who are Candidates for Places of Command as they become capable. And that Probationers for the Ministry should not be allow'd to administer Sacraments or Ordain, is no more strange than that such Volunteers, (tho' often occasionally employ'd, or it may be sometimes in daily Service) should not be allow'd the entire Management of distinct Regiments, or the creating Inferior Officers, till they have a Commission for that Purpose. I suppose my *Congregational Brother* had not read Mr. *Hooker*'s Survey; where an Unordain'd Persons Baptizing is represented as a *Frenzy*. I may also add, that the Sacraments are Matters of meer positive Institution, not to be us'd, but only because they are divinely Appointed, and therefore to be administred only by an Authorized Officer.

Quest. 3. If those who are *not sent of God, will not profit the People at all*, according to *Jer*. 23. 32. Then have not those that do considerably *profit the People*, a good Argument, that they are *sent of God*, tho' they have only a Call from the People to the Office of the Ministry? *Let*. Pag. 9, 10.

Answ. They may have been Call'd by God to the Ministry, and yet may have been guilty of a great Irregularity in not submitting their Abilities to Trial; and in not being solemnly invested in the Ministerial Office in the Gospel way.

Let. Pag. 11, 12, 16, 17.

Quest. 4. Are not the People as good judges who shall be Ministers, as who shall be their Ministers?

Answ. No, by no Means. The Body of the People (ordinarily speaking) are no fitter Judges who shall be Ministers in the Church of Christ, than who shall be Physicians or Counsellours at Law. As it is highly reasonable, the one should be judg'd off by the College of Physicians, and the other by the Benchers of the several Inns of Court, so is it to the full as reasonable that they who themselves are Ministers, should be allow'd to be the properest Judges, who are duly qualify'd for the Ministry. And yet it is as hard to tell People, you shall have this Minister to take Care of your Souls or none, as to say you shall have this Physician to take Care of your Bodies, or this Lawyer to take Care of your Estates, or none at all.

Let. Pag. 13.

Quest. 5. Must there not be an express Command in Scripture, for what is necessary in Ordination? Now where is there any such Command for the Imposition of *Presbyters* Hands in Ordination?

Answ.

Answ. An *express Command* is not necessary. That Word *Express* is foisted in by this Author, and not to be found in that Page of mine that is referr'd to.* Nay, I in so many Words distinguish there, between an *Express* and a *Virtual* Command. A *clear Command* I do indeed say is necessary, as to any thing that should be represented as Essential to Ordination: But not an *Express* one. For Proof, that there is such a clear Command in the Case, I might refer to the *Provincial Assembly* of *London.*† But being a *Congregational Brother*, that makes the Demand, I shall rather refer him to *Mr.* Firmin's *Weighty Questions Discuss'd*; mention'd before. However, tho' I am of this Mind, that the Scripture is sufficiently plain as to Ministerial Ordination, yet without *being much vers'd in the art of Complementing*, I can allow some such unordain'd Persons to have had Gifts, and to have been own'd by God in the Use of them, tho' they had not taken up their Commission. And I can venture to mention my late honest Neighbour Mr. *Beerman* for one; whom I must confess I particularly had in my tho'ts in that Case.

* *See Def. of Mod. Non-Conformity.* Part I. Pag. 133.

† *Jus Div. Min. Evang.* Cap. 10 Pag 156. *&c.*

Pag. 14.

Quest. 6. How can you in lift upon Ordination by Imposition of Hands, when you so frankly declare, that nothing is to be requir'd as a Term of Church Communion, which is not necessary to an Acceptance with God now, or an entrance into Heaven hereafter?

Let. Pag. 14.

Answ. I know of none, that make the owning a Necessity of the Imposition of Hands by *Presbyters* in Ordination, a Term of Communi-

on. We are ready to admit any soberly professing Christians to Communion, without enquiring their Sense in this Matter. We'll allow them to continue in Communion with us, tho' they differ from us in their Sentiments, in many such things as these. It can never therefore be pretended, it is made a Term of Communion. Such as are perswaded, God has requir'd Ordination by Imposition of Hands, may well insist upon it for themselves, or for their Ministers; without holding, that such as see not a Divine Appointment of it, however otherwise Qualify'd and Call'd, must be no better than Intruders.

Let. Pag. 15, 16, 17.

Quest. 7. Have not you your self intimated, that Christ approves of such as he has furnish'd with Ministerial Abilities? That none that are desirous to contribute their Help to throw down the Kingdom of Satan, should be discourag'd for want of a Formality? And dropp'd divers other Hints of the like Nature, which will as well justifie those who are only for the Call of the People without any Ordination; as those who are for Ordination by *Presbyters*, against those who are for being Ordain'd by *Bishops?*

Answ. My *Charity* and *Catholick Spirit* (to which about these Matters an Appeal is so often made) will not, I confess allow me to pour Contempt on such as are duly qualify'd for the Ministry and yet it will not induce me knowingly to Justifie or Countenance a Method, that would leave a Gap open to the Intrusion of Persons grosly insufficient, I must confess, I'm of that Temper, that let but the Uncircumcis'd

cumcis'd *Philistine* (the Enemy of all good) be vanquish'd; let Souls be rescu'd from him by any Man whatsoever, I shall heartily rejoice. And yet still can't help being of Opinion, that he who pretends to Lift himself in a particular *Order* of Militants against him and his Interest, would do well to follow the Authentick Rules of that Order. When I find 'tis one of them, that Diocesan Bishops give the Investiture, I shall look upon that as necessary. But as long as I can find no Confinement in Scripture to any Rank of Ministers, and yet no Instance of any set apart to the Office of the Ministry, without the Agency of Ministers; I shall conclude, tho' Eminence of Rank be not requisite, yet the Ministerial Agency is; and I cannot approve of the Neglect of it. I can rejoice in the Success of *Learned* and *Judicious* Persons, whom God hath furnish'd for and call'd to that Office, tho' there may have been a neglect in the Method of their taking it upon them, which I can by no Means approve of. Neither am I asham'd to own, that I look upon the want of solemn Ordination to the Office, (where there are the Qualifications, that are really necessary in order to fitness;) to be a less dangerous Irregularity to the Souls of Men, than gross Ignorance or Prophaneness, in those who are most formally Ordain'd: And that I apprehend it safer to attend ordinarily on the Preaching of such a one as Mr. *Beermany* (tho' he continu'd Unordain'd to the Last) than of several, who may be gotten into Parish Cures, whose Sermons have but little tendency to Good, and their Lives yet less. These things I reckon very Consistent. Nei- Pag. 16.

Pag. 18.

ther am I asham'd to stand to it. *That the Generality of Mankind have always tho't that Truth has a sufficient Autority to oblige Men both to Receive and Publish it how doubtful soever the Mission of him that brings it be.* And did it appear likely to contribute to the Conviction of a *Congregational Brother*, I could quote one that Mr. *Hoadly* would own to be one of the most Eminent of the Present Bishops of the Church in proof of if, and that in so many Words. Upon these Grounds I must declare, that whatever Liberty others may take, I think *Gamaliel*'s Counsel Good, and am for following it. Where I find God owning Persons in their endeavours to promote serious Religion, tho' there may be some Irregularities among them which I cannot approve of, I yet dare not slight them, and represent them as altogether unsent of God: I am clearly for letting them *alone, least haply I might be found fighting against God.*

Pag. 20.

Quest. 8. If the Ejected Ministers could not be *Re-ordain'd*, therefore because it would have invalidated their past Ministrations and if their Baptisms were not Valid, supposing that their Ministry was not Valid (as you have Asserted;) then do not you with Mr. *Dodwell* leave all those to Gods uncovenanted Mercies, that had not Ministerial Ordination?

Answ. Tho' the Ejected Ministers us'd that Plea with those who Silenc'd them, that the being Re-ordain'd tended to invalidate their past Ministrations, yet their meaning was not, that it would make them a whit the less Valid in the sight of God than they were before, but that

that it would tend to create endless Scruples among those that had been under their Ministrations, as to the Validity of them. And when I tell Mr. *Hoadly*,* that if it be own'd in the Case of those who were Ejected, that *their Ministry was not Valid, then their Baptisms mere not Valid*, I particularly mention my regard to the Apprehensions of those whom they had Baptiz'd; and bring it in with these Words in the Front: *The Re-ordination of our Ministers, would create universal Scruples as to their foregoing Ministations.* And presently after I add these Words: *A Man that observes him that Baptized him, owning that he was no Minister, naturally concludes that then he was not rightly Baptiz'd, and therefore must be Baptized anew; and this Way a Gap is open'd for incredible Disturbance.* So that it plainly appears, I herein express not my own Sense of the Matter, so much as intimate the Difficulties and Scruples, which would be this way occasion'd. But as for those who were Baptiz'd by such as had not Ministerial Ordination, for my Part I determine nothing concerning them. If their Parents really bound them to be the Lords, by a Cordial Dedication of them to his Service, I am sure I am not he that would leave them to the Uncovenanted Mercies of God: And if they did not, I don't see how the Character of the Person that Baptiz'd them, could secure them of Divine Acceptance.

* *Def. of Moderate Non-Conformity*, Part I. Pag. 225.

Quest. 9. Did your Preaching do any Good while you Preach'd as a Probationer? If it did, it was Valid for the Ends for which it was appointed: And why then might not your Baptism have been Valid too? Pag. 22.

Answ.

Answ. Tho' I don't use to boast about the Good I do, yet being urg'd shan't stick to own, that I am not without Hope my endeavours might be of use to some, before I was Ordain'd: And my Hopes of this, after I had spent several Years in the necessary Preparatory Studies, gave me the more Encouragement to offer my self to Ordination. I did not pretend while I was a *Probationer* to Act with the attested Autority of an Ordain'd Minister; and yet took the Success afforded as a confirming Evidence, (in my Case, who had been all along design'd for the Ministry, and educated in Order to it) that' God was sending me into his Vineyard, and had design'd me to be of Use in his Church in the Ministerial Office. In this I was Confirm'd, by finding the Method the same among the Prophets of Old; as has been hinted before. I did not, however in this Time Baptize, because I knew I had not a Commission; and to do it without, had been what I could not have justify'd: Tho' I don't suppose, that the blessed God laies any such stress on Matters of exterior Order, as that my Irregularity in this Respect (had I been guilty of any) would have had any influence to Cause others to be rejected of God, whom if I had been Regular, he had accepted.

Pag. 23, 24.

Quest. 10. Is it not a pleasant Circle, sometimes to make the Validity of Orders prove Ministrations Valid; and at other Times the Validity of Ministrations to prove, the Validity of Orders? And yet is not this your Course?

Answ.

Answ. A different Turn given to a Man's Expressions, often produces a different Sense from what was intended. That except Persons are design'd by God for the Office of the Ministry, it is not to be expected their Ministrations should ordinarily be successful, I do indeed affirm: And yet that God may make it the Duty of Persons to fix on the Ministry for the Employment of their Lives, and they in the mean Time not be invested in the Office God has design'd them for in a Scriptural Manner, or so as duly to Evidence their Mission to others, is with me past Question. If then I find God remarkably owning any Persons in their Endeavours in a Ministerial Way to promote the good of Souls, I cannot forbear apprehending he designs them for the Ministry: And yet tho' he do's so, it do's not therefore follow, that they are to be approv'd or justify'd in the Omission of what may be necessary to prevent Irregular Intrusions. That Valid Orders, do prove the Validity of Ministrations, no Man can deny. That Valid Ministrations do prove Orders Valid, I no where (as I can remember) Assert, and yet think it not so easie to disprove it, as some may imagine, in the Case of those, who take that sacred Office upon them, and deliberately fix on it, as the Employment of their Lives. If this be a Circle, 'tis not therefore presently to be rejected. A new Doctrine is to be Confirm'd by Miracles: And yet in Judging of Miracles, we must have an Eye to the Doctrine that is to be thereby Confirm'd. This also is a Circle, and yet not I suppose to be derided.

That

Pag. 24. That Persons should be satisfy'd of the Lawfulness of their Call to the Ministry, if they pretend to make it the Employment of their Lives, I think I had good Reason to Assert: And yet to say, that Success while Persons are but Probationers, if they are duly qualify'd, may be a Confirming Evidence of the Reality of a Call to the Ministry, is not as far as I can judge at all inconsistent.

Pag. 25, 26. *Quest.* 11. If (as you represent) the Agescy of *Presbyters* who are Scripture Bishops, is necessary to Ordination; then are not all that come into the Ministry without such an Ordination Intruders?

Answ. It was the *Validity* of Ordination by *Presbyters*, which I was Asserting in the Place referr'd to, against those who represented it as *invalid*, for want of the Concurrence of an Ecclesiastical Bishop: And not the absolute *Necessity* of such an Ordination. However, if my *Congregational Brother* will be at the Pains to read the Tract of Mr. *Giles Firmin* before referr'd to, (which he may perhaps do with the more Satisfaction, because that worthy Person was well known to have been of the *Congregational Perswasion*) He will meet with what may perhaps convince him, that those who come into the Ministry without such an Ordination, are guilty of an Irregularity, that is not by any Means to be approv'd off.

Pag. 28. *Quest.* 12. How can our Call, (who had no such Ordination by *Presbyters*) be unlawful as not being duly signify'd; and yet lawful as having

having God's Seal to it? How can the People Profit under us, and yet not Profit at all? How can God prosper and frustrate our Labours at once? Is this the force of Catholick Principles?

Answ. A Person that is qualify'd and inclin'd for the Ministry, by being so, may be call'd to it of God, and yet his Call may not be duly signify'd to others, nor sufficienty evidenc'd according to the Rule of Scriptures, for want of Ministerial Investitute. God may attest that he has call'd him to the Ministry, and yet he be blame-worthy, that he has not taken that Course which is requisite to prevent a general Disorder and Confusion. The Peoples profiting under such a Man may be an Evidence that God has call'd him; and yet no Evidence that he did his Duty, as to the Manner of his Entrance upon that Work which God had call'd him to. And tho' it is not possible for God to prosper and frustrate his Labours at once, yet his prospering the Labours of a well qualify'd Person, which may really be design'd for his Glory, is an Evidence that he design'd him for them, or otherwise the frustrating them might rather be expedited: But it is no Evidence, that he did his Duty in his Entrance upon those Labours. So that my *Catholick Principles* are not in this Case much put to it.

Quest. 13. If our Ordinations (without any help of Ministers) disagree with the Rule of the Scriptures, how can you own them? And if you disown our Ordinations, must you not invalidate our Ministrations? Pag. 29.

Answ.

Answ. I refer my *Congregational Brother* to Mr. *Firmin* as before, for a distinct Answer. For my own Part, if they are duly qualify'd as well as inclin'd, I am ready to own them call'd to the Ministry by God. And if he succeeds their Ministrations, I dare not pour contempt upon them; tho' for my own Part I could not be satisfy'd with their Method. And yet tho' they do go against a Rule of Scripture (which to me is plain, tho' not to them) I am afraid to condemn them as unaccepted of God, because his giving them Success, after he has qualify'd and inclin'd them, may be an Evidence of the contrary: It seems an Intimation, that He is ready to make them an Allowance for their not seeing that Rule in Scripture, which yet is plain to others. And if God makes Allowance in the Case, I think I ought to do so too; so far as not to contemn their Labours tho' it do's not therefore follow I must approve their Irregularity.

Pag. 35, 37.

Quest. 14. What are you? A rigid *Presbyterian*, or a *Latimdinarian?* How can your stiffness and your Freedom be reconcil'd? It were not to be wondred to hear Concessions from one who made somewhat of a broader Foundation: But for you who have settled upon Scripture, plain positive Scripture, How can you have room for granting any thing?

Answ. You may give me what. Name you please, provided you'll give me but leave jointly to pursue the Interests of Truth and Charity. My chief *Stiffness* is against *unscriptural*

rural:Impositions; in which I should think I might depend upon my *Congregational Brothers* hearty Concurrence. My *Freedom* is no other than what as far as I can judge the Word of God will warrant, and therefore not justly liable to blame. All that I aim at upon this Head, is that a true Scriptural Ordination may not be run down for want of an Ecclesiastical Nicety; nor an irregular Intrusion into the Ministry encourag'd, for want of a solemn Investiture into that sacred Office. I'm stiff for the Rule of Scripture, both against those who represent an Ecclesiastical Bishop as absolutely necessary; and those who look upon the Agency of any Ministers at all in Ordination to be unrequir'd and insignificant. And yet at the same Time I'm free from the Heat of those on one Hand, who represent Episcopal Ordination as utterly unwarrantable; and those also on the other Hand who contemn the Ministrations of such as are not of their own way, tho' ever so much own'd of God; or leave such as unwarily have run into an Irregularity, to the Uncovenanted Mercies of God. Tho' I have settled upon Scripture, and am willing to keep to it in all Particulars, as far as I can find God hath given it me for a Rule, yet I can still grant, that those who are unhappily and not wilfully lead into a Misunderstanding of Part of that Rule, may be entitled to a favourable Allowance: And I am the more willing to give it my Brethren in some Things, as not knowing but I my self may need it in other Things. And this sort of Allowance to each other, is what I apprehend to be much more for the Credit of Christianity, than to be rigorous in Censuring,

where

where there may be only want of Light, without any Malignity, or Obstinacy of Will.

If thus much will help to set this Gentleman Right, (who pretends at least to be much disturb'd) be he who he will, I shall not repent my Pains: But if his Disturbance still continues, and he is ambitious to propagate it, and that under a Disguise too. He may depend upon my Pity; but upon no farther Publick Notice to be taken of him by me, unless there should be more weighty Reasons for it, than I can as yet discover.

FINIS