



SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS



DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA



ANSWER

TO

Dr. Edmund Calamy's LETTER

TO

Mr. Archdeacon ECHARD,

Upon Occasion of his

History of *ENGLAND*.

WHEREIN

The Truths deliver'd by that Author
are defended, LOYALTY and the
CHURCH of *ENGLAND* vindicated,
several Persons fairly represented,

AND

A Number of wilful Mistakes rectified.

*By a Lover of TRUTH, and no Doctor
of DIVINITY.*

*Deliver my Soul, O Lord, from lying Lips, and
from a deceitful Tongue, Psal. 120. 2.*

*But if ye have bitter Envying and Strife in your
Hearts, glory not, and lie not against the Truth,
St. James 3. 14.*

L O N D O N :

Printed for JAMES BETTENHAM, at the Crown in
Pater-Noster-Row. 1718.

AC911.1718.S52

special
collections



DOUGLAS
Library

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA



A N

ANSWER

T O

Dr. *Calamy's* Letter

T O

Mr. Archdeacon ECHARD, &c.

I Have read over your Pamphlet, called, *A p. 5. Letter to Mr. Archdeacon Echard, upon Occasion of his History of England*, which I also believe cost you some Pains, and have made some Observations upon it, which I address to your self, to make what Use of them you please, except it be that of representing me as a *Discourager of useless and malicious Cavils*, which is a Character I shall be glad to deserve, and shall be fond of bearing it to Posterity.

I am naturally a great Lover of Truth, particularly in History, and I take Truth to be its best Qualification; 'tis therefore no small Pleasure to me to observe how Divine Providence, notwithstanding the wicked Endeavours of the

p. 6.

most inveterate Forgers of Falshoods, has interposed from one Period to another to keep it upon its proper Basis, when there have been so many Attempts to conceal it, and so many Designs to run down and overthrow it.

It has always been our Misfortune that we have wanted an impartial Censor of History, that should with an even Hand correct the real Blemishes in all Ages, as well as our own Times.

I can safely say, that when I took your Pamphlet into my Hands, I was rather prejudic'd for than against you; I was as sensible of the great Benefit and general Usefulness of having an History well revised and thoroughly examined as most Men; I look'd upon you as well qualified to perform such a Task, and apprehended Labour and Acrimony would not be wanting on your Part; I did not indeed expect an unbiass'd Examiner, according to the strict Rules of Impartiality; I am one that take perfect Impartiality either in a Preacher without Ordination, or in any other, to be a mere Chimæra. A Pamphlet *free from Spleen* was what I was not so weak as to look for; I reckon that the best Pamphlet, which the fewest can find fault with. Now I have gone thro' the whole, I am not at all inclin'd to detract from you, yet I can say little or nothing in your Commendation; the Clearness of your Prejudice on the one hand, and the Perspicuity of your Flattery on the other, are things you may think Excellencies, but which no other will admire. I make no Objection against your Form, Method, Colouring, or Style, &c. and yet I thought a *publick Anadversion* both proper and necessary; and as I suppose you consulted none but those you knew before would agree with you; so I having advis'd with none, have met with none that disagree with me.

I readily

I readily grant 'twould be unjust to charge you with Brevity, because nothing could have made your Letter more acceptable to the greatest Part of the Nation, than the cutting off nine Parts in ten of it. I own your Pamphlet to have many Conceits borrow'd from others of the Brethren who have gone before you: But this Consideration, instead of discouraging the making Remarks, rather renders it the more needful. The Reputation you have gotten among the Friends of the *Good Old Cause*, by holding forth, and other Performances, the great Name of your Grandfather, which you make use of, and the great Encouragements you daily receive from the *Godly Party*, tho' not notify'd in the Publick News Papers, are such Advantages in order to a general Reception among such Sort of People, that apprehending ill Impressions might be made by your Misrepresentations, I thought there was Reason to fear, that if no Notice was taken of them, they would seem to have a Publick Sanction, and be propagated to Posterity with a Shew of Authority.

You know very well, *Sir*, that Animadversions upon Animadversions, as well as other Works, have not been uncommon among us. They are so numerous, that it is needless to mention any of them; but there is such an Acrimony in many of them, and such a Contempt of the Author they were dealing with, as you would have us to believe you are altogether exempt from, but how truly, you soon convince us; and therefore I shall make my Remarks with the like Frankness of a Friend, as you use towards Mr. Arch-Deacon, and with no other Tartness of an Adversary.

And I am the more encourag'd to hope you'll herein bear with me, because you have made so bold with Mr. *Echard's* Name and his Reputation,

on, who, I believe, will scarce think it worth his while, on this Account, to give you any Trouble; nor should I have done it, but that I met with such Stuff in the Course of your Pamphlet, as I thought ought not to remain unadverted on, for the Sake of the malicious and ignorant that are to come after us. And therefore I shall not overlook what seems particularly pointed at Mr. Archdeacon, but shall take notice of it wheresoever there is Occasion, whether it takes up more or less Room.

p. 10

I cannot say with you, “ That it was with the Advice, and at the instance of several considerable Friends and others, that I set myself to make these Remarks: And I never was advised or urg’d to communicate my Observations, on a Pamphlet that does not seem barely designed to amuse, or turn the Penny, but is a discrediting of Truths, drawn up by an undignified imaginary Clergyman, to impose upon the present and future Ages, as to the most considerable Facts and their Consequences, as far as they are yet discover’d. And I must own, I will not pretend to those mighty Advantages you boast of, tho’ I have seen much in these latter Times, and read more of the past.

Had Bishop *Burnet*’s History, that is yet kept secret, been published to the World, I believe many would have been more in the Dark than ever they were, if it be like his other Works, or such as the Specimen of it, which has some Time since appeared in Print; for, like your self, he delivers what he pleases, with little Authority but his own, as standing Truth, takes great Liberty with the Church of *England* Clergy, spares none that are not of his own Stamp, and makes no scruple to cry down and damn the same Doctrine he had before asserted and preached up.

I have

I have very much to say, if Time would permit, to every Part of your Pamphlet, for I confess, it is hard to determine which Part is best; and if there were any Hopes of your Conversion, I think every Thing you have said deserves your second Thoughts. In your Vindication of that most audacious Man Mr. *Cartwright*, you most certainly are too fond of him, and I am inclined to believe any one besides your self might be convinc'd of it, that would take the Pains to consult Bishop *Rancroft's* dangerous Positions and Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline; or Dr. *Heylin*, p. 287. who tells us, that *Cartwright* *prov'd an unextinguish'd Firebrand to the Church of England*: But you would have one Phanatick try'd by another, and therefore none but Mr. *Pierce* must be consulted for his Character. We will do him the utmost Justice, out of his own Mouth let his Judgment come: This learned Mr. *Cartwright*, one of your *best Puritans*, those Men of great Piety, and true to the Interest of their Country, in the second Part of his Reply has the following Words. " Her Majesty
 " and State do maim and deform the Body of
 " CHRIST, and so bid God to Battle against them,
 " &c. By the same Authority that the Queen
 " appoints the Apparel now to the Ministers, she
 " may command any Piece of Popery, so she
 " name it Policy, &c. The Servants of God are
 " persecuted under her——That Excommunication
 " shall not be exercised against Princes, I
 " utterly dislike. It is but a meer Mockery of
 " the Lord, and to offer himser (meaning the
 " Archbishop of Canterbury) as a Bawd to all
 " manner of Sins in Princes. Thus the pious,
 learned, and innocent *Cartwright* You are too
 favourable to the *Puritans*, who, when you have
 said the best you can of them, were generally
 great

great Enthusiasts, and true only to their own Interests, tho' to the Ruin of their Country, as Time has shown; and tho' favour'd by such as thought to rise on their Shoulders, were always endeavour'd to be kept down by such as were zealous for their Sovereign, whose Authority they knew would not only suffer Diminution, but be entirely subverted by those Sectaries; wherein Experience afterwards shew'd them to be true Prophets.

In your Exception against the Representation of the Conference at *Hampton Court*, under King *James* the First, we have only your *ipse dixit* to prove that *Calderwood's* Account of it is more faithful than Bishop *Barlow's*; and perhaps your only Reason for that Assertion, is because it is more Puritanical, which could be no Motive of Credibility to Mr. *Echard*.

When you come to the Proclamation which that King publish'd for Uniformity, after that Conference, you question whether many doubted the Nonconformists being as great Enemies to the Church of *England* as the *Jesuits*, because you cannot reconcile it with the Temper and Proceedings of the Parliaments in that Reign; p. 12. it in the next Reign you grant it was so among many, and lament the Consequences. Now if you would have taken things right, you should have lamented that King *James's* Parliaments were so remiss in that Point, as encourag'd the Sectaries to ravage the Nation, and shed an Ocean of Blood in the next Reign, without any Remorse, till they murder'd King *James's* Son. Your Passage concerning your Reverend aged Clergyman, is as little to the Purpose as the rest; therefore give me leave to tell you, that I have heard not only one, but several serious *Presbyterians* solemnly affirm, that if they were to change, they would rather

rather be *Papists* than *Church of England Men*; and I believe, if it were your own Case, you would rather be an *Atheist* than either of them.

And when you add, that *Calderwood* says there were 300 Ministers either silenc'd or depriv'd, &c. in the Second Year of King *James's* Reign, p. 12. whereas Mr. *Echard* says, there were not above 49 that stood out and were depriv'd; you should show us, that Mr. *Echard's* Authority in this Point is not so good as *Calderwood's*; since your doubting, or not doubting of the Authority of either of them, is no Authority to the rest of the World.

I'll dismiss your *History of Nonconformity*, the Original whereof is sufficiently known; but it may perhaps come out embellish'd with some curious Pieces of Romance to gull the Ignorant; for the undeceiving of whom it is most likely the same may stand in need of revising, whatsoever Reign it happens to come from the Press in, either with or without a King's Name.

And now I have mentioned great Names, I can't forbear taking notice how impertinent to the Matter in hand, and how malicious it is for you to concern your self with Mr. Archdeacon's Dedications. I am sensible it must startle not a few of your Readers to see you, who pretend to examine the Truth of an History, busy your self about the Author's Patrons. All that I gather from thence is, that you would bring an Odium upon the Author for the Sake of his first Patron, whose Character you tell us is alter'd since that Time; as if Mr. *Echard* were oblig'd to be a Prophet, or to advise with you to whom he must dedicate his Works. But many will have it, that p. 14. it is to your Spleen and Envy, that the malicious Reflections you make on that Gentleman concerning the *Revolution*, are entirely owing, since

he can no way please you, either speaking well or ill of it, and you are for blasting of him with a mean Insinuation, that some that pretend to know him are of Opinion that he has *Views* and *Expectations*: a wretched way of slandering, upon a bare Opinion, and that of such only as pretend to know him. For Shame Doctor, an old Oyster Woman could not have utter'd any thing more absurd.

p. 15. However, since the second Dedication was allow'd, you vouchsafe not to enquire upon whose Motion it was done! A singular Grace! lest you should be oblig'd to defame the Promoter as much as you do the Author. And for you, who profess so much Zeal for the second Patron, as to reprove the Archdeacon for reflecting on any for their warm Affection to the Family of his Royal Grandmother the Queen of *Bohemia*, to revile and insult King *Charles* and King *James II.* who were so near related to that Queen of *Bohemia*, carries in it so manifest an Indecency, that I could easily believe, knowing the good Will of all his Party to Crowned Heads, that Dr. *Calamy* would be guilty of it.

p. 16. We the Posterity of the honest *Puritans*, is such a Jest, and their Affection to any Royal Family such an Irony, as cannot but provoke those who have ever read any thing of the *English* and *Scottish* History, from the Days that *Calvin's* Disciples first came over from *Geneva*, to a scornful Laughter. But you will allow of some Mixtures of Imprudence, which you are unwilling should be discover'd. It was with you a slight Matter, an Imprudence, to grieve at a Queen's being with Child, that is, in plainer *English*, to wish the reigning Family extinct; for you admire the Wisdom and the Justness of the Remark, and you only think the Expression of Zeal a little

little ill tim'd; and you make no scruple to blast that King's Sons, urging that the Nation has suffer'd so much from that King's Sons, and our Honour has been so much expos'd by their Management, as is scarce to be retriev'd. Thus you rail at our Kings, and yet run down Mr. *Echard* for not being so zealous as you would have him for a Princess he ow'd no Allegiance to. But here is nothing strange; you are the Posterity of those honest *Puritans*, who wish'd the Male Branch of the Royal Family extinct, who, in order to make it so, brought King *Charles I.* to the Block, delivering him up to the *Independents* to strike the Stroke, as the Sheriff carries a Criminal to the Scaffold, and there puts him into the Hands of the Executioner; those honest *Puritans*, who hunted after the Blood of his Son King *Charles II.* and who have committed so many Outrages scarce to be parallell'd, that none but their Posterity can have p. 17. the Face to justify. I move therefore, hardened Sir, for your own Sake, that your Vindications here may for the future be forborn.

It must be own'd you now and then give Mr. Archdeacon some fawning Words; but I can't think you pick Holes in his History for the Love of Truth, but rather that you are angry that he has not made it a Romance; you upbraid him with saying that the Prince *Palatine* had nothing great in his Character; you do not inform us that he had, but only whose Grandfather he was. Whom then must we blame, the Historian, for telling us that which you do not deny, or you, for requiring of him to write that which you will not your self affirm, and that only for the sake of his Grandson? Do you think your self the less valuable because it is known that your Grandfather first pretended to com-

ply with the Church of *England*, wore a Surplice, and bow'd to the Altar, and at the Name of *JESUS*, and afterwards when *Presbytery* prevail'd, put on the Cloak instead of the Cassock, preach'd up Rebellion instead of Loyalty, and had a Hand in the writing of *Sme'tymnus*, a most virulent Piece against the Bishops?

Nor is that in my Apprehension to the Purpose which you alledge of his speaking with Contempt of the young *Pr. Palatine*; you say your self he did indeed *join with the Parliament*, you might as well have said with the Rebels. But how does *Mr. E. hard* know, say you, what Reasons he had for so doing? And then you justify him with a *perhaps* he had more reason to expect Assistance from them, than from his Uncle *Charles*. But Prince *Rupert* and Prince *Maurice* you blame, and would have them pay him Respect, whereas they receiv'd him with Scorn. Thus you approve of the Nephew's joining with Rebels to destroy an Uncle, and yet you are very censorious upon younger Brothers for only refusing to be ceremonious to such an elder Brother. You cannot forbear discovering the old Leaven against that unfortunate Monarch, made such by the *honest Puritans*; therefore you vindicate whatsoever is done against him, and damn the least Disregard shewn to his Enemies. I will not pretend to advise you, I am satisfy'd you are incorrigible; but let all the World judge whether the Relation was not as much to be regarded by you as by the Author of the History, and whether you ought not to pay some Respect to your natural Sovereigns tho' dead, as to claim all for their Relations. But to inculcate these Things to those who boast of being of that honest Race of *Puritans*, who hunted their King down, is Labour lost. I must take the Liberty to tell you that
you

you are no fair Adversary, you pick a Quarrel with the Archdeacon unprovok'd, you challenge him, you let fly your poison'd Arrows at him, and then you skulk behind King *GEORGE*. This is like cutting a Man's Throat when he is at Prayers, and then taking Sanctuary in the Church. Mr. *Echard* dedicates his History to King *GEORGE*, and you take this as an Occasion to misrepresent him; and why? but because he does not flatter and extol all his Kindred, when you at the same time make as bold with his Relations as you please, abusing King *Charles I.* who was no remoter from him than an Uncle, King *Charles II.* and King *James II.* Prince *Rupert*, and Prince *Maurice*, as if they were not of the Royal Family. Do you imagine that King *GEORGE*, under whom you take Shelter, cannot see thro' your Artifice? Do you think he would be pleas'd, that under the Name of an History, a meer fawning Fable should be dedicated to him? You have expos'd your Malice to the Archdeacon barefac'd; and I must tell you, your Zeal for King *GEORGE* does not appear to be such as you pretend. Be more modest in your expressing your open Hatred, and more discreet in your seeming Affections. Do not fawn upon your Adversary when you are stabbing him to the Heart; and above all, do not conceit that you can persuade the World that you have not your *Views* and *Expectations* as well as any other, when you lay hold of such Opportunities to rail and flatter.

Another Observation I make on your Performance is, that you have nothing new or entertaining, for which Nobody thanks you, and yet you have omitted nothing that you could find to carp at, especially in Defence of your *honest Puritans*, which is not to be excus'd. When Mr.

Echard

Echard takes the Liberty to charge the Lord *Clarendon* with *unaccountable Omissions*, it is upon very good Grounds, as is very visible to every Man who has read that Author, and is acquainted with the History of those Times. The Stile of that Earl has a Publick Sanction, and to imitate it can be no Offence, any more than to make use of his Matter, for the same Facts related again must of Necessity come from those who went before.

- You are much too large in your following Charge of an Omission, of the Meeting in the
- p. 19. *Jerusalem* Chamber, to draw up Proposals in order to a peaceable Settlement of Ecclesiastical Affairs, and quote *Fuller* for his Opinion, that it might have choak'd the Civil War in its Infancy. That Author's Authority, you know, was never very great, and if it had been, his Opinion were little to the Purpose, tho' you tell us he is not singular in that Sentiment, but your worthy Grandfather Mr. *Edmund Calamy*, was of the same Opinion; that indeed ought to weigh very much with all *honest Puritans*, but I know not whether it will convince any other honest Man. It is true, you count it an Honour to be descended from him, tho' he is stil'd in the History an *Incendiary*. The Honour you claim, I believe very few will envy you; it were happy that none but you were descended from such honourable Ancestors, none but *honest Puritans*, and such like are proud of it. Whether he were an *Incendiary* or no, I will leave the World to judge from his own Words, deliver'd at *Guild-Hall*, where he made a Speech to excite the Faction to give their Money to carry on the Rebellion against his and their lawful Sovereign, on the 6th of *October*, 1643. The Words were as follows. "If you would have a Peace with Po-

" pery,

" pery, a Peace with Slavery; if you would
 " have a *Judas* Peace, or a *Joab's* Peace; (you
 " know the Story, he kiss'd *Amasa*, and then
 " kill'd him) if you would have a Peace that
 " will bring a Massacre with it; a *French* Peace,
 " it may be had easily. But if you would have
 " a Peace that may continue the Gospel among
 " you, and bring in a Reformation, &c. Such a
 " Peace cannot be had without Contribution
 " toward the bringing in of the *Scots*.—Let me
 " tell ye, if ever (Gentlemen) you might use
 " this Speech, *O happy Penny*, you may use it
 " now, happy Money that will purchase my
 " Gospel, happy Money that will purchase Reli-
 " gion, and purchase a Reformation to my Po-
 " sterity; *O happy Money*, and blessed be God
 " that I have it to lend. This is not all; in his
 Apology against *Burton*, the same worthy Mr.
Calamy gives us an Account of himself thus, " My
 " House was a Receptacle for godly Ministers
 " in the worst of Times. Here was the Remon-
 " strance fram'd against the Prelates. Here were
 " all Meetings, &c. That it may not be thought
 he only spoke such Language at *Guild-Hall*, or
 in his Apology against *Burton*, his Sermons were
 to the same Tune, whereof many Instances might
 be brought, if the Place would permit; take this
 one for all, in his Sermon, *December 25. 1644.*
p. 29, he says, " It is commendable to fight for
 " Peace and Reformation, against the King's
 " Commands. This is your worthy Grandfa-
 ther. Did not the same Spirit of Rebellion actu-
 ate the Grandson, he would have wish'd to have
 the Memory of such a Grandfather for ever bu-
 ry'd in Oblivion. Pardon me Doctor this Di-
 gression, in Honour of your worthy Grandfather.
 To return therefore; your Quotation from *Collier*
 is against your self, and his Reputation much
 better

better than *Fuller's*, besides that Experience has taught us, that all those Conferences were only Puritanical Amusements, as having no other View than that the Church of *England* should give into, and conform to *Presbytery*, and if that were refus'd, so to misrepresent Matters among the Party, as if all the Blame were on the Side of the Church, and themselves Promoters of that Peace which had been rejected. I shall say no more of *Dr. Fuller* and his Account, and as for *Mr. Baxter* we shall have Occasion hereafter to show what Credit ought to be given to him. In the mean time it is easy enough to account for *Mr. Echard's* passing by a Meeting, which was to no manner of Effect, and in all Probability rather intended to increase Divisions, than to procure an Union.

- p. 20. After the Restoration, *Mr. Echard*, you say, very calmly and as unconcern'd, will not determine whether there were such Plots or no, as then was nois'd; for which you will not excuse him, and the more, because he does not take
- p. 21. notice of Captain *Tarranton's* Narrative, which you with very great Confidence assert, proves all those Plots to have been forg'd to serve a Turn. I cannot but think *Mr. Archdeacon* somewhat to blame, for not determining where Things were so plain, and those Plots as clear as the Light of the Sun; but I think it most audacious in you to affront the King, the Ministry, and the Judges of that Time, by charging them with Forgery, and this upon the infallible Testimony, as you would make it, of a scandalous Fanatical Pamphlet. If the Affirmations of the Conspirators are to be credited against all legal Proofs, there will be no longer any need of Courts of Justice; but this, I suppose, you will allow only where your *best Puritans* are the Traitors. It is

is a wonderful Piece of Assurance to deny there were any Plots, when *Philips, Tongue, Gibs, and Stubs*, were fully convicted in *London*, and executed in 1662, for a Conspiracy to murder the King, the Bishops, Nobility, &c. wherein the infamous *Ludlow, Colonel Darvers*, and many more were concern'd. In 1663, 16 were executed at *York*, and 3 at *Leeds*, for contriving to raise a Rebellion in the North; and in 1666, *Rathbone, Saunders*, and six others, were most fully convicted of a Design to murder the King, and to fire the City, which latter Part we shall speak of elsewhere. These are vile Practices, Doctor, and you should have taken some notice of those Tryals and Treasons, as well as of *Tarranton's* worthless Libel.

Nor can I see how it is to be excus'd, that you lay such great Stress upon the Omission of the Explication of the *Assent* and *Consent*, mention'd in the Act of Uniformity, since it is impossible to observe every Thing that you shall require, and we cannot take your Word for the other Things which you mention to be taken notice of, and represent as of less Moment than that Explication.

Your Redundancies reach from the first to the p. 22. last Page; as for Omissions you are guilty of none, having rak'd together all that Malice could suggest. Thus you ridicule your Friend *Oliver's* Contract with the Devil. If you do not believe there is a Devil, give Christians leave to believe there is; and if you would have it thought that your Objection is against Contracts with him, you should have given some Reason against the Credit of so many learned and religious Men who have believ'd and asserted it. But you stomach it that *Oliver's* Reputation should lye at Stake, and from the Account given of his Death infer,

C

that

that the Archdeacon firmly believes it. Whether he does or not, is more than I can answer for; but if there was a Witch of *Endor*, and she made *Saul* see an Apparition, it is possible that Spirits may appear, and that the Devil may impose upon his Servants; yet this is nothing to you, who perhaps do not think your self under any Obligation to credit the Story of that Witch, more than this of *Oliver*, which I must tell you, has as much Attestation as in a Relation of that sort can be expected, unless you would have the Devil summon'd for his Evidence, or the dead Colonel brought to Life again.

p. 23. I cannot make any Allowance for the Ebullitions of your pretended Zeal for the Honour of the Citizens of *London*, whom you would artfully incense against your Adversary, by insinuating that he has a low Opinion of them. That Author does not tell you, that the thinking sober Men could be frightened at so ridiculous a Notion as the blowing up of the *Thames* to drown them; but there are in *London*, as well as other great Cities, no small Numbers of senseless Creatures, who when put into a Panick Fear, will swallow the greatest Absurdities, or even Impossibilities. Panick Fears you must needs know have dispersed whole Armies of the bravest Men, and they were Panick because there was no Reason to be shown for them. I suppose you have not forgot the Fright the whole Island of *Great Britain* was in, for it extended all over *England* and *Scotland*, at the Apprehension of having their Throats cut by about 2000 disarm'd *Irish*; the wicked Device, upon a bloody Design, of a profligate Wretch.

But to come to that which you take to be more considerable, you represent the Historian as inconsistent with himself. You love to harp upon the String of the *Revolution*, in hopes that if
another

another should touch it too roughly, he may cut his Fingers. You pretend to be pleas'd with the Author's applauding the Revolution: I cannot think but that it had been a much greater Satisfaction to you, if he had been sent to *Newgate* for writing against it, else you could not upbraid him with appearing for those Principles, which the Church of *England* has always asserted in her Homilies, in the Pulpits, and in the Writings of her greatest Prelates and ablest Divines. If the Archdeacon offends you with his Loyalty in seeming pleas'd with the Reign of so good a Prince as King *Charles II.* you have made your self Reparation enough by your shameless reviling of that Monarch, and insulting his unfortunate Brother.

For your Part, you would not by any Means p. 25. have a King out of Manacles and Fetters, you are so profoundly disloyal; you abhor the Thoughts of it. You appear greatly displeas'd with the Corporation Act, which oblig'd all Corporation Officers to make Oath, *that it was not lawful, upon any Pretence whatsoever, to take Arms against the King, &c.* This you fret at, *as a severe Mortification and Blow to a Party*, whom you take all Opportunities to cry up, and reckon it a mighty Unhappiness that it threw many of the most rebellious Members out of all the Corporations of *England*, by a legal and just Regulation. If Mr. *Echard's* Heart misgave him upon Occasion of the *Militia Act*, and he let drop some Words in Favour of the Revolution, p. 26. it does not follow that he was therefore oblig'd to damn all the Proceedings of the Parliaments in those Days, who thought they could never make the Allegiance of the Subject to the Sovereign too secure. That he was in no Fear for such Proceedings, is his great Commendation,

p. 27. and his vindicating *Dr. Tillotson's* Letter to the Lord *Ruffel*, is still a Testimony of his adhering to his Principles. As for that excellent Person's making no Retraction, the whole Course of his Life afterwards seems to have been a sufficient Retraction; and your Person of some Eminence, who was so angry with him for that Letter, must needs be very blind if he could never see so manifest a Retraction.

While others were grieving and lamenting. We know of none that did, but such as were profess'd Enemies to their King; and if the Archdeacon rejoices, it is a Demonstration that he is none of that Number. Passive Obedience being espous'd by the Court, the Pulpit, the Bench, the Bar, and the People, ought to convince you that it was the general Principle of the Nation, and that only such as I have mentioned before, were griev'd at it. You appear to be wholly of the mind of those who throw much Dirt, that some may be sure to stick.

You proceed to the *Oxford Decree*, and are offended that *Mr. Echard* will not take upon him to damn the publick Act of so famous an University; but he does not tell us that the House of Lords order'd it to be burnt after the Trial of *Dr. Sacheverell*; that you know was many Years after; and whether so long a Silence to it might not have pass'd for a sort of Approbation before, I must leave to better Heads to judge. Then you skulk again behind King *GEORGE*, and from thence pass away to your Clergyman of a greater Figure; you very well know his compleat History has been ever look'd upon as a wretched Performance, and never did or will make any Figure like that you are labouring to discredit. What your Clergyman says as to the Decree, deserves as little Regard as
all

all the rest of that worthless Narrative. But I will afford you a small Quotation from your own Clergyman, that you may not be so fond of quoting one who is so subject to contradict himself: it is taken from his Preface to an Address of Thanks to King *James II.* The whole Preface very well deserves your Attention, but being confin'd in Time, I shall only give you a few Lines of it. Your admir'd Clergyman after having extoll'd the said King *James* for all Princely Virtues, as far excelling the renowned Emperor *Trajan*, mentions his delivering a Sword to the Captain of his Guards, saying, *Take this, and if I govern well, use it for me; but if ill, against me.* This Action your Doctor of Figure descants upon, and severely lashes two Republican Commentators for making a rebellious Application of it, ridiculing the *Scots* on that Account; then he solemnly delivers his own Opinion concerning the same in these Words.

“ We are sure, if it be interpreted for a serious
 “ Instruction, for any practicable Advice, nothing could more proclaim the Unadvisedness
 “ of their Prince, because nothing more evacuates all the Ties of Allegiance. For if Subjects must in truth no longer submit, than they
 “ confess themselves unoppress'd and honestly dealt with, but as soon as a little teaz'd with
 “ any imaginary Wrong (for they themselves are to be the sole Judges, or the Principle has no
 “ Consequence) may fly in the Face of Authority which gives them the Affront, and depose
 “ that Power which they suppose to be too hard for them, is so rank a Tenet, that Treason,
 “ Tumult, Anarchy, Confusion, and all the licentious Mischiefs of Earth or Hell, would be
 “ its damning Inference. The Prince being
 “ crush'd into the most helpless of Slaves, and
 “ every

“ every peevish Incendiary prefer’d his supreme
 “ Lord. It hurries on so violently to Seditions
 “ and Rebellions, that did the *Romans* believe
 “ they might do what this Direction to the
 “ Captain implied, and yet permit the Empe-
 “ ror, who authorized them with that Privilege,
 “ to pass his 21 Years Reign without any Muti-
 “ ny or Insurrection; I say, did the *Romans* sup-
 “ pose it to be serious Advice, and yet never
 “ pervert it to the Prejudice of him that be-
 “ stow’d it, nothing less can be inferr’d, than
 “ (what is not handsome to own) that the Loy-
 “ alty of Heathens surmounts that of the precisest
 “ Christians, since the one could be steddily
 “ obedient, where they had in a manner Leave
 “ to resist, and yet the other be so apt to rebel,
 “ where they have all the Restrictions of Nature,
 “ Religion, and National Laws, to submit and
 “ be quiet; nay, had the soothing Prince deli-
 “ ver’d it as a License to have himself chastiz’d,
 “ yet, by the frankest Concession, he could not
 “ have authoriz’d the Captain’s Revolt. For it
 “ is even beyond the Prerogative of supreme Powers
 “ to legitimate Resistance, or endow their Subjects
 “ with a Charter to rebel. However valid unex-
 “ torted Resignations and voluntary Assent to a
 “ Deposition may be, yet it is certain no So-
 “ vereign Authority, while so continuing, can
 “ dispense any Liberty for Disobedience, or ab-
 “ solve from the Crime of Treason, any more
 “ than my saying to another, *I’ll give you leave*
 “ *to kill me*, would in Justice acquit him from
 “ the Guilt of Murder, &c.

“ After all, the most natural Deduction which
 “ I conceive this Passage capable of, is this; that
 “ such Flashes of good Nature in a Prince may
 “ be of very hurtful Consequence; they prosti-
 “ tute his Honour, alienate his Authority, and

“ make

“ make all the Rabble an execrable High Court
“ of Justice.

“ Hence I wonder’d at always, and condem-
“ ned the Inconsiderateness of those Authors,
“ who, tho’ they would interpret to no disloyal
“ Tendency, yet have wink’d at the Conse-
“ quence they presum’d to detest, and have on-
“ ly extoll’d this Saying for the noble Sally of a
“ resolute, undaunted, and heroick Soul; whereas
“ ’tis at best but an unwary Vapour, and undi-
“ gested Flant of Popularity, to the Quest
“ whereof this Prince was too abundantly ad-
“ dicted, as is further conspicuous in several
“ other of his Demeanors, remark’d in the fol-
“ lowing Harangue, particularly in *Señt. 56*,
“ where *Pliny* seems to intimate, that *Trajan*
“ submitted himself to govern upon the strange
“ and unheard of Terms, of the Prince being
“ *not* above the Laws, it *should be*, but the Laws
“ above the Prince; which destroys the Prince,
“ and fundamental Prerogative of Princes, their
“ being unaccountable to any but God, and was
“ the very Principle our *Regicides* proceeded
“ on, &c.

Chew this Quotation, Doctor, and consider
whether ever Mortal did or could say more in
Defence of Passive Obedience, than this your
Clergyman of a greater Figure has said; call up-
on him for a Recantation, and till you have ob-
tain’d it, quote him no more; and at the same
time remember his last Controversy with the
late Bishop of *Carlisle*.

Ask your Clergyman why he advanc’d King *James’s* Authority so high, and question those
Divines that were on the Scaffold with the Duke
of *Monmouth* concerning the Doctrine they in-
culcated to him, whether it were the Doctrine
of the Church of *England* or no; if it was, then
the

the same is still; if it was not, then what be-
 comes of your Friend the Clergyman of Figure,
 p. 30, 31. whose Authority you so much insist on? Let this
 serve for your two next Pages, which are all
 upon the same Subject. If such a Multitude,
 and among them those you so much admire,
 preach'd and taught the Doctrine of *Non Resistance*,
 what need you charge it so home upon
 Mr. *Echard* alone, as if he were the only Person
 p. 32. that had out-liv'd the *Revolution*, and talk'd of
Passive Obedience? *Resistance*, you say, was all
 along the Principle of those whom he sets him-
 self to oppose, tho' in them 'twas call'd Faction;
 you mean the Fanaticks, of whose Principles
 the Nation has had such Testimonies as it will
 p. 33. never have reason to forget. But you commend
 your self to Bishop *Burnet*; well, I will also com-
 mend you to him; take his own Words in the
 Preface to his Conferences as follows. " Among
 " all the Heresies this Age has spawned, there
 " is not one more contrary to the whole Design
 " of Religion, and more destructive of Man-
 " kind, than is that bloody Opinion of defend-
 " ing Religion by Arms, and of forcible Resist-
 " ance upon the Colour of preserving Religion.
 " The Wisdom of that Policy is earthly, sensual;
 " and devilish, favouring of a carnal, unmorti-
 " fy'd and impatient Mind, that cannot bear
 " the Cross, nor trust the Providence of GOD.
 Make the best of this short Quotation in answer
 to yours, and if you think proper, call upon
 that Doctor for a Retraction of this, and an
 Hundred more I could bring you out of him,
 if Time would permit.

You are highly pleas'd with this Subject of
Revolution and *Non-resistance*, and having but lit-
 tle to say against the History you would discredit,
 you spin this out to the full length, stuffing your
 crambe

ex ambe repetita down our Throats in several Shapes, tho' still the same; and the Sum of it is, that the Archdeacon does not condemn the *Revolution*, and yet seems to assert the Old Church of *England* Principle of *Non-resistance*. You have demanded of him often enough to reconcile these (to you seeming) Contradictions. I am apt to believe he will scarce give himself the Trouble of answering you. If you are earnest to have this Difficulty solv'd, I refer you to your good Friends Dr. *Tillotson*, Dr. *Burnet*, the Clergyman of a greater Figure, and to a Thousand of your Acquaintance, who have most zealously writ against *Resistance*, and for the *Revolution*. The Testimony of your brave Lord *Russel*, whom you p. 34. have made a Prophet, he having been before canoniz'd a Saint at *Covent-Garden*, by one of your own Stamp, notwithstanding his being executed for Treason, upon the fullest Conviction, is of no Weight with any Men of loyal Principles. But of him you give us more Occasion to take notice hereafter.

I have before been oblig'd to cut short with p. 35, 36. you in relation to the Revolution and the Church of *England* Principles, and since you will nauseate us so much with that same Dish over again, must refer you to what has been said before in relation to it, and to the Solution of your Friends there nam'd. The Life of King *William*, which you quote, all the wiser Part of the World looks upon as little better than a Romantick Piece of Flattery, and with half the Pains you have taken to revile the Archdeacon, you might have found therein notorious Falshoods enough to have doubled the Bulk of your Letter; but the Author, you tell us, was a Clergyman: you are not ignorant that there are too many of those, who wear the Gown for the sake of the
D Benefice,

Benefice, yet would be better pleas'd to have it chang'd into a Cloak; who are sick of the Surplice, and would rather hear a Bagpipe at the *Bear-Garden*, than an Organ in the Church.

P. 37. You are well pleas'd with the Bishops of *Scotland* for adhering to their Principles; not that you have the least Kindness for them, but because their so adhering prov'd their Ruin, and by that means Episcopacy was abolish'd in that Nation, and *Presbytery* has been ever since triumphant. If you have ever read the Account of the late Establishment of *Presbyterian Government* by the Parliament of *Scotland*, Anno 1690. London printed 1693, Quarto, you have certainly with great Satisfaction observ'd how the Church of *England* Clergy were there treated by your honest *Puritan Brethren*, with such Inhumanity as could scarce have been expected from Savage *Indians*, and how little Redress they found when they petition'd. I doubt not but that you have been further delighted with reading the Pamphlet call'd, *An Account of the Persecution of the Church in Scotland*, in several Letters, London, 1690. But the Bishops of *England* stopp'd short, to your great Grief and Disappointment, being then flush'd with the Expectation of practising the same here, that had been done by your Brethren in *Scotland*, or repeating what had been before that perform'd in *England*, by your worthy Grandfather and his Associates.

P. 38. If King *James* found himself deceiv'd, he may
to 42. thank your Friends, as well as those you charge. The Dissenters from all Parts of *England*, and of all Sorts had address'd him, upon his declaring for Liberty of Conscience; they had made Vows and Protestations of adhering to him, and yet you boast of their being as deep in the Design against him, as those you revile for the same.

Do

Do you extricate your self here if you can. King *Charles II.* had curb'd the Fanaticks, therefore they were for open Rebellion, and involving Three Kingdoms in Blood, as they had before done under his Father. King *James II.* gave them Liberty of Conscience, and therefore they fawn'd upon him; but at the same time you inform us they contriv'd his Ruin. Give us leave now to desire you to reconcile you with your self, as you are so urgent upon Mr. *Eichard*.

Another thing in your Pamphlet, which I am p. 42. not at all surpriz'd at, is, that you should with so much Freedom and Openness declare your self upon several Matters, where you could not be insensible you were liable to the Counter-evidence of Truth and Demonstration. The great Instance here is *Oates's Plot*, vulgarly call'd the *Popish Plot*, which made so great a Noise here, by the Discovery of the Villanies couch'd under that Pretence by the Saints, and all over *Europe*, as the common Jest of other Nations. You see no reason to doubt of a *Popish Plot* all along from the Restoration, and this you say is evident from the Testimony, of whom? of a few of the most profligate Wretches, the very Dregs of *England* and *Ireland*, rak'd together by designing Incendiaries to conceal their own Treasons, and confound these Kingdoms. But you tell us, it is very plain by *Plunket's Trial* that there were Dealings between the *Irish* and the *French* to bring in Popery. Had you nothing more authentick to produce than that *Puritani-cal* Contrivance, which has put all the Nation to the Blush, except that hardned factious Crew? Since you pretend to be so ignorant as to produce that as a Proof, I will with the utmost Brevity present you with a few Heads of that Affair. *Plunket* was kept Six Months Prisoner

D 2

in

in *Dublin*, barely on Account of his Function, before any Evidence appear'd against him in relation to a Plot. By that time some wicked Priests or Friars, or what you please to call them, whom he had reprov'd for their infamous Lives, being lost to all Shame, and only intent upon living lewdly, were corrupted by the Agents of the Faction to swear him into the then prevailing Plot. Upon their Information he was sent to be try'd at the Assizes in the County of *Armagh*, held on the 21st of *June* 1680, where he appear'd 2 or 3 Days successively in Court; but those vile Evidences being sensible that the Impossibilities they were to swear to, could find no Credit in a Place where those Things were well known, instead of appearing to make good their Allegations, got the Trial suspended, and so wrought as to have *Plunket* brought into *England* to be try'd. When brought to *London* he was refus'd Time to bring his Witnesses and Records from *Ireland*, tho' they were actually on the Road. His Trial coming on, and the then Sheriffs having pack'd a proper Jury, he was readily found guilty, receiv'd Sentence, and was executed. Now the Things sworn against him were so absurd and impracticable, that no Men in their right Senses could give any Credit to them, and particularly as for the *French* landing 40000 Men at *Carlingford*, it is well known that the said Port, if it deserves that Name, is dangerous for a Vessel of 50 Tons Burden, and therefore altogether incapable of such a Fleet as must carry 40000 Men. *Plunket's* raising of 70000 Men is such a Banter, as deserves only to be ridicul'd, for the whole Revenue of *Ireland* is too little to maintain such an Army, and *Plunket* himself was so poor, that he was oblig'd to the Charity of Friends to defray his Charges from

Dublin

Dublin to London. Then for the Evidences, they were the vilest of Mortals, Fellows so entirely given up to Wickedness, that most of them having squander'd the Wages of their Iniquity, were soon after imprison'd in *Dublin* for Cheats and Robberies, and several of them hang'd in that City for their Villanies, all of them at the Gallows confessing their Perjury against *Plunket*. Now make the most of your Evidence. But you say the Plot was believ'd by four successive Parliaments, who, you know, were always the same Men chosen again, and therefore equivalent but to one, and what those Men were, the History of that Time sufficiently informs us; besides we have only your Word for their believing it, and if they did believe, their Belief, I presume, makes no Article of Faith.

I do not believe you are troubled with the *p. 43.*
Jaundice, and therefore mistake Colours, as you would insinuate Mr. Archdeacon to be; I am satisfy'd you are wilfully blind, and therefore it is impossible to persuade you to see Demonstrations as clear as the Light of the Sun. What you make of his Account of the *Popish Plot* is the very Truth; and what you add of the Scheme of one that went before him, who tells us, that *Tong* unkennell'd the Fox, and *Shaftsbury*, the Master of the Blood Hounds, govern'd the Chace, is what has been long own'd and confess'd by the greatest Part of the Body of the Nation, as you would inculcate the contrary to have then been.

Believe me, Sir, your spitting your Venom *p. 44.*
 against a Person, whose Memory is still venerable among all Loyalists, I mean *L'Estrange*, your stigmatizing him with such virulent Malice, as to call him the Tool of a Party, and a Popish Pensioner, from such a Mouth or Pen as yours
 is

is rather an Honour than a Discredit to him. He was condemn'd to be hang'd for his Loyalty to King *Charles I.* when your worthy Grandfather, in whom you glory, deserv'd that Death for encouraging of that Rebellion; he preserv'd that Fidelity publickly to the Son, whilst you inculcated factious Principles in private Corners. His *History of the Times*, than which you say your Eyes never saw a viler Book, will ever remain a standing Monument of his Virtue and Integrity, as well as your *Puritanical Party's* Infamy, when neither you, nor perhaps they, have any longer Eyes to see, and when perhaps the other Works of your Apologist are condemn'd to the Flames, as you know one Piece of his was some Years after the Revolution.

- p. 45. If the Passage you quote, about *Oates's* telling *Tong* before Twenty Citizens, that he knew nothing of the Plot but what he had learn'd from him, were the best Evidence Mr. *Echard* had produc'd against the Plot, he would have been very defective; but the whole Course of his Relation makes out the Inconsistency of that Contrivance. King *Charles* himself discover'd several Perjuries of *Oates*, as for instance, in his Description of *Don John of Austria*, with whom he pretended to be well acquainted, yet swore him to be a tall black Man, whereas that Monarch knew him to be short and fair; in his not knowing *Coleman* over Night upon Oath, and yet knowing him so well the next Morning as to swear point blank against him; besides so many more Instances, as would be too tedious to repeat; and you may find enough, if you will open your Eyes, to convince any rational Person, in that brief *History of the Times*, which, because it so much exposes your Brethren, you are
46. so much enrag'd at. If that Author informs you
that

that *Simpson Tong* confess'd and protested that the Plot was contriv'd between his Father and *Oates*, it is no more than what the best Part of the Nation was convinc'd of; but if you insist on that Son's being a profligate Wretch, it is most evident that his Father and his Grandfather were the same, as well as *Titus Oates*, and all the hellish Herd of Evidences that supported him. Thus you may see that neither Mr. Archdeacon nor *L'Estrange* stood in need of the Story of the Passage before the Twenty Citizens, and if the former of them receiv'd some farther Information, which the latter had not, it is very impertinent to upbraid him both for borrowing from the other, and making use of his own.

The two main Evidences of the Reality of this P. 47. Plot, you say, besides the Depositions of *Oates* and *Bedlow*, &c. were the Letters of Mr. *Coleman*, and the Murder of Sir *Edmund-Bury-Godfrey*. Without any evading, what you quote from Mr. *Echard's History*, as taken out of *L'Estrange*, and added of his own, is so full against *Coleman's* Letters being any Proof of the Plot, that it is needless to say any more; and as for the criminal part of the Letters, there is no need of entering into the Merits of the Cause, for the Guilt he might incur by intermeddling with State Affairs to enrich himself, was no corroborating Testimony that all the others were engag'd in a Plot of a far different Nature, and without the least Shew of Contrivance, or so much as common Sense and Reason in it.

And as to the Story of Sir *Edmund-Bury-Godfrey's* Murder, what both the last mention'd Writers have said of it, is so just and true, that neither you nor all your Party will be ever able to invalidate their Allegations. Whatsoever Sir *William Scroggs* said at that Trial, you cannot but

but be sensible, that being afterwards convinc'd of the Villainy of those Evidences, and of the Impossibility of their Assertions, he follow'd that Conviction of his Conscience, check'd those perjur'd Wretches at the Trial of Sir *George Wake-man*, which was a Means of saving his Life, and did many other Acts, which evinc'd how far he was from persisting in the wrong, for which you may well remember he was most audaciously insulted by your Party, not only in private Whispers, but in the vilest Libels that the Press could produce. Here you fly for Sanctuary again, alledging it looks but ill in *L'Estrange*, but much worse in a dignify'd Clergyman, to arraign the Justice of the Nation. This is one of your virulent Insinuations. Is the Justice of a Nation arraign'd every time that a Man is found to have been wrongfully put to Death? If Witnesses will be perjur'd in Cases of Blood, is it in the Power of Courts to prevent the ill Consequences? Judges are suppos'd to be the Sages of the Law, they are not expected to possess the Spirit of Prophecy. How often have we known Persons executed for Murders and Robberies, when others have afterwards own'd those very Facts for which those dy'd, at the Gallows? Such Accidents only shew that there are some perjur'd Villains in a Nation, but do not in the least blemish the Justice of the same.

As for your Quotations from *L'Estrange* and *Mr. Echard*, to make out that the former of them asserted the Murder and the Conspiracy to be both Impostures, and the latter to seem to be of the same mind; I can only tell you that they are not singular, but that not only Thousands, but I may freely say Millions in *England*, have been of their Opinion, and in foreign Parts they are supported by the universal Con-

sent

sent of all that ever got any thorough Information as to those Affairs.

Whereas you are beating a Belief into all p. 507
Mankind with the Votes of two Houses of Commons. Had they been two Acts of Parliament, the denying of our Assent to them might have been of dangerous Consequence; but as even those I hope you would not have pass for Articles of Faith, so much less those which never went farther than Votes of that single House. All the Acts which have pass'd since the Days of Queen *Elizabeth* till the Revolution, against your Brethren, have been voted in the House of Commons, and yet I am apt to believe that Sanction is of little Weight with you. It was King *Charles I.* his House of Commons that voted him out of his Palace, and at last into a Prison; and tho' you may approve of that voting, there is a great Multitude that will not be prevail'd upon to pay such entire Submission to that House of Commons. The same House of Commons that voted the *Papish Plot*, voted all those who should lend or advance King *Charles II.* any Money, Enemies to the Nation, yet I do not find that half the Nation ever believ'd it. Sir *William Jones's* Speech can be of no Authority, he talk'd p. 511
as a Lawyer, and us'd all his Rhetorick to aggravate the Crimes charg'd upon the Prisoner; besides, he shew'd little Regard to Justice, when being sensible of many Incongruities, or rather almost Impossibilities in *Oates's* Depositions, he in his State of the Evidence huddled them all up, or rather took Pains to conceal them, by softning them into *Objections* against him, and Things wherein he was suppos'd to have been mistaken; and because the Prisoners had not made those *Objections*, and he knew not what Answer *Oates* would make to them, therefore he
E would

would not mention them; in short, he saw the Villainy, but would not discover it. Therefore I think there are few Persons of Probity, but what will have a greater Regard to *L'Estrange's* plain Demonstrations, than to that Lawyer's confident Assertions on the opposite side. Upon the whole, I think you can never convince your Readers, that either as to this Plot, or any other particular Observation in your Pamphlet, you have any regard to Truth and Fidelity.

p. 52.

Neither are you less warm and eager in asserting the Truth, Reality, and Horridness of *Oates's* Plot, than you are in running down that of the Fanaticks, as a meer Sham. The *Rye-House* Conspiracy, there is no doubt you know, was exactly true; and if Mr. *Echard* is more favourable to the Evidences in the one Case than in the other, it is because he is convinc'd that *Oates* and his Gang were the most perjur'd Scoundrels, pick'd out of Goals, and from among the most consummate Race of Villains; whereas the others were of a far different Strain, from *Keeling* the first Discoverer, and a Tradesman, without Blemish as to his Reputation, to the Lord *Howard* of *Essex*, a Peer of the Realm. Mr. Archdeacon's great Author, Bishop *Sprat*, very well deserves that Title you ironically bestow on him; he was a Person excellently qualify'd to write that or any other History; he was employ'd in it by two Kings, and had all the Evidences that could be requisite for such a Work; one half of his Book consists of the bare Depositions, the other relates the Contents of them in an historical Method, and therefore, in spite of your Snarl, is in reality a special Book, that is, an undeniable Authority to convey a true Account to Posterity. That the Paper which the Lord *Russel* left behind him was full

of

of enormous Falshoods, is what very much provokes p. 537
 your Gall. To disprove this you produce a Paragraph or Sentence out of that Lord's said Paper, and some Words spoken to the Sheriff. You would clear him upon his dying Words, and evacuate all that Plot upon the same; and yet you have so little Christianity as to maintain *Oats's* Plot as authentick, notwithstanding all the Persons that suffer'd for it, deny'd the whole in the most solemn and express Terms; whereas there was not one in your *Presbyterian Plot* but what confess'd enough to deserve Death, tho' they disguis'd it with the profoundest Cant. As for your Lord, he deny'd his having any Design against the King's Life, or for altering the Government; but then how meanly does he palliate the Matter, when he owns, *there was some Discourse then, and at other times, about the Feasibleness of seizing the Guards*. And again, *That several times by Accident he heard it mention'd, as a thing might easily be done*. Was not this, *then, and at other times, and several times*, discoursing of seizing the Guards, a sufficient Testimony out of his own Mouth to corroborate all the Evidence given against him? But he says it was *by Accident*: a very wretched Shift, to contrive Treason at several times, and then bring it off, by alledging it was *by Accident*. Then for the Evidence against this Lord, there was Colonel *Romzey*, a Man of Figure and Worth among the Party, till he discover'd their Secrets; Mr. *Shepherd* a Merchant and Citizen of Note, and the Lord *Howard of Esrick*, a Peer of the Realm. To corroborate all which, the Duke of *Monmouth*, and *Carstaires*, a sanctify'd *Presbyterian* Preacher, relate the Matter to the King, to the same Effect as had been depos'd at the Trial. Now against all these Testimonies from the Lord's own

Mouth, from Three substantial Witnesses upon Trial, and Two others of no less Figure to the King, all that you can bring is, your seeming want of Faith; for I cannot be persuaded that you do not believe as much as Bishop *Sprat* did of all the Facts alledg'd against that Lord; but you cannot prevail upon your self to grant them to be Treasonable, in regard that they all tended to carry on the Work of the Saints. You are willing to fancy there is little Likelihood that the Duke of *Monmouth* would make any such Confession. Would you impose your empty Notions upon Mankind, as more credible than the Assertions of a King, and of a Prelate? Your Presumption must be next to Madness, if you can conceit that any Man of common Sense can be so deluded by you. Your other Allegations in this Behalf are as frivolous as many of the Authors you quote. Then as for Mr. *Carstaires*, you can with Assurance say, that he never did bring such a Charge against the Lord *Russel*, because you

p. 54. had it from his own Mouth, and Mr. *Pierce* has publish'd a Letter which you procur'd from him to the same Effect. It is no new thing for a Fanatick, when he has escap'd the Halter he deserv'd, to unsay whatsoever he had said to save his Neck, and you may rest satisfy'd that the loyal Part of *England* will give more Credit to the bare Word of that King, or of that Bishop, than to the Oaths of Twenty rebellious Field Preachers. Your worthy Gentleman's pretty Turn of skreening themselves from the Danger which hung over their Heads, was in effect no other than raising a Rebellion to skreen themselves, at the Expence of others, from the Gallows, which they thought they could not otherwise escape. You ask, who can pretend to say how far the Alterations made by King

James

James II. in the Bishop's Copy of his Account of the Fanatick Plot, might go? Till you can inform us, it will be in vain for you to urge any thing upon that Topick. Your Account of the Bishop, from the Writer of the Life of King *William*, is very impertinent, and a meer Slander, as is much more of that Performance. This p. 56. you may depend upon, that as the Credit of that Book will never fail, so your beloved *Presbyterian Plot* will never fall.

If Bishop *Sprat* was so far prevail'd upon by Importunity, and the Persuasions of the Dean of *Canterbury*, as to say he was convinc'd of the Lord *Russel's* Probity, that can be no Proof against the undeniable Testimonies he had before alledg'd, as they are above; and Mr. Archdeacon is far from perpetuating a groundless Calumny, when he transmits to Posterity a Fact as well attested as any ever has been in Cases of High Treason.

Of all those concern'd in the Fanatick Plot, none had any unfair Usage, nor had the Earl of *Essex*, who cut his own Throat in the *Tower*. And it must really amaze all Mankind to find you so confident as to make a Question of his murdering himself there. You this way discover p. 57. a peculiar Fondness to imprint into the Minds of your Readers a most traiterous Suggestion, to blast the Memory of two successive Kings, by persuading your Party, for no other will without Horror read so infamous a Slander, that they were the Murderers of that Earl. All the malicious Circumstances you rake together to inculcate this infamous Notion, can have no Weight with any one that has the least Regard to the Dignity of Kings. And whosoever knows any thing of the too merciful Temper of that excellent Monarch King *Charles II.* at whom this

this Calumny must be chiefly levell'd; cannot but stand amaz'd that there should be so much Impudence in a Republican Party, as to presume to brand him with such an Action, as could be expected only from the Hand of an enthusiastick Fanatick, or desperate Atheist. You know the first Broacher of this Calumny was *Ferguson*, a Man as infamous as the Share he had in all Treasons could make him; and you are not ignorant that *Braddon*, a vile Emissary of that Miscreant, was legally convicted, for suborning any, the most inconsiderable Wretches, to assert the Falshood you now revive. If the Earl did it with a good Will, and cut both his Jugulars, it is no more than what many have done before and since. The taking of his Body out of the Closet was the Ignorance of his Servants, and it is most certain that, as you say a Juryman was told, it was the Body, not the Cloaths, that they were to enquire into. The Relations did acquiesce in the Verdict of the Jury, because they knew it to be true, having been before satisfy'd by the Earl's Servants, and more particularly by his *Valet de Chamber*, who gave him the Razor wherewith he did it, when he had return'd a Penknife he had before given him, which the said Valet had brought, believing it had been to pare his Nails. The Earl's frequently pleading the Lawfulness of *Self Murder*, is not an absolute convincing Argument that he was actually a Self-Murderer; but you cannot be ignorant that it is a most pregnant circumstantial Proof; for he that is in Prosperity so apt to vindicate such an unchristian Crime, may be justly suspected to put it in Execution in a raging spleenatick Fit, when he sees his Practices detected, and has cause to apprehend a violent Death from the Hand of an Executioner, without having any Tye of

of Conscience to restrain him. I am very con- p. 59.
fident you will be charg'd with contributing all
in your Power, not only to vitiate the Taste of
the present and succeeding Ages, but to conceal
the Truth of History, and to transmit to Poste-
rity the most vile Slanders as solid Truths.

And now my Hand is in, give me leave to
vent my Concern, that there should be any Man
so audacious, as in the whole Current of his
Pamphlet to discover so violent a Passion to de-
fame a whole Race of Kings. If the Lord *Clare-*
ndon in his History took such Liberties as to
speak disrespectfully of King *Charles I.* Mr. Arch-
deacon had all the reason in the World not to
tread in his Steps in that Particular. You up-
braid him with that which is highly commenda-
ble in him; but it is no Wonder; for that bloo-
dy Rebellion you think fit to call by the soft
Name of a Contest between that King and the
long Parliament, as if there had been nothing in
it but a few high Words, or that the Question
were still depending whether that had been re-
ally a Rebellion, or a most just Controversy on
their side. You, I must conclude, cannot be con-
vinc'd that it was an horrid Rebellion, in which
your worthy Grandfather was so deeply con-
cern'd, but no honest Man hesitates as to that
Point. Of that Author's improving the Lord
Clarendon, this which you pretend to find fault p. 63.
with is a very good Instance, and will be look'd
upon as such, notwithstanding all your Cavils.

The great Grievances of King *Charles II.*'s
Reign, were in Reality with you, his obstruct-
ing the Growth of *Fanaticism* towards the lat-
ter End of his Reign, and his not being sway'd
by the Counsels of his Enemies, who were visi-
bly aspiring to overturn the Monarchy, and ex-
ercise a *Republican Arbitrary Power*. And I per- p. 61.
ceive

ceive that you rail upon this Account, in such a manner; as very well becomes a profess'd Enemy of his King, and to the known Laws he govern'd by.

As to *the Growth of Popery* you talk of, that was the old Cry which destroy'd the Father, reviv'd against his Son. The Advancement, you instance, of known Papists to Places of Power, is a most notorious Falshood, else you might have nam'd one of that Number; but according to the old Strain, by *Papists* you mean all those who being sincerely of the Church of *England*, express their Abhorrence of the wicked Practices of your Brethren against that Prince. All who desire to be truly inform'd, may find upon Record how many Priests were put to Death, barely for the Sake of their Function, and with what Severity all the Professors of that Religion were handled, during *Oats's* Plot; but you make light of all that, and seem concern'd that there should be any thing less than a general Massacre of all those you would expose to Ruin, under that Denomination. Nothing is more plain than that the *Growth of Popery* has been often the Pretence of a wicked Party, to cover other Designs.

The Influence of *French* Counsels was then another grand Complaint of your pretended Patriots, for few others troubled themselves about it; a Place gain'd by an Usurper, and that in a great Measure for affording the Royal Family a Retreat, might have been better restor'd to the right Owner. But I must inform you, since you would seem to be ignorant of it, that the selling of that Place was mostly promoted by your own Friends, whose Cause you so much espouse, to weaken King *Charles II.* because a constant Garrison kept in that Place, might have been

been of use to him to suppress their Rebellions at Home. 'Twas upon just Provocations, and not Jealousies rais'd by the *French*, that the first *Dutch* War was begun, to assert the Honour and Trade of the Nation, and therefore Mr. *Echard* has good Reason to applaud it. The Lords and Commons chearfully contributing to p. 62. the Charge of it, ought, if you had any regard to what you say, to have made you spare this Remark, since you so often press'd a Vote of the House of Commons as an infallible Sanction, and yet now both Lords and Commons are slander'd by you, as if influenc'd by no Man knows who. Your poor Reflections on the Second *Dutch* War, the Indulgence to Dissenters, and the Earl of *Danby*, are not worth taking notice of, because there is nothing in them; but that Earl you might have spar'd, for I believe you have had a very good Opinion of him since that Time, and you seem to show him some Favour, when after charging him with having been a *French* Pensioner, you save it up by adding, whatever he might be afterwards.

ARBITRARY Power, which only the King's Enemies were afraid of in that Reign, may very well appear a meer Bug-bear to Mr. Archdeacon; and his applauding the King's *Declaration touching the Causes and Reasons that mov'd him to dissolve his two last Parliaments*, declares him a good Subject, pleas'd that his Sovereign would condescend to show *Causes and Reasons* for doing that which was his undoubted Prerogative to do, whensoever he saw Occasion, without being accountable to any Man. You are no less fret- p. 63. ted at that Author's seeming well pleas'd at the Seizure, or Surrendral, as you call it, of the Charter of *London*, and other Corporations, and you think he should have consider'd the Act that

F

pass'd

pass'd after the Revolution for reversing that Judgment. You have told us, *p.* 38. that he seems inclin'd to proceed to the Reign of King *William*, then will be the proper Time to mention the Acts pass'd in his Days, without obliging him to slip over so many intermediate Years to observe in the Reign of King *Charles II.* what was done after the Revolution. When it comes to another Impression, he has too much Sense and Honesty to be influenc'd by you to alter the Text of his History, or make any marginal Notes, which are not requisite in the Place. I forbear the Reflections which such a Method as this, of pretending to correct the History of your native Country, would lead to and justify, for fear of teasing you; and shall leave you to your own unrelenting Thoughts about it.

That only one Thing of Moment, that you cannot let pass without a Remark, is a bare Repetition in other Words, and upon a particular Occasion, of what you have all along been endeavouring to inculcate, *viz.* that Mr. *Echard* will not approve of all the factious Proceedings against King *Charles II.* for which all true Loyalists will applaud him, notwithstanding all the Cavils of your *Puritanical* Party. He calls it a *wonderful Infatuation* of the then *Whig* Party, not to accept of those *Expedients* and *Concessions*, which were offer'd to evade the Bill of Exclusion, and adds, It must be from the Spirit of Faction or Delusion, or an unaccountable Mixture of both. And what have you to object against this? You refer him to the Lord *Russel's* Paper. Enough has been said of that before; I shall only add, that to insist so much on such a Paper, of one delivering it under his Circumstances, shows you to be quite destitute of any thing
material,

material, to give a Gloss to your Animadversions.

You seem to be eagerly bent to prove that p. 65.
Mr. Archdeacon is not *Impartial*; and because
he says, that *Impartiality* has been always his
great Aim; you fancy, he, like other Writers, p. 66.
is apt to have favourable Thoughts of himself.
But after the strictest Search for his *Impartiality*,
you conceit he has not dealt forth his Favours to
the *Papists*, and the *Dissenters*, with an equal
Hand.

You think he more than once discovers a great
Tenderness to the *Papists*. This indeed is a great
Crime in a Clergyman, to have a *Tenderness*
for his Fellow-Creatures; for I suppose, you
will not allow them to be Christians. But how
do you make out this extraordinary *Tenderness*!
Why, he does not charge them with the burning
of *London* in 1666, tho' you falsely say, they have
generally born the Blame of it, and tho' the In-
scription on the Monument charges it home
upon them. And yet the Historian is suspecting
French Hugonots, and *Dutch*, and *English* Repub-
licans, rather than *Papists*. Your dearly beloved
Brother *Prynne*, who contributed so much to-
wards firing of the whole Nation, as is well
known, was the first that broach'd the Story of
the *Papists* firing the City; and tho' the Parlia-
ment in 1667 endeavour'd to have that Matter
prov'd upon them, they could never make any
thing of it, notwithstanding the indefatigable
Industry of your Brethren to throw the Guilt off
themselves, and fix the Imputation upon the
others. The Inscription on the Monument, you
very well know, was not there till your *honest*
Puritans began to appear triumphant by the
Perjuries of *Oats* and his Gang; and that addi-
tional Inscription then added underneath, is a

Contradiction to that which was originally cut above it. But to show you and the World that Mr. *Echard* has good Grounds for what he says; In the Year 1662, *Thomas Tongue*, *George Philips*, *Francis Stubbs*, *James Hind*, *John Sollars*, and *Nathaniel Gibbs*, were found Guilty of High-Treason, for conspiring to kill the King, and to fire the City. In April 1666, *John Rathbone*, *William Saunders*, and six others, were convicted for conspiring the King's Death, in order to which, they were to have fir'd the City on the very Third of September. Now all these were *Fanaticks* of the old Rebel Breed, and no *Papist* among them. As for *Hubert* the French Man, afterward executed for that very Fact, he was an *Hugonot*, and the Son of an *Hugonot*, which is much the same thing as your honest *Puritans*. Now since you are good at quoting Pamphlets, for your further Information I must refer you to one, printed in 1713, and entitul'd, *A Protestant Monument, erected to the immortal Glory of the Whigs and the Dutch, it being a full and satisfactory Relation of the late mysterious Plot, and firing of London*. I am satisfy'd you will give it all the ill Names you can think on, but I assure you it all along quotes Authorities for its Assertions, and those generally much more to be insisted

p. 67. upon than any you produce; yet you cannot forbear being ironical on Mr. *Echard*, for saying, That after weighing all Circumstances, he can still make no exact Determination. I am sure you cannot with any Shew of Justice pretend that he favours the *Papists*, when after full Evidence on their Behalf, he still leaves the Cause undecided. Well; but you have another grievous Charge against him, which is, that he seems to believe the most solemn, positive, and strong Expressions of *Langhorn*, and all the rest
executed

executed for *Oates's* Plot, in Vindication of their Innocence. That which you object as a Crime, p. 68. is a Demonstration of his Christian Charity, and if he is not so favourable to the dying *Fanatick* Conspirators, the Fault is their own, for they all at their Deaths shifted and prevaricated, and perhaps deny'd some part of the Charge; but I believe there was not one of the Number, who did not confess enough to convince all that were not of their Party, or Well-wishers to them, that they were guilty of the Treasons for which they died; whereas all the *Papists* to a Man, in the most solemn and authentick manner, and in the plainest Terms, denied the whole of their Charge, renouncing and rejecting all Equivocations, Evasions, Mental Reservations, and whatsoever else Malice it self could pretend to discredit their Assertions; and that they are not so free to swallow false Oaths, especially at the last Moment, has sufficiently appear'd by those who have suffer'd since the Revolution, who have never gone about to conceal the Facts they have dy'd for; and as for the Living, if they were such dull Souls as to believe that Dispensations could be had for swearing against their Conscience, they needed not to have paid double Taxes for 30 Years successively, to the great impoverishing of their Families, but would certainly have swallow'd all the Oaths that the Wit of Man could invent, as many *Presbyterians* are very well known to have done for their darling Interest.

But the Archdeacon you will acquit as for flattering the *Presbyterians*, and would have him consider, whether he has not advanc'd some Things that are a little exasperating. There is no question but that he has advanc'd some such Things; but if they have acted such Things as they are unwilling to have repeated, they may
 thank

thank themselves, and not lay the Blame upon him, who could not as an Historian, omit mentioning those Things which provoke them. If he has flatter'd any Person or any Party, he is much to blame, but to omit flattering the *Presbyterians* cannot be objected against him as a Fault.

p. 69. He acknowledges, that the *Presbyterians* had a very considerable Hand in the Restoration, and declares, that it was only to relieve themselves from the Oppression of the *Independents*. This you say, is no true Account of the Matter, not candid nor ingenuous, &c. Now nothing is more demonstrative in History, than that his Assertion is most infallibly true. The *Independents* had reduc'd the *Presbyterians* to the same Distress, to which the *Presbyterians* had before reduc'd the Church of England. They were kick'd out of the Pulpits, out of the Army, out of their Idol House of Commons, and in short out of all Places of Power and Profit, the Darlings they had been so long fighting for; all the Advantages they had aim'd at by their Rebellion, were wrested out of their ravenous Clutches. These were Circumstances inconsistent with the Rights of the *Saints Militant*, whose Profession is not to suffer any thing for Conscience, but to fight for *Gospel Liberty*, as they term it; that is, the Liberty of enslaving all such as do not join in their *godly Cause*, of binding of Kings in Chains, and their Nobles in Fetters of Iron. What Expedient could be found to extricate themselves from those Hardships they labour'd under? None but striking in with the Loyal Party, and endeavouring to bring in the King, without whom the Nation, which had groan'd under Fanatick Oppression for several Years, could never be made happy. This was their only Refuge, and yet how

how awkwardly did they go about it? The *Scottish Presbyterians* who first took it in hand, before they would receive the King, oblig'd him to such mean Terms, that it is a Reflection on that Monarch that he did submit to them. And how much was he the better after that Condescension? They treated him in *Scotland* after his coming over, with so much Insolence, reviling him to his Face, railing at his Royal Father and Mother, discarding and abusing his true Friends, and excluding him from any Part of the Government, that rather than continue under such unsupportable Masters, instead of dutiful Subjects, he made Choice to fly into the Highlands, at all Hazards of his Life, and could scarce be prevail'd upon to return to the Army, when those pretended Loyalists were convinc'd that his Presence was their only Support, and that without him all their Projects must fall to the Ground. When they had perswaded him to join them again, their Behaviour indeed was not quite so boisterous, nor was it such as became their Pretensions. They march'd with him to *Worcester*, and there it is more than suspected, that some prime Men among them betray'd him, as you may see in all our Historians, and particularly the Lord *Clarendon*, Vol. III. p. 410. of the Octavo Edition, informs you, that when the King had not been many Hours from *Worcester*, after the Defeat there, he found about him near, if not above 4000 of his Horse, and *David Lesley* there with all his own Equipage, as if he had not fled upon the sudden. And then a little below, the same Author tells you, that Sir *William Armorer* ask'd him (*David Lesley*) which Way he thought best? Which when he had nam'd, the other (*Armorer*) said he would then go the other, for he swore he had betray'd the King and the Army all that Time;

Time, and so left him. The *English Presbyterians* all along went Hand in Hand with the *Scots*, and it may be as well said that the *Independent Army*, which was then still on foot, restor'd the King, as that the *Presbyterians* did it. For a farther Testimony of their good Meaning, do but look back upon all their Plots and Conspiracies against that King immediately after the Restoration, and throughout the whole Course of his Reign, not to insist upon their Annual Commemoration of his Father's Death at their infamous *Calves-Head Club*.

You afterwards tell us, you thought you had made a sufficient Return to what Mr. *Echard* says concerning the *Savoy Conference*, viz. That the *Presbyterians* charging Eight Things in the Common-Prayer Book as flatly sinful, and contrary to the Word of God, they either begg'd the

P. 70. Question, or fail'd in the Proof. The whole Controversy will turn upon this; if your Ministers did prove their Assertion, then the Arch-deacon is in the wrong; if they did not, all you say is but a Cavil. To say they were not call'd upon to prove it, is saying nothing, they were oblig'd to that Proof, if it had been in their Power to perform it, for the Information of so many Thousands as they saw going on in that, which they thought they could evince to be a sinful Way. By the way, I must tell you, that those Teachers of yours have done your Cause a very great Prejudice by this their Assertion. If there are Eight Things in the *Common-Prayer* plainly sinful, and contrary to the Word of God, what Colour is there for pretending that the *Presbyterians* and the *Church of England* differ only in Discipline and Matter of Form? That which is sinful, and contrary to the Word of God, cannot be reckon'd a trivial Formality;
a sinful

a sinful Form of worshipping God is an heinous Offence, and the daily Repetition of the same renders it still the more grievous. Your ardent Desire for a Comprehension betrays your want of Religion, since you can desire to be comprehended with a People whose very Worship of God you affirm is sinful. This must be a fatal Stroke to your occasional Conformists, who must thus dispense with what is sinful, and contrary to the Word of God, for a good Employment; and thus you will be found to serve two Masters, *GOD* and *MAMMON*, the first in Presence, and the latter in Reality; for Truth it self has told us that there is no serving of them both.

You cannot agree that Rigor and Severity p. 71. would have gain'd the *Presbyterians*. Whether you do agree to that or not, is not very material, as being only your Opinion; and another Man's bare Opinion the other way is of equal Authority. Yet you are satisfy'd that above double the Number have gone over from the Dissenters to the Church since the Indulgence, than ever were prevail'd with before. This is an unlucky Confession, and only proves that their Separation is grounded only on Obstinacy and Humour; if you drive them, they will not go; whereas if you let them alone, they will come of themselves. They will not be compell'd to what you say is sinful, and against the Word of God, but they will readily submit to it; for what? out of Complaisance, or else for Interest. p. 72. But after all, it appears a little strange to you, that the *Strength and Glory of the Church* should upon all Occasions be represented as depending so much upon your being brought over to it; and you are willing to think it depends much more upon making the Church's Foundations wider,

and taking away Things offensive. That appears strange to you, which is obvious to all the World; for what can a Church more glory in, than in bringing over its Adversaries? To reduce those that are gone astray, into the Bosom of the Church, is evidently its Strength and Glory, and there is nothing strange in saying it is so. Your Notion of making the Foundations wider, is no less preposterous and ridiculous; you would have the Church pull'd down, and to what purpose? but to turn out the Proprietors, and make room for its Enemies. That is like throwing down the Fences, which secure the Sheep, to let in all the Herd of wild devouring Creatures. Your Similitude from Bishop *Wilkins* is not only homely, but absurd, and as such not worth an Observation. The Church has no broad or piqued End; and the Bishop of *Durham* was not for whipping of the Church to keep it up, but rather for whipping of those who will not let it stand upon its solid Basis.

- P 73. Upon occasion of the Five Mile Act in 1665, you say there is nothing in what Mr. *Echard* advances, that whatsoever Hardships the Dissenters met with from the Laws, they arose more from the seditious Practices of some of them, than the religious Practices of any of them. To convince the World that there is something in what he says, for it is not your Business to be convinc'd, I will repeat the very Words of that Act, which tell us, that *those Men of pretended holy Orders, under Colour or Pretence of Exercise of Religion, contrary to the Laws and Statutes of this Kingdom, have settled themselves in divers Corporations in England, sometimes three or more of them in a Place, thereby taking an Opportunity to distil the poisonous Principles of Schism and Rebellion into the Hearts of his Majesty's Subjects, to the great*
Danger

Danger of the Church and Kingdom. You may talk of retorting the Reflection, and slander the then Ministry; you have here granted that an Handful of the Remains of the Old Army Officers did correspond with the *Dutch*. That Handful could not correspond for themselves alone; that Handful you talk of was too insignificant, and the *Dutch* were as well satisfy'd, as you your self are, that they corresponded in the Name of, and with the Consent and Privity of the most considerable of your Party. I cannot pass by the great Liberty you here take with the Parliament. How often have you shot your Votes of the House of Commons at Mr. Archdeacon, as if no Armour were Proof against them, and that their Authority were sacred and infallible? and yet here, where the Act touches the holy Brethren, you value neither Lords nor Commons, who must both concur in it, besides the Royal Assent, which I know you least regard; you call in question their Justice, with an, As if the corresponding of an Handful of the Remains of the old Army Officers with the *Dutch*, would justify our Parliament in passing a Law, which tended to reduce a Number of Ministers and their Families to Want and Beggary. Pray, who would you have our Parliament try'd by, to justify their Proceedings? Had Mr. *Echard* presum'd to put such Words in Print, you would not have fail'd to call loudly upon him to justify himself, and in all likelihood would, to your Power, have call'd upon the Parliament to assert its own Authority. Is there any more occasion to justify the Parliament, for enacting Laws against those they declare seditious Dissenters, than against any other publick Enemies? But it reduced a Number of Ministers and their Families to Want and Beggary. The more common Di-

sturbers it reduc'd to that Condition, the better for the Government; Take me right, I do not mean it was the better that there should be so many to reduce; but if there were, it was better that it should be out of their Power to do more Harm. You use the Name *Ministers* to give a Sanction to their Character. What Ministers were they? If not duly ordain'd by Bishops, they could be no Ministers of the Church; if *Presbyterian* Ministers, those are no better than meer Tub-preaching Laymen.

You are disturb'd that the Archdeacon should call it *seditions*, to shew a manifest Disinclination to the War against the *Dutch*; and infer, that every thing that was against *French* Counsels, must by the same Rule be so too. Your Inference is impertinent, as having no Coherence with the *Dutch* War, any farther than a malicious Insinuation; and nothing is more plain and obvious, than that to be averse to a rightful Sovereign, and his Government, may justly be call'd seditious. I am weary of repeating the same thing, yet am still oblig'd to follow you. Since you would be thought to have so great a Veneration for the House of Commons, you should not so much forget your self as at every Turn, in so Magisterial a manner, to damn the Proceedings of the Parliament, and to represent p. 74. both Houses as subservient to the Chancellor's Interest; which yet you wretchedly make out, by urging that that Session of Parliament his Credit visibly declin'd; by which it evidently appears that the Interest of the Dissenters was great, and that it was not his Interest to decry them.

Your Quotation from Bishop *Burnet* is just as incongruous and disrespectful as your own Allegation; like many more of that Author's contradictory

discreet Flights, which are not worth the Trouble of a Remark. That good Man could suit himself to Times and Places; in his Speech for occasional Conformity he tells us, *I myself was an occasional Conformist in Geneva and Holland.* In his Letters he confesses, that at *Rome* a Man of Quality took him for one of their Clergy, *because he wore the Habit of a Churchman*, that is, of those of the Church of *Rome*; and he heard a Friar as he was just under the Pulpit; This looks very like occasional Conformity there: Then as for Times, read his Conferences and former Sermons, and compare them with his later Actions and Writings.

In 1669 there was a Treaty with the Lord Keeper *Bridgman* about a Comprehension, and this Account Mr. *Echard* gives, that Sir *John* p. 75.
Baber and Dr. *Burton*, both Favourers of the Dissenters, gave them over for a Company of whiffling Fellows, and despair'd of ever bringing them to Reason. This, which you say is but a Citation, you call a home Stroke, and a branding the poor Dissenters to all Posterity, but without enquiring into the Truth of that Report. Against this you alledge, that there is very good Evidence that those Dissenters were not such unreasonable and unaccountable Men. And what is that good Evidence? nothing in the World but your bare saying, that they were at all times ready to have acquiesc'd to King *Charles II.* his Declaration for Ecclesiastical Affairs. This, I say, we have your Word for; whereas Experience has shewn, and you confess'd it above, that they were for widening, that is, for digging up the Foundations of the *Church of England*, and laying others of their own. The Court indeed had no Inclination to give them such Satisfaction; and if Severities were

were us'd towards them after the Talk of a *Comprehension*, it is no difficult Matter to judge what Ends were design'd to be serv'd thereby, as you say, which were no other than to curb those restless Spirits, which would neither lead nor drive.

You go on with your Complaints, and tell us, that Offence was taken, and not given, when the *Presbyterians* assum'd too much Liberty, and to make themselves a more formidable Body against the Church, were projecting an Union and Coalition with the *Independents*, having been formerly great Enemies to each other. Your Objection to this is, that the Archdeacon does not act according to St. Paul's Maxim, that *Charity thinketh no ill*. Had St. Paul been alive again, and seen what the united *Presbyterians* and *Independents* had acted against King Charles I. he could have thought no good of such another Union under King Charles II. The laying aside of Animosities between those two Sects, is only lulling them asleep for a while, that they may be the better able to vent their Spleen upon the Church of *England*; and when that is once remov'd out of their way, their Animosities revive, and they spit their Venom at one another.

P. 77. All that the Dissenters did, was to meet together to worship GOD according to their Consciences, and you cannot see how this could raise the *Indignation of the Churchmen*, or how this should affect the *Government*, or give any Jealousy to the Friends of it, when none were more zealous for the *legal Administration of it* than they, you mean the Dissenters. Is not the Execution of the Laws the legal Administration of the Government? Were there no Laws in force at that time against Dissenters, and illegal Conventicles? To deny either is to fly in the Face of Truth,

Truth ; and then to pretend that none were more zealous than the Dissenters for all the legal Administration, is a barefac'd Falshood. The Friends to the Government did not take Offence at the Dissenters worshipping GOD, but at the wicked Designs they always found them carrying on under Colour of that Worship, as you may see in the Words of the Act of Parliament above quoted. Nor was it any odd way, as you pretend, which they took to shew their honest Concern for the Government ; there is no sacrificing of Liberty and Property in the Execution of known Laws, so often reviv'd, and corroborated by fresh Acts of Parliament ; but whatsoever pinches an *honest Puritan*, tho' ground p. 72. on all the Laws and Authority of the Universe, immediately becomes arbitrary, illegal, and a sacrificing of Liberty and Property. Your next Plea again is a Vote of the House of Commons in favour of the Dissenters, *January 1680*, in Opposition to, and invalidating all the Acts of Parliament made against them for above an Hundred Years before.

Upon the Dissolution of the long Pensionary Parliament. Such Liberties do you allow your self of vilifying Parliaments when you please, and extolling them at your Will. I cannot but observe that the House of Lords is very little beholden to you for any Favour, whence I cannot but conclude, that you could very well dispense with their giving themselves the Trouble of sitting, as was done in the Days of your worthy Grandfather ; for the generality of your Party is well known to be as indifferently affected to Peers as they are to Kingly Government. It is a grating Reflection, you think, to say that the Dissenters, after the Dissolution of the aforesaid Parliament, exerted themselves in the Elections

ons after an extraordinary manner, having a hopeful Prospect of a new Struggle, either for a Superiority, or an equal Establishment. In return you entertain us with a long Quotation out of Mr. *How's* Case of Protestant Dissenters, which is to as much effect as if the Words had been your own. There is no doubt to be made but that a *Presbyterian* Preacher will endeavour to

p. 79. vindicate his Flock. This he does by inculcating, as a thing well known, yet which perhaps neither he nor any other knows any thing of, that, after the Dissolution, the Dissenters were much courted to be subservient to the Designs of the Court. All Men who remember King *Charles II.* are sensible how little reason he had to court those People. Yet they, good Souls, fell in with the sober Part of the Nation. Thus we see none but Fanaticks were the sober Men; that King's fast Friends, consisting of the Church of *England*, must of consequence be all mad, or worse. Those three last Parliaments of King *Charles*, two at *Westminster*, and one at *Oxford*, did generously assert the Liberties of the Nation, says Mr. *How*. There are many still alive who very well remember that King *Charles* found much Difficulty to assert his own Liberty at that time, and that at *Oxford* particularly both his Life and Liberty were in such Danger, that he was oblig'd to fly for his Safety, that City being then full of a rebellious Rabble, arm'd and prepar'd for any Mischief. After that Mr. *How* again informs us there follow'd a dreadful Storm of Persecution, that destroy'd not a small Number of Lives in Goals, and ruin'd Multitudes of Families. The prosecuting of those who had like to have murder'd the Son as well as the Father, is here call'd a dreadful Persecution. Conventicles indeed were shut up,
and

and some few headstrong, turbulent Wretches committed to Goal in a legal manner; but I believe Mr. *How* and all his Party will find it a difficult Task to make good Proof of any Persons that dy'd in Goals, or Families that were ruin'd barely for having been at Conventicles; for open Mutinies, and private Treasonable Practices, some it is certain he may find. The Matter of your glorying is well known, if we look back to the Reigns of King *Charles I.* and *II.* without forgetting Queen *Elizabeth*, and the Prospect is no less visible. The Prospect of the *Dissenters*, howsoever you think fit to disguise it, was always the same as it appear'd in the great Rebellion, viz. to crush the Church of *England*, and to sit at the Helm of Government. Since you cannot guess, I will tell you; that the Struggle you seem to be so much at a loss about, was with King *Charles I.* formerly, when they prevail'd, and with his Son afterwards, when it pleas'd GOD to disappoint them; and there is no doubt but that they expected to get the Superiority over both Church and State. The *Dissenters* then, and at all times, desir'd more than they would allow their Neighbours, when they had the Power in their own Hands. The Vote they were so well pleas'd with, they look'd upon as superior to Laws, and you are not to wonder if it did not skreen them against Acts of Parliament. p. 80.

At length you ask Mr. Archdeacon why the Meeting-Houses should be such an Offence to him? Why he should reckon it so great and so desirable a thing to triumph over them? Is not this a very weak and ignorant Question? You know Mr. *Echard* is a dignify'd Clergyman of the Church of *England*, and you would persuade the World it is strange he should desire to have p. 81.

all the *Dissenters* reduc'd into the Bosom of that Church. Your next Words are very obliging to that Church, if rightly taken; for you tell us, that had his Desire been compass'd, there would have been no Accession either to real Religion or the common Liberty. That is, in plain *English*, that should all the *Dissenters* become Church of *England* Men, true Religion would be never the better, and the common Liberty rather the worse; it must be suppos'd by your common Liberty you mean Libertinism in Religion. Your Fear, that if King *Charles's* Reign had continu'd a little longer, the whole Body of the Nation would have become both Papists and Slaves, and that the Church of *England* might have been glad of Meeting-Houses for Protestant Worship, without Molestation, is a farther Indication, after the many Instances you have before given us, of your good Inclination to slander and revile that Prince. You know it was not long after that Prince's Death, before those who adher'd to the Church of *England* in *Scotland* were actually glad of Meeting-Houses for Protestant Worship, and even those they could not enjoy without Molestation. It would have been a singular Satisfaction to you and yours to have seen the same practis'd in *England*. Yet methinks you give us a very mean Idea of your *Dissenters*, when you fear that had King *Charles's* Reign continu'd a little longer, the whole Body of the Nation would have become *Papists*; this whole Body can be meant of none but the *Dissenters*, for the Church of *England* you say would be glad of Meeting-Houses for Protestant Worship, and consequently they would not become *Papists*.

But you han't yet done carping at the History on Account of the *Dissenters*, that tells you, that
the

the Dissenters did rejoice and present Addresses to King *James*, upon his Declaration for Liberty of Conscience. This being a thing so notorious, because you cannot forbear cavilling at it, you gravely quote Dr. *Burnet*, supposing some of them only under a Temptation to receive the same with a little too much Kindness. Of what Weight is his empty Supposition to invalidate a Truth of which there are still so many Thousands of living Eye-Witnesses? for it was not a Matter of Privacy, but the Publick Act of all Dissenters throughout the Kingdom, as you may still see by the printed Addresses of that Time. If that Author has recited your Reply to this Objection at large, and without a return to it, by way of Ballance, given the Historical Account of an *opposite Author*, leaving the Reader to his own Judgment, you have little Cause to complain, and ought rather to thank him for such favourable Dealing. Your Author here cited in the Margin, is not worth bringing into this Debate.

You at no time can seem pleas'd with any thing that Mr. *Echard* says. If he tells you that the *Dissenters* were forward in addressing King *James*, you slur that off with Dr. *Burnet*, and Mr. *Tong*; if he says they made a Stand with the *London Divines* against Popery, that does not satisfy you without an Exposition. Mr. Archdeacon has oblig'd the Publick with three Volumes of the History of *England*; the next Task you would put him upon, would be to write three Volumes of Commentaries, or Expositions upon each of them; and should that be perform'd, you might still start as many Difficulties as you do at present, and to as little Purpose. Your Favours to the *Church of England* are very frequent, and here you think fit to re-

present her Members as fawning on the Dissenters in time of Danger, but after the Revolution cold and shy, willing to forget their Promises made in the time of their Distress, and still to keep the Dissenters under an *undeserved Brand*. This is no better Language than to call them *Faithless* and *Slanders*; for to forget Promises, or not to perform them, is a Breach of Faith; and to brand any undeservedly is no other than Slander. They were not inclinable to a *Comprehension*, or an *Indulgence*. If they had not consented to the latter, it is plain you could never have obtain'd it, which I believe, is a Demonstration that they perform'd more than ever they had promis'd. But you are not yet satisfy'd with what they have done in Favour of you, and it is likely you never will, should they do much more, unless they would wholly divest themselves of all they have, and put the same into your Hands, to dispose of them at your good Will and Pleasure; and what may be expected from you in such a Case, I will give you in Relation to a Toleration, in the very Words of your worthy Grandfather Mr. Edmund Calamy, taken out of his *Publick Fast Sermon on Christmas-Day*: *Take heed of that Land destroying Opinion of those that plead for an illimited Toleration; the Lord keep us from being poison'd with such an Error. This Text riseth up against it: For it will divide a Kingdom against it self; it will rend it into a Thousand Pieces: It is a Doctrine directly contrary to your late Oath and Covenant; a Doctrine that overthroweth all Church Government, bringeth in Confusion, and openeth a wide Door to all Irreligion and Atheism. For at the same Door that all false Religions come in, the true Religion will quickly get out; and if it be as good for a Man to live where nothing is lawful, as where all Things are lawful: Surely it*

is every way as comfortable to live where there are all Religions, as where there is no Religion. Chew this Sentence from one you so much Honour, as well on Account of his Principles as of his Relation, and then set up the Cry again for more Liberty.

Upon the whole, I am as ready to grant as p. 84.
you to desire it, that it becomes all, and especially those who like you call themselves Doctors of Divinity, and take upon them to preach, to do as they would be done by; whether you have follow'd this Rule, and would not think you were hardly dealt with, should you receive the Reward that is justly due to such as blame others for delivering of known Truths, and at the same Time themselves falsely slander and revile whom they please, and particularly their deceas'd right-ful Monarchs, to whose Memory they still owe a dutiful Respect, which they who treat them as you have done, are apt to forget, I leave the World to judge.

But there is yet another Thing that is so remarkable in your Performance, that it by no means should be pass'd by; and that is, your cavilling at the Characters Mr. *Echard* has given of a Variety of Persons, as you term it, of Figure and Reputation, in the Times they severally liv'd in. We shall soon see what Figure and Reputation that was. You own you are very sensible, that proper Characters of Men give p. 85.
Life, as well as add Instruction to History. The Lord *Clarendon's* Characters, you acknowledge to be none of the least beautiful Parts of his History, tho' you fancy them sometimes severe enough. It is more likely you think them so beautiful, because they are very often nothing like the Person they represent, as making a notorious Rebel a very honest Man, whereof it were very easy to give you many Instances; but this one may serve to direct you in the rest.

Speaking

Speaking of Sir *John Hotham*, that Author tells us, that “ his Affections to the Government
 “ were very good; and no Man less desir’d to
 “ see the Nation involv’d in a Civil War, than
 “ he; and when he accepted this Employment
 “ (*of Governour of Hull*) from the Parliament, he
 “ never imagin’d it would engage him in Re-
 “ bellion; but believ’d that the King would
 “ find it necessary to comply with the Advice
 “ of the two Houses; and that the preserving
 “ that Magazine from being possess’d by him,
 “ would likewise prevent any possible Rupture
 “ into Arms. Let any Mortal now reconcile
 this fine Character with the Actions of the Man,
 by which alone we can guess at his Intentions,
 unless you would have that Lord to be very
 privy to the Secrets of Men’s Hearts, and them
 to play the Rebels out of meer Loyalty. *Hotham*
 accepts of a Government from those who had
 no Right to dispose of it, to deprive the King
 of his own Magazine, whose in Right it was,
 and this with a good Design to prevent a Civil
 War, by disabling his Sovereign to defend him-
 self against an open Rebellion. This is taking
 away the Weapons a Man has in his House to
 defend it from Robbers, in order to prevent the
 robbing of the House, or to oblige the Owner
 to deliver up his Goods tamely, that the Rob-
 bers may meet with no Opposition. Every
 Action of this Man is so diametrically opposite
 to his Character, that it is amazing that so great
 a Man could be guilty of leaving it under his
 Hand to be publish’d to the World. Now to
 corroborate what has been said against this Cha-
 racter. *Hotham* himself, solemnly at his Death,
 confirm’d his adhering to the Rebellion, and
 deny’d the Imputation lay’d on him, of having
 any Loyal Intention towards his King. In his
 Speech

Speech on the Scaffold, he begs Pardon of God for his Sins, naming many, and expresses some Penitence, but not one Word of his Rebellion. *Hugh Peters*, that bloody Incendiary, was his spiritual Guide, and accordingly he made his End. These are the Characters you like, you know there are more of them in the same History; therefore you are far from thinking that *Mr. Echard* is herein equally happy, because he does not make his Characters the very reverse of the Actions of those he characterizes.

As to the great Men of the *Scotish* Nation, you say it is a very rare thing for the Archdeacon to have a good Word for any of 'em. He gives an ill Character of the Duke of *Hamilton*, whom he stiles *unfaithful*; if you do not like this Word, see the *Lord Clarendon's* History, Vol. III. p. 459. Octavo Edit. where the King is inform'd that he had always betray'd him, and therefore his Majesty's Friends would not venture upon any thing for his Service, if communicated to that Duke. Besides, the same Author p. 409. says, *Disimulation* was his Masterpiece. That the *Earl of Traquair* was accounted by *Sir Philip Warwick*, a *versatile Man*, and by others worse, is not his Fault who barely relates what he finds, and does not invent. The *Earl of Rothes*, you tell us, is represented as one of the first and most active Instruments in the Troubles and Commotions; that you may not find Fault with this Expression, the *Lord Clarendon*, Vol. III. p. 189, informs us, that the said Lord was one of the *Scotish* Commissioners to treat with the King at *London*, just after the Treaty of *Rippon*, which shows him to have been one of the first; and Page 190, he adds, The *Earl of Rothes* had been the chief Architect of that whole Machine, which was no other than the carrying on of those Troubles

Troubles and Commotions; as for his End quoted from Archbishop *Laud*, it is a bare Citation, and it does not appear that you have any thing to invalidate the same. The Marquis of *Argyle*, Mr. Archdeacon says, was thought to have the Blood of several lying heavy upon his Head. Do you run through all the Histories of those Times, and consider the Behaviour of that Marquis, and then laying aside, if it be possible, your violent Prepossession in Favour of Rebellion, tell us whether so great a Promoter of the same had not much Blood to answer for. But you cannot recollect so much as one Nobleman or Gentleman from the North, except the Marquis of *Montross*, that Mr. *Echard* has a good Word for. It had been here proper for you to have put him in mind of some that deserv'd it; but you are not so much concern'd for the Defects you imagine in their Characters, as for the good one he bestows on that renowned Marquis, whose Memory will be immortal, for the signal Loyalty which renders him the Object of the Aversion of

p. 86. all your Party, which so audaciously murder'd that Miracle of his Country, and of the Age he liv'd in. You will now leave the *Scots* to make a Reply for their own Countrymen, if they find any just Exceptions: I do not question but they will do it much more to the Purpose than any thing you have hitherto said.

However, it is plain, you say, that the Archdeacon is very free with the Characters of many *English*, as well as *Scotish* Men. He seems to you to bear a little too hard upon Archbishop *Abbot*; yet you only tell us your Opinion is so, without showing any Reason for it, and all you have to add is only by way of Recrimination, to slander his Successor Archbishop *Laud* with invading of Liberty and Property. This is a foul Practice,

to find Fault with an Author for bearing a little too hard, as you term it, on a Prelate, who, most Writers tell us very well deserv'd it, and at the same Time in meer Spight to revile another against whom none but Fanaticks ever had any Objection. Read the wretched Account the Lord *Clarendon* gives of Archbishop *Abbot*, and you will find that Mr. *Echard* has been but too favourable to him. Among many other Particulars that Lord gives of him, this is very remarkable, viz. that he consider'd *Christian Religion* no otherwise than as it abhorr'd and revil'd *Popery*, and valu'd those Men most, who did that the most furiously. An excellent Bishop to be defended by any Man.

The Reflections on the Family of the famous *John Hambden Esq*; that great Man with you are unaccountable. You lay hold on every thing that you think may fall heavy upon the Archdeacon, your Zeal is therefore kindled to draw the Vengeance of that Family upon him; but nothing so much inflames that Zeal, as the calling a Rebel by that Name. The Lord *Clarendon* you own declares your famous *John Hambden Esq*; was violently carry'd by his Fate to pay the Mulct by his Death, in the very Place where a Year before he had committed his Transgression, in executing the Ordinance of the *Militia*, and engaging the County in Rebellion. This your admir'd Hero, that great and famous Man! all Men who have read the History of that Time, are sensible for what he was great and famous. But Mr. *Echard* has quoted *Sanderfon's History*, to tell us, that one of that great and famous Man's Sons was a Cripple, and the other somewhat like a Lunatick, which Dr. *Heylin* flatly p. 87: denies, and positively affirms that those Children were of an exact and comely Stature, and
I
had

- had all the Abilities, Wit, and Judgment, with which their Father was endu'd. This the Arch-deacon has omitted, and this is a most heinous Crime in your Opinion. He who writes three such Volumes of History, and can be charg'd with only one single Oversight, as this is, will with all Men who are not hurry'd away by Spleen and Malice, pass for a good and faithful Historian; and in your whole Pamphlet, except this Oversight, if I may be permitted to call it by that Name, without knowing what the Author may have to alledge in his own Defence, you have not made one single Remark or Objection that has any thing of Weight or Solidity.
- p. 88. One of those two Sons you inform us has since made a considerable Figure in the World, with much more of your Flourish. I desire that in your next Edition, for the Satisfaction of the Publick, you will acquaint us with the true Manner and Circumstances of that same Son's Death, who made that considerable Figure. To enter into the Discussion of God's Judgments, is not becoming any Christians; but it is a Remark very frequent in most Authors, to assign signal Punishments as the Consequences of enormous Crimes.
- p. 89. You seem very inclinable to ascribe the declining of some Loyal Families to their having espous'd the King's Party, and it is very likely you spare bringing down that as a Judgment upon them for their Fidelity to their Sovereign, only because you have condemn'd that Application towards your own Party. What you tell us of the Grandson of the same Gentleman, is nothing to the Matter in Hand, and perhaps only thrust into this Place to gain his Favour, and endeavour to make him an Enemy to him you have chosen for your Adversary.
- p. 90. As you have taken upon you to be the Advocate

Advocate to that Family, you ought to have declar'd whether you acted by Commission, or *motu proprio*, that the Expectations of the Branches of it you mention might be the better answer'd, and your Reward for the Service assign'd you.

And what a Character does Mr. *Echard* give of the great and good Lord *Russel*, of whom your eminent Person (you should have made no Secret of so eminent a Name in so eminent a Cause) said, *That an Age would not repair the Loss to the Nation*. Unhappy Nation! to sustain a Loss not to be repair'd in an Age. And what was this irreparable Loss? A Man that did not know it, would be apt to guess it had been some dreadful Pestilence, which had swept away Nine Parts in Ten of the Inhabitants of this Island; or that the greater Part of it had been swallow'd up by the Sea; or that an unparallel'd Mortality had destroy'd all the Cattel; or in short, that universal Earthquakes had totally overturn'd all the Structures, as well sacred as profane. A Loss not to be repair'd to the Nation in an Age, could be nothing less than such an unusual Calamity. The Plague in 1665 rag'd so violently as to carry off 14000 Inhabitants in the City of *London* in one Week, and yet in a few Years the City was fuller of Inhabitants than ever it had been. The very next Year a dreadful Conflagration consum'd the best Part of the same City, and yet in a short Time the whole was rebuilt more beautiful than it had been before. Yet this irreparable Loss was none of those publick and universal Calamities; no, it was the Executing of one of Dr. *Calamy's* Friends, one single private Man, convicted of High Treason upon the fullest Evidence, and try'd by a Jury of Men of known Reputation and Probity. But the

Preamble of the Patent, by which that Lord's Father was created a Duke, speaks many fine things of him. It is scarce to be imagin'd, that such a Preamble shall vacate all the Testimonies brought against that Lord, as to the Case of Treason, as well at his Trial, as before and after, and those which have been before mention'd from his own Paper deliver'd at the Place of Execution. Whatsoever your Opinion may be, it is certain that a very considerable Part of this Nation is fully convinc'd of the Fairness of that Trial. You will scarce allow all Preambles to Patents to be infallible, for there have been several publish'd within less than a Dozen Years, which if you were to mention, you would certainly revile with your usual Tartness. But that *excellent Person*, as you call him, is represented as one that *can hardly be clear'd from thirsting after the Blood of others, especially the Lord Stafford's*. You are heartily sorry, you pretend, there is such a Passage to be found in the History, and are afraid that the Author will this way become a greater Sufferer than he. You are on a sudden fallen into a most violent Transport of Love: you have been at the Trouble of raking together all the Materials you could any way distort, to make a large Pamphlet to destroy the Reputation of that History, and yet now you are heartily sorry that you have found a Passage in it, that you take so much occasion to carp at. You have industriously drawn up all your Remarks, so as to create the Author as many Enemies as possible, and now you are under great Apprehensions that he may prove a Sufferer. Next you bring the Words of that Lord's Paper,

91. which you call his Legacy to the World, and indeed a very wretched one with regard to himself; the Words are these, *I thank God, Falshood*
and

and Cruelty were never in my Nature, but always the farthest from it imaginable. Hence you infer that Mr. Echard represents him as dying with a Lie in his Mouth. The Sincerity of that Paper has been spoken to before, and therefore it will be needless to say more here than what is directly to this Point. The hardest Task a Man has to undertake, is to know himself; his Partiality is such, that it is rare for him to be sensible of his own Failings; for we are naturally prone to overlook that in our selves, which appears heinous in another. It is almost impossible to convince a covetous Man that he is so; and so a false, a cruel, a proud Man, or any other. The most avaricious Wretch looks upon himself as only provident and frugal. The faithless Villain fancies he is only more cunning than others. The haughty imperious Lordling conceits he is extreamly courtly and complaisant. The most bloody Mortal deceives himself with the Imagination, that the destroying of his Enemies, or those he hates, tho' he knows not why, is Justice. Thus Men may thirst after Blood, and at the same time entertain no such Notion of themselves. Your Defence of that Lord, and of Sheriff Cornish in the same Case, makes nothing for them, unless you will infer, that Beheading being a way to shed all the Blood, they were very merciful in insisting that he should be Hang'd, by which way of Death no Blood is shed; but then you should reflect, that according to the Sentence in Cases of Treason, the Lord *Stafford* was to have been quarter'd as well as hang'd, and there the bloody Part comes in again. But the Lord *Russel* and *Cornish*, thinking the Lord *Stafford* guilty of the Treason, concluded it was fitting he should be Executed, for deterring of others; and there

p. 93.
was

was some Debate about the Manner of the Execution, but no Cruelty or thirsting after Blood. How kindly you here soften so great an Insult upon the King's Prerogative, as the calling in question his Power of changing the Sentence, and only altering the Manner of the Death ! A thing none ever before had the Face to contend about. If it was not Cruelty, what will you call the Motion of that you so mildly term some Debate ? How many Insults must King *Charles* have suffer'd, had he propos'd to pardon the Lord *Stafford* ; because the Lord *Russel* and *Cornish* thought he ought to die ? Do you think the Clamour for his Blood would not have been much greater, if there had been any Design to save it, when so much Noise was made about the Manner of his Death ? They who disputed it, could not express greater Cruelty, than to oppose his being Executed, as had been ever us'd towards Peers ; and yet observe, that same Lord *Russel* afterwards, tho' no Peer, su'd for the same Favour of beheading, to which he had no Claim, and easily obtain'd it. Never Man made a more preposterous Inference than you do from Mr. *Echard's* Words : That the Court was under some Necessity of bringing the Lord *Russel* to Destruction ; by which you most absurdly conclude, that he charges Cruelty and thirsting after Blood home upon the Court. Your Malice against King *Charles* and his Court is so outrageous, that it carries you quite beside your Reason. This is a very scandalous Assertion from one who calls himself Doctor of Divinity ; a School-Boy would be ashamed of it. No Man beside your self could be guilty of such a Blunder. A Prince or Government find themselves in Danger from a factious Party, they judge it necessary for their own Safety to Execute

pute some of the Ringleaders, lawfully convicted; and the mentioning of this in an History you impute to the Author, as charging that Prince or Government with Cruelty, and thirsting after Blood. The Archdeacon never told you that the Court was under a Necessity of bringing any Man to Destruction for his Worth and Probity; that is your own wicked Insinuation; the Necessity he urges proceeded from the Crime for which he stood convicted. That Historian will have very little occasion to revise his Work on account of such wretched Remarks.

Among others whom you have undertaken to p. 94.
patronize in the Course of your Pamphlet, I must not omit Sir *George Treby*, of whose Merits you make a short Enumeration, after your manner. This Particular does not deserve much scanning; all the Matter is, that the History tells us he swore when he said, *Fitzharris* was a Rogue; to this latter part you seem to assent, but as for the Oath you will not believe it. Whether he did swear or not, is a Point not worth the discussing; and if it were, it is likely that as many would acquiesce in Mr. *Echard's* Relation as in your Negative, especially upon such Proofs as you bring for a Negative, viz. that his Family say, he did not use any Oaths in Discourse; when it is so frequent for many who do not use them in common Discourse, to forget themselves in a Passion, and let fall such Words as they do not use at other times. Your Story of a Friend of yours, and a Gentleman of the long Robe, in a Bookseller's Shop, where the latter said the History was a vile Book, is of so little Value, that p. 95.
it scarce deserves to be mention'd. In the first place we have only your Word for it, your Friend and the Gentleman being unknown; and supposing the whole to be Fact, all that we can
thence

thence infer is, that your said Friend, and the said Gentleman, are of your own Party, and whether they read, or do not read, are resolv'd to contribute all their Endeavours towards the damning that Book ; which you will find will all prove in vain ; and therefore Mr. *Echard* will in all Probability have no occasion to make use of your Advertisements, being sensible who they are that thus endeavour to expose him.

You are also surpriz'd that he should represent Sir *Edmund-Bury-Godfrey* as a *Favourer*, rather than a *Prosecutor of the Papists* ; and that Account of him you find given by none but himself and *L'Estrange*. You will allow that he might do them Offices of Humanity, but to expose himself for them, you find contradicted by all that
 P. 96. knew him. *L'Estrange's* Credit you fancy will go but a very little way ; depend upon it, his Credit will survive, and his Name be honour'd, when you will have no Credit left, and your Name will only be remember'd with Scorn. If Sir *Edmund's* Reputation is murder'd, it must be by you, who go about to rob him of that Christian charitable Temper, which those Authors attribute to him, and which he is still known to have practis'd, notwithstanding your contrary Assertion. They do not pretend to inculcate that he was a Favourer of that Religion, but that being acquainted with many that profess'd it, and himself in the Commission for the Peace, he had Bowels of Compassion for them, and would assist them in their Distress, especially when he was sensible that it was meerly on Account of Religion ; and therefore was averse to have Priests hang'd, barely as Priests, or that they, or any of their Religion, should starve in Goals, or be turn'd out of their Houses, to perish in the Streets, on no other Account. If
 then

then his Charity extended so far as to hazard any thing for them, you who are so zealous an Advocate for Liberty to all Sectaries, and even Atheists, have no reason to look upon it as a Reproach cast upon him, that he was merciful to those who suffer'd only for Conscience. Your Quotation from Bishop *Lloyd* is as impertinent as many others you have brought before; his Detestation of that Religion did not hinder the extending of his Charity to the Professors of it; that is all the Sermon imports.

You must be allow'd to be surpriz'd at such Reflections as these; that is, you will be surpriz'd at Fantoms of your own making; for the last above, if there be any Reflection, is no other than your wresting of the Meaning of the History. But Mr. *Echard* goes yet farther, and reflects upon whole Bodies of Men, and condemns them by the Lump. Let us pass by your curious Flourishes in relation to Characters of Nations or Societies of Men, to come to the Body you think unjustly reflected on, the *Assembly of Divines*, who met at *Westminster*, and with whom, according to your usual Practice, you slyly insinuate that the Archdeacon makes more free, because they went under the Denomination of *Divines*. You seem to allow, that those Persons were different in their Principles and Notions, as well as their Improvements and Abilities; an excellent Character! A Confusion of Principles and Notions brought together to settle Religion! However, you dare offer them to be compar'd with any Convocation either before or after the Restoration. No Man questions your Affection to Convocations; and all that have heard of you will easily conclude, that in your Opinion any Gathering of Sectaries is much

K

pre-

preferable to the best Convocation of Church of *England* Divines.

p 98. As for King *Charles's* Proclamation, charging the greater Part of them with having no Learning or Reputation, you make no Account of that; and the Lord *Clarendon's* Testimony, that some of them were infamous in their Lives and Conversations, and most of them of very mean Parts in Learning, if not of scandalous Ignorance, and of no other Reputation than of Malice to the Church of *England*; this Testimony, I say, must pass, in your Opinion, for downright Calumny. Thus your Authority must weigh down all the World; your Sovereign then living, and that celebrated Writer, who doubtless knew many of those Persons, are trifling Evidences with you; and all Mankind, you imagine, must submit to your Magisterial Contradiction. Nor do you pay any more Deference to your otherwise beloved Mr. *Whitlock*, telling
p. 99. you, that the learned Mr. *Selden* baffled those Pretenders to Divinity, and expos'd their Ignorance. All you have to say to this is, that Mr. *Whitlock* and Mr. *Selden* had no very profound Respect for Divines, with this Recrimination, that the latter also upbraided the Hierarchical Ministers with *Ignorance* and *Laziness*, &c. all which is not the least Vindication of those Sectaries. Your Reflections on the Character either of *Whitlock* or *Selden* will gain you no Reputation; the former was one of your own Brethren, the latter is too far above your Reach.

But the Archdeacon has given such Characters of a good Number of the Members of that Assembly, as shews, that notwithstanding all the Authorities above mention'd, he look'd upon them

them neither as infamous nor ignorant. All the *English* of this is, that he excepts from that Imputation such as he did not reckon to be comprehended in it, which is the best thing you could say of him. p. 100.

Thus Mr. *Echard*, you own, has given such Characters of Thirteen of them, as clear them from scandalous Ignorance; and the Divines that met in that Assembly were not full out an Hundred in all. If there were Thirteen tolerable or learned in near an Hundred, that does not confront and confute, as you pretend, the general Censures given by King *Charles*, and the rest above mentioned; for so great a Majority of ignorant or scandalous Persons might very well give an ill Character to the Assembly, notwithstanding your alledging that twice Thirteen more might have been added to the former Thirteen; for as to that we have only your Word, which few will allow to be infallible. However, from hence you infer, that the Historian should either have omitted the Character of those few he excepts, or the general Censures of the others; wherein you certainly err as much as in all other Points; for it is the greatest Proof of his Sincerity and Impartiality in this Particular, to inform the Publick, that tho' so great a Majority of scandalous or ignorant Persons had given a general ill Character to the Assembly, yet he took care to exempt those few that deserv'd better, from being involv'd in the Reproach. p. 102.

But there are some of them upon whom he reflects particularly, and that with Warmth and Keeness enough; and here you shall also follow him, as I shall you.

And I shall begin with your honour'd Grandfather, who, Mr. *Echard* says, was so much an Incendiary, and a Promoter of the Grand Rebellion, that his Actions cannot be vindicated, but only palliated under the venerable Name of an House of Commons. Here you very gravely ask the Question, Why, what is the Matter? and tell us he was no Chaplain in the Army, with some other as frivolous Remarks on him, as if Mankind were wholly ignorant of Old Mr. *Edmund Calamy's* Life and Conversation. Enough has been said before to convince all honest Men that he very well deserves all that Mr. *Echard* has said of him, it will be needless to repeat any Part thereof; but for a farther Confirmation of the same, you and your Friends may accept of what follows, from an Author you will not like, because he does not cry up your Brethren, yet well approv'd, and of Reputation among others, the famous Oxford Historian, *Anthony Wood*, in his *Fasti Oxonienses*, Vol. I. Col. 898. His Words are these:

“ After he (*Edmund Calamy*) had left that University (*Oxford*) he became a Preacher in St. Edmund's-Bury in Suffolk, where, as a certain anonymous Author observes, he comply'd with Bishop Wren, the Diocesan, preach'd frequently in his Surplice and Hood, read Prayers at the Rails, bowed at the Name of JESUS, and undertook to satisfy and reduce such as scrupled at those Ceremonies. Thus the said nameless Author; yet *Calamy* himself saith, that while he continued there, he never bowed to, or towards the Altar, never read the Book of Sports, never read Prayers at the High Altar, and that he preach'd against Innovations, &c. But so it was, let him say what he will, that after he had

“ con-

“ continued 10 Years at that Place, and had
 “ comply’d, as is before mention’d, *Robert the*
 “ Puritanical Earl of *Warwick* usually said, *He*
 “ *would be lost, if he were not taken off,* and so
 “ removed him to *Rockford* in *Essex*; where con-
 “ tinuing till the Long Parliament began, in
 “ *November 1640,* he remov’d thence to *London,*
 “ and became Minister of *St. Mary Alderman-*
 “ *bury.* About which Time the Presbyterians
 “ growing dominant, he became a great Evan-
 “ gelist of the new Way, ENCOURAG’D THE
 “ PEOPLE TO REBELLION, was one of those that
 “ join’d in making *Smectymnus*, which was the
 “ first deadly Blow in *England* given to Episco-
 “ pacy (as divers thought) that had happen’d
 “ for many Years before. His House also in
 “ that Parish, was a Receptacle then for all
 “ Presbyterian Ministers, and there was the
 “ Remonstrance fram’d against the Prelates, and
 “ all or most Things hatch’d to carry on *the blef-*
 “ *sed and beloved Cause.* At that Time he was a
 “ frequent Preacher before the Members of the
 “ Long Parliament, and he was the first that
 “ did openly defend before a Committee of
 “ Parliament, that our Bishops were not only
 “ not an Order distinct from Presbyters, but
 “ that in Scripture a Bishop and a Presbyter
 “ were all one. Afterwards he was made one of
 “ the *Assembly of Divines*, took the Covenant,
 “ to which he closely stuck ever after, and was
 “ not wanting on all Occasions to carry on the
 “ Cause, whereby he gained to himself not only
 “ a Name and Repute among the Brethren, but
 “ also Wealth, which was the chief Thing he
 “ looked after. The same Author, Vol. II. p.
 “ 235, informs us, that upon the Approach of
 “ the troublesome Times, *Cornelius Burges,*
 “ *Stephen*

“ *Stephen Marshal, Edmund Calamy, Calybute*
 “ *Downing, &c.* did first whisper in their Con-
 “ *venticles, then openly preach, that for the*
 “ *Cause of Religion it was lawful for the Subjects*
 “ *to take up Arms against their lawful Sovereign.*
 So much from *Wood*. As to his Behaviour after-
 wards, the *Lord Clarendon, Vol. III. p. 770*, of
 the *Octavo Edit.* says, that *Calamy*, and the rest
 of the *Presbyterian Ministers*, going over into
Holland, with the *Parliament Commissioners* just
 before the *Restoration*, after having been graci-
 ously receiv'd by *King Charles II.* they had the
 face among other Things to tell him, *that they*
had always, according to the Obligation of the Cove-
nant, wish'd his Majesty very well. Observe the
Loyalty of these Men, who could so far presume
 to insult that Prince, as to urge their cursed
Covenant, which had been the *Ruin* of his Fa-
 ther and of himself. Nor was this all; the same
 Author shows, how they took upon them to pre-
 scribe Rules to him for his own Chapel, desiring
 that neither the *Book of Common-Prayer*, nor
Surplices might be us'd therein, to express their
Affection towards the *Church of England*. *Heath*
 also, in his *Chronicle p. 858.* of the *Octavo*
Edit. says, that *Mr. Calamy* late *Pastor of Al-*
dermanbury, did on the 28th of *December 1662*,
 notwithstanding the *Inhibition to Nonconform-*
ing Ministers to preach and exercise their Mi-
 nistry, go into the *Pulpit* of that Church and
 preach, and by his *Text*, and *Sermon*, and *In-*
ferences, did reflect hardly and strangely upon
 the *State* of the Church, and beyond his *Last*,
 if he had been capacitated to preach; for which
Transgression and *Contempt*, he was by the
Lord Mayor committed to *Newgate*, where
 many Persons came to visit him to his no little

Ad-

Advantage. I have been the more tedious here for the Sake of your honoured Grandfather, who you say preach'd but three Sermons that you p. 103. can find, before the Commons, tho' *Wood*, above quoted, mentions Seven, where you may find them; there being little or no Occasion here to take Notice of your Defence of them, when so much has been shown in this Place and elsewhere of the Man. You will only have it suppos'd that p. 104. he lanch'd out farther than could be strictly justified, and only vindicate him by alledging that others did worse, which you can hardly make out. To preach in favour of the Restoration, when he was sensible all the Nation had resolv'd p. 105. upon it, is a poor Justification of him, if we consider how he behav'd himself before and after. Nor is his being made King *Charles's* Chaplain any more to the Purpose; look but into the Tryals of the Regicides, and you will find that *Hurrison*, one of that bloody Crew, objected, that *divers of those that sate upon the Bench, were formerly as active*; he was not permitted to proceed, but the Meaning of it was, that he was try'd by some who were as much Rebels as himself; which, it must be confess'd, was a most unaccountable Management in the then Lord Chancellor, and the rest of those concerned in appointing such Judges, when at the same time, the ever renowned Judge *Jenkins*, who had suffer'd so much for his heroick Loyalty, was unregarded, and oblig'd to retire into his own Country to live upon his small Estate, when he had been the properest Person to have grac'd that Bench. You conclude that this your Grandfather was more remarkable for nothing than for Peace and Moderation; Let the World judge how suitable that is to what has been said,
and

and to his known promoting of Rebellion, and encouraging the Citizens to contribute towards carrying on a War against their Sovereign, and all that Effusion of Blood which afterwards ensued.

Mr. *Stephen Marshal* was another Member of the Assembly, whom you pretend to justify, and perhaps a ranker Traytor's Cause you could not have espous'd. You find Fault that the Arch-deacon writes, that (jointly with Dr. *Downing*) he publickly maintain'd, That the Soldiers taken Prisoners at *Brentford*, and discharg'd by the King, upon their Oaths that they would never more bear Arms against him, were not oblig'd by that Oath, but that he boldly absolv'd them. Had this been true, you say, it could not but have been publickly known, and that he could not have kept up his Reputation, when he never had any other than that of a Rebel. You know
p. 106. not where Mr. *Echard* pick'd it up, and therefore you will question the Truth of it, till you see it attested. For your better Information, and to convince you, if you will believe any thing, look into the Second Volume of the Lord *Clarendon's* History, p. 81, of the Octavo Edition, where you will find that Assertion in almost the very same Words, with this Addition, that *so he engag'd again those miserable Wretches in a second Rebellion*. And then as for his departing the World mad and raving; this you look upon as a Mistake, because you do not find it in his Life, written by his Son in Law *W*——; yet you own, that Author says, that some report, that like *Henderson*, he dy'd full of Horror and Despair. Methinks Horror and Despair imply something of Mad and Raving, for Despair at the Hour of Death, is it self an hellish
Madness,

Madness, and such as will make any Man rave. Neither do the following Words, *viz.* They that speak most sparingly of him, say, he had not that Assurance of his Salvation, that he expected to have had at his Death. This, with such Predestinarians, and presumptuous Saints, who always pretend to be assur'd of their Election, is no other than a softer Way of expressing his Despair. But Mr. *Echard* freely represents him as *one of the Trumpets of the Times*, and what do you offer in his Vindication; why, his Defence of the Side he took in our Civil Broils. This is rather exposing your self, than defending of him; it is a Demonstration of your being a Champion for Rebellion, to offer a Traitor's Defence of Rebels as an Apology for him. The Lord *Clarendon*, Vol. I. p. 204, Octavo Edition, shows you how he knavishly trick'd the most harmless of his own Party into Rebellion, by procuring them to sign a Petition that had something of Modesty in it, and then cutting that off, and annexing another of a more villainous Nature to the long List of Names. And again, Vol. II. p. 583. the same Author tells you, that *Marshal* was chief Chaplain in the Army, that is, of the Rebels. Now for your fuller Satisfaction, hear what he trumpets himself to the Commons, February 23, 1641, p. 9. his own Words are these, *He is a cursed Man that withholds his Hand from shedding of Blood, or that shall do it fraudulently; that is, if he do it as Saul did against the Amalekites, kill some, and save some. If he go not through with the Work, he is a cursed Man, when this is to be done upon Moab, the Enemy of God's Church.* And again, p. 11, 12. *What Soldier's Heart would not start, deliberately to come into a subdu'd City, and take the little ones*

L

upon

upon the Spears Point : To take them by the Heels; and beat out their Brains against the Wall. What Inhumanity and Barbarousness would this be thought? Yet if this Work be to revenge God's Church against Babylon, he is a blessed Man that takes and dashes the little ones against the Stones. I could afford you much more, but let this suffice, and tell me whether Hell could have spewed out from its deepest Recesses, a more vile and abominable Trumpeter.

But there is one Member of the Assembly yet behind, that is Dr. Cornelius Burges, whom the Archdeacon calls, a scandalous Doctor of Divinity of the Puritan Party; That he was the Ringleader of the Rabble, that appear'd tumultuously against the Lord Strafford, and became famous in these sort of Exploits, and was wont to cry out and brag, these are my Bandogs, I can set them on, and take them off as I please. This you grant to be very unbecoming his Function. It will be needless to insert what you add out of the same History concerning this Man, since you grant the whole Charge, and have nothing to say in this Case, but that there were *Bouteferens* on the other Side, that have been vindicated and applauded. Those you are pleased to bestow that Title on, we in our next Page find to be such as were zealous for the Church of England, and loyal to their King. You have before in a foul and audacious manner, taken the Liberty to bespatter the Memory of your deceas'd Sovereigns King Charles the First and the Second; you now no less impudently proceed to stigmatize the two greatest Men of the former of those Reigns, who sell Sacrifices to the Rage of your Sectarian Party, by insinuating that the other Side may as well interpret the

the Judgments of God to have fallen on Archbishop *Laud*, and the Lord *Strafford*, as the Archdeacon seems to believe them to have fallen on some of the most virulent Traitors. You thus declare your self a common Advocate for Rebellion, since no Man of other Principles can imagine that Judgments should fall upon a Prelate for his Zeal to support his Church, or on a great Minister for being faithful to his Prince. The Impartiality you would have Mr. *Echard* observe in his History, is, that he should revile and slander his lawful Sovereigns, and all that faithfully adher'd to them, even to the Loss of their Lives, and that he should magnify and extol all those inhuman Wretches who destroy'd them. You therefore accordingly, that you may p. 110. do a little Justice to the Memory of Dr. *Burges*, give your self the Trouble to transcribe what you find concerning him in a Manuscript History of the Assembly, which you have in your Hands; but which no Man besides your self knows any thing of, and it might be as well written by you, for any thing that appears to the contrary, as by Dr. *Sampson*. Yet by whomsoever it was writ, it invalidates nothing of what the Archdeacon has said concerning *Burges*. I shall not therefore trouble the Reader with that Quotation, as being of no Authority; yet p. 111. since I find *Ant. a Wood* referr'd to in it, I will in lieu of that insert something of what he says concerning this *Burges*, Vol. II. Col. 235. He there tells us, he was so sorry a Disputant, and so sufficiently ignorant in the Terms of Logick, that instead of saying *negatur major*, or *negatur minor*, he could say nothing else but *negatur id*. At that time, and several Years after, he shew'd himself a zealous Man for the Church of Eng-

land—but having not that Preferment conferr'd upon him which he expected—he became a scandalous and schismatical Lecturer, using many Expressions in his Sermons that mov'd People to Sedition; for which also being question'd, he became incens'd against the Bishops, and afterwards very busy to pick Holes in the Coats of his Brethren, and rake up the very Ashes of the Dead to discover their Corruptions. Upon the approach of the troublesome Times, in 1640. he with *Stephen Marſhal, Edmund Calamy, Caly-bute Downing, &c.* did first wisper in their Conventicles, then openly preach, that for the Cause of Religion it was lawful for the Subjects to take up Arms against their Sovereign. Which Doctrines being also follow'd by the rest of the Elders, the People of *London* did violently rush into Rebellion, &c. especially if *Burges* did but hold up his Finger to his *Myrmidons*—'Twas usual with him and *Venn* to lead up the Tumults of the City to the Parliament Doors, to see that the godly Party in the House might not be outvoted (*here follows what has been above mentioned out of Mr. Echard's History of his leading on, &c. his Bandogs,*) and then *Ant. a Wood* goes on. So that being the Ringleader of the Rout, and the only Scandal to his Profession in all *London*, was thought fit by that blessed Parliament to be one of those godly Divines that were to hold forth before them, &c. *Essex* the General, finding him a zealous Instrument to carry on the Cause, made him Chaplain to the Regiment of Horse which was next under him.—The Doctor us'd to ride among the *Militia* of *London*, with his Case of Pistols, was call'd Colonel, and show'd himself very officious to assist plundering at the *Globe Tavern* in *Holborn*. He purchas'd

Bishops

Bishops Lands, which he had call'd Sacrilege before, and afterwards writ to vindicate the same. For the rest of this worthy Doctor's Actions we must refer to the aforesaid Author, being too long for this Place; but by what has been said it may sufficiently appear how well he deserves to have such a worthy Champion as your self. Dr. *Sparrow*, afterwards Bishop of *Exon* and *Norwich*, is very little beholden to you or Dr. *Sampson* for matching him with so infamous a mobbing Rebel.

And thus you have done with the Members of the Assembly at *Westminster*, and now pass to those Ministers that were ejected in 1662, of some of whom Mr. *Echard* has given favourable Characters, which is an Instance of his Impartiality; but you are of Opinion that a great many others deserv'd the like; wherein others may differ from you; but then he bears hard upon others; we shall see whether he had not Cause enough. P. 112.

You have nothing to object against his Account of the Representation presented in 1659 to the Rump Parliament by 38 Ministers of the County of *Leicester*, disclaiming all Concern in the Endeavours us'd to promote the Restoration, but that you have not had the Opportunity of enquiring into the Truth of it. If you know nothing to the contrary, you might as well have pass'd it over; for your recriminating upon such of the Episcopal Clergy as took the *Engagement*, is no Vindication of those Sectaries; and all that can be inferr'd is, that the former repented of the Sin they had committed, whereas the latter went on impenitent to their Graves.

But in particular the Archdeacon reflects upon Mr. *Baxter*, and speaks with Contempt of his
reform'd

- reform'd Liturgy*, which you question whether he has read; and then assure him, that some do judge it incomparably better than that which is establish'd by Law. The Church, and all its learned Members, were, and still are, of another Opinion; and you would have the Case decided
- P. 113. by a few of their declar'd Enemies. All that relates to him as to the *Savoy Conference*, terminates in your denying the Account Mr. *Echard* gives of the same, with only this difference, that
- P. 114. you confess he has another Author to back him, whom you do not like. Mr. Archdeacon owns *Baxter* to have been a Man of Parts, to which you would have him add, *eminent Piety too*, and tell us, that *he was one that GOD own'd eminently in his Work, and made use of to preach Piety in a degenerate Age*. If this Assertion be not blasphemous, it comes very near it; a vile Promoter of Rebellion, and all the fatal Consequences of that horrid Sin, is here set out as eminent for Piety, and own'd by God in his Work. The Work of GOD is Peace, meek Suffering, and Submission to our lawful Sovereigns; and the Work *Baxter* was chiefly bent upon, was the encouraging of Bloodshed, Sedition, and Treason, which is the Work of Hell. This pious Devil in his *Saints everlasting Rest*, p. 101. *Edit. 3.* tells his Brethren, that *Brook, Pym, Hambden and White*, are Members of a more knowing, unerring, well order'd, &c. triumphant Assembly than any Parliament; and tells his said Brethren they shall be with them, meaning in Heaven; and the only reason he has to canonize them is, because they were so zealous in promoting the Rebellion. That this was his Motive, appears by his constant adhering to that horrid Sin, which he gives us to understand in his *Holy Commonwealth*, p. 433 and 485,

486, in the following Words: *If I had taken up Arms against the Parliament in that War, my Conscience tells me I had been a Traytor, and guilty of resisting the highest Powers ; — and I cannot see that I was mistaken in the main Cause ; nor dare I repent of it, nor forbear the same, if it were to do again in the same State of Things.* In his Five Disputations he declares, that Prelacy is a Government which gratifieth the Devil and wicked Men, and contrary to the Word of God and Apostolical Institution ; against the Will of CHRIST, and the Welfare of the Churches. That the Churches (of the Legal Establishment) bear with Drunkards, Whoremongers, Railers, open Scorners at Godliness ; with much more such insolent and unchristian Language. But to trace him would be endless ; I grow weary of such Wretches, and yet cannot get rid of them. You still go on to vindicate

Dr. Manton, whose Proceedings during the Rebellion because Mr. Echard says he knows not how to excuse, you apologize for him, by telling us, you know not what he refers to, except it be to that Doctor's praying at the Inauguration of *Oliver Cromwel* ; for which you have nothing to offer, but your old Cant, that Bishop *Sprat* writ a *Pindarick Ode on the happy Memory of* p. 115.
the same Oliver. The Crime of one Man is no Excuse to another for committing the same ; besides, you have been told above, that the difference is great between a penitent Sinner and one that is harden'd and incorrigible. Dr. *Sprat's* unfeigned Repentance was a Means to recommend him long after to be a Bishop, and Dr. *Manton's* Impenitence prevail'd with him to quit his Living. The Church could lose nothing in him, tho' you seem to make a Jest of that Notion ;

tion; for it is much better to have a profess'd Enemy, than to harbour a false and treacherous pretended Friend. Whether those who succeeded the Sectaries, ejected in all Places, were as unexceptionable as Dr. *Patrick*, is nothing to the
 P. 116, Question about *Manton*; and it is certain they were preferable to him, or any other of that Gang, as professing themselves Members of, and conforming to that Church, in which they were appointed Pastors. It was not only justifiable and excusable, but highly commendable, and absolutely necessary to eject those unworthy Men, whose Consciences oblig'd them to be Enemies to the Civil & Ecclesiastical Government, which they ought to endeavour to support and assert. Your Wish that you may live in the World to as good Purpose, and at last leave it with as much Honour and Credit as *Manton* did, is what no Man will grudge you, and you may easily obtain it, by persisting in your own and his Sectarian Principles; but it is to be suppos'd, that Mr. Archdeacon being no way ambitious of such Honour and Credit as that you speak of, will not much regard your thinking he ought to be satisfy'd with it, and therefore will desire to be left to wish for himself.

P. 117. Mr. *Echard*, you say, is pleas'd to flirt at you for speaking of the Humility and Peaceableness of Dr. *Spurstow*, whom he calls a celebrated *Incendiary*, for having been one of the Five that compos'd that Book that struck at the establish'd Religion, call'd *Smectymnus*, and preach'd before the Long Parliament. If you will espouse the Quarrel of every Phanatical Traytor, you may well expect to be flurled at. But then he was ejected out of his Mastership of *Katharine Hall* in *Cambridge*, for refusing the *Ingagement*, and
 this,

this; very gravely you tell us, is no great Argument of his being an *Incendiary*. Your wise Assertion is granted, that the refusing of the Engagement does not prove him an Incendiary; but his preaching and encouraging of Rebellion, before and after that, and his taking and approving of the solemn League and Covenant, are sufficient Testimonies of his being a Traytor; all which Villainies you varnish over with the specious Pretence of *adhering to our old Legal Constitution*; and thus you justify all the Rebellion against King *Charles I.* till the *Independents* taking that Work out of your Hands, your Party thought it high Time to use all Means to destroy them, as they had before ruin'd their Sovereign. Since you cannot see so much, I am oblig'd to inform you that he could not be humble, because it was Pride that made him rebel; and he could not be *peaceable*, because he was a Promoter of War and Bloodshed. The *Humility* and *Peaceableness* of this your Brother Divine, is recorded by the Lord *Clarendon*, History Vol. III. p. 216, of the Octavo Edit. where, giving an Account of what passed between the King and the Parliament Commissioners at the Isle of *Wight*, he tells us, they thought fit to let loose their own Clergy upon the King, and proceeds thus: " That which
 " they urg'd most was the common Allegations,
 " that Bishops and Presbyters in the Scripture
 " Language, signify one and the same thing:
 " That if the Apostles exercis'd a larger Ju-
 " risdiction, it had been granted to them as
 " Apostles, and concern'd not their Successors,
 " to whom no such Authority had been grant-
 " ed, nor any Superiority over other Presby-

M

" ters,

" ters, who were of the same Function with
 " them. Then they inveigh'd violently against
 " Lords Bishops, their Pride, and Lustre, and
 " they all behav'd themselves with that Rude-
 " ness, as if they meant to be no longer sub-
 " ject to a King, no more than to a Bishop.
 " And two of them very plainly and fiercely
 " told the King, that if he did not consent
 " to the utter abolishing of Episcopacy, he
 " would be damn'd. The Men, *Jenkins* and
 " *Spurstow*, liv'd after the Return of King *Charles*
 " *II.* and according to the Modesty of that
 " Race, came to kiss his Majesty's Hand, and
 " continu'd the same Zeal in all seditious At-
 " tempts." Such was your humble and peace-
 able Divine.

You will not have your Plea touching the
 administering of the Sacrament over-ru'd by the
 Archdeacon, nor his Affirmation to be suffici-
 p. 118. ent, which is all you say to this Point; and
 thence it will follow that your doubting or de-
 denying is of no more Authority than his affirm-
 ing, which is enough as to this Point.

You cannot forbear adding one Reflection
 more, which is this, that you neither admire
 many of the Authors which he cites, nor his
 way of citing them; and you would make us
 believe that many of those Authors so cited
 have very little Credit in the World. If you had
 said, In the narrow Compass of the Puritanical
 World, you might have been believ'd; but as
 for all the rest of the wide World, there are very
 few that regard your Assertion. You have given
 us some Insight into the Matter, by which we
 may easily judge what Authors those are which
 you despise, whose Number is not inconsidera-
 ble,

ble, as being all those who have been loyal to their Sovereign, or well affected for the Church of *England*; and at the same time that you decry and disparage them, you would have Mr. *Echard* have recourse to obscure fanatical Pamphlets and scandalous Libels to compose his History. The way of citing them may be somewhat difficult for the Reader to turn to them, but in such a Multitude of Historians as are referred to, it would have been tedious to deliver what each says under a particular exact Quotation, which, if it had not been directly in his own Words, you would not have spar'd to cavil at; and if the Citation were only from one, where many speak to the same thing, that would have been much more subject to censure. This, you say, is a Method that looks suspicious, and that he best knows his Design in this Method; which is no other than a malicious Insinuation, to raise Jealousies in his Readers, as if he were not a fair Historian; but you have taken care to clear his Reputation; for since, with all your Toil and Prejudice, you have been able to charge his History with no other Blemishes, than such as have been here made appear to have been of your own framing and Invention, that Work will ever be esteem'd, and your Letter look'd upon with Contempt.

And now upon the whole, I pretend not to judge how these my Remarks on your Pamphlet, drawn up with so much Freedom, will be represented. It may perhaps displease you, that I should animadvert on what you call your *publick Animadversion* (p. 7) But tho' you might make Reflections at your own Pleasure, you could expect no other than different Censures from your

Readers; and if you are so dispos'd, I don't see why you mayn't make use of 'em, in order to make honest as well as spiteful and empty Remarks. You do not tell us that *you have either Honesty or Courage*: I should be heartily glad to hear you had, and that the Event would shew it; and perhaps you never had such a Trial in this respect as you'll have upon this Occasion. I can assure you I have not design'd *reproaching you*, which you do not seem concern'd about, tho' I think I have discover'd good reason in several things to differ from you. I will not say I have overlook'd a great many things that I think liable to just Objection, but I have omitted much that might have been said to the purpose, that I might not be tedious, and I have not push'd things to Extremity. Some, I know very well, will think I have been too soft and tender; but I have taken such a Way as is best in such a Case. And if what I have offer'd in this mild Way contributes nothing to your Conviction, I am far from thinking hard Words or severe Reflections would have added either Light or Force to my Suggestions.

Whether you will make me any Return at all, or what shall be the way of replying; if you think some Return not improper, I leave wholly to your self, without pretending to prescribe to you. Only if you should quote Authorities upon me, I beg you'd bring them from some Authors of Credit and Reputation, that I may not have an endless Toil, in seeking for wretched Pamphlets, and turning over Rubbish.

The true reason of my preferring this publick Way of the Press to that of a private Letter was, that I had some Desire to expose you, because
I was

I was not willing those that come after us should be impos'd on by you, in what I take to be of no small Concern to 'em. And I will not say I have studiously wav'd any thing that I thought might be offensive to you, as being sensible that you will take Offence at every thing that is not for the Support of *your good Old Cause*. Yet notwithstanding all my Freedom, I can declare with great Chearfulness, that your perfect Conversion, and, that you may apply your self to laudable Designs, is more heartily wish'd by no Man than by me, who in such Case should be,

S I R,

Your sincere F R I E N D,

A N D

Humble S E R V A N T,

Philalethes.

Middlesex, Nov. 23, 1718,
the Day of the F U N E -
R A L of your Old Friend
 OLIVER CROMWELL.

P. S. These

P. S. These Sheets were gone to the Press before the Letter to you, shewing that Mr. *Echard* has done the Part of a faithful Histori-
an in branding your Grandfather, &c. came to my Hands. Had I seen it before, I might have sav'd my self and you the Trouble of what is here said in relation to that Article. The Author of that Letter has done your *honoured Grandfather* so much Justice, that there is no doubt but that all Men of Sense and Probity will conclude that he very well deserves the Title of an *Incendiary*, bestow'd on him by Mr. Archdeacon.





