





SCC

2420

17367
LONDON: PRINTED BY J. BARNES, ST. MARTIN'S LANE, 1735.

AN
EXAMINATION

OF
William Notcutt's Reply
TO
H. B's VINDICATION
OF

R. BARCLAY'S APOLOGY,

WHEREIN

The DECEIT of the said *W. N.* is farther manifested; his many ABUSES of the People call'd *QUAKERS* detected; and the *Genuine Sense* of their Writers asserted; against his *Gross* and *Palpable Perversions* of them.

By *H. B.*

ISAIAH XXIV. 16.

The treacherous Dealers have dealt treacherously: yea, the treacherous Dealers have dealt very treacherously.

But we will give Thanks to the most good and mighty God, that such is our Cause, where against (when they would fainest) they were able to utter no Despight, but the same, which might as well be wrested against the *Holy Fathers*; against the *Prophets*, against the *Apostles*, against *Peter*, against *Paul*, and against *Christ* himself. Now therefore, if it be lawful for these Folkes to be *eloquent* and *finisongued*, in speaking Evil; surely it becomn eth not us, in our Cause being so very good, to be dumbe in answering truely. *Fuel's Apol. of the Ch. of Eng. Part 1.*

LONDON:

Printed and Sold by the Assigns of *J. Scwle*, at the *Bible* in *George-Yard, Lombard-street, 1735.*

T H E

P R E F A C E.

'T IS now a considerable Time, since W. NOTCUTT's *Reply*, to my *Vindication* of R. BARCLAY'S *Apology*, was first Published. The *Meanness* of his Performance, and his manifest *Inequality* to the Task he had undertaken, at first almost induced me to a *Resolution* of shewing by Silence my *Contempt* of a Work, the many & apparent *Absurdities* whereof seem'd to carry with them its own *Confutation*, and to render my *Notice* of it unnecessary. But being afterward informed that my *Silence* had rais'd the *Credit* of his *Book*, and that some of his *Admirers* from thence concluded and proclaimed it *unanswerable*; I was pre-

vail'd with to give some *Check* to their *Conceits* by a particular Examination of it; in which the necessary Avocations of Business, and other Interruptions of Importance, did so retard me, that I should not even yet have compleated it, had not my Friend *Joseph Besse* favour'd me with his kind Assistance in the *Transcription* of it: I am also oblig'd to him for some *Additions* he has made thereto, and several *Quotations* here and there adapted to the Matter under Consideration.

I need not say much in this Place of *W. N's* Abuses and Perversions, as well of the People called *Quakers* in general, as of *R. Barclay* and my self, with some Others, in particular; the Reader will find them plainly exhibited in the following Sheets. 'Tis hard, that an *innocent People* should be thus injur'd in their *Christian Reputation*, who hold no *Principles* but what are intirely consonant to the *Doctrine* of the *New Testament*, and the *moral Nature* of true *Religion*; whose Pro-
fession

fession is *prejudicial* to no Man, except themselves, who have always been more or less restrained thereby from *Privileges* common to other of their Neighbours. But is it not surprizing, that some Men who value themselves upon the Name of *Ministers* of the *Gospel of Peace*, should be among the foremost in such *Abuses*? Yet so it is, for their *Interest* goes against their *Profession*, and a *Selfish* Disposition leads to want of Charity: *W. Notcutt* had, in all probability, forborn his publick Opposition to the *Quakers*, had not the Danger of losing some of his Flock, and more especially that of their Fleece, excited his Indignation, and hurried him into an *Undertaking* which he may repent at leisure; being hastily enter'd into such a *Labyrinth* of Falshood and Error, as that he will not easily extricate himself.

HAD *W. N.* in this present Controversy been only mistaken, I might have entertained Hopes of convincing him; but as he appears in many places

knowingly partial and unjust, I fear my *Labour* will be *lost* upon him. However, if the unprejudiced Reader shall, through my Endeavours, receive such Light and Information, as may enable him to make a right Judgment of *W: N's* Undertaking, and of the *Innocence* of those he has abus'd; I shall think the same a sufficient Recompence for the Labour of

His Friend

H. B.

A FAR-

A FARTHER
PREMONITION
TO THE
Impartial Reader.

HAVING *been desired some Time since by my Friend H. B. to peruse and transcribe a Manuscript of his, intituled, An Examination of W. Notcutt's Reply to H. B's Vindication, &c. I took the Liberty from my own Approbation of the same good Cause he is engag'd in, and a Desire of promoting it, to insert (with his Consent) some Passages therein, viz.*

P. 8. to 12. I inserted an Answer to W. N's Query, What did G. Fox ever do to prove his Call and Mission from God?

P. 74, 75. I put in some Expressions of the Greek Poets, Phocylides, Pythagoras, and Orpheus, testifying to the Excellency of the Divine Word, or Light within.

P. 107, to 112. *I alter'd W. Notcutt's Cautions to Young Persons, by making them, as I apprehended, more agreeable to Scripture, and consequently more instructive.*

P- 124. *I made some Observations, and added a Marginal Note concerning the Word 'Αρχὴ [i. e. Principle or Beginning] in holy Writ: I also made here and there a Remark upon the Greek Text in some other Places.*

P. 175. *I enlarged upon W. N's Extraordinary Perversion of a Passage from S. Fisher's Rust. ad Acad. wherein he has given such an Instance of deliberate Fraud, and designed Imposition upon his Reader, as, at the first coming out of his Book, appeared to me so observable, that I then penn'd down such Remarks upon it, as are herein published.*

Of these Additions of Mine to my Friend's Copy, I thought proper to advertise both the Reader and W. Notcutt, that if he shall hereafter think proper to make any Objections to those Passages, he may know to whom they are imputable.

The following Sheets plainly discover W. N. to be guilty of a Practice very unjustifiable, yet frequently used by the Quakers Adversaries, viz. That of calling out and citing Bits and Scraps of Sentences,
and

and presenting them to the Reader in a false View, with a feigned Sense put upon them, directly contrary to the whole Scope and Tenor of their Authors whole Discourse. In this Method of Misrepresentation they have been too successful, for * “ It is an easie and
 “ a common thing, by Misconstruction to deprave
 “ whatsoever is most innocently done or spoken.”
 But the Success of such a Proceeding doth not lessen its Guilt, because † “ Such a thing done by
 “ Mistake or for want of Skill is bad enough, but
 “ if it be done wilfully, it is hard to think of any
 “ thing that is a greater Wickedness, for it goes the
 “ way to destroy the common Faith of Mankind,
 “ by which we are apt to rely upon a Writer,
 “ that how zealous soever he may be for his Opin-
 “ ion, he will not forge matter of Fact, nor speak
 “ wickedly (though it be) for God, as Job says.”
 cap. xiii. V. 7.

If, Reader, thou hast through such deceivable means been hitherto misled and beguiled, I hope, the following Sheets will tend to thy better Information, by giving thee a just and true Idea of the abused Quakers and their Principles.

JOSEPH BESSE.

* Bishop Sanderson in Serm. 2. ad Magistratum.

† Wall's Pref. to his Hist. of Infant-Baptism.

A N
E X A M I N A T I O N
O F

William Notcutt's Reply, &c.

T H E I N T R O D U C T I O N .

THE *Reply* made by *William Notcutt* to my *Vindication* of *R. Barclay's* Apology, against his Attempts, has been thought by some so effectually to expose the Weakness of its Author, as to stand in need of no publick Animadversion, he having, instead of fairly answering, and clearing himself of those Abuses and Perversions of our Friends Writings which I had charg'd upon him, stuff'd his Pamphlet with many more of the same kind, as if the Old Maxim of Persecutors were current with him; FORTITER CALUMNIARE, & ALIQUID ADHÆREBIT, *Throw Dirt enough, and some will stick.*

BUT though the Method he has taken, well known to be the usual and last Resort of confuted Obstinacy, may sufficiently manifest to every impartial Reader, skill'd in Controversy, his Want of good and rational Arguments to support his Cause; and

2 The INTRODUCTION.

to such Readers my taking any farther Notice of him would be unnecessary ; nevertheless, I have thought proper to publish this *Examination* of his *Reply*, for the sake of others, who either through Prejudice conceiv'd against the *Quakers*, Partiality or Affection for him, or Ignorance of the Rules of Disputation, may be in danger of being misled through his Means, so as to imagine his Performance unanswerable ; as well as in regard to himself, lest by my Silence I should seem to countenance him in the Vanity of applying to himself the Saying of Christ, *Luke xxi. 15 I will give you a Mouth and Wisdom which all your Adversaries shall not be able to gainsay, nor resist.* To which Promise I shall endeavour to demonstrate that no Man can put in his Claim more unjustly.

S E C T. I.

His INTRODUCTION considered:

PAG. I. He begins thus, “ In the Perusal of
“ *H. B's Vindication of R. Barclay*, which I
“ suppose is the Performance of a chosen Champion
“ of their Cause, I was not at all surpriz'd at the
“ censorious Spirit that manifestly runs through the
“ whole of it ; and that the Author, without any
“ Regard to Truth, has asserted in *p. 74.* That in
“ the REVIEW there was but *one true and exact*
“ *Quotation* out of the *Quakers Writings.*”

MY Words, speaking of a particular Quotation of his from *Edward Burroughs*, are, that it is *the only true and exact Quotation*, I may venture to say, he hath brought in his whole Performance. These
Words

SECT. I. *His Introduction considered.* 3

Words I do not yet see any just Cause to retract, notwithstanding his Tale *p. 2.* of turning down above twenty Pages in *R. B's* Apology, which, he says, he took his Quotations from.

THE Expressions of *Thomas Coe*, *p. 3.* in a private Letter to him, concern me not. Nor do his Citations *p. 4.* from *Mather's History of New-England*, of a Collection of Phrases said to be taken from the Works of *S. Fisher*, and *W. Penn*, or those *p. 5.* from *E. Burroughs* and others, at all relate to the Controversy between him and me: And how rough or uncouth soever those Expressions, as they stand collected by invidious Adversaries, such as himself and *Mather*, may appear; yet they may, for ought I know, be very aptly and properly applied, as occasionally dispersed in the Works of those Authors.

As foreign to the Purpose is his Account *p. 6, 7.* of *H. Smith's* refusing to answer him a Question, and the Certificate concerning *H. Smith* and *E. Walker*, which Certificate, as I am inform'd, is sign'd by Persons who were under the Influence of *W. Notcutt*; and the Contents of it are very insignificant, importing little, but that *W. Notcutt* kept talking, while the other two, being wiser, replied not to his Impertinence.

HE tells us *p. 7.* that he *determines not to return Railing for Railing*, but forgets himself again in the next Page, and says of me, "I have thought from several Passages in the Book, that it was the Performance of some Hackney-Writer, that matters not what his Theme is, or who are his Masters, or whether his Cause be good or bad" And *p. 9.* charges me with *Lying and Slander*. If this, altogether unprov'd, be not Railing, what is? His Thought of my being an *Hackney-Writer*, and no

Quaker, is scarce consistent with his own scoffing Supposition, p. 1. of my being a chosen Champion of their Cause. But his jeering Encomiums, and his downright Abuses are alike to me: However, on this Occasion, let me tell him, I am no Hackney Writer, nor have I any other Reward for my writing on this Controversy, than an inward Satisfaction and Peace of Mind, in discharging my Duty by defending the Injured from his Abuses. I add no more, though had the Man been wise, he might have foreseen the Opportunity he has given me of retorting his *Hackney* Phrase on such a Preacher as himself, with very great Advantage: But I spare him.

P. 9. He cites me saying, that *the Works of R. Barclay have merited the publick Applause of divers ingenious Men*, and a little lower insults thus, “ But behold the famous Authors, that have approv’d of *R. Barclay’s* Works, a Weekly News-Paper is the first; O ridiculous! If he could have produc’d more famous Authors, why did he mention him first? I suppose because this Champion converses more with News Papers than any Diviner Writings.” And in the Page before he has these Words, “ He has quoted News-Papers instead of the Holy Scriptures in favour of their Opinions; as if wise Men could safely venture the Concerns of their Souls upon that Religion, which the Author of a Weekly News-Paper should recommend to us.”

WERE I as frothy as himself, I might here use his own Expression of, *Risum teneatis Amici?* Who can forbear smiling at the Folly of the Man, who raises to himself imaginary Mirth from his own Mistake of my Meaning? I did not quote either that Author or *John Norris*, as Persons upon whose Recommendation Men might take up their Religion; but

but to shew that with respect to the Character given of *R. B's* Writings, the Testimony of those Men must necessarily be of so much more weight than that of *W. Notcutt*, as their Judgments were well known to be far superior to his, and in this case no less disinterested.

HIS gross Railery *p. 10.* against that good Man *G. Fox*, is very far from the Spirit of a true Christian. He speaks there of *G. F's* pretending *to have the same Measure of Inspiration as the Apostles had.* This he produces neither Book, Page, or Authority for, which could he have done, I suppose he had not fail'd. Now 'tis evident from *G. F's* Writings, that he did not pretend to the same degree of Inspiration as the Apostles had, but to a degree of the same Kind of Inspiration, which much alters the Case. He also tells us, that *G. Fox* "*endeavour'd to make others believe that he understood all Languages. All Languages to me are but Dust, who was before Languages were. Introd. to G. F's Battledoor. He could not mean, that he esteem'd them no better than Dust——because he set his Hand to a Book which contained many Languages, as tho' he would have the World believe that he was the Author of that Book.*" This Accusation is very ill grounded: The Design of that Book call'd the *Battledoor*, was to shew the Propriety of the personal Pronouns *Thou* to *One*, and *You* to *more than One*, in a Variety of Languages. *G. F.* is not esteem'd the Author of that Book, except the *English* Part of it, though he was concern'd in and consenting to the Publication of the whole, which is generally allow'd to have been the Work of several Persons, two of whom have their Names prefix'd to it, viz. *John Stubbs* and *Benjamin Furly*, Men of Learning, who themselves understood several Languages. The Book was a Collection made by them and others, for

'tis not to be suppos'd, that two or three Persons could understand all the Languages therein. If it be objected, that *G. F.* is put to several Passages of *Greek, Latin, &c.* in the Book, the Reason of that is obvious, those Passages being no other than a Translation of what had been sign'd by him in *English* in the first Page of the Book. And as to his saying, *All Languages to me are but Dust*, he did certainly mean, what *W. Notcutt* says, *he could not mean, viz. that he esteem'd them no better than Dust*, i. e. in comparison of the Teachings of the Holy Spirit, toward the right understanding of the spiritual Sense of Scripture, and making Ministers of Christ, in proof of which, let us hear him speak for himself in *Great Mystery*, p. 115. where in Answer to one *Giles Firmin* whom he cites saying, *No Man can be a good Text-Man, unless he have attained to the Languages, which hath cost us so much, and he cannot know the Errors but by Learning.* And that, *he may thus speak for the Necessity of Arts without which Men cannot be sufficient Ministers.* *G. Fox* thus replies, "None knows, nor is made Ministers of Christ by
 " Arts, nor by Languages; let them get all the
 " Languages upon the Earth, they are still but Na-
 " turalists; and Men learning another Man's natu-
 " ral Language; and he hath learned but that
 " which is natural, and he knows but that which is
 " natural; what another natural Man can speak,
 " and all their Arts is there. Now that which
 " makes a Minister of Christ is beyond the Natural:
 " Yea, all the natural Languages upon the Earth;
 " and seeth before they was: Let *it cost them never*
 " *so much*, yea Gold and Silver, a Wedge of Gold
 " and Silver to get Naturals, and the most precious
 " Things upon the Earth cannot purchase, nor
 " make a Minister of Christ, that which makes
 " them, is the Spirit of God, nor none knows the
 " Scriptures, but with the Spirit of God, given
 " forth

“ forth from the Spirit of God. Nor none knows
 “ the Errors but by the Spirit of God. Now if
 “ all Men upon the Earth have Scriptures in eve-
 “ ry one of their natural Languages; yet none of
 “ these knows the Errors, nor none of these knows
 “ the Scriptures, without the Spirit of God from
 “ which they was given forth.” This Passage
 fully shews *G. Fox’s* Sense of Languages, and in
 what respect they *were to him but Dust*. Nor is it
 rational to suppose that he, whose great Business
 and highest Honour was, to be an humble Mini-
 ster of Christ, and a faithful Expounder of the Ho-
 ly Scriptures by the Assistance of his Spirit, should
 be ambitious of being thought Master of Qua-
 lifications which in his own esteem were not ne-
 cessary for the Service he was called to and em-
 ployed in.

THE before cited Passage and many more in
G. F’s. Great Mystery, shew him to have been
 a Man of much Knowledge and Penetration in Re-
 ligion; and how conceitedly soever *W. Notcutt* may
challenge the best Man in the College of Bethlehem
to Compose more perfect Nonsense than G. F. has done
 in that Book, yet let me tell him, the Defect lies not
 in *G. F.* but in his own Understanding, who puffed
 up with a little Learning, and much Pride, may
 be incapable of forming a just Judgment what true
 Sense is, which he seems to Measure by the Gram-
 mar of Expression, a Rule very liable to deceive
 him; for certain it is, that the most profound
 Knowledge in religious Matters, such as that of
G. F. may be uttered in Words very ungramma-
 tical, yet plain and intelligible to honest and up-
 right Hearts; while mistaken Notions, such as
 those of *W. N.* strutting in a gay and Grammatical
 Dress, are apt to captivate conceited Sciologists with

an Appearance of Sense, which in reality they have not.

WHAT he Says *p.* II. concerning *Elisha, Amos,* and the *Apostles*, I believe to be also true of *G. Fox*, viz. *That God fitted them every one for the Work to which he had called them.* And as to his Question, *What did G. Fox ever do to prove his Call and Mission from God?* I shall give him a plain and direct Answer.

G. Fox did *prove his Call and Mission from God* in the same Manner by which the *Apostle Paul* and others did *approve themselves as the Ministers of God*, 2 Cor. vi. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, viz.

- (1) *In much Patience,*
- (2) *In Afflictions,*
- (3) *In Necessities,*
- (4) *In Distresses,*

in

(1) He bore a multitude of Injuries Abuses and Indignities, but never returned any, being of such a calm and peaceable Spirit, that he could even literally perform the Precept of Christ, *Matt. v. 39. Whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also.*

(2) He was afflicted from his Youth upwards.

(3) He travailed often with little outward Accomodations, sometimes in want of Food and Lodging, being as it were forsaken and destitute, as one of whom the World was not worthy.

(4) He had great Anguish and Trouble of Mind proceeding from Temptations of Satan wherewith he was buffeted almost unto despair, in which Condition he sought in vain to the Priests and Teachers of the Times, but found them all to be but miserable Comforters, and Physicians of no Value, not able to administer any Relief to his disconsolate Spirit

- (5) *In Stripes,*
- (6) *In Imprisonments,*
- (7) *In Tumults,*
- (8) *In Labours,*
- (9) *In Watchings, In Fastings ;*

By

Spirit: But as he came wholly to rely on the Lord Jesus Christ, he came to Witness Deliverance from the Snares of the Enemy, and to be enabled to praise the Name of the Lord on the Banks of Salvation.

(5) He was divers Times cruelly beaten and bruised by the rude People, animated by their Priests, insomuch that sometimes he was scarce able to stand or go through the Abuses received.

(6) Many Imprisonments he underwent, and some of long Continuance, sometimes in close and nasty Dungeons, under the tyrannical Usage of barbarous and unmerciful Keepers, through all which he was supported by the Grace of God, and enabled to persevere with an Innocence and Magnanimity of Mind amazing even to his Persecutors.

(7) Uproars of the People were raised on purpose to abuse him. At one Time with Pitchforks, Flails, and Staves, driving him out of their Town, and crying out, *Kill him ; knock him on the Head : Bring the Cart and carry him away to the Church-yard.* At another Time with Staves, Hedgestakes, and Holly-bushes beating him on the Head, Arms and Shoulders, till he fell down as dead: At a third, with Staves, Clubs and Fishing Poles, beating and punching, and endeavouring to thrust him backwards into the Sea: And all this for the sake of his Testimony against the Wickedness and Corruption of the Times.

(8) The whole Course of his Pilgrimage, by Land and Sea, in his own and in foreign Countries, was as it were a continual Travail and Labour in the Service of the Gospel of Christ, and for the Conversion of Men from the Evil of their Ways.

(9) The Great Concern of the Ministry wherein he was engaged did many Times intrench upon the usual Seasons

- (10) *By Purenests,*
 - (11) *By Knowledge,*
 - (12) *By Long-Suffering,*
 - (13) *By Kindness,*
 - (14) *By the Holy Ghost,*
 - (15) *By Love unfeigned,*
 - (16) *By the Word of Truth,*
 - (17) *By the Power of God,*
-

of Rest; and he was often exercised in Humiliation, Fast-
ing, and Prayer: Besides, he was through the whole Course
of his Life very temperate, eating little and sleeping less.

(10) He was through the Grace of God kept clean in his
Conversation, and free from the Stains and Pollutions of this
wicked World.

(11) He was richly endued with divine Knowledge; Clear
in unfolding heavenly Mysteries: He had an extraordinary
Gift in opening the Scriptures: He would go to the Marrow
of Things, and shew the Mind, Harmony and Fulfilling of
them with much plainness, and to great Comfort and Edifi-
cation.

(12) He was unapt to take Offence, and always ready to
forgive.

(13) He was of a tender and charitable Disposition, and la-
bour'd for the Good of all.

(14) He was called by the Holy Spirit to the Work of the
Ministry, and supported therein, his Testimony being set home
to the Consciences of many, and made instrumental for the
Conversion of Thousands from Darkness to Light, and from the
Power of Satan unto God.

(15) The Love of Christ induced him to spend and to be
spent purely for the Good of others, and to win Men to Christ,
without any sinister Ends or private Advantages.

(16) He faithfully dispensed the Doctrine of Life, Light,
and Salvation.

(17) The Power of God attended his Ministry, and made it
effectual to the Conversion of many.

- (18) *By the Armour of Righteousness on the right Hand and on the left.*
- (19) *By Honour, and Dishonour, by evil Report, and good Report :*
- (20) *As unknown, and yet well known ;*
- (21) *As dying, and behold we live ; as chastned, and not killed.*
- (22) *As Sorrowful, yet always rejoicing ;*
- (23) *As poor, yet making many rich ;*
- (24) *As having nothing, yet possessing all things.*

(18) He was enabled to repel the fiery Darts of the Enemy, and was preserved in many Perils and Dangers which surrounded him.

(19) As he was contemned, vilified, and traduced with numerous Lies and Slanders, by perverse and malicious Spirits, as an Impostor and Deceiver of the People, on the one hand : So on the other, was he highly esteem'd and honour'd by those that best knew him, as a Man of godly Sincerity, and of an upright Heart.

(20) He was scorned and despised by many as a private and contemptible Person ; yet *well known* among the Faithful to be a *Man of God* and *thoroughly furnished unto every good Work.*

(21) He was sustained by the Power of God through manifold Perils and Hazards of his Life, to the full accomplishing of the Work to which he was called ; and though his Bodily Afflictions and Chastisements were many, yet was he kept alive to praise the Name of the Lord through all.

(22) His outward Exercises, Troubles and Sorrows, were far over ballanced by a continual Sweetness and Serenity of Soul, rejoicing in Christ Jesus.

(23) How mean and despicable soever he might seem to some, as he does to *W. Norcut*, yet was he the Instrument of grounding and establishing many in the Way of Truth and Holiness, whereby they became *rich in the Faith of Christ*, and Heirs of the everlasting Inheritance prepared for those that love him.

(24) When depriv'd of all External Comforts, and under close Confinement in Prison, he enjoyed a sweet Communion with God, and the comfortable Presence of his Holy Spirit far exceeding all the Enjoyments and Riches of this World.

THESE are the *Proofs* which G. Fox gave of his *Call and Mission from God*. W. NORCUTT is desired, when he shall write again, to exhibit the *Evidences* of his own *Call and Mission*, that we may be enabled to judge whether they are equally *Apostolical*.

As to the Point of Miracles, tho' we are satisfied, that somethings extraordinary were wrought by the Hands of G. Fox, yet if it may not be granted us that he wrought Miracles, we shall not contend about it, seeing he published no other Gospel, nor preached any other Doctrines, than what were long since confirmed by the Miracles of Christ and his Apostles.

If the Reader shall think that we have dwelt long on this Subject, let him consider, that 'tis done in Defence of a *Deceased* Servant of Christ, from the Cavils and Calumnies of an Adversary, either Malicious, or insensible of his Merits.

FROM G. Fox he carries his unjust Reflections to R. Barclay p. 11. charging him with being insincere, and citing the following Passage from his Apology, p. 180, 181. viz. "We are moved of the Lord to call all, invite all, request all, to turn to the Light in them, to mind the Light in them, and believe in Christ as he is in them, and to mind the Light of Christ in their own Consciences". Upon which he thus exults, "Behold their Christ and the Object of their Faith. Not the Christ in Heaven at the Right Hand of God, but the Light within; Is this their sincere preaching of Christ? Why do they speak one thing and mean another? We justly distinguish between Christ and the Works of Christ; between the Spirit and the Works of the Spirit.

" And

“ And tho’ some of the *Quakers* have said that
 “ Christ without and Christ within, are but one
 “ and the same Christ; yet they themselves did
 “ not think so, when they persecuted *G. Keith*, for
 “ preaching up the Necessity of Faith in Christ
 “ *without*, as well as Faith in Christ *within*; for
 “ this they laid him in Prison, and he was forced
 “ to flee for his Life and Liberty to *England*.

“ And if *R. Barclay* had verily thought that
 “ Christ in Heaven and Christ within were in-
 “ deed the very same Christ, and that it would
 “ be equally available to Men’s Salvation, whether
 “ they consider the Object of their Faith to
 “ be Christ without, or Christ within; why
 “ does he, and all the rest of their Leaders, di-
 “ rect Persons not to look to Christ in Heaven,
 “ but to turn inward, and believe in something
 “ within? We request all, saith he, to turn to the
 “ Light *in them*, and to believe in Christ as he is
 “ in them”.

ALL this flourish of Words, *Vox est, prætereaq;*
nihil, is meer empty Rattle, and has nothing in
 it: For certain it is, that *R. Barclay* did, and all
Quakres do believe what *W. Notcutt* himself ac-
 knowledges some of them have said, *viz. That*
Christ without and Christ within are but one and the
same Christ. His Query, *Why does he and all the*
rest of their Leaders direct Persons not to look to Christ
in Heaven, but to turn inward, and believe in some-
thing within? carries with it a false Insinuation,
 for they do not *direct Persons not to look to Christ*
in Heaven, nor do they preach Christ within in
 Opposition to a Belief in Christ without, as the
 Words of *R. Barclay*’s Apology p. 141. most
 clearly evince; “ We do not, saith he, hereby in-
 “ tend any ways to lessen or derogate from the
 “ Atonement

“ Atonement and Sacrifice of Jesus Christ ; but
 “ on the contrary do magnify and exalt it. For
 “ as we believe all those Things to have been
 “ certainly transacted which are recorded in
 “ the Holy Scriptures, concerning the *Birth,*
 “ *Life, Miracles, Sufferings, Resurrection and Ascen-*
 “ *sion of Christ,* so we do also believe that it is the
 “ Duty of every one to believe it, to whom it
 “ pleases God to reveal the same, and to bring to
 “ them the Knowledge of it; yea, we believe it
 “ were *Damnable Unbelief* not to believe it, when
 “ so declared.” Again p. 142. “ We affirm, it is
 “ absolutely needful, that those do believe the
 “ History of Christ’s Outward Appearance, whom
 “ it pleased God to bring to the Knowledge of
 “ it.” So that *R. Barclay’s* directing to Christ
 within doth by no means import a denial of the
 same Christ without, or of his bodily Existence in
 Heaven, which he expressly owns in these Words,
 “ We believe, that that *Body* which Christ took
 “ of the *Virgin,* which was of the Seed of *Abra-*
 “ *ham* and *David,* in which Christ walked upon
 “ the *Earth,* and was *crucified,* did *arise* the *Third*
 “ *Day,* was glorified, and remaineth in *Heaven,*
 “ wherein the Centre of his most Glorious Soul
 “ remaineth for ever.” *Folio Collection of his*
Works, p. 861.

EQUALLY groundless is *W. Notcutt’s* Tattle of
G. Keith’s being *persecuted,* and forced to fly for his
Life and Liberty into England, for preaching up the
necessity of Faith in Christ without; for *G. Keith* was
 not persecuted for preaching up the *necessity of Faith*
in Christ without, nor indeed was he persecuted at
 all by the *Quakers;* but he was “ prosecuted le-
 “ gally for speaking and writing that which had
 “ a Tendency to Sedition, and Disturbance of the
 “ Peace, as also to the Subversion of the Go-
 “ vernment

“ vernalment, or to the Asperſion of the Magiſtrates
 “ thereof. * There is an Inſtrument with the Names
 “ of ſix Juſtices to it, wherein *G. Keith* is charged
 “ with publickly Reviling *Tho. Lloyd*, the Depu-
 “ ty Governour, calling him an *Impudent Man*,
 “ telling him he was not *fit to be a Governour*,
 “ and that *his Name would Stink*, with many o-
 “ ther Slighting and Abufive Expreſſions, both
 “ to him and the Magiſtrates. And alſo calling
 “ *one* in an open Aſſembly, *Impudent Rascal*, that
 “ was conſtituted by the Proprietary to be a Ma-
 “ giſtrate.” † Theſe and other ſuch like Offences
 being legally proved againſt him, he was fin’d
 by the Juſtices *Five Pounds*, “ A moderate
 “ Fine conſidering the Nature of the Offence ;
 “ and that which farther beſpeaks the Clemency
 “ of the Government towards him, is, That Fine
 “ *was never levied.*”

“ It neither has been, nor is, the Judgment, or
 “ Practice of the *Quakers* to perſecute any for
 “ Religion and Conſcience. But all this Noiſe
 “ about Perſecution of *G. Keith* in *Penſylvania*,
 “ is a meer Calumny againſt the Government for
 “ their legal Proſecution of him for his Contempt
 “ and Abufe of the Government.” ¶ But to put
 this Matter out of Doubt, and to prove beyond
 Exception that *G. Keith* was not perſecuted for
preaching the Neceſſity of Faith in Chriſt without,
 We ſhall here tranſcribe part of a Declaration which
 the *Quakers* in *Penſylvania* then and on that Oc-
 caſion did publiſh, which is as follows,

* See *R. Claridge's Melius Inquirendum*, p. 1:5, 175.

† *Ibid.* p. 160.

¶ *Ibid.* p. 170, 171.

* “ WHEREAS divers Accounts have been
 “ lately published in Print of some late Division
 “ and Disputes between some Persons under the
 “ Name of *Quakers* in *Pensylvania*, about funda-
 “ mental Doctrines of Christian Faith, &c.

“ WE therefore, in Behalf of the said People,
 “ as to the Body of them, and for all of them,
 “ who are sincere to God, and faithful to their
 “ Christian Principle and Profession—to remove
 “ the Reproach, and all causeless Jealousies con-
 “ cerning us touching those Doctrines of Christi-
 “ anity; ——— in Relation whereunto, we do, in
 “ the fear of God, and in simplicity and plain-
 “ ness of his Truth received, solemnly and sin-
 “ cerely declare, what our Christian Belief and
 “ Profession has been, and still is, in respect of
 “ JESUS CHRIST the only begotten Son of God,
 “ his Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, Glory,
 “ Light, Power, great Day of Judgment, &c.

“ WE sincerely profess Faith in God by his
 “ only begotten Son JESUS CHRIST, as being
 “ our Light, Life, our only Way to the Father,
 “ and also our only Mediator and Advocate with
 “ the Father.

“ THAT God created all Things: He made
 “ the Worlds by his Son JESUS CHRIST, he
 “ being that powerful Living Word of God,
 “ by whom all Things were made, and that the
 “ Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are one
 “ in divine Being, inseparable; One True, Living,
 “ and Everlasting God, blessed for ever.

* *Sewel's History*, p. 642.

“ YET that this Word or Son of God, in the
 “ fulness of Time took Flesh, became perfect
 “ Man, according to the Flesh, descended and
 “ came of the Seed of *Abraham* and *David*,
 “ but was miraculously conceived by the Holy
 “ Ghost and born of the Virgin *Mary*; and al-
 “ so farther declared powerfully to be the Son of
 “ God, according to the Spirit of Sanctification,
 “ by the Resurrection from the Dead, and that,
 “ as Man, *Christ* died for our Sins, rose again,
 “ and was received up into Glory in the Heavens;
 “ He having, in his dying for all, been that one
 “ Great universal Offering and Sacrifice for Peace,
 “ Atonement and Reconciliation, between God
 “ and Man: And he is the Propitiation, not for
 “ our Sins only, but for the Sins of the whole
 “ World; we were reconciled by his Death, but
 “ saved by his Life.

“ THAT *Jes us Christ*, who sitteth at the Right
 “ Hand of the Throne of the Majesty in the Hea-
 “ vens, yet he is our King, High Priest, and Pro-
 “ phet in his Church; the Minister of the Sanctu-
 “ ary. ——— He is Intercessor and Advocate with
 “ the Father in Heaven, and there appearing in the
 “ Presence of God for us, being touched with the
 “ feeling of our Infirmities, Sufferings, and Sor-
 “ rows. For any whom God hath gifted, and
 “ called, sincerely to preach Faith in the same
 “ *Christ*, both as within and without us, cannot be
 “ to preach Two *Christs*, but one and the same
 “ LORD *JESUS CHRIST*, having respect to those
 “ Degrees of our spiritual Knowledge of *CHRIST*
 “ *JESUS* in us, and to his own unspeakable Fulness
 “ and Glory as in himself, in his own entire Being,
 “ wherein *Christ* himself, and the least Measure of
 “ his Light or Life as in us, or in Mankind,
 “ are not divided, or separable, no more than the
 “ Sun

“ Sun is from its own Light ——— His Fulness
 “ cannot be comprehended or contained in any fi-
 “ nite Creature, but in some measure known and
 “ experienced by us.

“ WE sincerely believe in JESUS CHRIST,
 “ both as he is True God and Perfect Man.——

“ THAT divine Honour and Worship is due
 “ to the Son of God, and that he is in true Faith
 “ to be prayed unto,—— because of the Glorious
 “ Union or Oneness of the Father, and the Son,
 “ and that we cannot acceptably offer up Prayers
 “ and Praises to God, nor receive Answer or Blef-
 “ sing from God but in and through his dear Son
 “ CHRIST.

“ THAT true and living Faith in CHRIST
 “ JESUS, the Son of the Living God, has re-
 “ spect to his Entire Being and Fulness, to him
 “ entirely as he is in himself, and as all Power in
 “ Heaven and Earth is given unto him, and al-
 “ so an Eye and Respect to the same Son of God,
 “ as inwardly making himself known in the Soul
 “ —— whereby he is the immediate Cause and
 “ Author, Object and Strength of our living Faith.”

THE next Thing *W. Notcutt* undertakes, is, *p.*
 12. to shew that *R. Barclay's Works* will not bear
the fiery Trial of the Holy Scriptures: In Proof of
 which, he says, “ I might Instance in *R. Barclay's*
 “ Doctrine of Justification, by their own Works,
 “ and the Merit of Works.” A Doctrine *R. Bar-*
clay did not hold, as the very Proposition it self
 concerning Justification in his *Apology*, *p.* 196. doth
 evidently shew: His Words are, “ It is not by
 “ our Works wrought in our own Will, nor yet
 “ by good Works considered as of them-
 “ selves, but by *Christ*, who is both the Gift and
 “ the

“ the *Giver*, and the Cause producing the Effects
 “ in us; who as he hath reconciled us while we
 “ were Enemies, doth also in his Wisdom save us
 “ and justify us after this Manner, as saith the
 “ same Apostle elsewhere; *according to his Mercy*
 “ *he saved us by the washing of Regeneration and*
 “ *the renewing of the Holy Ghost.* Tit. iii. 5.” And
 in p. 203. he expressly says, “ Forasmuch as all
 “ Men who have come to Man’s Estate (the
 “ Man *Jesus* only excepted) have sinned, therefore
 “ all have need of this Saviour, to remove the
 “ Wrath of God from them, due to their Offences;
 “ in this Respect he is truly said, to *have born the*
 “ *Iniquities of us all in his Body on the Tree*; and
 “ therefore is the *only Mediator*, having qualified
 “ the Wrath of God towards us; so that our for-
 “ mer Sins stand not in our Way, being by Vir-
 “ tue of his most Satisfactory Sacrifice removed
 “ and pardoned; neither do we think, that Re-
 “ mission of Sins is to be expected, sought or obtain-
 “ ed any other Way, or by any *other Works* or Sa-
 “ crifice whatsoever.”

WITH equal Justice does *W. Notcutt* attempt
 to father the same *Doctrine of Justification by our*
own Works on *Samuel Fisher*, whereas if he ever
 read the Page in *S. Fisher’s Works* which himself
 has quoted, he cannot be Ignorant, that he expres-
 sly disowns any such Doctrine: The Paragraph in
 his *Rust. ad Acad.* p. 138. immediately preceding
W. Notcutt’s Quotation is as follows,

“ AGAIN, there are *good Works* (so called) which
 “ are only OURS, and not *Christ’s*, and such are
 “ all the best that we work *without him of our selves*,
 “ even all our own *Righteousness and Righteousnesses*,
 “ which are as an *unclean Thing*, as a *menstruous*
 “ *Rag.* Isa. lxiv. 6. as *dung and loss, and not gain*
 “ nor

“ nor any way profitable to save or deliver. *Isa.*
 “ lvii. 12, 13. *Phil.* iii. 4. and x. 10. And by
 “ these, though done in Man’s *Willings* and *Run-*
 “ *nings*, in a way of outward Conformity to the
 “ *Letter of the Law*, shall no Flesh ever be *justified*,
 “ any more than *Paul* was, for these are not *Christ’s*
 “ (all whose Works are *meritorious* and *acceptable*
 “ to God, and *deserving* no *Condemnation* that I know
 “ of, and consequently *deserving* *Justification* be-
 “ fore God;) but Man’s *own Righteousness*, as that
 “ of the *Jews* was, *Rom.* ix. 32. x. 3. ii. 3.
 “ and *Paul’s* was till he came to the *Light*, (though
 “ for want of coming to the *Light*, *T. D.* in his
 “ dark Mind saith *Paul* had no *Righteousness* that
 “ was not *Christ’s*, p 22.) is *meritorious* of no
 “ more *Acceptance* than *Cain’s* *Sacrifice* had, which
 “ was *justly* and *deservedly* rejected, because it’s the
 “ *Evil doer* still, that does that *Good*, which God
 “ (whate’er the Sinner calls it) accounteth *Evil*.”

LET the Impartial Reader after perusal of this
 Paragraph judge, whether the Man who wrote thus
 could hold *the Doctrine of Justification before God by*
our own Works. But that which aggravates *W. N.’s*
 Injustice in this Case, is, that if he has read in *S.*
Fisher’s Rusticus ad Acad. but one Page back from
 what he quoted, he cannot possibly be ignorant that
S. Fisher’s great Complaint against his Opponents
 was, that whereas he had affirmed that *Good*
Works deserved Justification, his Adversaries had
 altered his Assertion by Foisting in the Term *OUR*
 without his Consent or Allowance.

THUS, I think, I have fully proved, that *W. N.*
 has Indutiously endeavoured in this Point of *Justi-*
fication to pervert the Meaning of those Authors
 whose Arguments he will never be able to confute,
 and therefore his little Flirts of Raillery either at
 them or me on this Head are windy and worthless:

Not

Nor indeed can I discern any Thing else worth Notice, till he comes to p. 21, 22. where he weakly attempts to bring me into a Dilemma, by a pretended Parallel of certain Expressions of *G. Fox*, and *E. Burroughs*, with the Doctrine of Election asserted by *Elisha Cole*, which I call'd absurd, uncharitable, and Blasphemous. Whereas those Expressions carry not in them the least Appearance of the Doctrine I condemned, which was that of *Absolute and Unconditional Election and Reprobation* as maintained by *Elisha Cole*, from which the Doctrine held by *Fox* and *Burroughs* is as opposite as Light is to Darkness: Nor does *W. Notcutt* himself pretend to shew wherein their Parallel lies: Yet does he exercise his low insulting Wit in a Matter where he has not gained a tittle of Advantage.

P. 22. HE finds fault with my saying *Vind.* p. 9. that his asserting that *R. Barclay* said not a Word of the Blasphemy of his Friends against Christ and his Word, is an high Abuse, and looks to me as if he did not value what he said, so that he could answer his End of effectually prejudicing People against the Quakers in general, and *R. Barclay* in particular. Of this he attempts to clear himself p. 23. by a most pitiful Evasion, thus “*H. B.* calls this “*an high Abuse* of *R. Barclay*, whereas it is plain “*Truth*, and he cannot give me one Instance in “*R. Barclay's* Books, wherein he has so much “*as mentioned* any of the Blasphemies of his “*Friends.*” Whereas the plain and obvious Sense of the Abuse I complained of was, that his Assertion doth evidently carry with it a most vile Insinuation of Blasphemies in *R. Barclay's* Friends, and of his privity to them. Both which I yet insist upon to be utterly false and unprov'd by *W. Notcutt*, and that consequently *it looks as if he did not value what he said.*

S E C T. II.

Wherein the 1st Chap. of *W. Notcutt's*
Reply is considered.

Of the RISE of the QUAKERS.

THE Foundation of the Debate between *W. Notcutt* and me upon this Head, was his Assertion in his *Review*, that the Name Quaker was given them on Account of their Trembling. Upon which I observed in my *Vindication* how inconsistent it was with a Christian, or one acquainted with the Operations of the Spirit of God, to fix an Ignominious Character upon such Motions of the Body as had frequently been the visible Effects of such Operations, of which I gave several Instances from Scripture, whence I argued, That if Trembling were a sufficient Cause for fixing the Ignominious Character of QUAKERS, I could see no Reason why all in whom the same Effects appear'd might not equally be entitled to the same Appellation.

To avoid this plain Conclusion, *W. Notcutt* runs away from the Terms of the Debate, in keeping to which he saw he could not deny, that many good People in the primitive Times were QUAKERS, and starts a fresh Point, telling us, that Nothing is more manifest than that those Persons spoken of in Scripture were not of the Quakers Principles: But his Discourse of MOSES's respect to Ordinances, and of DANIEL's praying and Confessing his Sins, is no Proof of that, because the Quakers have no Principles that deny respect to Ordinances, or oppose Prayer or Confession of Sins; but live in the Profession and Practice

etice of both. As to the Apostle *Paul*, he might more rationally have argued, *that he must needs have been a Quaker*; because he declares, *Christ sent him not to baptize*: besides, he gives Directions how *Women* should demean themselves in their *praying and prophesying* in the Church. So that by his departing from the Terms in debate, he has gained nothing but the Character of an unfair Disputant.

But he cavils at an Argument of mine respecting himself, which was to this Effect,

IF *because Men trembled, they must be called Quakers.*

THEN if *W. Notcutt Works out his Salvation with Fear and Trembling, he is a Quaker.*

UPON which he rallies me thus, *p. 25.* “ But he thinks he has shewn a marvellous Piece of Learning, in forming a Syllogism. But, Friend, do you consider what you are doing? How comes it about that you go to *Hell*, to beat up for Forces against us? For, you know, that some of your Leaders have said, that *Philosophy and Logick* are of the Devil.”

HERE are two *Affertions* which 'tis impossible he could know to be *true*, and which I certainly know to be *false*. *viz.* 1. That I think I have *shewn a marvellous Piece of Learning* in forming a *Syllogism*, when as I do not think so, nor that much Learning was requisite to the forming such a plain Argument, which himself says, *is not reducible to any just Rules of Logick*. Nor do I pretend to be a Logician, or vers'd in that Art of *Wrangling*.

2. That I know *that some of our Leaders have said that Philosophy and Logick are of the Devil*, whereas I do

not know that any of them have said so. This again looks as if he did not value what he said.

HIS own *Arguments* p. 25, 26. are of no validity, because grounded on a Supposition entirely false, viz *To wit* the Quakers do not hold all the Fundamentals of the Christian Religion. It were much more just and Reasonable from the Contrary Truth to argue thus,

THE Quakers hold all the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion;

BUT *W. Notcutt*, declares that he differs from the Quakers in most or all of the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion;

CONSEQUENTLY, Wherein he so differs, he is as far from *Christianity*, as from *Quakerism*.

W. NOTCUTT proceeds p. 26. to *James Naylor*, without taking the least Notice of his Recantation and Submission produced in my *Vindication*, p. 14, 15. which would have had its due Weight with any reasonable Man. The Quakers, as I told him before, were not at all chargeable with the Actions of *James Naylor* and his Followers, because, the Society were not concern'd in, nor did ever Countenance such Extravagant Performances, but on the Contrary showed the utmost Dislike and Abhorrence to such Practices. And that they did so, doth farther appear by a * Letter written to them with his own Hand, when he was in *Bridewell*, to this Purport;

* *Sewells History*. p. 155.

“ *Dear Brethern,*

“ MY HEART is broken this Day for the Offence
 “ that I have occasioned to God’s Truth and Peo-
 “ ple, and especially to you, who in dear Love fol-
 “ lowed me seeking me in Faithfulness to God ;
 “ which I rejected, being bound wherein I could
 “ not come forth, till God’s Hand brought me, to
 “ whose Love I now confess: And I beseech you,
 “ forgive wherein I have evilly requited your
 “ Love in that Day, God knows my Sorrow for it,
 “ since I see it, that ever I should offend that of
 “ God in any, or reject his Counsel, and now that
 “ * Paper you have seen lies much upon me,
 “ and I greatly fear farther to offend or do
 “ amiss, whereby the Innocent Truth, or Peo-
 “ ple of God should suffer, or that I should dis-
 “ obey therein.

“ UNLESS the Lord himself keep you from me,
 “ I beseech you, let nothing else hinder your com-
 “ ing to me, that I might have your help in the
 “ Lord. In the Mercies of Christ Jesus this I beg
 “ of you, as if it were your own Case, let me not
 “ be forgotten of you.

“ AND I intreat you, speak to *Henry Clark*, or
 “ whoever else I have most offended; and by the
 “ Power of God, and in the Spirit of Christ Jesus,
 “ I am willing to confess the Offence, that God’s
 “ Love may arise in all Hearts, as before, if it be
 “ his Will, who only can remove what stands in
 “ the way, and nothing thereof do I intend to co-
 “ ver, God is Witness herein.”

* This seems to have been some Paper of Condemnation given forth by the Society against him.

THIS may satisfy Men of Reason, tho' perhaps not *W. Notcutt*, who continues to justify his unjust Remarks upon the Quakers, that *their Beginning was with Blasphemy*, and calls it in *p. 27.* A natural
 “ and honest Conclusion, for the Case *say he*, stands
 “ thus, *If James Naylor, and his Disciples, were some*
 “ *of the first of the Sect of the Quakers, and were both*
 “ *guilty of Blasphemy, then their Beginning was with*
 “ *Blasphemy; but the former is true, therefore the latter.*”

IN which *Argument*, the *Conclusion* he draws is no real Consequence of the Premises: For supposing, that *James Naylor* had been the * *first* of the Quakers, and that he had been † *guilty of Blasphemy*, yet would it not follow, that the *Beginning* of the *Quakers* was with *Blasphemy*, for *Naylor* himself had been a Quaker several Years before the Time of the pretended *Blasphemy* for which he was so cruelly punished. Besides, this ascribing the failings

* Which yet 'tis certain he was not.

† Which we do not admit: For as *Sewell* in his *History*, *p. 29.* well Notes, “ The Extravagancy of the Sentence which that
 “ Parliament passed upon him, with other Circumstances,
 “ give great Reason to suspect the Account (*in the printed*
 “ *Trial by them published*) was partially taken, and pub-
 “ lished to justify their Cruelty, which is also set forth in
 “ Print by way of Annotation on the said Trial. And as *J.W.*
 “ says) some of his Answers were Innocent enough, others
 “ not clear, and some aggravated by his Adversaries; some
 “ of them he denied, some he owned; they reported the
 “ Worst, and more than was true in some Things, adding
 “ and diminishing as they were minded, much wanting of
 “ what he said to the Committee, wresting and perverting
 “ his Words what they could, and endeavouring to draw
 “ Words out of him, to ensnare him, and take away his
 “ Life; and to shew their Confusion when he was before
 “ them, they would have had him to Kneel and pull off his
 “ Hat to them, tho' a part of the Charge against him was
 “ that some kneeled to him.”

of particular Persons to an whole Society, is altogether immoral and contrary to that excellent Rule of *Doing as Men would be done by*. Would it be thought just to impute the Extravagant Conduct of the *Anabaptists* of *Munster*, or of some *Independents* in 1648, or the Cruelty of those in *New-England* who persecuted the *Quakers* to death, to the respective Societies which now go under those Names? Yet thus unjustly and unreasonably does *W. Notcutt* deal with the *Quakers*: And at the same time wipes his Mouth, and demurely asks,

“ THEN why does *H. B.* complain of Injustice done them? *Adding*, But this is the common Clamour of the Advocates for your Principles, when Arguments fail: If any write against them they cry out, *That they are abused and treated unjustly; that they are bely'd both in Story and Quotations; that they are misrepresented, and their Expressions perverted.*

ALL which has been done as often as by them complain'd of, and being now again by *W. Notcutt* repeated, is again as deservedly blamed.

BUT hear him a little farther, p. 27. “ If, says he, their Adversary does but miss a Figure, or transpose one, or leave out or put in a Word in a Quotation, tho' he never injures the Sense by it, but designs to make better *English* of it; they presently make such an Outcry, as if it was done out of Malice, and on purpose to injure them.”

Fine indeed! Give him but the *Liberty*, of missing a Figure, or transposing one, and of leaving out or putting in a Word in a Quotation, and let him judge whether it injure the Sense or not, or make better *English* of it: Let but the *Quakers* also be still, and

and acquiesce in his Award, without *making* any *Complaint* or *Outcry*; and he'll confute 'em to all Intents and Purposes. A NOTABLE CHAMPION! But alas! Did the poor Man really know *himself*, and the *Deceit* of his own *Heart*, which is abundantly discovered to others in this *Reply*, he would never dream of being intrusted with such Privileges.

THE next thing observ'd by *W. Notcutt* p. 27. is thus express'd, “ *Pag* 16, 17. *H. B.* is very angry that I asserted, That *G. Fox* said that he was Christ; and with much warmth, he saith, “ *With what front can the Reviewer stand up in the Face of the Country, and assert, that this very Man gave out that he was the Christ?* ”

I did say, *With what Front THEN can the Reviewer stand up in the Face of the Country, and assert, &c.* I thought he had a very hard Front; but I think he shews it yet more hardned by asserting a second time, and attempting to prove, in the Face of the Country, what himself, if ever he read *G. F's* Works, must know to be false.

THE Word THEN by him fraudulently left out in citing me, has an express Reference to somewhat he was minded to conceal, namely, a direct Quotation from *G F's Doctrinals*, p. 417. thus, “ This Jesus hath God raised up, and we the People of God, in scorn called *Quakers*, do say, that there is no Salvation in any other Name under Heaven, whereby Men must be saved, but in the Name of Jesus Christ of *Nazareth*, which was crucified without the Gates of *Jerusalem*, whom God hath raised from the Dead.” This plain Acknowledgment to the Manhood, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and that there is no Salvation in any other Name under Heaven, as well as many

many other such Passages in the Writings of *G. F.* which I concluded our Author could not be ignorant of, who pretended to cite so much from them, was the Occasion of my saying, *With what front THEN can the Reviewer stand up in the Face of the Country, and assert that this very Man gave out he was Christ!* Because *G. Fox's* so giving out that he was Christ, would have been utterly incongruous, and incompatible with his own Declaration in the aforesaid Quotation, and in a Multitude of Places in his Writings. Now if *G. F.* had given himself out to be Christ, it must have been either before or after such Declaration made; if before, can it be thought he would have made any such Declaration, proving himself a Liar to the World, who well knew that he was not of *Nazareth*, nor crucified at *Jerusalem*: If after, his own Declaration would have equally confuted him. But how improbable soever the Thing be, *W. N.* undertakes the Proof of it with an Air of Assurance; p. 28. *You put me,* says he, *upon the Proof, and I am ready to do it.* Now then let's see his Performance.

1. HE produces a Citation from the *Snake in the Grass*, of some Expressions that Author charges upon *G. Fox*; but he leaves his Reader to seek whether those Expressions were forg'd by the *Snake*, who hiss'd out many Falshoods, or really spoken by *G. Fox*, from whom he produces neither Book nor Page.

2. THE Testimony of *Francis Bugg*, in his *New Rome arraigned*, p 33, 34. that "Others call'd *G. F. the Branch, and Star of Righteousness:*" Which if it were as true, as 'tis probably false, would be far from proving, that *G. Fox gave out that he was Christ.*

3. HE

3. HE tells us, “ That *Josiah Cole* sent a blasphemous Letter to *G. Fox*, and that *W. Penn* undertook to vindicate the Expressions.” But how *Josiah Cole’s* sending a Letter, or *W. Penn’s* vindicating it, proves that *G. Fox gave out that himself was Christ*, he has not demonstrated.

4. HE brings a Citation from *Qu. Chall. p. 6.* telling the Language a great Speaker us’d concerning *G. Fox*: which is as foreign as the rest from his Undertaking.

5. HE adds, that *G. Fox took upon himself the Royal Titles that belong alone to Jesus Christ*: An unprov’d Assertion, and, I think, utterly false: But had it been true it comes not up to his Point, which was to shew, not what *G. F.* took upon himself, but what he gave himself out to be.

No Man that knows the Nature of a Proof, can take these to be any: ’Tis therefore not improbable, than when *W. N.* vapour’d thus, *I am READY to prove it*, he intended by the Word *READY*, not that he was *ABLE*, but *WILLING* to do it; and in that Sense I can believe him.

BUT, though none of his pretended Proofs hit the Mark he aims at, yet, seeing they are little else but the Venom of the *Snake in the Grass*, long since wip’d off, but of late lickt up by him to spit again upon us, we shall here transcribe the Answers made thereto by *Joseph Wyeth*, about thirty six Years ago, in a Book entituled, *Anguis Flagellatus, or a Switch for the Snake.*

1. *Switch p. 175.* “ The *Snake, p. 113.* quotes
 “ Part of a Letter said to be writ by *G. F.* but for
 “ any Proof that he has given, it may either be
 “ adulterated

“ dulterated by the *Snake*, or some Apostate, or
 “ forg’d by them. If they were G. F’s why did not
 “ the *Snake* give the whole Letter? To what pur-
 “ pose hath he made a Break in it? And what is left
 “ out at it? The Editors of the Journal had no rea-
 “ son why they should have left out or alter’d, (as
 “ p. 114. he says, they have) those Words [*My*
 “ *Kingdom is not of this World,*] and those Words
 “ [*Who is the Son of God,*] which need not have given
 “ Offence, if they had been in. For they whom
 “ Jesus Christ hath washed from their Sins, in his
 “ own Blood, are by him made *Kings and Priests*
 “ unto God. *Rev* i. 6. and to them *it is their Fa-*
 “ *ther’s good Pleasure to give the Kingdom* (*Luke* xii.
 “ 32.) *which is not of this World.* And for those last
 “ Words said by the *Snake* to be omitted, and in-
 “ stead of *which*, he says are added, [*I set my Name*]
 “ what Room or Place was there for all that to come
 “ after his Name was set? Which the *Snake* hath
 “ given and omitted with a ———

2. *Ibid.* p. 178. “ The *Snake’s* next Quotations
 “ are from an Adversaries Book, which was an-
 “ swered.

“ YET such is his Injustice that he takes no No-
 “ tice of the Answer, but objects, as if they had not
 “ been reply’d to, wherefore it deserves not to be
 “ taken Notice of, till he shall have reply’d to that
 “ Answer, and disprov’d it. And any Man may
 “ with equal Justice quote the Books of the *Roma-*
 “ *nists*, to prove the *Church of England* Schismatical,
 “ Heretical, &c. without taking Notice of the
 “ Answers written to them Charges. But whether
 “ such Practice would be reasonable or not, not on-
 “ ly the aggrieved Party, but all impartial Men can
 “ readily determine,

3. *Ibid.* p. 178, 179, 180. “ One of these Quotations is from Part of a Letter, writ by *Josiah Cole* to *G. Fox*, and which had been formerly objected against by *John Faldo*, and other Adversaries, to which Objections *W. P.* did answer in two several Books, one entituled, *Judas and the Jews*, the other entituled, *The Invalidity of J. Faldo's Vindication*. Of the first of these Books the *Snake* takes so much Notice, (p. 115.) as to say, that, *W. P.* does in p. 44. excuse and justify *Josiah Cole* in that Letter; but has taken no pains to refute the Arguments, nor any Notice at all of the Book last named, in which *W. P.* does justify it; but only Serpent-like would deceive his Reader, by giving the Words in Old Black *English* Letters; as if that was Argument sufficient to shew that the Sense of the Words were Black and Idolatrous. But that they are not, I shall, *Reader*, intreat thy Patience, to weigh and consider the five following Paragraphs, which are the Words of that Letter, together with *W. P.*'s Defence and Explanation of them, as they are in his Book, *Invalidity, &c.* p. 354, 355.

“ *First*, That he should call *G. Fox*, *the Father of many Nations*; but what is this more than to say, that Men of several Nations have been begat unto Christ through him? Thus *PAUL* was a *Father to the Romans, Corinthians, &c.* 1 *Cor.* iv. 15. *For though ye have ten Thousand Instructors, yet ye have not many Fathers, for in Christ have I begotten you.*

“ *Secondly*, That his *Life* hath reached through his *Children* to the *Isles* afar off, to the begetting of many again unto a lively hope. But what of all this? “ *The Life of God* is one in all; *Paul* lived by the
“ *Life*

Sect. II. *Of the Rise of the QUAKERS.* 33

“ Life of Christ, and so did *Peter* ; *Paul* was present
“ in Spirit though absent in Body. 1 Cor. v. 3, 4.

“ Thirdly, *That Generations to come should call him*
“ *blest*: But is not the Memory of the Just blest ?
“ *Prov. x. 7.* And did not God by *Isaiab* promise
“ concerning *Israel*, *I will make thee an Eternal Ex-*
“ *cellency, and the Joy of many Generations.* Isa. lx.
“ 57. This belongs to *G. Fox*, *J. Cole*, and every
“ *Child of God* ; yea and *J. Faldo* too, if he were as
“ good as he should be.

“ Fourthly, *That his Being and Habitation was in*
“ *the Power of the Highest*: And so it should be ;
“ for that is the Habitation of every Child of God ;
“ for others dwell in the Power of the World. In
“ short we are exhorted to stand fast in the Power
“ of Godliness ; and we read that it was the End of
“ the Evangelical Ministry, *to turn People from the*
“ *Power of Satan unto the Power of God*, which is
“ the Power of the Highest.

“ Fifthly, *That he ruled and governed in Righteous-*
“ *ness*: This is but what *Paul* exhorts *Timothy* to do
“ in the Church of Christ, as both his Epistles in-
“ form us at large ; *Every Elder, Overseer or Pastor,*
“ *in the Church of Christ is bound to do so*: If *J. F.* can
“ prove he doth otherwise, he may then charge him
“ with uncomely walking, but not *J. Cole* with
“ Blasphemy for saying, *That a good Man governs*
“ *in Righteousness.*”

4. *Ibid. p. 180.* “ His next Instance is from a
“ Sheet, entituled, *The Quakers Challenge*, p. 6.
“ wherein the *Snake* says, *Solomon Eccles says these*
“ *Words of G. Fox.* “ It was said of Christ that he
“ was in the World and the World knew him not :

“ So it may be said of this true Prophet (*George Fox*)
 “ whom *John* said he was not.”

“ HERE the *Snake* takes some Pains to wrest,
 “ pervert and misconstrue these Words of *Solomon*
 “ *Eccles*, contrary to a sober Explanation given of
 “ them by *G. Whitehead*, in his Book, *Serious Search*,
 “ p. 58. But has knowingly omitted to accept, or
 “ refute, *Solomon Eccles* his own Explanation of
 “ them Words: Contrary to what he hath in the
 “ like Case, p. 195. said concerning *G. F.* viz.
 “ *You will best know his Meaning from himself.* Which
 “ if true, why did not this *Snake* either accept or
 “ refute *Solomon Eccles* his Meaning, which is given
 “ from himself, and mentioned in p. 59. of *Serious*
 “ *Search*, abovenamed; and also in p. 75. of *Judas*
 “ *and the Jews*, likewise beforenamed, and which
 “ for the Reader’s Satisfaction I here subjoyn?
 “ I did not say, nor did I ever believe, that the
 “ World was made by *G. F.* but by Christ, who
 “ was in the World, and the World knew him not:
 “ So that I say, it may be said of *G. F.* the World
 “ knows him not, though he be in the World, as
 “ was said of Christ. *He was in the World, though*
 “ *not of the World, and the World knew him not:* And
 “ he said of his Followers: *Ye are not of the World,*
 “ *as I am not of the World, and I have chosen you out*
 “ *of the World.* John xvii. 16. and xv. 19.

“ Now, Reader, what Faith or Honesty can we
 “ expect to find in an Adversary, who, with deep
 “ Hypocrisy and Injustice, shall thus wilfully pass
 “ over, and not accept, or refute, a Man’s own
 “ Explanation of his Words? What is become of
 “ his *great Charity, real Kindness, and good Wishes,*
 “ which in p. 2. he pretended to have? We may
 “ safely conclude, they have no more Reality than
 “ the

“ the Tears of a Crocodile, which Naturalists speak
“ of.

5. *Ibid.* p. 177. “ The Snake’s next Quotation
“ (p. 114) is from *The Title Page of News coming out*
“ *of the North*: From whence he insinuates, and
“ charges G. F. with saying of himself, *that he was*
“ *prophefied of.* His Quotation is this, *Written from*
“ *the Mouth of the Lord, from one who is Naked, and*
“ *stands naked before the Lord, clothed with Righte-*
“ *ousness, whose Name is not known in the World; ri-*
“ *sen up out of the North,* which was prophefied of
“ but now is fulfilled. (Here the Snake leaves off,
“ but G. F. continues) *The Army is coming out of the*
“ *North against you terrible Ones, whose Weapons are*
“ *not Carnal but Spiritual.*

“ Now from G. F’s Words it is plain, that these
“ Words [which was prophefied of] relate to the
“ Prophecy of *Jeremy* the xxxi. 8. and not to him-
“ self, or any Person; and are only an Allusion to
“ those Prophecies of the holy Prophets concerning
“ the Armies of the North, which were to fight a-
“ gainst and overcome the *Jews* and other Nations,
“ for their Difobedience and Wickedness. Which
“ as they literally did do, so (by a natural Allusion)
“ the People fulfilling this Prophecy, *Jer.* xxxi. 8.
“ will, through the Assistance of God’s Grace (their
“ Weapons being spiritual, not carnal) go on in
“ the Warfare of the Gospel Day.

6. *Ibid.* p. 61. “ Snake p. 19. *Having thus shewn*
“ *the Quotations of the Quakers out of their printed*
“ *Books.* I will now further prove my Charge in LE-
“ GAL FORM against them, by Evidence upon Oath.

“ HAVING hitherto detected the Snake in false
“ quoting of our Books, and perverting the plain
“ Sense

“ Sense and Meaning of them, so as it is obvious to
 “ the intelligent *Reader* ; I shall now examine and
 “ detect his *Legal Form*, but first will shew what it
 “ is.

“ *Snake*, p. 19. *Which you will find in a Book*
 “ *printed 1653. intituled, A brief Relation of the*
 “ *Irreligion of the Northern Quakers, &c.*

“ *HERE, Reader, is the Snake's Legal Form* ; a
 “ Pamphlet writ by profess'd Adversaries (like the
 “ *Snake*) which pretends to give an Account of two
 “ or three Trials, of *G. Fox* and *J. Nailor* for Blas-
 “ phemy : And what is in this related, the *Snake*
 “ says is proved by Evidence upon Oath. When
 “ indeed it is only a great Argument of the *Snake's*
 “ Ignorance or Malice, (I rather think the last) to
 “ call a private Pamphlet a *Legal Form*. A
 “ Charge of Fact done many Years past, and
 “ brought to Trial in Courts of Justice, cannot be
 “ said to be prov'd in *Legal Form*, if the Convicti-
 “ on of the Accused cannot be proved by the Re-
 “ cords of the Court. Which I defie the *Snake* to
 “ produce. Nay he cannot, because the Parties
 “ were discharg'd from their Accusations, the Evi-
 “ dence proving insufficient against them.

“ *AND* now for the *Snake* (in his own Language)
 “ *Boldly and Impudently* to give the Lye to the Judge
 “ of the Assize, or other Magistrates, before whom
 “ these Charges of Blasphemy were brought against
 “ *G. Fox* and *J. Nailor*, and to say it was proved
 “ when it was not, argues Impudence towards the
 “ Magistrates, but Villany towards the Memory of
 “ the Accused : For had it been proved, they must
 “ have been convict, and have suffered the Deme-
 “ rits of Blasphemy : And all this would have been
 “ upon Record. But besides this One Grand and
 “ Notorious

SECT. II. *Of the Rise of the QUAKERS.* 37

“ Notorious Lye of the Snake’s, viz. *That the*
“ *Charge was proved*; there is in his *Legal Form*,
“ many other Lyes, which I shall detect as I come
“ at them.

“ *Snake*, p. 19, 20. *There* (the *Snake* directs to
“ that lying Pamphlet) p. 2. and 3. *You have an Ac-*
“ *count how G. Fox did avow himself over and over to*
“ *be equal with God: Being asked by Dr. Marshall,*
“ *in the Presence of Mr. Sawro, Col. Tell, and Col.*
“ *West, Justices of the Peace in the County of Lan-*
“ *caster, at a private Sessions in the Town of Lanca-*
“ *ster, whether or no he was equal with God, as before*
“ *that Time he had been heard to assert? His Answer*
“ *was this, I am equal with God.*

“ Pray, *Reader*, observe, had this been true,
“ that *G. Fox* had so answered as the *Snake* says he
“ did in the Presence of three Justices, what need
“ was there for *Marshall* and *Altam* to swear it a-
“ gainst him? Since the Justices, if they had heard
“ it themselves, might have convicted him thereof
“ upon their own personal Hearing, without other
“ Evidence. Or how likely is it that *Col. West* and
“ *Thomas Fell*, both Justices upon the Bench at this
“ Trial, should sign a *Supersedeas*, which both of
“ them did for his Acquittal, if either of them had
“ heard him say the Words charged? Or how could
“ he have been discharged for want of another Evi-
“ dence, when his Adversaries might have brought
“ in the three Justices against him, had it been
“ true, that they had heard him themselves? But
“ besides, there are two Lies in this Paragraph; the
“ first is, There was not any Justice of the Peace,
“ or Colonel named *Tell*. Secondly, *G. Fox* did
“ not answer, *that he was equal with God*. But thus
“ it was; There were eight several Charges against
“ him, the fourth of which was, *That he had said*

“ *he*

“ *he was equal with God*; which, being asked in
 “ Court, he made the following Answer. *G. Fox,*
 “ That was not so spoken by me: *But he that sanc-*
 “ *tifieth, and he that is sanctified, is all one.* Heb. ii.
 “ 11. It is God and Christ that sanctifieth; and
 “ the Saints are all one in the Father and the Son,
 “ *They are of his Bone and of his Flesh.* Ephes. v. 20.
 “ And the Father and the Son are one, *and they are*
 “ *the Sons of God.* Gal. iv. 6. *And as they that are*
 “ *joined to the Lord are one Spirit, so they that are*
 “ *joined to an Harlot are one Flesh.* 1 Cor. xvi. 16,
 “ 17. This the Scriptures witnesseth, and I witness.”
 “ This Answer is Scriptural, and is directly oppo-
 “ site to what he was then charged with, as it also
 “ is to what the *Snake’s* Pamphleteer says, he did
 “ then answer.

“ *Snake, p. 20. This Blasphemy hath been attes-*
 “ *ted upon Oath, by the aforesaid Dr. Marshall and*
 “ *Mr. Altam, School-master at Lancaster, before*
 “ *the Justices at the last Sessions held at Appleby, the*
 “ *8th of January 1652. and before Judge Puleston,*
 “ *at the last Assizes held at Lancaster, the 18th of*
 “ *March 1652.*

“ THIS is false in both Parts of it. For *G. Fox*
 “ had not any Trial at any Sessions in *Appleby* in the
 “ Year 52. Nor had he any Trial before Judge
 “ *Puleston*, or any other Judge, at any Assize held
 “ in *Lancaster*, in the Year 1652. These notorious
 “ Lies I charge upon the *Snake*, let him clear him-
 “ self if he can. But for the Reader’s Satisfaction
 “ and Information, I shall briefly say, *G. Fox* was
 “ at *Michaemas* Sessions, in *Lancaster*, in the Year
 “ 1652. (at which Time was upon the Bench, with
 “ others, as Justices of the Peace, *Thomas Fell* and
 “ *William West*) called to answer to eight Articles of
 “ Blasphemy, &c. charged upon him by three
 “ Witnesses,

SECT. II. *Of the Rise of the QUAKERS* 39

“ Witnesses, viz. *Altam* (but *Marshall* did not
 “ swear) *Birkett* and *Atkinson*, (this last a young
 “ Lad) which Charge the Evidence did swear was
 “ gathered by them, from Words spoken by him
 “ at a Meeting sometime before. But when to the
 “ several Particulars, they were by the Bench sever-
 “ rally interrogated, they were confounded; inso-
 “ much that *Birkett* said, *he could not answer directly,*
 “ *but the other could say it.* To which the Bench re-
 “ plied, Have you charg’d the Prisoner upon your
 “ Oath, and now say, *He can say it?* It seems you
 “ did not hear these Words spoken your self. To
 “ this Confusion of the Evidence was also added the
 “ Testimonies of many * People, who had been at
 “ that Meeting where the Words were charged to
 “ be spoken by *G. Fox*. Besides all this, *G. Fox*
 “ did then himself go through all the several eight
 “ Articles of his Charge, and shewed his Scriptural
 “ Belief, in Opposition to the Blasphemies they had
 “ sworn. By which means the Matter issued thus;
 “ A *Supersedeas* was granted against a Writ which
 “ had gone out for his Apprehending, though he
 “ was not apprehended upon it, but came volunta-
 “ rily to this Sessions to answer his Enemies false
 “ Charges.

“ BESIDES this, *G. Fox* had no Trial at *Apple-*
 “ *by* or *Lancaster*, nor at any Assize at all in *Lan-*
 “ *caster* in 1652. Thus, Reader, the *Snake’s Legal*
 “ *Form* is false, both in Matter and Form, and him-
 “ self by these his Lies, must be scandalous, much
 “ below the Dignity of a Pleni-Potent, which by a

D 4

“ ridiculous

* Colonel *West*, being a Justice of the Peace, and then up-
 on the Bench, was so well pleased with these Evidences, that he
 (having been Weak in Body) said, *He blessed the Lord that had*
healed him that Day, adding, *that he never saw so many sober Peo-*
ple, and good Faces together in all his Life. Sewel’s Hist. p. 62.

“ ridiculous Assurance he arrogates ; when in p.
 “ 336. he pretends to demand *Reparation in the Name*
 “ *of the Church of England* : By what Name must
 “ he now be impleaded, whose *Legal Form* has only
 “ served to shew that he is truly proved a Liar ? ”

I shall now appeal to the *Reader*, whether *W. N.* has made good his Charge, or freed himself from the just Imputation of *Fraud and Lies*, who has produced such a Parcel of Old refuted *Calumnies* instead of *Proofs*. He may well say as he does, p. 13. *I had not said a Word of this Matter, if H. B. had not challenged me to make it good* : In which I really believe him, and that by my Challenging him to make it good, he was in a great Strait, whether honestly to confess his Fault, or fillily to defend it : Of which two Methods, he made a very ill Choice when he took the latter.

SECT. III.

Wherein *William Notcutt's* Second Chapter is considered.

Of the HOLY SCRIPTURES.

HE begins this Chapter thus, “ In Page 22. “ *H. B.* affirms, that they do not slight the “ *Scriptures*, to whose Authority they appeal for “ the Probation of their known Principles.” And then recites from *H. B.* two or three Passages of *R. Barclay*, so fully expressing the *real Value* and *high Esteem* which the *Quakers* bear to the holy Scriptures, as to put *W. N.* (who seems predetermined, right or wrong, to have it otherwise) upon this irrational

rational Exclamation, “ These are great Sayings
 “ indeed ; and what Soul that knows their Books
 “ and Principles no better, would not be captivated
 “ by these good Expressions, to entertain a most fa-
 “ vourable Opinion of them, but to these Things I
 “ must say as Mr. *Norris* did, that if the *Quakers*
 “ Principles were such as *R. Barclay* has laid them
 “ down, they are not worthy of that general Con-
 “ tempt, that they lie under. But this is what I all
 “ along blam’d *R. Barclay* for: That he has asserted,
 “ that he has truly stated and made Apology for
 “ the Principles of the *Quakers* in general, when it
 “ is utterly false ; he has deceiv’d his Reader. And
 “ so he has done even in the last Paragraph concern-
 “ ing the Scriptures, for therein he has not spoken
 “ the Mind and Judgment of their chief Leaders.”

’Tis well known that *R. Barclay’s* Apology has been printed and published divers Times, and in several Languages, for about 60 Years past, by the common Consent and Approbation of the *Quakers* in general, and that they have generally appeal’d thereto, as containing a true Declaration of their Principles : And that it was at first written with that very Intent and Purpose, *R. B.* himself in his Preface to the Reader informs us, “ I did, *says he,*
 “ some time ago publish certain Propositions of Di-
 “ vinity, comprehending briefly the chief Principles
 “ and Doctrines of *Truth*, which appearing not un-
 “ profitable to some, and being, beyond my Ex-
 “ pectation, well receiv’d both by Foreigners, tho’
 “ dissenting from us, (albeit also oppos’d by some
 “ envious ones) did so far prevail, as in some part to
 “ remove that false and monstrous Opinion which
 “ lying Fame, and the Malice of our Adversaries,
 “ had implanted in the Minds of some, concerning
 “ us and our Doctrines. In this Respect it seem’d to
 “ me not fit to spare my Pains and Labour.

“ THERE-

“ THEREFORE, being acted by the same Measure of the Divine Spirit, and the like Design of propagating the Truth, by which I published the Propositions, I judg’d it meet to explain them more largely at this Time, and defend them by certain Arguments.”

BUT *W. N.* being resolved to *support*, what in him lies, a *false and monstrous Opinion concerning the Quakers and their Doctrines*, ’tis no wonder that he excepts against the Authority of the plainest Evidence brought by them to *remove* it; however

WE shall in the next Place, not to convince *W. N.* whose Obstinacy seems to us incurable, but to keep the Dust, he raises, out of wiser Men’s Eyes, transcribe the Sentiments of the *Body* of the People call’d *Quakers*, in their most *collective* Sense, concerning the holy Scriptures, as we find the same express’d in several of their *Yearly-Meeting* Epistles.

Anno 1718. “ AND Dear Friends, It having been frequently recommended, That Friends should be diligent in providing *Schools* for the *E-ducation* of their *Youth*; not only in *useful* and *necessary Learning*, but also to bring them up in the Fear of God, and in frequent *reading* the holy Scriptures.”

Anno 1720. “ LET the holy Scriptures be early taught our Youth, and diligently searched and seriously read by *Friends*, with due Regard to the Holy Spirit, from whence they came, and by which they are truly opened; for they contain excellent Doctrines, Rules and Precepts, Divine and Moral, infomuch that there will be no need to enumerate, or often to repeat Laws or Precepts, like the *Jews*, under a literal and lower
“ Dispensation

“ Dispensation and Covenant, than we are called
 “ unto. The true Practice of the pure Religion
 “ given us will answer all.”

Anno 1730. “ WE did last Year, and do now
 “ again, earnestly recommend and beseech all
 “ Friends, to admonish and exhort the Youth un-
 “ der their Care, not to read, but refrain, all such
 “ Books, as tend to make void the DIVINE AU-
 “ THORITY of the holy Scriptures, and do tend to
 “ promote Prophaneness and Infidelity in the Earth.

Anno 1731. “ WE farther tenderly recommend
 “ to all Heads of Families, that they do frequently
 “ call their Children and Servants together, and in
 “ a solemn religious Way, cause them to read the
 “ holy Scriptures, and in so doing, that they hum-
 “ bly wait upon God with their Families, for In-
 “ struction and Counsel to them, respecting Christi-
 “ an Faith and Practice.”

Anno 1732. “ AND *Dear Friends*, we tenderly
 “ and earnestly advise and exhort all Parents, and
 “ Masters of Families, that they exert themselves
 “ in the Wisdom of God, and in the Strength of his
 “ Love, to instruct their Children and Families in
 “ the Doctrines and Precepts of the Christian Religi-
 “ on, contain’d in the holy Scriptures ; and that they
 “ excite them to the diligent Reading of those sacred
 “ Writings, which plainly set forth the miraculous
 “ Conception, Birth, holy Life, wonderful Works,
 “ blessed Example, meritorious Death, and glori-
 “ ous Resurrection, Ascension and Mediation, of
 “ our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and to edu-
 “ cate their Children in the Belief of those important
 “ Truths, as well as in the Belief of the Inward Ma-
 “ nifestation and Operation of the Spirit of God on
 “ their own Minds, that they may reap the Benefit
 “ and

“ and Advantage thereof, for their own Peace and
 “ everlasting Happiness, which is infinitely prefera-
 “ ble to all other Considerations. We therefore
 “ exhort in the most earnest manner, that all be
 “ very careful in this Respect: A Neglect herein,
 “ being, in our Judgment, very blame-worthy.
 “ And farther, where any Deficiency of this Sort
 “ appears, we recommend to Monthly and Quar-
 “ terly Meetings, that they stir up those whom it
 “ may concern to their Duty therein.”

Anno 1733. “ AND Dear Friends, we must re-
 “ mind you to take all convenient Opportunities to
 “ put your Children upon reading and meditating in
 “ the holy Scriptures, which having proceeded from
 “ the Dictates of the Holy Spirit, do afford the
 “ most comfortable and salutary Instructions of all
 “ Writings whatever.”

Anno 1734. “ AS there has been heretofore, so
 “ there yet remains upon this Meeting, a peculiar
 “ Regard to, and weighty Concern for the Off-
 “ spring of Friends, that the rising Generation
 “ might be trained up in the Principles and Pra-
 “ ctice of the Christian Religion; in order whereun-
 “ to, as formerly, so now again, we recommend an
 “ humble waiting upon the Lord for the Manifesta-
 “ tion of his Power and Spirit, and diligent Read-
 “ ing of the holy Scriptures in your Families.
 “ And that Masters of Families, Parents and Guar-
 “ dians of Children, at proper and convenient Op-
 “ portunities would stir up those under their Care
 “ to diligence herein, shewing them that those sa-
 “ cred Writings do contain the Doctrines and Prin-
 “ ciples of our Profession.”

THIS will undoubtedly satisfy reasonable Men, and one would think it sufficient to stop the Mouth even of Malice it self.

BUT *W. Notcutt* proceeds to make his Observations on the foregoing Assertion of *H. B.* and the aforesaid Passages of *R. Barclay*, thus.

I. HE saith, “ They don’t slight the Scriptures, “ but don’t they do so that speak slightly of them ? “ Who call them a dead Letter, Dung, Dust, and “ Serpent’s Meat. *Gr. Myst.* p. 45, 46. And *S. “ Fisher*, speaks of the Scriptures as *wrong, doubtful, “ and fallible*, p. 542. And p. 547. *The dead Let- “ ter, liable to be altered, corrupted, nullified, uncertain, “ most liable to be mistranslated, misinterpreted, mistran- “ scrib’d, wrested, moulder away, to perish, to be torn in “ pieces, burnt and many Ways brought to nothing.* Judge “ now, good Reader, whether they do not slight “ the Scriptures ; or whether in their Hearts these “ can honour them.” And yet himself exactly closes in with the real Sentiments of both those Authors in his very next Words, which are, “ What “ *S. Fisher* has here said of the Scriptures can be “ true only of the *Paper and Ink*, in which the Mind “ of God is written. And what if the *Paper and Ink* “ may perish, yet *the Matter* of the Scriptures which “ is the Word of God, and our Rule, is firmer and “ and more durable than the Heavens.” Thus saith *W. Notcutt*. And even so saith *G. Fox*, in *Gr. Mystery*. p. 111. “ The Letter of Scripture “ (*Paper and Ink*) we cannot say it is spiritual, but “ that which it speaks of is spiritual.

TO the same purport also doth *S. Fisher* express himself, when speaking to *J. Owen* his Antagonist who had asserted the entireness of the Letter of the *Hebrew and Greek Text*, to a Tittle, and that

that not one *Apex, Tittle*, or *Point*, of that had been altered, he thus *Queries*, “ Wilt thou never learn
 “ to put or at least to keep that *Difference*, which
 “ sometimes, when thou art deliberate, thy self
 “ puttest, between the *Word* that is written of,
 “ and the *Text*, which is the meer writing of it?
 “ Dost not thou *p.* 12, 13. (though I know thou
 “ blindly blendest them together both there and
 “ throughout thy *Book*) make the *Writing*, the *Book*,
 “ the *Letter*, one *Thing*, and the *Faith, Word, Doctrine*,
 “ declared in it another. Dost thou not distinguish
 “ now and then (as every wise *Man* does ever) be-
 “ tween the *Text* it self which talks of the *Truth*,
 “ and the *Truth* it self which the *Text* talks on.

“ WE know the *Truth*, and *Faith*, and *Doctrine*,
 “ and *Word of God*, which is but one and the same
 “ in its *Nature*, *Essence*, *Being* and *Substance*,
 “ whether written or not written of, whether clothed
 “ or not clothed in this or that outward accidental
 “ *Form*, whether *Displaying* it self through the
 “ *Vail of the Letter*, or *shewing* it self more im-
 “ mediately in it's native naked lustre, is to a tittle
 “ the same now that it ever was in *Substance*, tho'
 “ all the *Shadowy Discoveries* of it wax old
 “ and vanish, and as a *Vesture* are folded up, and
 “ pass away as a *Scrole* that is rolled up, and grows
 “ out of *Date*, when all *Letters* and literal *Ap-*
 “ *pearances* of it shall be mouldered away. The
 “ *Word* was before the *Letter* was, and is neither
 “ more nor less, what it was, now the *Letter* is,
 “ and will be no less than it was of *Old*, or what
 “ now it is, as to its *Preservation* in every *Point*,
 “ when the *Letter* shall be no more.” *S. Fisher's*
Works, *p.* 338:

2. In *Page* 34. HE, cites me saying, “ That
 “ they [the *Quakers*] appeal to the *Authority* of
 “ the

“ the Scriptures for the Probation of their known
 “ Doctrine,” and thus Remarks upon it, I must tell
 “ you, that that’s but a doubtful Expression, *Their*
 “ *known Doctrines!* May we gather from thence,
 “ that they have some *unknown* or *private* Doctrines;
 “ such Mysteries as they are careful to conceal
 “ from the Knowledge of the World? ”

I DO assure him that he may not justly gather any such Matter from my Words, which have no such meaning ; for I know of no private Doctrines we have, nor any other than what we openly profess : But there have been Doctrines unknown to us, which our Adversaries would falsely lay at our Door, as *W. Notcutt* attempts to do that of *Justification by our own Works*, which as I have before shewn in p. 18, 19, 20. we never held. A practice he repeats in this very Page, where he says, “ Others (of the “ *Quakers*) have said, That the *Scriptures* must be “ tryed by their *Spirit.*” A Doctrine unknown to them, and contrary to the whole Import of their Writings ; nevertheless this false and fictitious Doctrine, *viz. That the Quakers intend by the Light within not the Spirit of God but their own private Spirit*, is the Foundation of his inconsistent Discourse, thro’ the greater Part of this Chapter.

As to his Query concerning “ some, that are now
 “ *Quakers*, *who* were once of a differing Opinion in
 “ Doctrines and manner of worship : What was it
 “ led them to be of the former Persuasion, and
 “ what leads them now to be of differing Opinions,
 “ did they not follow the Light before ? ” I shall give him a plain and direct Answer,

THEY were heretofore darkened in their Understandings thro’ the cloudy Conceits wherewith their benighted Teachers had vail’d them, so that
 for

for a time they discerned not so clearly the shinings of the Divine Light, which yet at length broke through and dispelled that Darkness, and gave them a joyful Sight of its own Lustre, and 'tis no wonder that they then forsook their former blind Guides to follow such an excellent Director.

HIS saying, “ If the Light within be the Standard, it can be so but to one single Person ; and the Standard in one Man differs from the Standard in another: And then, there must be as many Standards as there are *Quakers* in the World ” Is but a stale Objection long ago made by *J. Owen*, as cited by *S. Fisher* thus, *Works*, p. 460. “ * If every Man’s private Light be the Rule of Obedience, then we have as many Rules as Men.” To which *S. Fisher* makes this Answer, “ His Consequence is most false, if by the Word private Light, he means every one’s particular Measure of Light that shines from God into his Conscience, for that doth not make *tot Regulas, &c. so many Men so many Rules* ; for the Light and Spirit which is the only Rule, is one, and the self same thing in all, distributed to every One (as to Degrees which never vary the Nature of any Thing) severally as seems good to him: And this is but a piece of his own peevish private piece of Prate, so often as he doth in his Disputes, to term the Light of God we testifie to as One in all, though in different Measures, *lumen privatum*, the private Light, for it’s *lumen publicum & commune*, that one publick Light that is communicated from God, and reproveth Sin in all Men, and never did, nor doth consent to any Iniquity,

* *J. O.’s* Words in Latin are, “ *Si cujusque lumen privatum sit Regula, tum tot regulas habemus, quot Homines.* ”

“ but

“ but condemns it in all Men, and all Men as found
 “ in Sin, and were *J. O. [W. N.]* as well skilled
 “ in Scripture, as he is in the way of unskillful
 “ Scribling for it, and would once learn of *Paul*
 “ whom he often prates on, he would have learn-
 “ ed 'ere this Time with him to stile the Light,
 “ in all the different Measures of it attained to by
 “ Men, to be but one Rule, One Thing still, and
 “ not to say, that if every Man mind the Light in
 “ himself, then so many Men, so many Rules,
 “ which Apostle. *Phil. iii. 15, 16.* saith, *Where-*
 “ *unto we have already attained, let us walk by the*
 “ *same Rule, let us mind the same Thing.*”

W. N.'s next Words are, “ *R. Barclay* had a Stan-
 “ dard that told him, that Men are *saved by Works,*
 “ and by the *Merit of Works*; and *S. Fisher* march'd
 “ to this Standard. But you have a Standard that
 “ tells you (if you quote the Words of Scrip-
 “ ture without Deceit,) that we are *saved by*
 “ *Grace.* Both which cannot be true.” But in
 that he is mistaken, for they are both true; nor is
 there any Discrepancy between *R. Barclay's* and *S.*
Fisher's Doctrine of Justification, and my Assertion;
 for the Justification they taught, was not by *our own*
Works, as I have before shewn, but by the Works
 of Christ wrought by his free Grace and Holy Spi-
 rit in us, which is of the same import with my
 asserting that we are *saved by Grace,* and do both of
 them concenter in the Saying of the Apostle. *Tit.*
iii. 5. *Not by Works of Righteousness which we have*
done, but according to his Mercy he saved us, by the
washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.

P. 35. HE cites *S. Fisher,* as saying p. 541. “ It
 “ is the Spirit and Light, and not the Letter, by
 “ which, Doctrines, Spirits, Prophets, true or false,
 “ are to be tryed. The Rule or Canon is the

“ Light, or Word within, and not the Scriptures ;
 “ the Light within is the Tryer of it self and of
 “ the Spirits.” With much more to the same Purpose,
p. 446. 451. 459. 547. and then adds, “ This is
 “ most ridiculous, to try any one Man’s Spirit by its
 “ self. If I suspect that a Piece of Gold is too light,
 “ must I try it by it self? What will that discover?
 “ Or if I Question whether any one is a Lyar, or
 “ a Thief; must I take the Man’s own Word?
 “ What Man of a Thousand who is now in a fatal
 “ Error, but will maintain his Notion, if his own
 “ Spirit must try whether he is right or wrong?”

*As a Madman, who casteth Firebrands Arrows and
 Death: So is the Man that deceiveth his Neighbour,
 and saith, Am not I in sport? Prov. xxvi. 18, 19.*
W. Notcutt raises all this wild and vain glorious
 Insult from his own Perversion of *S. Fisher’s*
 Words, for the very Passage which he pre-
 tends to quote from *p.* 451. stands thus, “ I say
 “ then ’tis the Spirit and Light and not the Let-
 “ ter, by which, Doctrines, Spirits, true or false,
 “ are to be tried, neither is the SPIRIT OF GOD
 “ which was before it, so to stoop to the Letter, as
 “ to stand at the Bar of the Letter, which is in-
 “ ferior to it, and came from it, but both the Let-
 “ ter, and all false Spirits, and their speakings,
 “ and it self, and its own also, to be tried, judged
 “ and determined, by the SPIRIT OF GOD which
 “ judges all, and is not to be judged by any.”

WITH what Front could *W. Notcutt* thus at-
 tempt to impose upon his Reader with an impudent
 Flounch of Words importing, that *S. Fisher* in-
 tended a *Man’s own Spirit*, when he expressly more
 than once calls it the SPIRIT OF GOD. But,
 alas, when Men set themselves perversly to Dispute
 against the *Light of Truth*, they are too deservedly
 left

left to involve themselves in palpable Darkness and Error,

THIS gross Perversion being thus manifested and removed, *W. Notcutt's Tattle*, p. 56. about one Man's Spirit being tried by another has no bottom or Foundation.

W. N's. Comparison about trying a Piece of Gold by it self, is frivolous, and doth not reach the Case: For 'tis not a Man's own Spirit unilluminated, which in matters of Religion is to try it self, but 'tis the *Spirit of God* which searcheth all Things, that we own as the Standard and Tryer of Spirits.

As to his Query, *What Man of a Thousand, who is now in a fatal Error, but will maintain his Notion, if his own Spirit must try whether he is right or wrong?* I Answer, I am not certain whether *W. Notcutt* mean a Man knowing himself to be now in a fatal Error, or a Man supposed by him to be so, which very much alters the Case; for it cannot reasonably be suppos'd, that a Man would knowingly remain in Error, except in some particular Cases where Self-interest is concerned: And even then his Spirit bears Testimony in himself against his own Hypocrisy. *There is, saith ELIHU, a Spirit in Man, and the Inspiration of the Almighty giveth Understanding.* The Spirit of a Man thus enlightned, becomes capable of forming a true Judgment concerning right and wrong: To deny this, would be to destroy all private Judgement, and would run us into one great Error of the Church of Rome, nor do I perceive any Medium between either admitting, with us, such a Degree of divine Illumination as may capacitate every Man to judge for himself, and allowing with the Romanists, the Necessity

cessity of some outward Infallible Judge, to do it for him.

HIS Comparifon of the two pieces of Gold, as he again applies it *p.* 36. thus “ If one Man’s Spirit must be tried by another, can I be sure that he is not liable to mistake as well as I? And suppose these two should agree in their Opinions, yet this Trial is but like weighing two Pieces of Gold, one against another; though these may be found of equal Weight, yet both may be too Light: Or if these two do not agree, that will shew that one is wrong; but does not prove the other to be right; and if another Man’s Spirit may be a Standard to me, who shall be a Standard to him?” doth not reach the Case he aims at, but is exactly applicable to the Scriptures, as I shall most plainly illustrate by the following Example,

LET us suppose a Question to arise about some Text of Scripture, for Instance this, *Rom.* ix. 21. *Hath not the Potter Power over the Clay, &c.* Upon this Text two Parties make Interpretations contradictory to each other: The *Calvinists* say, this Text imports the absolute Sovereignty God has over his Creatures, in making one to honour, *i. e.* to glorify him in his Salvation, and another to dishonour, on purpose to glorify himself in his Damnation. The *Arminians* interpret it, that tho’ God has power over his Creatures as a Potter hath over his Clay, yet that the Potter doth not make Vessels on purpose to destroy them: But that the Words, *Honour* and *Dishonour*, are us’d to shew that some Vessels are of more value and use, others of less, yet all intended for some Service: and that it is contrary to the Mercy and Goodness of the Great God
and

and Father of all, to make any Creature on purpose to Glorify himself in it's Damnation.

THESE opposite Interpretations arising, what shall decide the the Controversy? The Text it self cannot, for that is the Subject of Debate. If we have recourse to parallel Portions of Scripture, the Debate is not lessened, for each Party will Interpret them agreeable to their own *Hypothesis*. Thus weighing, as it were, one Piece of Gold against another, we discover not the true Worth of either. To whom then must we appeal for a Decision? Not to the meer natural and unenlightened Judgments of Men, which we plainly see are at Variance among themselves: Nor yet to the enlightned Judgment of Men, which of it self is not capable to determine. What then? To that very Light and Good Spirit of God which first gave forth the Scriptures, and illuminates the Understandings and Judgments of Men, rightly to understand the true Meaning thereof: The necessity of whose Illuminations in order to the right Understanding of Scripture, is well expressed by several of the ancient Christians, as well as by eminent Protestants of divers Denominations: Some of whose Testimonies I shall here transcribe from *W. Penn's Christian Quaker* in his Works, Vol. I. p. 599, 600.

“ *Justin Martyr* in *Expos. Fidei*. says, The Interpretation of the Scriptures is to be accommodated to the Will of the Doctrine of the Spirit; and not to humane Reasonings.” *Dell. Confut. of Sympson* p. 89, 90.

HIERON saith, *The Scriptures must be opened with spiritual Exposition.* Hieron Tom. 4. 7.

“ *Epiphanius*

“ *Epiphanius* saith, Only to the Children of
 “ the Holy Ghost all the Scriptures are plain
 “ and clear. *Bp. Jewel.* p. 532.

“ IT is the Substance of the fourth Article ex-
 “ hibited against the *Lutherans* in the *Council of*
 “ *Trent*, as an Erroneous Doctrine they held,
 “ That to understand the Scripture neither Gloss nor
 “ Comment is Necessary ; but only to have the
 “ Spirit of a Sheep of Christ’s Pasture.” *Polano*
Hist. Con. Trid. p. 150.

ERASMUS tells us, “ What Man sets forth
 “ by Man’s Device, may be received by Man’s
 “ Wit : But the Thing that is set forth by the In-
 “ spiration of the Holy Ghost, requireth an In-
 “ terpreter inspired with the like Spirit : and *with-*
 “ *out the Inspiration of it*, the Secrets of God cannot
 “ be known.” *Par. on 1 Pet.* i. 19.

LUTHER gives us his Mind thus, “ The Scrip-
 “ tures are to be understood, but by that very Spi-
 “ rit by which they were writ. *Tom.* 3. *Fol.* 169.

PETER MARTYR, that famous *Italian Prote-*
stant, teaches us, “ The Spirit is the Abettor, by
 “ which we must assure our selves for Understand-
 “ ing the Scripture, that thereby we must discern
 “ between Christ’s Words and a Strangers.” *Com.*
Loc. p. 1 c. 6.

“ AGAIN The Spirit of God revealeth the
 “ Truth in the Scriptures.” *Ibid.* p.2 c. 23.

H. BULLINGER. Men fetch the Understand-
 “ ing of heavenly Things, and Knowledge of the
 “ Holy Ghost, from no where else, but from the
 “ Spirit.” *Deccal.* 4. *Serm.* 8.

John Bradford answered to the Archbishop of *York*, thus, “ We know the Scriptures, as *Christ’s* “ Sheep, by the same Spirit, that wrote and spake “ them, being thereby assured, &c.” *Book of Martyrs*, Vol. 3. p. 298.

Calvin teacheth us in his *Institutes*: “ It is neces- “ sary the same Spirit that spake by the Mouth of “ the Prophets, should pierce into our Hearts, to “ persuade us, that they faithfully delivered that “ which was committed to them of God.” *Instit.* Lib. 1. Cap. 8.

Beza saith, “ That the Way of Understanding “ Prophecies and referring them to the right Scope, “ must be sought or fetcht from the same Spirit, “ which dictated them to the Prophets themselves.” And more to that purpose. *On 2 Pet.* i. 19.

W. Tindal, call’d the *English* Apostle by *J. Fox*, saith, “ It is impossible to understand in the Scrip- “ ture more than a *Turk*, for any that hath not the “ Law of God writ in the Heart to fulfill it.” *Tindal’s Works*, p. 319, & 80.

Bp. Jewel says thus against *Harding*, “ The Spi- “ rit of God is bound neither to sharpness of Wit, “ nor to abundance of Learning: Flesh and Blood “ is not able to understand the Holy Will of God, “ without special Revelation: Without this special “ Help and Prompting of God’s Spirit, the Scrip- “ ture is to the Reader, be he never so wise and “ well Learned, as the Vision of a sealed Book.” *Jewel* against *Harding*, p. 532, 534.

Dr. Ames, a great Father of the *Independents* saith upon Occasion of *Bellarmin’s* Words; “ The A- “ nointing of the Holy Spirit doth teach the Faith-

“ful, to understand those Things which they received of the Apostles; therefore to understand the Scriptures in those Things which are Necessary to Salvation.” Dr. *Ames* against *Bellarmin Lib. 1. Cap. 5. Thef. 32.*

G. Cradock, a famous *Independent* Preacher, preached “That the Scripture is a speechless Thing without the Spirit. *Divine Drops*, p. 217.

Charles Goad, an eminent *Separate*, thus taught, “There is no Knowledge of Christ, nor of the Scripture, but by *Revelation*. *Refr. Drops*. p. 12.

Dr. *J. Owen*, a Man of greatest Fame among the present *Independents*, saith, “*The Publick, Authentick, and Infallible Interpreter* of the holy Scriptures, is he who is the Author of them; from the breathing of whose Spirit they derive all their *Verity, Perspicuity and Authority*.” *Exercitat. 2. 7. 9.* against the *Quakers*.

WERE the Scriptures the only Infallible Rule, there could arise no Difference about their Interpretation, which themselves would not immediately decide: Whereas we see the direct Contrary; and that with very good Reason those Authors before mentioned did recur to the absolute necessity of the Interpretation of the Spirit it self which gave them forth:

HIS Observation of the *Bereans* searching the Scripture, and that 'tis as commendable for us so to do, we readily admit of; but must blame him, that when he cited *Prov. xxi. 2. Every way of a Man is right in his own Eyes*, he fraudulently concealed the other Part which is expressly against him, *viz. But the Lord*

Lord pondereth the Hearts. Then not a Man's own Spirit.

W. Notcutt proceeds, p. 36. “ 3. *R. Barclay* says, “ That without Deceit or Equivocation, they count the Scriptures the best Writings in the World.” But that Expression of *R. Barclay*, says he, cannot be without Deceit and Equivocation.” Why so? because as *W. Notcutt* tells us, “ They [the Quakers] have said, That the Writings of their Friends are of as great Authority as the Scriptures, and greater.” An Assertion which I challenge him to prove, and till he so does, I charge it upon him as a downright Falshood; and now go on to p. 37. where he again charges *R. Barclay* thus,

“ HE adds, *We count the Scriptures to be a very heavenly and divine Writing*: This directly crosses the Spirit of *G. Fox*, who saith, *That the Scriptures are not divine, but human.* *Gr. Myst.* p. 302. III. *The Letter, Scripture, Paper and Ink, we cannot say is spiritual.* p. 78. *The Letters are carnal.*”

IN all this *R. Barclay* and *G. Fox* do not at all cross each other, nor in the least Disagree. The former speaks by a *Metonymia Continentis*, of the Doctrine contained in the Scriptures, which is divine and heavenly: The Latter speaks of the meer external Letter in all the Places cited, *Gr. Myst.* p. 302. his Words are, “ Outward Writings, Paper and Ink, is not infallible, nor is not divine, but is human.” P. III. “ *The Letter of Scripture, (Paper and Ink,) we cannot say it is spiritual, but that which it speaks of is spiritual.*” And p. 78. “ *The Letter, Paper, and Ink, the Letters are Carnal, and what is gotten from it is Brain Knowledge without the Spirit. But the Scripture, the thing it speaks of, is spiritual.*” This last Expression

pression, willingly omitted by *W. Notcutt*, plainly shews, that *G. Fox* held the Scripture to be *Spiritual*, in the very same Sense wherein *R. Barclay* calls them *Heavenly* and *Divine*.

W. Notcutt goes on again thus. “ 5 He (*R. B.*) says, *We acknowledge the Scriptures to be very comfortable and necessary to the Church of Christ.* Others of their Friends have said, That the Scriptures are not necessary. And that a Man may know Christ, and be saved without them. *G. Fox.* Them that never heard the Scriptures outwardly, the Light that every Man hath, that cometh into the World, being turned to it, with that they will see Christ, with that they will know Scripture, with that they will be led out of all Delusion; come into Covenant with God, with which they will come to Worship God in the Spirit and serve him. *Gr. Myst. p. 168.*” In this too a Man must wear *W. Notcutt's* Spectacles to see any contrariety between the Saying of *R. Barclay* and of *G. Fox*. One speaks of those who have the Scriptures, and the other of those who never heard them. Now though the Scriptures are *very comfortable* and necessary to those that have them: Yet does it not follow that the far greater Part of Mankind, who have them not, are therefore left destitute of any Guide or Director. By no Means: The Light of Christ is Universal, and shines both in those who have the Scriptures, and those who have them not, imparting to every Man such a Portion, at least, of Knowledge, as is absolutely necessary in his Circumstances for his Salvation. To deny this, would be to exclude Multitudes of People out of the Pale of Salvation for want of the Means absolutely necessary for them. A Doctrine so harsh and uncharitable, that I have often admired how any Men, professing Faith in Christ, the *Universal Saviour, who gave himself*

himself a Ransom for all Men, can entertain the Thoughts of it. But we have otherwise learned *Christ*, and studied the holy Scriptures to better Purpose, than to harbour an Opinion so expressly Contradictory to their Testimony.

AGAIN, says *W. Notcutt*, “ 6. *R. Barclay* adds, “ *That they give Praise to God for his wonderful Pro-*
 “ *vidence in preserving the Scriptures so pure and un-*
 “ *corrupted.* This can hardly be without *Deceit* and
 “ *Equivocation*; for this very Man attempts to show
 “ in many Pages, *that the Scriptures are corrup-*
 “ *ted*; and therefore are now an uncertain Rule.
 “ Can *R. Barclay* give praise to God for what he
 “ thinks they have not? I doubt *R. Barclay* has but
 “ few Witnesses as to this particular in the Con-
 “ sciences even of his own Friends.”

THIS Doubt of his has no solid Foundation: For *R. Barclay* has many Witnesses as to this particular, in the Consciences of his Friends; That he has given *all due Honour* to the *Doctrines* contained in the *holy Scriptures*, and has ascribed to the meer Letter of them nothing but what is undoubtedly true, and beyond the Skill of *W. Notcutt* reasonably to contradict. That his whole Discourse on this Head is *honest* and *sincere*, and that he has said nothing in it, inconsistent, with *our praising God for the Preservation of them*, considering what Hands they have pass'd through. His Words which *W. Notcutt* has curtailed after his usual manner, are, “ We also
 “ admire and give praise to the Lord, for his
 “ wonderful Providence, in preserving these Writ-
 “ ings, so pure and uncorrupted as we have them,
 “ through so long a Night of Apostacy, to be a
 “ Testimony of his Truth, against the Wicked-
 “ nefs and Abominations, even of those, whom
 “ he made Instrumental in preserving them; so
 “ that

“ that they have kept them to be a Witness a-
 “ gainst themselves.”

W. Notcutt adds. “ 7. He [*R. Barclay*] says,
 “ *Whatsoever Doctrine is contrary to their Testimony,*
 “ *may therefore be utterly rejected as false.* Then what
 “ will become of *Womens speaking* in the Church ?
 “ For that is a Doctrine and Practice directly con-
 “ trary to the Testimony of the Scriptures. And
 “ what will become of a great part of their Friends
 “ Writings, which in many Things speak as con-
 “ trary to the Scriptures as Darknes is to Light,
 “ Therefore according to *R. Barclay* these are to
 “ be rejected as false.”

HERE he has wilfully drawn an untrue Con-
 clusion, for he knows, that according to *R. Barclay*,
 no such thing can follow, because he held both *Wo-*
men's preaching, and their *Friends* Writings, to be
 agreeable to the *holy Scriptures*.

BUT *W. Notcutt* goes on. “ 8. Once more *p.*
 “ 35. He [*R. Barclay*] says. *Whatsoever any speak*
 “ *or do pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to*
 “ *the Scriptures, shall be reckoned a Delusion of the*
 “ *Devil.* Then much of *S. Fisher* and *G. Fox*, is
 “ according to their own Confession a Delusion of
 “ the Devil.” Another meer Nonsensical *Non se-*
quitur ; and, which makes his falshood therein com-
 plet, he adds, *That Sentence is their own*, which
 he must needs know it is not, they having never yet
 granted him, that *S. Fisher* and *G. Fox* said any
 Thing contrary to the *Scriptures*.

HAVING now fully manifested the Weakness of
 all *W. Notcutt's* Remarks on my Assertion, and
R. Barclay's Declaration concerning the Scrip-
 tures ; his *Rant* against both in *p.* 38. and 39.
 is

39. is of no validity ; we therefore pass it by, and come next to the Text he cites *p.* 39, 40. *viz.* *Rev.* xxii 18, 19 *If any Man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the Plagues that are written in this Book ; and if any Man shall take away from the Words of this Book of the Prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life, and out of the Holy City, and from the Things that are written in this Book.* Upon which Text *R. B.* says, “ I desire they will shew me how it relates “ to any Thing else than that particular Prophecy. “ It saith not, *now the Canon of Scripture is fill’d* “ *up, no Man is to write more from that Spirit ;* “ yea do not all confess that there have been Pro- “ phesies and true Prophets since ? The *Papists* “ deny it not. And do not the *Protestants* affirm, “ that *John Hus* prophesied of the *Reformation.* “ Was he therefore cursed ? Or did he therein “ evil ? I could give many other Instances confessed “ by themselves. But moreover, the same was in “ Effect commanded long before. *Prov.* xxxvi. 6. “ *Add thou not unto his Words, lest he reprove thee,* “ *and thou be found a Lyar.* Yet how many Books “ of the Prophets were written after ? And the same “ was said by *Moses,* *Deut.* iv. 2. *Ye shall not add* “ *unto the Word which I command you ; neither* “ *shall ye diminish ought from it.* So that tho’ we “ should extend that of the *Revelation,* beyond the “ particular Prophecy of that Book, it cannot be “ understood, but of a New Gospel, or New Do- “ctrines, or of restraining Man’s Spirit, that he “ mix not his human Words with the Divine ; “ and not of a *New Revelation of the Old* as we “ have said before.”

As to *W. Notcutt’s* saying *p.* 40. that “ All the “ Enemies of the Scriptures have ever had such a “ Dread upon them, that they dare not alter them.”

If

If he intend it of the *Letter* of the *Text*, I shall believe it when he has prov'd it. But whatever the Enemies of the Scriptures have not dar'd to do; yet, I am sure some of the *pretended Friends* of the Scriptures, in their Controversies with the *Quakers*, the *real Friends* of them, have not been so scrupulous, but have alter'd them to serve their own Turn. One Instance of which is in *W. N.* himself, who as I before shewed *p. 56.* citing a Sentence out of the *Proverbs*, left out that Part of it which suited not his Purpose, though necessary to the right understanding of the whole.

SHOULD I put him to prove his Assertion *p. 40.* "That our *Friends* have alter'd much of what *G. Fox* had first written," I believe he would fall short of doing it: For, I dare say, he never was of their privy Council. However, supposing it true, and also that they believ'd *G. Fox* to be inspir'd, yet would not the altering some Words in his first Manuscript infer a Contradiction to that Belief: For we are not so silly as to think, (as *W. N.* seems to think concerning the Scriptures) that the Doctrine deliver'd by *G. Fox* had an absolutely necessary Dependence upon the numerical Identity of the Words he at first express it in.

TOWARD the Bottom of *p. 40.* he repeats the Charge he made in *p. 36.* and which I in *p. 57.* foregoing have challeng'd him to prove, *viz.* "That others of their Leaders have said, That the *Writings of the Quakers are of equal Authority with the Scriptures.*" And he has here fully confirm'd me in the Opinion that he cannot prove it, by producing Testimonies from *E. Burrough*, and *G. Whitehead*, wherein they say no such Thing. Nor can any such Matter be fairly deduced from their Assertions; for even admitting that *E. B.* and *G. W.* had received a
Measure

Measure of the same Spirit with the Apostles, yet may not their Authority be said to equal that of the Apostles, who had received a larger Measure of the same Spirit, any more than the Authority of the Apostles can be said to be equal to that of Christ himself, to whom the Spirit was given without Measure: And this I think is a plain Answer to the Question which in *p.* 41. he says *any Man would ask*, “ Why “ is not the Inspiration of the Spirit of the same Authority in one Age as in another ? ” Not that we presume to limit the Spirit of God, who undoubtedly is able to impart even the highest Degree of Inspiration, if he shall see fit, in every Age. And were it at this Day his good Pleasure to impart to any the self same Measure of the Spirit which the Apostles had, it would, no doubt, carry with it the same Authority.

As to *W. N.*'s Citation *p.* 41, 42. from *G. Fox*'s several Papers, it infers no Contempt of the Scriptures, of which we have before shewn *G. F.*'s real Sentiments. The *Fellowship* there spoken of, wherein *Drunkards, Railers and cursed Speakers all meet together*, I presume *W. N.* himself will not call the *Table of Christ*, nor the *Communion of Saints*.

WE agree with him in his saying *p.* 42. that “ As they [the Scriptures] are [or contain] a Revelation of the Will of God, they are a Rule of Faith, Worship and Life.” And therefore do we quote them and appeal to their Authority. And we as fully accord with him when he says, *p.* 43. “ We do not say that the Letter is our Rule of Faith, “ but it is the Matter or the revealed Will of God “ contained in the Scriptures.” A Confession, which would he regularly abide by, one half of his Talk in this Chapter might have been spar'd. He is very unjust in saying that *S. Fisher* does “ but put a cheat “ upon

“ upon the Reader, to say the Letter.” For ’tis impossible for any Peruser of *S. F.*’s Works not to see, that the Sum and Substance of the Controversy he was engaged in, was about the Letter, the *Tittles*, the *Iota’s*, *Apices* and *Points*, of the meer outward Text, which his Antagonists had superabundantly exalted into the very Place, Office and Dignity of the Holy Spirit it self.

THE Citation he produces *p. 43.* from *Isaac Pennington*, contains a Doctrine most agreeable to Truth, *viz. That the Reading and setting up a Knowledge of the Scriptures without, and in Opposition to the Holy Spirit whence they proceeded, will not humble Men nor cleanse the Heart, but tends to puff them up.* *W. N.*’s saying that Christ speaks *in Opposition to this Doctrine*, imports, that Christ bids Men read and set up the Scriptures in Opposition to the Spirit whence they proceeded. A monstrous Opinion ! But *the Knowledge W. N.* speaks of, *p. 44.* of a Man’s Poverty and Misery, “ which tends to humble him, and make Christ and his Righteousness to be the more esteemed,” is not obtainable by the holy Scriptures without the Concurrence of the Illumination of the Holy Spirit, which may work that Knowledge by the Scriptures, and is also sufficient and able to work it without them.

WE are next to consider his Quotations in *p. 44.* from *E. Burroughs*,

1. *That the Scriptures are not the standing Rule, neither doth it teach to serve and worship God.*

2. *That the Saints have no need of the Scriptures to teach them.*

3. *They*

3. *They that witness this, do not make the Scriptures of none Effect; but owns it in its Place, yet not as a Teacher.*

4. *No Man ever yet could, or can prove, in all the Scriptures, that the Letter, the Writings, are called the Word.*

As to the *First*, 'tis but Part of a Sentence, to the right understanding of which, the preceding and subsequent Words are necessary. It stands thus, *E. B's Works p. 485.* "The Scriptures they declare of the Rule, and of the Revelation of God; and are a Declaration of all Things which are to be believed and practised by the Children of the Lord: So that the Scriptures are not the *standing Rule*, neither do they teach to worship and serve God, but the Spirit that gave forth the Scriptures, that is *the standing Rule* in and through all Generations; and the Spirit doth reveal the Knowledge of God, and how he is to be worshipped and served." What *E. B.* means by *standing Rule*, he tells us just before, viz. *The Spirit of God*, that which was the Rule to *Abel, Enoch, Abraham*, and the rest of the holy Fathers that lived before any Scripture was written, and it was the Rule to the Prophets, to Christ, and to the holy Apostles; they all followed the Spirit, and walked in it; and spake, and wrote, and acted as the Spirit of God moved them, and led them; it was not the Scriptures, but the Spirit, that gave forth the Scriptures, that was the *standing, unchangeable, unerring Rule*, of worshipping, serving and obeying the Lord God; and that same Spirit is the *standing Rule* to us also, for the Apostle commandeth *to walk in the Spirit*; and that which we are to walk in is our Rule; and *as many as are the Sons of God, are led by the Spirit of God*, and then the

“ Spirit is their Rule.” From all which ’tis very evident, that *E. Burroughs* doth not deny the Scriptures to be a Means whereby the Spirit of God may teach Men, for he expressly says, *They are a Declaration of all Things which are to be believed and practised by the Children of the Lord*, and that, when he says, *they are not the standing Rule*, he means, they are not the Spirit of God it self, that *standing* and unchangeable Rule, by which *Abel, Enoch, Abraham, &c.* were led, before the Scriptures were written.

To the Second, *That the Saints have no need of the Scriptures to teach them.* I shall here transcribe his own Reply to an Adversary who objected to him that he had said, *The Saints have no need of Scriptures to teach them; but the Spirit of the Father leadeth and teacheth into all Truth.* He thus answers, “ My
 “ Words are justifiable; for *it is the Spirit that lead-*
 “ *eth into all Truth: John xvi.* And the Saints
 “ *need no Man to teach them, but they have the Anoint-*
 “ *ing within them; and they know all Things by the*
 “ *Unction. 1 John.* And the Spirit of the Father
 “ is given them, by which the Scriptures were given
 “ forth. *And the Lord is the Teacher of his People,*
 “ and they need not any to say to them, *Know the*
 “ *Lord. Jer. xxxi.* Yet they that witness this, do
 “ not make the Scripture of none Effect, but own
 “ it in its Place, yet not as their Teacher; for then
 “ they should deny the New Covenant, *Jer. xxxi.*
 “ and then something besides the Spirit leads into
 “ Truth, and they have something to teach them
 “ besides the Anointing: But if this be all the Proof
 “ that can be given against me, *That I and the Truth*
 “ *do not agree;* I doubt not but all spiritual Men will
 “ see the Emptiness and Weakness of the Witness
 “ against me; and will be more confirmed, rather
 “ than shaken, that I and the Truth do fully agree,
 “ though *P. T.* speaks otherwise falsely against me;
 “ and

“ and as if I had contradicted the Apostle’s Words
 “ which he quotes against me, who saith, *Whatsoever*
 “ *Things were written aforetime, were written for*
 “ *our Learning*, which Scripture I do own, and no
 “ way contradict ; it’s the Error of his Judgment
 “ which so judgeth ; for even they for whom the
 “ Things that were written, were for their Learn-
 “ ing ; yet they were led into all Truth by the
 “ Teachings of the Spirit, and they were taught of
 “ the Father ; and what was written to them, was
 “ not written because they knew not Truth, or to
 “ teach them Truth. 1 *John* ii. 21. let him learn
 “ what this means.”

THE above said Reply of *E. Burroughs*, carries with it a plain Answer to *W. N.*’s third Citation, which is also included in it, viz. *They that witness this, do not make the Scriptures of none Effect ; but owns it in its Place, yet not as a Teacher.* For ’tis plain, that he rightly distinguishes, viz. That the Spirit of God is the *Teacher*, and the *Scriptures* a *Book* whereby he often teacheth ; a very proper Distinction And such an one as *W. Notcutt* himself, who rambles in a Round of saying and unsaying, seems to observe in this very Page, where he says, “ What if the Spirit of God himself is the best *Teacher*, and Leader of his People ; yet he is pleased to make use of the written Word, and the Ministry of it, to teach Men the Way of Salvation.” Which I think is tantamount to what *E. Burroughs* has said ; for if the *Spirit of God, the best Teacher, make use of the Book of the Scriptures* to teach Men, then that *Book* is not the *Teacher*, but the Instrument he makes use of. And though a *Book* be frequently made use of in Teaching, yet a skilful *Teacher* can instruct without one.

HIS fourth Citation from *E. Burroughs*, viz. That no Man ever yet could or can prove in all the Scriptures,

that the Letter, the Writings, are called the Word, is fully explain'd in the very next Words of *E. B's*.
 " But as I still confessed, that which is written
 " of is the Word, and the Writings are the
 " Words that declare of the Word, which was in
 " the Beginning." Than which what can be plainer?

W. N. adds *p. Ibid.* " But by the Spirit of God
 " they mean nothing more than the *Light* within." And I answer, That by the *Light* within, we mean, nothing less than the *Spirit of God enlightning the Mind of Man.*

HIS next Paragraph *p. 44; 45.* is thus, " A-
 " nother of their Leaders puts this Question, *As for*
 " *the Terms, Revealed, or written Word, or Will of*
 " *God; where saith the Scripture such Words? I re-*
 " *quire you and your Doctors again to prove it.* *G. Bish.*
 " *Mene. Tek. p. 17. 1659.* Again, *How can or*
 " *dare any to say, without the highest Blasphemy, that*
 " *the Scriptures, or any visible comprehensible Thing, is*
 " *the Word of God.* *p. 22.* Again, *To say that is the*
 " *written Word or Will of God (which the Scriptures no*
 " *where say of themselves) is as absurd as blasphemous,*
 " *p. 23.* How this is directly contrary to the Lan-
 " guage of the Scriptures I have shewn elsewhere."

FOR the better understanding this matter, it may be proper to inform the Reader, that the Occasion of *G. Bishop's* writing his *Mene Tekel*, was an *Address* of the *Council* of the *Officers* of the *Army* to the *Parliament*, wherein they propos'd a *Profession of Faith* as a kind of *Religious Test* for *Toleratation.* *G. Bishop*, who had an high Esteem for the holy Scriptures, objects to that *Profession*, its not being exprest in the Words of Scripture, but that they had put in Terms of their own framing, such as *the revealed Word of God, the written Word of God, the revealed Will of God, the written Will of God, &c.* And therefore
 asks

asks them, *Where saith the Scripture such Words? I require you and your Doctors to prove it.* And adds this found Reason for his so doing, *For we cannot take a Testimony of the Scriptures which is not from the Spirit that gave it, which spake its own Words, and its Words we receive.* His Query they never answer'd by producing such Expressions in the Scriptures, neither doth *W. Notcutt.*

As to *G. Bishop's* calling it *the highest Blasphemy to say that the Scriptures, or any visible comprehensible Thing is the Word of God,* he does not stop there, but adds, *who is invisible, incomprehensible, whom no Man hath seen nor can see, blessed for ever, who cannot be written, and his Word is like himself; for when ye speak of a written Word, ye speak of something that is circumscribed, physical, or local, that is to say, something that may be seen, touch'd or handled by Man, which God cannot be, nor his Word, nor his Will.* Where he sheweth what are the proper *Attributes* of the *Word of God,* and that they are not applicable to any *visible comprehensible Thing.* Let *W. N.* confute his Reasoning if he can.

As to *G. B's* Words, *To say that that is the written Word or Will of God (which the Scriptures nowhere say of themselves) is as absurd as blasphemous,* his next Words are, “ And can no more be said to be the
 “ *written Word or Will of God,* because they are a
 “ *Declaration of the Will of God* to many Generati-
 “ ons, or a *Record in Writing with Pen and Ink* of
 “ his Word so spoken, by which his Will was de-
 “ clared to those Generations; or because they be-
 “ ing so recorded, are a *Testimony* that God left
 “ not himself through all Ages without a *Witness,*
 “ nor his People, and so are useful for the *Man of*
 “ *God* (as the Spirit testifies in them) and were writ-
 “ ten for our *Learning* (the *Church of God* (to which
 “ the *Holy Ghost* in *Paul* speaks) which is in God)

“ than the *Heavens* can be said to be the *Word of God*,
 “ which were made and are upholden by the *Word*
 “ of his Power, for they declare the *Glory of God* ;
 “ or the *Firmament*, which sheweth his *Handy-*
 “ work, &c.” In which *G. B.* shews a great *Re-*
gard and honourable Esteem of the holy Scriptures,
 which he acknowledges *were written for our Learn-*
ing, and are a Declaration of the Will of God ; but ad-
 mits them not the *Title of the Word of God*, which as
 he before shewed is *invisibile, incomprehensible, &c.*

WHEN we come to the Place elsewhere, where
W. Notcutt says he has shown *G. B.*'s Words to be di-
 rectly contrary to the *Language of the Scriptures*, we
 shall consider of such his *Demonstrations*.

P. 45. He cites me owning, *That the Scriptures*
are called a Revelation of the Mind of God to Mankind,
written by the Apostles as they were moved by the Holy
Ghost. My Words are, “ I take it for granted,
 “ as the universal Consent of Christians, that the
 “ holy Scriptures were wrote by Men who were in-
 “ spired with the Spirit of God, and according to
 “ the Apostles, *2 Pet. i. 20. Moved thereto by the*
 “ *Holy Ghost*, and therefore they are called a *Reve-*
 “ *lation of the Mind of God to Mankind.*” Now
W. N. having nothing to object to this, most unjustly
 charges both *R. Barclay* and me, saying, *That I*
exactly follow the Method of R. Barclay, that is first to
commend, and then to disparage the Scriptures. An
 Aspersion which I have before clear'd *R. Barclay* of,
 and to shew that my self deserve it as little, I shall
 transcribe *verbatim* the Passage, he, though not ex-
 actly, cites from my *Vindication* p. 25. viz.

“ WHAT was the Rule before the Scriptures
 “ were written? To say the World had no Rule,
 “ would be to assert they acted without Rule, which
 “ would be absurd; the Scriptures could be no Rule
 “ till

“ till they were in being, which was above two thousand Years after the Creation of the World ; and therefore there must be something as a Rule antecedent to the Scriptures, and which they themselves plentifully set forth, was the Spirit of God, and by whose Direction, and under whose Influence, they were wrote : And consequently that must be the primary and principal Rule ; to deny this would be to assert that the Thing revealed is antecedent to that which reveal'd it.”

How this can be called *Disparaging* the Scriptures I cannot conceive, neither has *W. N.* at all made appear : But 'tis usual with him, to charge without Proof.

WE come next to the Answer he gives to that Question of mine, viz. *What was the Rule before the Scriptures were written?* “ I answer, says he, That the World was not without a Rule before the Scriptures were written ; for God chose to reveal his Will to Men another Way ; that is, by a lively Voice, or by Dreams, or by Ministration of Angels, and now and then by the Ministry of the Prophets.” But how far this comes short of the Point, his next Words shew, viz. “ These were Favours afforded but to very few of all Mankind, and very seldom.” Then to be sure these were not a Rule to the World in general. By what then were all Mankind, except those few, directed ? He tells us thus, “ For the greatest Part of the World at that day, was left to the dim Light of Nature, or Light within, without divine Revelation.” This contemptuous Treatment of the *Light within*, under the scornful Appellation of the *dim Light of Nature*, is altogether contrary to the Testimony of the holy Scriptures, wherein it is frequently dignified with the highest and most honourable Titles, even those of God, Christ, &c. *This,*

F 4

says

says the beloved Disciple, *is the Message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is Light.* 1 John i. 5. And saith the Apostle Paul, *God, who commanded the Light to shine out of Darknes, hath shined in our Hearts.* 2 Cor. iv. 6. That's *within.* Our Saviour Jesus Christ speaking of himself saith, *I am the Light of the World.* And that this *Light* is the same with the Spirit of God, *W. P.* in his Works Vol. II. p. 861. fully proves from the Sameness of the Properties thereto in Scripture ascribed, which I shall present to the Readers View in the following Parallell,

PROPERTIES of the
L I G H T.

1. “ The Light proceeds from the *One Word*, and *One Life* of that *One Word*, which was with God and was God. *John* i. 4, 9.

2. “ It is *universal*, it lighteth every Man, *John* i. 9.

3. “ It giveth the Knowledge of God & Fellowship with him. *Rom.* i. 19. *John* iii. 21. 1 *John* i. 5, 6.

PROPERTIES of the
S P I R I T.

1. “ It proceedeth from God because it is the Spirit of God. *Rom.* vi. 11.

2. “ It is universal. It strove with the Old World. *Gen.* vi. 3. Then to be sure with the New One, *Every one* hath a Measure of it given to profit withal. 1 *Cor.* xii.

3. “ It revealeth God, *Job.* xxxii. 8. 1 *Cor.* ii. 10, 11.

4. “ It

Sect. III. Of the Holy Scriptures. 73

PROPERTIES of the
L I G H T.

PROPERTIES of the
S P I R I T.

4. " It manifesteth &
" reproveth Evil. *John*
" iii. 20. *Eph.* v. 13.

4. " It reproveth Sin.
" *John* xvi. 8.

5. " It is made the
" Rule and Guide of
" Christian Walking.
" *Psal.* xliiii. 3. *John* viii.
" 12. *Eph.* v. 13, 15.

5. " It is a Rule and
" Guide for the Chil-
" dren of God to walk
" by. *Rom.* viii. 14.

6. " It is the Path for
" God's People to go
" in. *Psal* cxix. 105.
" *Prov.* iv. 18. *Isa.* ii. 5.
" 1 *John* i. 7. *Rev.* xxi.
" 4. *And the Nations of*
" *them that are saved shall*
" *walk in the Light of*
" *the Lamb.*

6. " It is also the Path
" they are to walk in.
" *Rom.* viii. 1. *Gal.* v.
" 16. *Walk in the Spirit.*

Lastly, " It is the Ar-
" mour of the Children
" of God against Satan,
" *Psal.* xxvii. 1. *The*
" *Lord is my Light whom*
" *shall I fear.* *Rom.*
" xiii. 12. *Let us put on*
" *the Armour of Light.*

Lastly, " This is not
" all. It is likewise the
" spiritual Weapon of
" a true Christian. *Eph.*
" vi. 17. *Take the Sword*
" *of the Spirit, which is*
" *the Word of God.*

THIS Light, which is the same with the *Spirit of God*, was the *Light of the World* before the Scriptures were written. *Gen.* vi. 3. *And the Lord said, my Spirit shall not always strive with Man.* This was the Rule before the Scriptures were, and the Cause of the Destruction of the Old World was not the *Dimness*

ness of the Light, as *W. N.* suggests, but their *Disobedience to it*. This is evident in the Case of the *Israelites* in the Wilderness, of whom it is said, *Neb. ix. 20. Thou gavest also thy good Spirit to instruct them. And vers. 26. Nevertheless they were disobedient and rebelled against thee.*

THESE are some of the many Scripture Testimonies concerning the *Light within*, which *W. N.* (*absit Blasphemia*) calls the *dim Light of Nature*. Many of those he counts *Heathens* were taught by this Light within, far more Scriptural Conceptions of its Divinity and Excellency than this Professor of Christianity seems to have: I shall cite a few of them,

PHOCYLIDES said, * “ God has given to
“ every Creature an innate natural Defence; to the
“ Birds, an exceeding Swiftness; to the Lions
“ Strength; to Bulls the Power of brandishing their
“ Horns; to Bees Stings: But Reason is the Safe-
“ guard of Men: But the Word of divinely inspired
“ Wisdom is the best.”

PYTHAGORAS said, † “ Consider all Things,
“ the most excellent Reason from above, being thy
“ Guide, (or Charioteer.)

ORPHEUS

* Ὅπλον ἐκάσω νῆιμε θεὸς φύσιν ἠερόφαιτον,
“ Ὀρνισι μὲν πολλὴν ταχυτήτ’, ἀλλήν τε λέουσι,
“ Ταυροῖς δ’ αὐτοχύτοις κεράεσσιν, κειτρα μελίσσαις
“ Ἐμουτον ἄλλακ’ ἔδωκε λόγος δ’ ἔρυμ ἀνθρώποισι.
“ Ἰῆς δὲ θεοπνέου σοφίης λόγος ἔστιν ἀρίστος.

Phocyclidis poema admonitorium. V. 117. ad 122.

† φράζου ἕκαστα,
“ Ἠνίοχον γνῶμην εἴσας καθ’ ὑπερθεὶν ἀρίστην.
Pythagoræ aurea Carmina. V. 68, 69.

ORPHEUS speaks thus, * “ But looking to the
 “ Divine Word, attend diligently on it, directing
 “ the rational Capacity of thy Heart thereto, and
 “ go strait forward, and look only to the King of
 “ the World.”

HE that desires to see a large Collection of *Gen-
 tile Authors* in Proof of this great *Truth* of the Divi-
 nity of the Light within, may peruse *W. Penn’s* Chri-
 stian Quaker, *Chap. 8. In his Works, Vol. I. p. 547.*

As to *W. Notcutt’s* saying *p. 46.* “ Whatever
 “ the Light within was to them, they are all said,
 “ till that Time [*viz.* of the Gospel Revelation] to
 “ sit in Darkness, and the Regions of the Shadow of
 “ Death:” Those Words do by no means import
 any Imperfection or Dimness in the Light they had,
 but a Darkness contracted by Disobedience; *Because*
saith the Apostle, That when they knew God, they glo-
rified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became
vain in their Imaginations, and their foolish Heart was
darkned. Rom. i. 21.

BUT *W. N.* who often gives with one hand more
 than he takes away with t’other, after all his gross
 Mistakes about the Rule of Faith to those who had
 no Scripture, is become very condescending: “ We
 “ own, *says he, p. 46.* that the Scriptures of them-
 “ selves are not sufficient to Salvation, without the
 “ Power of the Spirit of God accompanying them;
 “ but we believe also, that the Spirit of God teaches,
 “ works upon, and leads Souls, in order to Salvation
 “ by

* Ἔτι δὲ λόγον θεῖον βλέψας, τὴν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν
 ἰδύναν καρδίας νεκρὴν κύτος, ἐν δὲ ἐπίσταται
 Ἄτραπιτῆ, μὲνον δ’ ἐσθρα κόσμιο ἀνακτα.
Orpheus de Deo. Poetæ minores Græci. Cantabrigiæ. 1634.

“ by the *written Word.*” [He means the *Scriptures.*] In this we concur with him, but he must give us leave to add, that we do believe that the Spirit of God did teach, work upon, and lead Souls in order to Salvation before the Scriptures were written, and that the same Spirit doth at this day teach, work upon, and lead Souls who have not the Scriptures, in order to Salvation without them : Whensoever *W. N.* who seems not to digest this Doctrine, shall be pleased expressly to deny it, we may plainly lay before him the dreadful Consequences of such Denial.

HE adds, “ We also acknowledge that the Spirit of God is the Author of the Gospel Rule of Faith ; and as the Scriptures are the revealed Will of God, and the Mind of the Spirit, so those that are try’d by the Scriptures are judged and tried by the Spirit of God.” Supposing this to be consequentially true, yet it doth by no means follow that the Spirit in its Tryings, Judgings, and Determinations, is so limited to the Use of the Scriptures, as not also to try, judge and determine without them.

HE then queries, “ What if we grant them that the *Spirit of God*, who is the Holy Ghost, is to be owned as the sole Judge of all Doctrines, and of all Controversies in Religion ? ” Why truly in so doing he would act right honestly, and close the Debate between us on this Head, by granting us the very Point we contend for ; which would be much more commendable, and favour of more Sincerity, than continuing, as he does, to cavil causelessly at what he can’t confute. For we are every whit as ready as himself to deny, *That every, or any, Man’s private Spirit is to be the Judge of Controversies.*

HIS little Flirt about *some of us taking our own strong Imaginations to be the immediate Impulse and Inspiration*

spiration of the Spirit of God, were it true, could no more prove that Men are not to be directed by the *Immediate Impulse and Inspiration of the Spirit*, than his own frequent muddy Mistakes of the true Sense of Scripture would prove that the Scriptures mislead Men. Away with such trifling, which carries not the Appearance of Argument.

HIS pretended Instance of a Contradiction of *W. Penn* and *R. Barclay*, has nothing in it, for *W. P.* does not say what *W. Notcutt* affirms he saith, viz. *That we can never prove by Authority of the Scriptures, that they were given forth by Inspiration of God.* But *W. P.* is there speaking of *J. Faldo*, who, he says, *by Authorities can never prove the Scriptures to be given by Inspiration, or that they are truly collected*; By which, as the Context manifestly shews, he meant not the *Authority of the Scriptures*, but the Authorities of those Persons or Councils who collected them.

BESIDES, that *W. P.* did acknowledge the Divine Authority and Inspiration of the Scriptures, every Man that reads with his Eyes open may see in the same Page, where speaking of the Scriptures he says, “ I believe great and good Things of them, and that from no less Evidence than the Eternal Word that gave them forth, which has oftentimes given my Soul a deep Savour of those blessed Truths it declares of, though we cannot allow them to be the *Word*, though the *Words of God.*” Again in the next Page, “ We accept them as the *Words of God himself*, and by the Assistance of his Spirit they are read with great Instruction and Comfort. I esteem them the best of Writings, and desire nothing more frequently than that I may lead the Life they exhort to; and whatever slight Appre-

“ hensions my * disingenuous Adversary is pleas’d
 “ to have of these kind of Acknowledgments, I
 “ write the naked Truth of my Heart, knowing I
 “ must give an Account to God.” What I have
 here transcrib’d from *W. P’s Works*, Vol. II. p.
 326, 327. fully shews the Unreasonableness of *W. N.*
 in thus exclaiming, *It is strange that W. Penn, a*
Man pretending to Divine Inspiration, should be igno-
rant of that Text † 2 Tim. iii. 16. All Scripture is
given by Inspiration of God. And again, Behold how
the Light within contradicts it self! For all which he
 has no Foundation but a false Quotation of his own
 making; and which had it been true, would have
 proved nothing of the Point he aims at.

WHAT he says p. 47. of *G. Fox*, we have spoke
 to in p. 57. foregoing.

HE asserts p. 47. that “ They [the Scriptures]
 “ come fully confirm’d to us with the broad Seal of
 “ the King of Heaven, in the many Miracles wrought
 “ by the Spirit of God for their Confirmation.”
 But had he given himself time to think, he might
 have perceiv’d, that all the Miracles recorded in the
 Scriptures, were wrought, before the respective Scrip-
 tures which give an Account of them were written:
 This is a self evident Truth, from whence, I think it
 as evidently follows, that the *Miracles* were so far
 from being wrought for the *Confirmation* of the Scrip-
 tures;

* Such was *J. Faldo* then, and such is *W. N.* now.

† If *W. N.* please to consult this Text in his Greek Testa-
 ment, he will find the Word *IS* to be only a Supplement of
 the Translators, and that the same Text may be render’d, *All*
Scripture given by Inspiration, is also profitable, &c. which would
 be full as agreeable to the Truth, but not so much to his Pur-
 pose.

tures, that the Scriptures themselves were written for the *Confirmation* of the *Truth* of *Miracles*.

MY Question which he produces *p. 47.* though he seem'd at first to evade it, yet he afterward answers by giving up the Point in this plain Acknowledgment, " We own, *says he,* that the Spirit of God, who is the Holy Ghost, by whose Inspiration the Scriptures were given out, is above the Scriptures." Thus he grants what I contend for; but then he adds, " We very needfully distinguish between the Spirit of God, and the Spirit which the *Quakers* talk of." A Distinction which (tho' 'tis the main Basis of his rotten Cause) I have already shewn to be a *meer Forgery* of his own, a *Brat* of his own *Brain*, which he would falsly father upon the *Quakers*, who direct to the Guidance of no other Spirit than the *Spirit of God*, and therefore I heartily wish him true Repentance for all the ungodly Speeches and reproachful Terms which he has utter'd against the *Spirit* which the *Quakers* talk of.

P. 48. W. N. says, " That I attempt to prove that there are immediate Revelations and Manifestations of the Spirit; because Christians of several Denominations, pray for the Assistance of the Spirit to perform the several Duties of Religion." And that I say, " It would be preposterous to pray for that which cannot be obtained."

THIS Inference, which I thought a very natural one, he says, *is weak and fallacious.* " This, *says he,* can never prove in effect we own the Light within to be the primary Rule; for we don't look within us for Assistance, but to the Spirit of God without us, even to Heaven, whence our Help must come."

WHAT an unguarded Expression is this? Does he call in question the Omnipresence of God? Or would he circumscribe and limit to *Heaven* his *Holy Spirit*, whom the *Heaven of Heavens cannot contain*? Will he make void the great Blessing of the Gospel Dispensation, *Christ in you, the Hope of Glory*? Col. i. 27. Or will he deny the Indwelling of the Spirit of God, who is *above all, through all, and IN you all*. Ephes. iv. 6? How are Men to witness and experience the Power and Assistances of the Spirit, if not *within* them? And is not the Spirit of God present where it operates? The Apostle says, That the *Power of God worketh IN us*. Ephes. iii. 20. *The Spirit of God dwelleth in you*. 1 Cor. iii. 16. *The Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us*. 2 Tim. i. 14. 'Tis pity the poor Man was not better instructed in the Christian Doctrine, before he undertook the Office of a Teacher. But, alas! when Men make it their Business to oppose the *Light or Spirit within*, they are suffer'd to fall into gross *Darkness*, even *Darkness* that may be felt. The very *Heathen*, who *W. N.* says were left to the dim Light of Nature, would have instructed him better: *Pythagoras* taught the * *Cobabitation of the Immortal God and mortal Men*.

HIERON, an ancient Philosopher, said, *The Eternal Mind is God, manifesting himself in every Particular of us*.

MANY more of their Testimonies to the Indwelling of the Spirit of God, may be seen in *W. P's Christian Quaker*, in the Folio Edition of his *Works*, Vol. I. p. 547, &c.

IN

* Γίωσι ἀθανάτων τε θεῶν ἐν ἡμῶν τ' ἀνθρώπων
 Σύστασι

IN my *Vind.* p. 27: I brought five Texts of Scripture to prove, that *there are Immediate Manifestations, or Revelations of the Spirit of God*, and that such *Manifestations or Revelations of the Spirit* were a Rule antecedent to the Scriptures.

THE first of those Texts was 1 Cor. xii. 17: *But the Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal.* Upon which *W. Notcutt* thus remarks p. 48, 49. “ I answer, that’s very true, we never deny the Words of Scripture. Every spiritual Gift is given to us to profit our selves and others withal, as much as we can: But how does that prove that the Spirit or Light within them is the primary Rule? ” To which I answer, *Because the Spirit did immediately manifest and reveal it self before the Scriptures were.* But he says, if we can believe him, “ I might as well argue thus, That the holy Scriptures themselves were given to every Man to profit withal; therefore the Scriptures are the primary Rule.” Notable indeed! As if because I drew a *just Conclusion* from *Premises* undoubtedly true, being the express Words of Scripture; he might as well draw an unjust one from an Assertion of his own evidently false: For he cannot but know that the far greater Part of Mankind never had the holy Scriptures.

THE next Text I produced was 1 Cor. ii. 10. *But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit, for the Spirit searcheth all Things, yea, the deep Things of God.*

UPON this *W. Notcutt* says, “ Here again he confounds the *Holy Spirit of God* with the *Light within*, for that’s what he means by *the Spirit.* ”

Ans. 'T IS no Confusion to mean by the *Light within the Spirit of God*, because, as I have before fully shewn, they are *one and the same* in the Dialect of holy Scripture.

W. N. “ WE believe, and heartily own, that
“ the *Spirit of God*, who is very *God*, searches all
“ *Things*, yea, *the deep Things of God*; (and no Man
“ can deny it without the greatest Blasphemy.”)

Ans. TO deny it of the *Light within*, which is the same with the *Spirit of God*, doth consequently involve a Man in the same Guilt.

W. N. “ BUT can the Spirit in the *Quakers* do
“ so? Or can the *Light within* search all *Things*;
“ yea, *the deep Things of God*? ”

Ans. UNDOUBTEDLY the *Light within*, which is the same with the *Spirit of God*, can do the same *Things*.

W. N. “ IF this Text may be apply'd to the
“ Spirit in every *Quaker*, then it may be equally
“ applied to every *Heathen* or *Pagan*; for by their
“ own Confession, those have the Spirit within as
“ well as the *Quakers*; but does the Spirit in *Hea-*
“ *thens* and *Pagans* search the deep *Things of God*? ”

Ans. THE *Light*, or *Spirit of God*, in many of those he calls *Heathens* or *Pagans*, did instruct them clearly in some of the deep *Things of God*, viz. not only in *Excellent Morality*, but in the Knowledge of the *Divinity* and *Universality of the Light within*, and the *Indwelling of the Spirit of God in Man*. These are great and Gospel Truths, yet *Things* to mysterious to *W. Notcutt*, that he seems in the understanding of them, (notwithstanding his high Pretensions)

Pretensions) to be but a meer Batt, or Bird of the Night, in comparifon of fome of the moft enlightned Gentiles, fuch as *Pythagoras, Plato, Socrates*, and many others.

W. N. “ IF fo, how is it faid, that they are “ *without God, and without Chrift, in the World ?* ”

Anfw. THOSE Gentiles, who, as the Apoftle *Paul* fays, *Ephes. ii. 12. were Strangers to the Covenant of Promise, having no Hope, and without God in the World*, were not fuch as had been obedient to the Light and Knowledge they had received ; but fuch as he fpeaks of in the fame Chapter, *who had been dead in Trefpaffes and Sins, and had their former Converfation in the Lufts of the Flefh, fulfilling the Defires of the Flefh and of the Mind.* Verf. 1, 3.

THE third Text I cited, was *1 Cor. ii. 11. For what Man knoweth the Things of a Man, fave the Spirit of Man which is in him, even fo the Things of God knoweth no Man but the Spirit of God.* This Text preffes hard upon *W. Notcutt*, and drives him to his old threadbare Diftribution, his dernier Refuge, when he has nothing elfe to fay. “ This, fays he, is intended of the Spirit, who is very God, and not of the Light within.” And then charges me thus, “ But he moft wretchedly wrefts the Scriptures, applying to their own private Spirit, that which belongs alone to the Spirit of God.” A grofs Abuse, for we never meant by the Light within any private Spirit, but the *Universal Spirit* of God only.

I alfo cited two other Texts, *viz. 1 Cor. xii 3. No Man can fay that Jefus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghoft. Mat. xi. 27. No Man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any Man the Father fave the Son, and he to whomfoever the Son will reveal him.*

These Texts so evidently confirm what I said, that himself in this Place passes them by without Objection: Yet he rattles on to no purpose about a Page farther, and then tells us, “ That any will readily own that the Spirit of God must be greater than the Scriptures, provided they intend it of the Holy Ghost.” As most certainly we do. So that the Question as stated by himself, *Whether the Light within every Man be a better Rule than the holy Scriptures?* Is all one and of the same Import as to ask, *Whether the Spirit of God within every Man be a better Rule than the holy Scriptures?* And let him propose the Question either way, it will be answer’d in the Affirmative by every sober Christian that observes our real Meaning of the Terms. But seeing *W. N.* says, “ I shall take more Notice of this under the Head of the *Light within*, therefore I dismiss it here.” We shall do so too, and attend him again when his farther Observations call for it.

NEAR the Bottom of *p. 51*, he cites me saying, “ That the Knowledge of God, is no other way to be obtained, but by the Revelation of Jesus Christ.” But takes no Notice of the Text I cited, which says the same Thing, viz. *No Man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any Man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him*, Mat. xi. 27. If I did not say, *saving Knowledge*, neither doth the Text say, *savingly* knoweth. So that his Remark *p. 52*. “ If *H. B.* had said, that the *saving* Knowledge of God is obtained only by Jesus Christ, we own it; but that’s not what he asserted; so indiscreet and unguarded was he in this Assertion,” is equally applicable to the Text it self; which if he rightly consider, he will see his own Indiscretion and Unguardedness on this Occasion.

HIS saying “ That Men may know the Being
 “ and Perfection of God by the Study of the Works
 “ of the Creation,” is not to the purpose, since
 their Understandings must be first enlightned by the
 Spirit of God, before they can make just and religi-
 ous Inferences from the Observation of his Works.

W. N. p. 52. says thus, “ *H. B.* argues, That
 “ if we deny the immediate Revelation of the Spirit
 “ in them, we weaken the Authority of immediate
 “ Revelation to those that wrote the Scriptures.”
 “ This is Childish arguing indeed. What if we should
 “ assert, that the *Quakers*, at this Day, are not
 “ divinely inspired, will it follow from thence that
 “ there never was any such thing as Immediate Re-
 “ velation? Or if any should say, that *H. B.* is not
 “ divinely inspired, would it follow from thence
 “ that *Moses* or *Paul* were not inspired? This Sug-
 “ gestion is but Fallacy, and a meer Cheat: If any
 “ should assert that *H. B.* was under Delusion, will
 “ it follow that the Prophets and Apostles were so
 “ too? I think any one can see the Weakness of
 “ such arguing.”

BEHOLD the Froth and Levity of the Man!
 who exercises all this wanton Insolence upon no other
 Occasion than his own false Citation of my Words:
 This shews that he loves Play, and to make himself
 Sport. What I said, I shall here transcribe *verba-*
tim. “ To deny the Precedency and Certainty of
 “ Immediate Manifestations of the Spirit, would
 “ threaten the Authority of Mediate Revelation;
 “ for though it is a mediate Revelation to us, yet it
 “ was Immediate Revelation or Inspiration to those
 “ who wrote the holy Scriptures, and therefore to
 “ give Precedency to the Scriptures, and make
 “ them the primary Rule, would be as bad Logick

“ as this is false Philosophy to place the Effect before the Cause.”

INSTEAD of an Answer to this, the poor Man shrugs up his Shoulders, and says, “ It is an hard Task to instruct the Conceited and Self-willed.” Asks his Reader’s *Pardon for saying again as he said before*, and then retires behind his old false Distinction, “ That by the Spirit of God they mean no more than their own private Spirit,” which we have again and again confuted, and he says nothing in support of, but this, “ Which Light they call the Spirit, but we deny it.” What then? Can he imagine that any body will believe, that he knows our Meaning better than we our selves do? But alas, finding himself destitute of reasonable Argument, he falls into *downright Raving*, crying out *p. 53.* that “ we do not speak plain as honest Men should, that we choose such Expressions as may (like *Janus’s* Face look two ways; or like the Answers given out by the Oracle of *Apollo*) admit of a double Interpretation, that *we* may leave room for a Retreat when *we* are driven to a Strait.” When as he makes all this lying Declamation purely for his own Retreat from the plain Force of my Argument. Such Usage as this our Christian Testimony to the *Divine Light* of Christ within entitles us to, from such outside and formal Professors as himself; we have been accustom’d to it, and can patiently bear it. But from abusing us for giving to the *Light within* such Appellations as the *holy Scriptures* do, he proceeds like a *Child of Darkness*, to rail against the *Light* it self, and says *p. 54.* *It is an IDOL.* Adding, “ It is the whole of the *Quakers* Religion to look to, believe in, and obey the *Light* in themselves.” I am heartily sorry that ’tis no Part of his: For the *Light* we believe in, is no other than that spoken of, *John* i. 9. &c. He goes on, “ But this Idol must fall
“ before

“ before the Ark of God ; and as it has neither
 “ Head nor Tail, so it will be found to be a God
 “ that cannot save.” O prophane ! As if the God
 that can save had *Head* and *Tail*. What shall I say,
 I stand surpriz’d at the *gross Irreverence* of his Expres-
 sions, which if upon serious Thoughts he shall come
 to see and retract, as proceeding from the *sudden*
Transports of his *confuted Rage* and *Madness*, we shall
 forbear to impute them to him as *blasphemous*.

HIS Distinctions p. 55. between the *Ruler* and
 the *Rule*: The Person that builds, and the *Rule* by
 which he builds ; are not scriptural : For in the Di-
 alect of holy Writ, Christ who is the *Guide* is also
 the *Way*, John xiv. 6. He who is the *Builder*, is also
 the *Foundation* of the Building, 1 Cor. iii. 11. and
 the *Corner-Stone*, Ephes. ii. 20. which sufficiently
 shews his Objections on that Head to be but empty
 Cavilling.

THE next Thing we shall observe is his Com-
 ment p. 55. upon *Deut. xxix. 29. The secret things*
belong unto the Lord our God ; but those things which
are revealed, belong unto us, and to our Children for
ever, that we may do all the Words of this Law.
 Whence he argues thus, “ Hereby we learn that
 “ we are not to wait for and expect new Revelations ;
 “ God has settled one Revelation of the holy Scrip-
 “ tures, to be the Standard of Truth for ever.”
 Certainly when *W. N.* drew this Inference from that
 Text, he did not look before he leapt, nor consider
 when it was written, or he must have seen the plain
 Consequence of it, which is the utter Exclusion of
 all the New Testament, and all the Writings of the
 Prophets and holy Men after *Moses*, from being any
 Part of the *one Revelation of the holy Scriptures* ; what
 was then written, being, according to him, by that

Text styled to be the Standard of Truth for ever. *Credat Judæus Apella.* Let him believe it that can.

P. 56. He produces a Text which I had cited, viz. *John v. 39 Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have Eternal Life, and they are they which testify of me, and ye will not come to me, that ye might have Life.* And then adds, “How this Scripture favours the *Quakers*, as to their Notion of Christ’s being the only Rule, I believe none can make out, without first putting on the *Quakers* Spectacles; for if the Scriptures must be searched, in Order to know *Jesus Christ*, and they are the only means of knowing him; then the Scriptures are the only Rule.”

THAT Text, however insisted on by *W. N.* as containing a Command to *search the Scriptures*, is in reality a Reproof upon the high professing *Jews*, for their Unbelief, and not coming to Christ *that they might have Life.* They professed an high Regard for the Scriptures, as appears by the Words of the Text, *In them ye think ye have eternal Life.* Now the Greek Word [Ἐπιμαρτυρεῖτε] may be rendered as well Indicatively, *Ye search*, as Imperatively, *Search ye.* And indeed the former Rendering seems evidently more agreeable to the Scope of the Place; which will then stand thus, *To search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal Life, and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come unto me that ye may have Life.* So that this Text is indeed so far from commanding to search the Scriptures, that it is a severe Reproof of those pretended Admirers of them, for not coming to him of whom they testify, nor to the Guidance of his Spirit, which would have led them to a right Understanding thereof.

THE Answer which he says *p. 57.* we give to Enquirers, *viz.* “ Turn into thyself, hearken to the Light, obey the Light, believe in the Light within, attend to the Guide within,” is excellent Advice, altogether Scriptural and Evangelical ; nor doth in the least import a disowning of the Existence of God and Christ in Heaven, as he most fillily suggests.

HE says also *p. 57.* that we “ want the necessary Distinction, between *Jesus Christ* the Author of Salvation, and the Scriptures which are the ordinary means of Salvation.” Whereas we most scripturally distinguish between *Jesus Christ*, who by his Holy Spirit immediately teaches, instructs, and guides his People ; and the *holy Scriptures*, which direct Men to follow his Guidance and Instructions.

NOR do we as he weakly insinuates *p. 57, 58.* by exhorting People to obey *Christ within*, in the least exclude a Belief in *Christ* without, who is the same and not another ; who though his glorified Manhood be exalted, and sits at the right Hand of God ; yet his Divine and Holy Spirit is every where present, and particularly in the Hearts of the Children of Men, reprovng them for the unfruitful Works of Darkness, and leading all that become obedient to its Guidance and Directions, in the Paths of Truth and Righteousness unto Life and Immortality.

HIS Assertion *p. 58.* that *W. Penn* calls *Christ* but a moral Virtue, I deny, and put him upon the Proof of ; which when he attempts to do, I may consider of his Performance.

HE is guilty of another false Assertion in the same Page, which is, that *this Spirit* that we say is above the Scriptures, teaches Men to slight the Scriptures.

tures. Which cannot be ; because it is that which gave forth the *Scriptures*, and always teaches Men a due Regard and Esteem for them.

W. N. tells us *p.* 59. That *p.* 30, 31. *H. B.* gives us his Reason “such as it is, why he cannot call the “ the *Scriptures* the Word of God.” What I there said I shall transcribe, “ The *Word* is an Appella-
 “ tion given to our Lord Jesus Christ, and whatever
 “ Appellation it given to him, I conceive, it is not
 “ proper to give to any other ; and for this Reason
 “ it is, that the *Quakers* object against the Scrip-
 “ tures being called the Word of God, because the
 “ *Word* of God is our Lord Jesus Christ, and is a
 “ particular Appellation, as appears by the foreci-
 “ ted *Scriptures.*” I also plac’d in the Margin the following Note, *viz.* “ I here observe, that the
 “ several Places of Scripture quoted by the *Review-*
 “ *er* in *p.* 13, 14. to prove that the Spirit calls the
 “ Bible the Word of God, not one of them doth
 “ prove any such Matter, but on the contrary,
 “ where the Word is mentioned in these Places, it
 “ expressly regards the Spirit, neither can in the na-
 “ ture of the thing be true, respecting the Bible
 “ taken collectively, seeing a considerable Part of
 “ it was not then wrote.”

THAT the Reader may judge of the Truth of what I asserted, I shall examine the several Texts which he again *p.* 60, 61. produces.

1. *The Word that* *Isaiah, the Son of Amos, saw, concerning Judah and Jerusalems.* *Isa.* ii. 1. Cannot possibly relate to the *Scriptures*; because what he saw was not written when he saw it; and he had equally seen it, if no Account of it had ever been committed to Writing.

2. *So shall my Word be that goeth out of my Mouth.* Isa. lv. 11. doth not relate to the Scriptures; but to the Command, or rather the Spirit the Messenger of God: For how blindly soever *W. N.* imagines it *Nonsense* to read that Place, *So shall my Spirit be that goeth out of my Mouth*; yet is that Reading most agreeable to the Words of the Text immediately following, which imply the Office of an effectual Agent, or Performer of a Command; *It shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I send it.*

3. *The Word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord.* Jer. vii. 1. The very next Word which *W. N.* has left out, viz. [*Saying*] doth plainly shew, that *the Word* in that Verse mentioned, denotes the Spirit of the Lord which delivered to *Jeremiah* his Message. But *W. N.* says, “It is the same that is also called “the Words of the Lord,” citing the next Verse thus, *Stand in the Gate of the Lord’s House and speak these Words.* Whereas the Text is, *Stand in the Gate of the House of the Lord and proclaim this Word.* I mention this to shew how he can alter a Text to serve his own Turn,

4. *The Word that Jeremiah spake unto Baruch.* Jer. xlv. 1. could not possibly mean the Writing or Account of it which *Baruch* wrote. For the *Word* that *Jeremiah* spake would have been *the Word*, tho’ *Baruch* had never written concerning it.

5. *Now the Parable is this, the Seed is the Word of God, those by the way-side are those that hear; then cometh the Devil, and taketh away the Word out of their Hearts, lest they should believe and be saved.* Luke viii. 11, 12. This Text evidently relates to the Doctrine of the Gospel, *the glad Tidings of the Kingdom of God*, ver. 1. which Christ himself preached,
who

who saith, *John vi. 63. The Words that I speak unto you are Spirit.* And notwithstanding *W. N.*'s prophane Talk, *that the Devil cannot take away the Spirit*, yet certainly, through giving way to his Temptations, the Hearts of that People became hardned, and their Ears dull of Hearing, so that they did not receive the Testimony of Christ, whose Words, as is said in the Text before cited, are *Spirit*, and they are *Life*, and which had they accepted, would have quickned and enlivened their Souls.

THUS we see, that *W. N.* rather than acknowledge one mistaken Assertion of his, will corrupt and wrest many Texts to defend it.

6. *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost; and they spake the Word.* Who can be so weak as to think this has any relation to the Scriptures; or that, *they spake the Word*, in this Place, can signify they read a Chapter.

W. N. yet adds some other Texts that (he says p. 61.) shew us that the Scriptures are called the *Word of God*.

7. *Sergius Paulus, a prudent Man, who called for Barnabas and Paul, and desired to hear the Word of God.* Acts xiii. 7. This he produces to shew that the Scriptures are called the *Word of God*; but contradicts his own Assertion in the very next Words, saying, “That Word which they desired to hear, was the Message of God from their Mouths.”

8. *We are not as many, who corrupt the Word of God.* 2 Cor. ii. 17. must be understood of the Doctrine of the Gospel which they preached. The Greek Text is, *Ὅτι γὰρ ἕσμεν, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ καταπλέουσι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ.* *We are not as many, making Sale or Merchandise*

dise of the Word of God: Which may more justly be rendred, *We do not preach for Hire, than, we do not corrupt the Scriptures.*

9. *But have renounced the hidden Things of Dishonesty, not walking in Craftiness, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully.* 2 Cor. iv. 2. is much of the same Import with the former. For, saith the Apostle, Vers. 5. *we preach not our selves, but Christ Jesus the Lord.* For those in Scripture are counted Deceivers, who seek their own Profit, who take the Oversight of the Flock for filthy Lucre, who serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own Belly. And (to use *W. N.*'s own Words) "it is no difficult Task to shew who do so;" I think the last Instance may serve for a Glass for *W. N.* to see his Face in.

10. *And take the Helmet of Salvation, and the Sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.* Ephes. vi. 17. Upon which he says, "What Nonsense would be made of this Text, if instead of *the Word of God*, any should read it, as *H. B.* would have us, either of *Christ*, or the *Spirit*." Yet certainly that Reading, how profanely soever by him call'd Nonsense, is most agreeable to the Context and Scope of the Place. For in the preceding Verses, what is meant by the *Girdle of Truth*, but *Truth it self*? What is intended by the *Breast-plate of Righteousness*, but *Righteousness it self*? Or by the *Shield of Faith*, but *Faith it self*? Or by the *Helmet of Salvation*, but *Salvation it self*. Even so, by the same Phrase or manner of Speaking, *The Sword of the Spirit* is *the Spirit it self*. But it seems all these Elegancies of Expression, used by the Apostle, are in *W. Notcutt's* Esteem NONSENSE.

11. *W. Notcutt* attributes that Expression, *Sharper than a two edged Sword.* Heb. iv. 12. to the Scriptures,

tures, though the very next Words of that Text might have taught him better, viz. Piercing even to the dividing asunder of Soul and Spirit, and of the Joints and Marrow, and is a Discerner of the Thoughts and Intents of the Heart, neither is there any Creature that is not manifest in his Sight. These are peculiar Attributes of God, and in no sense applicable to the Scriptures.

12. *Every Word of God is pure. Prov. xxx. 5. That is, says W. N. Every Portion of the Scriptures is so: As if that Text could relate to every Portion of the Scriptures, when as the far greater Portion of them was not at that Time written.*

13: *As new born Babes desire the sincere Milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby. 1 Pet. ii. 2. This he applies to the Scriptures, whereas the Apostle evidently speaks it of the Word whereof they were born again; Being, says he, born again, not of corruptible Seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever. Chap. i. Vers. 23. Though perhaps, W. N. in his superabundant Zeal for the Letter, will also apply the Word of God here spoken of, to the Scriptures, by asserting them to be incorruptible, and to live and abide for ever.*

14. *Man shall not live by Bread alone, but by every Word of God. Luke iv. 4. To interpret this of the Scriptures would imply, that Men live by the Scriptures, which would contradict that of the Apostle, 2 Cor. iii. 6. The Letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth Life.*

15. *But I certifie you, Brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me, is not after Man, for I neither received it of Man, neither was I taught it, but by the Revelation of Jesus Christ. Gal. i. 11, 12.*
Here

Here is another Text brought by *W. N.* in *p.* 68. to prove that the *holy Scriptures have their Original from Heaven, not of Men*; which we acknowledge to be true as to the Doctrine therein contained. But that this Text doth speak concerning the meer *Letter* of the Text, I think no Man can believe, till he shall first have shut his Eyes to follow *W. Notcutt* blindfold.

16. *The Law of thy Mouth is better unto me, than Thousands of Gold and Silver.* Psal. cxix. 72. Supposing what we see no Necessity to grant, that *David* then spake this concerning the *written Law of Moses*; yet what Proof are those Words of the Divine Authority of the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles who wrote several Ages after?

17. *I have esteemed the Words of his Mouth, more than my necessary Food.* Job. xxiii. 12. This Saying of *Job* is so far from *W. N.*'s Purpose, that it evidently shews, that *Job*, who * spake thus before any Scripture was written, could not possibly understand by that Expression, *the Words of his Mouth*, what *W. Notcutt* does.

HAVING now gone through all the Texts by him cited to prove the Scriptures to be called *the Word of God*, and I think sufficiently shewn that he has misapply'd them; the Saying of *E. Burroughs* by him cited *p.* 60. "That the Scriptures no where call themselves the Word of God," may yet stand true, notwithstanding any Thing *W. N.* has prov'd to the contrary. For such is the Absurdity
of

* *Job* is said to have lived when the Children of *Israel* dwelt in *Egypt*, about A. M. 2300, a considerable Time before *Moses*, the first Penman of the Scriptures, wrote.

of the Man, that having undertaken to prove that the Scriptures call themselves *the Word of God*, he takes that *Term* in any Text where he finds it, and applies it to the Scriptures, without any regard to its real Meaning.

WE are next to consider *W. N's Citations p. 63.* from *G. Fox, E. Burroughs, W. Bailey, and Isaac Pennington*, who called the Messages they had to communicate to Men, *the Word of the Lord*. After his producing of which, he thus exults, “ Where
 “ is the Sincerity of these Men, that pretend *Consci-*
 “ *ence*, for not calling the Scriptures *the Word of*
 “ *God*? And yet commonly call their own Writings
 “ so.” And then falls upon me in particular thus,
 “ But now take notice of another Cheat, *H. B.* re-
 “ plies to this, and saith, If *G. Fox* did say so of his
 “ own Writings, This is the Word of the Lord, he
 “ had the Example of the Prophets for so doing,
 “ and whosoever has such immediate Revelation,
 “ has right to follow their Example;” Here *H.*
 “ *B.* contradicts himself; for just now he said, *that*
 “ *the Scriptures or Message is no where called the Word*
 “ *or the Word of God*, but it is intended of the *Spirit*,
 “ and now he saith, that *G. Fox* had the Example of
 “ the Prophets in calling his Message *the Word of*
 “ *God*. Thus he either denies or affirms the same
 “ Thing, according as he has Occasion to serve his
 “ Turn.” In this he does me wrong, for I never
 yet did, nor do, deny, that the Messages received
 by the Prophets from God, are in holy Writ fre-
 quently called *the Word of the Lord*. My Words,
Vind. p. 33. by him not clearly cited, are these,
 “ It could not be understood that *G. F.* intended any
 “ Thing more than that it was the Counsel of God
 “ immediately impressed on his Mind, and herein
 “ I apprehend, that the Prophets are an Example
 “ in this Case: To say, *This is the Word of the Lord*,
 “ because

“ because it was to them an immediate Revelation
 “ of the Word, and whosoever has such immediate
 “ Revelation, has a right to follow their Example.
 “ And thus we find it the manner of the Prophets,
 “ *The Word of the Lord came unto me saying. Thus*
 “ *saiſt the Word of the Lord:* And herein I conceive
 “ *G. F.* would have been defensible for following
 “ their Example.” By which ’tis evident, that I
 do allow that the Prophets call’d their Messages re-
 ceiv’d by immediate Revelation, the Word of the
Lord. I indeed added that “ Neither they [the
 “ Prophets] nor him [*G. F.*] did ſay, that the Wri-
 “ tings or Meſſage which was ſent or delivered, was
 “ the *Word of God* PRECISELY UNDERSTOOD.”
 For I had before ſhewn, that the *Word of God*, ſo
 underſtood, was an Appellation of Jeſus Chriſt; ſo
 that I do admit they call’d their Meſſages *the Word*
of God, though not in that Senſe.

BUT theſe Objections, however now aſreſh vamt
 up by *W. N.* I find to be of an old Date, and to
 have been made above Thirty Years ago by *John*
Stillingfleet a Clergyman, and then ſo judiciously an-
 ſwer’d by Dr. DANIEL PHILIPS, as to ſhut up the
 Mouth of that Adverſary from making any Reply:
 I ſhall therefore here tranſcribe ſome of the ſaid Cler-
 gyman’s Objections, with the *Doctor’s* Anſwers there-
 to, as I find them in a Book call’d *Vindiciæ Veritatis*,
 printed at London Anno 1703.

P. 184. Objection. “ *A ſecond Inſtance I ſhall*
 “ *give you of theſe Men’s Contempt of the Holy Scrip-*
 “ *tures,* is their denying them to be the Word of
 “ God.

“ *Anſw.* IF all thoſe, that deny the Scriptures
 “ to be *properly the Word of God*, are to be eſteemed
 “ Contemners of them, we plead guilty to the In-
 H “ dictment,

“ dictment : But till our Enemies have proved those
 “ sacred Writings, in a collective Sense, are *pro-*
 “ *perly the Word of God*, they do little. We do,
 “ and have always granted, that figuratively, viz.
 “ by an *Enallage numeri*, they may be termed the
 “ *Word of God*. Some Essays have been made by
 “ our Opposers to prove a single Verse or Sentence
 “ in them, to be *the Word of God* ; but that is no-
 “ thing to the Subject under Debate : For the Con-
 “ troversy hath not been, whether a particular
 “ Passage in them is *the Word of God* ; but whether
 “ the Bible, collectively considered, is *the Word of*
 “ *God*. When *J. S.* [or *W. N.*] hath done this, I
 “ shall think his Arguments will merit my Obser-
 “ vation ; till then, if I dismiss them without any
 “ farther Reply, I would have him to understand,
 “ ’tis not because they are unanswerable, but because
 “ I conceive they are not pertinent, or to the Pur-
 “ pose.”

Ibid. p. 186. Objection. “ *The Laws of God are*
 “ *in holy Scripture, plainly called God’s Word.*

“ *Answ.* WHO hath opposed this? Certainly
 “ none of our Friends. We grant, that the Laws
 “ of God, and the Doctrines therein mentioned, are
 “ in holy Writ sometimes called the *Word of God*.
 “ The shortest way, in my Opinion, to bring this
 “ Controversy to a Period, will be for each Party
 “ to settle the precise determinate Signification of the
 “ Terms, *Word of God*. The Greek Word *λογος*
 “ which in the Places * mentioned by the *Reſtor*, is
 “ translated *Word*, signifies also *Reason, Speech,*
 “ *Treatise, a Sentence or Proposition, Command, Doc-*
 “ *trine, Christ, the Eternal Word, &c.* Hence it
 “ is

* Mark vii. 13. 1 Thes. ii. 13.

“ is possible that we may use the same articular
 “ Sounds, and at the same Time form different
 “ Ideas in our Minds concerning them. To re-
 “ move this Ambiguity in Terms, there is one way,
 “ which is to explain the determinate Sense, we an-
 “ nex to this or that particular Term in the Propo-
 “ sition controverted: Should we do this to the
 “ Term *Word* in the Sentence under Debate, viz.
 “ *whether the Scriptures are the Word of God or not,*
 “ the Difference between us and our Enemies, doubt-
 “ less, would be soon adjusted. By our Denial of
 “ the Scriptures being *the Word of God*, we only
 “ mean, that they are not *Christ the Eternal Word*
 “ *of God*; and some of our Opponents, by main-
 “ taining they are *the Word of God*, commonly in-
 “ tend (if I may judge by their Words) no more
 “ than *that they are the Words or Sayings of God,*
 “ *penned by Men divinely inspired*: In this Sense we
 “ grant the holy Scriptures may be called the Word
 “ of God; and I doubt not but *J. S.* will subscribe
 “ our Opinion, viz. *That they are not Christ the Eter-*
 “ *nal Word of God*, when he hath a true Idea con-
 “ cerning them; though some Ministers, in Oppo-
 “ sition to us, have blasphemously term’d them
 “ * *The Sword of the Spirit, the Power of God*: Nay,
 “ *God himself.*

Ibid. p. 187. Object. “ *No Arguments hitherto*
 “ *have prevailed with these Men, to own the Scriptures*
 “ *to be the Word of God, yet they have frequently*
 “ *called their own Writings the Word of the Lord.*”

“ *Ans.* ’Tis true, no Arguments hitherto used
 “ by our Opponents, have been so prevalent, as
 “ to convince us, *that the Scriptures may and ought*

H 2

“ to

* Of which Number is *W. Notcutt*, See his Reply, p. 62.

“ *to be properly called the Word of God*: We can no
 “ more imagine how Ten Thousand Words can be
 “ properly called *the Word*, than how Ten Thou-
 “ sand Men can be properly called *the Man*; when
 “ sufficient Reasons can be offered to persuade us of
 “ the Truth of the latter, we shall readily subscribe
 “ the former Proposition; if, till then, we enter-
 “ tain the same Opinion we have hitherto, we hope
 “ our Adversaries will not be so severe in censuring
 “ us, as they have formerly been; because we so-
 “ lemnly declare, That it is not the Prejudice of
 “ Education, but Scripture and Reason, that makes
 “ us hesitate in that Matter.

“ WE acknowledge, that though some have
 “ scrupled to call the Scriptures *the Word of God*,
 “ yet some of our Friends have called their Counsels
 “ given in writing, *the Word of the Lord*. The
 “ *Word of God*, is properly, in the New Testa-
 “ ment, predicated of the Eternal Son of God: To
 “ predicate the same Terms of the Scriptures, that
 “ we do of the Son of God, may induce ignorant
 “ Persons from the Identity of the Words, to con-
 “ clude, that the Scriptures are the only Word of
 “ God. From such Reasonings I am apt to think,
 “ sprung those blasphemous Expressions of certain
 “ *Priests* in the *North*, mention'd by *G. Fox* in his
 “ *Great Mystery*, who affirmed, That *the * Scrip-*
 “ *ture is God*, † *the Sword of the Spirit*, ¶ *the Power*
 “ *of God*, &c. To obviate such abominable Posi-
 “ tions for the future, our Friends have been obliged
 “ to oppose the calling the Scriptures *the Word of*
 “ *God*, by telling People, that *Christ was the Word*
 “ *of God*; and the Scriptures were the *Words*, and
 “ not properly *the Word of God*.

“ FROM

* P. 261.

† P. 247.

¶ P. 230.

“ FROM our calling any Writings the WORD OF THE LORD, this Mistake cannot arise ; because Christ is no where called *the Word of the Lord* ; and those Messages, which the Prophets, &c. instrumentally delivered to the House of *Israel* by a special *Afflatus*, are in sacred Writ commonly called *the Word of the Lord* : Therefore we do not oppose the calling those divine Messages, which some now a-days have been commanded, by the same Spirit the Prophets formerly had, to communicate to the People, the WORD OF THE LORD.”

THESE Answers that Adversary made no Reply to, let *W. Notcutt* shew his superior Abilities by doing what he did not.

W. NOTCUTT in his *Review*, had given a Relation of a Woman *who told him, One of their Preachers called the Bible rotten Scripture.* This I put him upon Proof of, but how does he do it ? Why truly he says, *p. 65.* “ I offer’d your Friends, to give them in Writing her Name and Place of Habitation, but they did not accept of it.” Which shews, that though he offered it, he did not give it. But he adds, *Why then do you question the Truth of it ?* Because he does not give now, what, he says, he offer’d to give then ; having as good an Opportunity now as he had then. In short, his silence herein, is a strong Confirmation of his Falshood : And ’tis a most pitiful *Salvo* for his crackt Credit, to say, *p. 66* “ But be that as it will, *S. Fisher* has said the same Thing, surely you will not call him an Old Woman.” A Term I had not us’d.

HE then cites *S. Fisher, Rust. p. 312.* thus : “ He was speaking to one that honoured the Scriptures, as our Rule. He saith, *Is your Word of*

“ God possible to be utterly corrupted? Ours is not:
 “ Is your Foundation, Rule, &c. so rotten, such a Nose
 “ of Wax?” This Honourer of the Scriptures was
 John Owen, who had made such a Pother about the
 Punctuation of the Hebrew Text, and the Danger of
 various Lectiōns therein, as to make the Certainty
 in and about all sacred Truth to depend thereon;
 crying out, “ Who shall secure us against the lux-
 “ uriant Spirits of these Days, who are bold on all
 “ Advantages, ἀνίετα κινεῖν, to break in upon every
 “ Thing that is holy and sacred, that they will not
 “ by their Huckstering utterly corrupt the *Word of*
 “ *God?*” Upon which *S. F.* expostulates with him,
 and shews that *the Word of God*, properly so called,
 could not be corrupted. He uses no such Expression
 as *rotten Scriptures*; but his Words purely refer to
 J. O’s Exclamations about the Danger of various
 Lectiōns, which he was then discoursing of.

W. N.’s next Citation p. 66. is from *Morn. Watch.*
 p. 22, 23. “ They call, *says he*, the holy Scrip-
 “ tures, Traditions of Men, Earthly Root, Dark-
 “ nefs and Confusion, *Nebuchadnezzar’s* Image, Pu-
 “ trefaction and Corruption, rotten and deceitful.”

THIS has not the Appearance of a true Quotati-
 on, for ’tis not at all probable, that all those Terms
 stand together as here cited. I have not yet met
 with any Book written by any of our Friends, un-
 der that Title of *Morn. Watch*: And I have some
 reason to doubt, that *W. Notcutt*, notwithstanding
 his pretended Citation, may be as ignorant in this
 matter as myself. However, if I am herein mista-
 ken, and *W. Notcutt* will be so friendly as to convince
 me of my Error, by informing me fully of the Title
 of the Book with it’s Author’s Name, and when it
 was printed, and will help me to the Sight and Pe-
 rusal of it, if upon his so doing, I shall find the matter
 to

to be as he represents it, I will as publickly acknowledge his Justice in this particular, as I have discovered his Injustice in many others.

AGAIN he cites *S. Fisher* saying, “ One Bible would serve a whole Town.” but as he tells us not where to find it, so is he so civil as to make no Remarks upon it; wherefore we let that pass. A little lower he again cites *S. Fisher*, whose Words as they are in his Works, *p. 412.* we shall transcribe, “ I deny not but that it [the Scriptures] is of divine Original, and so one way or other is every Thing else, that hath a truly good and honest being, yea the very Devil himself, as a Creature of God, though neither any of his Deeds, which are Sin, which is Deceit and Defect, nor himself, *quã didoros*, as he is a Deceiver, had as immediate an Original from God, as any meer Writing or Scripture in the World hath.” This, *Notcutt* himself a few Lines farther acknowledges to be true, “ For, *says he*, what if the Devil and the Scriptures had both their Original from God, (as indeed all Things had)” but calls it “ a most vile and odious Comparison,” though indeed *S. Fisher* makes no farther Comparison, nor does he insinuate any such Matters as *Notcutt* vilely insinuates he does.

W. N. p. 67. “ *H. B.* endeavours, *p. 36.* to wipe off the Odium of that Expression, *That it is dangerous to read the Scriptures.*” I think I did so, by plainly demonstrating that there was no such Expression in the Place cited: But *W. N.* say, “ My Quarrel is, that *he* did not repeat all his Words.” My Complaint was, that he not only omitted the real Words, but made an Expression which was not there: Nor do I at all wonder, that he did not repeat the whole Passage, because it carries a most *just Reproof* of a *Practice* he lives in; and were he oblig’d

to rehearse it *vivâ voce*, it might, for ought I know, with the additional Rising of his own Guilt, check him: I will therefore repeat it for him: “ You, “ *says the Author*, take it [the Scripture] to make a “ Trade upon it, so that some have 30, 40, some “ 50, 60, some 100*l.* a Year, and so are Hirelings. “ You seem like Christ in Words, having painted “ your selves with Christ’s Words, and the Apostles “ Words, but Christ cried Wo to such whited “ Walls, and here you read with Danger, because “ you speak of your selves, and it is dangerous to “ read that, and to make a Trade of that, which the “ Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles, spoke forth “ freely.” And to shew that the Author’s Meaning was not, that *’twas dangerous to read the Scriptures, but to make a Trade of them.* I produc’d a Quotation from his very next Page thus, “ The Scriptures “ are for perfecting the Man of God, for the fur- “ nishing of him, through Faith in Christ Jesus; “ they are for Instruction, to instruct and admonish, “ but not to make a Trade on.” Whether *W. N.* has fairly reply’d to all this, I leave the Reader to judge.

Reply, p. 67. W. N. says, that *I undertake, p. 38.* to answer for *G. Fox*, for calling the Scriptures, Paper and Ink; and upon *G. Fox*’s saying, “ The “ Scriptures is not the Ground of Truth, but Christ, “ who was before the Scriptures were written.” he thus flouts, *p. 68.* “ What a wonderful Discovery “ is this, that Christ was before the Scriptures were “ written! Is there any Argument in it, that be- “ cause God himself was before his own Laws, there- “ fore his Laws, or his revealed Will, cannot be “ the Ground of Truth.” I answer, Yes, a very good Argument, for if God did reveal himself to Men before the Scriptures were, then the Scriptures
were

were not that only Ground or Foundation of Truth, which must be general, immutable and eternal.

IN the same Page he says, that “ *J. Pennington* affirms, *That Directions taken out of the Scriptures, cannot be a Rule to true Christians.*” But where to find it he directs us not: However, that Assertion is undoubtedly true, if restricted to some *particular* Commands, to some *particular* Persons, and in some *particular* Cases.

P. 69. He cites *W. Penn* Spirit of Truth, *p. 23:* thus, “ I will assure them (such as study the Scriptures) they shall yet grope in the Dark, till they come into the daily Obedience of the Light, (till they turn *Quakers*) and there rest content to know only as they experience.

W. Penn is there speaking to such as denied the Guidance and Direction of the Holy Spirit; wherefore *W. N.*'s Remark (such as study the Scriptures) is not just: For *W. P.* in the same Tract, speaks thus, “ The Scriptures we own, and the divine Truths therein contained we reverence and esteem, as the Mind and Will of God to Men; and we believe that they ought to be conformed to, according to the true Intent of the Holy Spirit therein; and we know, that all good People will respect them, read them, believe, and endeavour to fulfil or obey them.” *Works*, Vol. 2. *p. 107.* How then could *W. N.* believe it to be *W. P.*'s Meaning, to shut out the Search of Scripture History? Certainly his Faith in this Point has no Foundation.

UPON my saying, that “ *G. Fox* does not call the Scriptures, Dust, Dung, and Serpent's Meat, consider'd in themselves, but as carnal minded Men feed upon them, and content themselves with

“ with reading, and unwarrantably applying the
 “ Experience of good Men in those Days.” He
 thus discants, “ Friend, I must tell thee, that this
 “ Apology stinks; for suppose that Drunkards
 “ should abuse the good Wine, their Excess in
 “ Drinking, does not make the Wine to be naught,
 “ though they shew themselves to be so. Or if a
 “ Man is guilty of Gluttony, his Sin does not alter
 “ the Property of the Food; Or if Men abuse the
 “ Lord’s Supper, that does not make it become the
 “ Table of Devils, and the Cup of Devils. So, if
 “ some wicked Men have abused the holy Scriptures,
 “ that does not alter the Property of them, they are
 “ still *holy, just and good.*” This does not at all tend
 to weaken what I said; for though Wine abus’d by
 Drunkards, is not alter’d in its Property, considered
 in it self, yet ’tis become naught and noxious to
 such Drinkers. And as to what he calls the Lord’s
 Supper, the Apostle expressly says to those that came
 together hungry and drunken, *When ye come together
 therefore into one Place, this is not to eat the Lord’s
 Supper.* It was not so to them. So also the Scrip-
 tures, however holy, just and good in themselves,
 are not so to carnal minded Men, who wrest them
 to their own Destruction, or who make a Trade of
 them.

IN his Observations on the Text 2 Cor. iii. 6. he
 seems to apply the Word *Spirit* to the very *Letter* of
 the New Testament, which he also calls the *Gospel*,
 thus confounding what ought to be distinguished;
viz. the *Scriptures*, and the *Spirit* which gave them
 forth.

P. 72. HE says, “ As to the Word of God
 “ contained in the Scriptures, he (*S. Fisher*) speaks
 “ most contemptibly of that.” Though himself,
 but a few Lines before, contradicts this by asserting
 the

the Truth, viz. “ *S. Fisher* speaks very highly of
 “ the Word within, or the Word in the *Heart*, or
 “ the Word which is written of, that not one Tittle
 “ of that Law shall fail.”

HE has one Citation more from *G. Whitehead's Antidote*, viz. *That the Light within is sufficient to Salvation, without any thing else*: Which is a Truth he will never be able to confute.

HAVING thus follow'd him Step by Step thro' this long Section, and manifested the Weakness and Impertinence of his tedious and tautological Tattle therein; I shall close this Head with altering his Cautions to young Persons, and making them more agreeable to the Scriptures than as he has given them.

1. ABOVE all Things, regard the Dictates of the Holy Light and Spirit of Christ in your own Consciences, which convinces of and reproves for Sin, *John* xvi. 8. and as Obedience is yielded thereto, leads into all Truth, vers. 13. This will excite you to read the holy Scriptures, and is the only certain and infallible Expositor of them. The Neglect of this in the *Jews* of old, those pretendedly great Admirers of the written Law, was severely reproved by Christ himself, *John* v. 39, 40. *Ye search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have Eternal Life, and they are they which testify of me, but ye will not come to me that ye might have Life.* A Disregard of the Teachings of the Spirit, which are always one with the Scriptures, is the great Cause of Men's Ignorance about many necessary Truths, and of their fatal Perversions of Scripture.

2. BE not wanting in your daily Prayers to God in the Name of Jesus Christ to enable you, altogether weak and infirm of your selves, to come up in
 Obedience

Obedience to the Teachings of his heavenly Spirit, without which the Application and use of Outward Means will be ineffectual to your Salvation, and even the holy Scriptures themselves will be as a sealed Book unto you.

3 EVER look on this Position as infallibly true, that those who slight the Holy Spirit, and speak contemptuously of the Light within, have never yet been taught of God rightly to understand the holy Scriptures, which direct Men to the Light and Spirit of God within them, the great and immediate Teacher and Instructor under the Gospel Dispensation, *As God hath said, I will dwell in them and walk in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my People.* 2 Cor. vi. 16. *In whom you also are built together for an Habitation of God through the Spirit.* Ephes. ii. 22.

4. BELIEVE that the Inward and immediate Guidance of the Holy Spirit is of absolute and indispensable necessity for all Ages, Ranks and Degrees of Christians, notwithstanding the Advantage and Benefit of the holy Scriptures. *If any Man have not the Spirit of God he is none of his,* Rom. viii. 9. To this the holy Scriptures ascribe both cleansing from Sin, Sanctification, and Justification. 1. Cor. vii. 11. *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* This excellent, Christian, and Scriptural Doctrine of *walking in the Spirit,* Gal. v. 19. *Being led by the Spirit,* v. 18. *Living in the Spirit,* v. 25. *Sowing to the Spirit.* Gal vi. 8. *Having the Spirit of God in them.* Rom. viii. 9. *Believing in the Light.* John xii. 36. *Walking in the Light.* 1 John i. 7. is abundantly born Testimony to in the Writings of those called *Quakers*, which is an Indication of their being sent on the same Errand with
with

with the Apostles, One of whom says, “ *This then is the Message which we have heard of him, and declare to you, that God is Light, and in him is no Darknefs at all.* 1 John i. 5.

5. **HAVE** a care of slighting *the Reproofs of Instruction* which are *the Way to Life*; or of contemning the heavenly Instructions of the Holy Spirit of Christ within; which is the principal Guide of Life; and 'tis for want of Believing and Regarding the Directions of that divine Monitor in themselves, that the *whole World lieth in Wickedness*.

6. **CONCLUDE** that those poor Souls are under a great Delusion, who think, that the Scriptures have discarded the Spirit of God from its immediate Influence on the Minds of Men: That the Bible is the *only Rule* of Faith, to the Exclusion of the Inward Teachings of the Spirit, which they speak of as of little or no Use or Service in Religion. Men, neglecting the Teachings of the Spirit, may dispute about the Sense of Scripture, and never be able to reconcile their differing Sentiments, for lack of a certain and infallible Interpreter, in whose Exposition they may safely acquiesce.

7. **BE** very careful to distinguish between *Outward Profession* and Inward Conversion, betwixt *Talking* of Religion and *Walking* in it. Men may be very *Observant* of External Rites and Ceremonies, and yet their Hearts remain unchanged. They may lull themselves asleep in a false Peace and carnal Security, founded on an Outside Conformity to supposed Ordinances and Institutions of no absolute Necessity, or real intrinsic Holiness, while yet their Minds are unrenewed, and their Lives and Conversations not reformed. Such Persons to gratify their Pride, Ambition and Selfish Views, may commence

commence *pretended* Doctors and Teachers of others, while themselves deny the Teachings of the Spirit, which alone can make Men really so, and qualify them, (as it has done many among the *Quakers*) *freely* to discharge that Office, which such Intruders push themselves into, not without some Assurance of *present Pay*.

8. HAVE a care of taking up with narrow and uncharitable Notions in Religion; such as would limit to a few the unutterable and universal Grace and Mercy of God in Christ Jesus; restraining to some Particulars the boundless Love of him *who gave himself a Ransom for all*. Notions that have a tendency to withdraw Men from looking into themselves, and from the Knowledge of *Christ in them*; directing Men to such a looking out to *Christ*, as would seem to confine and locally circumscribe the Presence of him who *filleth all in all*: Eph. i. 23. And who *ascended far above all Heavens, that he might fill all Things*. Eph. iv. 10. 'Tis natural for proud Man, instead of looking into himself, to place his trust in self-Righteousness, and in his own Talkings and Performances, which carrying a specious shew, may gain him the Applause of Men; while yet he may be an utter Stranger to *true Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*, who declared of himself, that he came *not to call the Righteous, but Sinners to Repentance*.

9. CONCLUDE that is not safe for you to hear such, as under pretence of honouring the Scriptures, would teach you to slight the Instructions of the Holy Spirit which they direct to; who trust in their own *Works of Righteousness* wrought in their own Wills, without Christ's Assistance; who run in a Diurnal round of what they call Duties, which they work in their own Wills, and to be *seen of Men*; but such

Sect. III. *Of the Holy Scriptures.* IIII

such Works have no place in the Article of Justification, nor any share in the Honour that's due only to the Righteousness of Christ, who worketh all our Works both *in us and for us*, and that of his *own good Pleasure*. By gratifying your Curiosity in hearing such Teachers, you may put your selves in danger of being seduced from the Guidance of the Holy Spirit, which *leads into all Truth*. I shall therefore close this Head with that excellent Portion of Scripture, *Prov. xix. 27. Cease my Son, to hear the Instruction that causeth to err from the Words of Knowledge*; that is, such Instructions as would draw Men from the teachings of the Holy Spirit, which only instructs how to use the holy Scriptures in their proper Places, and to read them to true spiritual Benefit and Advantage. For if Men forsake the Teachings of the Spirit, they may, notwithstanding their Reading of the Scriptures and Men's Expositions of it, be yet in the dark as to the saving and experimental Knowledge of the Christian Religion. The holy Scriptures do indeed contain a faithful Relation of those Things which Christ did and suffered in the Flesh; but 'tis the Spirit of God that can set home those great Truths upon the Hearts and Consciences of Men, so as to render them Effectual to the great Ends of their Salvation. A Man may have an historical Knowledge of Christ's Outward Birth, Life, and Death in the Flesh, yet unless he be taught by the Spirit of God to lead a moral, sober, honest, Life, he is no real Christian. Christianity doth not destroy Morality, but perfect it. 'Twas the very End of Christ's coming *to save his People from their Sins*. The Scriptures are an excellent Means, under the Direction of the Holy Spirit whence they proceeded, to inform Mankind in the great Duties of Religion; but 'tis the Spirit of God that worketh an Effectual and thorough Reformation, and teacheth Men to
fear

fear God and work Righteousness, which in every Nation, he that doth, shall be accepted of him.

IO WE cannot judge them to be sound in Doctrine, who putting their own Glosses upon the Words of Scripture, expect a blind Submission thereto from others, while they themselves, by their perverse Disputations one with another concerning the Sense of Scripture, shew themselves estranged from the Guidance of the Divine Light, which leads into the Unity of the Spirit, which is the Bond of Peace. *

* *W. Notcutt's Assertion. p. 74.* "That some of them [the Quakers] have affirmed, that they believe that the Scriptures were rather a *Hinderance*, than an *Help* to Religion, is but *Gratis Diktum*, and we do here put him upon the Proof of it."

His Citation in the same Page, from *S. Fisher's Rust.* is but a blind put upon the Reader, for *S. Fisher* plainly acknowledges, "That that *Law, Testimony, and Word* that *Moses,* and the Prophets spake of, is the *True Touchstone of all Truth, a sure, and stable, firm, fixt, and standing Ground for Faith and Repentance.*"

His Quotation from *G. Fox's Gr. Myst.* that *In Christ the Scripture Ends*, is well explain'd by *G. Fox* himself in one of the Places cited, *viz. p. 110.* "I say, the Scriptures of Truth given forth from the Spirit of Truth are the Words of God: God's Words which Christ the Word fulfilled."

He has perverted *E. Burrough's* Meaning by a partial Citation: His Words are these, "You are in the Witchcraft as they were, *Gal. 3.* who take on things in your own Wills; and observe Commands without from the Letter, *thereby drawing from the Teachings of God within by the Spirit.*" Which last Words, concealed by *W. N.* are necessary to the Understanding the true Sense of the Place.

G. Fox. in the Place cited, *viz. Gr. Myst. p. 280.* doth directly acknowledge *that the Holy Ghost moved in them that gave forth the Scriptures.*

SECT. IV.

Wherein the 3d Chap. of *W. Notcutt's*
Reply is considered.

Of the LIGHT WITHIN.

IN my *Vindication* p: 42, 43. I shewed, by many Texts of Scripture, in what Sense the Word *Light* is frequently made use of in the *holy Writings*, and that the *Quakers* use it in the same Sense. To all this, whereon indeed the main Strefs of the Controversy lies, *W. Notcutt* is as mute as a Fish, and passes it by with a profound Silence. But what he wants in Point of *Sound Argument*, he endeavours to supply with *empty Cavilling*, and groundlessly charges us with *Contradictions* in our Definitions of the Light.

I. HE says, p. 79. " If he (*R. Barclay*) or you
" will call the Light within, sometimes by the
" Name of an immutable, eternal Principle, God
" and the Spirit, and at other Times say, it is a
" *Measure of the Spirit*, and a *Measure of Grace*, you
" must take the Contradiction upon your selves."
And again, " If the Light within be a *Measure*
" of the Spirit, and a *Measure of Grace*, then it can
" neither be Christ nor the Spirit,"

WHAT Reasoning is this? Surely the Man has bid Defiance to common Sense; which tells us, that *Degrees alter not the Nature of Things*, and consequently that if it be a *Measure of the Spirit*, it must be *the Spirit*.

2. HE pretends (p. 80.) a Contradiction from *Elizabeth Bathurst's* saying, that the *Light is the Grace that bringeth Salvation*, and that it *qualifies Men to receive the Grace of God*. Upon which he exclaims, "Here's a Contradiction with a Witness." Not considering that the *Preparations of the Heart in Man are of the Lord*. Prov. xvi. 1. *In thy Light shall we see Light*. Psal. xxxvi. 9. So that to assert that the *Grace of God doth qualify Men to receive it self* is a certain Truth; how blindly soever call'd a Contradiction by *W. Notcutt*.

THAT *Elizabeth Bathurst* doth describe the *Light* by variety of Scripture Phrases is very true: She also foresaw and answered the like Objections as *W. Notcutt* now makes thereto. I shall therefore transcribe from the Writings of that *excellent Woman*, what, I think, contains a very judicious Confutation of his Objections.

" READ here now, *saieth she*, what this Principle is, in which the Lord hath given a Remnant to believe.

" 'Tis the Grace of God: 'Tis the Light of Jesus: 'Tis a Manifestation of the Spirit: 'Tis the glad Tidings of Salvation: 'Tis the Word of Reconciliation: 'Tis the Law written in the Heart: 'Tis the Word of Faith: 'Tis the Seed of the Kingdom: 'Tis that Stone which hath
" been

“ been rejected by many a foolish Builder, but
 “ now it is become the Head of *Sion's* Corner.

“ THESE are all significant Expressions of that
 “ excellent Principle, which I have undertaken to
 “ treat on. *But if any shall say, they are Expres-*
 “ *sions of so different a Nature, that they know not how*
 “ *to reconcile them, and make them one together.*

“ To such, *I Answer*; They might as well con-
 “ fess they cannot understand how the *Lamb* of God
 “ can be the *Lion* of the Tribe of *Judah*, nor how
 “ the *Shepherd* of *Israel* can be the Bishop of his
 “ People's Souls; there seeming as much difference
 “ in these latter, as in any of the former; yet
 “ do they all speak but of one Thing, although
 “ it be expressed by divers Names: For it will ad-
 “ mit of a manifold Description, though as I said
 “ before, 'tis still but one Thing, if Rightly un-
 “ derstood in its true Notion. And thus I chose to
 “ express it, because thus I have found it, (*viz.*)
 “ A Principle of Divine Light and Life in Christ
 “ Jesus, placed in the Conscience, which discovers
 “ both Sin and Duty to us; and not only so, but
 “ it reproves the One, and enables to perform the
 “ Other; and this I know, that a Measure of the
 “ same is placed in the Consciences of all Man-
 “ kind, by which they might see the right Way,
 “ were but their Minds turned thercunto. There-
 “ fore let none slight or undervalue this Light of
 “ Jesus, (manifest in their Consciences) by calling
 “ it, (as some have done) *A Natural, Created, In-*
 “ *sufficient Light, which will lead Men down to ut-*
 “ *ter Darkness*: Though sometimes again these ve-
 “ ry Persons will confess, *That the Light of Nature*
 “ (as they call it) *ought to be followed as far as it*
 “ *will lead* for say they, *Though the obeying its Di-*
 “ *states will never bring Men to Heaven; yet the*
 “ *disobeying*

“ *disobeying them will certainly sink them down to Hell.*
 “ Hereby rendering the Lord cruel to his Crea-
 “ tures, as if he would desire them to follow a
 “ Guide that would certainly lead them amiss, or
 “ leave them short of the Place of Rest; and then
 “ would punish them for being misled, or for sit-
 “ ting down when they had no Guide to shew them
 “ the Way to walk in, and that from a Purpose
 “ in himself, to leave the greatest part of Mankind
 “ without any other Guide to direct them in mat-
 “ ter of Salvation, but that *that is so insufficient,*
 “ *that it must be a Miracle if it shew them the Way*
 “ *to Heaven,* according to their common Answer,
 “ when asked, how those must be saved who have
 “ not the Scriptures among them, (which these ac-
 “ count the only Rule to Guide Men) *Why, we*
 “ *leave them to the Mercy of God,* (say they) *the Lord*
 “ *may in an extraordinary Manner bring some to*
 “ *Heaven, if he have any Elect among them; but whe-*
 “ *ther any of them shall be saved or not, 'tis hard for*
 “ *us to determine.*

“ T H U S they darken Counsel by uttering Words
 “ without Knowledge: They say, *The Grace of God*
 “ *is free;* and yet they make it a Monopoly; so it
 “ shall not be free to all, nor must all be sharers
 “ in it; neither will they allow the Lord himself
 “ to dispense it; nor yet to inspire his Servants to
 “ go forth and preach it: But arrogate to them-
 “ selves a kind of Sacerdotal Right, to be Dispen-
 “ sers of the Grace of God, and Ministers of the
 “ Gospel of Jesus Christ, because of some Outward
 “ Qualifications atchieved by them (as external
 “ Parts or human Learning) although they were
 “ never called of God to the Work of the Mi-
 “ nistry, nor never had the Word of Reconcilia-
 “ tion committed to them; yet would they have
 “ People to enquire of them the Way to the King-
 “ dom

“ dom, though they are so narrow spirited, as to
 “ shut out the greatest Number of Mankind by
 “ Absolute Predestination, not sticking to affirm,
 “ that God nor Christ never purposed Love nor
 “ Salvation to the greatest part of Mankind, and
 “ that the Coming and Sufferings of Christ,
 “ never was intended nor can be useful to their
 “ Justification, but must and will be effectual for
 “ their Condemnation. So being void of universal
 “ Love themselves, they fondly imagine the Lord
 “ to be like themselves: Hence concluding there is
 “ no Salvation to be had without the explicit
 “ Knowledge of Christ’s coming in the Flesh,
 “ and of the Scriptures; both which we know whole
 “ Kingdoms and Empires in the World are un-
 “ avoidably ignorant of; and yet few or none of
 “ these jeopardize their Lives to preach amongst
 “ such; notwithstanding, this was the Apostle
 “ *Paul’s* Practice, to preach Christ, where he had
 “ not afore been named; for said he, *If I build*
 “ *upon another Man’s Foundation, I make my Glory-*
 “ *ing void.*

“ BUT blessed be the Lord, he has caused many
 “ Witnesses to rise up amongst us, who have given
 “ Testimony to the Truth as it is in Jesus, and
 “ have taught others (both in our Country and in
 “ Nations abroad) to take heed to that sure Word
 “ of Prophecy nigh in the Heart and in the Mouth,
 “ which is the true Grace of God, that is suffici-
 “ ent for us, not only, (as some say,) to leave
 “ Men without Excuse, and to aggravate their
 “ Condemnation, but as ’tis received and obeyed,
 “ it will lead out of Sin into Holiness, and in
 “ the End crown with Salvation.

SHE then proceeds to shew what the *Light is,*
whence it comes, and how it operates, in so clear and

convincing a manner, and so agreeably to Scripture, that I would advise *W. Notcutt* with an humble Mind to sit for a while under her Teachings, and seriously peruse what she has written on this Subject. See the Collection of her Writings printed in 1691. from p. 63. to p. 129.

HE tells us p. 82. “ That they say, *The Light within is the very same Christ that came from Heaven, and suffered without the Gates of Jerusalem.*” But tells us not where they say it. Hence he draws this Inference, “ Then, says he, the Light must have a Body of Flesh to Suffer, and Blood to shed, and then there is one Body in another; and Christ has so many Bodies, as there are *Quakers* in the World.”

A STRANGE Conceit! Does the poor Man think that the Presence of Christ is limited to his Body of Flesh! Is not his Holy Spirit every where and in all, notwithstanding the Being of his glorified Body in Heaven? In short, the Grossness of *W. N's*. Inference gives just Ground to question whether he believes the Divinity and Omnipresence of Christ: I desire him when he shall write again, for the sake of his own Reputation, fully to clear up this Point.

HIS Flirt p. 83. about *G. Keith* we have before fully considered in p. (14, 15.) and as to his Citations from *G. F.* and *W. Smith*, he that will peruse the Places cited will see, that the Matter those Authors opposed, was not simply the *Preaching Christ without*, for that they themselves also did, but the *Gain-saying and Contradicting the Scripture-Doctrine of Christ within*, which their Adversaries like *W. N's* were too much Guilty of.

P. 83. HE cites me saying, "By the Grace of God we mean the Gift of our Lord Jesus Christ for the Redemption of Men; and when we speak of Grace in the Heart we mean the Operation of the Spirit, by which the New Creature is brought forth." This he finds fault with as no Scripture Distinction, but yet immediately makes the like himself, when he says, "We own that as Jesus Christ is a *Free Gift* of God he may be called *Grace*." And again, "We also call the Spirit's Working upon the Soul with the Effect of his Working by the Name of *Grace*." Thus doth himself make that Distinction, which in me he calls *Confusion*.

IN p. 85. He speaks of the *Grace* of Faith, the *Grace* of Repentance, and makes all the Fruits of the Spirit, as *Love, Meekness, Temperance, Patience* to be so many *Graces*; which are no other than the Effects of the manifold Operations of the *One Grace* of God upon the Souls of Men. This Word *Graces* which he so much affects is not Scriptural; The *Heathen* indeed had their (*αι χαρις*) *Graces*: Whether *W. Notcutt* borrowed the Word from them, I shall not determine; but I do not find it any where us'd in holy Writ.

The Word *Grace*, (not *Graces*) is very frequently read in the New Testament, and doth there often signify the *Spirit of Christ*, in which Sense to call it, as *W. Notcutt* does p. 86. *A meer Creature*, and an *Imperfect Creature*, would be downright Blasphemy. And indeed to call *Christ's Work* of Grace upon the Heart, as he does, by the Name of an *Imperfect Creature*, is as irreverent as unscriptural: He will not find the Word *Imperfect* annexed to any of the Works of Christ upon the Soul in holy Writ, nor do I remember that that Word is at all

to be there met with : It seems to be part of the Man's Trade to deal in unscriptural Terms. But so it is, that when Men form to themselves corrupt Opinions in Religion, they are under a necessity of using a Dialect foreign from that of the holy Scriptures to express them in.

BUT *W. Notcutt* tells us, *p.* 86. “ That our
 “ Friend *W. Penn*, was guilty of as great an Ab-
 “ surdity, in saying, *that Jesus Christ is no more*
 “ *than a moral Virtue.*” A thing which *W. Penn*
 never said ; and consequently *W. Notcutt's* falshood
 in this Assertion is equal to his Absurdity in the
 other.

BUT pray, Reader, Observe, what unaccountable
 Consequences *W. Notcutt* draws, from our saying,
 “ That the Divine and Heavenly Principle of the
 “ Light within is perfect.” Then says he, “ you
 “ have no need to pray.—You cannot confess your
 “ Sins.—You have no need of the Throne of Grace
 “ to come to.—— Then it follows from your
 “ Principles, that you live without Sin.—You
 “ serve God as you should do ; — You have no
 “ wandering Thoughts in Time of Duty.—You
 “ are as faithful in Good Works as as you should be.
 “ and as Holy as the Law of God requires you
 “ to be.” All which Consequences are just as
 rational (and no more) as it would be to argue thus.
 The Teacher is perfect in his Art, therefore the
 Scholar is so too ; the Master does his Work per-
 fectly well, therefore the Scholar can have no
 faults in his ; 'twere absurd for him to confess any,
 or to ask Pardon for them. 'Tis impossible for
 the Scholar to do wrong when his Master did right.
 Or that he who has a perfect Pattern before him,
 can have one wandering Thought while he professes
 to be imitating it. He that cannot see the Weakness
 of

of such Arguing, may be blind enough to follow *W. Notcutt* for a wife Man;

IN *p.* 87. He brings a Quotation from *R. Barclay*, to prove that when they the (Quakers) call upon Men to believe in Christ, they mean it of the Light within. The Quotation doth indeed shew that when they call Men to believe in the Light within, they mean it of *Christ within*; but proves nothing of what he designs by it, *viz.* That they do not acknowledge the same Christ also without, the contrary whereof I expressly shewed, *Vind. p.* 51. by the Declaration of *E. Burroughs*, which I here again transcribe, *viz.* “ Is that very Man that was crucified on *Mount Calvary* between two Thieves, whose Name is *Jesus the Son of Mary*, is he the very Christ of God yea or nay? To which *E. Burroughs* answers, “ Yea, he is the very Christ of God, which was before the World was, by whom the World was made, who was made manifest from *Mary’s Womb*, and was persecuted to Death by the *Scribes and Pharisees.*” This plain acknowledgment of *Christ without* he takes no Notice of; but tells us, *p.* 88. That “ if the Question, *What shall we do to be saved?* was put to the Quakers, they do not direct Men to look out, or to look up to Heaven, to *Jesus Christ*, but to turn inward and look into themselves, believe in the *Light within*, obey the *Light within.*” The Directing to Christ within, is not at all Inconsistent with the believing of Christ also without: But if *W. Notcutt* doth not believe Christ to be within as well as without, ’twill be proper for him to shew, as I observed before, how he believes his Divinity and Omnipresence.

HIS Saying p. 89. That we make, “ The
 “ Light or Christ within to be differing from
 “ Christ in Heaven, is not proved by what he cites
 “ from *W. Smith.*” Who as I before said, blamed
 not any Ministers meerly for preaching *Christ with-*
out, but for denying and opposing the preaching
Christ within. For neither he nor *G. F.* acknow-
 ledged any other *Christ within*, than the same whom
 they also acknowledged to be *without.*

IN p. 91. *W. Notcutt* charges me with *Cavilling,*
want of Brains and honesty, and what not, for saying
 that “ he made Christ four sorts of Light.” His
 Words by me cited were these, “ Jesus Christ lightens
 “ every Man that comes into the World,
 “ some with the Light of Nature, others with
 “ divine Revelation, others with saving Light and
 “ Grace, all Men with the Light of Conscience :
 “ But that he enlighteneth every Man with saving
 “ Grace cannot be gathered from that Scripture.”
 The Text of Scripture was *John i. 9.* *That was*
the true Light that lighteth every Man coming into the
World. The Text speaks but of one Light, *W.*
Notcutt of Four ; 1. *Light of Nature.* 2. *Light of*
divine Revelation. 3. *Saving Light.* 4. *Light of*
Conscience. Upon his mentioning so many Sorts of
 Light, I queried with him thus, *Vind.* p. 53. “ What
 “ does he intend by *Light of Nature* as opposed to
 “ *Light of Conscience, and divine Revelation* as op-
 “ posed to *Light and Grace, and Saving Light* and
 “ *Grace, as opposed to unsaving Light and Grace?*
 “ And desired him to tell us in his next what he meant
 “ by these Distinctions.” What says he to all this?
 Why, truly, instead of shewing the Reasonableness
 of his Distinctions, he tells his Design in them,
 “ My Design, *says he,* was to help them, if I could,
 “ duly to distinguish between Christ and his Gifts.”
 But how can he expect his Design to succeed, when
 being

being desired, he does not so much as produce one single Reason to support the Validity of the Distinctions he has made.

Page 92. UPON my saying in *Vind.* p. 59. “ If
 “ that the Divine Light which is Christ and God,
 “ (* as the Scriptures plentifully set forth) is not
 “ to be worshipped, then I know not who is the
 “ proper Object of Worship.” He thus Remarks,
 “ We answer that the True God is to be wor-
 “ shipped, none deny; and also that *Jesus Christ*,
 “ who is the *Eternal Son of God*, is to be worship-
 “ ped, all true *Christians* own; for God will have
 “ *all Men to honour the Son, even as they honour the*
 “ *Father.* But to worship the *Light* of Christ in
 “ Men, instead of *Christ* himself who is in Heaven,
 “ is but to set up an *Idol* in Men’s own Hearts,
 “ as God himself complains of *Ezek. xiv. 3. Son*
 “ *of Man, these Men have set up their Idol in their*
 “ *Hearts.*”

I WOULD here ask *W. Notcutt*, whether he does really think that the *Idol* which he says the Children of *Israel* set up in their Hearts was the *Light of Christ in Men*? If so, ’tis his Business to prove how that could be an *Idol*. Doth not Christ himself say of himself, *I am the Light of the World*; is not then calling the *Light* an *Idol*, calling Christ so? And is not that in *W. Notcutt*’s own esteem Blasphemy? Does he not know that the Text, *Ezek. xiv. 3.* doth not say *Idol*, but *Idols*, i. e. *Images*, which they worshipped? If he does, how could he be guilty of such a known Perversion of

* These Words in the Parenthesis, *W. Notcutt* has left out in transcribing,

the Text, on purpose to mould it to his own evil Design?

HIS next Observation is upon my asking, *Can a heavenly Principle be a Creature?* And then to shew his great Conceit of his own little Learning, he assumes the Office of my Tutor, to teach me my A B C, and to make me guilty of a Mistake forges one I never made; He says, I take *Principle* to be the same as *Principal*. Which indeed I did not; for though I acknowledge *Christ* to be the *Principal*, or *Chief*, so do I also acknowledge him to be the *Principle* or *Beginning*, and certainly *W. Notcutt* is very unfit for a Teacher if he does not know that *Christ* calls himself so. *Rev. i. 8. I am Alpha and Omega, the BEGINNING [or Principle] and the Ending.* *Rev. iii. 8. The Beginning [or Principle] of the Creation of God.* *Rev. xxi. 6. The Beginning [or Principle] and the End.* *W. Notcutt* well knows, had he not thought fit to Cavil where he cannot Reason, that I was not speaking of any *Principles* of *Doctrines*, or Rudiments of Learning, and therefore all he says on that Head is meer Impertinence. And as to his saying that he hopes *I will see my Error, that every heavenly Principle is not God and Christ but the Creature of God*; I must inform him, that the Heavenly Principle is but One; and if he be pleased to consult his *Greek Testament*, he will find that the Word ἄρχῆ [i. e. Principle or Beginning] is there used only in the Singular Number, * so that in

* The Word *Principles* which he makes such a Pother about, is not in the Original, in either of the Texts he cites, viz. *Heb. v. 12.* and *Heb. vi. 1.* the former of which is thus, πάλιν χρῆσαν ἔχετε τῆ διδασκειν ὑμᾶς τίνα τα στοιχεῖα της ἀρχῆς των λογίων τῆ θεῶ. *To have again need that one teach you some rudiments of the BEGINNING of the Oracles of God.* Διὸ ἀφίεντες τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆ χρίστου λόγον, ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα ἐξέρχεται. *Therefore leaving the Discourse of the BEGINNING of Christ, let us go on unto Perfection.*

mentioning *every Heavenly Principle*, he does as he uses to do, depart from the Language of the holy Scriptures.

Page 93. W. NOTCUTT speak thus, “ *H. B.* “ was even frightened to hear such a Charge against “ *G. Fox* that they have taught, That the Light “ within is a more sure Guide than the Law of God.” What I express’d a surprize at was, that *W. Notcutt* had given as a real Quotation from *G. Fox*, that which he had not at all said : which not only related to the aforesaid Assertion, but also to his Fathering upon *G. Fox* these Words, *If the Light within bid a Man steal he ought to steal*, and asserting that *G. Fox* also said, *if the Light within had bid him, he might have also stolen the Communion Plate from the Church.* When as I shewed, *G. Fox* had not said any Word of that Nature ; I added, “ How he (*W. Notcutt*) “ can answer this Imposition on his Reader, and the “ Injustice done to *G. Fox*’s Memory he best knows.” Well, what Satisfaction does he give in this Case? He stands manifestly detected of a gross Imposition on his Readers, and grand Abuse of *G. F.* The Matter is so palpable that he cannot defend it ; and such is his Pride that he will not stoop to a downright honest Confession of his Fault ; and therefore to palliate the Business puts us off with this “ *N. B.* “ Before I leave this Page, *says he*, I must desire “ the Reader to correct an oversight in the *Review*, “ *p. 22. l. 14.* blot out these Words (*and he said* “ *also*) and instead of them write the Words follow- “ ing (whence one inferred that) and then they “ stand no longer for *G. Fox*’s Words, as they “ were represented in the *Review*, but as a just Inference from them.” Had this *Note* come freely at first, to prevent his Reader’s Mistake, it would have look’d honestly ; but to insert this after a plain Detection of his Falshood, looks like a shuffling

ling *Salvo* in a desperate Cause, and the Reader is certainly obliged to my Discovery of the Man's Deceit, or else he had never had it,

P. 95, HE says, " Before I dismiss this Chapter, I will make a few Remarks upon it for the Assistance of the Reader." Those Remarks of his I shall briefly consider,

" IF the Light within be a *Manifestation* of the Spirit and this *Manifestation* is in every Man, then I infer that it can be no special Gift; it is but a common Privilege."

Answer. THE Light is a common Privilege, universally given to enlighten all Men, and is in all a Reprover of the *Unfruitful Works of Darknes*, and would lead *all out of them*; and did *all Men* but follow its Guidance, it would equally afford a *Manifestation* of Unspeakable Comfort and Consolation to the Souls of *all*. 'Tis a *Manifestation* of the same Light, which reproves the Evil, and comforts the Good. 'Tis an heavenly and saving Gift *in all*, and if all are not saved, the Default is not in the Gift, but in the Disobedience of the Persons to whom it is administred. The Saving Virtue of the heavenly Medicine is not lessened, because Stubborn Men refuse to submit to its Operations.

" IF the Light within were, as they say, the Law of God written in the Heart, would it not incline them to love the written Word of God?"

Answer. IT always leadeth those that have the holy Scriptures to a reverent Regard of the heavenly Doctrines therein contained; and indeed, the Dictates of the *Light within*, and the *holy Scriptures* without, may well be called a *Double and agreeing-Record* of true Religion. 'Tis that which gave forth
the

the Scriptures, and which only gives a right Understanding of them.

“THEY call the Light within the Word of God.”

Answer. DO TH not the Scripture do so too? Most Impertinent is our Opponents saying, *p.* 97. “But we are at a loss whether I must worship the Light, as it is in my self, or as it is in a Brother or Sister.” The Light being one and the same in all; nor are the *Errors and Faults* of Men to be attributed to it, but to their own disregard of it.

“THEY call the *Light* within by the Name of the Gospel,” &c.

Answer. WE have before shewn that the holy Scripture doth set forth the *Divine Light* and it's Operations under a Diversity of Denominations; and therefore need not repeat it here: The Light within doth not oppose Christ in Heaven, or Christ without, as he insinuates; as we have before fully shewn: But *W. Notcutt* on this Occasion is full of Doubts and Queries; which we shall endeavour to answer. *P.* 97. he says, “When they call it (the Light within) *Christ*, and a *Manifestation of Christ*, is it not unpardonable Confusion? Is the King and his Proclamation the same Thing?” *Answer.* His Comparison will not hold: The Cases are not Parallel: For Christ is *Omnipotent*: The King is not so. Christ is wheresoever a *Manifestation* of him is; but a *King's* Proclamation may be in many Places where himself is not.

W. Notcutt again Queries, “If the Light within be the Gospel, how comes it not to preach Jesus Christ to the Heathens where the Scriptures have not come?” *Answer.*

Answer. THE Light of Christ which shines more or less in the Hearts of all Men, doth impart to all that obey it, the Benefit of the Universal Salvation that is come by *Jesus Christ*; which Salvation is not so necessarily limited to the Historical Knowledge of what Christ outwardly did and suffered, as to exclude all the rest of Mankind, who have not the Means of such Knowledge, from the Benefit of it. Christ is the great Physician of Souls, and his Grace is an Universal Medicine, which Cures all that receive it, and submit themselves to it's Operation. Nor is it at all improbable, that a sick Patient may be cured of his Malady by a skilful Physician whose Name and Circumstances of Life he is altogether unacquainted with.

HE again asks, too profanely, “What is your “Gospel a dumb Gospel?” *Answer.* No! It is the Power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. Rom. i. 16.

HIS next Query is, “If this Gospel of the “Light within be in every one, how are Men said “to perish for lack of Vision, where the written “does not come?” *Answer.* When he shall shew us where it is so said, we will consider of it.

AGAIN, “What! have Men an infallible Light “and Guide within, and the Gospel within, “and Christ, and the Spirit, and Grace within, “and yet in a perishing Condition? *Answer.* No Man is any farther in a perishing Condition than he is in a disobedient One.

IN p. 98. He goes on thus, “If the Light “within is the Gospel, then we ask, are the Scriptures, “and Jesus Christ, and the Spirit of God the same “Thing?”

“ Thing ? ” *Answ.* They are not : For the Scriptures are a Declaration of the Gospel of Christ. But if *W. N.* would know whether Christ and the Gospel be the same Thing ? Let him ask the Apostle *Paul*, who, *Romans* i. 16. speaking of the Gospel of Christ, says, *It is the Power of God.* And *1 Cor.* i. 24. speaking of Christ, says, *Christ, the Power of God.* And if he shall yet think, that *the Power of God*, *Romans* i. 16. is to be understood of the Scriptures, let him read *Mat.* xxii. 29. where he shall find them expressly distinguished, *Ye do err not knowing the Scriptures, nor the Power of God.*

HE yet again queries, “ How the *Law of God* and the *Gospel* were from *Eternity* ? ” *Answ.* *The Gospel* is the *Power of God.* *Rom.* i 16. Perhaps *W. N.* will hereafter query, whether the *Power of God* were from *Eternity* ?

HE asks again, “ How is it true that *Life and Immortality* are brought to light by the *Gospel* ? that is, says he, *the written Word.* ” But, say I, that is the *Power of God* which raised up *Jesus* from the *Dead.*

HE has one Query more, *viz.* “ What one Gospel Truth has your Light within ever revealed, that the Scriptures have not reported before ? ” *Answ.* He need not have askt this, because he may see that we have expressly declared, that “ we do firmly believe, that there is no other Gospel or Doctrine to be preached, but that which was delivered by the Apostles.” *R. B's Apol.* p. 91.

“ THEY call, says he, the Light within by the Name of the *Spirit*, as they often affirm, that *the Spirit is in every Man*, then I ask you to reconcile this common Opinion with that Affirmation of *G. Fox*,

“ Great. Myft. p. 91. So the Light being turned to,
 “ he receives the Spirit of God which ſanctifies him.”

Anſw. This is eaſily reconcil'd. The Light is given to all; but there are *thoſe that rebel againſt it*, Job. xxiv. 13. There are alſo thoſe who turn to, and receive it, and become ſanctified thereby. But, ſays *W. Notcutt*, “ Is the Light within before the Spirit
 “ of God be there? ” *Anſw.* No, but the Spirit of God is there before it be either received or rejected. His *Queries* p. 99. “ What Spirit can that be
 “ that teaches Men to flight the Scriptures? *And*,
 “ What Spirit can that be that makes a Man more
 “ averſe to the Work of Prayer than before he
 “ turn'd to *Quakeriſm*? ” carry with them very unjuſt Reflections: Becauſe the Spirit we profeſs to be led by, teaches to *honour the Scriptures*, and to *pray without ceasing*.

HE asks again, “ What Spirit can that be that
 “ puts Men upon Railing at good Men, only be-
 “ cauſe they differ in Opinion from themſelves.”
I anſwer, That Spirit which put *W. Notcutt* upon railing at, abuſing, and miſrepreſenting *G. Fox*, *W. Penn*, *R. Barclay*, and *S. Fiſher*, as *good Men* and *Orthodox Chriſtians*, as perhaps any the Age they liv'd in did produce. The Text *John* xiv. 16, 17. is miſapply'd by *W. Notcutt* p. 100. for the ſame Spirit which the Believers did receive, was alſo in the World, and did *reprove the World of Sin*. *John* xvi. 8.

“ OTHERS, ſays he, call the Light within,
 “ a Meaſure of the Light of Chriſt.—If they mean
 “ that every Man has ſome Knowledge of Chriſt,
 “ we deny that.” What then will he make of thoſe great Goſpel Promiſes; *Iſa.* xi. 9. *The Earth ſhall be full of the Knowledge of the Lord, as the Waters cover the Sea.* *Jer.* xxxi. 34. *They ſhall teach no more every*

every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, saying, Know the Lord, for they shall all know me from the least of them, even unto the greatest of them.

“ IF the Light within is a *Measure of Grace*,
 “ then it cannot be the *Author of Grace*: If it be
 “ but a *Measure*, then it cannot be infinite, &c.”
Ans^w. Let him seriously consider the Words of
 Christ, *John iii. 34. For he whom God hath sent, speaketh the Words of God: For God giveth not the Spirit by Measure unto him.* And then tell us, whether those Words do not evidently import, That God did give the Spirit by Measure to others. Will he dare to say of the Spirit so given, *If it be but a Measure it cannot be infinite.* Surely the Man perceiv'd not the plain Consequences of his uncouth way of philosophizing:

“ IF the Light within is the same with the
 “ Seed sown in divers Sorts of Ground, as they as-
 “ firm; then it will follow, that Ministers can sow
 “ the Light within, &c.” *Ans^w.* While Peter yet
 spake, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the
 Word. *Acts x. 44.*

“ IF the Light within be the same with the
 “ Corner-stone, which the foolish Builders rejected, and
 “ which is now become the Head-stone of the Corner,
 “ as they say, then the Light within is the only
 “ Foundation upon which Souls must rest for Salva-
 “ tion: For there is but one Foundation, *1 Cor. iii.*
 “ *II. Other Foundation can no Man lay, than that*
 “ *which God has laid, which is Jesus Christ.*”

HE well enough knows, that we profess that he who is the *Light of the World*, is the same Christ, who is at the Right Hand of God, and not another. To obviate which, he again repeats his Talk about

G. Keith, which we have several Times before met with, and replied to. But he proceeds thus, “ Can they be the same, when One is a *Person in Heaven*, and the Other a *Principle on the Earth*? One of *God’s laying*, and the Other of the *Quakers laying*. The One *God blessed for ever*, and the Other an *Idol* that cannot save? Thus they attempt to preach the true Christ out of the Bible, out of the Church, and out of the World.” Alas, poor Man, how is he bewildred in his Imagination! We preach the Omnipresence of Christ, by asserting him to be both in Heaven, and also present in, and dwelling with, his People here on Earth, according to the Scriptures; while himself, by his way of Discourse concerning Christ as a *Person* residing only in Heaven, seems to deny his *Immediate Presence on Earth with his Church and People*. I must here heartily pity *W. Notcutt*; and though I would not be harsh or censorious, yet I cannot see how ’tis possible a Man can give a greater Demonstration of his own being a *Child of Darkness*, than calling the *Light within* an Idol, as he hath repeatedly done.

“ IF the Light within be the same with the true Christ, then all the Fulness of the Godhead dwells in the Light within; and the Light within created the World, &c.” *Ans.* We never said that the Light in Men was the *Manhood* of Christ, in which the Fulness of the Godhead dwelt: But a divine Ray or Beam of his Omnipresent enlightning Spirit which fills both Heaven and Earth, so that his Remark on this Head is altogether impertinent.

As to his Quotations in *p. 103*. That from *W. Smith’s Catechism*, he may find answer’d in *W. Penn’s Works* Vol. 2. *p. 410, 411*. *W. N.* in his *Review* had quoted *Isaac Pennington*, as saying, *That the Blood*

Blood of Christ is not sufficient to cleanse the Soul from Sin. This Quotation, I assur'd my Reader in *Vind.* p. 73. *was untrue*, and could not be less than a Forgery. *W. Notcutt* in his Reply says, *he has examin'd the Quotation, and finds it to be true*; but at the same Time contradicts himself by producing a different one; and then has the Front to say, that I assur'd my Readers this latter Quotation was untrue; whereas he had not then produc'd it: And now he has, it cannot bear the Meaning he would force upon it, it being directly contrary to what I made appear that *Isaac Pennington* had in the very same Page asserted. His Citation from *W. P's Ser. Apol.* viz. *That the Outward Person, which suffered, was properly the Son of God, we utterly deny*, he may find fully explain'd and vindicated by Dr. PHILIPS in his *Vindiciæ Veritatis*, p. 100, 101. and also by *W. Penn* himself, in his Preface to the same Book.

P. 104. *W. N.* produces a pretended Quotation from *W. Bailey*, which being almost *verbatim* the same as was lately publish'd in *A Vindication of the Bp. of Lichfield and Coventry*, I shall refer him, for an Answer thereto, to an *Appendix* to a Book call'd **A DEFENCE OF QUAKERISM**, printed in 1732, p. 387, 388. where he may see how much *W. B.* is injur'd in that Quotation, which I suppose *Notcutt* has but borrow'd.

P. 105. "IF the Light within, &c." *Answ.* This Remark is in substance the very same with another foregoing, which we have before consider'd in p. 129:

"IF the Light within be *in every Man*,
 " then it can be no better than the Light of Nature,
 " it cannot be a supernatural Light, whereby one
 " reasonable Creature is distinguished from another."
Answ. If by reasonable Creature he means *Man*, we

are to seek what that Light is, which he says distinguishes one Man from another. In his next let him tell us plainly.

P. 106. “ If the Light within was not a *perfect Rule* before the Fall, it cannot be a perfect *Rule* now.” *Ans.* The Light is and always was perfect, doth and always did instruct Men by its Supernatural Revelation, it neither is nor can be darkened, though Men’s Hearts may be so. It did of Old reveal to the Prophets Jesus Christ, and God’s Way of Pardon and Salvation. It did also reveal to the Apostles and Penmen of the *New Testament* the great Doctrines of the Christian Religion, and God’s Way of Pardon and Salvation. It is for lack of taking heed to the *Divine Light* within, that too many under the Christian Name are as blind as *Heathens*, and though they have the Advantage of the most excellent of Books, the holy Scriptures, yet they do not rightly understand them.

S E C T. V:

Wherein *W. Notcutt’s* fourth Chapter
is considered, *viz.*

Of the HOLY TRINITY.

IN my *Vindication* p. 64. I told him, “ That
“ whatsoever the Scriptures say of the *Trinity*,
“ the *Quakers* firmly believe. 1 *John* v, 7. *That*
“ *there are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the*
“ *Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these*
“ *Three*

“ *Three are One.* I also told him, that herein we
 “ did allow and abide by the Scriptures to be the
 “ Rule of Doctrine, even when the greatest Con-
 “ tenders for their being the only Rule depart from
 “ them; by which means they plunge themselves in-
 “ to inextricable Difficulties, confounding themselves
 “ and their Readers with Distinctions which are un-
 “ scriptural, and which, strictly speaking, they can
 “ have no direct Idea of.” I also told him, “ That
 “ in this Case he had better be uniform and con-
 “ sistent with himself, in abiding by the Scrip-
 “ ture as a Rule, for that I imagined him not
 “ equal to the Controversy as generally managed,
 “ in which very great Men have found themselves
 “ involved in great Difficulties.” But notwith-
 standing all my Advice, the Man will be babbling,
 and imposing the Word PERSON in expressing
 the Doctrine of the *HOLY THREE*, though
 we find it not any where so used and applied
 in the Holy Scriptures, and indeed is a Word
 of so various a Signification, as that the Use of it
 in explaining this Doctrine has ministred Occasi-
 on to abundance of unnecessary Contention. Doth
 not *W. Notcutt* know that *John Calvin* himself calls
 the Terms * *Trinity of Persons*, † *Invented Names*,
 and wisheth indeed, ¶ *they were buried, so that this*
Faith were agreed to by all, that the Father, Son and
Spirit, is one God: and yet that the Son is not the Father,
nor the Spirit the Son, but distinct by some Property.

* Personarum Trinitatem. *Instit.* l. 1. c. 73. Sect. 4.

† Inventa nomina. *Ibid.* Sect 5.

¶ Utinam quidem sepultra essent, constaret modo hæc inter omnes fides, Patrem & Filium et Spiritum esse unum Deum: Nec tamen aut Filium esse Patrem, aut Spiritum Filium, sed proprietate quâdam esse distinctos. *Lib. 1. Cap. 14. Sect. 5.*

To prove that *W. Penn* denies the Doctrine of the Trinity, *W. Notcutt* tells us, *p.* 197. that he speaks of Christ being Co-essential, and Co-eternal
 “ with the Father, his being made Man, his dy-
 “ ing for our Sins, his rising again and ascending
 “ into Heaven, *as confused Babble, Canting and Ro-
 “ mance.* Guide Mist. *p.* 25.” Whereas he that will peruse the Passage cited, will see, that *W. Penn* applied those Terms only to the confused Discourse of his Adversary on those Subjects. Just as if I should exclaim thus, *O! the confused and unprofitable Babble of W. Notcutt about the Trinity!* Would it thence follow, that I called the *Doctrine of the Trinity* it self *confused Babble.* Certainly not; for I might firmly believe that *Doctrine* according to the *holy Scriptures,* and yet think *W. Notcutt* very confused, Babbling, and impertinent, in his unscriptural way of expressing it.

IF *W. Penn* doth use the Phrase *imagined Trinity of Persons*; 'Tis so like *Calvin's* Term *invented Names*; that I see not how *W. Notcutt* can Censure the One without the Other.

HE tells us, *p.* 107. “ That *W. Penn* does justify
 “ *G. Whitehead* in saying, *That he could not understand
 “ how Paul, Peter, and John, could be three Persons
 “ and one Apostle.*” And says, *p.* 103. “ For *G.
 “ Whitehead* and *W. Penn* to compare God with
 “ Men, and Men with God, is foolish and carnal.”
 When as *W. Penn.* and *G. Whitehead* might, and did, very properly apply the Term *Three Persons* to *Three Men*, while *W. Notcutt* doth both unaptly and unscripturally apply the same Term *Three Persons* to *One God.* But though *W. Notcutt* is pleased to call their *Comparison* foolish and carnal, yet 'tis such an one as himself makes in the very next Page, when, speaking of *Christ* and his Father,
 he

he says, *The very Term Father, necessarily supposes* “ the Son, and *the Term SON supposes the FATHER :* “ For though any one might be a *Man* without “ a Son, yet he cannot be a *Father.*” I also shewed before how he made a Comparison, p. 97. between *Christ, and a Manifestation of Christ ;* and the *King* and *his Proclamation :* Thus himself practises what in other Men he Censures as *foolish and carnal.*

THE Citation he brings from *Gr. Myst.* p. 356. “ though I do not there find it, yet it is Truth, “ viz. *That the Scripture doth not tell of Three Per-* “ *sons.*

As to his Quotations from *Popish Inqui.* we can say nothing to them, because we neither know that Book nor who was the Author of it: If he be wiser in that Point he might have made us so.

G. Fox's Answer to one that asserted, “ That God *the Father* never took upon him human Nature, is found and Scriptural. That God was in *Christ* reconciling the World to himself, is called by the Apostle, *the Ministry of Reconciliation* 1 Cor. v. 18. That God was manifest in the *Flesh* is a part of the *Mystery of Godliness,* 1 Tim. iii. 16. And the Name of *Everlasting Father* is expressly attributed to *Christ* by the Prophet *Isaiab,* when he says, *For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and his Name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the EVERLASTING FATHER.* *Isa. ix. 6.*

HIS Citation from *Isa. Pennington,* asserting that *Man's Wisdom* doth not understand how “ *Christ* “ should send the Spirit in his Name, and also be “ himself the Spirit which he sends,” carries it in a just Observation, plainly verified in *W. Notcutt* himself,

himself, who *p.* 110. thus argues, “ If the Spirit
 “ be not distinct from the Son, how does Jesus Christ
 “ say, *If I go away, I will send him unto you.*”
 He does not say in that Place, *I will come, but I*
 “ *will send.* And every Body knows that coming
 “ and sending are two differing Things, and ne-
 “ cessarily supposes Distinction of Persons ; there-
 “ fore the Father is said *to send,* and the Son is said
 “ *to come ;* and again, the Son is said *to send,* and
 “ the Spirit is said *to come.*”

BUT let him seriously consider these Words of
 Christ, *John* xiv. 26. *But the Comforter which is*
the Holy Ghost whom the FATHER WILL SEND in
my Name. And *John* xv. 26. *When the Comforter*
is come whom I WILL SEND unto you from the Father.
 Also *John* xiv. 16, 17, 18. *And I will pray the*
Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that
he may abide with you for ever? even the Spirit of
Truth, whom the World cannot receive, because it seeth
him not, neither knoweth him : But ye know him, for
he dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. I will not
leave you comfortless, I will come to you. And he
 will find, that as the *Father* is said *to send,* so the
Son is said *to send :* And as the *Son* says, *I will send,*
 so he also says, *I will come.* And then perhaps he
 will not make *coming* and *sending* such very differing
 Things. If these Texts, most plainly declaring,
 that Christ both *prayed for,* and also would *send*
 the *Comforter,* and that *himself* is that same *Com-*
forter whom he would send, do not necessarily ex-
 clude such a *Distinction of Persons* as *W. N.* pleads
 for, I am much mistaken. If he thinks they do not,
 'tis his place to shew their consistency with each
 other.

I SHALL close this *Section* with the Words of *W. Penn*, who in answer to one that charged the *Quakers*, with denying the *Trinity*, says thus, “ No-
 “ thing less, They believe in the *Holy Three*, or Tri-
 “ nity of *Father, Word and Spirit*, according to
 “ Scripture, and that these Three are truly and
 “ properly One: Of one Nature as well as Will.
 “ But they are very tender of quitting Scripture
 “ Terms and Phrases for Schoolmen’s, such as di-
 “ stinct and separate Persons and Subsistencies, &c.
 “ are; from whence People are apt to entertain
 “ gross Ideas and Notions of the Father, Son, and
 “ Holy Ghost. And they judge that a curious
 “ Inquiry into those high and divine Relations,
 “ and other speculative Subjects, though never
 “ so great Truths in themselves, tend little to
 “ Godliness, and less to Peace, which should be
 “ the chief Aim of true *Christians*. And there-
 “ fore they cannot gratify that Curiosity in them-
 “ selves or others: Speculative Truths being in
 “ their Judgment to be sparingly and tenderly de-
 “ clared, and never to be made the Measure and
 “ Condition of *Christian* Communion. For be-
 “ sides that Christ Jesus hath taught them other
 “ Things, the sad Consequence in all Times of
 “ superfining upon Scripture Texts, doth suffi-
 “ ciently caution and forbid them. Men are too apt
 “ to let their Heads outrun their Hearts, and their
 “ Notion exceed their Obedience, and their Passion
 “ support their Conceits; instead of a daily Cross,
 “ a constant Watch, and an holy Practice. The
 “ despised *QUAKERS* desire this may be their Care;
 “ and the Text their Creed in this, as in all other
 “ Points, preferring self-denial to Opinion, and
 “ Charity to Knowledge, according to that great
 “ *Christian* Doctrine. *I Cor. xiii.*” *W. Penn’s*
Works Vol. 2. p. 783.

 SECT. VI.

Being an Examination of *W. N's*
5th Chapter, Entituled,

Of J E S U S C H R I S T.

WILLIAM NOTCUTT Begins his Fifth Chapter, thus, “ p. 70. *H. B.* charges “ the *Review* with a most unjust Representation “ of *G. Fox*, in saying these Words as applying them “ to himself, *I am the same Door that ever was, the* “ *same Christ, Yesterday, to Day, and for ever.*” I did not only charge, but also prov’d my Charge, plainly shewing, p. 72. “ That where *G. F.* says, “ *I am the Door*, he refers to several Texts of Scrip- “ ture, wherein Christ declared himself in the first “ personal Pronoun.” My Proofs he hath not confuted in his *Reply*, and therefore he yet stands fairly convicted of the Falshood I charg’d him with. Nor doth his Citation p. 111. from *Isaac Pennington*, speaking of *the Church as the Body of Christ*, at all help him; nor those from *G. Fox* in the same Page, which we have considered before in p. 5, 35. foregoing.

P. 112. He cites *G. Fox* in *Great Myst.* p. 12. thus; “ You Ministers that say that Christ’s Body is out “ of Sight, are not Saints, neither are you of his “ Church, which is his Body.” which shews only, that in *G. F's* Opinion, the *Church of Christ*, which in Scripture is called also *his Body*, is not out of Sight.
But

But it doth not tend in the least to a Denial of *Christ's Body of Flesh*. The other Citation from *Gr. Myst.* p. 207. viz. "That God's Christ is not distinct from his Saints, nor his Bodies, for he is within them; nor distinct from their Spirits, for they witness him;" carries with it its own Explanation, viz. That Christ is not so separated from his Saints, but that he is also *within them*; and that he is not so at a Distance, but that their Spirits experience the Comfort of his Spirit; Nor is it attended with any of the Consequences *W. N.* suggests.

P. 112. He speaks thus, "P. 72. *H. B.* accepts against this Quotation, *They say that what Christ did, was but a Type of the Light within them. Christ without was but a Shadow, and we are the Substance.* *H. B.* tells his Reader that he denies the Matter." I do so; and how doth *W. Notcutt* prove what I deny? He tells us, "It stands plain to be read of any Man in *Gordon's Testimony to the true Saviour*, p. 36, 37. where that Man, though a *Quaker*, charges that Error upon his Brethren." What a Proof is here? It amounts to no more than this, That *Gordon*, an Apostate *Quaker*, many Years ago belied his Brethren; the Falshood he then utter'd, *W. Notcutt* now again reports: And being put upon the Proof of it, appeals to the Testimony of *Gordon* who made it. "But, *he adds*, *H. B.* is ignorant of the Matter, and supposes that will serve for an Answer." I am indeed ignorant of the Matter, and his own Story shews, that himself is as ignorant of the Matter as I am; who had it from *Gordon* as I had from *him*, Authors equal credible. In short, his own Knowledge in this Case appears just as much as his Honesty; a small Degree of which would have kept him from spreading a Story he knew nothing of.

P. 113. he quotes *Ser. Apol.* p. 146. “wherein, *he says*, their Leaders affirm, *That Christ’s Body was no more than a Cloak, or a Vail, like the Bodies, in which the Angels have appeared in former Times,* and threw them off again; which, *he says*, *H. B.* also denies.” And I do so still, notwithstanding his prodigious Confidence in saying, “But there it may be seen, as a Witness against him and them.

IN p. 113. *W. N.* expresses himself thus, “The Word *Christ* signifieth *anointed*, and it was not the *Godhead*, but the *Manhood* of *Christ*, that was anointed, so that the Term *Christ* belong’d to his *human Nature* consisting of Soul and Body.”

I have several times before suspected from what he hath said, that he is not found in the Belief of the Divinity of Christ; but this Passage seems to put that Matter out of doubt, for if to say as he does, *that the Godhead was not anointed* (i. e. was not *Christ*) be not an express Denial of his Divinity, what is?

IN p. 114. *W. N.* pretends to open “One of the *Mysteries of Quakerism*, which, *he says*, is a *Mystery of Iniquity*, viz. They hold that Christ had two Bodies; one from the *Earth*, the other from *Heaven*: One *Carnal*, consisting of *Flesh, Blood* and *Bones*; the Other a *Spiritual Body*, &c.”

IN answer to this, and what is contain’d in the next two Pages, concerning the Blood of Christ shed at *Jerusalem*, I shall transcribe from a Book entitled *Melius Inquirendum*, written by *Richard Claridge* Anno 1706. as follows, viz.

“IN compleat Justification, we are to consider not only Remission of the Guilt, but also a destroying of the Power, and taking away the
“ Filth

“ Filth or Defilement of Sin ; where both these are
 “ witnessed, there is compleat Justification. By
 “ the Blood of Christ, that was shed at *Jerusalem*,
 “ * understanding thereby his Death, and whole Suf-
 “ ferings preceding, both Inward and Outward, in-
 “ cluding his Obedience, we are so far justified, as
 “ to be put into a Capacity of having the Guilt of
 “ Sin actually remitted, through Repentance to-
 “ wards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus
 “ Christ, *who is the Propitiation for our Sins. and not*
 “ *for ours only, but also for the Sins of the whole World.*
 “ 1 John ii. 2. But notwithstanding the Shedding
 “ Christ’s Blood, yet none are actually justified by
 “ that Blood, who are not in measure sanctified by
 “ his Holy Spirit ; for if the Power of Sin is not de-
 “ stroyed, and the Filth and Defilement of it is not
 “ taken away, by the Power and effectual working
 “ of the Spirit of Christ, in Renovation and Sancti-
 “ fication of the Heart, the Blood of Christ which
 “ was shed at *Jerusalem* doth not justify any. Justi-
 “ fication is sometimes opposed to Condemnation,
 “ now, as the Apostle saith, *There is no Condemna-*
 “ *tion to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk*
 “ *not after the Flesh but after the Spirit.* Rom. viii. 8.
 “ and that come to know *the Law of the Spirit of*
 “ *Life in Christ Jesus, to make them free from the Laws*
 “ *of Sin and Death.* see vers. 2. So ’tis as true on
 “ the other hand, that there is no *Justification* to
 “ them which are *out of Christ Jesus, who walk not*
 “ *after the Spirit, but after the Flesh*, and witness not
 “ in their Measures that Freedom from the *Law of*
 “ *Sin and Death*, which is effected by the *Law of the*
 “ *Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus.*

“ MEN

* This is very agreeable to what *W. Norcott* himself says p.
 115. “ By the Blood of Christ we are to understand the whole
 “ Life, Obedience and Death of Jesus Christ.”

“ MEN must first come to know and witness
 “ Christ to be their Saviour, saving them from Sin,
 “ before they can truly apply to themselves the Be-
 “ nefit of his Sacrifice for Sin. 'Tis a wrong and
 “ dangerous Notion of Justification, to think of be-
 “ ing justified in a State of Sin, to rely in Words
 “ on the *Blood of Christ*, while they do Despite to
 “ his *Holy Spirit*.

“ THE Apostle says, *God justifies the Ungodly*,
 “ Rom. iv. 5. But how doth he justify the Ungod-
 “ ly? Not in his Ungodliness, but as *Augustin* truly
 “ says, * *Of ungodly he makes him Godly*. For ¶ *when*,
 “ *saith he, an ungodly Man is justified, of Ungodly he*
 “ *is made righteous, and passeth out of the Possession of*
 “ *the Devil into a Temple of God*.

“ WE may, *saith JOHN SMITH*, in a true
 “ Sense be as Legal as ever the *Jews* were, if we
 “ converse with the *Gospel* as a Thing only *without*
 “ *us*, and be as far short of the Righteousness of
 “ God as they were, if we make the Righteousness
 “ which is of Christ by Faith, to serve us *only* as an
 “ *Outward Covering*, and endeavour not after an
 “ *Inward Transformation* of our Minds and Souls
 “ into it. *Select Discourses* p. 324.

“ FAR be it from me, † *saith he*, to disparage
 “ in the least the *Merits of Christ's Blood*, his becom-
 “ ing obedient unto Death, whereby we are justified.
 “ But I doubt sometimes, some of our *Dogmata* and
 “ Notions

* Ex impio facit pium. *Aug. Tract. 3. in Evangel. Johannis.*

¶ Cum justificatur impius, ex impio fit justus; et ex possessione Diaboli, migrat in Templum Dei. *Idem in Psal. vii.*

† The same, say we.

“ Notions about Justification, may puff us up in
 “ far higher and goodlier Conceits than God hath
 “ of us; and that we profanely make the unspotted
 “ Righteousness of Christ, to serve only as a *Cover-*
 “ *ing* to wrap up our foul Deformities and filthy
 “ Vices in.

“ ’Tis the Abuse of the Doctrine of Justifica-
 “ tion that some Men are guilty of, not the Doc-
 “ trine it self, truly taught and held forth according
 “ to the holy Scriptures, that we are grieved at. For
 “ to maintain Justification by the *Blood of Christ*,
 “ without reference to Sanctification by the Spirit of
 “ Christ, is to contradict the End and Design of the
 “ *Gospel of Christ*, which is to make Men holy, in
 “ order to their being happy both here and hereafter.

“ Now as touching the *Blood of Christ*, that I
 “ may clear up this Point to the Reader, we do be-
 “ lieve it to be two-fold, *viz.* That which was shed
 “ at *Jerusalem*, and that which *John* speaks of, chap.
 “ vi. where, by the *Flesh and Blood of Christ*, is un-
 “ derstood his *Spiritual Flesh and Blood*. For when
 “ the *Capernaïtes* thought Christ spoke there of his
 “ *Natural Flesh and Blood*, he reprehended them for
 “ their gross Conceit, and gave them to understand
 “ that he spake not of his *Natural*, but of his *Spiri-*
 “ *tual Flesh and Blood*, as his Words plainly mani-
 “ fest. *It is*, saith he, *the Spirit that quickneth, the*
 “ *Flesh profiteth nothing; the Words which I speak*
 “ *unto you, they are Spirit and they are Life.* vers. 63.

“ To this Purpose speaks *Clem. Alexandrinus*,
 “ * The Blood of the Lord is two-fold, the one is
 “ *Carnal*, by which we are redeemed from Corrup-
 “ tion, and the other *Spiritual*, wherewith we are
 “ anointed. To drink the Blood of Jesus, is to
 “ partake of his Incorruption. The Spirit is the
 “ Virtue of the λόγος, or Divine Word, as the
 “ Blood is of the Flesh.

“ ¶ THE Flesh and Blood of Christ, saith *Hierom*,
 “ is understood two Ways; either it is that Spirit-
 “ ual and Divine Flesh and Blood, whereof he
 “ said, *My Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is*
 “ *Drink indeed, and unless ye eat my Flesh and drink*
 “ *my Blood, ye shall not have eternal Life*, or it is
 “ that Flesh which was crucified, and that Blood
 “ which was shed by the Soldiers Spear.

“ † I desire to drink the Blood of Christ, saith
 “ *Ignatius*, which is Love incorruptible, and an
 “ everflowing Life.

Again

* Διπλὸν δὲ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου, τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σαρκικὸν ὡς τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ πνευματικὸν ὡς κεχρίσμεθα· καὶ τὸ ἐστὶν πίνειν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τῆς κυριακῆς μεταλαβῆν ἀφθαρσίας· Ἰχθὺς δὲ τῷ Λόγῳ τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὡς αἷμα Σάκκος· *Clem. Alexandr. Paedagog. l. 2. c. 2.*

¶ Dupliciter verò Sanguis Christi & Caro intelligitur; vel Spiritualis illa atque Divina, de qua ipse dixit, Caro mea vere est Cibus, & Sanguis meus vere est Potus; & nisi manducaveritis Carnem meam, & Sanguinem meum biberitis, non habebitis vitam æternam: Vel Caro & Sanguis, quæ crucifixæ est, & qui Militis effusus est lancea. *Hier. Com. in Eph. c. 1. v. 7.*

† Καὶ πῶμα θέλω τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ὃ ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἀφθαρσίας, καὶ ἀέννας ζωῆς. *Ignatii Epist. ad Romanos.*

Again, saith he, “ * Taking Gentleness and Patience, refresh your selves in Faith, which is the Flesh of the Lord, and in Love, which is the Blood of Jesus Christ.

“ So then, according to Scripture and these Writers, there is a two-fold Flesh and Blood of Christ, Natural and Spiritual. Both of which we do believe have a Concern in our Justification.

“ BUT as *Hierom* says, * There is a Spiritual Understanding by which Christ is seen.” So say we, a spiritual Mouth by which the Faithful do eat the Flesh, and drink the Blood of Christ.”

HENCE *W. Notcutt* may perceive, that if this Doctrine which he calls a *Mystery of Iniquity*, has been held by some *Quakers*, there were among the Early Christians, Men, whose Shoestrings he is not worthy to untie, that were of the same Opinion.

THE Citations he pretends to produce p. 117. are only such, as we have before shewn, as were not intended to oppose the preaching Christ without; but to reprove those who so preached him in Opposition to his Being also within; and consequently were representing him as a *meer Man*, locally confin'd, who is also God Omnipresent, and filleth all Things.

L 2

IN

* Ἐμείς ἐν πραΐαν εὐπάθειαν ἀγαθίνεις, ἀνακλίσασθε ἑαυτοὺς ἐν πίσει, ὃ ἐστὶ Σῶζ' τῶ Κυρίου, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ὃ ἐστὶ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Idem in Epist. ad Italios.*

¶ Est intelligentia Spiritualis, quâ Christus cernitur. *Hier.* in *Amos*, Lib. 3. c. 9.

IN p 118, 119. he repeats a Citation from *Edw. Burroughs*, with his own ill-natur'd Comment, viz. that by this "they make Jesus Christ a Sinner, and " his *Murderers* to be blameless." Whereas I had fully made appear in my *Vind.* p. 75, 76. that *E. B's* Words have no such Import; but related purely to the manner of the Sufferings in the Days of Christ, which were inflicted under a wicked Pretence of *Law*, and those of the *Quakers*, some of whom had been persecuted without Colour of any Law.

WE shall now proceed to

S E C T. VII.

Wherein *W. N's* Sixth Chapter is considered.

Of P E R F E C T I O N.

HE begins his 6th Chapter with two Citations from *R. Barclay*, the One importing that by Perfection, he intended that which was perfect in its kind, yet so as to admit of a Growth: The Other, wherein he speaks thus, "I will not deny, but " that there may be a State attainable in this Life, " in which to do *Righteousness*, may become so natural to the regenerate Soul, that in the Stability " of this Condition, they cannot sin: Others perhaps may speak more certainly of this State, as " having arrived to it." Upon these two Citations

W. N.

W. N. remarks thus, “ I observed, *says he*, the In-
 “ consistency of *R. Barclay*, from the Comparifon
 “ of his firft Account of Perfection with his after
 “ Practice, in employing above 20 Pages, to prove
 “ fuch a Perfection, as will not admit of Degrees or
 “ Growth.” When as every Reader of *R. Barclay*,
 not perversly blind like *W. N.* cannot avoid feeing,
 that the whole Drift and Purport of his Difcourfe is
 to prove fuch a Perfection, as the very *Propofition* it
 felf declares, *doth ftill admit of a Growth.* And the
 Reason, why he faith *he dare not deny* fuch a Stability
 wherein Men *cannot fin*, is, becaufe it feems positive-
 ly to be afferted by the Apoftle in thefe Words. 1
 John, iii. 9. *He that is born of God, finneth not, nei-*
ther can he, becaufe the Seed of God remaineth in him.
 In fhort, *W. N.* inftead of clearing himfelf of a for-
 mer Abuse of *R. B.* which I prov’d upon him in p.
 79. of my *Vindication*, has here added another fo
 grofs, as to fhew, that he either underftands not what
 he reads, or wilfully mifreprefents it.

WE come next to a Paflage which in *Vind.* p. 80.
 I cited from the *Review*, viz. “ Now hear alfo,
 “ *says, W. N.* what their Apoftle faith, *Great*
 “ *Mystery*, p. 110, 111, 231, 271, 281. fo many
 “ times over hath he affirmed, that they are free
 “ from all Sin, and that it is the Doctrine of Devils
 “ to teach that Men fhall have Sin as long as they
 “ be on Earth. The fame Author faid alfo, p. 248.
 “ that they are perfect as God.” Upon this I
 charged him, and now again charge him, with falfly
 afferting that *G. F.* had five times over affirmed,
 what he did never once affirm, viz. That *they* (the
Quakers) *are free from all Sin*, and again, That *they*
are perfect as God. How does he acquit himfelf of
 this Charge? Why truly, he produces *G. Fox’s*
 Words from the feveral Pages cited, which fay no
 L 3 fuch

such Matter, nor have any such real Import ; they are as follows,

1. “ WHOSOEVER comes to Christ, comes to
 “ him that is perfect. They that pretend coming
 “ to God and Christ out of Perfection, they be in
 “ the Error. They that say, that Men must have
 “ Sin, while they be upon Earth ; and that plead
 “ for it, they are not the Friends of Christ.

2. “ Now ye that say they shall not be perfect,
 “ and that none shall be without Sin upon Earth,
 “ no Perfection in the Life we live in. Ye are not
 “ worthy the Name of Ministers, for ye are plead-
 “ ing while Men live upon Earth, they must have a
 “ Body of Sin ; and so ye keep them in their Wounds
 “ and Sores ; putrifying and imperfect.

3. “ HAVE you cry’d up your selves to be the
 “ Ministers of Christ all this while, and have not
 “ perfect Knowledge, perfect Holiness, perfect
 “ Unity. The least Unity is perfect in the Spirit,
 “ and the least Knowledge, and the least Holiness
 “ in the Spirit.

4. “ THE Life of Saints is Christ, not Sin at
 “ all, they are Believers, and the Works of Faith
 “ are not sinful.

5. “ IT is the Devil that preaches that Men
 “ shall have Sin, and be in a Warfare so long as they
 “ be on Earth.

THESE are the Quotations which *W. N.* produces to prove his Assertion, that *G. Fox* five times over affirmed that they (the Quakers) are free from all Sin. Whereas *G. F.* hath not once so affirmed, nor indeed does he speak one Word either concerning himself
 or

or any of the *Quakers*, but indefinitely treats of the Doctrine of Perfection according to the Scriptures, *Rom. vi. 18, 20.* Yet so hardned is *W. N's* Front, that he blushes not to impose upon his Reader his own *false Conclusions*, under the Name of *G. F's* Assertions; and to prove that *G. F. said so*, produces the Passages wherein he *did not say so*. I might here justly invert upon himself his own Expressions, *p. 123, 124. viz.* That he has *affirmed Falsities by wholesale.* that what he says is *not consistent with Honesty and Sincerity*, and that, he *makes Lies his Refuge*, that 'tis not for the Credit of the Society he is of, to entertain a Preacher that has utter'd *such notorious Untruths instead of an honest Answer, &c.* But *Nil opus est verbis, ubi facta loquuntur.* The Thing it self speaks out, and there's little need of *my Words* to set forth, what *his own Act* proclaims.

JUST as honestly does he undertake *p. 124.* to prove that *G. Fox* asserted *that he was perfect as God*, by producing Passages where he has not asserted any such Thing.

WHILE he pretends *p. 125.* to correct *G. F's* Ignorance in asserting, that *Perfection of Parts is Perfection of Degrees*, he does but expose his own by saying, "His (*G. F's*) Argument, such as it is, lies plainly thus, That the House is finished, as soon as the Foundation is laid; and a little Child is a Man; and a Man grown is a little Child," when as *G. F's* asserting a *Perfection of Parts*, or *Degrees*, has no such Import: But *W. N.* in this Case seems so superlatively ignorant, as to see no Difference betwixt saying, **The Foundation is perfect*, and

L 4

The

* A Foundation may be perfect so far as it is laid; though no Building be rais'd thereupon. And a Child may be perfect in all his Parts, though he never arrive at Manhood.

The House is finished. Betwixt asserting, that a little Child is *perfect in all his Parts*, and that *he is a Man grown*. Let him no more talk of *G. F's* Ignorance, while his own is much greater; nor of *G. F's* Nonsense, till himself hath *Sense* enough to observe common and proper Distinctions. 'Tis for want either of such Sense, or Discretion to make Use of it, that he *p. 128, 129.* brings the Failings of *Job* and *Aza*, who in Scripture are said to be *perfect*, as opposing *R. Barclay's* Doctrine of Perfection; for *R. B.* in his very *Thesis* concerning Perfection, expressly says, "There remaineth always a Possibility of Sinning, where the Mind doth not most diligently and watchfully attend unto the Lord." If *W. N.* either could, or would, rightly distinguish, as any wise Man easily may, between a *Possibility of Sinning*, which *R. B.* admits, and an *Impossibility of not Sinning continually*, which is the Doctrine *R. B.* opposes, he might have sav'd himself some fruitless Labour in this Chapter.

HIS vain Exclamation *p. 131.* "Would not any reasonable Creature wonder at the Ignorance and Pride of some Men, that can pretend to absolute Perfection!" And his several Queries following, are very foolish and impertinent, having no Subject to which they can be applicable. For they are directly opposite in Terms to the very Supposition of a *perfect* Man; seeing such an one must of necessity be *perfectly humble*, and consequently can have no such exalted Notions, nor vainglorious Boastings concerning himself. I never yet knew any Man either so *proud* or *ignorant*, as to assert *himself* to be *absolutely perfect*. *W. Notcutt* has been either so weak or wicked as to charge this upon the *Quakers*, which Charge I have fully shewn he has been very far from proving. *Perfection* doth certainly include *Humility*; yet, how true soever *W. N's* Words may

be with which he concludes this Chapter, *viz.* “ The
 “ Saints, both of the Old Testament and the New,
 “ did not look on themselves to have arrived to ab-
 “ solute Perfection,” ’tis certainly as true, that the
 holy Scriptures do teach a *Freedom from Sin* attainable
 in this Life. To conclude, though no *Quaker* hath
 ever affirmed, that himself was arrived to a State of
absolute Perfection, yet is not such a State the less at-
 tainable. Most grossly dark is *W. N.*’s asserting *p.*
 128. “ The Notion of absolute Perfection in this
 “ Life to be as mischievous as reigning Sin, *and that*
 “ it has a natural Tendency to nourish spiritual
 “ Pride in the Heart, and that it tends to shut out
 “ Christ, his Merits and Righteousness, &c.” than
 which nothing can be spoken more opposite to Truth
 and Reason, for it supposes the *Nourishing of Pride*
 to be the Effect of a Belief of that State wherein ’tis
impossible any Pride can be; and that Christ’s Merits
 and Righteousness are excluded by a Notion of that
Condition, which is the most glorious and blessed Con-
 sequence of them, and whereby they are in the highest
 Degree magnified and exalted.

SECT. VIII.

Containing an Examination of *W. N's* Seventh Chapter.

Of Womens Speaking in the Church.

IN my *Vind.* p. 83; &c. I shewed my Judgment on 1 Cor. xiv. 34. *Let your Women keep Silence in the Church, for it is not permitted unto them to speak,* that it was not design'd to be a general Prohibition against Womens Preaching, Prophefying or Praying. In favour of my Sentiments I produced *Pool's* Annotations on the Place, which say, "Certainly
" if the Spirit of Prophecy came upon a Woman in
" the Church, she might speak." As also the Testimony of *John Locke*, who says, "I apply this
" Prohibition of Speaking only to Reasoning, and
" purely voluntary Discourse, but suppose a Liberty
" left to Women to speak, when they had an im-
" mediate Impulse and Revelation from the Spirit of
" God, vid. Chap. xi. 3. In the Synagogue it was
" usual for any Man, that had a mind, to demand
" of the Teacher a farther Explication of what he
" said: But this was not permitted to the Women." These Testimonies did plainly shew, that those Annotators did not take the Text for a Prohibition of Speaking in general: Yet *W. Notcutt* asks p. 135.
" What did *H. B.* quote Mr. *Pool* and Mr. *Locke*
" for? Can any body make it consistent with Ho-
" nesty? Did he think that few of his Readers would
" have

“ have Mr. *Pool* and Mr. *Locke* to consult? And
 “ then he might pass undetected.” Who would not
 think by this Talk of his, that he had detected me
 in some unfair Quotation? Yet indeed he hath not:
 For the very Passages he brings, I had fully produ-
 ced, but 'tis his method to cover his lack of Reason
 with empty Noise.

I ALSO shewed that *Leigh* in his *Critica Sacra* says,
 “ The Word *λαλέειν* to speak, is vulgarly taken in the
 “ bad Part; and signifies *temerè & inconsideratè ver-*
 “ *ba fundere & effutire*, rashly and inconsiderately
 “ to pour out Words which had been better kept
 “ in.” And that *Constantine* and *Scajula*, Authors
 of the two best Greek Lexicons, have explained the
 Word *λαλέειν* in the same manner. But to this *W. N.*
 replies p. 135. “ I will oblige my self to demon-
 “ strate, to any one that shall desire it, that that
 “ very Greek Verb is us'd in a good Sense, above
 “ two hundred Times within the *Compass of the New*
 “ *Testament.*” And what then? Can he shew that
 when so us'd, 'tis express'd with any mark of Dislike
 or Prohibition? 'Tis generally admitted, that all
 manner of Speaking is not prohibited in *1 Cor. xiv.*
34. as appears both by the Practice of the Church of
England and *Dissenters*, who permit Women to make
 Responses, or to sing Psalms in the Church. So
 that the Word *λαλέειν* according to themselves in that
 Place, is not to be understood of Speaking, indefi-
 nitely; and then surely the very Prohibition being
 annexed to it, is a sufficient Token of its being there
 us'd not in the *Good*, but in the *Bad* Sense of it. So
 that *W. N.* does but lean upon a rotten Staff, when
 he relies upon the Number of Times 'tis us'd in a
 good Sense; for could he make his two hundred to
 be two thousand times, it would be equally insigni-
 ficant and nothing to the purpose.

HIS saying p. 136. that *the Prophecy of Joel, was actually fulfilled in the Days of the Apostles*, doth not prove that the same Prophecy did not also extend to future Times, for the Apostle Peter speaking of the same Gift of the Holy Ghost which *Joel* prophesied of, says, *Acts ii. 39. The Promise is unto you and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* Nor doth this import that they must all *speak with Tongues*, of which the Prophecy of *Joel* makes no mention. Nor doth the Word *prophecie* always denote a Foretelling of Things to come; so that *W. N's* Queries, *Can their Women foretel Things to come? Can they speak with Tongues?* are impertinent; because those *Qualifications* do not always accompany the *pouring forth of the Spirit*, which was promised; and consequently those Credentials are not always to be produced, by such as have a right Commission from the Lord, and are immediately inspired. That *W. N. does not believe* we are immediately inspired, is no wonder, because he believes not that any body is so; and therefore a *Distich* I have met with in *S. Fisher's Works*, is very applicable to him, and such as he is, *viz.*

*Ye say, that God's inspir'd Ones are all gone,
Then Ye of God's inspired Ones are none.*

*I were absurd for him to pretend a Commission from Heaven to preach, who denies that which alone can give it. And as to his Call from Men, 'tis little worth, unless they had been inspir'd in making their Choice, which had they been, they would not have chosen such an uninspired Person.

IN p. 137. he tells us, that he *will give us G. Fox's Interpretation of those Words, Let her ask her Husband at home*, which he introduces with this egregious Falshood, "It comes from one that tells you
" he

SECT. VIII. Of Women's Preaching. 157

“ he is infallible.” Let him if he can wipe off this Untruth, by shewing where *G. Fox* tells any such Thing of himself. *G. Fox's* Interpretation cannot seem more nonsensical to him, than his way of confuting it must to others; which is this, *p.* 138. “ Thus “ they wrest the Scriptures, and content themselves “ with any manner of Nonsense, rather than suffer “ the Scriptures to be their Rule.” But he neither shews wherein *G. F.* has either perverted the Scriptures, or is deficient in Reasoning. The Reader is to take *W. N's* Word for that, or go without a Proof.

W. N. in his *Review* having cited, out of a pretended Letter of *Solomon Eccles* to *John Story*, that *Women's Preaching is a great Ordinance which Christ Jesus set up in his Church.* To this in my *Vind.* *p.* 83. I objected, saying, “ I know nothing of any such “ Letter, neither is it supported with any Authority but his own, and I confess he has forfeited his “ Credit so much with me, that I shall not accept “ any Thing without Evidence.” Let us now examine the Evidence he brings to support it. “ *Sol. Eccles's* Letter to *John Story*, dated the first Day “ of the first Month 1677, printed by *Tho. Crisp* in “ his *Babel's* Building. First Part. Reprinted at “ *London* 1682.” This is so far from proving the Genuineness of such a Letter, that it justly increases my Suspicion of its being a Forgery. Nor indeed will any reasonable Man expect that we should regard a Letter which is not any where to be met with, but in the Writings of a professed Adversary, such as *Crisp* was. 'Tis strange that any should imagine, the Apostle intended totally to prohibit Women's Praying and Propheying in the Church, when as 'tis plain he gives Directions concerning the decent Manner of their performing them. *1 Cor.* xi. 5. Did he direct how they should demean themselves in
doing

doing what was totally prohibited? Such Absurdities Men run into for want of rightly understanding the Holy Scriptures, and through neglect of the Teachings of the Spirit which gave them forth.

S E C T. IX:

Wherein *W. N.*'s Eighth Chapter
is considered:

Of SILENT MEETINGS.

IN the Beginning of this Chapter *W. N.* discovers his gross Ignorance of the Nature and Spirituality of Gospel Worship; which *R. Barclay* most excellently describes in his Apology, from *p.* 344, to *p.* 408. Shewing both from Scripture and Reason, the Necessity of an *Inward Retirement of the Mind, as previous to Prayer and Preaching*, that the *Spirit of God may be felt to move* to those external Acts of Worship, without which Motions Men cannot worship acceptably to God, or beneficially to their own Souls. But *W. Notcutt* says, “ I cannot approve of Silence in “ the Congregation, that’s not a proper Place for “ Meditation.” This looks as if he thought all publick Worship to consist in Words: Perhaps to himself, who is paid for Talking the whole Time, it may be so: But would he not have his Hearers silent while himself preaches? Does his Discourse convey nothing proper for their Meditation? Is not the Place for Hearing proper for Thinking on what is heard?

HE adds, “ But whatsoever is pleaded by them
 “ for their Silent Meetings, as being an *Ordinance*
 “ of God; I look upon them as accidental: Name-
 “ ly, because they pretend to speak only when the
 “ Spirit moves them; so that when the Imagination
 “ is not strong enough, then there is a Silent Meet-
 “ ing” In this he seems not to understand the Sub-
 ject he is treating of; we shall therefore endeavour
 to inform him. Our Silent Meetings are not acci-
 dental, for all our Meetings are more or less so; the
 chief End and Design of them is to wait upon and
 worship God in Spirit, which Worship is an *Ordi-*
nance of God: The Hour cometh, saith Christ, and
now is, when the true Worshipers shall worship the
Father in Spirit and in Truth, for the Father seeketh
such to worship him. God is a Spirit, and they that
worship him, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth.
 John iv. 23, 24. ’Tis the Spirit of God which moves
 to the Exercise of this Spiritual Worship, and its
 Motions are as necessary to the acceptable Perfor-
 mance of it in Silence, as in uttering Words. Alto-
 gether impertinent therefore is *W. N’s* Observation,
 “ If this be the most Spiritual Part of their Worship,
 “ as some of them have said, then that’s the most
 “ Spiritual wherein the Spirit least moves them.”
 For the Motions of the Spirit in Worship are not to
 be measured by external Actions, but by the inward
 Attention of every individual Soul to God for it self.
 As there may be much good Preaching and vocal
 Praying, and yet the Heart of every Hearer not ex-
 exercised in true Worship; so on the other hand, the
 Hearts of those who are assembled may be rightly
 influenced to worship God in Spirit, though no
 Words be utter’d. Yet Words proceeding from the
 Motions of the Holy Spirit, wherein all acceptable
 Worship is performed, are so far from being an In-
 terruption to Spiritual Worship, that they are really
 a Part of it. Very weak therefore is *W. N’s* Talk
 about

about *Meetings in the Country being more spiritual than in the City.* For the Spirituality of Meetings consisteth neither in meer Outward Silence, nor yet in Words, but in the pure Devotion of the Soul quickened by the divine Influences of the Spirit of God, whence proceedeth such Worship as is acceptable in his Sight.

W. N's personal Reflections on *T. Coe*, are indecent and frothy, and probably grounded upon some Misinformation concerning him. If *T. Coe* doth witness such comfortable Influences of the Spirit as cannot be express'd by him in Words, that Experience is a great Happiness, and such a Conception is more to be esteemed than a good Utterance. *W. N's* saying concerning *T. Coe*, "here's a Man tells you, he is ready to burst with the Spirit," carries with a twofold mark of Levity and Falshood; it being not in the least probable that *T. Coe* did ever so express himself. But with such idle Trifles doth *W. N.* please his vain Mind, while yet he passes by in profound Silence almost all I had said on this Head in my *Vind.* Lest his Reader therefore should think, that my Discourse on this Subject was as *impertinent* as his Reply, I have thought proper to transcribe some Part of what I had before said in *Vind.* p. 90, 91, &c. wherein I thus described the Nature of Silent and Spiritual Worship, *viz.* "That
 " the Mind should come into true Retirement to
 " God, contemplating and waiting upon him with
 " deep inward Reverence and Prostration before
 " him, in which such Retirement, we are made to
 " see our States and Conditions, and then to apply
 " to him according as they are made to appear to
 " us, and this is the true manner to perform Spiritu-
 " al Worship, which our Lord spoke of, *The*
 " *Time is coming, and now is, that they that worship*
 " *the Father, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth.*
 And

“ And this is the true End and Design of the *Qua-*
 “ *kers* meeting in Silence, for as it is the Business of
 “ every Member to wait upon God, so it is like-
 “ wise the Business of the Preacher, that by the
 “ preparing Grace of God, he may be fitly quali-
 “ fied to speak to the State of the Hearers, and so
 “ speak to their Comfort and Edification. But
 “ then it does not always fall out, that the Preacher
 “ may have any Thing to declare from the real
 “ Moving of the Spirit of Christ, and then it is his
 “ Place to sit in Silence; so that it is from a mistaken
 “ Opinion, that many Persons have derided this of
 “ Silent Waiting upon God, which is the most di-
 “ rect Way to attain the End proposed by meeting,
 “ namely, to worship God, and to obtain Strength
 “ and Comfort to the Soul: It is the most becoming
 “ our rational Nature; we are framed for Conside-
 “ ration and Contemplation with our Maker, and
 “ the more intense we are in that, the more we are
 “ becoming our selves. And this Sort of Solitude
 “ and Retirement, is the most apt and fittest means
 “ to conform the Soul to the Will of God, so that
 “ when People are met to worship God, and their
 “ Minds are rightly disposed to him, then he is
 “ worshipped in Spirit: He stands not in need of any
 “ outward Performances, no vocal or instrumental
 “ Musick to have chaunted out to him, what may
 “ be called Praise and Thanksgivings; but he looks
 “ at the Heart, at the Frame and Disposition of the
 “ Soul, and as that is, he accepts or refuses the
 “ Offering. Preaching is for the Benefit of the Hear-
 “ ers, to put them upon their Duty, and to raise
 “ fit and proper Desires for Devotion; but Wor-
 “ ship which concerns every individual, is an imme-
 “ diate Action of the Soul towards God; and there-
 “ fore the *Quakers* assert, that an humble waiting
 “ upon God for the Manifestation of his Spirit and
 “ Power, in order to incline and draw to him, is

“ the most acceptable to God, the most becoming
 “ our selves, and the true way to attain the End
 “ propos’d.” To all this *W. N.* is mute, and takes
 no more notice of it, than he does of *R. B.*’s excellent
 Reasoning on the same Subject, or of about thirty
 Texts of Scripture by him referr’d to, which direct
 waiting upon God, and set forth the great and pre-
 cious Promises thereto annexed. But though he
 takes no Notice of about forty Pages of *R. B.*’s choice
 and solid Reasoning on this Subject, yet he cavils at
 two Texts which that Author laid but very little
 Strefs upon, and only produced to shew, what cer-
 tainly they do, that there were such Things as *Silent*
Meetings, though as himself well observes, *Apol. p.*
385. “ Supposing such a Thing were not record-
 “ ed, it will not therefore follow that it is not law-
 “ ful, seeing it naturally followeth from other *Scrip-*
 “ *ture Precepts*, as we have proved this doth.” And
 certainly no Man, that has any Respect for the holy
 Scriptures, will deny, that *Scripture Precepts* are a
 sufficient Proof of our Duty, whether particular
 Instances of Men’s observing them be recorded or
 not, for *there might have been*, says *R. B.* *many*
such Things among the Saints of old, though not recorded
in Scripture. But *W. N.*’s fruitless Babble about
 those two Texts which *Robert Barclay* laid little or
 no weight upon, seems a meer Artifice to hide his
 own Inability, to gainsay what that Author has
 urged, and shewn to be the natural Consequence of
 more than *ten times* that Number of Texts by him
 produced.

To conclude, *R. B.* has abundantly demonstra-
 ted an humble, devout, and silent waiting upon God
 in religious Meetings, to be a necessary Christian
 Duty, most comfortable and beneficial; and that
 without it the Heart is not rightly prepared to per-
 form true Spiritual Worship. This great Duty has
 been

been always opposed by such Pretenders to Religion as make the *Talk* of it the *Means* of their Maintenance; their Interest inducing them industriously to instill into the People mistaken Notions concerning the Nature of Gospel Worship; the publick Exercise whereof they limit to a set of formal and external Performances, that themselves, as necessary Actors therein, may be admired and maintain'd.

SECT. X:

Being an Examination of *W. N's*
9th Chapter:

*Of Praying without the immediate Impulse of
the S P I R I T of G O D.*

WILLIAM NOTCUTT begins this Chapter with a Concession, which, *he says*, he granted in the *Review*, viz. “ That the best *Christians* “ need the Help of the Spirit of Grace and Sup-
“ plication in Prayer, to shew us our Wants.” This single Concession gives away his whole Cause; for as the Assistance of the Spirit is necessary to shew us our Wants, so the Knowledge of our Wants is necessary to Prayer, unless *W. Notcutt* will assert we ought to pray for we know not what. The Texts he produces, *Psal. li. 8. Make me to bear Joy and Gladness*, and *Psal. lxxx. 18. Quicken us, and we will call upon thy Name*, are manifestly against him, for they plainly import, that the Psalmist was sensible of his *Want of Joy and Gladness*, and of the *Need* he had of quickening, before he so

M 2

prayed,

prayed, and consequently had the help of the Spirit to shew him his Wants antecedent to his Prayer.

PAGE 144. *W. Notcutt* says, “ It is a rare thing
 “ to hear of a Family of *Quakers*, that keeps up
 “ daily reading the Scriptures, and the Duty of
 “ Prayer. — Or so much as ask a Blessing of God
 “ upon the Food they eat, unless it be done with-
 “ in, as they pretend, which is not doing it to the
 “ Glory of God, as we are all commanded.” In
 this he seemst o have no right Sentiments concern-
 ing the Nature of *true Prayer*, nor what the *Duty of*
Prayer really is : It is not as he supposes, a Rota-
 tion of uttering Words at certain prefix'd Hours;
 but 'tis the lifting up of the Heart to God, the pure
 breathings of the Soul unto the Lord in a Sense
 of its own Wants and of his Sufficiency. Words are
 not of the Effence of Prayer ; for though they may
 be necessary for the making known our Requests
 one unto another, yet they are not necessary for
 the Conveying our Prayers to God, who knows the
 Heart, and every Thought thereof without them.
 This lifting up of the Heart to God, these earnest
 Desires and Aspirations of the Soul to him, are
 Essential to true Prayer, and are that *Duty of prayer*
 which is enjoined by those Scriptures, which
 command us *always to pray*. Luke xviii. 1. and xxi.
 36. *To pray without ceasing*. 1 Thes. v. 7. *To give*
Thanks always. Ephes v. 20. *To pray always with*
all prayer and Supplication in the Spirit. Ephes. vi. 18.
 These Texts cannot be understood of vocal Prayer :
 Whence it necessarily follows that the *Duty of Pray-*
er by them enjoined may be performed without
 Words. On the other Hand, a Course of formal,
 Diurnal, and circular Expressions, under the Name
 of Prayer may be used where no real Prayer is.
 What therefore *W. Notcutt* adds, *viz.* “ That some of
 “ them

“ them, who, before they turned to the *Quakers*, were
 “ frequent in the Work of Prayer, have shewn them-
 “ selves but *indifferent* in that needful Work after
 “ they pretended to wait for the Spirit,” with his
 Query, “ Doth that shew that they have received
 “ *the Spirit of Grace and of Supplication?*” are easi-
 ly answered: For, having received the Spirit of
 Grace and Supplication, it taught them that no true
 and acceptable Prayer could be performed without
 it, and that all that Diurnal and customary Course
 of Words which they had formerly been exercised
 in, and which *W. Notcutt* calls the *Work of Prayer*,
 was but a meer *Opus Operatum* altogether Life-
 less and unacceptable. Having their Hearts thus
 influenced, they forsook their wonted dry and dead
 Performances, to pray as it were continually in Spi-
 rit to the Praise and Glory of God, and not in
 Words (as they had before customarily done to the
 Praise and Glory of Men) but as they found a super-
 added Influence thereunto. The Saying of Christ,
Matt. vi. 5. 6. is a plain Reproof of loud customary
 praying, in publick, viz. *And when thou prayest,*
thou shalt not be as the Hypocrites are; for they love
to pray standing in the Synagogue, and in the Corner of
the Streets, that they may be seen of Men; verily I
say unto you they have their Reward. But thou when
thou prayest, enter into thy Closet; and when thou hast
shut the Door, pray to thy Father which is in secret,
and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee
openly.

THE Texts he produces (*p. 144.*) prove not an
 Obligation to verbal Prayers or Thanksgivings at
 our common Meals; for,

1 Tim. iv. 4, 5, Every Creature of God is good,
and nothing to be refused, if it be received with Thanks-
giving, is not at all restricted to common Meals,
 nor to expressing of Words, but denotes a thank-

ful Disposition of Heart for all the Mercies we receive, as the Words *Every Creature* do plainly import.

THE Instances of what Christ did, *Matt.* xiv. 9. and xv. 36. and of what *Paul* did, *Acts* xxv. 35. are no President for common Imitation. 'Tis exceedingly unreasonable in *W. Nottcut* to infer, that because Christ, who had the Spirit without Measure, and the Apostle *Paul*, who was inspired by a large Degree of the same Spirit, gave Thanks; therefore other Men must give Thanks without the Spirit's Inspiration: Or that, because Christ gave Thanks on extraordinary Occasions of miraculously feeding great Multitudes, and the Apostle *Paul* gave Thanks on a particular Occasion when in imminent Danger of Shipwreck, therefore other Men must imitate them at their common Meals.

I Cor. x. 31. *Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the Glory of God,* is a Precept respecting all our Actions through the whole Course of Life, and to restrict it to the expressing of certain Words at common Meals is as great a Perversion of the Text as a Man can be guilty of.

Rom. xiv. 6. *He that eateth, eateth to the Lord, for he giveth God Thanks,* explains it self by the very next Words, *He that eateth not, to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God Thanks.* In both which Expressions the Words *giveth God Thanks* are of one and the same Import, and 'tis evident the Latter of them cannot relate to verbal Thanksgiving at common Meals.

I shall close this Section with the following Paragraph from *R. Barclay's Apology*. p. 398, 399.

“ BUT *Lastly*, saith he, From this false Opinion of praying without the Spirit, and not judging it necessary to be waited for, as that which may be felt to move us thereunto, hath proceeded all the Superstition, and Idolatry, that is amongst those called *Christians*, and those many Abominations wherewith the Lord is provoked, and his Spirit grieved; so that many deceive themselves now as the *Jews* did of Old, thinking it sufficient, if they pay their daily Sacrifice, and offer their customary Oblations, from thence thinking all is well, and creating a false Peace to themselves, as the Whore in the *Proverbs*, because they have offered up their Sacrifices of Morning and Evening Prayers; therefore it is manifest, that their constant use of things doth not a whit influence their Lives, and Conversations, but they remain for the most part as bad as ever: Yea, it is frequent both amongst *Papists* and *Protestants*, for them to leap as it were out of their vain, Light, and profane Conversation, at their set Hours and Seasons, and fall to their customary Devotion, and then when it is scarce finished, and the Words to God scarce out, the former profane Talk comes after it; so that the same wicked profane Spirit of this World acts them in both. If there be any such thing as *vain Oblations, or Prayers, that are an Abomination*, which God heareth not, (as is certain there are, and the Scripture testifies, *Isa. lxvi. 3. Jer. xiv. 12.*) certainly such *Prayers* as are acted in Man's Will, and by his own Strength, without God's Spirit, must be of that Number.

To which may be added the following Words of Cyprian concerning *mental Prayer*, viz. * “ Last-ly, The Lord by his Authority hath commanded us to pray secretly, in private and secret Places, even in our Chambers, which is more agreeable to Faith, that we may know God to be present every where, to hear and see all Men, and by the Fulness of his Majesty to penetrate even into private and secret Places, as it is written, * *Am I a God at hand, and not a God afar off? Can any Man hide himself in secret Places, that I shall not see him? Do not I fill Heaven and Earth? † The Eyes of the Lord are in every Place beholding the Evil and the Good.*———God is an Hearer not of the Voice, but of the Heart: Nor is he to be called upon by Noises, who knoweth the Thoughts of Men, as appears by the Saying
“ of

“ * Denique magisterio suo Dominus secreto orare nos præcepit, in abditiis & secretis locis, in cubiculis ipsis, quod magis convenit fidei; ut sciamus Deum ubique esse præsentem, audire omnes et videre, & majestatis suæ plenitudine in abdita quoque et occulta penetrare, sicut scriptum est, *Ego Deus approximans, et non Deus de longinquo? Si absconditus fuerit homo in absconditis, ego vero non videbo eum? Nonne Calum et Terram ego impleo? In omni loco Oculi Dei speculantur bonos et Malos.*———Deus non vocis, sed cordis auditor est: Nec admonendus est clamoribus, qui Cogitationes hominum videt, probante Domino et dicente, *Quid cogitatis n. quum in cordibus vestris? Et alio loco. Et scient omnes Ecclesiæ quia ego sum scrutator renis & cordis. Quod Anna in primo Regnorum Libro, Ecclesiæ typum portans, custodit & servat; quæ Dominum, non clamorâ petitione, sed tacite & modeste, intra ipsas pectoris latebras precabatur. Loquebatur prece occultâ, sed manifestâ fide, loque-*
“ batur

* Jer. xxiii. 23, 24.

† Prov. xv. 3.

“ of our Lord † *Wherefore think ye Evil in your*
 “ *your Hearts?* And in another Place ¶ *And all*
 “ *the Churches shall know that I am he which search-*
 “ *eth the Reins and Heart.* Which *Hannah*, in the
 “ *first Book of Kings*, carrying a Figure of the Church,
 “ Observes and Keeps; who prayed to the Lord,
 “ not with a noisy Petition, but silently and modest-
 “ ly, within the very private Recesses of her Breast.
 “ She spake with an hidden Prayer but an open
 “ Faith; she spake not with the Voice but with
 “ the Heart; because she knew that God so
 “ heareth, and she effectually obtained what she
 “ prayed for, because she asked in Faith. This the
 “ holy Scripture declareth. * *She spake in her Heart,*
 “ *only her Lips moved, but her Voice was not heard,*
 “ and the Lord heard her. So we read in the
 “ *Psalms.* † *Commune with your own Hearts,*
 “ *and upon your Beds, and be thoroughly concerned.*
 “ &c.

“ batur non voce, sed corde; quia sic Deum sciebat audire;
 “ et impetravit efficaciter quod petiit, quia fideliter postu-
 “ lavit. Declarat hoc Scriptura Divina, quæ dicit, *Loqueba-*
 “ *tur in corde suo, et labia ejus movebantur, et vox ejus non audie-*
 “ *bitur, et exaudivit eam Deus.* Item legimus in Psalmis,
 “ *Dicite in Cordibus, et in stratis vestris, et transfundimini, &c.*

† *Matt. ix. 5.*

¶ *Rev. ii. 23.*

* *Sam. i. 16.*

† *Psal. iv. 5.*

S E C T. XI.

Wherein *W. Notcutt's* Tenth Chapter is considered.

Of immediate Inspiration and the Spirit of Prophecy, and of Infallibility.

HA V I N G already treated on these Points in several former Sections ; we shall be the more brief in this ;

WILLIAM NOTCUTT begins it thus, “ That there has been such a Thing as Inspiration of God we own ; and that the holy Scriptures were given out thereby. We also believe that some who pretend to have that Inspiration are deceived.” In this he seems not to acknowledge any Inspiration of God now ; imputing it to the *Quakers*, as a great Error, that they “ have affirmed, that they have this immediate Inspiration of God, as the Prophets and Apostles had.” And from thence would father upon them the pretended Doctrine of personal Infallibility ; which they are very far from holding. In order to this he produces some Citations from *G. Fox*, *E. Burroughs* and *S. Fisher*, which we shall consider.

Page 145. HE brings a Citation from *Gr. Myst.* p. 242. and p. 147. he repeats the same with a Flout thus, “ How can he help his old Father in that Expression, That every one that understands the Gospel, is in the same Power, Understanding, Knowledge, and immediate Revelation from Heaven that the Apostles were in.” This, *he says*, “ is utterly false.” It therefore rests upon him to shew, what other *Power, Understanding, and Knowledge*, than a Degree of the *same the Apostles were in*, can enable Men to *understand the Gospel*; in doing which let him beware that he oppose not *John Calvin* himself, who saith, “ * ’Tis therefore necessary, that the *same Spirit* which spake by the Mouth of the Prophets, enter into our Hearts to persuade us, that they faithfully declared what was commanded them of God.”

W. Notcutt's next Citation is p. 145. from *Gr. Myst.* p. 89. which in less than four Lines he has perverted by leaving out Words necessary to explain it viz. “ *The Quakers have a Spirit given them beyond all the Forefathers,*” [here he leaves out these Words, *since the Days of the Apostles in the Apostacy*] “ *and that they can discern who are Saints, and who are Devils, and who are Apostates without speaking ever a Word,*” [here again he leaves out, *they that be in the Power and in the Life of Truth.*] But if *W. Notcutt* did leave out those last Words, and put in *the Quakers*, Yet not may he ask with a seeming Innocence, p. 157. “ *What harm was there in it? Seeing it was the very Sense and Meaning*

* Idem ergo Spiritus, qui per Os Prophetarum loquutus est, in corda nostra penetret necesse est, ut persuadeat eos Fideliter protulisse quod divinitus erat mandatum. *Institut.* l. 1. c. 2. S. 4.

“ of *G. Fox*.” But if that Sense and Meaning which *W. Notcutt* intended had been evident before, why did he make that Alteration of Words? He tells us, *p.* 147. “ *G. Fox* would never own that “ any one understood the Gospel aright, or was in “ the same Power and immediate Inspiration from “ Heaven but the *Quakers* only.” And to prove it cites him thus, “ You that have not that “ which is Infallible, to judge in you, know not “ the Spirit of Christ, neither can you judge of “ Persons or Things, that have not the Infallible “ Judgment, nor have not the Spirit of God now, “ neither have you the Word of God in your “ Hearts, nor Christ which is Eternal and Infallible, [*now pray Mark*] all which the *Quakers* “ have, to judge Persons and Things.” All which is nothing to *W. Notcutt*’s Purpose; for it doth not follow, that because *G. Fox* asserted that the *Quakers* had *Christ* in them, that therefore he denies him to be in other Men. Those he had then to Dispute with, were such as renounced all Infallibility of Judgment, and would not admit the *Spirit it self* to judge in Men after an *Infallible Manner*. If *G. Fox* did treat such Men as not *having the Spirit of Christ*, and as being *none of his*; it doth not therefore follow that he denied all but *Quakers* to have any spiritual Knowledge or Understanding.

P. 141. HE cites *E. Burroughs* in his *Gr. Myst.* speaking concerning the *pouring down the Spirit which they had received*; and upon *E. B.*’s saying, *we spake with new Tongues*, *W. Notcutt* queries thus, “ Does not all this look as if they spake “ with other Tongues as the Apostles did? Tho’ what *E. Burroughs* means, he might have seen, a few Lines lower, where he says, “ Then began we to “ sing Praises to the Lord God Almighty, and to the
the

“ the Lamb for ever, who had redeemed us to
 “ God.” So that the *new Tongues* given were *Tongues*
 “ of Praise and Thanksgiving.

Ibid. HE cites *Test. of Truth concerning E. B.* part of which he puts thus, “ He was a Man in
 “ whom the Fulness dwelt of Grace and Virtue.” But I find no such Words in that Place; but these Words, “ Understanding was plentifully manifested
 “ unto him by the good Spirit of God, which (I
 “ may say) he received in a plentiful manner.”

P. 149. HE tells us, that *G. Fox* will not allow any to be Ministers of the *Spirit*, that are not Infallible. And cites *Gr. Myst.* p. 82. Tho’ ’tis manifest that *G. Fox* doth not there place Infallibility in Men’s Persons, but in the Spirit of Christ only; by which those that are Ministers of the *Spirit* are led in their Ministry, and are no otherwise Infallible than as they follow its Guidance. *G. Fox* doth indeed query as *W. Notcutt* cites him, “ How
 “ can ye be Ministers of the *Spirit* and not of the
 “ Letter, if ye be not Infallible?” But he also gives an Answer to that Query which *W. Notcutt* conceals, *viz.* “ For who be in the Spirit are in
 “ that which is Infallible.” Again when he queries,
 “ And how can they but delude who are not In-
 “ fallible.” He added, “ and are none of Christ’s
 “ which have not the Spirit which is Infallible, and
 “ are not Ministers of the Gospel, which is the
 “ Power of God, which is infallible.” So that *G. F.* plainly ascribes all the infallibility to the Spirit and Power of God.

BUT saith *W. Notcutt*, it is something strange that they should affirm every *Quaker* to be infallible; but thus they do.” And to prove this, cites *G. Myst.* p. 312 thus, “ Every Man that
 “ hath

“ hath a Measure of the Spirit, in the least measure or degree, it is infallible, and so far they may teach infallibly.” Here *W. Notcutt* seems determined to deduce *Quidlibet e quolibet*, what he pleases out of what he lists: How else could he pretend to infer from *G. Fox's* asserting that a *Measure of the Spirit is infallible*, that he affirms every *Quaker* to be infallible. Does the Man think a *Measure of the Spirit* and every *Quaker* to be Terms Synonymous?

HIS next Citation is from *G. Fox's G. Myst.* p. 213. “ Thou canst not know the Scriptures but by the same Degree of the Spirit that the Prophets and Apostles had.” This is best explicated by *G. Fox's* own Words in the Page foregoing, viz. “ Every Man that hath a Measure of the Spirit of God in the least Measure or Degree, it is infallible, and so far they may teach Infallibly, and know Scriptures, but they cannot know all Scriptures, but as they attain to the full Measure of the Spirit of the Prophets and Apostles.” So that *G. Fox* doth declare the least Measure of the Spirit to give some Degree of Scripture Knowledge. And when he speaks of the *same Degree* of the Spirit the Apostles had, he makes it only necessary for attaining the same Degree of Understanding they had. So that *W. Notcutt's* Admirations and Exclamations on this Account are impertinent; for the real Sense of *G. Fox*, and all other *Quakers*, in this Point of Infallibility may be very justly expressed in *W. Notcutt's* own Words, p. 150 viz. “ They have the Spirit of God, who is an *Infallible Guide*; yet they do not hold *themselves* to be infallible, tho' the Spirit of God is so. *W. Penn* saith “ That *Quakers* are no farther infallible, than they follow the Light within. So that if you leave your chosen Rule, you are
“ fallible

“ fallible as well as we.” All which is very true, for the *Quakers* do not peculiarize any such thing as a *personal Infallibility* to themselves, nor do they pretend to be in any wise more infallible than any other Man in the World following the same Guidance: For which Reason *W. Notcutt*’s objecting their personal Mistakes in Opposition to the Infallibility of the Guidance of the Holy Spirit is foreign to the Purpose.

WE come next to a Quotation *W. Notcutt* pretends to bring from *S. Fisher*’s Works, which he thus introduces, p. 152. “ But behold the Impudence and horrid Blasphemy of their Champion *S. Fisher*, p. 575. We assert, *saieth he*, the Saints and Ministers of Christ, [that is the *Quakers*; for they call all others false Ministers,] to be infallible, no farther than they follow the Leading of the Spirit which is infallible. And who makes them not only infallible, but Omniscient as himself is; Omniscient in all Things? Absolutely; without Exception; neither are Omniscency, or Omnipresency themselves, as to all these Things that are to be known and done by such, so altogether incommunicable to Spiritual Men, as our Academical Animals imagine they are.” I think, adds *W. Notcutt*, “ This is so gross, that it needs no Remarks from me. You plainly see that they Equal themselves with God. They are *Infallible*, they are *Omniscient* as God is; in all *Things*; and *Absolutely* so, without any Exception, (I suppose he means without any Limitation) Now they must have a notable Stock of Impudence, that shall pretend to vindicate such blasphemous Expressions as these.”

SUCH Expressions as are here given for *S. Fisher's*, I know no Body will undertake to vindicate. But what if *S. Fisher* did never so express himself? What if *W. Notcutt* has grossly perverted this whole Passage? What if by wilful Omissions and Mispointings he has made *S. Fisher* seem to speak what he never thought? Where will the notable Stock of Impudence lie then? Certainly at *W. Notcutt's own Door*. To demonstrate which I shall first transcribe *S. Fisher's* Words exactly, from his *Rust. ad Acad.* p. 575. where in answer to *T. Danson's* asserting “ the Infallibility of the Spirit to be an
 “ Idiom, a Property of the Spirit, as incommu-
 “ nicable to the Saints as Omnipotency or Omni-
 “ sciency, he thus replies,

Rep. “ I SAY, that's a meer *Flim-flam* as to the
 “ Point in hand, for we assert the Saints and Mini-
 “ sters of Christ no farther infallible, than they follow
 “ the Leading of the Spirit, which is infallible, *out*
 “ *of which they are not in their Ministry, and so far*
 “ *as following that, which is given to be all Men's*
 “ *Guide, Men and Ministers (whom we confess to be*
 “ *all fallible in themselves, as abstract from that, and*
 “ *not only liable to err, but actually erring as they*
 “ *leave off to be led by that and lean to their own Un-*
 “ *derstandings) are all (so far I say) infallible,*
 “ *and infallibly guided; for as God hath no fallible*
 “ *Spirit, so his infallible Spirit hath no fallible Gui-*
 “ *dance, nor leads any fallibly at all, but all infalli-*
 “ *bly, who are led by it into all Truth, so as in all*
 “ *those Things it teaches, and are needful for them to*
 “ *know, to make them, otherwise fallible and igno-*
 “ *rant in themselves, not only infallible, but (as to all*
 “ *those Things I say) Omniscient, as himself is Omni-*
 “ *scient in all Things absolutely without Excepti-*
 “ *on.*

“ NEITHER

“ NEITHER are Omniscieny and Omnipotency themselves, as to all those Things that are to be known and done by such, so altogether incommunicable to spiritual Men, as our *Academical Animals* imagine they are; for tho’ God, Christ, and the Spirit, only know and can do all Things absolutely, yet through God, Christ, and the Spirit, Teaching, Leading, Guiding, Revealing, Enabling all Things: i. e. all Things that are truly good, fit, suitable, comfortable, profitable, for such, are both infallibly to be known, and possibly to be done by the Ministers of God in their Respective Services and Seasons; whereupon the Wisdom of God hath spoken thus of the Spirit, as in reference to the Saints that learn of him, receive and are led by him, he shall lead you into all Truth, bring all Things to your Remembrance, whatever I have said, ye have an Unction little Children, and ye know all Things, and not only of the Spirit it self, that it searcheth all Things, even the deep Things of God; but of the spiritual Man also, to whom the Spirit reveals them, that he discerneth all Things, when the Animal Man, nor doth nor can perceive the Things of the Spirit; and that the Spiritual Men had the Mind of Christ. *John* xiv. 26. *John* xvi. 13. 1 *John* ii. 20, 27. 1 *Cor.* ii. 9. xv. 16. and not only so, but saith *Paul* who had no Sufficiency of himself to any Thing, *I can do all Things through Christ that strengtheneth me.* *Phil.* iii. 13. *Panta ischuo*, and *Col.* i. 11. of the Saints, *en pafe dunamei dunoumenoi*, strengthened with all might, i. e. Omnipotency.

“ WHEREAS therefore *T. D.* prates, as his Fellow Preachers do of the other *Incommunicables*, of these Things, I say, it is *Parrot like*, of what he knows not himself; for in such wise

“ and measure, as Saints are Partakers of his *Holi-*
 “ *ness, Purity, Perfection, Mercy, &c.* they are ho-
 “ ly as he is *holy*, pure as he is *pure*, merciful as
 “ he is *merciful*, perfect as he is *perfect*, though not
 “ so absolutely and infinitely *pure, holy, merciful,*
 “ and *perfect*, as he is ; so, so far, and in such a
 “ measure as they are led by his Spirit, and indued
 “ with his Power from on high, they are, and in
 “ the Scriptures are said to be, not only *infallibly*
 “ *assured* of Things, which is *Tantamount* to *in-*
 “ *fallible*. Luke i. 1, 2, 3. 4. *Acts*. i. 3. and
 “ to have *plerophorian*, full Assurance ; but also
 “ *Omniscient, Omnipotent. Panta anakrinontes, eidon-*
 “ *tes, isebuontes, &c.*

So that the whole Import of *S. Fisher's* Discourse is no more than this, *viz.* That the Spirit of God doth *teach* it's Followers *all Things* which are necessary for them to know, and enables them to perform the same. This *S. Fisher* confirms by many Texts of Scripture.

BUT *W. Notcutt*, upon a Passage thus Scriptural, forges to himself an Occasion of bawling out *Horrid Blasphemy*, by the most gross and flagrant Perversions imaginable ;

1. HE has left out all those Sentences above distinguished by an *Italick Character*, and whereby *S. Fisher's* meaning is most plainly expressed, without the least Break or Notice given to his Reader of any such Omission.

2. HE has perverted the plain evident Sense of *S. Fisher's* Words by an artful and treacherous mispointing them, in manner following,

S. Fisher

S. Fisher speaking of the *Spirit's* leading the Saints into all Truth, adds, “ So as in all those Things it teaches, and are needful for them to know, to make them, otherwise fallible and ignorant thereof in themselves, not only infallible but (as to all those Things, I say) Omniscient, as himself is Omniscient in all Things absolutely without Exception.”

HERE, 'tis as plain as can be, that *S. Fisher* attributes *absolute Omniscience* to God himself only.

BUT, *W. Notcutt* gives us this Passage, of his own Pointing, thus, “ And who makes them not only infallible; but Omniscient as himself is; Omniscient in all Things? Absolutely; without Exception.”

So that *W. Notcutt* by forging a Question and Answer, where *S. Fisher* had none, makes him seem to attribute that absolute Omniscience to the Saints, which he had expressly ascribed to God only.

THIS Proceeding of *W. Notcutt*, has all the marks of a designed Imposition upon his Reader; and is indeed so exceeding Gross, that upon my first comparing *S. Fisher's* Words in his Folio Edition of his Works, with those cited by *W. N.* I was surprized, and could scarce believe that any Man under the Name of a Minister of Christ, could be guilty of so **black a Business**: wherefore I consulted the *Quarto* Edition of *Fisher's Rust. ad Acad.* where I found the Passage to be the same, and pointed as in the *Folio* Edition. I can do no less in this Place than invert his own Words upon himself, *viz:* Now he must have a notable Stock of Impudence, that could dare to forge such Blasphemous Expressions as these, and father them upon the Innocent.

W. N. closes this Section with a Page or two relating to Miracles; In answer to which we transcribe the following Passage from *R. Barclay*,

“ SOME unwise and unwary *Protestants*, do
 “ sometimes object to us, *That if we have such an*
 “ *immediate Call, as we lay claim to, we ought to con-*
 “ *firm it by Miracles.*

“ BUT this being an Objection once and again
 “ urged against *the Primitive Protestants* by the
 “ *Papists*, we need but in short return the Answer to
 “ it which they did to the *Papists*; to wit, *That we*
 “ *need not Miracles, because we preach no new Gospel,*
 “ *but that which is already confirmed by all the Mi-*
 “ *racles of Christ and his Apostles; and that we offer*
 “ *nothing, but that which we are able and ready to con-*
 “ *firm by the Testimony of the Scriptures, which both*
 “ *already acknowledge to be true.* And that *John*
 “ *the Baptist*, and divers of the *Prophets* did none
 “ that we hear of, and yet were both immediately
 “ and extraordinarily sent. This is the common
 “ *Protestant Answer*, therefore may suffice in this
 “ Place, though if need were, I could say more
 “ to this Purpose, but I study Brevity.” *Apol.*
 p. 296.

S E C T. XII.

Wherein *W. Notcutt's* 11th Chapter
is considered, *viz.*

Of WATER BAPTISM.

WILLIAM NOTCUTT tells us, *p. 154.* That *R. Barclay* had said, *p. 418.* That *Water-Baptism* was not the *Baptism of Christ*, and calls it a false Assertion. In Proof whereof, he says,

1. “ That the Apostles were *commanded* to baptize, “ (he should have said to *teach baptizing*) *Matt.* “ xxviii. 18, 19, 20. But how that Command relates to baptizing with *Water*, which is the very Point in Debate, he has not shewn; tho’ he says, *p. 155,*

2. “ That Baptism with the *Spirit* could not be “ intended in the Command of *Jesus Christ* to his “ Disciples: For then it would follow, that the “ Change of the Heart, and putting of the Spirit “ within any, would be in the Power of the Mi- “ nister.” Not considering that the Apostles were made Instrumental in the Hand of God for conferring the *Gift of the Holy Ghost*, *Acts viii. 17.* Then laid they their Hands upon them, and they received the *Holy Ghost.* *Acts x. 44.* While Peter yet spake these

Words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word.

ACTS xix. 6. *And when Paul had laid his Hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them.*

3. "THAT *Water-Baptism* was what the Apostles practised in the Churches and Families "where they preached the Gospel." But he hath not shewn that they so practised by Christ's Commission.

IN the Text he produces, *Acts* x. 44. the Question, *Who can forbid Water?* was put to the Believing Jews, in Condescension to whom 'tis probable *Peter* then baptized with Water, even as *Paul* circumcised *Timotheus* because of the Jews which were at *Lysra* and *Iconium*. *Acts* xvi. 2, 3. That the Eunuch was baptized with Water by *Philip* is true, but proves no more the necessary continuance of *Water-Baptism*, than *Paul's* circumcising *Timothy* doth of *Circumcision*. But, says *W. Notcutt*, "The Eunuch was "baptized with Water after he had been bap- "tized with the Spirit, for it is said that he believ- "ed." Even so *Timothy* is said to have been a *Disciple* before he was *circumcised*. See *Acts* xvi. 1.

HE adds, "I also quoted *Heb.* x. 22. *Let us "draw near with a true Heart in full Assurance of "Faith, having our Hearts sprinkled from an evil "Conscience. There's the Baptism of the Spirit: "And our Bodies washed with clean Water. There's "the Ordinance of Water-Baptism."* This is *W. N's* Interpretation of that Text, adapted to his present Purpose. But we shall oppose thereto *Samuel Clark's Annotations* upon the same Text: Upon the former part, he speaks thus, "Cleansed (by the "Application of Christ's Blood, *Chap.* ix. 14.) "from a Conscience defiled with vicious Habits,

“ so that it does not perform its Office aright.” And on the latter Part he thus notes, “ Our outward Conversation free from scandalous Sins, by the Assistance of the sanctifying Spirit of God.” Hence it appears, that this Learned Annotator discovered nothing of the Ordinance of Water-Baptism in this Text; who yet must be allowed to have been as clear sighted in that Affair as *W. N.* who closes this Chapter with telling us, “ that he was pleading for nothing but the pure Ordinance of Jesus Christ;” thus taking for granted the very Point in Debate, and which is still incumbent upon him to prove, *viz.* That *Water-Baptism is an Ordinance of Jesus Christ.* Had he acted the Part of a fair Replier, he must have taken Notice of the following Passage in my *Vindication*, p. 106. “ But I would here enquire what Baptism it was our Lord commanded; Water is not mentioned in the 28th of *Matthew*; and the Word Baptize or Baptism, is a complex Word, we find it made use of in different Senses in the Scripture, sometimes regarding Water, other times Afflictions; and its made use of with respect to the Operation of the Holy Ghost. So that as this is a complex Word, the *Reviewer*, to maintain that Christ commanded Water-Baptism, must shew, that the Word in that Text was made use of to regard Water.” When he shall have made any tolerable Essay toward the Performance of this, he may merit some farther Consideration.

SECT. XIII.

Containing an Examination of *W. N's* Twelfth Chapter.

Of the LORD'S SUPPER.

WILLIAM NOTCUTT begins this Section with a Recapitulation of part of what he had said in his *Review*; and thereupon rallies me thus. “But *H. B.* did not think good to answer these Things: yet he thinks he has done it in saying never a Word. What! was he self-condemned; or would his Spirit yield him no Assistance, when the Nakedness of their Cause was so exposed?” Thus, it seems, my Silence, to what I thought not worth answering, has made him so *wise in his own Conceit* as to imagine it unanswerable; I may therefore now, to give a seasonable Check to his Vanity, make some Remarks on what he repeats;

“I had, *says he*, taken Notice, that *R. Barclay* p. 453. had said, That Men are not tyed to the Ceremony of breaking of Bread.” If he means the *Quakers*, it is true; they are not tied, indeed; for they *will not be bound* with any Precept of the Gospel.” Thus he takes for granted the main Point in Debate, which he ought to prove, *viz.* That the Ceremony of breaking of Bread is a Precept of the Gospel: If there be such a Precept, let him produce
produce

SECT. XIII. *Of the LORD'S SUPPER* 185

produce it, and shew it to be of perpetual Obligation on the succeeding Ages; and then he will have performed something: But till then the following Passage in my *Vindication* p. 109. stands unanswered, viz. “It would seem unreasonable, that Jesus Christ who by his coming, did abolish the Law of Ceremonies, and came to establish a Religion upon the moral Reason of Men’s Obligation to God and Man, should Institute others in the Room of those he had abolished, which had no more intrinsic Worth, nor no more related to the Nature of such Obligations than those very Ceremonies he had abolished.” I might here deservedly retort upon him his own Expressions, “But *W. Notcutt* did not think good to answer these Things: What! was he self-condemned, or had he nothing to say when the Nakedness of his Cause was so expos’d?”

BUT *W. Notcutt* proceeds, “He [*R. B.*] confesses, that the *Corinthians* did observe the Lord’s Supper, but, he says, they did it only as some Men observed a Day, that some others did not.” Whereas *R. Barclay* doth not so say.

W. Notcutt again tells us, that “He [*R. B.*] attempts to make some believe that Jesus Christ only charged, that as often as they eat Bread and drink Wine at their own Tables, they should remember him even in eating and drinking their common Food.” A meer Misrepresentation, upon which he groundlessly asks such Questions as these, “How is our common Bread the Body of Christ? Or how is our common Wine the New Testament in the Blood of Christ?” Which no Body had asserted they were.

HE

HE tells us a little lower, that he “ observed
 “ that *R. Barclay* called the Lord's Supper a *carnal*
 “ *Ordinance*, p. 457,” which is another Mistake,
 for though *R. Barclay* did account the Ceremony
 of eating Bread and drinking Wine to be a *carnal Or-*
dinance, yet did he not esteem that Ceremony to
 be the *Lord's Supper*, which according to him is *In-*
ward and *Spiritual*.

PAGE 158. *W. N.* says, “ Jesus Christ is called our
 “ *Passover* ;” which is very true ; but his next Words,
 “ And the Lord's Supper is a Commemoration of the
 “ Death of Christ, this therefore is our *Passover*, and
 “ the Apostle calls it so,” he must excuse our Belief
 of, untill he shall produce the Chapter and Verse
 where the Apostle so calls it.

HE adds, “ I also shewed how *R. Barclay* goes
 “ on Trifling, and saith, p. 478. That that Charge,
 “ *Do this till I come*, is till *Christ is risen in the*
 “ *Heart*,” and then proceeds to shew that “ This
 “ Fancy is also freighted with Absurdities.”
 But if it be, *R. Barclay* is not answerable for them,
 because he hath said no such Thing, as *W. Notcutt*
 says he does. Nor is there indeed any such Charge
 in Scripture as *Do this till I come* ; But *W. Notcutt*
 has feigned such a Charge, to introduce a preten-
 ded Interpretation of it ; and then goes on to draw
 Absurdities from Things that never were. A Man
 that can employ himself thus, may easily keep
 his Pen at work. “ But says he, *H. B.* does not
 “ think good to answer one Word to all these
 “ Charges ; or to make Apology for these Ab-
 “ surdities.” Nor has *H. B.* any reason to con-
 cern himself in this Case, it being *W. Notcutt's*
 own proper Business to answer for his own *Fictions*,
 and

Sect. XIII. Of the LORD'S SUPPER 187

and to *apologize* for the *Absurdities* he pretends to draw from them.

HIS saying, that “ Their Friend *Smith*, *Prim.* p. 36. saith, *That Baptism and the Lord's Supper were invented by the Pope* ;” is not true.

HIS Assertion, that *E. Burrrough* saith, that the “ *Lord's Supper was an Institution of the Great Whore,*” is also false.

HIS Citations also *p.* 159. from *F. Howgill* and *G. Fox* are grossly perverted: His saying, “ If Gluttons and Drunkards abuse their Food, that doth not make the Food to be naught, and if wicked Men abuse the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, their Sin does not alter the Nature and Ends of that holy Ordinance,” we have already replied to in *p.* (106) foregoing.

HIS little Witticism with which he concludes this Section, *viz.* “ We argue for the *Use* even from the very *Abuse* of it ; for what is *Abuse*? but *ab usu,*” has nothing in it ; for certainly a Man may *abuse* a Thing which he was not under any obligation at all to use.

S E C T. XIV.

The C O N C L U S I O N.

Wherein *W. Notcutt's* Remarks on
the Conclusion of my *Vindication*
are considered.

HE begins his 12th Chapter thus, “ Now I
“ shall conclude with a few Remarks, *H. B.*
“ tells you that he has impartially considered the
“ REVIEW, and finds it an *ill-natured malicious*
“ *Performance*, and done without *Order or due*
“ *Method*, and that he has been very *unjust in his*
“ *Quotations*, and has declared to the World, that
“ for their Principles which are not so. I shall
“ consider this Charge distinctly.

“ 1. He saith the REVIEW is an ill natured Piece,
“ I answer as to the ill Nature of it, I leave to the
“ Reader to judge. Have I in all that Book given
“ such ill-natured *Language* to the *Quakers*, as you
“ have given to me, while you charge me with
“ want of *common Honesty*, with *forging of Lies*
“ to Reproach others; *with Injustice* and *Unchari-*
“ *tableness?*”

Answer

Anfw. I gave him no worse Language, than his own Partiality and Injustice did justly entitle him to. The Reason, why, I thought his Performance to proceed from an *Ill Nature*, was, that such Perversions and Falshoods, as I detected him in, were never known to be the Effects of a *Good One*.

2. W. N. “ *That the REVIEW is a malicious Performance.* For this I appeal not to Men, but to “ *God* the Searcher of Hearts. And I am sure, that “ he knows that *H. B.* in this Matter, wants *Charity*. “ And *H. B.* cannot bring one Evidence of it. Thus “ the unjust Judge measures another Man’s Corn by “ his own Bushel.”

Anfw. I did not pretend to search his Heart, nor to judge of him otherwise than by his Actions, the Scripture Rule of Judging, *Mat. vii. 16. Ye shall know them by their Fruits. Do Men gather Grapes of Thorns, or Figs of Thistles?* To judge of Men by this Rule, is no breach of Charity. And I would very willingly have entertain’d better Thoughts of him, had not his own Practices prevented me.

W. N. 3: “ HE says, *That the Author of the REVIEW has been unjust in his Quotations.* If I “ have quoted nothing but the very *Words*, or “ *Sense* of your Friends, where is the *Injustice*? If “ the Printer misplac’d a Figure, you deny’d that “ ever your Friends had written any such *Words*; “ where is the *Honesty* of that? If you did not “ know that those very *Words* had been often in “ Controversy before; You are a rare Champion “ for their Cause. If you approve of the *Expressi-* “ *ons* which I have quoted out of your Friends “ *Books*, why are you angry? But if you do not “ approve of them, why do you reprint their Works “ where

“ where these Things stand? Answer that *Dilemma*
 “ if you can.”

Ans. THAT he has been *unjust* in his *Quotations* I have fully prov'd. If he neither quoted the *Words*, nor the *Sense* of our Friends, where was the *Justice*? 'Twas not *misplacing* a Figure, but *counterfeiting Expressions*; that I found fault with. If *W. N.* knew that those very Words had been often in Controversy before, he must needs also know that 'twas because we objected to the Truth of 'em. Why then does he repeat them? Would he have us impute the *Reviving of Old Slanders* to his *good Nature* and *Charity*? A Champion for a good Cause would scorn to use such Weapons. His pretended *Dilemma* is easily answer'd, for though we may reprint our Friends Works with Approbation, yet may we reasonably except against *broken Scraps* of them, cull'd out from the middle of Sentences, sometimes on purpose to misrepresent the Author's Meaning, which the preceeding, intervening, and subsequent Matter, would shew to be sound and orthodox.

W. N. 4. “ HE adds, *That the REVIEW has declar'd to the World, such Things to be their Principles that are not so.*” And a little lower *W. N.* says, “ If I have injur'd them in Words or Sense, shew me the Place and I will acknowledge it.” That's well said, and I wish he may abide by it; for as I have herein before several times shewn him *the Place* where he hath *injur'd* us both in *Words* and *Sense*, if he observe his Promise, his next Writing will be full of *Acknowledgments*; which if they shall appear plain and sincere, we shall readily forgive him. I shall next shew him some of the Places where he hath injur'd us in his *Reply*.

P. 12. HE has injur'd the *Quakers* by saying, that
 “ they persecuted *G. Keith*, and laid him in Prison,
 “ for preaching up the Necessity of Faith in Christ
 “ *without.*”

Ibid. HE hath injur'd *R. Barclay* in charging him
 with holding “ the Doctrine of Justification before
 “ God by their own Works.”

P. 23. HE hath injur'd *Robert Barclay* and his
 Friends by insinuating, that they were guilty of
 Blasphemies, and that he was privy to them.

P. 28. HE has grossly injur'd *G. Fox*, in under-
 taking to prove what he had before injuriously asser-
 ted in his *Review*, viz. “ That *G. Fox* gave out
 “ that he was Christ.”

P. 36. HE has injur'd *R. Barclay*, in charging
 him with Deceit and Equivocation, for saying, *that*
we count the Scriptures the best Writings in the World.

P. 38. HE injures the *Quakers* by saying, that
 much of *S. Fisher*, and *G. Fox*, is, ACCORDING TO
 THEIR OWN CONFESSION, a Delusion of the Devil.

P. 40. HE injures them by a false Assertion,
 when he says, “ Others of their Leaders have said,
 “ *That the Writings of the Quakers are of equal Au-*
 “ *thority with the Scriptures.*”

P. 46. HE injures us by insinuating, that we
 assert, that *every Man's private Spirit is to be the*
Judge of Controversies.

P. 47. HE injures us by a feigned Distinction
 between the *Spirit of God*, and the *Spirit* which the
Quakers talk of.

P. 53. HE injures me in saying, *I do not speak plain as honest Men should.*

P. 86. HE has injur'd *W. Penn*, by asserting that he says, *That Jesus Christ is no more than a moral Virtue.*

P. 89. HE injures the *Quakers* in saying, that they make the Light, or *Christ within*, to be differing from *Christ in Heaven.*

P. 99. HE injures the *Quakers* by insinuating, that they slight the Scriptures, that they are averie to Prayer, and that they slight the Ordinances of Christ.

P. 113. HE in injures them in asserting, that in *Ser. Apol.* p. 146. their Leaders affirm, that Christ's Body is no more than a *Cloak* or a *Vail.*

Ibid. HE has injur'd them again by saying, that they deny the Term *Christ* to the Son of *David* and *Mary.*

P. 131. HE has injur'd us by insinuating, that we pretend to *absolute Perfection.*

P. 139. HE injures *T. Coe*, by saying, "Here's a Man tells you, that he is ready to burst with the Spirit."

P. 152. HE has injur'd *S. Fisher*, by corrupting, curtailing and mispointing, a pretended Citation out of his Works, in the most fraudulent and unjust manner imaginable.

THESE are some of the Places wherein he has injur'd us; to mention them all, were to transcribe

a great Part of his Books : Whensoever he shall be in such an enlighten'd Disposition of Mind as to make his Acknowledgment of these in Sincerity and Truth, I doubt not but himself will see many more ; for we have represented Things just as they are ; if that makes him seem *Vile*, let him not blame us, but reform his own Conduct.

BUT how *unjust* and *base* is he who endeavours to represent me as *Vile* as he can by an egregious Falseness, when he says, *p.* 161. That he has *shewn* me in five Instances in one Page, how I have wronged him, and have plainly prov'd my self a *Liar* by wholesale. Whereas the Fact I charg'd upon him, was altogether true, *viz.* “ That he had falsly asserted, that “ *G. Fox* five times over affirmed what he never did “ once affirm.” And that the Reader may see clearly how far the five Instances *W. N.* brings to prove his false Charge, fall short of doing it, I refer to *p.* 150. foregoing, where that Matter is fully spoken to.

IN his next Paragraph, *p.* 161, 162. he owns, “ That the *Quakers* are commonly peaceable Neighbours, free from open Vices, and that they may “ in such Cases be set as Examples to Thousands,” by which he means, “ Thousands of *common Inhabitants* of the Towns where they live.” but says also, that I am mistaken in supposing “ That he “ means to set the *Quakers* as Examples to Thousands of Christians.” By which 'tis evident, that, in his Esteem, *Thousands of common Inhabitants* of the Towns where the *Quakers* live, are no *Christians*. This shews the Stinginess of the Man's Spirit, and the Narrowness of his Principles, and that he has as little Charity for Others of his *Neighbours*, as for the *Quakers*. He seems to think those *too vicious*, and these *too virtuous*, for Admittance into his *Class* of *Christians*. Nor is it any wonder that he places

○

Vice

Vice and *Virtue* in the same *Category*, if we consider his following Words, *p.* 162. *viz.* “ I said that in
 “ *such Things* they might be set for Examples ; but
 “ what Things were they ? No Doctrines of the
 “ Christian Religion, or any real Holiness, or the
 “ Method of Gospel-Worship, but in their *Sobriety*
 “ and *Freedom from open Vices*. Moreover, *H. B.*
 “ might have seen in the same Place, that I excep-
 “ ted Religious Matters ; for in the next Line I
 “ added these Words, “ But in the great Concerns
 “ of our Souls Salvation, or in the Matters of Faith
 “ and Gospel-Worship, I must take the Liberty to
 “ speak according to the Word of God, which I
 “ heartily own to be the sole Rule of my Faith and
 “ Worship.” These Words stood as fair to be seen
 “ and read, as those that he took Notice of ; why
 “ then did he pervert my Words ? We cannot take
 “ this for honest Dealing.”

I designed no Perversion of his Words, for I really thought by the *Thousands* he spoke of, he had meant *Christians* ; nor did I then know, that he esteemed *Thousands* of the common Inhabitants of the Towns where we live, (who profess Faith in Christ, and are generally baptized or sprinkled with Water) *Heathens*. If therefore I mistook his Meaning, 'twas because he is far more uncharitable than I thought for. Nor did I then think, that he esteemed *Sobriety and Freedom from open Vices*, *No Doctrines of the Christian Religion* ; *No Religious Matters* ; *Nor any of the great Concerns of our Souls Salvation* ; all which his Words before cited do most evidently imply. Does he think the Exhortations of the Apostles to Sobriety, *1 Thes. v. 6, 7, 8. Titus ii. 6. 1 Pet. i. 13. v. 8.* and in many other Places, to be but meer *Heathenism*, and no Doctrine of the Christian Religion ? Or does he think that what the Grace of God teaches, is no Christian Doctrine ?

Is it not written *Titus ii. 11, 12.* *The Grace of God that bringeth Salvation hath appeared to all Men; teaching us, that denying Ungodliness and worldly Lusts, we should live SOBERLY.* And is not this SOBRIETY which the Grace of God teaches, a *Religious Matter*, and one of the *great Concerns of our Salvation*? Are not *Sobriety and Freedom from open Vices, good Fruits*? And are not *Fruits the Characteristick* Christ hath directed us to judge by? Doth he not expressly say, *By their Fruits ye shall know them.* *Mat. vii. 20. and v. 18.* *A good Tree cannot bring forth evil Fruit, neither can a corrupt Tree bring forth good Fruit.* Is not then *W. N.* exceedingly uncharitable, who will censure Men in Opposition to so excellent a Rule? Or can he *heartily own* the Scriptures (which he calls the *Word of God*) *to be the sole Rule of his Faith and Worship*, while he is advancing Positions directly contrary to their Testimony.

IN the Close of my *Vindication*, I asserted our Belief, in Opposition to his Perversions, to some Part of which he puts in his Exceptions.

Page 162. HE cites me thus, “ In p. 113. *H. B.* affirms, that the *Quakers* do not deny *any one Article of the Christian Faith.*” I also added, “ as recorded in the holy Scriptures.” Which last Words of mine he conceals, and says, “ I shall bring him and his Doctrines to the Test of the holy Scriptures.” as it I had not admitted their Testimony.

HE then proceeds to remark upon my saying, that *we do not utterly reject a Sabbath.* “ And how, says he, does he make that out?” I think I told him, “ that we plead it expedient there should be one Day in seven, a Day of Rest, and that People should go to the publick Worship of God.”

“ But, *says he*, they don’t do this out of any Conscience of keeping it as holy Time to the Lord, more than any other Day of the Week : So that this is but an Equivocation.” If he think that there is a real intrinsick Holiness in one Period of Time more than in another, let him produce his Reasons ; or if he can, let him shew us any Text in the New Testament, whereby the first Day of the Week is consecrated. If any of us have said, that the *Sabbath is done away in Christ*, it was doubtless intended of the *Jewish Sabbath* ; which if himself does not think to be abolished, it will become him to produce a valid Reason for his not keeping it.

THE next Thing he finds fault with is, my affirming, That *we do not deny any of the Ordinances of Christ*. And then fillily taking for granted the very Point I expressly objected to, *viz.* that *Water-Baptism* and the *Use of Bread and Wine*, are Ordinances of Christ ; he calls me all to naught, and says, “ he supposes me akin to the Knights of the Post, who can say or swear any Thing.” for which Abuse I gave him no Ground, it being our real Belief that *Water-Baptism* never was any Ordinance of Christ ; and that his Words to his Disciples, *Do this in Remembrance of me*, were spoken only upon that present Occasion, and were no Precept of perpetual Obligation to others. Let him in his Next, make an Essay to prove what he so scurrilously abuses me for denying.

HIS next Remark is upon my saying, that “ We do not teach Men to patch up a Righteousness of their own, but assert that all our Righteousnesses are filthy Rags, and that the Righteousness that Christians are to be clothed with, is the Righteousness of God by Faith in Jesus Christ.” Upon which he thus observes, “ If this be really
“ the

“ the Judgment of *H. B.* he had better have said,
 “ That *this is really my Opinion.* But why does he
 “ speak like *R. Barclay*, in representing this to the
 “ World as the common Opinion of the Society of
 “ the *Quakers.* This is far from Sincerity. Did
 “ not this Man know that *R. Barclay*, whom he un-
 “ takes to vindicate, was of another Judgment?
 “ And could he be ignorant that *Samuel Fisher* has
 “ written very much against it?” To this I an-
 swer, that I well know *R. Barclay* was of the same
 Judgment; and that *S. Fisher* has not written against
 it, but *W. N.* hath perverted the Sense of those
 Authors, as I have fully shewn in *p.* 18, 19. fore-
 going.

P. 165. HE cavils at my saying, “ We be-
 “ lieve the Scriptures in as full and extensive a Sense
 “ as any other Christians, save only we object to
 “ their being the primary and only Rule of Faith
 “ and Practice, and the Word of God.” To this
 he objects certain Passages from *G. Fox*, *W. Bailey*,
 and *G. Bishop*, which we have before reply’d to.
 For which I refer my Reader to the Section of the
 Scriptures, where he will fully see our Judgment,
 and how little Occasion this Adversary has for charg-
 ing us with slighting the Scriptures, which we highly
 honour, as proceeding from the Dictates of the Spi-
 rit of God, and containing a Revelation of his Will.

P. 166. HE carps at my saying, *We believe a*
Judgment to come, or the last Judgment. Which most
 certainly we do, nor do the Citations he produces
 say any Thing to the contrary. His flouting Ex-
 pressions, “ But I must tell thee, Friend, that
 “ this is deceitful Dealing, and a Trick to cover
 “ thy Notions,” I abominate, and must place to
 the Score of his manifold Abuses of that Kind, which
 I desire to forgive.

HIS last Objection is to my saying, that *We believe Heaven and Hell*. In Opposition to which he produces some Expressions of our Friends who speak of an *Heaven within*: And falsely infers, *that Heaven and Glory are only in this present Life*; whereas no such Inference can be justly drawn from their Words. So that his several Objections to my Declaration, being of no weight, I shall conclude this in the same Manner as I did my *Vindication*, viz. “ All these
 “ Doctrine which *W. N.* asserts, and insinuates we
 “ deny, we fully and sincerely own, as they are
 “ contained in the sacred Writings; and therefore
 “ what must his Treatment of the *Quakers* in this
 “ manner be attributed to? If not Prejudice, it must
 “ be a profound Ignorance of their Principles, and
 “ too great a Dependence on the Credit of their Ene-
 “ mies: Let it be which way it will, he gave suffi-
 “ cient Proof in his *Review*, of being an unfair Ad-
 “ versary, and in his *Reply*, has abundantly con-
 “ firm’d the same, in both which, instead of im-
 “ partially stating *R. B.*’s and the *Quakers* Principles,
 “ he has most partially abus’d them.”

HIS following Matter being nothing but old Objections, frequently by us answered and confuted, I pass by, as having no Relation to my *Vindication*, which I think I have fully defended against his *Reply*, the Injustice whereof I have plainly detected, and wish he may unfeignedly repent of the manifold Injuries and Abuses which he has undeservedly cast upon the Innocent.

P O S T S C R I P T.

SINCE the foregoing Sheets were printed off, the Book call'd *Morn. Watch*, mentioned in p. 102. is come to our Hands: And we can now assure the Reader, that *W. N.*'s pretended Citation from thence, *viz.* "They call the holy Scriptures Traditions of Men, Earthly Root, Darknefs and Confusion, *Nebuchadnezzars* Image, Putrefaction and Corruption, Rotten and Deceitful" is a most gross Misrepresentation, there being nothing spoken contemptuously of the Scriptures in that Book, nor are any of those Terms applied to the Scriptures therein. If *W. N.* read the Book before he quoted it, he is guilty of a most abominable Perversion of it. If he has never read it, but borrow'd the Quotation from some other Adversary, the Falshood is justly imputable to himself, in that he repeated it as his own.

F I N I S.

THE
CONTENTS.

The INTRODUCTION, Page 1, 2.

SECT. I.

W. NOTCUTT's *Introduction consider'd.*

Remarks on W. Notcutt's *Collection of Phrases from Mather's Hist. of New England. On a Certificate concerning H. Smith and E. Walker. On his Promise to forbear Railing.* p. 3. *On his froth and levity about my citing a News Paper.* p. 4. *On his gross Railery against G. Fox.* p. 5. *A full Answer to his Query, What did G. Fox ever do to prove his Call and Mission from God?* p. 8. *A Defence of R. Barclay from his unjust Reflection.* p. 12. *His Objection, concerning G. KEITH's being persecuted for preaching Faith in Christ without, refuted.* p. 14. *A Declaration of Faith made by the Quakers in Pennsylvania on that Account.* p. 16. *His abuse of R. Barclay and S. Fisher concerning Justification by our own Works, detected.* p. 19. *The Weakness of his pretended Parallel between the Doctrine of Election held by G. Fox and E. Burroughs, and that of Elisha Cole, with his pitiful Evasion about a Charge of Blasphemy on R. Barclay's Friends exposed.* p. 21.

SECT.

The CONTENTS.

S E C T. II.

Of the Rise of the QUAKERS.

Observations concerning trembling. p. 22. On W. N's asserting what he could not possibly know. p. 23. On the weakness of his Syllogisms. p. 24. On his Injustice in taking no Notice of J. Naylor's Recantation. *ibid.* A Letter of J. Naylor's with Observations on his Tryal from Sewel's History. p. 26. On the Injustice of W. Notcutt's ascribing to a Society the Failings of particular Persons. On the Liberty he would assume in making Quotations. p. 27. The Vanity of his attempt to prove his Assertion that G. Fox gave out that himself was Christ, with a large Citation from Joseph Wyeth's Switch, in answer to the Snake in the Grass, from whom W. Notcutt seems to have borrowed his pretended Proofs. p. 28. to 40.

S E C T. III.

Of the Holy Scriptures.

THE Design of R. Barclay in writing his Apology. p. 41. The Quakers reverent Regard to the holy Scriptures manifested by Extracts from their Yearly Meeting Epistles. p. 42. On private Doctrines. p. 47. W. Notcutt's Reflections on the Light within being the Standard, answered. p. 48. No Disagreement between S. Fisher, R. Barclay and me about Justification. p. 49. The Weakness of W. Notcutt's Comparison, about trying a Piece of Gold, exposed. p. 52. Testimonies

The C O N T E N T S.

Testimonies of ancient Christians and eminent Protestants, to the Necessity of the Spirit's Illumination. p. 53. *A pretended Disagreement between R. Barclay and G. Fox, reconciled.* p. 57. *Several Objections against R. Barclay refuted.* p. 59. *An Instance of W. Notcutt's Perversion of Scripture.* p. 62. *Several Quotations from E. Burroughs considered.* p. 65. *Citations from G. Bishop considered.* p. 68. *We do not disparage the Scriptures.* p. 72. *Testimonies of some called Heathens to the Divinity and Excellency of the Light within.* p. 74. *The Holy Spirit the Guide of those who have not the Scriptures.* p. 76. *A Perversion of W. Penn expos'd.* p. 72. *The Scriptures confirm the Truth of Miracles, not Miracles the Truth of Scripture.* p. 78. *Remarks on an unguarded Expression of W. Notcutt.* p. 80. *Collection of Testimonies to the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit referred to.* *ibid.* *The Weakness of W. Notcutt's Objections to several Texts by me cited.* p. 81. *His Froth and Levity justly exposed.* p. 85. *His impious Railing against the Light within considered.* p. 86. *His Distinction between the Ruler and the Rule, not Scriptural.* p. 87. *His false Charge on W. Penn.* p. 89. *An Examination of 17 Texts by him produced to prove, that the Scriptures call themselves the Word of God.* p. 90. *His Objections against some of our Friends calling their Writings the Word of the Lord, long since answered by Dr. Philips.* p. 97. *Observations concerning a feigned Story of his, of what a Woman told him.* p. 101. *His Perversions of S. Fisher. Isaac Pennington and others, detected.* p. 102. *His Cautions to young Persons made more agreeable to Scripture.* p. 107.

The C O N T E N T S.

S E C T IV:

Of the Light Within.

WILLIAM NOTCUTT'S *Objections against the Light answered by a Citation from Eliz. Bathurst. p. 114. A Query whether he believes the Divinity and Omnipresence of Christ. D. 118. Observations on his unscriptural Use of the Word Graces. p. 119. A false Charge of his on W. Penn. p. 120. The Absurdity of W. Notcutt's Consequences about Perfection. ibid. The Quakers Acknowledgment of Christ without asserted. p. 121. Remarks on W. N's 4 sorts of Light. 123. On his calling the Light within an Idol. 123. Observations on the Use of the Word אֵשׁ (or Principle) in the New Testament. p. 124: W. Notcutt convicted of a gross Imposition on his Reader. p. 125. His Remarks concerning the Light within considered. p. 126.*

S E C T. V.

Of the TRINITY.

JOHAN CALVIN'S *Observations concerning the Terms Trinity of Persons. p. 135. W. Notcutt Uses the same Comparisons which he censures in others as foolish and carnal. p. 137. The Name Everlasting Father attributed to Christ. Isa. ix. 9. p. 137. The Weakness of W. Notcutt's Remarks upon the Words I will come, and I will send. p. 138. A Choice Passage of W. Penn concerning the Trinity. p. 139.*

S E C T. VI.

The CONTENTS.

S E C T. VI.

Of J E S U S C H R I S T:

Several Citations rescued from W. Notcutt's *Per-*
versions. p. 140. *Remarks on W. Notcutt's say-*
ing, that the Godhead of Christ was not anointed.
p. 142. *An Answer, to what W. Notcutt calls the*
Mystery of Quakerism, transcrib'd from R. Claridge.
p. 142. *W. Notcutt's Comment upon a Citation from*
E. Burroughs shewn to be an ill-natur'd one. p. 148:

S E C T. VII.

Of P E R F E C T I O N:

WILLIAM NOTCUTT'S *Charge of In-*
constancy in R. Barclay proved groundless p.
149. *The falshood of his Charge on G. Fox, and his*
inability to defend it, fully detected. p. 150. *His own*
Ignorance discovered in pretending to expose G. Fox's.
p. 151. *The Failings of Job and Afa carry no Op-*
position to R. Barclay's Doctrin of Perfection. p.
152. *Perfection necessarily includes Humility.* *ibid.*
W. Notcutt's Assertion, that the Belief of Perfection
tends to nourish Pride, shewn to be weak and imperti-
nent. p. 153.

S E C T. VIII.

The CONTENTS.

S E C T. VIII.

Of Women's Preaching.

WILLIAM NOTCUTT's *Suggestion, of my unfairly quoting Pool and Lock, groundless* p. 154. *His Remark on the Word λαλέειν insignificant* p. 155. *Speaking with Tongues no part of Joel's Prophecy, nor do Miracles always accompany an immediate Commission to preach.* 156. *A short Remark on W. N.'s own Commission.* *ibid.* *His mean way of confuting G. F.* p. 157. *Notes of a pretended Letter from S. Eccles, to John Story.* *ibid.* *Remarks on the Apostle's Directions concerning Women's praying and prophesying.* *ibid.*

S E C T IX.

Of Silent Meetings.

W. NOTCUTT's *Ignorance of the Nature of spiritual Worship, and Remarks on his saying that the Congregation is not a proper Place for Meditation.* p. 158. *His Discourse of Silent Meetings being accidental answered.* p. 259. *The Indecency of his personal Reflections on T. Coe expos'd.* p. 160. *A Description of the Nature of Silent and Spiritual Worship.* *ibid.* *Silent Worship opposed by those who are maintained by Talking about Religion.* p. 163.

S E C T. X.

Of P R A Y E R.

Remarks on a Concession of W. N. which gives up his Cause. p. 163. *What true Prayer is.* p. 104. *Words are not essential to that Duty of Prayer enjoined*

The C O N T E N T S.

enjoined by those Texts which command us To Pray always p. 164. A formal Course of Expressions may be us'd where no true Prayer is. ibid. What W. N. calls the Work of Prayer may be a meer Opus Operatum and unacceptable. ibid. His Misapplication of several Texts on this Head, p. 165. 166. A Passage from R. Barclay's Apology concerning Prayer. 167. A Passage out of Cyprian concerning Mental Prayer. p. 178.

S E C T. XI.

Of I N F A L L I B I L I T Y.

THE Quakers hold not a personal Infallibility. p. 170. W. N.'s Citations from G. F. examined. p. 171. His Misinterpretation of E. Burroughs. p. 172. 173. Several other injurious Quotations from G. F. examined. p. 174. A Detection of W. N.'s most egregious Perversion of S. Fisher. p. 175. to 179. A Passage of R. Barclay's concerning Miracles. p. 180.

S E C T. XII.

Of W A T E R B A P T I S M.

WILLIAM NOTCUTT doth not prove Water-Baptism to be the Baptism of Christ. p. 181. The Apostles were instrumental to confer the Gift of the Holy Ghost. ibid. S. Clark's Annotations on Heb. 10. 22. p. 182. A Passage from my Vindication by him unanswered. p. 183.

S E C T. XIII.

The CONTENTS.

SECT. XIII.

Of the LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Defects of W. N's Discourse on this Head demonstrated. p. 184. 185. His Misrepresentations of R. Barclay. p. 186, 187.

SECT. XIV.

The CONCLUSION.

HIS Remarks on the Conclusion of my Vindication considered. p. 188, 189, 190. Many Instances shewn wherein he has injured the Quakers. 191, 192. A particular Injustice of W. Notcutt remarked p. 193. Observations on his unchristianing the common Inhabitants of the Towns. *ibid.* Remarks on his calling Sobriety and Freedom from open Vices no religious Matters. &c. p. 194. His Exceptions to my Declaration of our Belief shewn to be weak and frivolous. p. 195. &c.

BOOKS lately Printed, and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle, at the Bible in George-Yard, Lombard Street.

A Defence of *Quakerism*; or, An Answer to a Book intituled, A Preservative against *Quakerism*; written by *Patrick Smith, M. A. and Vicar*, as he styles himself, of *Great Paxton in Huntingdonshire*. In which Answer, His Charges against the *Quakers of Deism, Enthusiasm, Heresy, and Schism*, are considered and refuted: His Misinterpretations of the *Holy Scriptures* manifested: His frequent *Perversions* of the *Quakers Writings* detected; and their truly *Christian Principles* stated, and vindicated, in Opposition to his *Attempts*, which are shewn to be weak and self-contradictory. With an Appendix, containing, I. An *Examination* of the first Class of *Quaker-Testimonies* produced in a late Vindication of the *Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry*. II. A *Detection* of the *Falseness* of *Pickworth's Narrative*. By *Joseph Besse*. price 4s.

A Confutation of the Charge of *Deism*: wherein the Christian and Orthodox Sentiments of *William Penn* are fully demonstrated from his own Writings, which are clear'd from the Perversions and Misconstructions of a Nameless Author, in his late Vindication of the *Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry*: With a particular Examination of that Author's Comment on several Texts of Scripture: And an *Appendix*, in which the *Falseness* of *Henry Pickworth's Narrative* are fix'd upon his own head, from his late pretended Defence of them. By *Jos. Besse*. price bound 2s.

The *Protestant Flail*: Or a Defence (grounded upon Scripture) of a Letter to the Clergy of *Northumberland*, in Answer to a Pamphlet intitl'd *A Vindication of Bishop Taylor, &c.* pr. 9d.

A Vindication of the Doctrine of *Baptism*, as held by the People call'd *Quakers*; in Answer to *Philip Beddingfield's* Pamphlets, especially that called, *A Letter to a Quaker in Norfolk*: Wherein his Arguments for *Water-Baptism* are *Enervated*: His mistaken Notions concerning the *Baptism* of the Spirit, *Detected*: And his Exposition

BOOKS Printed and Sold, &c.

Exposition of fundry Texts of *Scripture, Refuted*: Proving, that the Baptism with the Holy Spirit is the true Baptism of Christ; whereby every true Believer is initiated into the Christian Church. With a Questionary Postscript directed to the Clergy. By *Josiah Forster*. Price bound 1s. 6d.

Some *Considerations* relating to the Present State of the *Christian Religion*, wherein the Nature, End and Design of Christianity, as well as the Principal Evidence of the Truth of it, are explained and recommended out of the holy Scriptures; with a general Appeal to the Experience of all Men for Confirmation thereof. The second Edition. price 6d.

Part the Second. Wherein the principal Evidence of the Christian Religion is explain'd and defended upon the Principles of Reason, as well as Revelation: With some Observations on some Passages in the Book intituled *Christianity as old as the Creation*, so far as concerns the Doctrine herein advanced. The second Edition. pr. 1s.

Part the Third. Wherein the principal Evidence of the Christian Religion is farther explain'd and defended; in Answer to the Objections made against it in a late Vindication of the Bishop of *Lichfield and Coventry*: With an Appendix, containing some Remarks on a Passage in the second Volume of Bishop *Burnet's* History of his own Times. price 1s. All of them by *Alexander Arscott*.

An Abstract of the Sufferings of the People call'd *Quakers*, for the Testimony of a good Conscience, from the Time of their being first distinguished by that Name, taken from Original Records, and other Authentick Accounts. Vol. the first. From the Year 1650, to the Year 1660. Price 5s.

The Impartial Quaker: In Answer to the *Impartial Churchman*, Written by Dr. *Robert Warren*, Rector of *Stratford Bow* in *Middlesex*. By *H. L.* price 6d.

A Salutation to the *Britains*, to call them *From the Many Things, to the One Thing* needful, for the saving of their Souls. Especially, to the poor Unlearned Tradesmen, Plowmen and Shepherds, those that are of a low

BOOKS lately Printed and Sold, &c.

Degree like my self, this, in order to direct you to know God and Christ, the only wise God, which is Life Eternal, and to learn of him, that you may become wiser than your Teachers. By *Ellis Pugh*. pr. 1s

Vindiciæ Veritatis: Or an occasional Defence of the Principles and Practices of the People called *Quakers*, in answer to a Treatise of *John Stillingfleet's*, miscalled, Seasonable Advice concerning *Quakerism*, &c. by Daniel Phillips, M. D. price 1s 6d.

A Collection of the Works of the memorable *William Penn*, Governor of Pensilvania. In Two Volumes, in Folio. To which is prefix'd a Journal of his Life, with many Original Letters and Papers not before published. price 1l. 10s.

A compleat Index to *W. Penn's* Works. pr. 6d.

Fruits of a Father's Love: Being the Advice of *W. Penn* to his Children, relating to their Civil and Religious Conduct. Written occasionally many Years ago, and now made publick for a general Good. By a Lover of his Memory: price 9d.

An Essay concerning the Restoration of Primitive Christianity, in a Conduct truly pious and Religious, the second Edition with Additions. By *Tho. Beaven*. p. 1s

A brief Account of the Life, Convincement, Sufferings, Labours and Travels of that faithful Minister of Christ Jesus, *Christopher Story*. price 1s.

Truth's Vindication: Or, a gentle Stroke to wipe off the foul Aspersions, false Accusations, and Misrepresentations, cast upon the People of God called *Quakers*, both with respect to their Principle, and their Way of profelyting People over to them. by *E. Bathurst*. pr 1s

Fruits of Early Piety, consisting of several Christian Experiences, Meditations and Admonitions, written in Verse, by *Richard Bockett jun.* Very profitable for the Perusal of Youth. The second Edition. pr. 3d

Musa Parænetica, or a Tractate of *Christian Epistles* on sundry Occasions, in Verse. by *William Maffey*, price 6d

Books Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle.

Gospel-Truths demonstrated, in a Collection of Doctrinal Books, given forth by that faithful Minister of Jesus Christ, George Fox, containing Principles essential to Christianity and Salvation, held among the People called Quakers, folio.

God's protecting Providence, Man's surest Help and Defence in Times of the greatest Difficulty and most eminent Danger, evidenced in that remarkable Deliverance of R. Barrow, with divers other Persons, from the devouring Waves of the Sea, among which they suffered Shipwreck; and also from the cruel devouring Jaws of the inhumane Cannabals of Florida, faithfully related by one of the Persons concerned therein, Jonathan Dickenson, price 1s

The Harmony of the Old and New Testament, and the fulfilling of the Prophets, concerning our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and his Kindom in the latter Days, with a brief Concordance of the Names and Attributes, &c. given unto Christ: and some Texts of Scriptures collected, concerning Christ's Humiliation and Sufferings, also his excellent Dignity and Glorification. Published for the Benefit of Christians and Jews, by John Tomkins. With an Appendix to the Jews by W. Penn, the third Edition, price 1s

The Works of the long mournful and sorely distressed Isaac Pennington, in folio, price 12s

The spiritual Worship and Service of God exalted; and acceptably performed only in the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ. With some other Things inserted herein worthy of Observation. By a Lover of Truth, and Well Wisher of the Souls of all Men, George Myers, price 9d

A Light shining out of Darkneis; or occasional Queries, submitted to the Judgment of such as would enquire into the true State of Things in our Times. The whole Work revised by the Author, the Proof englished and augmented, with sundry material Discourses concerning the Ministry, Separation, Inspiration, Scriptures, Humane Learning, Oaths, Tithes, &c. With a brief Apology for the Quakers, that they are not inconsistent with Magistracy. By an indifferent, but learned Hand. the third Edition, price 1s 6d.

Where also may be had, Bibles, Testaments, Concordances, Spelling Books, Primers, Horn-books, Writing Paper, Account-books for Merchants and Shopkeepers with other Stationary Ware, Wholesale or Retail.







