



BOOK-BINDING,
IN ALL ITS VARIOUS
BRANCHES,
EXECUTED BY
TUTTLE,
WITH ELEGANCE,
AND
PUNCTUALITY.
MONTREAL.

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Rare book

Division

SCC

Section...

1176

*The Late ASSOCIATION for DEFENCE
Farther Encouraged:*

O R,

DEFENSIVE WAR Defended;

A N D

ITS CONSISTENCY with TRUE CHRIS-
TIANITY Represented.

I N A

R E P L Y

T O S O M E

EXCEPTIONS against *WAR*, in a late
COMPOSURE, intituled,

*The Doctrine of Christianity, as held by the People
called QUAKERS, vindicated.*

By GILBERT TENNENT, A. M.

Judges vi. 11. 16. 34. *And the Lord looked upon him, and said,
Go in this thy Might, and thou shalt save Israel from the
Hand of the Midianites: Have not I sent thee? Surely I
will be with thee, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one
Man. The Spirit of the Lord came upon Gideon, and he blew
a Trumpet, and Abimezer was gathered after him.*

Psalms cxlix. 5, 6. *Let the Saints be joyful in Glory: Let the
high Praises of God be in their Mouth, and a two-edged
Sword in their Hand.*

Matthew xxiv. 43. *But know this, that if the Good-man of the
House had known, in what watch the Thief would come, he
would have watched, and would not have suffered his House
to be broken up.*

P H I L A D E L P H I A :

Printed and Sold by B. FRANKLIN and D. HALL.

MDCCLXVIII. Price 2s. 6d.

C O R R I G E N D A.

Page 11. Line 1. dele *the*. p. 14. l. 18. for *Scriptures* read *Scripture*. n. 16. l. 33. for *ermnon* read *he. mon*. p. 78. l. 36. for *descenderet* read *descenderat*. p. 79. l. 29. for *utappy* read *unhappy*. p. 93. l. 20. for 1 *For* xvii. 2. read 1 *7* l. 8. p. 93. l. 31. for *Mileu* read *Mineu*. p. 108. l. 4. for *given* read *given up*. p. 121. l. 22. for *est* read *Set*. p. 123. l. 35. for *do. et* in a f. 3. *Cap. 15* read *doet*. p. 115. l. 20. for *fra* read *from*. p. 122. l. 27. for *utigne* in a f. 3. *Cap. 15* read *ut igne*. p. 131. l. 25. for *Laurentius* read *Laurentinus*. p. 163. l. 31. dele *e*. p. 168. l. 2. for *deferendum* read *deserendum*.

The EPISTLE DEDICATORY.

To the GENTLEMEN of the ASSOCIATION.

Honoured Gentlemen, and dear Brethren,

I BEG Leave to offer the following *Reply* to you in particular, and humbly ask your kind *Acceptance* of it: I may truly say, that the being engag'd in a *Controversy* of this Kind, is one of the most unexpected *Events* to me that ever I met with: 'Tis not long since that I had almost come to a full *Resolution*, never more to offer any *Production* of mine to *publick View*; being somewhat sensible of my *Unfitness* for Things of that *Nature*, and likewise desirous of *Peace*!

But the All-governing *Providence* of God, sometimes brings about Things in a Way we know not, by a surprizing *Train* of *Incidents*!

My appearing in Publick, by the first *Discourse* upon *Defensive War*, which some of you were pleas'd to honour by your *Presence*, was not of my own *Motion* or Seeking, but what a little before I had almost determin'd against; having an Aversion to *Controversy*, which I knew not but it might occasion: In the mean Time, you are sensible *Sirs*, that in the aforesaid *Discourse*, I endeavour'd carefully to guard against giving *Cause* of *Offence* to particular *Persons* or *Societies*, that were of different *Sentiments*; and only offer'd some of the *Reasons* of my *Opinion*, together with an *Answer* to some *Objections*.

That *Discourse*, *Gentlemen*, you were pleas'd (some of you) to encourage the *Publication* of; which, as it was an *Evidence* of your *Regard* to the *Design* of the *Performance* in general, so of your *Kindness* and *Indulgence* to me in Particular; for which I acknowledge my *Obligation*!

The aforesaid *Sermon*, as you all know, has been since *opposed* from the *Press*, and that under the *Umbrage* of vindicating the *Doctrine* of a particular *Society*, which I had not attacked; this *Composure* I have carefully examined, and deliberately considered, and not being thereby convinced of any *Mistake* in my *Sermon*; I think it my *Duty* (tho' I am not comparatively *par negotio* equal to the *Province*) to defend it; and the rather at this Time, because I do not only look upon *Defensive War* to be an important Truth, as it respects *Society* in general, but a very reasonable *Truth*, considering our *perilous Circumstances* in Particular; and because in this *Debate*, I am upon the *Defensive*, and therefore do but act agreeable to the *Position* advanced in the *Sermon*.

I cannot

I cannot say that I have manag'd it as the *Moment* of the *Subject* deserves, and its *Necessity* requires ; but I can say, that I have attempted it, and this is my *Comfort*, that (*In magnis voluisse sat est*) in great and arduous *Matters*, an honest *Essay* is acceptable to a gracious *God*, thro' *Jesus Christ*, and will not be disagreeable to ingenuous and unbiassed *Minds*.

And perhaps this humble *Essay*, this small *Specimen* of my good *Wishes* for the *Defence* of labouring *Truth*, and an endanger'd *City* and *Colony*, may incite some *abler Pen* to pour more *Light* upon the *Point* in *Controversy*, which would doubtless be of singular *Service*.

But tho' I may safely say that my *Heart* is engaged in the *Subject* of the following *Pages*, with *Design* to promote the *Safety* of this (but lately) defenceless *Province*, yet I bleis *God* I bear a friendly *Disposition* towards those who have a different *View* of the *Point* in *Debate* ; and have a *charitable Opinion* of the good *Intention*, at least of divers of them, notwithstanding.

And this, my dear *Brethren* ! I would humbly advise you all to exercise ; *Charity thinks no Evil, but hopeth all Things*.----- Altho' the *Point* appears clear to us, yet considering the great and secret *Influence* of *Education*, upon the most of *Mankind*, and the *Number* of *Scripture Passages*, which seem to have a *Sound* contrary to *War*, in *Gospel Times* ; it is not to be wondered at, that some serious and well-dispos'd *Minds*, are *scrupulous* of it, or *averse* to it ; and surely it is cruel to *persecute* them, for what they cannot help, yea, for that which doubtless they have a good *Design* in !

But if there be any, who are in their *Consciences* convinced of the *Lawfulness* of *Defensive War*, yet dare not appear for it, for *Fear* of the *Displeasure* of *Men*, certainly it is no good *Sign* either of their *Piety* or *Courage*.

I would humbly ask of *Readers* in general, of every *Denomination*, who shall be pleas'd to look into the following *Performance*, this *Act* of *Justice* to me, and *Favour* to themselves, namely, That they would *examine* impartially, and *weigh*, without the *Byas* of *Prepossession* and *Prejudice*, what I have *offer'd* in the *Scales* of *Scripture* and *Reason* ; for seeing *Truth* will not bend to our irregular *Passions*, it is best by calm and candid *Enquiries*, to labour to find it out amidst the *Mazes* and *Colourings* of *Error* and *Mistake* ; and having found it, would we act up to the *Character* of *Men* and *Christians*, we should profess it boldly, and conform to it inviolably in our *Conduct* at all *Adventures* ! I am,

Honoured Gentlemen, and dear Brethren,

Your affectionate Well-wisher, and unworthy Servant,

GILBERT TENNENT.

Defensive War Defended, &c.

The INTRODUCTION.

PREVIOUS to my Entrance upon the *Vindication* itself, I would observe, that I have credible Information, that that *Performance* is highly recommended by many; and has had, a few Days after the first, a second *Edition*.

The *Gentleman* who is the *Author* thereof, is welcome to examine my Sermon with the severest *Scrutiny*.

If I am mistaken in any Particular in it, I am willing to receive better *Light* and Information from any *Quarter*,* and to alter my *Opinion* upon Conviction by *Scripture* and *Reason*; for it is TRUTH and the PUBLICK SAFETY, and not *Victory*, I seek.

And doubtless, the aforesaid *Gentleman* has a Right to express his Sentiments as well as any others: Nor can I think that *Truth* will lose Ground by proper *Enquiries*; we are all *Men*, and therefore *fallible Creatures*, liable to manifold Mistakes†.

In the mean Time I can't but admire at the Title of his *Performance*! He is pleas'd to call it, *A Vindication of the Doctrine of Christianity, as held by the People called QUAKERS*; which seems to insinuate, that I had attack'd that *Society* in particular in my Sermon, which I have not done, nor any other.

B

I

* *Fas est, et ab hoste doceri,*
nil a me alienum puto.

† *Homo sum, et humanum,*

I had no *Party-View* in that *Discourse*: No! my *Design* was, and still is *Catholick*; namely, to promote, according to my Capacity, * the common *Safety* of all the *Societies* in the *Colony*; and therefore I will not intermeddle with *Party-Disputes* in the Course of this Debate, any farther than I judge necessary to open the *Cause* in *Controversy*, whatever Provocation has been given thereto notwithstanding: No! I resolve to keep to the generous *Plan* upon which I have embark'd, and to contend by *Reason* and *Argument*, for the *Protection* of our *Author*, and the *Society* to which he belongs, as well as others, how displeas'd soever perhaps he is, or may be, with my *Concern* and *Endeavours* that Way!

Surely this *Gentleman* must needs know, that there are divers Persons in this *Colony*, and that of various *Denominations*, besides the *Quakers*, who are against *Defensive War*, as well as many of them? Why therefore should he apply the Sermon to them particularly, more than to others of the same Way of thinking in that Point?

When I think it my *Duty* to attack any *Society* in particular about their *Principles*, I will endeavour to defend my *Charge* as well as I can; but till then, I desire to be excus'd.

As to this *Gentleman's* Intention in the Performance aforesaid, I charitably hope it is as he expresses it in his Preface. God forbid that I should condemn the *States* and *Defenses* of those that differ from me in the *Point* under *Debate*; such as are *truly Religious*, may, I believe, differ in *Principles* that more deeply affect the *Doctrines* of *Christianity*, and yet be sincere!

However, I confess, that the *Time* he chuses for his publick *Animadversions* upon a *Catholick Sermon*, calculated to promote the publick *Safety*, is so perilous,

* *Pro viribus.*

ous, and the *Manner* of his *Management*, in some Instances, so extraordinary (as I shall afterwards endeavour to evince) that it is somewhat difficult to reconcile these Things to his good *Intentions!*

One wou'd think that if he didn't believe it to be his Duty to do any Thing of an encouraging Tendency towards the noble *Design* of the ASSOCIATION himself, he might at least suffer others unoppos'd, to use Means for the *Protection* of him and the *Society* to which he belongs, among others; and for a long r Time at least, agreeable to the *Roman* Proverb † have suspended his entering into an *offensive War*--- Yet still I hope the best of him, and ascribe his odd *Management* rather to the *Difficulty* of supporting his *Cause*, and the Warmth of his *Zea!* for it, than to any bad *Design!*

My Purpose at present is to enquire into the Merits of the Cause in Controversy, and to reflect no more upon our *Author's* Management of it (and that with *Reluctance* and Regret) than *Justice* to the aforesaid important *Cause* necessarily requires.

Personal Reflections are certainly of little Moment in Controversy: *Truth* should be received for its own sake, with *Candour* and Readiness, by whomsoever it is proposed, let their *Denomination* and *Character* be what it will, seeing the *Qualities* of the Person speaking or writing, cannot enter into the Nature of the *Truths* they communicate, or in the least alter them.

The *Method* I propose for my *Reply*, is just to examine the *Force* of the *Objections* offered against the *Arguments* of my Sermon.

Our *Author* begins his *Animadversions*, by observing that the Deliverance to which my *Text* refers, was *miraculous*---wrought without any human *Contrivance* or *Force*,

Ans. Who has said any Thing to the Contrary ? It was not from any Supposition of *Israel's* fighting, at that Time (tho' they were prepared for it, and under Arms) that I drew any Inference in Favour of my Sentiment ; but from the FIGHTING of *Israel's* GOD, and the just TITLE ascrib'd to him on that Occasion, *The LORD is a MAN of WAR.*

Our *Author* again observes very justly, that the Command to *Israel*, when closely pursued by their Enemies, was, *Fear ye not, stand still, and see the Salvation of God, the Lord shall fight for you :* But wasn't there good Reason for their Standing still, when God promised to fight for them in a miraculous Manner ? Mr. *Poole* observes, that the Command of standing still, denotes the calm Posture of their *Minds*, and not of their Bodies § : But if any incline to extend the Sense further, even to the Body, I shall not contend ; no, tho' they themselves should conform thereto in their own Practice, provided they can get a Promise from God, that he will fight miraculously for them.

But by the by, I confess I am surpriz'd ! that any of the Children of Men, should be so bold, as to represent that to be *Evil* in itself, and absolutely forbid by the *Doctrines* of *Christ*, which they may easily perceive God himself has done, *The Lord shall fight for you, Exod. xiv. 13.* as if it was wicked and contrary to the *Gospel* to be like *God* ; O strange unaccountable Notion ! I forbear to give it the Name, which, in my Opinion, it really deserves !

But our *Author* proceeds to say, ' Tho' some Wars were commanded of God, under that Dispensation, and therefore these Appellations, *A Man of War, the Lord of Hosts, &c.* were then suitable and proper, yet I cannot, saith he, perceive that they discover any Approbation of War, be-

gun

§ Vid. *Poole's* Annotat. in Loc,

‘gun and carried on at the mere Will and Pleasure of Men, I rather take them to denote the Greatness of his Power and Superiority, and therefore the Justness and Propriety of an entire Dependance upon God.’ And then the Case of Gideon is introduced, who at the Command of God, reduced his Army from 32,000 to 300, and put the mighty Host of the Midianites to Flight; ‘Here (says our Author) tho’ the Use of outward Means was permitted, a strong and entire Dependance upon God was required, even in that Day: Can such a Dependance be less necessary in a Day of Gospel Light?’

Here observe, that our Author acknowledges expressly, in the above Paragraph, these three Things, viz.

1. That some Wars were commanded by God, under the *Jewish* Dispensation.
2. That the aforesaid Appellations of *Man of War*, &c. were suitable and proper then.
3. That tho’ the Use of outward Means was permitted, a strong and entire Dependance upon God was required even in that Day.

Upon the aforesaid Concessions, I would propose the following Queries, viz.

Query 1. Can it be reasonably supposed that the Almighty can command at any Time what is contrary to his Nature or Approbation?

Query 2. Is the Almighty God changed now in his *Nature* and *Properties*, from what he was under the *Jewish* Dispensation? Doesn’t the Scripture declare, That *He is far from the Shadow of Change*? Now if the Almighty does not, cannot change, in the aforesaid Respects, then I query,

3. How comes our Author, Page 3, 4. after he had mentioned my Endeavour to prove from my Text, and some other Appellations given to the Almighty,

mighty in the Old Testament, viz, *The Lord of Hosts, The God of the Armies of Israel, &c.* to prove from thence that War was agreeable to him, to insert under the Margin this Text, *Lam. iii. 33. The Lord doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the Children of Men*; if it be not to prove a Change in God's Nature, is it not impertinent to the Point under Debate? And if it be, how shocking is the Doctrine our Author advances? For if *God* changes in his *Nature*, he must grow better or worse; if better, he was imperfect before the Change; if worse, he is imperfect after it; and consequently either Way he cannot be God!

Query 4. How comes our Author to pass by in entire Silence the Argument I advanced in the Sermon he opposes, to prove that *War* is approved of by the Almighty, which is this (Page 6) 'And can we think Sirs, that the Almighty would accept of a Name contrary to his Nature, or suffer himself to be called by any Thing he dislikes or detests?' If our Author thinks that *Defensive War* is contrary to the Divine Nature, why didn't he answer that Question in the Negative, and speak out fairly?

Query 5. Why does our *Author* in the aforesaid Paragraph change the State of the Question, and speak of a *War begun and pursued at the meer Pleasure and Will of Men*? Have I not in stating the Question under Debate, expressly opposed such a wicked *offensive War*, in these Words; (Page 6, 7) 'That Kind of War is not approved of by God, which is commenced merely to gratify the *Ambition* and *Avarice* of *Princes*---Such *Wars* are undoubtedly unlawful; and likewise all such as are begun without a View to *Justice* and *Peace*, and carried on without *Compassion* and *Humanity*.' Is this candid Management? But I proceed:

Query

Query 6. Why does our *Author*, in the aforesaid Paragraph, in order to remove the Force of my Argument from the aforesaid Appellation (mention'd to prove God's Approbation of War) insinuate some *Contrariety* between God's *Approbation* of War, and his *Greatness, Power, Superiority, Sufficiency*, and our *Dependance* on him: If such a *Contrariety* be not insinuated, how is his Glors supported? And if it be, how can it be prov'd contrary to the express *Command* of the Almighty for War at that Time? Isn't it easy to conceive a sweet *Harmony* in these Things? namely, God's being entitled a *Man of War*; his commanding *Defensive War*; his approving what he commands; his presiding over all *Wars*, by his *Power* and *Providence*, and therefore a *Necessity* of our entire and continual *Dependance* upon him, in the Use of *Means* for *Success*.

Query 7. What does our *Author* bring the Instance of *Gideon* for? Is it to prove what no Body denies, namely, the Almighty *Power* of God; the *Necessity* of entire *Dependance* on God, in the Use of *Means*; if so, it is impertinent to the Point in Debate, and unkind Dealing; for it insinuates, that such as are now for *Defensive War*, question the *Power* of God, and oppose an entire *Dependance* upon his *Providence*. This Insinuation he farther manifests in the Close of the aforesaid Paragraph, in these Words, 'Can such a *Dependance* be less necessary in a Day of Gospel-Light?'

Now that such an Insinuation is unreasonable, appears from his own Concession beforementioned, whereby he acknowledges a *Permission* of the outward Means (*viz.* of War) and yet that a strong and entire *Dependance* upon God was at the same Time requir'd. Well, if both these Things were requir'd and consistent then, why not now?

Farther :

Farther : That the aforefaid Infination is unjust, appears from the following Paragraph of the Sermon which he opposes, *Page 39* : ‘ But, *Sirs*, allow me to observe, that tho’ outward *Means* are necessary and excellent in their Place, yet they are not like to be crown’d with *Success*, except we look above them to *God* for *Direction* and *Assistance* ; except we *repent* of our *Sins*, and *reform* our *Lives* !’

But if our Author brings the Instance of *Gideon* to prove that the *Mean* of *War* is not at *Times* necessary or requir’d by the *Almighty*, he contradicts what he acknowledges, and opposes the Instance he produces : For tho’ *Gideon*, by *God’s* Command, reduc’d his *Army* to a small Number, yet he didn’t reduce the Number to nothing ; and with that small Number that remain’d, he us’d diverse *Stratagems* to obtain *Victory* ; he divided it into three *Battalions* to make the greater Appearance ; made his Descent in the *Night*, when he was least expected, in order to put the *Enemy* into *Consternation* ! And likewise he labour’d to alarm their *Fear*, by the sounding of *Trumpets*, the Clashing of *Pitchers*, the *Blazing* of *Torches*, and by the *Shouts* of his *Soldiers*, every one crying aloud, *The Sword of the Lord, and of Gideon* †.

Query 8. Why does our Author, in the Instance of *Gideon*, at first speak of *God’s* commanding and directing him, and his obeying ; and yet a Line or two afterwards, when he comes to make mention of the Use of outward Means, Why does he change the Form of Expression into the soft Word *permitted* ? ‘ Tho’ the Use of outward Means was *permitted*.’ Had he no Design in this ?

But I must hasten to the next Paragraph, which speaks of *God’s* prohibiting *David’s* building the *Temple*. For Answer to this Objection I refer the Reader

Reader to two Sermons upon *Exodus* xv. 3. now in Mr. *Bradford's* Press, and shall only add a little by Way of *Reply*, to two Particulars in the latter Part of the aforesaid Paragraph, (V. P. 5;) where our Author,

1st Enquires, in the following Words ; ‘ If a Cessation from War was necessary for the building that outward Temple, How much more so is it, for the Gathering of all Nations to be Members of the Church of Christ ?

Answer. A Freedom from the Disturbances and Injuries consequent upon *offensive War*, is, no doubt, a valuable Priviledge in many Respects ; and what therefore we should not only desire after, but labour for, by opposing with all our Might, under God, the cruel Cause of those *Miseries* (*viz offensive War.*) I therefore commend our Author's *Zeal*, in taking Pains to write against that *great Iniquity* (tho' I cou'd wish he had done it with more Distinctness, and then the Trouble of a *Reply* wou'd have been prevented.) I should be glad to hear of the Increase of his *Zeal* aforesaid, that so, if Necessity requir'd, he might with as great Readiness and Ardor use his *Sword*, as he has his *Quill* against it, in order to its utter Extirpation, and the procuring of that glorious and delightful Blessing of *Peace* !

2. Our *Author* towards the close of the aforesaid Paragraph speaks thus : ‘ Tho' the Almighty is styled by *Moses*, *A Man of War*, he is called by the Apostle *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* xiii. 11. *The God of Love and Peace.* And the Apostle *John* saith, *God is Love, and he that dwelleth in Love, dwelleth in God, and God in him*, 1 *John* iv. 16.’ Here I would beg leave to propote a few *Queries*, *viz.*

Query 1. Was not God represented as full of Mercy under the *Jewish Dispensation* ? See *Exod.* xxxiv. 6, 7. *And the Lord passed by before him, and*
C *proclaim'd,*

proclaim'd, *The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in Goodness and Truth, keeping Mercy for Thousands, forgiving Iniquity, and Transgression, and Sin.* Jer. xxxi. 20. *Is Ephraim my dear Son? Is he a pleasant Child? For since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still; therefore my Bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have Mercy upon him, saith the Lord.* Hof. xi. 8. *How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? Mine Heart is turned within me; my Repentings are kindled together.*

Query 2. Is not JUSTICE the Foundation of DEFENSIVE WAR? And isn't God invariably just, as well as merciful, in his *Nature*? Is not *Justice* one of his essential *Attributes*? And if so, will it not follow, that he is, and always will be inclined to approve of *Defensive War*, when there is a Necessity of it; so long as he retains the same *Nature*?

Query 3. Is there not a perfect and perpetual *Harmony* between the *Mercy* and *Justice* of God? What is his *Mercy* or *Love*, but a *Property* of his *Nature*, inclining him to vouchsafe Kindnesses upon his penitent and believing Creatures? And what is his *Justice*, but a *Property* of his *Nature*, disposing him to render to impenitent and unbelieving Transgressors, the Punishment due for their Offences*?

Now, tho' there be a Difference in the *Objects* upon which those divine *Perfections* terminate in their outward Acts; yet there is none in the *Principle* of them; no! it is the same divine *Nature*, producing wisely and voluntarily various *Effects* upon different *Objects*, suitable to the different *Occasions* that present themselves, and in such a *Way* as serves to answer

* The general Idea of Justice, *Est suum cuique tribuere*, To give every one his Due.

swer the *End* of God's *Government* over the intelligent Beings. Or,

Query 4. Has the great *God*, I would speak it with awful Reverence, lost one of his *Attributes*, viz. his *Justice*, since the *Gospel* Dispensation (strictly so called) commenced? Or have we a *God* different in *Nature* from the *God* of the *Jewish Church*? If not, then one of two Things in my Apprehension will necessarily follow, viz.

1. That what was *moral*, or, in other Words, agreeable in itself to the divine *Nature* then, is so now; and consequently *Defensive War* is lawful. * Or,

2. That we have no *God* at all, seeing he has lost one of his *Attributes*, he is imperfect, and of Consequence no *God*; for the Idea of a *God* necessarily includes absolute Perfection; and therefore upon this *Hypothesis*, there is now no *Religion* at all, no future State of Rewards and Punishments, they are all but a mere *Chimera*, a vain *Phantom*; the former has no *Object*, and the latter no *Foundation* of Certainty; It is, I confess, a shocking, but, in my Opinion, a just and unavoidable Consequence! **

Now, seeing that from *Truth* nothing but *Truth* will flow†, it is therefore evident, that the *Principle* from which those *Absurdities* do naturally and freely proceed, must needs be false, viz. The Denial of the Lawfulness of *Defensive War*.

The next Particular that our Author animadverts upon, is the following Passage of my *Sermon*, Page 8. ' Surely if *Protection* from Injuries, *Peace* among Neighbours, and the Administration of *Justice*, be desirable and valuable Benefits, which all Mankind must with one Voice acknowledge; then of Consequence that which at Times is the only *Mean* left to procure them, must be lawful, necessary and valuable also.'

Our Author observes upon the aforesaid Words as follows, in his V. Page 6. ‘ The only *Mean* here is *War*, and whether the Expression suits with the Belief of an over-ruling, omnipresent *Providence*, without whose Permission no Evil can happen, and who alone hath the Controul of every Thing, I would have a little to be thought upon.’---

To which I answer, that the Sense our Author puts upon my Words (The only Mean) is forced, as may appear from the very Paragraph of the Sermon that immediately precedes what he has cited, (except one) in which I speak thus: ‘ *War* is no doubt lawful, and consequently approved by God, when undertaken by the *Magistrate* for the Punishment of some great *Injury* or Wrong, which much affects the *Credit* and *Interest* of a Nation or People, after all softer Means fail of Success;’ *i. e.* All human *outward Means*; this Sense the Series of the Sermon naturally leads to. Now, there being a Connection between this and the other Paragraph, the Sense of the Words (Only Mean) must be the same, *viz.* The only *human* or outward *Mean*; it was about such, and such only, that I was reasoning, and therefore it was a Force upon the Words to put that Sense upon them, which our Author has done. This will appear more plainly from what I have said in the Improvement on the Subject (S. p. 39) where it was proper that I should speak of *spiritual Means*; the Words are these;

‘ But Sirs allow me to observe, that tho’ *outward Means* are necessary and excellent in their Place, yet they are not like to be crowned with *Success*, except we look above them to God for Direction and Assistance; except we repent of our Sins, and reform our Lives.’ Here I plainly distinguish between outward and spiritual Means, assert a Necessity of, and yet an Insufficiency in both,
without

without the Concurrence of Providence, to answer the End design'd.

Yet our Author is pleas'd to put a hard Sense upon the Words aforesaid, and thence takes Occasion to question my Belief of an overruling, omnipresent Providence, and so gravely sets about the Proof of it for my Conviction †. O unaccountable! This is the first time in my *Life* that I have been charged with *Atheism*; for he that denies a Providence, of Consequence denies a *God*! He leaves out one Half of the Paragraph, and casts Dust upon me, in the Room of an Answer to the other. Now, whether such a Method of managing Controversy be a Sign of a good *Cause*, or of candid *Conduct*, I leave to the *Reader* to determine, and proceed to consider,

The next Objection, which is *Vind. p. 8*. Here our Author cites Mr. *Poole's* Annotations on *Sam. xxx. 7*. and labours to make that learned and consistent Man's Writings serve a Purpose contrary to his professed Sentiments, but in vain: All that can be reasonably inferred from Mr. *Poole's* Gloss is this, That it was their Duty under that Dispensation to consult the *Urim* and *Thummim* upon the High-priest's *Breastplate*, for immediate Information and Direction in some difficult Cases.

Upon the aforesaid Instance our Author speaks thus, *p. 8*. ' If then it had been an Error, not to have enquired of God, in so pinching a Case as this, the Consequence fairly deducible is, That should we be in the like Circumstances, we must make the like Enquiry, and receive the divine Permission and Command, otherwise *David's* Example will not be wholly followed.'

I answer, That if we were under the same *Dispensation* with *David*, the Consequence would be just

† *Calumniare fortiter, & aliquid adhibebit.*

just and fair, that in the same Circumstances we should make the like Enquiry; but otherwise the Consequence is not fair; from different Premises the same Conclusion cannot flow, and so the Case is here.

In this *Dispensation* we have no temporal *High-priest*, with the *Urim* and *Thummim* upon his *Breast-plate*, from whom we may expect immediate and oracular Answers about Things to come; and therefore it is not possible for us, in this State of Things, *wholly to follow David's Example*.

Nor have we any Necessity for, or Promise of immediate objective *Revelation*, in place of the *Jewish Urim*, in the ordinary Times of the Gospel, from Christ our *High-priest*, in any Matters whatsoever, whether temporal or spiritual, by *Visions*, *Voices*, &c. seeing *the Prophecy is sealed*, the *Canon of Scriptures* is completed, and *able to make the Man of God perfect, and thoroughly furnished to every good Work*.

It is enough, that we have in place of the *Urim* a greater Measure of the Influences of the holy Spirit than the pious *Jews* ordinarily enjoyed, enlightening our Minds in the Use of appointed Means, to the right understanding of the Meaning of the holy Scriptures, and enabling us to believe their divine Authority; and so impressing the Truths contained in them upon our *Hearts*, as to transform them into the divine *Image*, and reform our Practice, agreeable to the divine *Law*: This I call *subjective Revelation*, which is necessary to Salvation.

It is true, the Apostles were immediately inspired, or had an *objective*, infallible *Revelation* of new *Truths*, in the same extraordinary Manner which the Prophets of old had; and it was necessary it should be so in the Beginning of the Christian *Institution*, seeing they were to commit to Writing a *Rule* to direct

rest the *Faith* and *Practice* of the *Church* in all succeeding Ages, which they could not do infallibly without immediate *Revelation*; and of this extraordinary *Endowment* they could give certain rational Evidences, by working real *Miracles*; without which, we have no Reason to believe the Claims of any thereto.

But in the ordinary Times of the Gospel, after the *Doctrines* of Religion were sufficiently confirmed by miraculous Works, and the *Rule* of *Faith* and *Practice* fully committed to Writing, there is no Need of extraordinary *Inspiration*, or miraculous Works; the holy *Scriptures*, the sanctifying Influences of the blessed *Spirit*, the Dispensations of divine *Providence*, together with the sober Use of our own *Reason*, are sufficient to direct us in every Duty we owe to *God* and *Man*.

Moreover it may be observed, that *David* did not in the aforesaid Instance, consult the *Ephod*; whether it was lawful to go to War in general, but whether it was expedient for him to pursue the *Amalekites* at that Time in particular, and what would be the *Issue* of it, 1 *Sam.* xxx. 8. And *David* enquired at the Lord, *Shall I pursue after this Troop, shall I overtake them? and he answered him, pursue, for thou shalt overtake them, and without fail recover all*; agreeable hereto is the Instance of *Keilah*, 1 *Sam.* xxiii. 9.---13. where *David* only consults the *Ephod* concerning *Events*, and receives Answers accordingly.

Now seeing the *Government* of our *Nation* is no *Theocracy* (nor the *Government* of any other) as the *Jewish* certainly was; if the *Conductors* of the *State*, must enter upon no *Business* of great *Difficulty* and *Moment*, till they get an immediate Answer concerning the *Event*, as the *Jews* did from the *Urim*, our national Affairs wou'd soon be embarrassed

fed in a Maze of inextricable Difficulty, and brought to Desolation and *Ruin* !

Upon the Supposition that some did by immediate *Inspiration*, really obtain a certain Knowledge of some future *Events*, and of the Expediency of Performing this or that *Duty* at such a Time ; yet if they cou'dn't prove the Reality of it to others, by miraculous Works, their bare Declaration cou'd give no reasonable Satisfaction to others that wanted such a Revelation, and so must needs fail of answering the *Necessities* of the Publick.

Nor do we find that the *Jews* always consulted the *Urim*, respecting every of their Battles ; and we know not that *Abraham* had any to consult about his famous Fight with *Chederlasmer*---Yet he was at no Loss about his Duty, in that Affair, but directly obey'd the Call of Providence.

Our Author silently passies over what I have said in the 9 *p.* of the *Ser.* respecting the prudential Care that People take, in securing of their temporal Goods ; and the Advice of King *Asa* to fortify their Cities, &c. as well as the Inference drawn from it, of preserving our Lives, which are a more valuable Depositum (*S. p. 10*) and proceeds to confute my Argument from the *Light* of *Nature*, which he has tho't proper not to mention, and only finds Fault with my saying, that it was from God ; and then labours to remove the Force of the Argument, by a Distinction.

Now in order to have a just View of this Matter, it will be necessary to cite my Argument and his Answer, and then propose a few Queries.

The Argument in the Sermon, is as follows (*p. 10*) ' It is true, Man was originally created for the
' maintaining of Peace with his Fellows, and to this
' all the Laws of Nature, respecting others, have a
' primary Regard ; yet when milder Measures cannot

not

‘ not screen us from intollerable Injuries, the *Light*
 ‘ of *Nature* directs to fly to Force as the last Remedy,
 ‘ the last Resource ; for the *Obligation* to the
 ‘ Offices of *Peace* is mutual, and binds all alike.
 ‘ Nature hath given no Man a Priviledge of break-
 ‘ ing her Laws at Pleasure towards others, and yet
 ‘ obliged them to maintain the *Peace* towards him :
 ‘ No ; the Duty being mutual, should be mutual-
 ‘ ly performed ; and he that violates the Laws of
 ‘ Peace, and seeks another’s Destruction, may im-
 ‘ pute to his own Wickedness, all the Misery which
 ‘ another is necessitated in his own Defence, and in
 ‘ Pursuit of the Principle of it, to inflict upon him.’

Our Author’s Answer is expressed thus, ‘ The
 ‘ first Proof proposed in the Sermon, that War in
 ‘ the foregoing Instances is lawful, is from the Light
 ‘ of Nature ; and I should not have attack’d the
 ‘ Arguments drawn from thence, had not the Wri-
 ‘ ter thereof asked, “ *Who is the Author thereof*
 ‘ *but God himself ?*” The following Distinction
 ‘ seems therefore necessary to be made : God crea-
 ‘ ted Man good, upright and holy, and had he con-
 ‘ tinued in this State, there never would have been
 ‘ *any War, and consequently no Need of Self-de-*
 ‘ *fence* : But Man falling, thro’ Disobedience, his
 ‘ Nature became corrupted, his Faculties depraved,
 ‘ and the whole intellectual System disordered ;
 ‘ thus began shedding of Blood, and the Earth was
 ‘ early filled with Violence. This was the unhap-
 ‘ py Consequence of Sin. I hope this Writer will
 ‘ not venture to say, that God was the Author of
 ‘ Nature thus corrupted ; the Nature, and the
 ‘ Light of Nature, that he was Author of, was ho-
 ‘ ly, *innocent* and *perfect* ; but the Corruption in
 ‘ Nature, from whence proceeded Violence and
 ‘ Bloodshed, was occasioned by adhering to the
 ‘ Voice of *Satan*.’

To which I reply, as follows ; Is it so, according to our Author's Acknowledgment, that had Man continued in his primitive, good, upright and holy State, there never would have been any *War*, and consequently NO NEED OF SELF-DEFENCE ; then it naturally follows, from his own Method of Reasoning, that there is now Need of SELF-DEFENCE : Seeing, as he justly observes, Man is fallen and corrupted. By *War*, our Author seems here plainly to mean *Offensive War*, and gives a brief, but substantial Hint of the Necessity of *Self-defence* (and consequently of *Defensive War*, which is the same) against it. This is wholesome Doctrine indeed, and the very Sum of all that I have been contending for in the Sermon ; the natural and easy Sense of the Words aforesaid, is this ; if innocent Man had continued in his original Integrity, there would have been no Violence committed, and consequently no Need of Defence against it ; but now Man is fallen, degenerate and corrupted, inclin'd to commit Acts of Violence, and to shed Blood, and therefore there is a Necessity of *Self-defence*, to screen us from that Violence ; and thus our Author indeed reasons well in that Particular, but in the mean time gives up his Cause.

But this Consequence he seems to oppose, by observing what confirms it, namely, That Violence proceeded from the Corruption of Nature, and was occasioned by adhering to the Voice of Satan ; very true, all unjust Violence, or *Offensive War* (which is the same Thing in other Words) proceeds from those criminal Causes, and therefore there is a Necessity of *Self-defence*, or of *Defensive War*, to oppose and suppress that *Violence*, that Iniquity : Now inasmuch as *Self-defence* does oppose and tends to subdue it, it must needs proceed from a contrary, and therefore a good Cause ; unless our Author sup-

poses

poses that the same Cause will produce contrary Effects, which is absurd and impossible.

Our Author is pleas'd to express some Charity towards me, in the aforesaid Paragraph, by saying that he hopes I will not venture to say, that God was the Author of Nature thus corrupted; after acknowledging my Obligations to the Gentleman, for his charitable Sentiments,

I Answer, That Nature, and the Corruption of Nature, are two distinct and different Things; God is the Author of the former, but by no Means of the latter: By *Nature* I understand our very BEINGS; and by the Corruption of Nature, any Disconformity to the moral Law of *God*, that cleaves to them in Man's fallen *State*.

There is likewise a great Difference between the Light of Nature, even in Man's fallen State, and the corrupt Inclinations of Nature; these often oppose each other in Things moral, and therefore cannot be the same; this inward *Conflict* between *Light* and *Lust*, divers *Pagans* perceived and lamented! Hence I may say justly, that our Author didn't do well in blending these Things together, in the aforesaid Paragraph, by which his unwary Reader is apt to be impos'd upon.

But to make this Matter still more plain, and easy to be understood, let it be observed, that I shew'd in the Sermon what I meant by the Law of Nature (which this Gentleman has taken no Notice of) namely, something that was substantially the same with the Moral Law, *p.* 14.

It pleas'd God when he made Man, to impress upon his Mind, a Knowledge of the *Offices* which it was proper for him to perform towards God, his *Neighbour* and *himself*; this Knowledge was doubt-

D 2

less

§ *Video meliora proboque, deteriora Sequor. Nitimur in vetitum, semper cupimusque negatum.*

less impair'd by Man's Apostacy, yet there are still such Remains of it in the human Mind, as shew (if suitably attended to and improved) the principal moral Duties required of us ; this I conceive the Apostle Paul confirms, *Rom. ii. 14, 15. For when the Gentiles which have not the Law, do by Nature the Things contained in the Law (i. e. the moral Law revealed in the Scriptures) were a Law unto themselves, which shew the Work of the Law written in their Hearts, or some remaining Notices of it engraven upon their rational Nature ; Their Consciences bearing Witness, and their Thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another.*

Now tho' this Light of Nature be in a fallen corrupted Creature, yet it came originally from God, who is *the Author of every good Gift* ; and hence Solomon calls the *Spirit of Man the Candle of the Lord* : It is true it is less in Degree and Influence than that which Adam enjoyed, yet it is and must be of the same Kind, inasmuch as it opposes the same moral Evils, and directs to the same moral Good, as far as it reaches.

It is called the Light and Law of Nature in a good Sense (which the Word Nature is capable of, as well as a bad) because the first Man received it together with his Nature or Being in Perfection, and we the *Remains* of it with ours. This Representation the Scripture before mentioned confirms ; *The Gentiles did by Nature (i. e. not by the Inclinations of Nature, which, at least, generally tend to Evil, but by the Light of Nature which directs to and approves of moral Good§. But what did those Gentiles do thro' the Instigation and Conduct of the aforesaid Monitor ? Why, The Things contained in the Law. What Law ? Not the Ceremonial, for that*

§ *Nil conscire sibi nullave pallefcere culpa, murus abeneus esto;*
He that is conscious of no Crime, may be bold and intrepid.

that the *Gentiles* had no Notions of, and therefore it must be the Moral, which is for Substance the same with the Law of Nature||.

What tho' shedding of Blood and Violence in *Defensive War*, be the unhappy Consequence of Sin, *i. e.* There would have been no need thereof if Man had not sinned, yet it will not follow, as our Author imagines, that it is therefore sinful; then by the same Way of Reasoning, human Laws, and Physick, and shedding the Blood of Criminals by the Magistrate are *sinful*, and should be carefully avoided; which is false and absurd! Our Author's Argument concludes too much, and therefore nothing at all to his Purpose: All those Particulars but now mentioned, tho' they be the Consequences of the *Sin* of Man, *i. e.* they wou'dn't have been necessary, if Man had not *sinned*; yet they are not the
proper

|| *Socrates* expresses his Sentiments about the Law of Nature in the following Manner: 'There are (saith he) certain Laws which are not written; these are the Laws which are universally received throughout the World: But nevertheless Men did not make them; for all Men could not assemble themselves together in any one Place; neither could they all speak the same Language. They were therefore made by the Gods. It is also commanded every where, and to every Man, to honour his Father and Mother: And that Fathers and Mothers should not marry with their Children. No One ever violates with Impunity, any one Law established by the Gods. There are Punishments which inseparably adhere to the Crimes committed against those Laws, which Punishments it is impossible to escape; whereas a Man may easily ward against the Severity of human Laws, after he has transgressed them, either by concealing, or defending himself by open Force.---To do Good to them that do Good to us, is also a universal Law.---When I consider that each Law carries with it the Punishment of him who transgresses it, I easily perceive it to be the Work of a *Legislator* more excellent than Man. The Gods never make any Laws that are unjust; on the contrary, other Legislators can scarce make any that are just.' *Xenoph.* Ed: *Paris*, p. 807. B. and p. 470, Ed. *Oxon.*

proper Effects of Sin ; it is not *Sin* and *Satan*, but *God* and right *Reason* that direct to the regular Use of them ; and therefore inasmuch as the Fall of Man renders them necessary, it is an Argument for, and not against them.

The Light of Nature directs to *Health* in the first Place, by the Use of all proper Means, and chuses it as the most agreeable State ; but in Case of Sickness, prescribes the Use of Physick, tho' disagreeable to our Inclinations, because medicinal and necessary for the Recovery of our *Health*.

And thus, undoubtedly, the same Light and Law of Nature directs to pursue Peace with our *Neighbours* in the first Place, and chuses it as the most desirable Condition ; but when this is lost, thro' the *Injustice* of others, in important *Instances*, and cannot be recovered by gentle *Methods*, the Light of Nature directs to the Use of Force to obtain it, either by the Civil Law, or by *Self-defence*, and *War* as the last *Remedy*, which we are drove to with *Reluctance*, and by extream *Necessity*.

But to proceed, our *Author* observes in the afore-said Paragraph, ' That the Light of Nature which God was the Author of, was *holy* and *innocent* : ' Which implies, that the *Light* of Nature in Man's fallen State, is sinful and guilty ; and this he confirms in the following Words ; ' For it is not from the *degenerate fallen Light* of Nature, that Arguments are to be drawn, for the Formation of Christian Principles, neither are any from it of any Weight in Opposition thereto.'

Now considering that the *Light* or *Law* of Nature I reasoned from, is substantially the same with the *Moral Law* ;

- Was instituted for Man's Security, *S. p. 12* ;
 - Has a primary Regard to *Peace* ;
 - Lays a mutual *Obligation* upon *Mankind* to it,
- And

‘ And threatens those that violate that *Obligation*
 ‘ with *Punishment* ; thence I query,

1. Doesn't our *Author's* charging the *Light* of *Nature*, in Man's fallen State, as being *sinful*, necessarily imply one of two Things, either an unfair speaking beside the Point, as I stated it, or something worse ; namely a calling in Effect the *Promotion* of *Man's Security*, a *primary Regard* and *Obligation* to *Peace*, together with the whole *moral Law* of *God*, *sinful*. This is a *Blow* at the *Root* of all *Virtue* and *Religion* ; for if the *moral Law* be *sinful*, and it can't be otherwise, if the *Light* or *Law* of *Nature* (which is the same in Substance with it) be so ; then of Consequence it must be a *Duty* to break the *Moral Law*.

Query 2. Can that be *sinful* which opposed *Sin* in the *Pagans*, and directed them to keep the *moral Law* ? Then two *Contraries* are one and the same !

Query 3. If the *Light* or *Law* of *Nature* is not from *God*, then pray who is it from ? Has *Sin* or *Satan* formed such a beautiful and consistent *Scheme* of *Offices*, that does so much *Honour* to human *Nature*, and so much promotes the *Weal* of *Society* ? Then certainly they have very much forgot their own *Interest*, and regarded ours, for which we are laid under very great *Obligations* of *Gratitude* to them.

In the mean Time, I don't doubt but *Mr. S.* meant well, but he has sometimes an unhappy Way of expressing his good *Intention*.

But our *Author* proceeds to another Paragraph of my *Sermon*, *Page 11.* where I thus represent the sad Consequences of neglecting *Self-defence* ;
 ‘ If it be not lawful to oppose by Force unjust Inva-
 ‘ ders, then the *Goods* of *Providence* are vouch-
 ‘ safed to us in vain, and Men of the strictest *Inte-*
 ‘ *grity*, and Females of the most unblemish'd *Vir-*
 ‘ *tue*,

‘ tue, will ever be expos’d as an easy *Prey*, to the
 ‘ vilest Insults of the most scandalous *Scoundrels* !’

Upon which our *Author* observes as follows ; p.
 10, ‘ If these extraordinary Consequences are *true*,
 ‘ what a strong *Faith* in, and Dependance upon
 ‘ God do those manifest, who have embraced, and
 ‘ do religiously maintain the peaceable *Doctrin*e ?’

To which I reply, That his saying the Consequences I drew are *extraordinary*, without offering any other Reason, does not prove the Point ; and the very contrary follows, from these Consequences, to what our *Author* imagines ; for this Reason, If the exposing of our *Goods* and *Honour*, continually without *Necessity*, to the *Insults* of *Scoundrels*, be *true Consequences* of the *Neglect* of *Self-defence* ; then it cannot be that the Premises from which such absurd Consequences flow, should be Good, or from *God* ; and consequently has no Promise of *Protection* annexed to it, without which it is *Presumption* to depend on *God* in any Case.

It is true the *Power* of *God* is such, that he can if he pleases make Millions of *Worlds* more than there be, may we therefore expect that he will ? No ; it is a vain Confidence to expect *Protection*, out of the Way of proper Means. When *Satan* tempted our *Saviour* to cast himself down from the *Pinacle*, and yet expect *Protection*, he rejected the Motion.

There is no Instance in the Sacred *Volume*, of the Preservation of any in a Time of Danger and *Calamity*, but of such who had been, or were using proper *Means* for *Defence*.

In the mean Time I trust, that a Number of the *Quakers* and *others*, who from a Conscience misinformed do oppose War, have true and saving *Faith* in *Christ*, and are upright before *God* in the general
 Course

Course of their *Conduēt* ; notwithstanding of their *Mistake* in the aforesaid Particular.

As to the marvellous *Interposure* of Divine Providence, in respect of the *Jebuētā* Fleet, which not long since struck such a Terror into this BRITISH-MAIN ! of which our Author speaks, *Vin. p. 10, 11.* I wou'd only observe, That seeing the Dispersion of that *Naval Armament*, happened on the very Evening of that *Day* which was appointed by the Government for *Publick Prayer* and *Humiliation* in NEW-ENGLAND, for Defence against that formidable Squadron ; it may commend to our Esteem and Observance, such publick Solemnities upon proper Occasions : But if there had been no *Preparation* made for *Defence*, by the Inhabitants of the *Massachusetts* Colony, in providing the proper Instruments of War, is it not highly probable, that the aforesaid *Fleet*, would have rather entered the *Bay* of BOSTON, than the *Haven* of *Jebuētā* ?

Give me Leave likewise to observe here, *en passant*, that Almighty God has put such singular Honour, especially of late, upon that *pious, generous, praying, and warlike People*, above the other *Provinces* on this *Continent*, not only in the Instance before mentioned, but also in taking the important Fortrefs of CAPE-BRETON, that Time itself will not be able soon to efface the Memory of those great *Events* : What ardent *Piety*, in amiable Union with the most heroick *Bravery*, opened all their Charms, in the *High-places of the Field* ! when the intrepid Sons of *New-England*, nobly attack'd the aforesaid almost impregnable Fortrefs ! But no Danger, no Difficulty is too great for a *brave Mind*, Heaven smiling, to encounter and surmount.

E

Our

¶ *What Queen Elizabeth said of the Spanish Armada, may be apply'd to the Fleet of Jebuētā ; Afflawit Deus, et dissipantur ; God blew with his Wind, and they were scattered.*

Our Author proceeds next to remark upon a Paragraph of the Sermon about *Self-murder*, Ser. p. 12, 13. which runs thus ;

‘ He that suffers his Life to be taken from him, by
 ‘ One that hath no Authority for that Purpose,
 ‘ when he might preserve it by Defence, incurs the
 ‘ Guilt of *Self-murder* : Since God hath enjoined
 ‘ him to seek the Continuance of his *Life*, and *Nature*
 ‘ itself teaches every Creature to defend itself
 ‘ when assaulted : In Particular, Nature hath not
 ‘ only given to Man a quick Sense of *Injuries*, that
 ‘ he might not suffer himself to be oppressed and in-
 ‘ sulted, but she hath also *armed* him with *Strength*
 ‘ and Ability of *Body*, that he should not be
 ‘ forced tamely and sordidly to submit ! Tho’ there
 ‘ is a Self-love that is criminal and vicious, *viz.*
 ‘ That which hath no Regard to the *Honour*,
 ‘ *Safety* and *Interest* of our Neighbour ; yet there
 ‘ is a *Self-love* that is rational and excellent, which
 ‘ inclines us primarily to regard our own : And
 ‘ hence is that of the Apostle, *That no Man ever*
 ‘ *yet hated his own Flesh, but nourisheth and cherish-*
 ‘ *eth it* ; if so, then it is every Man’s Duty to *love*
 ‘ his own *Life*, to desire its Continuance, and use
 ‘ proper *Means* for its Preservation ; for this Pur-
 ‘ pose the Almighty hath put into our *Nature*, a
 ‘ Principle that desires *Life*, avoids *Death*, and is
 ‘ afraid of its Approaches ; for which Reason, it
 ‘ is call’d the *King of Terrors*.’

My Opponent is pleas’d to remark, upon the a-fore-said Paragraph, in the following Words, *viz.*

‘ This Author should have consulted the Mean-
 ‘ ing of *Self-murder*, before he used the Term so
 ‘ freely in several Parts of this Sermon---Murder is
 ‘ defin’d to be a wilful and felonious killing another,
 ‘ upon premeditated Malice, &c. *Felo de se*, or a
 ‘ *Self-murderer*, is he that commits Felony, by wil-
 ‘ lingly

‘lingly and deliberately killing himself : So that the
 ‘Case in the Sermon does not reach this Descripti-
 ‘on, unless we can suppose, he who does not en-
 ‘deavour to defend himself, is unactive from a wil-
 ‘ful deliberate Desire of being killed. It is with-
 ‘out Doubt every Man’s Duty to use proper
 ‘Means for the Preservation of Life ; but if any
 ‘Man is convinced that Christ hath forbidden him
 ‘the Use of military Preparations, and yet will use
 ‘them, they are to him very improper Means,
 ‘*Mat. xvi. 25. 26.*

To which I reply, as follows, namely, That
 these *Arguments*, in my Opinion, support the
 Charge in the preceding Paragraph :

1. The *Command* of God to seek the Continu-
 ance of *Life*.

2. The *Light* of Nature’s teaching the Reasona-
 bleness of *Self-defence*, from the *Example* of the
Brute-creation, as well as from the *Sense* of *Injuries*,
 which is natural to Men, and the *Ability* given by
 the *Almighty* whereby they might resist them.

3. The reasonable *Self-love* that is recommended
 in the divine Oracles.

4. The natural *Desire* of *Life*, and *Fear* of
Death, implanted in the *human Nature*.

All these our Author acknowledges by his Si-
 lence ; and only offers three Exceptions against the
 Consequence I draw from them. The

1. Of which is a *Definition* of *Self-Murder*, ex-
 tracted, I suppose, from some *Law Book* ; which
 is this, ‘ A Self-murderer, is he that commits Fe-
 ‘lony, by willingly and deliberately killing him-
 ‘self.’

To which I answer, That our Author by his own
Pen proves the *Charge* ; because the *Definition* he
 offers of *Self-murder*, is applicable in some Degree
 to the *Neglecters* of *Self-Defence* : For,

1. They willingly and deliberately hold a *Principle*, contrary to the Use of an apt *Mean* to preserve *Life in Danger*.

2. In Pursuance of this *Principle*, they are here supposed to neglect that *Mean* willingly, when the Use of it is necessary and seasonable.

3. The necessary *Consequence* of which is their *Death*; which must therefore be charged upon them, at least in some *Measure*, so long as it is just and reasonable to believe, that a *Premises* contains in it its just and natural *Consequences*; or a *Cause* its natural *Effects*; that is, so long as Men are rational, and intelligent Beings. *

4. It ought also to be considered, that he who doesn't endeavour to *prevent* an *Evil*, which it is, under God, in his Power probably to prevent, by the Use of an apt *Mean*, not forbidden, is Partaker of that *Evil*, *Eph. v. 11. Have no Fellowship with the unfruitful Works of Darkness, but rather reprove them*; that is, says Mr. Poole, 'Not only do not
' practise them yourselves, but do not join with o-
' thers in them, by Consent, Advice, Assistance, or
' any other Way, whereby ye may be defiled by
' them;---but convince them, not only by your
' Words, but especially by your Actions, which be-
' ing contrary to them, will both evidence them to
' be, and reprove them, as being Works of Dark-
' nefs.'

Supposing a *Magistrate* should suffer gross Wick- edness complained of and proved, to pass trium- phant, without opposing it, without inflicting the *Penalty* prescribed by the *Law*, woudn't he be a Partaker thereof, *and bear the Sword in vain*? And isn't the Case the same as to *Heads of Families*, when they don't labour to check with Force and Se- verity growing *Evils* in their *Houses*, when other *Means* fail of Success?

Wasn't

Wasn't *Eli's* excessive *Mildness* and *passive Behaviour* towards his *Sons*, the Cause of his *Grief* and their *Ruin*? See 1 *Sam.* ii. 22---24. *Nay, my Sons, said he, it is no good Report that I hear; ye make the Lords People to transgress. Eli's Sin, says Mr. Poole, in this Matter, was not only that he 'Reproved them too gently, but especially, that he 'contented himself with a verbal Rebuke, and did 'not restrain them, as is said, Chap. iii. 13. For 'this the Almighty told him, that he would judge his 'House for ever.'*

Surely, as *Solomon* observes, *He that spareth his Rod, hateth his Son, but he that loveth him, chasteneth him betimes, Prov. xiii. 24.* Hence we may see how hateful to *God*, and pernicious to *Men*, the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of absolute *Non-Resistance* are. If *Resistance*, and all *Use of Force*, be a *Sin*, it must be of *Consequence* sinful for *Parents* to correct their *Children*, and *Masters* their *Servants*; yet these Things are commanded; it must therefore be a *Sin* to obey the positive *Commands of God*, upon the aforesaid *Hypothesis*. Can we think that such an unaccountable *Doctrine* can come from *Heaven*, as makes the *Almighty* contradict himself, who is all *Wisdom* and *Harmony* in his *Perfections*, his *Precepts*, and all his *Government*! A *Doctrine* that not only tends to overthrow all *Rule* and *Authority* in the *State*, but to destroy at a *Stroke* all *Family Government* and *Order*!

Whatever *Influence Instruction* and *Example* may have upon some *ingenuous Minds*, to form them to *Virtue* and *Piety*, yet others, of a more obstinate *Turn*, are like to be ruined, unless they be learned *Wisdom* by *Stripes*.

Unless *Correction* had been necessary, an *All-wise God* would have never commanded it.

Surely

Surely the Passion of *Fear* was not put into the human *Soul* by the *Author* of Nature in vain ; no, but for valuable Purposes, both in respect of *Society* and *Religion*. As a Consequence of this I may say,

5. That he who suffers such, whom he has Reason to conclude have a murderous Intention to assassinate him, and consequently without *Resistance* to kill him, may be said *interpretatively* to consent to their murderous *Design* ; because he opposes not, by all proper *Means* in his *Power*, the Execution of it. But to proceed :

The second Exception of our *Author* against the Charge aforesaid, is his Reasoning from the Description of Murder already mentioned, in the following Manner, *namely*, ‘ That the Case in the Sermon ‘ does not reach the aforesaid Description, unless we ‘ can suppose, he who does not endeavour to defend himself, is unactive, from a wilful and deliberate Desire of being killed.’

To which I answer, That he who willingly and deliberately uses a *Mean*, and that from a fixed *Principle*, that has a natural Aptness to answer a certain *End*, does at least *virtually* aim at the *End* to which the *Mean* tends, and so is chargeable with the Consequence, whether he actually aims at the *End* or not ; because he is a *rational Creature*, who ought to act with *Discretion* and *Design*. If he doesn’t actually aim at the *End*, to which the *Mean* he uses has a natural Fitness, it argues Weakness of *Mind*, to choose *Means* that verge to an *End* he dislikes : However, if the aforesaid Person doesn’t aim at his own *Death* actually, notwithstanding of the Weakness and Inconsistency that attend his *Conduct*, yet the *Malignity* of the *Crime* is no doubt lessened in *Degree*, because that lies much in Intention. In the mean time, as the Prophet *Ezekiel* informs us, *Who-*
soever

soever beareth the Sound of the Trumpet, and taketh not Warning, if the Sword come and take him away, his Blood shall be upon his own Head.

Supposing a pious Person abstains totally from Food, with a religious Design, to be conformed to the Example of Christ's Fasting, and presumptuously expecting to be miraculously supported without Food for Forty Days, dies in that Space, woudn't he be guilty of *Self-murder* in some Degree, tho' his Crime is not so heinous and aggravated, as if he designed his own *Death*? But I proceed to the third Exception, which is this: 'It is without doubt, says our *Author*, every Man's *Duty* to use proper *Means* for the Preservation of *Life*; but if any Man thinks that *Christ* hath forbidden him the Use of *military Preparations*, and yet will use them, they are to him very improper *Means*.'

Here observe, that in the aforesaid Paragraph our *Author* tacitly acknowledges the Lawfulness of *military Preparations* in themselves, as *Means* to preserve *Life*; and that it is every Man's *Duty* to use them, who reckons them lawful; which is indeed a giving up of his whole *Cause*. Great is the Power of *Truth**. But,

2. He concludes, 'That any One who is convinced that *Christ* hath forbidden him the Use of *military Preparations*, they are to him improper *Means*.' It is very true, they are so, at that Time, till he is better instructed; for doubtless it is a Sin to act contrary to *Conscience*, and therefore it is a necessary *Duty*, in such a Case, to use with Speed and Impartiality, all proper *Means* to obtain *Light* from *God*!

Our *Author*'s citing *Mat. xxv. 26.* and *Poole's* Annotations upon the Place, to prove that we shou'dn't act contrary to *Conscience*, in order to escape

* *Magna est veritas, & prevalebit.*

‘escape *Sufferings* upon a *religious Account*,’ is quite foreign to the *Point* in *Question*, which is strictly and properly a *civil* and not a *religious Matter*: Who denies that we shou’dn’t suffer patiently upon the *Score* of *Religion*, when called thereto by divine *Providence*? If the *Magistrate* under which we live, shou’d *persecute* us, because of our religious *Principles* or *Practise*, no doubt we should endure it with *Calmness* and *Meekness*; but this is very different from our being *passive* under the *Violence* of a foreign *Fee*, who comes to *rob* us of our *Goods*, and therefore jumbling those Things together, that are so very different, serves only to deceive the unwary *Reader*!

But our *Author*’s following Paragraph, is very unjustifiable, namely this, ‘That if any sincere Christian understands it to be his *Duty*, not to make any *Defence* at all, his forbearing to use any, will never incur *Guilt*.

Ans. Tho’ *Ignorance* of the *Evil* of any *Crime*, and a false *Perswasion* consequent upon it, do, if the *Ignorance* is not *affected* and wilful, lessen its *Malignity*, yet they cannot totally remove it.

1. Because that *Ignorance* and *Error* are Sins themselves, *Isa.* xxvii. 11. 2 *Pet.* ii. 1. and therefore can’t take away the *Guilt* of other Sins, or justify our *Conduct* in following the aforefaid *blind Guides*.

2. Because the *holy Scriptures* are the *supream Rule*, which we are bound to search and understand, especially in Things of great *Moment*, and to which we ought to be conformed, both in *Sentiment* and *Practise*, *Isa.* viii. 20. 2 *Tim.* iii. 16, 17. and *Conscience* is but a subordinate or *ruled Rule*; For *God* is greater than our *Conscience*, and knoweth all Things, 1 *John* iii. 20.

3. Things of a *moral Nature*, are either good or bad

bad in themselves, antecedent to, or before our Tho'ts about them; nor can our Opinion alter their *Nature*. If our *Ignorance* or wrong *Perswasion* do justify wholly a continued *Neglect* of *Duty*, or *Sin of Omission*; by a Parity of Reason, they may justify a *Sin of Commission*; and if one, why not another? And consequently the Guilt of all Crimes, yea the greatest, will be removed by what is criminal, which is very absurd!

This Notion will justify *Saul's* persecuting the primitive *Christians* from *City* to *City*, even unto *Death*! For he verily tho't with himself, that he ought to do many Things contrary to the Name of *Jesus of Nazareth*, *Acts* xxvi. 9. which is very shocking!

This Notion likewise justifies all the *Persecutions*, or *Sufferings* upon a *religious Account*, which the *Quakers* have endured; at any Time or Place, since they have appeared in the World; in case that those who oppressed them, tho't it their *Duty* so to do, which *Charity* obliges us to hope they did, at least some of them.

Now why does our Author appear as an *Advocate* for the *Quakers* unattack'd, and yet in the mean Time, hold a *Principle*, that in its natural Consequences, justifies all their unreasonable Sufferings? Is this rational? Is this consistent?

Our Author takes Notice of another Passage in the Sermon, p. 13. viz. this, ' Well, if *Self-murder* be a heinous Sin, it will follow by the Law of Contraries, that *Self-defence* is an important Duty: Surely he who is unjustly attacked, and does not endeavour by suitable Means to preserve his Life, especially if there be any probability of Success, in so doing betrays it, and so is guilty of *Suicide*; a Crime of the first Magnitude and deepest Dye!'

Upon this Passage (saith our Author) I would

F

' remark

‘ remark, that frequently the most suitable Means
 ‘ to preserve Life, when attacked, is to deliver up
 ‘ that for which the Attack is made.’

I answer, 1. Sometimes the *Attack* is with a malicious Design to *murder* ; and then if that be delivered up, for which the Attack is made, the *Life* itself must be given up.

2. If the *Attack* be for *Goods*, and we tamely deliver them up, without *Resistance*, do we not hereby encourage the Wickedness of the Wicked, and wrong ourselves and Families (and that perhaps in Matters of such great Importance as ruin both) and are these Things just and good ?

But our Author proceeds to say, ‘ If however I
 ‘ were thus attacked by *Villains*, who were so wicked as to determine to take away my *Life*, were I
 ‘ in the meek and peaceable Disposition, which the
 ‘ Gospel inculcates, I believe that would have such
 ‘ an Effect upon the worst of Men, that it would
 ‘ disarm their Malice ; but if it did not, my submitting calmly, and resigning my *Life*, rather
 ‘ than running the Risk of taking away another’s,
 ‘ would be so far from *Suicide*, that it would be
 ‘ acting agreeable to the Nature and Temper of the
 ‘ *Gospel*, and consequently *highly rewardable*||.

To which I reply, that there are these *Defects* in the aforesaid Paragraph, which render it inconclusive, *viz.*

1. A *Miracle* is expected without a *Promise*, which is *presumptuous*.

2. The *Question* in Debate is begged, that should be proved, which is unfair, *viz.* That the
 Neglect

|| What our Author Means by *highly rewardable*, I don’t certainly know ; I would hope that he is not for the *Popish* Doctrine of the Merit of good Works ; I acknowledge that the Doctrine of absolute *Non-resistance*, deserves a Reward, but of a different Kind from what he, I suppose, intends.

Neglect of *Self-defence* upon a proper Occasion, is agreeable to the *Nature* and *Temper* of the *Gospel*.×

3. It seems to be here suppos'd, that the *Gospel* Dispensation, strictly so called, is different in *Nature* from the *Jewish*, which is *untrue*, as appears from the *Appendix* annexed to my Sermon, which our Author tho't proper not to meddle with in his *Animadversions*, and yet takes for granted what it opposes.

4. It seems to suppose, as if our *Author* imagined that his *meeke* and *peaceable Disposition* wou'd have more Influence upon *Villains* than the *meeke Temper* of our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, which is *absurd*! For their *Malice* was not disarm'd by the latter, and how then is it probable it shou'd by the former?

I heartily wish that the *Gentleman*, my *Opponent*, and all of his *Principles*, may never have their *Perswasion* put to the *Trial*; upon such melancholy Occasions!

To what has been said under this *Head*, of *Self-murder*, I would add the following *Observation* of *Mr. Poole* in his *Synopsis*; *Tou shalt not kill*, that is, unlawfully; 'This Precept (saith he) treats concerning all these Things which in *Scripture* are called *Murder*; nor are we to imagine that *Divinity* treats no otherwise of *Murder* than civil or human *Laws*; one of the original Words, properly signifies an unjust killing†.'

So that our *Author* finds *Fault* with me, for keeping within my own proper *Province*, and speaking like a *Divine* from the *Desk*, and not like a *Lawyer* from the *Bench* or *Bar*, in a *Sermon* upon the

F 2

Point

† *In hoc precepto agitur, de omnibus iis, quæ sub Homicidii nomine, in Scriptura veniunt; nec putandum, non aliter Theologiam agere de Homicidio, quam Jurisprudentiam; RATSACH propriè significat occisionem injustam,*

Point in *Controversy*; which, whether it be a just *Censure*, let others judge.

As to the Instance of the *Night Robber*, mentioned in the *Sermon*, p. 12, in the *Vindication*, p. 13. I shall for the sake of Brevity only mention Mr. *Poole's* Annotations on the Place (*Ex. xxii. 2*) which I think sufficiently solve the Difficulty our Author has started, and add a few Words; ' For the Thief (says Mr. *Poole*) tho' he be killed by a Man in his *own Defence*, because in that Case, the Thief might be presumed to have a worse Design, and the Owner of the House cou'd neither expect, nor have the Help of others, to secure him from the intended Violence; nor guide his Blows with that Discretion, which in the Day Time he might use; *If the Sun be risen, there shall be Blood shed for him; he that kills him, shall be put to Death.* Because he punished him more than his Crime deserved, and might have been otherwise either secured, or righted; and in that Case, it is probable, the Thief design'd not *Murder*, but *Theft* only; but if it were evident that the House-breaker design'd *Murder*, he might doubtless *kill him* in his *own Defence*.

Augustine gives this Reason why the Law of *Moses* allow'd of killing a *Thief* in the *Night*, but not in the Day; ' Because (says he) after Sun-rising, a Man might distinguish whether the *Thief* came to *kill*, or barely to steal; in the latter Case, he was not to be killed.' *In Quest. 84, on the Book of Exodus.*

I might add hereto, the Sentiment of the famous *Rabbi Maimonides*, who may be reasonably supposed to understand thoroughly the political Laws of his own Nation; he observes, ' That no private Person was permitted to kill another, except in Defence

‡ Defence of that which if once lost is irreparable,
 ‡ as Life and Chastity.

To what has been said, I shall only add, That our Author, in his *Gloss* aforesaid, has been so unhappy, or rather happy, in his Manner of Expression, as to give up the *Cause* for which he contended; for by his *Pen* he has acknowledged the *Necessity* of *Self-defence*, in these Words, (*V. p. 14*) ‘*Whilst the Owner of the House was making a necessary Defence: Sound Doctrine indeed; Truth will out sometimes: Now if the Gentleman wou’d but stand by this, our Controversy would soon come to a comfortable Period; which I am not without Hopes it will.*

He next proceeds to consider a Query I proposed under the Margin of the 12 *p.* from *Luke xxii. 36.* where Christ enjoins his Disciples, *That each of them who wanted a Sword, should sell his Coat and buy one*; from which I propose this Query, ‘*If Christ was against all Fighting and War, to what Purpose did he counsel his Disciples to buy Swords, must they be bought and never used, or bought for nothing?*’

Our Author answers, *Vind. p. 14.* ‘*That we have no Account of the Disciples ever using Swords after Christ’s Ascension; and we have several very strong Intimations that they did not, which sufficiently demonstrates that they did not understand the Text in its present literal Acceptation.*’

To which I reply, by way of Query,

1. Where are those several very strong Intimations that our *Author* speaks of? Why did not he mention some of them?

Query 2. Was it any more lawful to have *Swords* before Christ’s Ascension, than after? If this be supposed, pray what is the Reason?

Query

Query 3. Didn't Christ suffer some of his *Disciples* to wear *Swords* before his *Ascension* without *Reproof*? Now, wherefore were they suffered to wear them? Was it for *Ospretation*, or *Defence* in their *Travels*?

Query 4. Was that a *spiritual Sword* with which *Peter* struck off *Malchus's Ear*?

Query 5. If we take the *Sword* in a *spiritual Sense*, why not the *Coat*? Doesn't it seem hard and unprecedented, to take two *Words* joined in one *Sentence* in different *Senses*? Well, if we take the *Word Coat* in a *spiritual Sense*, as well as the *Sword*, and consider that the *Righteousness* of *Christ* is compared to a *Garment*, and likewise *Holiness* in *Scripture*, and that the *Word* written is termed a *Sword*, will not the *Sense* be this, That we should part with the *Robe* of *Christ's Righteousness*, or the *Garment* of *Holiness*, in order to buy a *Bible*, and is this a *reasonable Bargain*?

' It is probable at least, saith *Grotius*, that some
' of the *Apostles* wore *Swords* in travelling, in the
' Sight, and with the Knowledge of our *Saviour*,
' during the whole Time they accompanied him;
' which *Josephus* informs us, other *Galileans* also
' did, in their *Journey* from their own Country to
' *Jerusalem* (the Roads being much infested with
' *Higbwaymen*) and who also tells us the same of
' the *Essenes*, the most quiet and peaceable of all
' Men †. Hence it came to pass, that when *Christ*
' told his *Disciples*, such a Time was at hand, *That*
' *they should sell even their Garments, to buy Swords*,
' the *Apostles* presently answered, That there were
' two *Swords* in their Company, and in that Com-
' pany there were none but the *Apostles*.' They under-
stand their Master as speaking of *temporal Swords*,
and he did not reprove them. Perhaps it may be
suggested,

† *De Bell. Jud. Lib. 2. Cap. 12.*

suggested, that *Christ's* saying, it was enough, implied a *Reproof*; I answer, no, not at all; for two Swords were enough for that little Company for the present to guard them from the *Robbers*, while they kept together; but when they parted, and travell'd two and two in Company, it was but proper they should have more.

As to the Gloss of those Gentlemen (who carried on the Annotations begun by Mr. *Poole*) which is mentioned by our *Autor*, tho' they are inclined to take the Passage in a spiritual Sense, yet they signify that others were of another Mind, and only say, that it was difficult to reconcile their Sense of the Words to the *Apostles* Practice, and to the last Words of our Saviour, *It is enough*: But they don't say it is *impossible*; and if they had, they would have been very much mistaken. For my part, I can't but think a much greater *Difficulty* attends their Sense of the Words. Mr. *Poole* in his *Synopsis* upon the Place speaks thus: 'He does not so much exhort them to oppose Force by Force, as from a Foresight of the Enmity they were to be exposed to, to repress their private Animosities or Resentments*:' This includes the Sense I have been pleading for.

But famous GROTIVUS is still more express, and takes the Words absolutely in their plain literal Sense; 'Let him, saith he, by all Means get a *Sword*; if it cannot be had otherwise, even by the *Sale* of his *Garment*; whoever has a *Purse*, let him take it, with the *Scrip*, and whoever has no *Sword*, let him rather sell his *Coat* than want One; for this is the *Custom* of Mankind, when *Violence* is fear'd †.

Here

* *Non tam hortatur eos, ut vim vi repellant, quam ut apprehensione communis contra ipsos inimicitiae, propriam inter se animositatem repriment.*

† *Omnino gladium sibi comparet, veste divendita, si aliter comparere non potest, quisquis crumenam habet sumat eam, sed simul cum*

Here let me propose a few Queries, viz.

Query 1. Is it not most safe to take Places of Scripture in their literal Sense, when it involves no Absurdity, and is not contrary to the *Analogy of Faith*?

Query 2. Doesn't *Grotius's* Sense of the Text aforesaid, agree best with the *Context*? Where *Christ* says, *When I sent you without Purse or Scrip, lacked ye any Thing? But now be that hath a Purse, let him take it, and likewise his Scrip, and be that hath no Sword, let him sell his Garment, and buy One.* If the *Sword* be taken in a spiritual Sense in the latter, why not the *Purse* and *Scrip* in the former? And then wou'dn't it follow, that *CHRIST* sent forth his *Apostles* into the *Ministry* without necessary spiritual Qualifications, which is not true!

Give me leave to mention some *Hints* of an ingenious *Pen* upon this Head, not long since inserted in the *Gazette*; his *Strokes* methinks are pertinent and pungent!

He justly observes, that these Words of *Christ* to *Peter*, 'Put up again thy Sword into his Place, convey an *Idea* very different from laying it aside for ever as unlawful; do they not rather hint, that the *Sword*, when in its proper Place, is ready upon a suitable Occasion; *Luke xxii. 35*, we find very plainly *Christ's* Opinion of the Necessity of having *Swords* in these Words; *When I sent you without Purse, and Scrip, and Shoes, lacked ye any Thing? And they said, Nothing.* This was done when our Lord sent his Disciples, *Chap. x. 1.* into every City and Place whither he himself would come; but now when the Lord is about to be offered up, and his Disciples are to remain in the World, it seems

pera; et quisquis non habet, potius vestimentum dividat, quam gladio careat, id enim mos est facere; quoties vis timetur. Vid. Pol. Synop. in Loc.

' seems they are not to expect a *miraculous Support*
 ' and *Defence*; for *Christ* says, Chap. xxii. 36. *But*
 ' now, be that hath a Purse, let him take it, and like-
 ' wise his Scrip; and be that hath no Sword, let
 ' him sell his Garment, and buy One; (He that hath
 ' a Purse, let him take it) Money, it seems, in the
 ' tedious Journey of human Life, was lawful and
 ' necessary (and likewise his Scrip) Provisions or
 ' Food were also (and be that hath no Sword, let
 ' him sell his Garment, and buy One) but a *Sword*
 ' was lawful, and still more necessary, even of great-
 ' er Consequence than our very *Clothes*; and the
 ' Experience of Christians, from that Time down
 ' to the present, may be appealed to, Whether Mo-
 ' ney and Provisions have not been found very use-
 ' ful, and, in many Cases, the *Defence* of Mens *Lives*
 ' and *Liberties*, of greater Consequence than *Food*
 ' or *Raiment*; agreeable to our *Saviour's* Words in
 ' another Place, Is not the Life more than Meat,
 ' and the Body than Raiment? *Mat. vi. 25.*

' Yet how punctually do some *Christians* perform
 ' the first and second Parts of this Injunction? Very
 ' diligently they provide *Purse* and *Scrip*, yet ne-
 ' glect that most necessary Provision the *Sword*, not-
 ' withstanding *Food* and *Raiment* are represented by
 ' *Christ* of so much less Consequence than *Life*,
 ' which, under Providence, is protected and defend-
 ' ed by the *Sword*, and (on account of its signal Use
 ' no doubt) is commanded to be purchased at the
 ' Expence of our *Garments*. It has been already
 ' shewn, that Christianity was not to be forced upon
 ' People by the *Sword*; what better Use then re-
 ' mains, than the *Defence* of our *Country*, and the
 ' *Protection* of the *Helpless* and *Innocent*?

' Should some object on the Answer; Verse 38.
 ' *Lord, behold here are two Swords, Christ said, It*
 ' *is enough*; let them remember, that the *Propor-*

‘*tion* which was adjusted for the Disciples, is enough
‘in most well peopled Countries.’

Our Author next cites a Sentence of my *Sermon*,
p. 14. which is this ; ‘*War* was lawful under the
‘*Old Testament Dispensation*, and therefore is lawful
‘under the *New*.’

Upon which he remarks as follows ; ‘ Let us see
‘how this extraordinary Inference will hold in other
‘Cases ; *Burnt-Offerings*, *Sacrifices* and *Circumci-*
‘*sion*, were lawful under the *Old Testament Dispen-*
‘*sation*, are they therefore so now ? ’ *Vind.* p. 15.

I answer ; If our Author had not dealt unfairly
with my Paragraph, in breaking the Connection of
the *Jewish Dispensation* and *moral Law* apparent in
it, which I formed with *Design*, and so put a Sense
upon it contrary to what he might see was my In-
tention in the next Page, where I express the *Lim-*
itation I had in View in writing the aforesaid Words ;
namely this, in *Things of a moral Nature* : I say, if
he had taken notice of that, it would have spoiled
his vain *Triumph* about *Sacrifices*, which had no o-
ther Foundation but his own *Overfight*, or some-
thing worse, but I would hope the former !

Our *Author* next proceeds to animadvert upon my
Argument from the sixth *Command*, S. p. 14. which
is this : ‘ The *sixth Commandment* does undoubtedly
‘imply a lawful *War* ; for if we must not kill o-
‘thers, much less ourselves ; and if we must have
‘no Hand in our own *Death*, we must defend our
‘Lives against *Violence*, which sometimes cannot be
‘done without *War*. Now, the blessed *Jesus* never
‘came to destroy the *moral Law*, or the *Law of*
‘*Nature*, which is in Substance the same, but to
‘fulfil it : *Do we make void the Law by Faith* (or
‘by the Doctrines of the Gospel) says the Apostle ?
‘No ; but we establish the *Law*. *Moral Precepts*
‘are grounded upon invariable *Equity*, upon the
‘*Nature*

‘ Nature and Reason of Things, and so cannot be
‘ alter’d.

The *Foundations* or *Grounds* of the aforesaid *Reasoning*, which proves *Defensive War* to be implied in the *sixth Command*, are these, *viz.*

1. Reasonable *Love* to ourselves, in a *Degree* superior to others. If we must not kill others, much less ourselves; why? Because we must love ourselves more in *Degree* than them. Now, does our Author deny, either that we should *love* ourselves at all, or in a *Degree* superior to others? No!

2. Another *Ground* is the *Necessity* of our avoiding having a *Hand* in our own *Death*; from which is inferred, by the *Law* of Contraries, that we should preserve our *Lives*: What can be more plain?

3. Another *Ground* is the intrinick *Equity* of this *Precept*, and its Confirmation by the *Gospel*. Now, can any Reasoning be built upon firmer *Foundations* than these mentioned? Does our *Author* deny those *Principles* I reason from? No! Well, isn't my Reasoning from them just and natural, thus, If we must not *kill* others, because we *love* them; much less ourselves, because we *love* ourselves more in *Degree*.

Farther; If we must have no *Hand* in our own *Death*, we must *defend* ourselves against unjust *Violence*: The Reason of the Consequence is the *Law* of Contraries, which always holds good §. The *Negative*, in the very Nature of Things, necessarily implies the *Positive*; if we are altogether *passive*, when formidably attacked, and suffer our *Death* to be compassed without resisting, when we can resist, we virtually consent to it.

Now, are not the *Reasons* of these Consequences just and clear? Does our *Author* deny them in particular?

G 2

icular?

§ *Duo contradictoria, non possunt esse simul vera*; Two Contradictories cannot be together true.

ticular? No! Well, seeing he grants the *Premisses*, from which I argue, and offers nothing in particular against the *Reasons* of the *Consequence*, it will hold good, he cannot avoid it. If the aforesaid *Principles* be not plain and self-evident, and the *Consequences* or *Deductions* from them just and clear, I know not what is.

Well, but our Author doesn't like it: Why so? Hear his own Words, *Vind. p. 15, 16.*

' There are such strange *Absurdities* in this Manner of *declaiming*, and drawing Conclusions, a Man must be very blind that cannot see them. A positive *Precept* is made to imply its direct *Reverse*: A Commandment not to kill, is implied to authorize Killing: And in Consequence thereof the blessed *Jesus* is supposed to approve of *War*. Whether this be agreeable to his *Life* and *Doctrines*, the Reader is desired to consult.'

To which I reply as follows, Stay, *Sir*, and cool a little; why so hasty? why so hot? Take care that the Charge of *declaiming* does not turn upon yourself, which it will do unavoidably, if you don't give good Reason for your Censure.

Let us therefore examine the Strength of our Author's Reasonings against the Consequence aforesaid. And,

1. He says, *Vind. p. 16.* ' A positive *Precept* is made to imply its direct *Reverse*.'

I answer no, not at all, unless it be in *Sound*, not in *Substance* or *Reality*: 'Tis true, it forbids the killing of any unjustly, and yet at the same time *enjoins*, or allows of the just killing of *Criminals* by the *Magistrate*, but inasmuch as this *killing* and not *killing* respect different *Persons*, and contrary *Causes*, it implies no Contradiction. But if our Author does not like this *Solution* of the Difficulty he starts, will he please to excuse me, if I venture to turn his

GREAT

GREAT GUN upon himself, not to hurt him, but to convince him of his Mistake, and see how he will like it. ' There are such strange Absurdities in this Manner of declaiming, and drawing Conclusions, a Man must be very blind that cannot see them.' E. G. The sixth Command, with its Threatening, according to our Author's Judgment, is thus, *Thou shalt not kill*; but if thou dost, thou shalt be *killed* by the Hand of the Magistrate (if he does not deny all civil Government, he must own this) then the Consequence comes upon himself; he makes a *positive Precept* to imply its direct *Reverse*; in a Commandment not to *kill*, he imagines that an authorizing of killing is implied; I leave it to our Author's *Prudence* to clear himself in what Way he sees best.

As to his Query afterwards, *Vind. p. 16.* ' And in Consequence thereof the blessed *Jesus* is supposed to approve of War. Whether this be agreeable to his *Life* and *Doctrines*, the Reader is desired to consult.'

I answer, The blessed *Jesus*, in his *Doctrine*, explained and confirmed the *moral Law*; this he himself informs us, *He came not to destroy, but to fulfil*; he likewise solemnly assures us, *That till Heaven and Earth pass, one jot, or one Tittle, shall in no wise pass from the Law---and that whosoever therefore shall break one of the least Commandments, and shall teach Men so, he shall be called the LEAST in the Kingdom of Heaven*, Mat. v. Now, was not the *Life* of Christ agreeable to his *Doctrine*? Yes surely,

If our *Author* doesn't like this Answer, he must chuse one for himself; for the aforefaid Query concerns him in Effect as much as me.

I may likewise for the sake of Brevity, leave his other following Query to himself to Answer, in a Consistency with his *Doctrine* of *killing Criminals* by the
the

the Magistrate, or his Order, which is the same Thing.

‘ Where there is one (saith our Author, *V. p.* 16) who take it in its first Sense (*i. e.* the Sixth Command as forbidding War) slain, are there not many Thousands of the latter killed in the Practice of Fighting ?’

I Answer, It may be so ; but in the mean Time, if those that hold the Doctrine of absolute Non-Resistance, are not slain, they have Reason to thank those under God for their *Protection*, who hold *Defensive War*, and therefore shou’dn’t slight them, and condemn them upon that Account !

Farther, if our *Author’s* Observation be just, as it probably is, then the *Doctrine* of absolute *Non-Resistance* is a *Flesh-pleasing* Doctrine ; seeing that it tends to save the *Cash*, and (in some Sense) to protect the *Buff*, tho’ ingloriously ; I confess it passies my Understanding to perceive much *Spirituality* and *Self-denial* in such Matters ; but I leave it to every one to judge for himself ; and proceed.

Our Author complains of my Explication of *Prov. xxii. 3.* in his *V. p.* 16. and observes, ‘ That I make hiding one’s self, and preparing for Defence, so exactly alike, that they are taken the one for the other.’

I Answer, They are, in my Opinion, alike ; for he that rightly prepares for *Defence*, provides a *Hiding-place* from the Enemy, a *Fort* and Instruments of *War*, to screen him from their *Vengeance* ; and are not these Things the Intention of a *Hiding-place*, viz. to *conceal* and *protect* ?

Here I may enquire how can a prudent Man, who, according to the common Course of Things, foresees temporal Danger and Calamity approaching, rationally

rationally hide himself, in the *Neglect* of the aforesaid Method ?

‘ He foresees the *Evil* both of *Sin* and *Punishment* which he is like to incur, by considering *Scripture* and *History*, and the natural Tendency of *Causes* ; he foresees those *Evils* that he may shun them ; he betakes himself to a *Place of Safety*, as is done in a *Tempest* or in *War* : He declines the *Occasions of Sin*, and averts *Danger* from himself ; he *bides* himself till the *Indignation of God* or *Man* be overpast ; says *Mercer* and *Fejerus*. See *1 Kings* xvii. 3. *Isa.* xlvi. and xxxii. 2. *Mat.* x. 23.’

But the Simple pass on and are punished ; ‘ *Passing* they are punished,’ say *Junius* and *Tremellius*. ‘ *While* they go rashly and imprudently, wherever their *Minds* lead them, and pass securely, they are punished,’ says *Piscator*. ‘ *They cast* themselves into *Danger*,’ saith *Vatabulus*. ‘ *Like Travellers*, who not perceiving their *Danger*, do not labour to shun it, saith *Marian* and *Castalio*. ‘ *They pass* on to *Evils*, which thro’ their *Folly* they don’t foresee ; or, having foreseen them, have slighted them,’ saith *Mercer*. ‘ *They go* on boldly and carelessly in their customary *Road*,’ saith *Fejerus*. ‘ *And are punished* ; being involved in *Misery*, and oppressed, they pay the *Punishment of their Imprudence*, saith *Mercer*.’

But our Author proceeds to mention the following Paragraph of my Sermon, p. 14. viz.

‘ *Now* if the *Almighty* has approved of *War* formerly, and there is still the same *Necessity* of it, under the *Gospel-Dispensation* as before, it will follow, that it is equally lawful now : It is absurd to suppose, that the blessed *God*, who is infinite in *Wisdom*, and unalterable in his *Nature*, would determine contrarily at different *Periods of Time*

‘ Time, concerning a Case that is substantially the
‘ same !’

Upon which our Author remarks as follows, ‘ If
‘ this Manner of Arguing proves any Thing, it
‘ proves Offensive War, as lawful as Defensive.
‘ God approved of the *Israelites* taking away the
‘ Possessions of many Nations : He commanded
‘ them to destroy some utterly : is it therefore e-
‘ qually lawful to do so now, whether we have this
‘ Command or not ?’

To which I reply, That Almighty God never
commanded *Offensive War* (properly and strictly so
called) *at all* ; and may be reckoned by some a
Paradox ; and I think it is a plain Truth ; the
aforesaid Instances are not *Offensive Wars*, which is
the unjust *Invasion* of another’s Right : for the
blessed God, who is the absolute and original *Pro-
prietor* of all, transferred the *conquest* of those
Nations, which they forfeited by Sin, to the Peo-
ple of *Israel*, previous to, and before their taking
Possession thereof ; and, as *God* the Lord of *Life*,
and a righteous *Governor* and *Judge*, for their ex-
traordinary *Wickedness*, gave his People *Israel* Au-
thority and Commission to punish them, and put
them to Death. In the former Instance, they did
but take forcible Possession of their own Country and
Goods ; and in the latter, they were but *Executio-
ners* of *judicial Punishment* under a proper *Authori-
ty*, and therefore there was nothing of *Offensive War*
in those Things.

The *Almighty* never did, nor, to speak with Re-
verence, ever can, in a Consistency with the *Purity*
and Perfection of his *Nature*, enjoin such a *wicked*
and abominable Thing as *Offensive War* !

It is true the Manner of conveying the aforesaid
civil Right, and *penal Authority*, was extraordinary
and immediate, peculiarly suited to that Dispensa-
tion

tion, which was a *Theocracy*, *God* himself being their *King*, in an extraordinary and immediate Way ; a Priviledge which no other Nation ever had, or, so far as we know, are like to have.

And therefore not only *civil Rights*, and *judicial Power* and *Authority*, are conveyed always *mediate-ly* to other Nations, by ordinary human *Means*, according to the different *Laws*, *Constitutions* and *Customs* of Countries ; but also the claiming the afore-said *Rights*, and exercising the afore-said *Authority*, must be *mediate* also, regulated by human *Reason*, agreeable to the *Laws* of different *States* and *Kingdoms*.

Hence if the *Almighty* should in an extraordinary and immediate Manner, give to any a *Right* to others *Possessions*, there wou'd be Need of infallible and immediate *Revelation*, to assure us of this Matter ; nor could we safely act before it, in either of the above Instances.

But there is no Need of immediate *Revelation*, to inform or assure us of these *civil Rights*, or *civil Authority*, which are convey'd to us in an ordinary *Channel*, we are apt to know them full well without.

Nor need we any new *Revelation* to inform us of a *Truth* that is engraven with indelible Characters upon our rational Natures, as with the Point of a *Diamond*, and written with a *Sun-beam* upon a great Variety of Pages in the sacred Volume ; namely, That we should *defend* ourselves and *Properties*.

Nor do we need a new *Revelation* to instruct us, when to prepare for, and endeavour the afore-said *Defence*, the *Providence* of *God*, together with our own *Reason*, will easily, when attended to, point out the *Time*, as they do in other temporal Cases.

As to our *Author's* hard Construction upon these Words, '*Only Barrier*,' in my Sermon, p. 5. V.

p. 17. and the Use he is pleas'd to make of it, I shall only say, that the aforesaid Errata of the *Press*, in leaving out the Word *Sometimes*, our Author may see corrected by the *Press* in divers of them ; the Sentence in the original Manuscript runs thus ; ' Which is *sometimes* the *only Barrier* ;' but if the aforesaid Word hadn't been corrected, our Author might easily know, from the *Series* of the *Discourse*, my Meaning to be only this, That sometimes *Self-defence* is the only human or outward *Barrier* against *Injustice* and *Violence* ; now seeing the *Law* of *Charity* oblig'd him to put the most favourable Sense upon the Words that they can in Reason bear, I leave it to the Reader to judge, whether such Management be a Commendation of our Author's Cause or Candour.

But to proceed ; my *Opponent* mentions another Paragraph of the Sermon, p. 15. *Vin.* p. 18. which is this ;

' It is strange to think, and hard to reconcile it
' with any just Notion of divine Goodness, that
' Almighty God, shou'd under this last and
' brightest Dispensation of his Grace towards the
' Children of Men, instead of enlarging diminish
' our *Priviledges*, and that in so tender and impor-
' tant a Point ! Indeed, methinks such a Notion
' tends to cast a dishonourable and inglorious Re-
' flection upon the divine Benignity and Goodness ;
' and the most illustrious Display of it, that was e-
' ver given to the Children of Men, by the *Gos-
' pel* of our Lord Jesus Christ.'

Upon which he remarks as follows ; *V.* p. 18.
' What Priviledges are here meant, those of *Fight-
' ing* for our Possessions, *gaining Riches*, enjoying
' Estates, &c. Tho' Riches acquired by honest
' Means, may not be *inconsistent* with the Doc-
' trines of Christ ; and tho' we may possess in the
' World

‘ World many near and dear Enjoyments, yet
 ‘ *Christ* and his *Testimony* ought to be preferred a-
 ‘ bove all Things, if we would render ourselves ac-
 ‘ ceptable in his Sight, *Luke* xiv. 26.’

To which I reply, that there are these following
Blemishes in the aforesaid *Paragraph*, as I apprehend ; namely,

1. A *Misrepresentation* of the *Point* in *Debate* ; here it is hinted as if what I was contending for, was, in Part, *gaining Riches*, which implies an *Offensive War* ; now this was expressly guarded against, in stating the *Question* in the Beginning of the *Sermon*, in the *Negative* there mentioned.

2. A *begging* the *Question* in *Controversy*, which shou’d be proved ; for he here takes that for granted, which I deny ; namely, That the *Doctrine* of *absolute Non-resistance*, is the *Testimony* of *Christ* ; and then reasons upon it, to the *Terror* of the *Ignorant*, which is very unfair.

3. By the *Application* of *Luke* xiv. 26. to his Purpose, he makes the *Doctrine* of *absolute Non-resistance*, or the *Neglect* of one outward *Mean* for *Self-defence*, one *Term* of *Christianity* ; insinuating, that one can’t be a *Disciple* of *Christ* without it, or true *Christians*, and resign’d to the *Will* of *God*, which is very uncharitable !

4. He shifts the *State* of the *Question*, which is not whether *God* can make us comfortable in those common *Afflictions*, which we are liable to, consider’d as *private Men*, by the *Course* of *Providence* ; or which we may suffer as *Christians* upon a *religious Account*, which is term’d *Persecution* : But whether as a *State* or *Community* we shou’d endeavour to defend ourselves by *Force*, when *Necessity* requires, against a *foreign Foe*, who endeavour to rob us of our *Goods* and *Lives*, under no religious *Pretext* ?

The next Particular that our Author confiders, is what I have said, S. p. 15, 16. which is this ;
 ‘ Why, my Brethren, should it be now a Sin to
 ‘ perform (in respect of Things of a moral Nature)
 ‘ that which was under the *Jewish Dispensation* a Sin
 ‘ to neglect? Was not *Meroz* exposed to a bitter
 ‘ *Curse, because she came not to help the Lord against*
 ‘ *the Mighty?* i. e. as appears by the Context, Be-
 ‘ cause they came not to assist their Brethren engaged
 ‘ in *Battle* in a good *Cause*. Is not *God* the same as
 ‘ formerly, and the *Nature* of *Justice* and *Injustice*
 ‘ the same? Did not the *Jews* live under the same
 ‘ *moral Law* that we are to be governed by? And
 ‘ had they not the same *Gospel* for Substance?’

Upon which our Author remarks in the following Manner, *Vind. p. 20.*

‘ The first of these Questions I really think not
 ‘ applicable to the Point in Dispute; because there
 ‘ is not any Part of the *moral Law* which enjoins
 ‘ *War*: And the Reason why *Meroz* was so severely
 ‘ *cursed*, *Poole* says, was to shew the Sinfulness and
 ‘ Unreasonableness of their cowardly Desertion of
 ‘ this Cause, because it was the Cause of God; and
 ‘ they had the Call of God to it, whom they knew
 ‘ to be able easily to crush that Enemy whom they
 ‘ dreaded, and who had promised to do it: So that
 ‘ upon this View of the Case, there is this only pro-
 ‘ ved by the *Parallel*, That it is a *Sin to neglect going*
 ‘ *to War in the Cause of God, when he calls to it*:
 ‘ This, therefore, cannot at all operate against those
 ‘ who refuse Fighting, because they apprehend God
 ‘ hath forbidden it.’

To which I reply, by offering the following Particulars to the *Reader*’s Consideration.

1. That our *Author* begs the Question in Debate; namely, That not any Part of the *moral Law* enjoins *War*. Whether a *Defensive War* be not implied

in, and consequently enjoined by the *sixth Command*, I leave to the Reader to determine, after a View of the Reasonings I have before offered upon that Head, together with what is said in the Sermon to the same Purpose upon the fifth Command, p. 15, 16, 17, which our Author has thought proper not to meddle with, for what Reasons he knows best.

2. My Opponent, in the aforesaid Paragraph, really, as I conceive, gives up the Cause for which he contends; for he acknowledges that this is proved by the *Parallel of Meroz*, namely, ‘*That it is a Sin to neglect going to War in the Cause of God, when he calls to it.*’

And only endeavours to screen himself from the Consequence of the aforesaid Concession, by this slender Pretext, namely, ‘*This cannot at all operate against those that refuse fighting, because they apprehend God hath forbidden it.*’ This Argument I have before considered---to which I refer the Reader, and shall only add a few Words, together with the Sentiment of *Grotius* upon this Head.

The aforesaid Pretext or Apology, directly tends, so far as I can see, intirely to overthrow all the intrinsick or *inward Goodness* or *Badness* of *human Actions*, and consequently to make both *Scripture* and *Reason* a mere *Nose of Wax*!

‘*Grotius*, speaking of just Wars, observes, that they are in holy Writ called *Battles* of the Lord, 1 *Sam.* xvii. 47. The *Israelites*, saith he, under the Conduct of *Moses* and *Josbua*, having by Force of Arms repelled the *Amalekites*, who attacked them, *Exod.* xvii. God approved of the Conduct of his People, tho’ he had given no *Orders* upon that *Head* before the *Action*. And farther, God himself prescribed to his People certain general and established *Rules* of making War, *Deut.* xx. 10, 15. thereby plainly shewing, that *War* might
 { some-

‘ sometimes be *just*, even without a *special Command*
 ‘ from God; for there he makes a manifest Diffe-
 ‘ rence between the Case of those seven Nations, and
 ‘ that of other People: And seeing he does not de-
 ‘ clare the just Reasons of making *War*, he hereby
 ‘ supposes, that they may be easily discovered by the
 ‘ Light of Nature: Such was the Cause of the War
 ‘ made by *Jephtha* against the *Ammonites*, in *Defence*
 ‘ of their *Borders*, *Judges xi.* But,

3. From Mr. *Poole*’s Annotations upon the Case of *Meroz*, which I had not cited in my Sermon, nor don’t remember I had read, our Author is pleased to take Occasion to reflect under the Margin, *Vind. p. 20.* upon many of the *People* of my *Profession*, as *cowardly*, ‘ when many of the same
 ‘ *Profession* with this *Sermon-writer* hid themselves.’

To which I reply, that it seems something strange and extraordinary in this *Gentleman*’s Conduct, who appears as a *Patron* for the Doctrine of *absolute Non-Resistance*, that he should not only enter into an *Offensive War* with me, and fight me unprovoked, but likewise cast *Scandal* and *Reproach* upon many Persons, whom I have the Honour of being related to by *Profession*, who were long since dead, and in their *Graves*, and so could not possibly offend him †.

I do declare, that I had it not in the Thoughts of my *Heart*, to offer any *Charge* against the People of his *Profession* about *Cowardice*, and therefore was not a little surprized to meet with our Author’s *Animadversions* upon this Head!

But seeing this *Gentleman* is pleased to insinuate a *Charge* of *Cowardice* against many of the same *Profession* with me (and brings some *Authors* of his own *Perswasion*

† *Mortuus non mordet*; A dead Man does not bite. *De mortuis & absentibus, nil nisi bonum dicito*; Concerning dead and absent Persons, say nothing but Good.

Perſwaſion to prove it) I would only obſerve in their Vindication, that the *Instance* alledged of their *bid- ing* themſelves (in a Time of *Perſecution*, is no Proof of it ; forasmuch as it is but agreeable to the Direction of our *Lord Jesus*, who counſels his *Disciples*, when they are *perſecuted in one City*, to fly to another.

And pray, have not divers of both our *Professions* actually done ſo (for Subſtance) at the Time of the firſt Settlement of this Country ? Did they not fly from their native Soil on *Carvas Wings* across the great *Atlantick*, to this then howling *American Wilderneſs*, in order to find a ſecure *Retreat*, from the Tempeſt of *Perſecution* ?

Is this Instance of our Author's Conduct calm and conſiſtent ? I will aſſure him, that the *Sermon* he is diſpleaſed with, was not framed to ſerve the narrow and comparatively mean *Designs* of a *Party*, but to promote the common *Benefit* of all the *Societies* of the *Province*, in their *Protection* from impending *Danger* and *Calamity* !

But to proceed : Our Author, in order to reconcile *God's* commanding *War*, under the Old Teſtament, to his (ſuppoſed) prohibiting it now, propoſes this Expedient, *Vind. p. 20. 21. namely*, he ' be-
' ſeeches his Readers to remember, that *he ſuffered*
' *and required many Things of the Jews*, because of
' *the Hardneſs of their Hearts*, which was not to
' continue in his Church, after the bright *Discovery*
' of his *Gospel* was manifeſted.---Is it therefore rea-
' ſonable to ſuppoſe, that this univerſal, glorious De-
' ſign, admits of *War* and *Fighting*, eſpecially be-
' tween ſuch Nations as profeſs to be under the Go-
' vernment of the ſame Lord and Lawgiver ?

Now, in order to ſhew that the aforeſaid *Expedient* will not answer his *Design*, I ſhall firſt mention *Mr. Poole's* Interpretation of the Place of Scripture
his

his Words refer to, *namely, Mat. xix. 8.* where Christ saith, *Moses, because of the Hardness of your Hearts, suffered you to put away your Wives, but from the Beginning it was not so.*

Poole observes thus upon the aforesaid Words: ‘ The Substance of our Saviour’s Answer seemeth to be
 ‘ this, *Moses* gave you no positive *Command* in the
 ‘ Case, he could not make a *Law* directly opposite
 ‘ to the *Law* of my *Father*. But *Moses* saw the
 ‘ Wantonness and Wickedness of your Hearts, that
 ‘ you wou’d turn away your *Wives* without any
 ‘ just or warrantable Cause; and to restrain your
 ‘ Extravagance of *Cruelty* to your *Wives*, or disorderly
 ‘ turning of them off, upon any Occasion, he
 ‘ made a *Law* that none should put away his *Wife*,
 ‘ but upon a legal Cognizance of the Cause, and giving
 ‘ her a *Bill of Divorce*: And you by your
 ‘ *Traditions* have expounded that *Law* beyond *Moses*
 ‘ his Intention, and made a *Bill of Divorce*,
 ‘ grantable in Cases which he never tho’t of, nor intended
 ‘ in that *Law*: But the *Measures* of *Lawfulness*,
 ‘ are neither to be taken from *Moses* his
 ‘ temporary *Toleratation*, and much less from your
 ‘ *Traditions* and Expositions of the *Law* of *Moses*,
 ‘ but from the original Institution of *Marriage*, and
 ‘ from *God’s* original *Law* in Relation to it.’ The
 above Exposition of the Place, I apprehend to be
 just and genuine.

I wou’d therefore observe, that the *Author* of the *V.* goes upon a wrong *Foundation* in the aforesaid Paragraph; and hence his Superstructure cannot be good†. He saith that *HE*, meaning *GOD*, for of him he speaketh, as will appear to every Eye, by the Connection of these Words with the foregoing Part
 of

† *Stabit opus melius, si bene fixa basis, i. e.* If the Foundation be well laid, the Superstructure will stand the better; but on the Contrary, *Debile fundamentum fallit opus.* A weak Foundation ruins the Fabrick.

of the Paragraph, *suffered and required many Things* ; but *Christ* saith it was *Moses* that *suffered*, not *required*, the *Jews* to put away their *Wives*, which was but one Thing ; this is a strange complicated Mistake.

It is admirable that our *Author* shou'd ascribe to *God* by Way of *Command* (for does't the Word *Required* signify as much) what was only a temporary *Permission* of *Moses*, and thus contradict our *Saviour's* express *Declaration*, in no less than three Particulars at one *Dash* ; but I hope it was thro' Inadvertency that our *Author* fell into this unhappy *Mistake*, and that when he considers the Matter farther, he will correct it.

In the mean Time, can it be tho't, with the least Shadow of Reason, that from such a *Foundation*, any good *Conclusion* can be drawn against *Defensive War*, which *God* the Father, and *God* the Son, repeatedly commanded, approved of, and encouraged with their *Presence* and *Blessing*||.

It is likewise probable that our *Author* meant also the *Jewish Ceremonies*, but these Things being *Shadows* of *Christ*, must of Consequence expire and vanish, when the *Sun* the *Substance* came ; but where is there any Ground to believe, that *War* is a *Type* of *Christ* ; and if so, wou'dn't it conclude what my Opponent doesn't like, namely, that *Christ* is an eminent *Warrior*, seeing that the *Type* is eminently included in the *Antitype*.

Farther, the *Jewish Sacrifices* and *Ceremonies*, were Things in themselves indifferent and innocent, antecedent to, or before the divine *Precepts* concerning them, and therefore might by divine *Sovereignty* be for a Time enjoined, without any Contradiction to the *Purity* and other *moral Perfections* of the divine *Nature* ; but the Case is not so as to *War*, it can be

|| See the Sermons upon *Exodus* xv. 3.

no Matter of Indifferency in itself, for it consists not in the shedding the *Blood of Beasts*, but of *Men*; and therefore if it be not *morally Good*, it is *morally EVIL* in itself, before the divine *Precept* respecting it: Else there is no such Thing in any Instance, and all *Virtue* and *Vice* are empty *Names*, and meer *Cyphers*, that have no Foundation in the *Nature* of *Things*; and thus the very *Basis* of all *Virtue* and *Religion* is sapp'd: A doleful Stroke indeed!

For what can more deeply concern the Manners of Men, than the taking away the *human Life*? Which puts a final *Period* to our State of *Trial*; and fixes unalterably our everlasting *Condition*: Hence one of these two Things follows, either that *God Almighty* commanded, encouraged and approved of frequently, what is in itself *morally Evil*, or else that *Defensive War* is in its own *Nature*, *morally Good*, and consequently lawful now.

As to the latter Part of the aforesaid Paragraph, I answer in the Affirmative; that it is, in my Apprehension, reasonable to suppose, that the universal glorious *Design* of the *Gospel-Dispensation* admits of *Defensive War* and *Fighting*, when Necessity requires, even between *Nations* that profess to be under the *Government* of the same *Lord* and Lawgiver, for these Reasons;

1. Because it is under the aforesaid Limitations *morally Good*, as, I hope, appears from what has been already said. And,

2. Because being so, it cannot of itself have a Tendency to Contention or Confusion, or any Thing that is *Evil*; what is Good, cannot in itself tend to what is bad; except it be supposed that a *Cause* produces *Effects* contrary in *Kind* to itself; which is absurd, and contrary to the very *Nature* of *Things*! For thus, upon this *Hypothesis*,
Light

Light would produce *Darkness*, and *Darkness* *Light*.

Nay, it is so far from this, that the Doctrine of *Defensive War* directly tends to keep the worst of Men from *Injustice* and *Violence*, by affecting their *Fear*, with a *View* of the *Penalties* they are like to incur thereby ; this tends to teach Men *Wisdom*, as pious *Gideon* taught the Men of *Succoth*, with the *Briars* and *Thorns* of the *Wilderness*.

Whereas the contrary Opinion, by removing the Arguments of *Fear* and *Terror* from the Impenitent, which generally have the most Influence to restrain them from the *Evils* they *love*, tends to give an ungovernable *Loose* to their *Passions* and *Appetites*, and so opens a *Door* to *Violence* and *Confusion*, and every evil Work, and therefore in the present degenerate *State* of Mankind, it is of dangerous and pernicious Consequence !

Not to add that this Method of affecting the *Fear* of Men, by the threatening of *Punishment* against Transgressors, proportioned to their Crimes, and of inflicting it when there is Occasion, and in this Way endeavouring to deter them from Iniquity ; I say this is the very Method which the blessed *God* himself takes with Mankind, in his *Word* written, and by his *Providence*, of which there are innumerable Instances ; Doesn't the Almighty *hedge up* frequently *the Way of Sinners with Thorns*, to keep them within proper Bounds ? Doesn't the allwise *God* in the holy Scriptures denounce *Threatnings* of temporal Punishments, against Transgressors ? And doesn't he at Times inflict them, and therefore from hence, may he not be justly called even now, *A Man of War* ? And does it not easily follow, from what has been said under this Head, that all such who oppose a *just War* as unlawful under the *Gospel*, do consequently (tho' I trust not designedly)

reflect upon the *Wisdom* of God's *Government* over the Children of Men, and labour to make us unlike our *Maker*, imagining that the *Perfection* of *Christianity* consists in this Instance, in our being unlike God ; a strange Sort of *Perfection* indeed ! For my Part, I cannot but think that *JEHOVAH* is the *Fountain* and *Pattern* of all *Excellency*, and that the *Perfection* of *intelligent Creatures*, consists in Conformity to him ; but it seems our *Author* is in this Instance of a different Opinion !

3. Another Reason why I think the *Design* of the *Gospel* Dispensation admits of *Defensive War* and *Fighting* is, because the *Jewish Church* enjoyed the *Gospel* as well as we, the very same for *Substance*, as I have proved at large in the 16 p. of the *Sermon*, and in the *Appendix*, which he has tho't proper not to meddle with, for what Reason he knows best !

Our Author proceeds to cite another Paragraph of the *Sermon*, p. 16.

‘ Can we think, my Brethren, that *God* would
 ‘ enjoin and approve of any Practice formerly, that
 ‘ was contrary to the *moral Law* and *Gospel*, which
 ‘ the *Jews* enjoy'd ? Surely No ! That is contrary
 ‘ to his unalterable *Purity*, of which the *moral Law*
 ‘ is a legible *Copy* and *Exemplar*. Well, if a just *War*
 ‘ was not contrary to the *moral Law* under the
 ‘ *Jewish* Dispensation, and before it, why should it
 ‘ be so now, in the like Circumstances of *Necessity* ?
 ‘ And if it be not contrary to the *moral Law*, the
 ‘ standing and unalterable *Rule* of our *Conduct*,
 ‘ why should any scruple it, or oppose it now ?

Upon which our Author remarks as follows (*V.*
 p. 21)

‘ I have already observed, that the *Almighty's*
 ‘ enjoining and approving of some Wars formerly,
 ‘ does not authorize any *Wars* begun and carried on
 ‘ at the mere *Will* and *Pleasure* of *Men*. The like
 Cir-

‘ *Circumstances of Necessity* must be, when we have
 ‘ the divine *Command* and *Direction*, and not other-
 ‘ wise. * If it be a Doubt why the dark and distant
 ‘ Prospects of the *Gospel*, which the *Jews* had,
 ‘ did not discover to them in general, that the
 ‘ Time should come when outward *War* should be
 ‘ laid aside, the same Difficulty recurs with respect
 ‘ to *Sacrifices*, *Burnt-Offerings*, *Circumcision*, &c.
 ‘ and yet some of the inspired Prophets foresaw that
 ‘ Time. If it be objected, that *Sacrifices*, &c.
 ‘ were Types and Figures ; so, in my Opinion,
 ‘ were the outward Wars and Fightings of the
 ‘ *Jews*, and are considered in that Light, by reli-
 ‘ gious Writers of many Denominations. That the
 ‘ *moral Law* is the standing and unalterable *Rule* of
 ‘ our Conduct; I grant *as far as it reaches* : But it
 ‘ is not from thence that a Scruple about Fighting
 ‘ arises. The blessed *Jesus* hath taught some *Chris-*
 ‘ *tians*, both by the *immediate Dictates* of his *Spi-*
 ‘ *rit*, and the Expressions of his Will, *when perso-*
 ‘ *nally* upon *Earth*, that the best Way to keep the
 ‘ Commandments, *Thou shalt not kill*, and, *Thou*
 ‘ *shalt love thy Neighbour*, is *not to harbour any*
 ‘ *Ill-will or Revenge against any, but to love Ene-*
 ‘ *mies*, &c.

To which I reply, That our *Author* in the preceding Paragraph,

1. Shifts the Question in Controversy ; I never pretended to defend *War*, begun and carried on at the meer Will and Pleasure of Men, or according to their Humours and corrupt Lusts : No !

2. He gives a wrong Turn to those Words, ‘ *The like Circumstances of Necessity*,’ contrary to their natural and usual Acceptation, as if they signified the *Time* when we have an immediate *Command* (such as the *Jews* had in some Instances by the *Urim*) he must mean this, or say nothing to his Purpose ;
 whereas

whereas the Words only signify our being in the like *Danger* or *Distress* !

No doubt we shou'd consult the holy *Scriptures* in our *Wars*, which contain our standing *Rule of Conduct*, and consider *God's Providences* towards us, and *pray* to him for *Direction*, and in this Way we may expect to know the *Mind of God* as well as the *Jews* did by the *Urim* and *Thummim* ; nor did they in all Cases consult that *Oracle*, but in difficult only ; *When they heard that the Two Tribes and a Half had built an Altar by Jordan, the whole Congregation gathered themselves together at Shiloh, to War against them* ; but so far as we can learn, did not consult the *Urim*, *Josh. xxii. 12.* So likewise in that *War* undertaken against the *Tribe of Benjamin*, *Jud. xx.* they only enquired who should go up first, *v. 18.* tho' after a *Defeat* they change the *Question*.

3. Our *Author* puts *Sacrifices*, *Burnt-Offerings* and *Circumcision* upon a Par with *Defensive War*, and believes them to be *Types* and *Figures* ; but offers only his own *Opinion*, as the *Foundation* of this *Argument*, together with the *Opinion* of other religious *Writers*, which are no *Proof* to me.

To imagine that the *Jewish Wars* were *Figures* and *Types* of the *spiritual Wars* of *Christians* against *Sin* and *Satan*, as it wants a *scriptural Foundation*, so it is attended with this *Absurdity*, *viz.* It either supposes that the pious *Jews* had no *spiritual War*, which is false ; or else that the *Type* and *Thing* typified (for *Substance*) existed together, which is absurd ! Besides if *Defensive War* be not in itself lawful, it is *Murder* ; and methinks its hard to imagine, that a *holy* and *merciful God*, shou'd make a *Type* of *Murder* !

Why should it be supposed, that *War* is any Part of the *ceremonial Law*, or *Law* peculiarly given to
the

the *Jews*, seeing it obtained before that Dispensation, as appears by *Abram's Battle* ?

But if it be for Argument sake suppos'd, will our *Author* say that it is lawful in any Case, to offer *Sacrifices* under the *Gospel* ? And where do we find that ever *Circumcision* was permitted to the *Gentiles* ?

4. He asserts in other Words, that the *moral Law* is imperfect ; he grants indeed that it is an unalterable *Rule* of our *Conduct*, as far as it reaches ; this insinuates that it doesn't reach far enough ; and this indeed he elsewhere signifies, p. 44. but adds to it (*i. e.* to the *moral Law*) Love your *Enemies*--- Now the aforesaid Assertion is contrary to the express Declaration of the holy Scriptures, *Psal.* xix. 7, 8. *The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the Soul.*

5. Our *Author* also insinuates, in the aforesaid Paragraph, that *Love to Enemies*, and not harbouring *Ill-will* or *Revenge* against any, are *Precepts* materially new, given by our *Saviour* when personally upon *Earth*, and inconsistent with *Defensive War*. To which

I reply, That these Duties were expressly commanded under the *Jewish Dispensation*, and therefore are not new *Precepts* (materially) See those famous Scriptures, *Prov.* xxv. 2. *If thine Enemy be hungry, give him Bread to eat ; and if he be thirsty, give him Water to drink : By Bread and Water, says Mr. Poole, he understands all Things necessary for his Subsistence ; and likewise Exod.* xxiii. 4. *If thou meet with thine Enemy's Ox or Ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again.* ' So far ' (saith *Mr. Poole* upon this Scripture) shalt thou ' be from revenging his *Injuries*, that thou shalt ' render *Good* to him for them.'

Now

Now seeing the *Almighty* commanded both *Love to Enemies* and *Defensive War* under the *Jewish Dispensation*, then either they can consist together, or God commanded inconsistent Things at the same Time; but seeing the latter is absurd, and conveys a *horrible Notion* of the *blessed God* as an *unreasonable Being*! the former must therefore be true.

Farther, let it be observed, that *Love to our Neighbours as ourselves*, was as expressly enjoined under the *Jewish Dispensation* as now: See *Levit. xix. 18. Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thy self, I am the Lord*; and therefore it is consistent with *Defensive War*, for that was at the same Time enjoined, or else the aforetaid absurd and terrible Consequence will follow, *viz.* That God commanded contrary Things at the same Time!

Moreover *Revenge* was as expressly forbid under the *Jewish Dispensation*, as under the *Gospel*; see *Lev. xix. 18. Thou shalt not avenge or bear any Grudge against the Children of thy People*; *Prov. xxiv. 28, 29. Be not a Witness against thy Neighbour, without Cause---Say not I will do to him as he hath done to me, I will render to the Man according to his Work.* Hence one of two Things necessarily follows; either that *private Revenge* is a Thing different from, and contrary to *Defensive War*, or that *Almighty God* both commanded and forbid the same Thing at the same Time; for while he forbid *Revenge*, he commanded *Defensive War*; the Absurdity of which every Eye may see!

MEER REVENGE, which proposes no *Aim* but the *Grief* or *Destruction* of him who hath hurt us, is contrary to the *Law of Nature*§, the moral *Law* of

§ The following Sentence, is a Rule of *Hesiod, Oper. et Dier. L. 1. V. 710.*

‘ But if th’ injurious Friend the Wrong repair,
And beg a Re-admission to thy Care,
Reject him not — — —’

of God and the Gospel of Christ ; inasmuch as it falls under the *Vice* of Cruelty, and is inconsistent with *Love*.

But the Case of the *Magistrate* in the *Execution* of *Criminals*, is quite different, as I observed in the S. p. 32. ‘ He loves them as *Fellow Creatures*, and ‘ *compassionates* their *Miseries* from a Principle of ‘ *Humanity* ; and yet in the mean Time he must ‘ put them to *Death*, not out of personal *Revenge*, ‘ but to promote *Justice* and the good *Ends* of *Go-* ‘ *vernment*. And thus it is in respect of *Self-de-* ‘ *fence* and *War*, the *Law* of *Nature* directs to fly ‘ thereto, as the last Remedy, of Necessity, S. p. ‘ 10. The Severities exercis’d thereby, should be ‘ only when the Case comes to *Extremity*, and our ‘ own *Safety* absolutely requires it, and only then ‘ as far as it does require it, and that with *Reluc-* ‘ *tance* and *Compassion*, S. p. 29.’ So that a *private* Desire of *Revenge*, is neither the *Principle* that animates *Defensive War*, nor the *Scope* to which it is directed ; but a just *Regard* to *God’s commanding Authority*, is the *Source* from which it springs, and the *Protection* of our own, as well as our dear *Relatives Persons* and *Properties*, from unjust *Violence*, is the *End* to which it tends, and in which it terminates !

So that *Execution* of *Justice* upon *Criminals* by the *Magistrate*, either after an ordinary *Course* of *Trial*, or by the extraordinary *Method* of *Defensive War*, is called *Revenge* only *improperly*, and in a large Sense ; because of the *Effect* thereof, which somewhat resembles it. But in the mean Time it differs as much in its *Principle* and *End*, from what is *strictly* and *properly* called *Revenge*, as *Light* from *Darkness*, and therefore can consist with *Love* : The due Consideration of these Things, wou’d

prevent our being imposed upon, by a meer Sound of harsh Words.

Our Author next proceeds to a Paragraph in the Sermon, p. 20. with which the 18 and 19 p. have a Connection, which seeing he has tho't proper, perhaps for prudential Reasons, to give but a brief Hint of, I will take the Liberty to cite more largely, as follows :

‘ And should not the *Magistrate* protect his
 ‘ *Subjects* from unjust *Violence*? Is not this the
 ‘ *Design* of their *Office*, that under them we may live
 ‘ quiet Lives, and that they may be to us a *Hiding-place*
 ‘ from the Wind, and a Covert from the Tempest of Op-
 ‘ pression! Why else is the *Sword* committed to them,
 ‘ and can they always protect us without *War*, with-
 ‘ out opposing Force to Force? No surely!

‘ Now unless the *Magistrate* punishes *Criminals* in
 ‘ his own *Community*, and screens his *Subjects* from a
 ‘ foreign Force, what is his *Office* but an empty Name,
 ‘ a meer *Cypher*, of no Moment and Consequence
 ‘ to *Society*? Nor is it reasonable he should expect
 ‘ Support, Honour and Obedience, from his *Subjects*,
 ‘ if they in Consequence hereof, do not obtain *Pro-*
 ‘ *tection* from him. In the mean Time it should be
 ‘ carefully observed, that the *Magistrate's Office*,
 ‘ and consequently the *Duties* of it, does not belong
 ‘ to the *political Laws* of the *Jews*, which were alterable,
 ‘ but to the *Moral*, which was invariable and per-
 ‘ petual. Surely by the Word PARENT in the Fifth
 ‘ COMMAND, we are not only to understand natu-
 ‘ ral, but political Parents; the MAGISTRATE is
 ‘ the FATHER of his COUNTRY by OFFICE, and
 ‘ then only indeed does he merit that honourable
 ‘ Character, and act up to it, when by forming
 ‘ and executing wholesome penal *Laws*, he suppres-
 ‘ ses *Injustice* among his *Children*, when by prudent
 ‘ and necessary Preparations, and when Necessity
 ‘ requires,

‘ requires, by vigorous and valiant *Efforts*, he guards
 ‘ them from a foreign *Enemy* !

‘ If the *Magistrate* may, and sometimes must use
 ‘ *Force* in suppressing *Tumults*, and punishing *De-*
 ‘ *linquents* in his own *Domains*, and among his pro-
 ‘ per *Subjects*, else all *Order* and *Government* must
 ‘ cease, and the wildest *Anarchy* enue ; why then
 ‘ may he not use *Force*, when easier *Methods* avail
 ‘ not, in protecting them from the *Insults* of o-
 ‘ thers ? May he according to the express *Word* of
 ‘ God, punish *his criminal Subjects* with *Death*, in
 ‘ some Cases, agreeable to that famous *Scripture*,
 ‘ *He that sheds Man’s Blood, by Man shall his Blood*
 ‘ *be shed* ; and shall he not inflict it upon others equal-
 ‘ ly guilty, especially when this becomes necessary
 ‘ to defend himself and his *Country* from *Desolation*
 ‘ and *Ruin* ? Can it be reasonably imagined, that
 ‘ a *Magistrate* should show greater *Love* and *Cle-*
 ‘ *mency* to *Foreigners* and *Strangers*, than to his
 ‘ own *Servs* and *Subjects*, to whom he is under pe-
 ‘ culiar *Obligations*, both natural and political ?

‘ Nor has our Lord *Jesus*, in the *New-Testa-*
 ‘ *ment*, disannul’d the *Magistrate’s Office*, which is
 ‘ so needful to *Society* ; No ! But on the contrary
 ‘ honoured and establish’d it, by his *Doctrine* and
 ‘ *Example* ; he enjoined his *Disciples*, *To give to*
 ‘ *Cæsar the Things that are Cæsar’s, to give*
 ‘ *Honour to whom Honour is due, and Tribute to*
 ‘ *whom Tribute ; to be subject to the higher Powers,*
 ‘ *and that for this Reason, because there is no Power*
 ‘ *but of God, and the Powers that be, are ordained*
 ‘ *of God ;* and he himself paid *Tribute*, yea rather
 ‘ than this important *Duty* should be neglected, he
 ‘ procured *Money* by a *Miracle*.’

Now let us hear how our *Author* answers to the
 aforesaid *Argument*, which I look upon to be the
 Chief that I have offered, upon which the whole

Cause very much rests ; his Answer is as follows
(V. p. 22, 23)

‘ Upon which I remark, that whenever the Magistrate is convinced that the Doctrines of Christ forbid War, it will be as much his Duty, as any other Man’s, to render Obedience to those Doctrines. However the People called Quakers, do not undertake to condemn their Superiors engaging in War, in the present unhappy State of human Affairs : We rather think it probable, that as they have shewn a noble and Christian Disposition, in granting Liberty and Protection to such as are of tender Consciences, it may please God to bless their Arms with Success, and reward them for their Kindness to his People, who desire to live in Obedience to the inward Appearance of his Spirit, which leads to Purity and Perfection : And agreeable to the Advice of the Apostle Paul, we find it our Duty, to put up Prayers for Kings, and them that are in Authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life, in all Godliness and Honesty, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2.’

To which I reply,

1. That if it be the Magistrate’s Duty, to render Obedience to the Doctrines that forbid War, when convinced, then he must either quit his Office, or bear the Sword, the Ensign of it, in vain ; for in this Way, the End of that Institution cannot be answered ; but the latter is absurd ; namely, to carry an empty Title, a Name without the Thing, and therefore the former must take Place ; and hence it follows, That if all Magistrates were convinced as aforesaid, they must all, wou’d they act with Decency and Consistency, quit their Places, and then there wou’d be no Government at all ! Doesn’t therefore this Doctrine of absolute Non-Resistance destroy Magistracy at a Stroke ? And thus this
Gentleman,

Gentleman, as usual, gives up his *Cause* in Effect !
But, *

2. Why doesn't our *Author* answer to my Argument from the *fifth Command*, in favour of the *Magistrate's Office*, which I signified in the *Sermon* shou'd be *carefully observed* ? Is it included or not, in that *Precept* ? Why doesn't our *Author* speak out his Mind plainly ? Is it the *Magistrate's Duty* to *protect* his *Subjects* or not ? If nay, then his *Office* is a meer *Bubble*, which only deserves to be laugh'd at ; if yea, then *Defensive War* is included in the *moral Law*, and consequently is lawful now ; unless it be suppos'd, that the *Gospel* opposes and destroys the *moral Law*, which as it is contrary to the express *Declaration* of Christ himself, elsewhere cited in this *Reply*, so it tends to tear up by the *Roots* all *Virtue* and *Religion*, at one dismal *Dash* !

If our *Author* had faulted any Part of the preceding *Train of Reasonings* about the *Magistracy*, he should have declared it ; but seeing he has not, his Silence gives Consent to the whole, which therefore concludes to the *Overthrow* of his *Cause* !

3. Our *Author* informs us, ' *That the People called Quakers, do not undertake to condemn their Superiors engaging in War, in the present unhappy State of human Affairs.*'

Well, if they don't condemn them, they justify them ; for there is no *Medium*, unless the Mind be in Suspence and undetermin'd on which Side of the Question *Truth* and *Duty* lies ; and if they justify their *Superiors* engaging in *War*, they cannot consistently condemn *Inferiors* that war under them, seeing that *Princes* cannot war without *Soldiers*. But our *Author* proceeds to inform us,

2. That the *Quakers* hope for *God's Blessing upon the Arms of their Superiors* ; ' *We rather think it probable, that as they have shewn a noble and*
' *Christian*

‘ *Christian Disposition, in granting Liberty and Protection to such as are of tender Consciences, it may please GOD to BLESS their ARMS with SUCCESS.*’ Now surely if they believed all *War* was unlawful, they wou’dn’t, one wou’d think, expect God’s Blessing upon it. They justly commend the *Liberty* granted by the *Government* to *tender Consciences*, I join with them with all my Heart, and bless God for it, and pray that it wou’d please that Sovereign Majesty, by whom *Kings* reign, and *Princes* decree *Justice*, to continue it to the latest Generations, even while Sun and Moon endure ! I cannot but look upon *Liberty of Conscience*, and *Protection* therein, in Matters of a *religious Nature*, to be the unalienable *Right* of all *Mankind*, and the peculiar *Glory* of the present *Reign* !
But,

3. The People called *Quakers* (as our Author informs us) *pray* for the *Blessing* aforesaid, for having before in the same Paragraph signified their not condemning of their *Superiors* engaging in *War*, and having expressed their *Hopes* of a divine *Blessing* upon their *Arms*, he tells us they crown all with their *Prayers* for *such* as are in *Authority*, and that for this *Purpose*, that *they may live a quiet and peaceable Life* ; *i. e.* That by the Exercise of their Sovereign’s Authority in Arms, accompanied with the Blessing of God, the Enemies of our Peace may be repress’d, and our Quiet restored upon a firm and honourable Basis ; this I take to be the true Sense of the Paragraph in its *Connection*, without the least *Strain*.

This is wholesome Doctrine indeed, with which I cordially concur, and am glad to have such a *Testimony* in favour of the late excellent ASSOCIATION ; in the mean Time allow me to propose the following Queries ; namely,

Query 1.

Query 1. If this be the *Quaker's* Sentiments, do they not firmly hold the Lawfulness of *Defensive War* under the *Gospel*?

Query 2. Then how comes our *Author*, who appears under the *Character* of their *Apologist* (before an *Attack*) to contradict them so much in his present Performance? In his Preface he declares, that *War* is *absolutely forbid* by the *Doctrines* of *Christ*; 'I thought, says he, the *Sermon* was to prove that agreeable to the *Doctrines* of *Christ*, which is *absolutely forbid* thereby.' Now, what was the *Scheme* of the *Sermon* to prove but *Defensive War*? The *Title* and whole *Frame* of it shew this. And *V. p. 23.* he calls it an *Evil*, an *Apostacy* from the *Life* and *Spirit* of *Christ*, a forsaking of the *Simplicity* of the *Gospel*; his Words are these; 'Thus the *Simplicity* of the *Gospel* being forsok for worldly *Pomp* and *Power*, instead of the loving and forgiving *Temper*, which it enjoined, it was misconstrued to allow of *Violence* and *Oppression* in this *Apostacy* from the *Life* and *Spirit* of *Christ*; many *Evils* which the primitive *Christians* were redeemed from, come to be reckoned necessary and expedient; and, speaking of the primitive *Friends*, he says, they were convinced by the *Spirit* of the *Sinfulness* of *War*.'

Yea, so great is the *Evil* supposed to be, that our *Author* informs us, *Vind. p. 3.* That such who hold it *doctrinally*, are to be excluded from *Church Fellowship*; 'And they esteem it, saith he, their *Duty* to testify, that such are not in *Unity* with them, who, making *Profession* of this inward *Principle*, manifest a *Conduct* contrary to it.' If so,

Query 3. How can he or they forbear condemning so great a *Wickedness*, as he represents *War* of all *Kinds* to be, if they are of the same *Opinion* with him? And much more, how can a *Blessing* from

from *God* be expected upon what is supposed to be an *abominable Iniquity*, and that *Blessing prayed for*? I profess, it surpasses the Reach of my Understanding, to reconcile these Things together!

Query 4. Is there no Appearance (at least) of great *Uncharitableness* in the aforelaid Paragraph, in confining Persons of *tender Consciences*, and *true Christianity*, to the narrow Pale of the *Quaker Society*, or peculiar Principles? *To his People, who desire to live in Obedience to the inward Appearance of his Spirit, which leads to Purity and Perfection?* Now, who can we understand by those Terms agreeable to our Author's *Vind.* but such as are for immediate *Inspiration*, and against *Defensive War*? Isn't Gratitude expressed for *Liberty* granted to those, and to no others; and a *Hope of Success* upon our *Sovereign's Arms*, grounded alone upon that *Foundation*? Isn't this strange and hard to account for?

But, blessed be *God*, whatever our Author may imagine to the contrary, *Christ's Sheep* are not cooped up in one *Fold*, but scattered in many; we have Reason to rejoice that the Lord is to be our Judge, and not short sighted Creatures.

Here I would beg Leave to transcribe the Sentiment of the learned *Grotius* upon that famous *Scripture* cited by our *Author*, 1 Tim. ii. 1, 2, 3. *I exhort therefore, that first of all Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions, be made for all Men; for Kings, and all in Authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable Life in all Godliness and Honesty. For this is GOOD AND ACCEPTABLE IN THE SIGHT OF GOD OUR SAVIOUR.* Hence, saith *Grotius*, 'We are taught
' three Things; 1. That it is pleasing to God that
' *Kings* should become *Christians*. 2. That being
' converted to *Christianity* they still continue *Kings*;
' which *Justin Martyr* thus expressed, We pray that
' *Kings and Princes* may, together with their royal
' Power

Power, be found to have wise and reasonable Sentiments †. And in the Book intituled, The Constitutions of *Clement*, the Church prays, *Christiana ta tele*, for Christian Magistrates. And 3. That it is acceptable to God that Christian *Kings* should contribute their utmost to the *Quiet* of others. But how he explains this in another Place, *Rom. xiii.* 4. *He is the Minister of God to thee for Good; if thou do Ill, be afraid, for he beareth not the Sword in vain; for he is God's Minister, an Avenger to execute Wrath upon them that do Evil. Under the Right of the Sword is figuratively comprehended every sort of Punishment*.*

The next Particular taken notice of by my Opponent, Mr. S. is what I have said upon the Counsel of *John the Baptist* to the Soldiers, S. p. 20. the Force of which he endeavours to evade by three Exceptions. 1. He says, 'They were *Roman Soldiers.*' Answer, What then? Should not they be told their Duty for that Reason? 2. 'If abstaining from War be the *Perfection* of the *Christian Religion* (says Mr. S. V. p. 23) that is a Point the most difficult to be learnt, is it likely or reasonable to expect that *John*, upon the Pagan Soldiers first Application; should declare that to them?'

Answer, Here our *Author*, as usual, begs the *Question* in *Dispute*. I deny abstaining from War totally to be any *Point* of *Christianity* at all; it is so far from a *Perfection* in it.

3. Mr. S. tells us what he would do. Answer, What is that to the Purpose? It is what he should do we enquire after, and not the other. If he would not reprove Men for what he reckons sinful, who can help that? Farther, he enquires, towards the Close of his Paragraph, p. 24. Can War subsist
L without

† *Apol. 1. p. 32. Edit. Oxon.*

* A Translation with *Barbeirack's* Notes, p. 32.

without Violence? Answer, Yes, without private Violence or Ravages. The *Roman* Laws, tho' they allowed *Soldiers* to take Prey from Enemies, yet did not permit the least Injury to Friends †.

If these Words, *do Violence to no Man*, be considered in a consistent View with the other Part of the Advice, *to be content with their Wages*, it can reasonably be supposed to mean no more, than to abstain from *private Plunders* and *Ravages*, an *Evil* which *Soldiers* are at Times under strong Temptations to!

Or that they should beware of engaging in an *unjust War*, or of exercising Inhumanity and Cruelty towards those they conquered by a just One, seeing his advising them to be content with their Wages, is a tacite Approbation of that Work for which they received them.

The Abuses of War by some can be no just Argument against the regular Use of it. It is true, it is attended with distressing Circumstances; but it is as true, that the utter Rejection of it, and being intirely *passive* under the *Rage* and *Ravages* of abandoned *Barditti*, is much more so; and indeed this makes us *criminal*, as well as *miserable*!

Our *Author* next attacks my Argument from the Instance of the *Centurion*, S. p. 21. This he endeavours to confute, V. p. 24, 25. The Grounds upon which he builds are two, *viz.*

1. His usual *begging* of the *Question* in *Controversy*, which makes it for granted, that the Denial of every Sort of War is a Point of *Perfection* in *Christianity*, which I absolutely deny; and upon this *Foundation*, which he has offered no Arguments in his whole *Performance* to establish, he proceeds farther to observe, that our Lord knew the best Method to deal with,

† *Vid. Annot. Bez. & Calv. in Loc.*

with frail Mortals, was to lead them by Degrees to *Perfection*.

Answer ; This is not applicable to his *Argument*, unless he had first proved, that the rejecting of *Defensive War* was a *Point of Perfection*.

2. He labours to divert the Force of my *Argument*, by observing, that if the *Sermon-writer* could have proved, that after this *Miracle*, which our Lord wrought, that if the *Centurion* had retained his *military Employ*, there would have been some *Foundation* for my *Argument*.

I reply, it is a *Mistake* ; an *Argument of Right* is vastly better than from *Fact*, in fallible, imperfect *Creatures* : I enquired what was his *Duty* to do, and not what he did ; it is not by the *Examples of Men*, but by the *Laws of God*, that we should regulate our *Conduct* !

Besides, seeing our *Author's Opinion* supposes the *Repeal* of an established *Practice*, it is his *Business* to shew, that the *Centurion* did not retain his *military Office* : We do not find that *Christ* said a *Word* against his *Continuance* in it ; No ! but on the contrary, he elsewhere *commands to render to Cesar the Things that are Cesar's* ; among which was the *TRIBUTE MONEY*, wherewith the *SOLDIERS* were *SUPPORTED*. Now, if this had been simply unlawful, would *CHRIST* have enjoined it for that *End*, without *Reproof*, yea, and paid the *Tribute Himself* ? Doesn't *CHRIST'S PRECEPTS and PRACTICE*, respecting the *TRIBUTE MONEY*, plainly imply his *Approbation* of a just or *Defensive War* ?

My *Argument* is not drawn from the *Centurion's* not laying down his *Office*, but from *Christ's* not enjoining him so to do.

The next *Argument* in the *Sermon* that *Mr. S.* is pleased to animadvert upon, is that from *Job's* xviii. 36. *My Kingdom is not of this World, else would*

would my Servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews, S. p. 22.

Our Author, to compass his End, cites Mr. Peole's Annotations on the Place; which, tho' they shew that it was not the Duty of Christ's Disciples to fight for his Protection, in his present extraordinary Situation, or to promote his spiritual Kingdom; yet they confirm the Point I had in View in my Argument in these Words, viz. 'For was there ever an earthly Prince apprehended and bound, for whom none of his Servants would take up Arms?'

But Mr. S. desires me to consider, whether Christ's directing us to pray, *That his Will may be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven, does not much more clearly express an Injunction to live in Love and Peace?* I answer, *Defensive War* is consistent with Love, as I have before shewn; if not, what becomes of the Magistrate? See this Matter opened in the Sermon, p. 31, 32. which it seems our Author thought it prudent to pass over in Silence;--and is it not the Design of *Defensive War* to procure Peace by Constraint? Moreover, the Angels in Heaven are Warriors, as appears from the preceding Sermons!

Religion is one Thing, and human Society is another; the former is spiritual, the latter temporal; and therefore spiritual Weapons are suited in Nature and Kind to the one, and temporal to the other: How unreasonable is it therefore to suppose, that because Christ's Reign in the Soul, which is a spiritual Thing, cannot be promoted or maintained by temporal Means (directly or immediately) that therefore a temporal Kingdom cannot, or should not be promoted, or preserved by them, under God, which are of the same Kind with it, and suited to it! This is just, in other Words, to say, Because that unsuitable Means will not answer the End, therefore suitable

able will not ! According to the aforesaid plain *Concession* of our Lord, the *Subjects* of a *temporal King* may, and ought to fight, in the Defence of their *King*, their *Country*, and *civil Privileges* ; and that for this *Reason*, because that *Mean* is suited to the *End*.

But to open this Matter a little more, let it be observed, that there are two notable *Societies* among Men, namely, *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical* ; which, tho' they appear mixed and confus'd, because the same Persons are frequently Members of both, are notwithstanding distinct and different from each other ; they tend to different *Ends* by different *Means*, and have respectively different *Kinds* of *Power*. The *End* of ecclesiastical or religious *Society*, is everlasting *Happiness* ; but the *End* of civil *Society*, is the Peace and Safety of the *State* : These *Ends* being very different, it is no Wonder if the *Means* conducing to them be so likewise. To eternal *Happiness* none can come, except by an unconstrained and sincere Obedience to the divine Precepts, issuing from Faith and Love, which it is the great Business of *Religion* to promote : But, on the other hand, it is no Matter to the *State*, whether its *Laws* are obey'd *freely* or not ; if they be but *obey'd* outwardly, it is enough ; this *Obedience* it is their proper *Business* to procure, which may be effected by the *Fear* of *Punishment* and *Death*. In short, the *Power* of the *State* extends to Mens *Bodies*, but that of the *Church* respects the *Soul* : The former may, and therefore ought to be compelled to *Obedience*, thro' a Dread of *Punishment* and *Death* ; but the latter cannot be forced by outward *Violence* ; and therefore the *Church* can have no *Power* over it, nor reclaim Delinquents any other Way, but by *Reproof*, *Counsel*, *Entreaty*, and in case of persevering *Obstinacy*, declare them unworthy of their *Communion*. The *Laws*
of

of civil *Society* respect the *Peace* and *Good* of the *Commonwealth*; but the *Canons* of Churches are designed to promote and preserve *Purity* of *Doctrine*, and *Piety* of *Discipline*. From these *Principles* it easily and clearly follows, that the *Power* of the *Church* is only spiritual, and the *Power* of the *State* only temporal.

Now our Lord *Jesus* by the Text aforesaid, plainly informs us, that he came not into the World to exercise the *Power* and *Dominion* of a temporal *Prince*; *Augustine* upon this Scripture speaketh thus, ‘Hear ye *Jews* and *Gentiles*, hear ye earthly *Kingsdoms*, I hinder not your *Domination* or civil Rule ‘in this World†.’ Our Lord did not only by *Words*, but by *Deeds* declare, that he came not to assume a civil *Authority* over temporal Things, particularly by his *Flight*, lest he should be chose a *King* by the *Jews*, and also by his refusing to exercise the *Office* of a civil *Judge* upon their temporal Affairs; when he was entreated to divide an *Inheritance*, he reply’d, *Man, Who made me a Judge or Divider over you?* As if he had said, Go to those to whom that *Power* is committed; hence *Ambrose*, upon this Place, saith, ‘He justly declin’d intermeddling in their temporal Affairs, who only descended ‘to promote heavenly, nor did he think it proper ‘to commence a *Judge* of their *Debates*||.’

But I hasten to the next *Argument* (or rather *Illustration* of what has been reason’d upon before) which Mr. S. takes Notice of, viz. that of *Cornelius*, *Acts* x. S. p. 23.

Upon

† *Audite ergo Judæi et Gentes---Audite omnia regna terrena; non impedio dominationem vestram in hoc mundo.* Tract. 15. in *Joannem*.

|| *Bene inquit, terrena declinat, qui propter cœlestia tantum descenderet, nec dignatur esse judex litium et arbiter facultatum,* Vid. *Ambrose* in *Loc.*

Upon which he asks this *Question*, ‘ Is *Cornelius* commended for his *military Office* ?

Answer, No ! I offered no such Argument, and therefore his Query is impertinent, but seems artful, and calculated to turn my *Argument* out of its proper *Channel*.

He observes that *Cornelius* had the *Character* of a *devout Man*---before he was instructed in the *Principles* of the *Christian Religion*.

Answer, It is true, he had the aforesaid *Character*, before he conversed with the Apostle *Peter* ; but it is probable he was a *Profelyte* of the *Jewish Religion* (of the Gate) and believed in a *Messias* to come:

Whether he continued in his *Office* or not, is of little Consequence to this Argument, because that is a Matter of *Fact* of an imperfect Creature ; but it is concerning *Right* we are to enquire, namely, whether he cou’d, consistent with *Christianity*, continue in that *Office* ! If his *Office* was *sinful*, it was *Peter’s Duty* to instruct him better, and more especially, seeing he came to visit him upon that Design ; but not a Word of this, tho’ that Apostle was free enough to speak his Mind upon other Occasions.

Farther, Mr. *Smith* signifies his Dislike of my *Interpretation* of these Words of the Apostle *Paul*, *If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all Men*, S. p. 23. and gives one himself, which has this unhappy *Defect* attending it, namely, a begging of the *Question* in *Debate*, as usual with him in this Controversy, V. p. 27. for in it are these Words, ‘ Tho’ some make *War* upon you, or try ‘ to disturb you, yet let *nothing appear on your Side*, ‘ but a *meeke and quiet Spirit* ;’ i. e. No Defence by Action, nothing but absolute *passive Obedience*, and *Non-resistance*.

Besides, Mr. *Poole's Gloss*, cited by our *Author*, upon that sacred Sentence of the Apostle, of, *Overcoming Evil with Good*, respects private Revenge, and is impertinent to the *Point* under *Debate*; there is a sweet Consistency between the Prohibition of *private Revenge*, and the Execution of *publick* by the *Magistrate*, as appears from the *Sermon*, p. 30. where Mr. *Poole's Words*, cited under the *Margin*, prove the *Harmony*.

Now it is something strange to me, I confess, that our *Author* having had a View of those Words, which fairly and easily solve the *Difficulty* he starts, shou'd not only pass them over in intire Silence and Neglect, but introduce the Annotations of the same worthy and consistent *Gentleman*, in another Place, in such a Way, as seems to contradict himself, at least in the Eye of the unwary and unskilful *Reader*; and so use him as a *Tool* to promote a *Cause* he oppos'd! Whether this *Method* of proceeding is a good *Specimen* of his own Candour, or the Goodness of his *Cause*, I leave to the Determination of others; but for my own Part, I hope the best of his *Design*, and ascribe this odd *Method* of managing *Controversy*, either to Oversight, or the Difficulty of supporting the *Cause* he is so zealous for, or both together.

To what has been said, allow me to add, that unless the Words of the Apostle aforesaid, *If it be possible*, do not suppose that it is sometimes *impossible* to live peaceably with Men, as the *Sermon* observes, the Expression seems to be improper; there is a needless *Supposition*, without a Foundation to support it, altho' the Experience of all Ages, gives a *doleful Suffrage* to the Truth of the *Matter of Fact*, that there is too much *Foundation* for such a *Supposition*.

The next Particular that Mr. S. censures, is the Argument from *Heb. xi. 32,--34.* mentioned S. p. 23, 24. the Substance of which is, that the Apostle gives an honourable *Encomium* of the *Prowess* and *Exploits* of divers ancient *Heroes*, compassed by a *Gospel-Faith*, without the least Hint of an Alteration in *Gospel-Times*; hence it is concluded to be improbable, that he himself shou'd be of a contrary *Sentiment*, especially considering, that he virtually and consequentially signified his *Approbation* of *War* by his *Practice* in not rejecting the *Protection* of an *armed Force*.

Our *Author* answers in the following Manner, V. p. 28, 29. 'But where is the Difficulty? Does not the Apostle in the same Chapter commend the *Faith* of *Abram* in leaving his own Country, and offering up his only Son *Isaac* at the *Command* of God? Now will, or can this be construed to infer, that because *Abram* did these Things at the divine Command, and the Apostle don't give the least Hint of any Alteration in *Gospel Times*, in that Respect, that therefore a Christian may follow that Example without such Command? And yet this Consequence is as fair, as to infer, that because *Gideon*, &c. did go to War at the Command of God---that therefore Christians may follow their Example without such *Command*.

'The Reader will not find that *Paul* did so much as make any *Application* for the *Protection* of an *armed Force*, tho' he knew there was a *Conspiracy* form'd for the taking away his *Life*; he only took the necessary Steps to inform the *Chief Captain* (in whose Custody he was) of that *Design*.'

Our *Author* adds, 'That *Paul* being a *Prisoner*, it would not be reasonable or prudent for him, supposing his Judgment had been clear against the Lawfulness of *War* for Christians, to refuse being

'conducted by the Soldiers, whither their Superior had ordered them to take him.'

To which I reply, that there are the following *Errata* in the aforesaid *Answer*, which render it inconclusive, viz.

1. Our *Author* passes over in deep *Silence*, the aforesaid *Worthies* compassing their *Victories* by a *Gospel Faith*, upon which I laid the greatest *Stress* of the Argument, and from it reason'd thus, 'Now can it be that that War shou'd be agreeable to, and encourag'd by *Faith* in the *Messias*, that grand *Peculiar*, and *Foundation* of the *Gospel*, and yet be contrary to it? This *Omission* of our *Author*, seems to be more *cautious* than *candid*.

2. He represents *Defensive War*, against the unjust *Encroachments* of an *Enemy*, and a *Parent's* killing an *only Child*, when done without immediate *Revelation* or *Command*, as of a *parallel Nature*, which is shocking indeed! Is *Defensive War* then as contrary to the *Law of Nature* and the *moral Law*, as a *Parent's* killing of an *only Child*, when done without immediate *Command* and *Revelation*? If the Case be so, then being the far greater Part of the World are for *Justice War*, and pretend to no immediate *Revelation*, they are of Consequence look'd upon by our *Author*, as a Set of *heinous Murderers*, which is no great *Expression* of *Charity*!

Was not God's *Command* to *Abraham* very extraordinary, and only for *Trial*, without *Design* of its being executed, and was this the Case of *Abraham* and the *Jews* in their Wars? The Consequence is therefore unjust, of the Necessity of an immediate *Command*, or new *Revelation*, for what is in itself *morally good*. If there must be a new *Revelation* for every *Battle*, there must be the same also by a *Parity of Reason*, every Time before the

Ma-

Magistrate kills a Criminal, for the *Object* of his *Faith* must be *Deus loquens* ; and what then must become of all *publick Justice* and *Government* ? Must every *Magistrate* be inspir'd ?

3. Our *Author* shews some *Art* in separating what I said of *Paul's* not refusing the *Protection* of an *armed Force*, from the preceding *Argument*, which it was join'd with in the same *Paragraph*, in order to support it ; but in the mean *Time*, he is so unhappy as to contradict himself ; for while he declares that *Paul* did not so much as make ANY APPLICATION for the *Protection* of an ARMED FORCE ; yet he acknowledges, that he took the NECESSARY STEPS TO INFORM THE CHIEF CAPTAIN OF THAT DESIGN, not doubting but he would have so much JUSTICE, as to prevent such a PRIVATE MURDER. But how as a *Captain*, but by Force ? Our *Author* here acknowledges all that I intended by my *Argument* ; I would therefore proceed to new *Matter*.

And that which comes first to be considered, is our *Author's* *Remarks* upon what I have said upon *James* iv. 1. *S. p. 25. viz.* ' That the *Apostle James* does not say, that *War* is ever unjust and sinful upon both Sides, or unnecessary in *Man's* fallen State, but that the original Cause of *War* is Evil, because it is always unjust upon one Side !

Upon which *Mr. S.* proposes the following *Query*, namely, ' Can a *true Christian* then, who hath known *the Axe* laid to the *Root of the Tree*, i. e. the *Spirit of God* giving him *Victory* over *Lust*, join with, countenance, or encourage that which hath *Lust* for its *Original* ?

Ans. Not with *Offensive War*, which doubtless rises from that fatal Source, No ! by no Means ! but ought to oppose it in *Words* and *Works* ; not

only with the *Tongue* and *Pen*, but even with the *Sword*, when *Necessity* requires.

I join with the *Gentleman* my *Opponent* with all my *Heart*, in his just *Refriment* against *Offensive War*, and cou'd wish he might have *Freedom*, to carry it to a higher *Pitch*, and prove it by *Action*, in joining with the late excellent *ASSOCIATION*, for the *suppression* of that *awful Evil*, which *Words* and *Writings* fail to express the *Perverseness* of !

But I think it is a *Pity* that our *Author*, for want of distinguishing *Offensive* from *Defensive War*, in the preceding *Paragraph*, has unhappily condemned the *Innocent* with the *Guilty* ! for he represents all *War* in the *Complex* as *Darkness*, and the *Power of Satan*, which I humbly conceive our *Author* will never be able to prove, till he can prove two *Contraries* to be the *same*, which is impossible in the *Nature* of *Things* ! And as a *Consequence* of the aforesaid *Confusion of Sentiment*, he is exceeding *uncharitable* in his *Opinion* of all the *World*, a *Handful* excepted (which they may be comparatively call'd) who are for absolute *Passive-Obedience* and *Non-Resistance* ; all the rest besides them, our *Author* judges to be ' No true *Christians*, and not to ' have had the *Aw Laid to the Root of the Tree* ;' this is lamentable ! and doesn't shew such a *Degree* of *Familiarity* or *Love* as could be wish'd, tho' I trust he means well !

Give me leave to add to what has been said, that the aforesaid *Place* of *Scripture*, plainly and only refers to the *Original* of *Offensive War*, which doubtless is the *ungovernable Lusts* of wicked Men ; such as *Ambition* and *Avarice*, as the *Apostle* explains in the following *Verse*, these make Men dissatisfied with their own *Possessions*, and dispose them unjustly to invade others, which is quite foreign to the *Point* in *Dispute* ; that is, the *Defence*
of

of our *Lives* and *Properties* from the aforeſaid *unjuſt Violence*, and differs as much from the other, as *Juſtice* from *Injuſtice*, and therefore I ſee not how the *Oppoſers* of *Defenſive War*, will ever be able fairly to carry their Point, until they ſolidly prove, that *Juſtice*, and *regular Self-love*, are evil and wicked; which, if I am not much miſtaken, is a *Herculian Labour*!

The aforeſaid Paſſage of the *Apoſtle James*, is ſo far from being a new *Revelation*, materially, that it is no other than what divers judicious *Pagans* diſcover'd by the *Dint* of *Nature's Light*. E. G.

Cicero ſays, 'Diſorderly Paſſions give Birth to Hatred, Diſſentions, Diſcord, Seditions and Wars.' *De Finib. Bon. et Mal. Lib. 1. Cap. 13.*

Claudian ſays, 'If Men wou'd be content with the little Nature requires, we ſhou'd not hear the Sound of Trumpet, nor be expoſed to Sieges.' *In Ruf. in Lib. 1. V. 206.*

Maximus Tyrius obſerves, 'All Places are now full of War and Injuſtice; for irregular Paſſions are every where let looſe, and inſpire all Mankind with a Deſire of adding to their Poſſeſſions.' *Differt. 13. p. 142.*

Plutarch ſays, 'There is no War among Men, but what ariſes from Vice; one from the Deſire of Pleaſures, another from Covetouſneſs, and a Third from Ambition.' *Page 1049. Vol. 2. Edit. Wech.*

The Saying of *Tibullus*, is agreeable hereto, *viz.* 'That Gold is the Cauſe of ſo many Quarrels: There were no Wars (ſaith he) whiſt People drank out of wooden Gobblots.

'*Divitis hoc vitium eſt auri; nec bella fuerunt faginus adſtabat quum ſcyphus ante dapes.*'

Now to conclude that thoſe Men were againſt *Defenſive War*, becauſe of the aforeſaid Speeches,

is unreasonable, and contrary to Matter of Fact, and why is it not to be deemed so in the other case?

In the next Place, our *Author* endeavours to enervate my Answer, to an Objection that might be formed, from these Words of the *Apostle*, 2 Cor. x. 4. *That the Weapons of our Warfare are not carnal*, S. p. 25, 26.

Which our *Author*, in his *Reply*, V. p. 30. signifies, if it be interpreted to mean no more than what I have said in the Sermon (to which, for the sake of *Brevity*, I refer the *Reader*) is not doing Justice to the *Text*, but rather charging it with an Absurdity! because the *Apostle* in the preceding Verse had told them, *For tho' we walk in the Flesh, we do not war after the Flesh*; from whence he infers, that they did not use *carnal Weapons* at all.

I answer, the Consequence is unjust, and not bottomed on the Words he cites. The *Apostle* doesn't say that they didn't *war in the Flesh*, but only, that they *didn't war after the Flesh*; i. e. for *fleshy* or wicked *Ends*, from *fleshy* or wicked *Principles*, and in a *fleshy* or wicked *Way*, as the Word *Flesh* is sometimes taken in a good Sense in Scripture; and hence *all Flesh is said to be Grass*; so sometimes in a bad; and thus he that is said *to be born of the Flesh, is Flesh*. Mr. *Poole* in his Annotations upon the Place, favours the Sense I have given; his Words are these; 'Tho' our Souls are in a State of
' Union to our *Bodies*, yet we war not after the
' *Flesh*, neither as *fleshy Men*, or in a *fleshy Man-*
' *ner*, nor yet for *fleshy Ends*; the Men of the
' *World* war for their Honour and Glory, or for
' *Revenge* and Satisfaction of their Lusts, or for the
' *Enlargement* of their Territories and Dominions;
' but we do not thus;' No! that is a wicked, *offensive War*, which our *Author* does well to oppose:
Does the aforesaid *Text* speak any thing against a
lawful

lawful War? No! only directs us how to conduct all Actions to the divine Acceptance; and therefore our Author's Charge of Absurdity wants a Foundation! But not perceiving this himself,

Our Author proceeds to confute a Paragraph in the Sermon, p. 25, 26. which signifies, that it is presumptuous to expect an *End* without the Use of *Means* suited to it; 'To expect a *Crop* by the *Dint* of our *Supplications*, without *plowing*; or *Defence* from unreasonable Men, without using proper *Means* for *Defence*, are equally unreasonable.'

Mr. S. offers several Things to overfet the afore-said Paragraph, the Force of which I shall as briefly as possible examine. And,

1. He observes, V. p. 31. 'That the *Means* which the *Gospel* allows for maintaining and keeping of *Peace*, are, in the first and chiefest Place, the Practice of Christian *Virtues*.' Very true, they are excellent in Nature and Tendency, and it were to be wished that they prevailed more in the *World* than they do; *offensive War* is not like to come from that Quarter, where they have the Ascendant!

But does our *Author* think, that when a *Man's Ways please the Lord*, that he will *always* make his *Enemies* to be at peace with him? If so, then what shall we think of *Christ* and his *Apostles*? And what of these Sayings of *Jesus*? That his *Disciples* must bear his *Cross*, and be hated of all *Men* for his *Name's* sake, and that the *World* shall hate them, because they are not of it.

As to any good Understanding that has subsisted between this *Province* and any *Pagan Nations*, it is to be acknowledged with all Thankfulness, as a great and undeserved *Mercy* of *God*! yet I cannot think that it is any certain *Argument* of the superior *Piety* of the first *Planters* (tho' I have no Inclination or
Intention

Intention to reflect upon them, being unacquainted with their *Character*) and my Reason is this, because the wise Man observes, *That we cannot know either Love or Hatred, by all that is before us ; and there is one Event to the Righteous, and to the Wicked.*

This is a State of *Trial*, and not of *Rewards* ; and hence it is that *Events* are promiscuous, and being such, there can be no certain Conclusion drawn rationally from them, concerning the States of Men.

But supposing the superior *Piety* of the first *Settlers* of this *Province*, and their good *Understanding* and *Harmony* with *numerous warlike Nations* ; yet neither of these Particulars singly, nor both complexly, will prove that they were right in all their religious *Sentiments*, because a gracious God, when the Intention is sincere, may, and does sometimes overlook and forgive *Mistakes in Principle*, about Things not essential to *Religion*, as well as *Failures in Practice*, naturally consequent thereupon, and vouchsafes his favourable *Smiles*, notwithstanding ; which is indeed a great Argument of his *Goodness* and *Condescension*, and of the *Riches* and *Glory* of his *Grace*, but no certain *Evidence* of the *Justness* of the *Sentiments*, or *Regularity* in the Practices of Men of any Denomination in this or that Instance.

In the mean time, I am credibly informed, that the good Understanding which this Province has had, &c. has been only with the *Five Nations*, with which the other *American Colonies* have had Peace likewise ; so that there is nothing extraordinary in the Matter.

Not to say that the aforesaid good Understanding has been doubtless maintained by the Use of outward Means, such as *Treaties*, and repeated Donations : But now I am told that the *State* of our Affairs with some of the *Indian Tribes* is *dark* and *dubious*,

bions, which should alarm the Inhabitants of this Province, to prepare for their *Defence* against such *savage Enemies*, whose *Barbarities* in *War* are too shocking to relate !

But tho' the Practice of *Humility*, *Meekness*, *Beneficence*, &c. are very good to continue *Peace* where it is ; what shall be done to procure it where it is lost, if *Defensive War* be denied ? Must we tamely deliver up our *Lives* and *Properties* to the *Lusts* of Men, without Controul ? No ! our *Author* seems to acknowledge the contrary, by saying,

2. ' And the Trust reposed in the *civil Power*,
' for the *Punishment* of *Evil-doers*, &c. faithfully
' discharged, we should be so blessed and favoured
' with the peculiar Care of *Heaven*, that no violent
' Men should be permitted to make a Prey of us ;'
This is sound Doctrine indeed ; but pray how can the *Trust* reposed in the *civil Power* be *faithfully discharged*, without preparing for *Defence* against an *Enemy*, and actually wielding the *Sword* for that Purpose, when there is Occasion ? Without these, to talk of the *civil Power's* *discharging its Trust faithfully*, is, in my Opinion, unintelligible *Jargon* and *Gibberish* ; and if these Things be allowed, our *Author* gives up his Cause. But,

3. Our *Author* thinks, that to expect a *Crop* by the *Dint* of our *Supplications*, and to expect *Protection* on account of our *Piety* and *Prayers*, are not similar Cases. Why so ? 1. Because that the *Means* to procure a *Crop*, are necessary, *innocent* and *useful* to the *Creation*, but *War* is ruinous and destructive to it. *Answer*, Very true ; *offensive War* is so ; and therefore *defensive* being its contrary, is excellent and necessary to preserve the *Creation* from *Ruin* !

2. Some have learnt of their Lord not to fight, *V. p. 32.* *Answer*, We have no sufficient Ground to believe a Claim to immediate *Revelation* in any, ex-

cept they prove it by *miraculous Works* ; and when this supposed *Revelation* enjoins any Thing in itself unreasonable, and opposes any *moral Duty*, which I think I have proved *Self-defence* to be, we have good Ground to believe it is a *Mistake* ; for the Almighty is consistent with himself in all his *Precepts* : And indeed such a dangerous *Mistake* should warn, and invite us to keep close to the *Law* and the *Testimony*, to *the surer Word of Prophecy*, as well as to value highly, and use humbly, in Subordination thereto, that *Reason* which *God* hath graciously given us, lest we fall into many more.

But our *Author* proceeds to enquire, *V. p. 33.*
 ‘ Is it not more consistent with the *Duty* of a *Minister* of the Meek, Self-denying *Jesus*, to recommend
 ‘ *Piety* and *Prayers*, as the only acceptable *Means* necessary to obtain the *Protection* of *Heaven* ?’

I answer in the Negative, No ! a *Minister* of *Jesus* should tell the Truth, and *deliver the whole Council of God*. A *Watchman*, when he sees the *Sword* coming upon a *Land*, should blow the *Trumpet*, and warn the *People*, otherwise their *Blood* will be required at his *Hand* !

Mr. *S.* proceeds next to consider what I have said upon the Prophecy of *Isaiab*, ii. 4. upon which he spends several Pages, *V. 33, 34, 35, 36, 37.* He censures my Interpretation of the Prophecy, and thinks it was designed to signify an utter Exclusion of all *War* of every Kind ; and therefore concludes it sinful for pious People to be concerned in *War* at all ; this I take to be the Substance of what he has said. I have in the Sermon asserted, that the *Gospel* inclines all that receive it in Truth, to live as much as is possible in Peace with all Men : That it is attended with an *internal Peace*, and that probably there will be a *Time*, before the End of the World, when the Power of *Religion* shall prevail more generally

nerally than at present, and outward Peace flourish, as the Consequent of it. See *S.* p. 26, 27.

The Difference then between us lies in this single Point, of the Lawfulness of using *Defensive War*, till that Time comes when there will be no Occasion for it; I assert this, and he denies it; let me therefore examine the Grounds of his *Negative*. And,

1. 'The *Cause*, saith our Author, is the judging of *Christ* internally in Individuals, and the *Effect*, that wherever this judging is experienced, there is such a Cessation from all War, *A good Tree bringeth not forth corrupt Fruit*, Luke vi. 43. But *War* is a corrupt Fruit, because it hath Lust for its Original.'

A. Very true, *Offensive War* is so; and therefore those that are pious will not bring forth such Fruit, as our Author well observes; No! but oppose it; and this, methinks, should be in *Works*, as well as in *Words*. I am so far from a Desire of lessening our Author's *Opposition to sinful War*, namely, *Offensive*, that I heartily wish it was much *stronger*, and that he might get such Light, as to concur with others in Preparation to crush that *Cockatrice*, under God, by main *Force*, if milder Measures will not do, which we should be glad they would, and so prevent the Necessity of *shedding human Blood*; this is a Disposition truly sublime, as he justly observes!

2. Our *Author* offers the *Jewish Objection* against my *Opinion*, *V.* p. 35. which he is pleased to introduce with an Air of *Disdain*; how will our *mighty Pleader* for *War* answer this Objection? Mr. *S.* has to Appearance used slighting *Terms* in several Parts of his Performance, this *Sermon-writer*, &c. not considering, perhaps, that he is guilty likewise of that *awful Crime* as well as me, since he has enter'd into an *Offensive War* against me; and in this Place, by

the Figure *Antiphrasis*, he represents me as very weak!

Well, I own the *Justice* of his *Charge*, and therefore any *Defects* that may attend this *Essay*, are to be ascribed thereto; and if there be any thing of a different *Kind*, it is to be ascribed to the Kindness of a gracious *God*, and the goodness of my *Cause*, that have helped a *weak Instrument*!

In the mean time, as to the *Jewish Objection*, so far as I can see, his Opinion does not in the least weaken it, for as much as the Prophecy respects a *national Peace*, which does not obtain; and therefore what becomes of the *Truth* of the *Prophecy*, if it certainly intends an external as well as internal Peace, as an immediate Consequent of the *Messiah's* coming?

3. Our *Author* finds Fault, *V. p. 35.* with my saying that the *Gospel* subdues Mens Corruptions in a *Measure*; he would have had me to have omitted these Words, in a *Measure*; but I assure him, that I don't know how to leave them out, nor does he do so, as to himself, in his *Preface*.

'For Humility and Meekness, saith he, are quite opposite to *War* and *Fighting*, which proceed from Pride and Covetousness.'

Ans. Very just, and therefore we ought to suppress in others, that Monster, *Offensive War*; only our *Author*, as I conceive, doesn't oppose enough in *Degree*; there seems to be his great *Defect*.

But our *Author* is pleased to query, Does not the Intimation, that the *Gospel* received in the Love of it, only in a *Measure* subdues Mens Corruptions, imply a *Deficiency in the Power*? And can it be consistent with our Lord's Doctrine, *Except a Man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God*?

Ans. To the former Question, No! I'll make bold to take himself for an Instance. In his *Preface*

face he acknowledges *that he has not yet attained, nor is already perfect*: I am apt to think our Author speaks the *Truth* here, and that his present *Performance* is a Proof thereof. Now, one of these two Things follows from these two Passages of our *Author*; either that he has not received the *Gospel* in the *Love* of it; or that his Imperfection argues no Deficiency of Power in *God* or his *Gospel*.

No! the Wisdom of *God* appears in suffering our present State to be attended with *Defects*; hereby constant Occasion is given for Self-abasement, prizing of *Christ*, and continual *Dependence* upon him, as well as longing for that Time and Place, when and where *that WHICH IS PERFECT SHALL COME, and that which is in Part, shall be done away.*

Bringing in *Poole's* Annotations, to patronize the Doctrine of *Perfection*, is no Argument that our Author has attain'd it himself; for it is an *Attempt* to make him speak contrary to his real *Sentiments* †.

The

† See his Annotations upon 1 *John* xviii. *If we say that we have no Sin, we deceive ourselves, and the Truth is not in us.* 'If we either profess it as a Principle, or think in our Minds, or do not bear in our Hearts, a penitential remorseful Sense, correspondent to the contrary Apprehension—*We deceive ourselves, i. e.* The Frame and System of Gospel Doctrine (as 2 *John* i. 2. 4) cannot be duly entertain'd, lies not evenly and agreeably with itself in our Minds, or hath no Place with Effect in us, as *John* viii. 37.' He speaks the same Thing for Substance in his *Synopsis*, and declares, *That none live without daily and frequent Sins;* and observes, *That Augustine, Hierom, Ambrose, and the Council of Mileu, have asserted the same against PELAGIUS;* and interprets that other Scripture, 1 *John* iii. 9. *That Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit Sin; for his Seed remaineth in him: And he cannot sin, because he is born of God.* In this Manner, *A regenerate Man, and a Child of God, are all one; he cannot do an Act of known gross Sin deliberately, easily, remorselessly, maliciously, as Cain, V. 12. out of a Hatred of Goodness; For his Seed remaineth in him; i. e.* the Principles of enliv'ned holy Truth,

The *New-Birth* no doubt implies a real and universal *Change* of all the *Powers* of the *Soul*, whereby the general and free *Byas* of it is turn'd towards *God*, and the *Dominion* of *Sin* broken, but not in a perfect Degree; for if so, Mr. S. by his own Acknowledgment, aforesaid, is unacquainted with it.

In *V. p. 37, 38.* our *Author* proposes this Query, 'When the *Flame* of an unjust *War* broke out against the Followers of *Christ*, did they resist? did they defend themselves? If not, how will the Sermon's Conclusion, *p. 24.* stand good? If the Offensive be unjust, the Defensive must of Consequence be just.'

I answer, That our *Author* changes the *State* of the *Question*, in the aforesaid Particular; there is a wide Difference between *private Persons* suffering *Persecution* upon a *religious Account*, with Meekness, which is their *Duty*, and a *Nation's* suffering tamely an *Enemy* to rob them of their *Goods* and *Lives* upon

'Truth, 1 *Pet. i. 23. James i. 8.*---It belongs to his Temper and Inclination, received in Regeneration, to abhor from the grosser Acts, much more from a Course of Sin.' In his *Synopsis* he speaks largely and nobly to the same Effect, and cites *Tertullian Austin* and *Hierom*, as of the same Sentiment. The Words of *Tertullian* are these, '*Peccare enim graviter potest, qui aliquando filius Dei fuerit.* He may sin grievously, who has been some Time a Child of God!'

I would not have cited Mr. POOLE's *Annotations* so frequently in the Course of this *Debate*, tho' I value them highly, had it not been partly to shew how little Reason Mr. S. had to use his Writings to support his Side of the *Question*; what I have already cited from him, plainly shews, that he held the Lawfulness of *Defensive War*; to which, for Brevity's sake, I would only add what he says upon a Place of Scripture parallel to 1 *Chron xxviii. 3.* 'Not (saith he) that *Wars* either now are, or then were simply unlawful, for it is manifest, that *David's Wars* were undertaken by *God's Command*, or with his Leave, and were attended with his *Blessing*.'

upon a *civil*, which is their *Sin* ! This *Fallacy* being removed, the *Sermon's Conclusion* stands good.

But to return from this *Digression*, which I have been led into by Mr. *Smith*, I shall beg Leave to offer somewhat more upon the *Prophecy* aforesaid, *Isa. ii. 4.* Supposing that the *Design* thereof was outward *Peace*, the Doctrine of *Defensive War*, when Necessity requires, does not oppose it, for this only allows the *Liberty* of using *Force*, in Cases of Extremity, after all mild Measures are used, and prove ineffectual ; and in the mean Time inculcates, a *peaceable loving Temper* of *Mind* towards others ; now how can that hinder *Peace*, which inculcates it upon the Good, and constrains the Bad to it, by Arguments of *Fear* ? or, in other Words, how can that hinder *Peace*, which promotes it ?

Those that are truly pious, are so disposed to *Peace* and *Love*, that they do not give Cause for *War*, by their Conduct ; No ! it is the Wicked and Impenitent who *oppress*, and thereby give Cause for *Defensive War*.

Hence it appears, that in order to promote a general *Peace*, there is no Need of Mens quitting the *Principle* of *Defensive War* ; no, but only of a *Change* of the *Hearts* and *Lives* of *wicked Men* ; for it is from them, that that *Monster* of *Offensive War* proceeds !

If a *peaceable Disposition* cannot consist with the Doctrine of *Defensive War*, then it will follow, that those *pious People* before the *Law*, and under the *Law*, that held it, which they all did, so far as we know, were not of a *peaceable Disposition* ; but the latter is false, and therefore the former. Was not *Abram* of a *peaceable Disposition*, and *Moses*, and *Joshua*, and *David*, and a Multitude of others, of whose *Piety* we have the infallible Testimony of *God* himself, *Heb. xi. 13.* King *David*, that gallant
Hero,

Hero, had such strong Desires after *Peace*, and yet cou'd not obtain it, that he takes up a Lamentation on that Occasion, and says, *Wo is me that I sojourn in Mesbech, that I dwell in the Tents of Kedar. My Soul hath long dwelt with him that hateth Peace. I am for Peace ; but when I speak, they are for War !*

Can any Now-a-days, who are for the Doctrine of *passive Obedience*, and absolute *Non-resistance*, pretend to exceed *Abram* in Faith, *Moses* in Meekness, *Joshua* in Integrity, and *David* in holy Zeal and Desires after *Peace* ?

Pray are not *Magistrates* to be peaceable in Disposition as well as others under the *Gospel* ? and yet must they not use *Force* and shed *Blood* in some Cases ? Hence I query, Can these Things consist in the *Magistrate*, yea or not ? If yea, then I ask, why not in others ? If nay, then why is such a wicked *Office* appointed, in which a Man cannot be of a *peaceable Disposition*, and consequently cannot be *pious* ? For how can there be any true *Piety*, without such a *Temper of Mind* ? If there can, let it be shewn ; if not, shou'dn't every one that desires the *Salvation* of his *Soul*, upon this *Hypothesis*, shun the *Magistracy*, as he wou'd the *Damnation* of *Hell* ?

It is true, if Goodness in Perfection was universally obtain'd, there wou'd be no Need of *Defensive War*, nor of the *civil Law* neither ; will it therefore follow, that before that Time comes, we may reasonably reject all Use of the *Law*, and tamely suffer unreasonable Men, to ruin our *Credit*, abuse our *Bodies*; and rob us of our *Estates*, without applying to the *Magistrate* for *Protection*, Reparation of important *Wrongs*, and the Punishment of heinous *Delinquents* ? If so, then what signifies the *Magistracy* ? Is it not a meer *Farce* ? And if so, how will the *Apostle*

postle's Expression hold, *That the Law is good, if it be used lawfully?*

Pray do not the same *Reasons*, that support human *Laws* with *Penalties*, support *Defensive War*?

Grotius speaks excellently upon the aforesaid Prophecy, in the following Manner; 'Or this Place is to be understood literally, and then it is plain, the Prophecy is not yet fulfill'd; but that the Accomplishment of it, and of the general Conversion of the *Jews*, is yet to be expected. But take it which Way you will, there can be nothing hence inferred against the Lawfulness of *War*, as long as there are those, who will not suffer others to live in Quiet, who insult such as love Peace.'

Our *Author* next proceeds, *V. p. 38, 39.* to refute my Explication of *Christ's* Words, about *not resisting Evil*, *Mat. v. 44.* the Substance of which he represents to be this, 'That we shou'd rather endure smaller and tolerable Injuries with Patience, than contend or go to Law for Satisfaction---That we should not indulge *private Revenge*, &c. That we should wish well to our Enemies, and treat them with Humanity and Kindness when in Want and Distress; and be ready to forgive the Injuries they have committed against us, when they repent over them---and that we shou'dn't exercise Severity toward them, till the Case comes to Extremity, &c.' I desire the Reader to see the Matter stated in my own Words, more at large, in the Sermon, from *p. 28. to p. 32.*

Our *Author* dislikes the aforesaid *Explication*, and offers several Objections against it, which I shall now endeavour to examine; but before I enter upon this, I would have the *Reader* carefully to remark, that he has in his *Reply*, entirely pass'd over what *GROTIUS*, and *POOLE*, and *MYSELF* have said to re-

O

move

move the DIFFICULTY that seems to arise from the aforesaid Text, in the forecited Pages of the *Sermon*, viz. 28, 29, 30, 31, 32. which is very unfair Dealing, and a Sign of the Indefensibleness of his *Cause*. But I proceed to his Objections, the 1st of which is this, *V. p. 38.* ‘It is probable our Author ‘tho’t he thou’d make his Objection too strong, ‘if he had given the Reasons which the Text uses, for enforcing Obedience to these Doctrines, ‘*That ye may be the Children of your Father in Heaven, for he maketh his Sun to rise on the Evil, and on the Good, and sendeth Rain on the Just, and on the Unjust---Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect.*’

Ans. It is so far from what our *Author* has uncharitably imagined, that the Addition thereof strengthens my Argument, for our heavenly Father executes Justice upon the Impenitent, as well as vouchsafes Mercy upon the Penitent, and shou’dn’t we endeavour to imitate him in all his moral *Excellencies*? Or must we, to obtain *Gospel-perfection*, go beyond God himself, or be *unlike him*? A dreadful *Perfection* this indeed! Pray isn’t *Justice* one of God’s moral *Excellencies*? And when we are commanded to be *perfect* as he is, doesn’t it necessarily imply, our being like him in that as well as others? Or does this *Gospel-perfection* contain one Excellency only, namely, *Mercy*? Or does it exclude any one? Then it is a poor, *partial, imperfect Perfection* indeed! unworthy of the honourable Name of the *Gospel*, and contrary to right *Reason*!

Objec̄t. 2. ‘A small *Injury* is attended with a Degree of *Injustice*, and the enduring rather than returning it, shews in some Degree a Christian *Disposition*---Now consider that Consequence with Respect to greater; the enduring of them, rather than returning *Evil* for *Evil*, doth certainly shew

‘ a much greater *Degree* of that *Meekness*, and
 ‘ *Lowliness* of Heart, which *Christ* taught his Dis-
 ‘ ciples to learn of him,’ *V. p. 33.*

Ans. I deny the Consequence, unless the *Injury* come upon us for the Cause of *Religion*; there is a *Measure* to be observed in these Things†; the Place of *Virtue* is the *Middle* between two Extreams||; e. g. Giving is a *Virtue*, when suited in Degree to our Circumstances, but otherwise it is a great *Evil*, as the Apostle observes, such *have denied the Faith, and are worse than Infidels*; it is a *robbing* of our *Families*, which we are under special Obligations first to regard and assist; and thus it is in Respect of *Abuse*, there is a Degree beyond which we cannot go, without encouraging the *Abuser*, then the *Good* that we shou’d return for *Evil*, is *bodily Correction* for their *Insolence*, or the *Discipline* of the *Law*, which we may hope will learn them better *Manners* for the future, and deter others: *Due Correction* for *Offences*, is in its Place very necessary, wholesome, and of excellent Service!

Some may fondly imagine, that an absolute *Lenity* or Mildness towards the *Obstinate* and *Rebellious*, and a passive Behaviour under their grievous and intollerable *Insults*, is a *Christian Virtue*, and Evidence of *Love*; No! (the Case of *Persecution* excepted) if we will admit of the Judgment of *God* himself, it is an Argument of *Hatred*; *He that spareth the Rod, hates the Child*. It is a real *Vice*, instead of a *Perfection*, which shou’d be sincerely lamented, and speedily abandoned! People’s sincere Intention no doubt lessens the Malignity of it, but cannot wholly take it away; for whatever is bad in itself, does and will remain so, whatever we think of it notwithstanding; the *Almighty’s Patience* has

O 2

its

† *Est modus in rebus, sunt certi denique fines.*

|| *Virtus in mediocritate posita, Aristot. medio tutissimus ibis.*

its Limits, and therefore so shou'd ours; else it is no Sin to be disconform'd to the *Example* of God, and *Dictates* of Reason, in Things of a *moral Nature*, which is absurd!

We express our *Love* by repelling unjust Violence with *Force*, for hereby our *Enemies* are restrain'd from doing *Mischief*, and bringing the Guilt of *innocent Blood* upon themselves; it is an Instance of *Love* to bind an enraged Man's Hands, from committing *Murder*; and hence it must needs be so, to resist by *Force* and *Arms*, a *bloody Tyrant* that cannot be otherwise restrained!

Object. 3. *V. p.* 39. 'If every particular *Member* of the *Church* is forbidden Revenge, it is because allowing of it, would manifest a Want of *Patience* and *Fortitude* to endure, and encourage Envy, Strife, Malice, &c. which produces Destruction to Particulars---

Ans. I deny that the *Reason* of prohibiting *private* Revenge, or opposing and punishing Injuries, is because allowing of it would manifest a Want of *Patience* and *Fortitude* to endure; No! But because it is unreasonable in *Society*, that one shou'd be his own *Judge* in his own *Cause*, when there is any Probability of having the Matter more impartially determin'd by others.

Our *Author's* Reason aforesaid, if I understand it right, implies a gross Reflection upon all that are for *Defensive War*, as if they were a *Sett* of *Cowards*; a Reflection as unjust and unreasonable as it is uncharitable; for if it be true, there is no such Thing in Nature as active *Fortitude*, which opposes not only the clearest *Dictates* of our *Reason*, but also the express *Testimony* of God himself, who has frequently commended the *Heroes* of *Israel*, for their active *military Bravery*; hence are these high and honourable *Encomiums* upon some, that they were
mighty

mighty Men of Valour, that they waxed valiant in Fight, and put to Flight the Armies of Aliens.

Object. 4 *V. p.* 39, 40. ' Besides, can those who are separately forbid a Thing, be at Liberty collectively to do it---Suppose ten Men are each commanded by their *Prince* to abstain from a Particular *Dyett*, because it is *pernicious*; it cannot surely be agreeable to that *Prince*, that these ten Men together, should do what separately he forbid them; upon this View of the Case, does it look reasonable to suppose, that *Christ* intended to prohibit *private* particular *Revenge*, and allow of *national* and *publick*, to punish lesser Degrees of *Evil*, and justify *greater*? Did he not reprove the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*, for omitting weightier Matters, whilst they tythed *Mint*, and *Annis*, and *Cummin*.---Ye *blind Guides*, which strain at a *Gnat*, and swallow a *Camel*, *Mat. xxiii 23, 24.*

Ans. Here is a bold *Blow* indeed at the *Root* of *Magistracy*, in as plain Words as can be well devis'd; all Execution of publick *Justice*, which the *Almighty* by his *Apostle* calls *Revenge*, or *the Execution of Wrath upon him that doth Evil*, *Rom. xiii. 4.* is call'd by our *Author*, in the preceding Paragraph, *pernicious*, a *greater Evil*, yea, as much greater than *private Revenge*, as a *Camel* is to a *Gnat*, and all that swallow this *Camel*, or approve of the Execution of *publick Justice*, are represented as *blind Guides*, who like the *Scribes* and *Pharisees of old*, strain at a *Gnat*, and swallow a *Camel*.

Large *Charity* indeed! I confess that if the *Foundation* our *Author* goes upon, in the aforesaid Reasoning, was just and true, his Consequence wou'd follow, to the utter *Overthrow* of all *Magistracy* and *Government*; *i. e.* If opposing of *Injuries*, or in other Words, *Revenge*, was in it self unlawful, it cou'dn't be made lawful by any *Association* of *Individuals*;

dividuals ; but this I deny, and on the contrary assert, that in a State of *Nature*, or when a Man is not joined to *Society*, he may *resist* or *revenge* *Injury*, but not so in *Society*, in ordinary Cases, because he is then under Obligation to leave the Matter of *Wrong* to be determined by the *Magistrate*, when he can get his Determination and Protection : This the *Light* and *Law* of *Nature*, and Nations, dictate ; and this the *Law* of *God*, and *Gospel* of *Christ* confirm ; all which conspire to establish the *Magistrate's Office*.

Now if *publick Revenge*, or the Execution of *publick Justice*, be in itself a great *Evil*, then it necessarily follows, that the *blessed God* himself has appointed a standing *Office* in the World, in order to carry on a Course of notorious *Iniquity*, namely, the *Magistracy*, which offers an Idea of *God*, that is shocking and horrible ! utterly inconsistent with the *essential Purity* of his *Nature*.

And yet our *Author* elsewhere, p. 31. approves of the *Magistrate's Office*, and the Execution of it, in punishing Transgressors, in these Words ; ‘ And the
‘ Trust reposed in the *civil Power*, for the Punish-
‘ ment of Evil-doers, &c. faithfully discharged, we
‘ should be so bless'd, &c.’ To reconcile these Things together, I freely confess, vastly exceeds the Reach of my Understanding !

Object. 5. In Answer to what I had said in the Sermon, ‘ That if the aforesaid Scripture, viz.
‘ *Mat. v. 44.* be taken in a literal Sense, going to
‘ Law is as much contradicted thereby, as *Defensive*
‘ *War* ; but the former is absurd, and therefore the
‘ latter.’ S. p. 30.

Our *Author* answers in the following Manner.

‘ Where is the Absurdity ? There are many pious
‘ Christians, that look upon the Precept to extend
‘ thus far, and therefore do not sue at Law at all :
‘ And

‘ And if there are others who think it may be done,
 ‘ without contradicting the Text, provided it be
 ‘ done in Uprightness, and without any Hatred,
 ‘ Malice, or Revenge : Yet the Practice of these,
 ‘ doesn’t in the least make void the Authority of the
 ‘ Precept, *Resist not Evil, &c.*’ *V. p. 40, 41.*

To which I reply, that the aforesaid Answer seems to me to be very strange and evasive ; for 1. Mr. S. asserts, that there are many pious Christians, who look upon the Precept to extend thus far ; how far pray ? why so that they do not sue at Law at all ; *i. e.* if our Author wou’d speak out, they think it wrong for them to go to Law, and so incur the Absurdity mentioned in the *Sermon*.

2. ‘ If there are others, saith our *Author*, who
 ‘ think it may be done, without contradicting the
 ‘ Text, &c. Yet the Practice of these, doesn’t
 ‘ make void the Authority of the Precept, *Resist*
 ‘ *not Evil, &c.*’ These Expressions are so dark
 and dubious, that it is hard to come at our Author’s
 Meaning, which seems to be this, that there are
 some Christians by Profession, whose Sincerity he
 questions, that think they can safely go to *Law*,
 and if they do so, with a right *Temper of Mind*, it
 doesn’t lessen the Authority of the Precept aforesaid.

From this Paragraph, I would observe two Things.

1. That our *Author* seems to question the gracious State of all those that go to *Law* ; this Sense his Words in their Connection easily bear ; which is scant *Charity*, and not very consistent with his own Approbation of the *Magistrate’s Office* !

2. He allows that Persons, who think it is right, may go to *Law* without *Hatred*, and if so, why not with such a Disposition to *Battle* for their *Defence* ? And so his Cause is in Effect given up !

3. Our

3. Our *Author* doesn't tell us, which of the two Companies aforesaid he is of himself, which it was but proper for him to do. But to proceed.

Object. 5. Is borrowed from Mr. *Barclay's Apology*, V. p. 41. whose Words are these, 'For it is
' as easy to reconcile the greatest Contradictions, as
' these Laws of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, with the
' wicked Practices of *Wars*----Whoever can recon-
' cile this, *Resist not Evil*, with resist Violence by
' Force, may be supposed also to have found a Way
' to reconcile *God* with the *Devil*, *Christ* with *Anti-*
' *christ*, *Light* with *Darkness*, and *Good* with *E-*
' *Evil.*'

I Answer, Mr. *Barclay's* Reasoning concludes well against *Offensive War*, between which and *Love to Mankind*, as well as *Justice* and *Goodness*, there is doubtless an unreconcilable Contradiction !

But seeing *Defensive War* is contrary to *Offensive*, in *Principle* and *End*, as well as *Manner*, it must needs therefore be agreeable to *Love*, *Goodness*, and our *Saviour's Precept*.

If Mr. *Barclay* intends by the aforesaid Reasoning, to signify, that both *Offensive* and *Defensive Wars* are contrary to the *Precept of Christ*, the *Spirit* and *Temper of Christianity* ;

Then I may justly turn his own Argument against himself, and say, whoever can reconcile these Contraries, *viz.* *Offensive* and *Defensive War*, (and reconciled they must be, before they can join in Opposition to *Love*, the *Precept of Christ*, and the *Temper of Christianity*) may be supposed also to have found out a Way to reconcile *God* and the *Devil*, *Christ* and *Antichrist*, *Light* and *Darkness*, *Good* and *Evil.*

Mr. *Barclay* was doubtless a *Gentleman of Letters* and *Ingenuity*, but seeing he was but a *Man uninspired*,

red, he might be mistaken in some Points, as well as other Men.

If we take the *Apologist* in the former Sense, we have him for a *Patron of Defensive War* ; but if in the latter, he is inconsistent with himself, and runs into the same unfurmountable Absurdities, which he reproves others for, without Foundation !

Our Author proceeds to confute a Passage in the *S. p. 30, 31.* where I say, ‘ That killing of our Enemies, is more consistent with *Love* to them, than *Self-murder* is with *Love* to ourselves ;’ the Reason of which I there represent to be this, *viz.* ‘ A greater Degree of *Love* we should bear to ourselves, and hence this Conclusion is drawn, that when the Safety of others and our own come in Competition, we must rather secure our own.’ Well how does our *Author* confute this ? Why, in the following Manner, *V. p. 43.*

‘ But are either of these Cases in the least Degree consistent ?---Are they not rather as opposite as East to West ? A Man can never designedly injure what he really loves, and it is his Duty to love Enemies.’

To which I reply, that the aforesaid *Answer* shifts the *State* of the *Question*, and leaves out entirely the *Reason* upon which my *Argument* is bottomed ; *e. g.* The *Question* is not whether we shou’d *love* our Enemies, and avoid *killing* them, as much as can consist with our own *Safety* (for that I had frequently asserted in the *Sermon*, see *p. 28, 29, 30*) but whether we shou’dn’t *love* ourselves in a *greater Degree*, and in Consequence hereof, when their *Lives* and ours come in Competition, so that one must be lost, we shou’d rather secure our own. This Foundation of my *Argument* he drops entirely. At this Rate of proceeding, our *Author* may with Ease confute any *Book*, that ever was composed !

But our *Author* proceeds to say, *V. p. 43.* as follows ; ‘ The Paragraph in p. 31. wherein the ‘ *Sermon-writer* undertakes to prove, that no more ‘ is meant by Christ’s Command to *love Enemies*, ‘ than was enjoined under the *Jewish Dispensation*, ‘ is (in my Opinion) a Piece of *Sophistry*, and can- ‘ not be reconciled with the Manner in which our ‘ Saviour introduceth this Doctrine, *You have heard ‘ that it hath been said, &c.*’

Ans. Pray Sir cool a little ; *Sophistry* ; why so ? Cannot be reconcil’d, &c.----Why so ? Where is the Proof ?----Here we have warm Words, and nothing else !

But because great *Stress* in this Argument is laid by the *Gentlemen* of the other Side of the *Question*, upon the afore said Words of our *Saviour*, *against resisting Evil, Mat. v.* which I think they misunderstand, I will therefore take the Liberty to enlarge more upon this important Part of the Argument.

And here let me enquire, if the Words of *not resisting Evil*, be taken in their strict, literal Sense, without *Limitation*, then why not the following *Precepts* about *giving* and *borrowing* ? Either all shou’d be understood absolutely and literally, or none of them.

Is it not unreasonable to imagine, that we should be obliged, by the *Laws* of Christianity, to give to one that ask’d, that we knew either did not need it, or in all Probability would make a bad Use of it, or to give without our being able to afford it, to the Prejudice of our *Families* ? In one of these Cases we should encourage another in *Wickedness*, and so be Partaker of their Sins ; and in the other, oppose a just, natural Affection to our *Families*, and so, as the Apostle observes, be *worse than Infidels* !

If a Man by an unjust *Law-suit* takes away our *Coat*, is it reasonable to take this Passage of *giving*
him

him our Cloak also in a literal Sense ? Isn't this to encourage him in Wickedness, not only to be entirely *passive* under the Wrong, but to give him as much more of our Goods gratis ? Can it be thought the *Laws* of an allwise *God*, rightly understood, wou'd thus fight against each other ? Shou'dn't we interpret Scripture according to the *Analogy of Faith*, in such a Way as to make it Self-consistent ?

If the following *Precepts* do oblige to *give* and *lend*, at the meer *Pleasure* of the *Asker*, or *Borrower*, without any Regard had either to their Wants, or our Abilities, then their *Lusts* or unreasonable Desires, are to be the *Rule* of our Proceeding in the aforesaid Points, and not *Scripture* or *Reason*; and if the Case be so, how then is *Religion a reasonable Service* ? How then can we order our Affairs with *Discretion* ? How then can we be said to have any *Property* in our *Goods*, seeing we are obliged, upon the aforesaid *Hypothesis*, to *give to every Asker and Borrower, and not to turn away* ?

An impudent *Beggar* may come an hundred Times in a Day, or more, and clear us of all our *Cash*; an unreasonable *Borrower* may come as often, and strip our *Houses* in the like Space, so that we sha'n't have a *Stool* to sit on, or a *Bed* to lie on; and may they not also, in the like Space, strip our *Persons*, so that we sha'n't have a *Rag* to cover us ?

Who then has the greatest *Right* to our *Goods*, the impudent *Beggar*, the unreasonable *Borrower*, or the *Owner* ? I Answer, the *Beggar* and the *Borrower*; for they can, according to this Sense of the Words, dispose of our *Money* and *Goods* according to their *Lusts*, and we dare not hinder them, even tho' our *Reason* and *Conscience* shou'd oppose; No! instead of that, we must help the *Vagrants* forward in their Wickedness, to the Ruin of our

selves and Families, or act in direct Opposition to the favourite *Principle* of *absolute Non-resistance*, (which we are supposed to entertain) which it seems is not to be given! Is this the *Gospel* of *Jesus*? Can such an unreasonable, unaccountable *Religion*, come from the *allwise, good God*? If this be suppos'd, then I wou'd enquire, whether the *Christian Religion* be not worse in Respect of *Property*, than the *Jewish, Mahometan, or Pagan*? Was there ever since the Foundations of the Earth were laid, such an irrational *Religion*!

Well, if to avoid the aforesaid Consequences, the *Precepts* of *Giving* and *Lending*, must be taken in a limited, restrained Sense, *viz.* To signify a merciful, beneficent Temper and Disposition of Mind, regulated in its Exercise by Reason, judging of our own and others Circumstances, so as not to give away all we have, to *lazy Lurches, flurdy Beggars, unconscionable unmannerly Borrowers*; then why shou'dn't we take the *Precept* about *Resistance*, in a limited Sense too? Isn't the *Reason* the same, the *Form* of Expression the same, and the absurd and perilous Consequences more than equal? Or are our *Persons* less worth protecting, than our *Cash* or *Goods*?

Not to add, that there is nothing annexed to this *Precept* of *Giving*, which intimates a *Restriction*, but it is only to be inferr'd by the *Dictates* of *Reason*, and the *Rules* of *Equity*; whereas the *Precept* respecting *Resistance*, has its *Explication* adjoin'd, which implies a *Limitation*, *viz.* that of *Smiting us on the Cheek*, which can intend no more than smaller and tolerable Injuries; is it not therefore exceeding unreasonable in any, to hold the Limitation of the former, and not of the latter?

Moreover, to illustrate this Case yet further, let it be observed, that we are commanded by our *Saviour*,

viour, in the sixth Chapter of *Matthew*, *To take no Thought for To-morrow, what we shall eat, or what we shall drink, nor yet for our Bodies, what we shall put on, seeing that God, who clothes the Lillies, and feeds the Sparrows, will abundantly provide for his Children, who are much better than many Sparrows.* The Form of Expression here is as *absolute* as the other about *not resisting Evil*; and yet if it is taken literally, without any Limitation, it destroys at a *Stroke* all human *Care* and *Diligence*, all prudent *Forefight*; for have the *Lillies* and *Sparrows* any of these?

Now, if the aforesaid *Precept* be taken absolutely, can any *Merchant* carry on his *Business*? Can he, without any *Thought* of *To-morrow*, buy *Bills*, and send them to *England*? Send *Vessels* to *Sea*, and never think of the *Time* of their returning?

Or can a *Shopkeeper* carry on his *Business* of buying *Goods*, without any *Thought* of selling them again? Or sell them, without any *Thought* of the *Time* of *Payment*? Or if he did so, would it answer? Must not he shut up *Shop*?

If the *Tradesman* must not think of *To-morrow*, how shall he inform his *Customers* when they may expect their *Work*? Or if they want ready *Money*, how shall he tell them of a *Time* of *Payment*?

And how can a *Farmer* carry on his *Husbandry* according to this *Notion*? Can he *plow* rationally, and never think of the *Time* of *sowing*; or *sow* rationally, and never think of the *Time* of *reaping*? Then if the aforesaid *Precept* to avoid such *Aburdities*, must be taken in a restrained, limited *Sense*, as signifying no *anxious Thought*, why not the other about *Resistance* much more; in as much as *the Life is more than Meat, and the Body than Raiment*?

Seeing that the *End* of *Civil Government* is to secure civil *Property* by Force and Compulsion, when Necessity requires; and hence the *Magistrate* is said to carry the *Sword*; if *Property* must be tamely given up to every unjust Invader, the *End* of *Government* being destroyed, there is therefore no Need of the *Mean*; and hence it follows, that *civil Government* is a *needless, superfluous Institution*, unless it be said, that a *Mean* should be used without an *End*, or for nothing, which is absurd!

If we are *not to resist Evil at all*, then how comes the *Magistrate*, by virtue of his *Office*, to punish *Crimes* according to *Justice*, and in some Cases to *resist even unto Blood*?

Surely *Defensive War* is necessarily included in the *Magistrate's Office*, seeing that he, instead of submitting to the *Violence* of *Criminals*, *resists* and kills them, for the *Defence* and *Advantage* of the *Publick*; and what does *Defensive War* do more? The Difference, as to the Instruments of Death, in these two Cases, is but a *Circumstance* that does not affect the present Argument; for both Ways *Violence* is used; the Death of the Person is compassed; the *Substance* is the same, and the *End*, in View, the same.

If *civil Government*, as described by the *Apostle Paul*, be agreeable to the *Gospel* of *Christ*, and yet that *Force* and *Fighting* is *essential* to the very *Being* and *Preservation* of it, in some Cases, it will follow, unavoidably, that *Defensive War* is, when Necessity requires, lawful, and agreeable to the *Gospel*; the Reason of the Consequence is this, that there is an exact *Parallel* between the two in all Things material.

The *Substance* of both is the same, *viz.* *Force, Fighting, Bloodshed, and Death.*

The

The *Authority* enjoining both is the same, *viz.* of the *Magistrate*.

The *End* of both is the same, *namely*, to execute *Justice* upon those that deserve it, to preserve *Life* and *Property*, and promote the *Good* of the *State*.

The *Necessity* of both is the same; *namely*, that easier *Measures*, at some times, and in some *Cases*, will not, cannot answer the aforesaid *Ends*.

Now, that *Force* and *Fighting* are in some *Cases* essential to *civil Government*, appears both from *Scripture* and *Reason*; hence a *Sword* is assigned, ascribed to the *Magistrate*, and he is said *not to bear it in vain*; *i. e.* when he acts up to his *Office*, he is, as the *Apostle* observes, *a Terror to Evil-doers*, *a Revenger to execute Wrath*, and that in some *Cases* to *Bloodshed* and *Death*, upon him that *doth Evil*, Rom. xiii. Now, if these *Things* do not imply *Force*, what does?

All acknowledge that *Laws* are necessary to *Government*; now, can these be put in *Execution* upon *Criminals* always without *Force*, without *Fighting*? Then certainly they are grown much better humoured of late than formerly!

What has come to pass, may again, in the like *Circumstances*. Does not *History* inform us of many *Tumults* and *Insurrections* that have been? And in such *Cases*, if the *Sword* be not drawn, and used, will not the *Magistrate* be trampled under *Foot*, his *Office* contemned as a silly *Cypher*, all *Order* be over-*set*, *Justice* perverted, *Property* unhinged, and a universal *Chaos* succeed, in which the *Honours*, the *Goods*, the *Lives* of the *Innocent*, are made a *Prey* to lawless and rapacious *Violence*! If a *Magistrate* pronounces *Sentence* against a *Criminal*, and no *Force* is to be used for the *Execution* of it, would not the *Criminal*, in all *Probability*, especially if apprized of this, insult him with the greatest *Rudeness*,
kick

kick him and cuff him on the *Bench*, for daring to offer such an Affront to a Person of his Dignity and Extraction? /

Supposing, what has often happened, that a Criminal, legally condemned, should fly from *Justice*, and refuse to be taken, and, being *armed*, would declare that he would not be taken alive, what is to be done in this Case? Is *Force* and *Arms* to be used or not, to bring him to Punishment? If not, then civil *Laws*, and civil *Government*, are but a meer *Sham*, not worth a *Rush*, for the *Protection* of *Property*, and *Execution* of *Justice*; a poor, contemptible *Institution*, of no *Authority* and *Influence*, a fit Object for *Derision* and *Ridicule*! If yes, then *Force* and *Arms* are lawful to defend *Property*, and execute *Justice*, which is the Point in Question!

But what if the Number of *Villains* be greater, who join in Confederacy to affront *Law* and *Justice*, to wrong a Community, either in their *Lives* or *Properties*, or both; does not it necessarily follow, upon the same *Plan* of Reasoning, that a greater *Force* of Men in Arms be sent to bring them to *Justice*? For can the *Number* reasonably exempt them from the *Jurisdiction* of the Law, seeing it does not lessen the Crime of each? No! but on the contrary their Confederacy encreases their Crime, as well as the *Danger* of the publick *Safety*; and therefore they must be opposed in Arms, except it be supposed, that lesser Crimes should be punished, but not greater; lesser Dangers guarded against, but not greater; which, if it be not absurd, I know not what is!

Well, has a *foreign* Enemy any better *Right* to rob and murder us, than *Rogues* of our own *Nation*? If yea, let it be produced; if nay, then why should not we oppose them with equal Care and Force, in order to maintain the *Honour* of our King,
the

the *Safety* of our *Country*, our *Lives*, our *Liberties*, our *Goods*, from *Violence* and *Ruin*!

If the forming of good *Laws*, and annexing proper *Penalties* to them, be agreeable to *God*, and good *Men*; why not the Execution of those *Penalties* upon *Delinquents*, without which they are but insignificant *Scarecrows*, of no *Moment* or *Influence*?

If we regard good *Laws*, is this *Regard* well expressed, by our tamely suffering them, without *Opposition*, to be trod under *Foot*, and consequently the *Government* and *Privileges* built upon them, overturned and destroyed!

Pray what is *civil Government*, but the *Union* of *Individuals*, for the effectual *Protection* of *Person* and *Property*, from *Injustice* and *Violence*? What is it but a *Union* of many, to do that for the publick *Good*, which is not in its own *Nature* sinful for particular *Persons* to do, who are not united to *Society*, but what they frequently have not *Power* to do; to remedy therefore this *Inconvenience*, is the *Design* of *social Union*, whereby a sufficient *Measure* of *Power* is by common *Consent* treasured up, for the *Good* and *Security* of all the *Members* of that *Body*; which *Power* is to be used to the aforefaid valuable *Purposes*, upon proper *Occasions*, as the publick *Managers* or *Officers* of the *Society* shall direct.

Hence it is that *Persons* who are *wronged*, or in *Danger* of being so, and unable to right or guard themselves, reasonably fly to the *Magistrate* for *Justice* and *Protection*.

This I think is a just *Representation* of the *Nature* and *Design* of *civil Government*; and therefore I see not how it is possible for the *Wit* of *Man* to reconcile to it the *Doctrine* of absolute *Non-Resistance*; for if it be unjust in itself for a *private Person*

son to *resist* in all Cases, it must be so also for a greater Number, as our *Author* has well observed, *V. p. 39, 40.* It must be so likewise for the *Magistrate*; for a *Union* of *Individuals* can never alter the *Nature* of *Things*, or make that which is in itself *unjust*, to be *just*, as our *Author* fairly reasons in the aforesaid Pages, but from a false *Principle*.

Nor can the *Almighty*, to speak with Reverence of his *Majesty*, in a Consistency with the *Parity* and *Perfection* of his *Nature*, give *Authority* to do what is in itself *wicked* and *unjust*; and therefore this Consequence easily and unavoidably follows, That *civil Government*, and the *Doctrine* of absolute *Non-Resistance*, are *Asustata*, incompatible, irreconcilable *Contradictions!* And likewise,

Hence it follows, that such as are for any one of them, must, if they would consist with themselves, give up the other.

It is true, the *Colourings* of *Art* and *Address*, the *Subtleties* of *indefinite Terms*, *Evasion* and *Subterfuge*, may cast a *Mist* of seeming *Confusion* over these plain *Things*, so as to mislead the *Unwary*, *Partial*, and *Injudicious*; but they can never blend them together, or really weld them into one Piece, without a *Botch* that may be discerned without the *Help* of *Spectacles!*

I may add, that such who think it sinful to *resist* in any Case, and yet approve of the *Magistrate's* *resisting* in some Cases, do virtually approve of, and thereby become accessory to what they themselves condemn as sinful; which, whether it be either innocent or consistent, let the Reader judge. But to proceed.

As to our *Author's* Reflections, *V. p. 46.* upon my being *affected* with a *View* of the melancholly *Circumstances* of this *People*, in case of an *Enemy's* coming suddenly upon them, unprepared for *De-*
fence,

fence, considering that it was not without *Cause*, which that rational, catholick, and manly Performance, PLAIN TRUTH, makes unanswerably evident, and was a generous Concern for *others Safety* more than my own; and likewise considering, that the holy Scriptures represent *fearing always* to be the *Character* of a wise and good Man, and that their Practice is accordingly. Thus righteous Noah being moved with Fear, prepared an Ark, to the saving of his House, by which he condemned the World. Thus pious Jechshaphat, hearing of the Design of the Ammonites and Moabites to invade his Kingdom, feared, and set himself to seek the Lord, and proclaimed a Fast throughout all Judah. Thus the Man after God's own Heart trembled for fear of God's Judgments! I say, considering all these Things, it is something strange that our *Author* should represent me, on account of the aforesaid Concern, which he is pleased to term *mus'ing*, as of a *Temper* of *Mind* and *State* very different from *Christianity*, which I freely forgive, and look upon his groundless *Satyr* as an honourable *Panegyrick*! In so great, so good a *Cause*, as Concern for my *Country's Safety*, and an honest *Essay* to promote it, it is my *Glory*, and my *Joy*, to endure *Invective*!

As to our *Author's* Observations from some Passages out of the *Prophets*, V. p. 47, 48. these Scriptures being, in my Opinion, parallel to *Isaiab* ii. 4. which I have before explained and considered, I think that Answer is sufficient here; and therefore, for the sake of Brevity, shall not add at present.

As to our *Author's* Citation from a Treatise, entitled, *A modest Plea*, V. p. 54, 55, 56. I wou'd only observe this, that whatever our *Fathers* have believed, we ought with the noble *Bereans*, to Search the Scriptures, and see whether those Things be so or not. The *Perswasion* of our *Fathers*, how

pious soever any of them might be, or were ; or how sincere soever they were in their *Designs*, is no sufficient *Foundation* for us to receive any one of their *Principles* upon, unless we see with our own Eyes, the Reasonableness of them, and judge for ourselves !

As we are reasonable, accountable *Creatures*, 'tis fit we should do so, for another can't answer for our *Conduet* to God, in our Place. The best of Men, are but Men at the best ; *We see but in Part*, and therefore in Part we may err ; and this indeed is but *human**.

Give me leave to offer a Word to our Author, by Way of Query, respecting divers uncharitable Sentences in his *Vindication*, some of which I have mentioned in this *Reply*.

Pray, *Sir*, Isn't judging the *States* of others, on Account of a suppos'd or real *Mistake* in *Principle*, respecting Things not *essential* to *Religion* and *Salvation*, contrary to the *Apostle's Chain* of Reasonings, in the 14th Chapter of his *Epistle* to the *Romans* ; and in very Deed, a *Degree* of real *Persecution* for *Religion* ? And does this *Persecution* consist well with *passive Principles* ?

And seeing that vastly the greater Part of the *Christian World* are for *Defensive War*, and many of them live sober and regular Lives, and are acquainted with experimental *Religion*, and considering that they have herein the Concurrence of all the Rest of *Mankind*, does it look so decent and humble like as cou'd be wished, to treat them with an Appearance of *Slight*, and to condemn their *States* ?

It is no Doubt a great Duty to depend on divine *Providence*, in the regular Use of all appointed Means ; but if we may, without *Presumption* and Impunity, depend in the Neglect of one Mean,

may

* *Humanum est errare.*

may we not, by a Parity of Reason, in the Neglect of more, and consequently of all, and thus become intirely unactive, when we come to the *Perfection* of *Virtue* ; a strange Sort of Perfection indeed, a Perfection of *Sloth* and *Indolence* !

But before I conclude this *Reply*, I think it necessary to consider those *Instances* which our *Author* has brought from *Antiquity*, for the Confirmation of his *Opinion*, and that with a sufficient Degree of *Confidence*, that the *primitive Church* was upon his Side of the *Question*.

Before I enter upon this Point, I would observe, that I had not meddled with the *Fathers*, in the *Sermon* he is pleased to animadvert upon, as believing that the *Merit* of the *Cause* in Controversy, does not depend upon their *Testimony*, but upon the Suffrage of *Scripture* and *Reason* : They were fallible Men as well as others, and had no other *Rule* to direct their Sentiments and Conduct, but what we have ; no *Antiquity*, or human *Authority*, can alter the Nature and Reason of Things ; or justly commend to our Esteem and Acceptance, what is erroneous or absurd !

I have not mentioned these Things from any Diffidence respecting the *Fathers*, as tho' they were not for *Defensive War*, No ! But to fix the *Stress* of the *Controversy* upon its proper *Basis*.

At the Beginning of the *Reformation* (if I remember right) in the *Disputes* between the *Protestants* and *Papists*, the latter often urged, that the *Fathers*, together with the *Scriptures*, shou'd be appeal'd to as determining *Judges* thereof, but the former justly rejected the Proposal.

After some Enquiry, I cannot yet find, that our *Author* had any Ground of *Triumph*, in Respect of the *Fathers* : However, after having offered my *Reasons*, I freely leave this Point to the Judgment of
the

the impartial *Reader* ; to this End therefore let it be observed, That in order to have a just View of the *Sentiments* of the *Fathers* concerning *War*, it is necessary, in my Opinion, to understand and consider these following Particulars, *viz.*

I. THAT they taught unanimously, that the *Church* had no material *Sword*, or civil Power, to force or punish Men ; that she cou'd only entreat, admonish, and excommunicate those that wou'dn't obey, or were refractory and obstinate. They also plainly distinguished between the *State* and the *Church*, and ascrib'd a temporal *Sword* to the former, and a spiritual to the latter ; agreeable hereto, these following *Fathers* speak.

Tertullian saith, ' That it is not the Business of ' *Religion* to force Religion, or use Compulsion to ' that End (a).'

Lactantius saith, ' That there is no Need of *Force* ' and *Injury*, because *Religion* cannot be forced---- ' and that it is to be defended not by killing, but by ' dying (b).'

Athanasius in like Manner observes, ' That the ' *Truth* is to be preached not with *Swords* or *Darts*, ' or with a military Hand, but by *Perswasion* and ' *Council*. It is the Property of sincere Religion, as ' I have said, not to force, but to persuade ; thus ' the Lord did not compel, but granting Liberty, ' said to all, If any will come after me ; and to the ' Apostles in Particular, Will ye also go away (c).'

Hilary,

(a) ' Non est religionis, inquit, cogere religionem.' *In lib. ad Scap.*

(b) ' Non est, inquit, opus vi et injuriâ, quia religio cogi non potest ;---defendenda est non occidendo, sed moriendo.' *Lib. 5. Divin. Institut.*

(c) ' Non enim gladiis, aut jaculis, aut militari manu veritas predicatur, sed suadendo et consulendo piæ religionis est proprium, ut dixi, non cogere, sed suadere. Siquidem do-

' minus

Hilary, against the *Arians*, speaks the same Thing : ‘ The *God* of the Universe, saith he, does not need a forced Obedience, or require a constrain’d Confession----I cannot receive any but him that is willing (*d*).’

Gregory Nazianzen saith, ‘ It is more equitable to perswade than compel, and more decent for us (*e*).’

Chrysofom saith, ‘ Our Bodies are committed to the KING, and our Souls to the *Priest* ; he constrains, this intreats ; he by Necessity, this by Choice ; he has OUTWARD ARMS, this spiritual ; he carries on WAR with the Barbarians, but I have War against Devils. And having spoken of King *Uzziab* being smitten with *Leprosy*, for intermeddling with the particular Business of the *Priest*’s Office ; on the contrary, he speaks of those of the sacred Character, in the following Manner ; For, says he, it is the Business of a *Priest* only to *reprove*, and boldly and freely to *admonish*, not to handle *Arms*, not to wield the *Buckler*, to brandish the *Lance*, to bend the *Bow*, or to shoot the *Dart* ; and after he has finished his *Reproof*, the King ceases not, but uses his Power, excites to ARMS, and manages the SPEAR and BUCKLER (*f*).’

2. T H E

‘ minus non cogens, sed libertatem concedens, dicebat omnibus: si quis vult venire post me : apostolis vero omnibus : numquid et vos vultis abire ?’

(*d*) ‘ Deûs universitatis, obsequio non indiget necessario, non requirit coactam confessionem, non possum nisi volentem recipere.’ *Lib. 2. In Arianos.*

(*e*) ‘ Suadere quippe equius est quam cogere, magisque nobis convenit.’ *In Carmine de Vita Sua.*

(*f*) ‘ Regi, inquit, corpora commissa sunt, sacerdoti animæ, ille cogit, hic exhortatur ; ille necessitate, hic libera voluntate ; ille habet ARMA SENSIBILIA, hic arma spiritualia ; ILLE BELTUM GERIT CUM BARBARIS ; mihi bellum est adver-

2. THE *Fathers* generally maintained, that offending *Kings* could be punished with temporal Punishments by GOD only.

One of the apostolical *Canons* speaks thus; Whoever reproaches an *Emperor* or Magistrate, let him be punished; if a Clergyman, let him be deposed; if a Layman, let him be excommunicated (*g*). Now these apostolical *Canons*, tho' they were not framed by the *Apostles*, they are nevertheless reckoned to be very antient.

Arnobius, speaking upon the Fifty-first Psalm, Verse 4. *Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, saith,* 'Every One, when he offends, comes into Judgment, sins against God, and violates the Laws of the World; but this *Prince*, acting under none but God alone, sinn'd only against him (*b*).'

To the same Purpose, upon the same Psalm, speaks '*Hierom, Ambrose, Cassiodore, Euthymius, Haymo, Alexander Aletensis, Lyranus, Thomas*, and to the same Effect, *Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyril, Agapetus, Gregory* and *Isidore*.' Whose Words I wou'd cite, were it not for fear of Prolixity.

3. IN Consequence of the aforesaid Tenet, they believed, that it was not lawful for the *Church* by Force

'sus demones; rex autem Ozias non sustinuit admonitionem, sed arrogantia inflatus, ingressus est templum, volens adolere incensum, nam sacerdotis tantum est arguere, et audacter ac libere admonere, non movere arma, non clypeos usurpare, non vibrare lanceam, non arcum tendere, non jacula mittere, postea quam igitur arguisset sacerdos; REX autem non cessisset, sed ARMA moveret, CLYPEOS et HASTAS, suaque uteretur potentia.' *Homil. 4. de Verbis Isaiaë, T. 3: p. 758.*

(*g*) 'Quisquis imperatorem aut magistratum contumelia affecerit, supplicium luito; et quidam si clericus, deponitor; si laicus, à communionem removetur.' *Canon Octogesima Tertius.*

(*b*) 'Tibi soli peccavi, omnisque sub judicio venit cum deliquit, Deo peccat et legibus mundi: hic autem rex sub nullo alio nisi sub Deo solo agens, ipsum solum super potestatem metuens Deo soli peccavit.' *Commentar. Arnob. in Psalmos.*

Force and *Arms* to resist the *King*, or such as were in Authority, even when they abused their Power to *Oppression* and Tyranny ; No ! But on the contrary, that it was their Duty to endure their Cruelties with Patience.

‘ We are reproached, says *Tertullian*, in his Discourse to *Scapula*, and in his *Apology* respecting the Majesty of the *Emperor*, but the *Christians* cou’d never be found like the *Albinians*, *Nigrians*, or *Cassians*, who besieged the *Emperor* between two Triumphs, and rushed under *Arms* into his *Palace*. They were of the *Romans*, if I am not mistaken, that is, they were not of the *Christians*.

‘ But they say that the *Christians* only wanted *Power*, but not a Will (*that is, to rebel against their Sovereign*) yea, *Tertullian* witnesses, that they had such a great Force, that they could sufficiently *avenge* themselves in one Night, by a few *Torches*, if it had been lawful for them to free themselves from one Evil by committing another ; but God forbid, saith he, that a divine Sett shou’d be freed from *Oppression* by human Fire ; we have fill’d up all your Places, your *Towns*, your *Islands*, your *Forts*, your *Borough Towns*, your *Council Houses*, yea, your very *CAMPS*, your *FILES OF SOLDIERS*, your *Palace*, *Senate*, *Market House*, we only leave the Churches to you ; what *War* shou’d we not be fit for, and ready to undertake, albeit unequal in Force, who are so willingly slain, if it were not according to that Discipline, more lawful to be killed than to kill (*i*) ?’

R

It

(*i*) ‘ Circa majestatem imperialem (inquit Tertullianus ad Scapulam) infamamur, tamen nunquam Albiniani, vel Nigriani, vel Cassiani, inveniri potuerunt Christiani :’ Et ex Apologetico : ‘ Unde inquit Cassii, et Nigrii, et Albini, qui inter duos lauros obsident Cæsarem...qui armati palatium irrum-
punt...’

It was no Doubt in a Measure owing to the primitive Christians patient suffering cruel Usage from the Government they liv'd under, upon a religious Account, that Christianity did then so much prevail.

'Hence it is, saith *Cyprian*, that none of ours when he is apprehended resists; and albeit our People are more numerous, yet do they not avenge themselves against your unjust Violence (*k*).'

And *Lactantius* speaks in the same Strain, 'We confide, saith he, in that *Majesty*, who can as easily avenge the Contempt of himself; as the Labours and Injuries of his Servants, and therefore we suffer such abominable Things, and do not so much as resist in Word (*l*).

Augustine speaks excellently upon this Head, agreeable to what has been before mentioned, in the following Manner; 'Nor then under Heathen *Emperors* did the *City of Christ*, altho' they dwelt as Pilgrims on Earth, and had a vast Multitude of People, fight for their temporal Safety, against ungodly Persecutors; but rather to obtain eternal,

punt---de Romanis, ni fallor, id est, non Christianis. At in-
quiunt, vires tum temporis non animi defuerunt, imo eodem
Tertulliano teste, vires iis erant tante, ut una nox pauculis fa-
culis largitate ultionis potuisset operari, si malum malo disjun-
gi per nos licuisset; sed absit ut igne humano vindicetur divina
secta,-- et vestra omnia implevimus urbes, insulas, CASTEL-
LA, municipia, consiliabula, CASTRA IPSA, tribus DECU-
RIAS, palatium, senatum, forum, sola vobis reliquimus tem-
pla: cui bello non idonei, non prompti fuisset, etiam co-
piis impares, qui tam libenter trucidamur, si non apud istam
disciplinam magis occidi liceret quam occidere.'

(*k*) 'Inde est (inquit *Cyprianus*, in Lib. ad *Demetr.*) quod nemo nostrum quando apprehenditur, reluctatur nec se adversus injustam violentiam vestram, quamvis nimius et copiosus sit noster populus ulciscitur.'

(*l*) 'Confidimus enim majestati qui tam contemptum sui possit ulcisci, quam servorum suorum labores et injurias: et ideo cum tam nefanda perpetimur, ne verbo quidem reluctamur.'

‘ ternal, they did not resist, they were *bound, slain,*
 ‘ *imprisoned, tortured, burnt, torn in Pieces, mur-*
 ‘ *dered,* and yet multiplied. It was not their Prac-
 ‘ tice to fight for their Safety, except to contemn
 ‘ *Safety for Salvation* : And hence arose that famous
 ‘ Proverb, That the *Blood of the Martyrs* is the
 ‘ *Seed of the Christians* (m).

To these I may add the Testimony of *Ambrose*,
 who frequently taught, that against a Christian *Em-*
peror attempting to do Injustice, and invade the
 Rights of the *Church*, we shou’d use no *Arms* but
Patience, nor any Ways resist ; ‘ Being compell’d,
 ‘ saith he, I have not known to resist, I can mourn,
 ‘ I can weep, I can lament against *Arms*, against
 ‘ *Gothish Soldiers*, *Tears* are my *Arms*, otherwise I
 ‘ ought not, nor cannot resist (n).

Augustine in his Exposition of the Epistle to the
Romans, speaks with great Clearness and Judgment,
 and very largely upon this Head, a little of which I
 would cite ; ‘ Seeing, saith he, we consist of *Body*
 ‘ and *Soul*, while we possess this temporal Life, we
 ‘ use temporal Things for the Support of it : It be-
 ‘ hoves us in that Part which respects this Life, to
 R 2 ‘ be

(m) ‘ Neque tunc sub imperatoribus Ethnicis, civitas Chri-
 ‘ sti quamvis peregrinaretur in terris, et haberet tam magnorum
 ‘ agmina populorum, *adversus impios persecutores pro salute tem-*
 ‘ *porali pugnavit*, sed potius ut obtineret eternam non repugná-
 ‘ vit ; ligabantur, cedebantur, includebantur, torquebantur, ure-
 ‘ bantur, laniabantur, trucidabantur, et multiplicabantur. Non
 ‘ erat eis pro salute pugnare, nisi salutem pro salute contemne-
 ‘ re : hinc celebre illud proverbium, sanguis Martyrum semen
 ‘ Christianorum.’ *August. de Civitat. Dei, Lib. 22.*

(n) ‘ Adversus christianum imperatorem injusta tentantem,
 ‘ et ecclésiæ jura invadentem, nulla preter patientiam arma adhi-
 ‘ bere oportet, nec ullo pacto resistendum esse, sepius docet Am-
 ‘ brosius, coactus repugnare non novi, dolere potero, potero
 ‘ flere, potero gemere, adversus arma, adversus milites Gothos
 ‘ quoque, lacrimæ meæ arma sunt, aliter nec debeo, nec possum
 ‘ resistere.’ *Ambrosius Oratione in Auxentium.*

' be subject to the civil Government ; but in Re-
 ' gard of that Part by which we believe in God, and
 ' are call'd into his Kingdom, we shou'd not be
 ' subject to any Man who endeavours to overthrow
 ' that which the Almighty has been pleas'd to give
 ' us, in Order to eternal Life. If any one thinks,
 ' because he is a Christian, that therefore he shou'd
 ' not pay the *Taxes*, or offer due *Honour* to those
 ' that are in civil Authority, he is in a great Er-
 ' ror ; but if any one thinks that he shou'd be sub-
 ' ject to them, in Matters of *Faith*, he is in a
 ' greater *Error* : That Measure is to be observ'd,
 ' which the Lord himself has prescrib'd, *That we*
 ' *should render to Cæsar, the Things that are Cæsar's,*
 ' *and to God, the Things that are God's.* If
 ' they take from us our temporal Substance, we
 ' shou'd not resist ; because it is necessary, on Ac-
 ' count of this Life, to be in Subjection, not only
 ' *to escape Wrath, but for Conscience sake (o).*

4. THE *Fathers* likewise believed, that it was
 not proper for *Ministers* to bear temporal *Arms* :
 Hence in the Apostolical *Canons*, ' It is decree'd,
 ' that

(e) ' Cum enim constemus ex anima et corpore, quamdiu in
 ' hac vita temporalium sumus, etiam rebus temporalibus ad subsidi-
 ' um utamur : oportet nos ex ea parte quæ ad hanc vitam per-
 ' tinet, subditos esse potestatibus ; ex illa vero parte qua credi-
 ' mus Deo, et in regnum ejus vocamur, non nos oportet esse
 ' subditos cuicumque homini id ipsum in nobis evertere cupienti,
 ' quod Deus ad vitam eternam donare dignatus est. Si quis er-
 ' go putet, quoniam Christianus est, non sibi esse *veligal* red-
 ' dendum, ut *honorem* exhibendum debitum, iis qui hæc curant
 ' potestatibus, in magno *errore* versatur. Item si quis putat se
 ' esse subdendum in sua *fide*, in majorem errorem labitur ; sed
 ' modus est servandus iste quem dominus ipse prescribit, ut red-
 ' damus Cæsari quæ Cæsaris sunt, et Deo quæ Dei sunt, non re-
 ' sistentes si quid illi auferre voluerint, in quo sibi potestas data
 ' est de temporalibus rebus, quia necesse est propter hanc vitam
 ' subditos esse, non solum propter iram, sed propter conscien-
 ' tiam.' *Exposit. Epist. ad Roman.*

that no *Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon*, should follow the *War*, and retain at the same Time the Sacerdotal Function ; for *those Things that are Cæsar's, should be given to Cæsar, and those Things that are God's, should be given to God (p).* By which it is evident, that those *Christians* who did not aspire to *Offices* in the *Church*, were not forbid to follow *Arms* ; and thus the *Judgment* of the *primitive Church*, appears plainly to be in Favour of *Defensive War*.

Ecclesiasticks were forbid any secular Employment, that requir'd continual Application, lest they shou'd be thereby diverted from their proper Work ; nay, they were not allow'd even to be Guardians, for the aforesaid Reason (q) This appears from what was before quoted from *Chryso- stom*.

Ambrose speaking to the persecuting *Emperor*, saith, ' We *entreat*, but we do not *fight* ; we do not fear---*Palaces* belong to the *Emperor*, but the *Churches* to the *Priest* : The Power of publick or civil Offices belongs to thee, but not of sacred---When I heard that the *Soldiers* had taken Possession of the *Church*, I had only a greater Spell of mourning----To deliver up the *Church* I cannot, but to resist I ought not (r).

5. T H E *primitive Christians* did oftentimes decline engaging in *War*, on account of *sinful*

(p) Canon Apostolick 82.

(q) Canon Apostolick, 1. 80. Canon Confil. Mentz Decretal. Lib. 3. Cap. 1. Concil. Africk. 7. Epistol. Jerom. ad Nepotian. Epistola Cyprian. ad Sacerdotes, Diacon. Lib. 1. Epist. 9.

(r) ' Rogamus Auguste, non pugnamus, non timemus, sed rogamus, ad imperatorem palatia pertinent, ad sacerdotem ecclesiæ : publicorum tibi mœnium jus commissum est, non sacerdotum ; ---eo tempore quo audieram occupatam esse militibus Basilicam, gemitum tantummodo liberiores habuisse, tradere Basilicam non possum, sed repugnare non debeo,' *Ambros. Oratione ad Auxentium,*

ful Terms imposed upon them by the *Emperors*; such as *swearing* by their *Genius*, or by the *Heathen Gods*, or *sacrificing* to them; thus *Licinius* dismissed those *Soldiers* from the *Service*, who would not *sacrifice* to their *Gods* (f).

This was likewise the Practice of *Julian*, for which Reason *Vitricius* and others laid down their *military Honours*, and *Offices*, for the sake of *Christ* (t). *VALENTINIAN*, who was afterwards *EMPEROR*, had for the same Reason been deprived of a *military Dignity* (u).

And before this, in *Armenia*, under the Reign of *Dioclesian*, no less than 1104 *Soldiers* had quitted their martial Character, as the *Martyrologies* witness; and *Menna* and *Hessius* in *Egypt*.

Yea, such was the Severity of *Licinius*, that those who for the Cause and Name of God, which they bore in their Consciences, had resigned their *military Offices*, could not be admitted again, unless they renounced the *Christian Faith*; it was under his Reign that *Arsaceus* and *Auxentius* resigned, two Persons of distinguished Eminence.

And this was the very Case which *Tertullian* speaks of in his Treatises of *Idolatry*, and the *Soldiers Crown*, as I shall afterwards prove; I might mention more, but I think it needless.

The aforesaid Particulars shed an easy Light upon the *Writings* of the *Fathers* respecting *War*, and plainly prove, that those Passages in them that seem contrary thereto, only intend their *Aversion*, either to the Method of propagating *Religion* by *Force*, or

(f) *Euseb.* on the Life of *Constantine*, Lib. I. Cap. 54. *Sulpitius Severus* likewise bears Witness to the same Fact. *Hist. Sacr.* Lib. 2. Cap. 33. Num. 2. Edit. *Vœest.*

(t) See *Sozomen Hist.* Lib. 5. Cap. 17.

(u) *Rufinus*, *Philostorgius*, *Theodore*, *Sozomen*, and *Victor of Utica*, bear Testimony to this.

to that of *resisting* of any *lawful Prince*, or the *Magistrates* under which we live, or the Unfuitableness of *Ministers* bearing *Arms*, or the Sinfulness of *Christians* *engaging* in *War* under such Circumstances as necessarily involved them in *Iniquities* prohibited by the Religion they profess'd, or at least endanger'd their *Innocence*.

Having premis'd the aforesaid Particulars, I proceed to observe, That the most ancient *Writers* of the *Christian Church*, manifest their Approbation of inflicting *capital Punishments*, and *Defensive War*, the Reasonableness and Justice of which depends upon the former, and is indeed the same Thing substantially with it, as I trust I have before prov'd.

Clement, who liv'd in the Times of the *Apostles*, and wrote his Epistle to the *Corinthians* in the Year of our Lord 68, hath these Words in it, ' Let us consider those that bear ARMS under our PRINCES, with how much Order and Submission they execute their Commands ; they are not all *Presepts*, *Tribunes*, or *Centurions*, yet each Man in his *Rank*, executeth the Orders of the *Emperor*, or of his *Lieutenants*. The Superiors cannot do without the Inferiors, nor Inferiors without the Superiors. There is a Mixture and a Use in every Thing ; for Instance, let us consider our Body, the *Head* without the *Feet* is nothing, nor the *Feet* without the *Head* ; the smallest of our Members are useful to the whole Body, but all conspire, and are subordinate to the Preservation of the whole (x).'

And in the *Constitutions* ascrib'd to the aforesaid *Clement*, who is call'd by some *Clemens Romanus*, which whether they were his or not, are acknowledged to be of an early Original, we have these Words, ' Not that all killing is unlawful, but only that of
' the

(x) Epist. ad Corinth. p. 109.

‘ the Innocent ; provided that this Right of putting
 ‘ to Death, be reserved to the Magistrate alone (y).’

Farther, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who liv’d in the
 second Century, says, ‘ That a Christian, if he be
 ‘ call’d to the Government, shou’d be as *Moses*, a
 ‘ living Law to the Subjects, reward the Good,
 ‘ and punish the Bad.’ And in another Place, de-
 ‘ scribing the Habit of a Christian, It wou’d be-
 ‘ come him to go Bare-foot, says he, unless he
 ‘ shou’d happen to be a SOLDIER (z).

Irenius (in the Second Century) proving that
Kings are the *Ministers of God*, whom all are
 bound to obey, speaks thus. ‘ Because Man by
 ‘ wandering from the Allegory, grew so enraged,
 ‘ that he reckon’d his Blood-relations his Enemies --
 ‘ Therefore the *Almighty* laid upon him human
 ‘ *Terror*, that so being subject to the Power of
 ‘ Men, and bound by their *Laws*, they might at-
 ‘ tain to some Measure of Righteousness, and be in-
 ‘ duc’d thro’ *Fear* of the *Sword*, publicly held
 ‘ forth, to moderate their Conduct to each other ;
 ‘ and agreeable hereto, they are *Ministers of God*,
 ‘ who demand *Tribute* of us, *Powers* ordain’d by
 ‘ *him*, in Order to compass this Design (a).’

But that which is of greater *Weight* in this *Argu-
 ment*, than the private Opinion of particular Per-
 sons, is the *Authority* of the *Church*, which appears
 to be evidently in Favour of *Defensive War*, from
 the

(y) Lib. 7. Cap. 3.

(z) Pædag. Lib. 2. Cap. 11. p. 240.

(a) ‘ Quoniam absistens à Deo homo, in tantum efferavit, ut
 ‘ etiam consanguineum hostem sibi putaret ; imposuit illi *Deus*
 ‘ humanum *timorem*, ut potestati humanum subjecti, et lege eo-
 ‘ rum astricti, aliquod assequantur justitiæ, et moderentur ad in-
 ‘ vicem, in manifesto positum GLADIUM timentes ; et secundum
 ‘ hoc ministri Dei sunt, qui *tributa* à nobis exigunt ; in hoc ip-
 ‘ sum servientes potestates à Deo ordinatæ sunt.’ *Trec. Lib. 5.*
Cap. 24.

the Apostolical *Canon* before mentioned, and the following Particulars, namely,

1. Never any were deny'd *Baptism*, or *excommunicated* by the *Church*, because they were *Soldiers*; which surely they wou'd have done, if they had reckon'd the *military Profession* sinful, and absolutely forbidden by the *Doctrines* of Christ, with our *Author*.

Tertullian in his Treatise concerning *Idolatry*, says, 'Such Persons are not received into the Church, as exercise *Professions* not allowed of by the *Law of God* (b).'

Augustine asserts, 'That the primitive Christians admitted neither *Prostitutes*, *Stage-players*, nor Persons of any other *infamous Professions*, to the *Sacraments* of the *Church*, till they had renounced such criminal Engagements (c).'

Cyprian mentions an Example of this Kind of *Discipline* upon a *Comedian* (d).

And there are others of *Gladiators*, great Promoters of *Lewdness*, and of such as traded in *Cattle* for *Sacrifices*, in the Writings of *Tertullian* (e). And one of a *Charioteer* in the publick *Games*, in *Austin*.

On the contrary, we have in the aforesaid *Constitutions* of *Clemens*, this notable Declaration of the *Churches Judgment*, respecting the Lawfulness of the *military Office*; 'Let a *Soldier* that desires to be baptiz'd, be exhorted to abstain from Wrongs and Oppressions, and to be content with his Pay: If he complies with these, let him be admitted (f).'

Nor is it any Wonder that the primitive *Church* admitted *Soldiers* to her *Communion*, without *Censure*, seeing that the inspired Apostle *Peter* did so

S

before

(b) De Idololat. Cap. 5.

(c) De Fide, et Operibus, Cap. 18:

(d) Epist. 6. 1. 2. Edit. Oxon.

(e) De Idololatria, Cap. 11.

(f) Constitut. Lib. 8. Cap. 32.

before them, in the Cause of *Cornelius the Centurion*, that worthy pious *Soldier*, whom he baptiz'd without Rebuke; and probably together with him, that DEVOUT SOLDIER, of them that waited on him continually: Hence I would propose the following Queries, viz.

Query 1. Why does the *Spirit of God*, speaking by the Scriptures, put such Honour upon *Soldiers*, even under the *New Testament*, if the Profession be sinful?

Query 2. Why were such admitted to *Baptism*, or added to the Church by his infallible Direction, without any Profession of *Sorrow*, for being concerned in the military Business in Time past, without any Promise of discontinuing in it for the future? (See *Acts* x. 2, 7, 41) How can these Things be reconcil'd to the Purity of the blessed *Spirit*, and to the Government he has instituted in the Church, upon the Supposition of the Sinfulness of *Defensive War*? Didn't gross Offenders, that were baptized by *John*, confess their Sins first, before they were admitted to be Members of the Christian Church by Baptism? See *Mat.* iii. 6.

If the military Business be sinful under the *Gospel*, then *Cornelius* (the Prefect, or Captain over a hundred Soldiers, as the Word *Centonarches* signifies) and his *Soldier Attendant*, liv'd in a Course of Sin, which the Scriptures represent to be a Sign of a damnable State, *He that commits Sin, is of the Devil*: Then,

Query 3. How is it that both are honoured by an inspired Person, with the Character of *devout* and *right Worshippers of God*, which the Word *eu bene et sebo colo* signifies? How can these Things consist together?

Soldiers that suffered Torments and Death for the Cause of *Christ*, received the same Honours from the

the Church with other Martyrs, as is afterwards mentioned, which surely they never would have given, if they had not looked upon *Defensive War* to be lawful.

The following Words of eloquent and pious *Cyprian* are very memorable and full to this Purpose ;
 ‘ *Laurentius* and *Ignatius*, saith he, did heretofore
 ‘ bear ARMS in secular CAMPS, but in the mean
 ‘ time were true, spiritual *Soldiers* of God, while by
 ‘ the Concurrence of *Christ* they vanquished *Satan*,
 ‘ they merited *Palms* of the LORD, and *Crowns*,
 ‘ by their illustrious *Passion* ; we always make ho-
 ‘ nourable Mention of them on every anniversary
 ‘ Day, in which we celebrate the *Memory* of the
 ‘ *Martyrs Passions* (g).

Rigaltius upon these Words saith, ‘ That it was
 ‘ the Custom of the *Greeks* to celebrate *Panegyricks*
 ‘ to the Honour of brave Men, who have endured
 ‘ the Cruelties of a *Tyrant Monarch*, or have other-
 ‘ wise fought nobly for their *Country*, that by their
 ‘ Example they might incite their own to worthy and
 ‘ gallant Actions. The Christians, saith he, on sta-
 ‘ ted Days every Year praise God, having
 ‘ mentioned the Names of those who have, for
 S 2 ‘ the

(g) ‘ *Laurentius* et *Ignatius*, in *castris* et ipsi quondam *se-*
 ‘ *culeribus militantes*, sed veri et spirituales *Dei milites*, dum di-
 ‘ abulum *Christi* congressione profesternunt, *palmas Domini* et
 ‘ *coronas illustri passione meruerunt*, *sacrificia* pro eis semper,
 ‘ ut meministis offerimus, *quoties* *martyrium* *passiones*, et dies
 ‘ *anniversaria* *commemoratione* *celebramus*.’

Rigaltius super hæc verba, *sacrificia pro eis semper*, inquit,
 ‘ *Græci* *panegyrica* *celebravere* *honori* *virorum* *fortium*, qui
 ‘ *tyrannum* *sustulerant*, ut *animas* *pro patria* *feliciter* *pugnaverant*,
 ‘ ut hoc exemplo *suorum* *animos* *ad præclara* *facinora* *erigerent*,
 ‘ *Christiani* *sacris* *anniversariis* *laudes* *Deo* *dicunt* *commemoratis*
 ‘ *eorum* *nominibus*, qui *pro fide* *Christo* *dicta* *martyrium* *forti-*
 ‘ *ter obierunt*.’ *Cypr. Epist. ad Cler. et Fleb.* 34. p. 48. Edit.
Paris.

‘ the Faith of Christ courageously endured. Martyrdom.’

3. The *primitive Church* expressly declares her *Judgment* in favour of *Defensive War*, as appears thus: Tho’ the *Emperor Constantine*, after he professed Christianity, and put the *Name of Christ* on his *Standard*, had a great many *Christians* in his *Army*, and was engaged in *War*, yet we find not one of all that *Multitude of Bishops*, that lived in his *Empire*, who either dissuaded him from going to *War*, or dissuaded the *Christians* from serving him in it, altho’ divers of them were strict enough in the *Discipline* of the *Church*, and ready to speak their *Minds*.

Among all that *Multitude of Canons* respecting *Discipline*, which were made by the various *Councils* of the *Eastern* and *Western Churches*, at their numerous *Sessions*, during the first five *Centuries* after *Christ*, tho’ many of them were severe respecting divers *Abuses*; yet, after some *Search* and *Enquiry*, I cannot find one *Canon* in all the *Catalogue* against *Defensive War*, as unlawful in itself; or any One, whereby *Laymen* are authoritatively debarred of *Church Fellowship*, or of *Baptism*, and the *Lord’s Supper*, for their engaging in it: And can any reasonably imagine, that this would have been wholly passed over, if the *Judgment* of the *Church* had been against it! Nor do I know of any *Canon* made by any *Council* or *Synod* of *Ministers* against *Laypersons* (who had not done *Penance*) engaging in a *Defensive War*, when no *sinful* and *ensnaring Terms* were proposed, for 1500 *Years* after *Christ*; so that it is surprizing to me, that our *Author* should so strongly imagine the *primitive Church* to be on his *Side* of the *Question*!

‘ The *Bishops*, in the *Reign* of *Constantine*, when he consulted him about his *warlike Design* against
‘ the

‘ the *Persians*, were so far from discouraging him
 ‘ in this Enterprize, that they willingly promised to
 ‘ follow him to the *Wars*, and fight against his Ene-
 ‘ mies, by the spiritual Warfare of Prayers to God
 ‘ for him. In this Expedition, saith *Eusebius*, he
 ‘ seemed to follow them, and commanded a *Taber-*
 ‘ *nacle* or *Tent* to be built in Fashion of a *Church*,
 ‘ wherein he and his *Bishops* might pray unto *God*,
 ‘ the Giver of Victories.’ *Eusebius on the Life of*
 ‘ *Constantine*, p. 69.

This Instance clearly proves, that the primitive Christians were for *Defensive War*; this was the first Time of their being clothed with civil Authority as a *State* (and surely they could not act as a *State* before they were one) Now they had a *Prince* of their own *Religion* at their Head; now they could *fight* in *Defence* of their *Country*, without complying with *idolatrous Terms*; and therefore this was the proper Time for them to declare their Opinion, and to act according to it, and this we see they did.

Pray, where is there any Instance of a Christian’s refusing to serve in the *War* in *Constantine’s* Reign? It was so far from this, ‘ That an *Act* was made to
 ‘ restore *Professors* of *Religion* to their *military Offi-*
 ‘ *ces*, who had been deprived of them for their Con-
 ‘ stancy and Courage in the Cause of *Religion* by
 ‘ *persecuting Princes*; and consequently we find a
 ‘ Number of Christians in his *Army*. He gave Li-
 ‘ berty and Vacancy, saith *Eusebius*, to those who
 ‘ by a divine Instinct had embraced the *Faith*, that
 ‘ they might freely frequent the *Church* of God, and
 ‘ offer up their *Prayers* to him; for he said, they
 ‘ ought not to use their *Spears* only, or put their
 ‘ *Confidence* in *Weapons* and *Strength* of *Body*; but
 ‘ to acknowledge *God* the Giver of *Victory*, to whom
 ‘ with *Hearts* and *Hands* lifted up to *Heaven*, we
 ‘ ought to render due *Praise* and *Prayer*, and be-
 ‘ seech

‘ seech him to protect and defend us.’ *Eusebius on the Life of Constantine*, p. 27. and 59. agreeable to which was his own Practice. Will our Author condescend to learn the Lawfulness of *Defensive War* in *Gospel* Times, and the wide Difference between the Use of martial Weapons, and a Dependance on them, of one of the greatest and best of Men that ever the *Sun* saw? I mean the EMPEROR CONSTANTINE the Great. Behold that pious, potent *Prince*, earnestly praying to his *God*, with his *Bishops*, and other devout Souls, before the *Battle*, for *Success*! Behold him intirely depending upon *God* for that Purpose! And when the *Victory* was obtained, see with what a grateful Mind he ascribes all the *Glory* of it to *Jehovah*! *Constantine* embraced *Christianity* in the Year 311.

Augustine expresses distinctly and clearly the Opinion and Practice of the *primitive Church* respecting *War* in the following notable Words: ‘ *Julian*,
 ‘ faith he, was an *Infidel Emperor*, a wicked *Apo-*
 ‘ *state* and *Idolater*, and yet *Christian Soldiers* served
 ‘ the *Infidel Emperor*; when the *Cause of Christ*
 ‘ came upon the *Carpet*, they acknowledged none
 ‘ but him, who was in *Heaven*; when he would
 ‘ have them worship *Idols*, or burn *Incense*, they
 ‘ preferred *God* to him; but when he bid them put
 ‘ the *Battle in Array*, and march against any parti-
 ‘ cular *Nation*, immediately they obeyed; they distin-
 ‘ guished the eternal from a temporal *Lord*; never-
 ‘ theless, for the sake of the eternal *Lord*, they were
 ‘ subject to a temporal One (b).

‘ *Augustine*

(b) ‘ *Julianus existit infidelis imperator, nonne existit apo-*
 ‘ *stata iniquus et idololatra? milites Christiani servierunt impera-*
 ‘ *tori infideli; ubi veniebatur ad causam Christi, non agnosce-*
 ‘ *bant nisi eum qui in cælo erat, quando volebat ut idola cole-*
 ‘ *rent, et thurificarent, præponbant illi Deum: quando autem*
 ‘ *siccebat PRODUCITE ACIEM, ITE CONTRA ILLAM GENTEM,*
 STATIM

‘ *Augustine* shewing that War is not absolutely
 ‘ condemned by the Gospel, reasons thus, If all
 ‘ Wars were condemned by the *Christian Doctrine*,
 ‘ the *Soldiers* in the Gospel, when they ask’d Ad-
 ‘ vice, for the Security of their Salvation, wou’d
 ‘ rather have been commanded to lay down their
 ‘ Arms, and entirely renounce their Profession ;
 ‘ whereas ’tis only said, *Do Violence to no Man*,
 ‘ neither accuse any falsely, and be content with your
 ‘ Pay. Now when they are commanded to be con-
 ‘ tent with their Pay, they are not forbid to conti-
 ‘ nue in the military Profession.’ *Epist.* 5. and 105.
 And elsewhere he says, ‘ That if the *Soldiers* who
 ‘ guarded *St. Paul*, had fallen upon his factious E-
 ‘ nemies, the *Apostle* wou’dn’t have tho’t himself
 ‘ guilty of their Blood ; *Saint Paul*, saith he, took
 ‘ Care to provide himself with a strong Guard
 ‘ for his Defence, *Epist.* 50. to *Boniface* ; 154. to
 ‘ *Publicola*, and 164.’

Chrysoftom observes, ‘ That to this End *Tribu-*
 ‘ *nals* were erected, *Laws* made, *Punishments* ap-
 ‘ pointed, and various Kinds of *Penalties* enjoined.’
Serm. ad Patrem Fidel.

Moreover the *Council of Africa*, makes Use of
 the aforesaid Passage in Order to justify their Reso-
 lution, of imploring the *Emperor’s* Assistance a-
 gainst the Factious ; for thus they speak, ‘ Against
 ‘ whose Fury we may call for such Defence, as is
 ‘ not unusual, or disallow’d by the *Scripture* ; since
 ‘ the *Apostle Paul*, as we read in the Book of *Acts*,
 ‘ secur’d himself against a Conspiracy of factious
 ‘ Men, by a military Force.’

Now can clearer Evidence of the Churches Judg-
 ment

‘ STATIM OBTEMPERABANT ; distinguebant Dominum æter-
 ‘ num a domino temporali ; tamen subditi erant propter Domi-
 ‘ num æternum domino temporali.’ *August in Ps.* 1. 24.

ment in the Affair of *War* be reasonably desired, than the aforesaid Particulars considered complexly ?

But before I offer a *Train* of SOLDIER MARTYRS to the Reader's View, I would beg Leave to mention a few Particulars more, to confirm and illustrate what has been already observed.

Meliton, Bishop of Sardis, presented to *Marcus Aurelius, Anno Dom. 170*, an *Apology* for the Christians, wherein speaking of the *Plunders* committed against them, he saith, ' If it be by your Order, I shall not say but it is well done ; a just Prince never ordains any Thing that is unjust, and we are willingly recompenced with such a Death (i).'

Arnobius, in his eloquent *Apology* (wrote in the Third Century) has the following beautiful *Paragraph* ; ' The Christian Religion, saith he, is contented with its own Strength, and stands firm and unshaken on the *Foundations* of *Truth* it self ; nor is it spoil'd of its *Energy*, tho' it has no *Avenger*, no *Protector* ; yea, tho' every Tongue shou'd reproach and oppose it, and conspire its utter Overthrow (k).'

Cyprian, who flourish'd about the Middle of the Third Century, speaks sweetly, in the following Strains ; ' If it be glorious for secular *Soldiers*, after having vanquish'd their *Enemies*, to return in *Triumph* to their native Country ; how much more eligible and greater is the *Glory*, after having overcome our spiritual Enemy *Satan*, to return in *Triumph*

(i) Vid. Valef. hic.

(k) ' Religio Christiana suis est contenta viribus, et veritatis propriis fundamentis nititur; nec spoliatur vi sua, etiam si illi reprobae vindicem; immo si linguæ omnes contra faciant, et conspirent ad fidem illius abrogandam conspirent. Arnob. contra Gentes. p. 45.

‘ *Triumph to Paradise, bearing the Trophies of Victory (l).*’

Arnobius, in another Part of his *Apology*, addresses the *Pagans* in this Manner, ‘ Why do ye persecute *Christ*, saith he, with such distressing *Wars*, that even at the very mentioning of his *Name*, your *Bosoms* boil with *Rage* and *Resentment*? Did ever he claim a *Kingly Authority*, and fill the World with his *hostile Legions*, destroying some that were from Time immemorial peaceable, and forcing others into his *Obedience (m)*?’ Here it may be observed, that altho’ *Arnobius* justly opposes an *Offensive War*, yet he acknowledges the *kingly Authority* to maintain a *Defensive*.

Minutius Felix (who according to *Rigaltius*, was Cotemporary with *Tertullian*) and liv’d in the Second Century, says, ‘ What *SOLDIER* wou’d not with greater Intrepidity under the Eye of an *Emperor* encounter *Danger*? None before *Trial* receive the *Reward*; and the *Emperor* gives not what he has not; he cannot prorogue *Life*, but he can make *War* lawful and *honourable*; but the *Soldier of God*, is neither deserted in *Grief*, nor finally destroyed by *Death (n)*.’

T

Nazarius,

(l) ‘ Si militibus secularibus gloriosum est, ut hoste devicto redeant in patriam triumphantes: quanto potior est gloria, victo diabolo ad paradysum triumphantem redire: et trophaa victorici reportare.’ *Cypr. de Exhort. Martyr. Cap. 10. p. 74.*

(m) ‘ Quod tam gravibus insectamini Christum bellis? ut ad ejus nominis mentionem rabidorum pectorum effervescentis ardoribus? numquid regiam sibi vindicatis potestatem, terrarum orbem cunctum legionibus infestissimis occupavit, et pacatas ab exordio nationes alias delevit ac sustulit, alias sibi parere cervicibus compulit subjugatis?’ *Arnob. contra Gent. Lib. 2. p. 20* He lived under the Reign of *Dioclesian*, says *Hierom* and *Rigaltius*.

(n) ‘ Quis non miles sub oculis imperatoris, audacis periculum provocet? nemo enim premium percipit ante experimentum: et imperator tamen quod non habet non dat, non potest propogare’

Nazarius, in his *Panegyrick* upon *Constantine*, saith, ‘ So great a Share in *War* hath a good *Conscience*, that *Victory* is rather owing to the *Integrity*, than the *Courage* of the *Soldiers* (o)

Augustine, who flourish’d in the Fourth Century, concerning the Causes of War, speaketh as follows, ‘ The usual Distinction of just *Wars*, is, that they are undertaken for *revenging Injuries*, when any *Nation* or *State* upon which *War* is made, either has neglected the *Punishment* of its own *Delinquents*, or the *Restitution* of what was taken away unjustly (p).’ And elsewhere he saith, ‘ We seek not *Peace*, to make *War*; but we make *War*, in order to establish *Peace* (q).’

Basil speaks thus of the ancient Christians, ‘ Our Ancestors never accounted Slaughters committed in War as Murders, excusing them who fought for *Virtue* and *Piety* (r).’

Ambrose saith, ‘ That *Valour* which either defends our Country by *Arms* from *Barbarians*, or protects the weak at Home, or our Companions from *Robbers*, is compleat *Justice* (s).’

How can an *Emperor* try the *Courage* of his *Soldiers*, except he has an *Enemy*? Saith *Lactantius* (t).

Then

‘ propogare vitam, potest honestare militiam. At enim Dei miles, nec in dolore diseritur, nec morte finitur.’

(o) *Nazar.* tantum etiam inter arma, bona conscientia sibi vindicat, ut jam ceperit non virtutis magis, quam integritatis esse victoria, *Cap. 7. Edit. 2.*

(p) *Lib. 6. Quest. 10. on Joshua.*

(q) *Augustin. kethor. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. p. 445. Edit. Paris.*

(r) *See Grot. on the Rights of War. p. 53.*

(s) *De Offic. Lib. 1. Cap. 27. Ambrose* flourished in the fourth Century.

(t) *Quomodo enim potest imperator militum suorum probare virtutem, nisi habuerit hostem? LaTant. de Justitia, Lib. 5. p. 425. Edit. Paris.*

‘ Then we pray, saith *Cyril of Jerusalem*, for
 ‘ *Kings*, for their *Armies*, and their *Allies* (u).’

Gregory Nazianzen saith, ‘ That we must render
 ‘ to *Cæsar*, the *Tribute* that belongs to him ; that
 ‘ *War*, which occasion’d *Tribute*, was a Confe-
 ‘ quence of the first Sin (x).’

Gregory Nyssen has made no less than three set
 Discourses, or Panegyricks in Praise of the 40 *Soldi-
 er-Martyrs* (y) of whom mention is made after-
 wards in this Reply.

But to proceed.

That the *Christians* in general bore *Arms* under
 the *Roman Emperors* farther appears from the fol-
 lowing Instances of SOLDIER-MARTYRS.

‘ Among the *Martyrs* at *Vienna* and *Lyons*, in
 ‘ *France*, was *Maturus*, lately baptized, yet a nota-
 ‘ ble *Warrior* (z) under the *Emperor Antoninus*
 ‘ *Verus*.

Histories do record, that when *Marcus Aurelius*,
 ‘ the Brother of *Antoninus*, warred against the *Ger-
 ‘ mans* and *Sarmatians*, his *Host* was ready to perish
 ‘ with *Thirst*, so that he wist not what to do ; and
 ‘ that the *Soldiers* of the *Legion* called *Melitina*,
 ‘ mov’d with *Faithfulness* towards their *Prince*,
 ‘ bow’d down upon their bare *Knees* (as our accus-
 ‘ tom’d Manner of praying is) in the *Midst* of the
 ‘ *Army*, turning them to the *Enemies*, and made
 ‘ *Supplication* unto *God*. When as this *Sight*
 ‘ seem’d strange unto the *Enemy*, there was shew’d
 ‘ a far more strange *Spectacle*, to wit, *Lightning*,
 ‘ which put the *Enemy* to *Flight* and *Overthrow* ;
 ‘ and withal a *Show*er of *Rain* to refresh the *Army*,
 ‘ which was well nigh perishing with *Thirst*, poured
 ‘ out their *Prayers* before the high *Throne* of the

T 2

‘ *Majesty*

(u) *Dupin. Eccles. Hist. Fourth Cent.*

(x) *Dupin. Eccles. Hist. Fourth Cent.*

(y) *Dupin. Eccles. Hist. Fourth Cent.*

(z) *Eusebius, Book 5, Chap. 1, p. 75, 77.*

‘ *Majesty of God.* This History is reported by
 ‘ such as favour’d not the Christian Faith, yet were
 ‘ careful to set forth the Things which concerned
 ‘ the foresaid Persons. It is also written by our
 ‘ Men, whereof *Apolinarius* is a Witness of Credit,
 ‘ who reporteth that this *Legion* (by whose Prayers
 ‘ this *Miracle* came to pass) was from that Time
 ‘ call’d by the *Emperor* the *Lightning Legion*. *Ter-*
 ‘ *tullian*, also a Man worthy of Credit, dedicating
 ‘ an *Apology* in the *Latin* Tongue, unto the *Roman*
 ‘ *Senate*, in the Defence of our *Faith*, hath con-
 ‘ firm’d this History with a more manifest Proof ;
 ‘ for he writeth that the most prudent *Epistles* of
 ‘ of *Marcus* are yet extant, wherein he himself tes-
 ‘ tifieth, that warring with the *Germans*, his *Army*
 ‘ well nigh perished thro’ the Scarcity of Water,
 ‘ yet was saved thro’ the Prayers of the *Christi-*
 ‘ *ans* (a).’

‘ The Substance of this memorable and miracu-
 ‘ lous Deliverance, says *Echard*, is sufficiently con-
 ‘ firmed, both by the Christian and Pagan Writers ;
 ‘ who unanimously ascribe it to the Power of God.
 ‘ Some of those Writers liv’d almost in the same
 ‘ Age, all of them before Learning was sunk. *Di-*
 ‘ *on Cassius* has given us a particular Account of it,
 ‘ and ascribes it to some divine Power assisting the
 ‘ Emperor.---Other Heathen Writers, as *Capitoli-*
 ‘ *mus*, *Themistius*, and *Claudian*, ascribe it to the
 ‘ Prevalency of the *Emperors* own Prayers.-----The
 ‘ Care that the *Pagans* took to carry off the Ho-
 ‘ nour of this miraculous Event, serves, at least, to
 ‘ confirm the Truth of the Fact. And without
 ‘ Fear of being tho’t too credulous, or endeavour-
 ‘ ing to support the Christian *Religion* by Fable
 ‘ and Falshood, Artifices it never needed, we shall
 ‘ affirm, that there is no Reason to reject the Tes-
 ‘ timony

(a) *Euseb. Book 5. Chap. 5.*

' timony of the Writers of those Times, who posi-
 ' tively assure us, that the *Captain* of the Guards
 ' having inform'd the *Emperor* that GOD deny'd
 ' nothing to the *Christians*, of whom many were in
 ' the *Legion of Meletina*, a City of *Capadocia*, and
 ' that he ought to try if their Prayers wou'd pro-
 ' cure that Deliverance which he could not otherwise
 ' expect : The Emperor order'd they shou'd be call'd
 ' together, and that they all did at the same Time in-
 ' voke the only true *God*, whom the Winds and
 ' Storms obey, and who had often deliver'd his
 ' Servants by such extraordinary Interposition. *An-*
 ' *toninus* being too just to stifle the *Miracle*, imme-
 ' diately wrote to the *Senate of Rome* in Favour of
 ' the *Christians*, and order'd their Accusers to be
 ' punished with *Death*; a convincing Proof that
 ' he tho't *this Assistance* owing to their Prayers.
 ' *Tertullian* appeals to these *Letters* within twenty-
 ' six Years after, in a solemn *Apology* in Behalf of
 ' *Christianity*, which he durst not have done, had
 ' not the Thing been past Dispute.---The Additions
 ' made to this Story in after Ages, can do no real
 ' Prejudice to the *History* itself. For the Reader's
 ' farther Satisfaction, we refer him to the ingenuous
 ' Mr. *Wotton's* Notes at the End of his Life of the
 ' Emperor *Marcus Aurelius*.' See *Echard's Ec-*
 ' *clesiast. Hist.* p. 338-9. To the same Effect speaks
 Doctor *Cave* in his primitive Christianity, p. 58.
 The aforesaid memorable Event happened in the
 Year of our Lord 174, says *Echard*.

Dionysius, Bishop of *Alexandria*, relates the Con-
 stancy of such as were martyr'd at *Alexandria*, un-
 der *Decius*, among whom a *Soldier* was beheaded
 for being a *Christian*; of him *Eusebius* speaks thus;
 ' When as they were bro't forth, a certain *Soldier*
 ' rebuk'd such as revil'd them, wherefore they ex-
 ' claim'd against him, so that this valiant *Warrior*
 ' of

‘ of the *Lord* was bro’t forth to *fight*, who after
 ‘ that he had stoutly behav’d himself, in that great
 ‘ *Skirmish* for the Christian Faith, was behead-
 ‘ ed (b).’

Dionysius, Bishop of *Alexandria*, in his Epistle to
Domitius and *Didymus* (under the *Emperors Valerianus*
 and *Galenus*) making mention of many who
 were persecuted, says, ‘ Take this for certain, there
 ‘ were Men, Women, young Men, old Men,
 ‘ Virgins, old Women, SOLDIERS, and simple Men
 ‘ of all Sorts and Sects of People ; whereof some
 ‘ after Stripes and Fire were crowned *Victors*, some
 ‘ after Sword, some others in small Time sufficient-
 ‘ ly try’d, seem’d acceptable Sacrifices to the Lord
 ‘ (c).’

Eusebius likewise informs us, ‘ That about the
 ‘ Year of our *Lord* 262, at *Cæsarea* in *Palestina*,
 ‘ one *Marinus*, a famous *Soldier* for *Feats of Arms*,
 ‘ of noble Lineage and great Substance, was be-
 ‘ headed for the Testimony of Christ, because he
 ‘ was a *Christian*, and sacrific’d not unto the *Empe-
 ‘ rors*.

Farther, *Eusebius* elsewhere observes, ‘ That after
 ‘ a great *Abuse of Liberty*, and much sinful *Con-
 ‘ tention*, the heavy Hand of God’s Judgment, in
 ‘ the *Persecution* rais’d by *Dioclesian*, came upon
 ‘ them, which, saith he, took his first *Original*
 ‘ from the *Brethren under Banner in Camp*.’ And
 in another Chapter of his Book, speaking of this In-
 stance, he saith, ‘ At the first the Chief *Governor*
 ‘ starting up, as it were out of a profound Drunken-
 ‘ ness, levell’d at the *Church* privily and obscurely
 ‘ (since the Time which pass’d after the Reign of
 ‘ *Decius* and *Valerianus*) and waged *Battle* with us,
 ‘ not suddenly, but first assail’d only the CHRISTI-
 ‘ ANS

(b) *Euseb.* Book 6. Chap. 40. p. 115.

(c) *Euseb.* Book 7. Chap. 10. p. 1. 29.

‘ ANS which were in CAMP, by this Means he tho’t
 ‘ easily to ensnare the rest, if that first he conquered
 ‘ these. And here you might see many of the
 ‘ SOLDIERS desirous to lead a private and solitary
 ‘ Life, fearing they shou’d faint in the Service of
 ‘ Almighty God ; for when the *Captain* first went
 ‘ about to *persecute* his *Host*, and to try and sift as
 ‘ many as were bro’t to him thro’out every Ward,
 ‘ and to give them in Choice, either to obey and
 ‘ enjoy their *Dignity*, or to resist, and on the con-
 ‘ trary be deprived : Many of the SOLDIERS which
 ‘ were of the KINGDOM of CHRIST, without any
 ‘ Delay or Doubt, preferred the Faith of CHRIST
 ‘ before the Favour and Felicity they seem’d to en-
 ‘ joy. And one or two of them, very heartily, not
 ‘ only contemned their *Dignities*, but also endured
 ‘ bitter *Death*, for their Constancy in the Service of
 ‘ God (d), *Anno Dom.* 301.’

Another Instance mentioned by *Eusebius*, is that
 great *Officer* PHILOROMUS, *Governor* of *Alexandria*,
 a Gentleman of no small Account, ‘ Put in Trust
 ‘ with weighty Matters of the *Empire*, being guard-
 ‘ ed after the *Roman* Dignity and Honour, with a
 ‘ Troop of *Soldiers* to his *Train*, a Man of Riches,
 ‘ Honour, Eloquence, and Philosophy, yet pre-
 ‘ ferred before all these, the *Piety* and *Faith* in our
 ‘ Lord *Jesus Christ*, with a constant and philosophi-
 ‘ cal *Mind*, yea rather divine, enduring all the
 ‘ Threats and Contumelies of the *Judge*, was be-
 ‘ headed (e).’

Another memorable Instance mention’d by *Euse-
 bius*, is, ‘ A City in *Pbrygia* wholly inhabited of
 ‘ *Christians*, which when the *Soldiers* had besieged
 ‘ and compassed in (both Men, Women and Chil-
 ‘ dren, which called upon the Name of the Lord)
 ‘ they

(d) *Euseb.* Book 8. Chap. 1. and 4. and p. 144. and 146.

(e) *Euseb.* Book 8. Chap. 9. p. 149.

‘ they set all on Fire, and burnt them to Ashes ;
 ‘ for with one Consent all the Inhabitants thereof,
 ‘ the LIEUTENANT, the CAPTAIN, the whole SE-
 ‘ NATE, and the People, every one protested them-
 ‘ selves to be *Christians*, and could by no Edicts be
 ‘ brought to *adore Idols*, or carved *Images* (f).’

‘ Another famous *Officer* in the *State*, renowned
 ‘ for *Roman Dignity*, whose Name was AUDACTUS,
 ‘ by Lineage come of a noble House in *Italy*, and
 ‘ for his *Virtue* in great Credit with the *Emperor*,
 ‘ so that he governed with great *Wisdom* and Up-
 ‘ rightness the *Commonwealth*, and weightiest Mat-
 ‘ ters of the *Empire* ; but above all he was famous
 ‘ for *Religion* and *Faith* in *Christ*, endured Tor-
 ‘ ment, and was crowned with *Martyrdom* (g).

Eusebius gives us another Instance of a *Confessor*
 and a *Soldier*, by Name *Seleuchus*, who was be-
 headed for the *Cause* of *Christ*, whose Character he
 represents in the following Manner : ‘ He excelled
 ‘ all the rest of the *Soldiers* in youthly *Favour*, in
 ‘ *Strength*, and goodly *Stature* ; he was famous at
 ‘ the Beginning of the *Persecution*, for his patient
 ‘ *suffering* of *Stripes* in the *Defence* of the *Faith*,
 ‘ and being deprived of his *warlike Dignity*, which
 ‘ he enjoyed, became a zealous Follower of the
 ‘ *Worshippers*, or *religious Men* ; he succoured and
 ‘ provided for with fatherly Care and Oversight, the
 ‘ *Fatherless*, the *Succourless*, the *Widows*, and such
 ‘ *Men* as were visited with great *Misery* and Afflic-
 ‘ tion ; wherefore God being rather delighted with
 ‘ such *Sacrifices* of *Mercy*, and *Works* of *Charity*,
 ‘ than with smoky *Incense*, and bloody *Oblations*,
 ‘ called him, of his *Goodness*, unto this glorious
 ‘ and renowned *Garland* of *Martyrdom* (b).

‘ We

(f) Chapter 11.

(g) Chap. 11. p. 150. sixth Edition, London.

(b) *Eusebius*, Book 8. Chap. 29. p. 109.

‘ We may add, saith *Grotius*, that some *Soldiers* that had suffered Torments and *Death* for the sake of *Christ*, received from the Church the same Honour with other *Martyrs*; among whom are recorded three of *Paul’s Companions*: *Cerealis*, who suffered Martyrdom under *Decius*; *Marinus*, under *Valerian*; FIFTY under *Aurelian*; *Victor*, *Maurus*, and VALENTINUS a LIEUTENANT-GENERAL, under *Maximian*: About the same Time *Marcellus* the *Centurion*, and *Severian* under *Licinius*. Hence it is plain what the common Opinion of the primitive Christians was concerning War, even before the *Emperors* were *Christians* (i).’

Learned *Barbeirack* adds to the Instances before-mentioned, ‘ That of a *Soldier* baptized by *Cornelius*, related by *Ado*, in his *Martyrology* (k).’

Monfieur Fleury, in his *Ecclesiastical History* of the three first Centuries, gives an Account of four *Soldiers*; ‘ Namely, *Ammon*, *Zeno*, *Ptolmeus*, and *Ingenuous*, who came of a sudden before the *Tribunal*, a *Christian* being at that Time under the *Torture*, and almost ready to abjure, to whom they made Signs by their *Looks*, and with their *Bodies*, gnashing their *Teeth*, and stretching out their *Hands*; all the People cast their *Eyes* upon them; but before any Body laid hold of them, they ran to the *Scaffold*, laying that they were *Christians*. The *Præfēt* and his *Council* were surpriz’d at it, and the *Martyrs* coming from the *Tribunal*, went joyfully to the Place of Execution.’

Tertullian, in his *Apology*, speaketh in this Manner to the *Senate*, ‘ You need but consult the Letters of *Marcus Aurelius*, that wise *Emperor*; in which he bears Testimony to the *Rain* which the

U

‘ *Christian*

(i) Vid. *Grot. de Jur. Bell. et Pac. Book 1. Chap. 2. p. 49.*

(k) See *Notes upon Grot. p. 49.*

‘ *Christian Soldiers* obtain’d by their *Prayers*, for as-
 ‘ *fwaging the Thirst of his Army in Germany.*’

Afterwards speaking of the *Emperor*, he saith,
 ‘ We shall not entreat for him, those who are not
 ‘ Gods ; dead Persons that have no Power ; but
 ‘ we shall address ourselves for his Safety, to the liv-
 ‘ ing God, lifting up our Eyes to Heaven, and stretch-
 ‘ ing out our Hands, with our Heads bare, we
 ‘ pray for all the *Emperors* ; and we beg that they
 ‘ may live long, and reign peaceably, that they may find
 ‘ Safety in their Houses, VALOUR in their TROOPS,
 ‘ and Fidelity in the Senate.---

‘ We swear not, saith he, by the *Genius* of the
 ‘ *Emperor*, but by his Safety, more venerable than all
 ‘ the *Genii* ; know ye not that the *Geni* are so many
 ‘ Demons----(1)?’

‘ They reproach us in another Respect ; they say
 ‘ we are useless in the Affairs of Life : How can
 ‘ they affirm this, since we live amongst you, using
 ‘ the same Food, the same Clothes, and the same
 ‘ Goods ? We go to your publick Places, to your
 ‘ Markets, and to your Fairs, and to your Baths, and
 ‘ to your Inns ; we sail with you, we traffick, and
 ‘ we BEAR ARMS (m).’

‘ *Maximian* associated in the *Empire* his
 ‘ Son *Maximus*, and it is probable, that upon
 ‘ his Accession, he gave *Largeffes* to the *Soldi-*
 ‘ *ers* ; and to this we may attribute the *Book* which
 ‘ *Tertullian*

(1) Denique oramus pro omnibus imperatoribus, vitam illis
 prolixam, imperium securum, domum tutam exercitus fortes,
 senatum fidelem. Vid. Apologst. p. 30. Edit. secunda, Lutet.
 a Rigaltio.

(m) Itaque non sine foro, non sine Macello, non sine balne-
 is, tabernis, officinis, stabulis, nundinis vestris, ceterisque com-
 merciis cohabitamus hoc seculum, navigamus et nos vobiscum,
 et vobiscum militamus. Vid. Apologst. Tertul. p. 38. Edit. se-
 cunda, Lutet. a Rigaltio.

‘ *Tertullian* wrote after his *Fall*, concerning a *Soldier’s Crown*.-----

‘ The *Soldiers* came as was usual, *crown’d* with
 ‘ *Laurel*, to receive their Share of the *Donation* ;
 ‘ and there was one amongst them who appeared
 ‘ with his Head bare, holding his *Crown* in his
 ‘ *Hand* ; the rest who were far distant, pointed at
 ‘ him and scoffed, and those who were near, raged
 ‘ with indignation ; the *Tribune* hearing of the *Noise*,
 ‘ ask’d him why he wasn’t like the rest ? It isn’t law-
 ‘ ful for me, said he, because I am a *Christian* : Then
 ‘ they consulted about the Matter, and he was sent
 ‘ back to the *Prefect’s* of the *Camp* ; there he was
 ‘ degraded, and quitting his *Coat*, his *Buskins*, and
 ‘ his *Sword*, he was put into *Prison*. Several bla-
 ‘ med him, as having expos’d himself rashly, and
 ‘ endanger’d the *Peace* which the *Church* had long
 ‘ enjoy’d ; maintaining besides, that this *Crown* was
 ‘ an Ornament that was indifferent. & *Tertullian* on
 ‘ the contrary asserts, that it was a *Mark* of *Idola-*
 ‘ *try*, and accordingly undertakes to defend the *Sol-*
 ‘ *dier* (n).’

But in the mean Time acknowledges, that that
 Soldier had many *Christian Fellow-Soldiers* in the
Army (Cop. 5).

The aforesaid Particulars, duly considered, do, in
 my Opinion, plainly prove, that *Tertullian* acknow-
 ledged the Lawfulness of *War*, when no sinful
Terms are impos’d. But to proceed.

‘ The *Emperor Maximian* went into *Gaul* in the
 ‘ Beginning of his Reign, against *Eliau* and *Aman-*
 ‘ *dus*, whom he defeated. He brought out of the
 ‘ East a *Legion* call’d the *Theban Legion*, consisting
 ‘ entirely of *Christians* ; and when he would have
 ‘ made use of them to persecute the *Christians*, as
 U 2 ‘ the

(n) See *Fleury’s Eccles. Hist.* p. 287, 292, 293, 294, and
 344.

' the other *Legions* did, they refus'd to obey him.
 ' The *Emperor* to refresh himself after the Fatigue
 ' of his *March*, staid at a Place in the *Alps* near *Octo-*
 ' *todura*, now *Martinach*, in *Valois* ; and the *The-*
 ' *ban Legion* was then near *Agouna*, at the Foot of
 ' the *Alps*, which is at present called *Great St. Ber-*
 ' *nard*. *Maximian* enraged at their Disobedience,
 ' commanded the *Legion* to be *decimated*, and re-
 ' peated his Orders to oblige the Rest to persecute
 ' the Christians. *Decimation* is a military Punish-
 ' ment appointed to be inflicted on a great *Body* of
 ' *Criminals*. The *Theban Soldiers* hearing of the
 ' second Order that was given, began to cry out o-
 ' ver all the Camp, that they wou'd suffer all Ex-
 ' tremities, rather than do any Thing contrary to the
 ' *Christian Religion*. *Maximian* ordered that they
 ' should be decimated a second Time, and that the
 ' Remainder of them shou'd obey his Orders. Then
 ' every Tenth Man was put to Death, according as
 ' the Lot fell, and the rest exhorted one another to
 ' persevere.

' They were principally encourag'd by three of
 ' their General Officers, *Mauritius*, *Exuperus*, and
 ' *Candidus*, who propos'd to them the Example of
 ' their Comrades, whom *Martyrdom* had already
 ' conducted to Heaven ; by their Advice they sent a
 ' Remonstrance to the *Emperor*, the Substance of
 ' which was this, My Lord, we are your *Soldiers*,
 ' but the *Servants* of the true *God*, as we freely con-
 ' fess : We owe you *Service* in *War*, and him *Inno-*
 ' *cence* : We receive *Pay* from you, from him *Life* :
 ' We cannot obey you by renouncing *God* our *Cre-*
 ' *ator*, our *Master*, and yours likewise, even when
 ' you reject him. If we are commanded nothing
 ' that gives us just Offence, we readily obey, as we
 ' have done to this present Time ; otherwise we
 ' will obey him rather than you. We will rea-
 ' dily

' dily oppose all your *Enemies*, whosoever they are;
 ' but think not that we can be allowed to dip our
 ' Hands in the Blood of innocent Persons. We
 ' have taken our *Oath* to *God*, before we took one
 ' to you, and you can place no Confidence in our
 ' second Oath, should we violate the first. You
 ' command us to search out for Christians, in order
 ' to punish them; you need not enquire after others,
 ' behold we are here. We confess *God* the *Father*,
 ' *Author* of all Things, and his Son *Jesus Christ*,
 ' we have seen our Companions slain in our Sight,
 ' without lamenting for them; we rejoice at the *Hon-*
 ' *nour* they have had to suffer for their *God*; neither
 ' this Extremity, nor Despair, hath urged us to re-
 ' volt; we have *Arms* in our *Hands*, but resist not;
 ' because we had rather die blameless, than live cul-
 ' pable!

' *Maximian*, having no Hopes of overcoming so
 ' great Constancy, order'd them all to be put to
 ' Death, and commanded his *Troops* to surround
 ' them, and cut them to Pieces! They made no
 ' Resistance, but dropt their Arms, and presented
 ' their Necks to their Executioners! The Ground
 ' was covered with their dead *Bodies*, and *Streams*
 ' of *Blood* flowed on it! Their Number is supposed
 ' to be about Six thousand, of which Number a *Le-*
 ' *gion* did generally consist.

' A veteran *Soldier*, named *Victor*, who was not
 ' of that *Legion*, but out of the Service, met him
 ' as he was passing along, among those Soldiers who
 ' had put the *Martyrs* to Death, and rejoicing over
 ' their Spoils, they invited him to eat with them,
 ' and related with Pleasure what had passed. As he
 ' retired, detesting the Feast, and those that made it,
 ' they enquired of him, if he was not also a *Christi-*
 ' *an*? He answered that he was, and should always
 ' continue

‘ continue one ; upon which they instantly fell upon him, and slew him (o), *An. Dom.* 285 (p).’

The next Instance that I would mention is St. *Victor* of *Marseilles* ; it is certain, saith *Fleury*, ‘ That he suffered Martyrdom by Order of the present Emperor *Maximian*, and after the *Theban Legion* ; he was a *Christian Soldier*, and so zealous, ‘ that he went in the Night-time to visit the Faithful, and encourage them to *Martyrdom* ; being ‘ seized, he was immediately brought before the ‘ *Prefects*, who exhorted him not to resign his Expectations, and the Favour of his *Prince*, for a ‘ *dead Man* ; such they took *Jesus Christ* to be. He ‘ answered with Abundance of Freedom, which ‘ drew upon him the Looks and Insults of all the ‘ Infidels about him ; but because he was a Person ‘ of Distinction, the *Prefects* referred him to the ‘ *Emperor* himself ; and he shewing no less Constancy at his *Tribunal* ; the *Emperor* being highly incensed, ordered him to be dragged through the City ;

(o) See *Fleury's Eccles. Hist.* p. 495, 496.

(p) The Account which Doctor *Cave* gives of this memorable Event, is substantially the same : He only adds from *Marcus*, ‘ That there was another, *Mauritius*, Commander of ‘ a Legion in the East (mentioned in the *Greek Menologic*;) who, ‘ together with *Seventy* of his *Soldiers*, was condemned by, and ‘ suffered under, this same *Emperor Maximianus*, for refusing ‘ to do Sacrifice ; their Martyrdom being recorded by *Simeon* ‘ *Metaphrastes*.’ See *Cav. Primit. Christ.* p. 431. to 436.

St. *Cyril* likewise confirms the aforesaid Relation ; and *Albert Kranzius* speaks of some *Martyrs* of the *Theban Legion*, whose Bodies were removed to *Brunswick*. *Saxonick* 7. 16. *Grotius*.

Eucherius, Bishop of *Lyons*, asserts, that from *Mauritius*, Commander of the aforesaid *Legion*, the Town of *Aganum*, in *Switzerland*, was afterwards called St. *Maurice*.

Guiliman, in his History of *Switzerland*, declares, that that Nation pays a great Veneration to the Memory of the famous Martyr *Mauritius*, Commander of the *Theban Legion*. *Vid. Franc. Guiliman, de Rebus Helvet. Lib. 1. Cap. 15.*

ty; whereupon they tied him Hand and Foot,
 and drag'd him in this Manner, expos'd to the
 Blows and Insults of the Populace; which every
 one tho't they had been criminal if they had not
 offered. He was then bro't back mangled and bloody
 to the *Tribunal* of the *Presets*; and believing
 him sufficiently humbled by this Usage, they still
 pressed him by the Reasons which the Pagans commonly
 made Use of. The *Martyr* on the other
 Hand, encourag'd by this Beginning of a *Victory*,
 answered them, expressing his Fidelity to the *Em-*
peror, and Contempt of their false *Gods*. After
 which the *Presets* said to him, *Victor*, will you
 not leave off Philosophizing? Chuse in one Word,
 either to appease the *Gods*, or miserably to perish.

Since you have made this Proposal to me, says
 he, it is necessary that I shou'd confirm my Dis-
 course by my Example. I despise your *Gods*;
 I confess *Jesus Christ*; inflict on me all the Tor-
 ments you can invent. The *Presets* being enra-
 ged, and one of them being willing to torment
 him more than the other, they were divided in
 their Opinion; one of them named *Eutichius* re-
 tired, and the Charge of tormenting the *Martyr*,
 fell upon *Asterius*. He ordered him to be bound,
 and very cruelly tormented a long Time. The
Martyr held his Eyes fix'd towards Heaven, pray-
 ing for Patience, which was accordingly granted
 him; *Jesus Christ* appeared to him, holding a
 Cross in his Hands, and said to him, *Peace be*
with you Victor; I am Jesus, who suffer in the
Persons of my Saints: Be of good Courage, I will
assist you in the Combat. These Words dispersed
 both his Grief and Torments. Then began he to
 praise God with a chearful Countenance; and the
 Executioners being fatigued, and seeing they
 cou'd prevail nothing with him, the *Preset* or-
 dered

‘ dered him to be taken from the *Rack*, and put into a very dark *Dungeon*.

‘ At Midnight *Jesus Christ* sent his *Angels* to visit him ; the Prison was open and fill’d with a Light brighter than the Day ; and the *Martyr* sung with the *Angels* the *Praises* of God. Three *Soldiers* who guarded him, seeing this Light, threw themselves at the Feet of the *Saint*, begg’d his Pardon, and desir’d *Baptism* ; whom he instructed and *baptized*. Their Names were *Alexander*, *Longinus* and *Felician*. The next Morning this being known, the *Emperor* sent his Officers, and brought them to a publick Place, where the whole *City* was assembled together. The three *Soldiers* faithfully persevering in their Confession, were beheaded ; and after a few Days *Victor* himself was put to a very cruel *Death*, which he endured with an unshaken Magnanimity ; his Feet being first cut off, and his Bones broken and crush’d under the grinding Stone of a Hand-mill, his Head was at last cut off (q).’

‘ Monsieur *Fleury*, speaking of *Constantius*, saith, That he, as well as other *Emperors*, had a great Number of *Christians* among his OFFICERS, and in his Household ; he gave them their Choice, either to *Sacrifice* and continue in their *Posts*, or to be banish’d his Presence, and lose his Favour if they refus’d. Many preferred their *temporal Interest* to their *Religion* ; but *several* continued steadfast in the *Faith* (r).’

‘ But they were all astonished when *Constantius* declared, that he esteemed the *Ap'states* as self-interested and base Persons, supposing that they would be as treacherous to him, as they had been to their *God* ; and therefore discharged them forever

(q) See *Fleur. Eccles. Hist.* p. 497-8.

(r) *Hist. Eccles.* 521.

‘ ever from his Service. On the contrary, he look’d
 ‘ upon the other as worthy to be esteemed his best
 ‘ Friends, and the faithfulest *Guard* he could intrust
 ‘ himself and his *Empire* with.’

Doctör *Dupin*, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, observing, that St. *Basil* gives an Account of the Life of St. *Gordus*; he says, ‘ That this Saint was at
 ‘ *Cesarea*, and that he had the Command of a hundred Men in the *Emperor’s Army*; that in his Time
 ‘ a furious Persecution was raised against the Church;
 ‘ that then this Saint, of his own Accord, quitted
 ‘ his Office of *Captain*, and retired to a solitary
 ‘ Place; that after he had been there exercised, purified and prepared for the Combat, he came into
 ‘ the *City* one Day, when all the People were assembled to see a publick *Shew*, which was presented
 ‘ upon the *Theatre*, and declared who he was, and suffered *Martyrdom*, as was believed, under
 ‘ *Licinius*: Now, tho’ the forward *Zeal* of this pious *Soldier*, as *Dupin* justly observes, needs an
 ‘ Excuse, yet there was certainly something noble in it!’

St. *Basil*, in the *History* of the forty *Martyrs* that suffered under *Licinius*, observes, ‘ That they
 ‘ were forty *Soldiers*, who being at *Sebestia* during
 ‘ the *Persecution* of *Licinius*, declared that they
 ‘ were *Christians*. When the Governor of the *City*
 ‘ saw that their Constancy could not be shaken, nor
 ‘ they by fair Means persuaded to change their
 ‘ *Religion*, he ordered them to be exposed in the
 ‘ Night all naked to the *Rigour* of the *Air*, and
 ‘ Time when a Pond near the *City* was quite frozen
 ‘ over. They all resolved to endure this Torment
 ‘ with Constancy; but one of them being overcome
 ‘ with Pain, renounced the *Faith* of *Jesus Christ*;
 ‘ but he lost his Soul, and could not save his
 ‘ For he was no sooner put into warm Water, so

‘bring some Heat into him again, but he expired. However God permitted that the Number of the forty Martyrs should be compleat; for one of their *Guards* perceiving the Angels, who distributed to each of them a *Crown*, made Profession of being a Christian, and put himself into their Number, and was baptized in his own *Blood*, and saved by his *Faith*. The next Morning they were all burnt, and their Ashes thrown into the River.’ *Basil* adds, ‘That the *Mother* of one of these *Martyrs* exhorted him to suffer boldly (*f*).

Having premised such Considerations as I tho’t necessary, to enlighten the labouring Subject; I proceed to consider the particular Instances, that our Author has adduced in Favour of his Sentiments. The

1. Of which is *Socrates*, *V. p. 9.* who is represented by Mr. *S.* as saying, ‘That Injury is to be done upon no Account; nor if you have suffered Injury, are you at Liberty to take Revenge, as the Vulgar believe, &c.’

I Answer, that what *Socrates* says, is very just and true: Private *Revenge* in *Society*, in ordinary Cases, or repelling Force by Force, is irregular and unjust, as I have before observed; and therefore this Instance is quite beside the Point in Dispute.

Isn’t it something strange, that our Author shou’d bring in a Sentence of that eminent *Pagan*, to condemn his known *Practice*; and use the Gentleman’s *Magazine* as his Voucher to this Purpose. The

2. Instance that our Author advances, is *Ambrose*, a Christian *Father*, *V. p. 15.* who upon these Words of our Saviour, respecting the two Swords that the Disciples spoke of, *It is enough*; saith, ‘O Lord, why commandest thou me to buy

‘a

(f) *Vid. Dupin’s Eccles. Hist. fourth Cent. p. 155, 156.*

‘ a Sword, who forbiddest me to smite with it ?
 ‘ &c.’

To which I reply ;

1. That even by our Author’s Manner of citing *Ambrose’s* Words, the Cause I am defending, is proved by this Sentence, ‘ *Unless perhaps a Defence be prepared ;*’ pray what else is the Design of the *Association*, but the *Defence* of our *Lives* and *Properties*, together with due Preparation for it ; which the Sermon our *Author* opposes, was calculated to encourage.

2. Mr. *S.* or his *Apologist*, has not cited *Ambrose’s* Words fairly ; which are these, ‘ *Unless perhaps a Defence be prepared, not willingly necessary, the Law nevertheless does not forbid to strike again (t) &c.*’

3. To take *Ambrose’s* Words in our *Author’s* Sense, as opposing all *War*, makes him contradict himself in the very Passage he cites from him ; for therein he owns the Lawfulness of *preparing* for *Defence* ; ’tis true he says, ‘ *It is not willingly necessary ;*’ and we join with him heartily, and wou’d be glad there was no Necessity of it ; besides, he acknowledges that the Law does not forbid to strike again, and that it is equitable in itself, ‘ *That in the Law there might be learning of Equity.*’

Besides it makes him contradict himself elsewhere, not only in that Passage I have before cited from him, in which he expressly declares for *Defensive War*, but likewise in this that I shall now mention ; his Words are these ; ‘ *How great Justice is, may be understood*

X 2

(t)---‘ *Cur haberi precipis quod vetas promi, nisi forte ut sit parata defensio non ultro necessaria, ut videar potuisse vindicari, sed noluisse, lex tamen referre non vetat ; et ideo fortasse Petro duos gladios offerenti, fat est dicit, quasi licuerit usque ad evangelium, ut sit in lege, equitatis eruditio in evangelio bonitatis perfectio. Ambros. Lib. 7. in Lucam,*

‘derstood from this, that it is to be excluded from
 ‘no Places, Persons, or Times; but is to be kept
 ‘even to Enemies; so that if a *Place* or *Day* is ap-
 ‘pointed for *Battle* with an *Enemy*, it is reckoned
 ‘contrary to *Justice* to come before the *Place* or
 ‘*Time*; if indeed our Enemies have been more ve-
 ‘hement and unfaithful, and to such as have hurt us
 ‘more, a more vehement *Revenge* is returned; as to
 ‘the *Midianites*, who by their Women, made ma-
 ‘ny of the *Jewish* People to sin: It is evident
 ‘therefore, that even in *War*, *Faith* and *Justice*
 ‘must be kept (u).’

But the chief Difficulty in *Ambrose’s* Words, is in
 the latter Part of the Paragraph, ‘That in the *Law*
 ‘there might be learning of *Equity*, but in the *Gos-
 ‘pel* a *Perfection* of *Goodness*.’

Now the Meaning of *Ambrose* in the aforesaid
 Sentence, can, in a Consistency with the rest of the
 Paragraph, and other Passages cited from him, be
 no other than this, *viz.* ‘Tho’ the *Church* under the
Jewish Dispensation, or *Ministers* of it, us’d a *tem-
 poral* *Sword*, in the Exercise of their *Discipline* upon
Transgressors; yet that under the *Gospel* the *Officers*
 of the *Church* are to use a *spiritual* *Sword* only in
 their *Discipline* upon *Offenders*, for this Reason,
 because that under the former Dispensation, God’s
 Equity or *Righteousness* was peculiarly display’d;
 and under the latter, his *Goodness*. Now these
 three

(u) ‘Quantum autem *justia* fit ex hoc intelligi potest, quod
 ‘nec locis nec personis, nec temporibus excipitur, quæ etiam
 ‘hostibus reservatur, ut si constitutus sit cum hoste aut lo-
 ‘cus aut dies prælio, adversus *justitiam* putaretur, ut loco pre-
 ‘venire nat tempore, siquidem vehementioribus hostibus et infi-
 ‘dis et his qui amplius *leserint*, *vehementior* *refertur ultio*, ut
 ‘*Midianitis*, qui per mulieres suas plerosque peccare fecerant ex
 ‘plebe *Judeorum*;--liquet, igitur etiam in bello fidem et *justitiam*
 ‘servare oportere.’ *Ambros. Cap. 29. p. 11. Tom. 4. Edit.*
An. v. c. p.

three Things confirm this Interpretation of *Ambrose's* Words, *viz.*

1. That it agrees with the rest of the Paragraph, and what is cited from him elsewhere.

2. The Words of *Christ*, which he explains by them, were spoken to a *Minister*. And,

3. This was the prevailing Sentiment of the primitive Church (with which undoubtedly *Ambrose* agreed) as I have shewn before ; to which I wou'd add these few Words ; *Cyprian* saith, ' That God ' commanded the *Disobedient* to be *slain by the* ' *Priests*, whom he constituted Judges for a Time, ' and then indeed they were kill'd with the *Sword*, ' *saith he*,---but now the Proud and Obstinate are ' slain by the spiritual Sword, while they are cast out ' of the Church (x):'

Augustine speaks to the same Purpose, as follows ; ' The Priest *Phineas*, saith he, run thro' with the ' avenging Iron (*viz.* the *Sword*) the Adulterers ' found together ; what was even then signified concerning Degrading and Excommunication, is to be ' done at this Time, when in the Discipline of the ' Church the visible Sword ceaseth (y).'

'Tis Pity that our *Author* shou'd so much wrong that excellent Father *Ambrose*, in misapplying to the Defence of the *State*, what he only spake of the *Discipline* of the *Church*. The

3d Instance that Mr. S. brings, is *Justin Martyr*, V. p. 35. who speaking of this Prophecy, *That Nation*

(x) ' Interfici Deus jussit non obtemperantes a sacerdotibus suis, judicibus a se ad tempus constitutis, et tunc quidem gladio, occidebantur,---nunc autem *spirituali gladio* superbi et contumaces necantur, dum de ecclesia ejiciuntur.' *Cypr. Epist.* 11. *Lib.* 1.

(y) ' Phineas sacerdos, inquit, adulteros simul inventos ultro re ferro transfixit, quod utique de degradationibus et excommunicationibus significatum est, faciendum in hoc tempore, cum in Ecclesiae disciplina gladius visibilis fuerit cessaturus.' *Lib. de Fide et Operibus, Cap.* 2.

tion shall not lift up Sword against Nation, neither shall they learn War any more---says, ' That this is thus fulfilled, you have Grounds to believe ; for we ' who in Times past kill'd one another, do not war ' or fight with our Enemies.'

To which I answer ; It is very true, the Prophecy is fulfill'd in its spiritual Sense (in some Degree) by the peaceable Temper and Behaviour of Christians towards each other, by their Aversion to all Appearance of *Rebellion* against their rightful *Governors*, and likewise by their Abhorrence of, and Opposition to that Abomination, *Offensive War* !

That this is *Justin's* Meaning, appears from the Words which Mr. S. has cited from him ; ' For we ' who in Times past kill'd one another, do not war ' or fight with our Enemies.' And likewise from the following Words of the same Apology (presented to *Titus Elius Adrianus*) speaking of the Change that the Christian Religion wrought upon them, he saith, ' Formerly we delighted in *Debauchery*, but now we love nothing but *Purity*---- ' We *bated* one another ; but now since the Coming ' of *Jesus Christ*, we live familiarly together, and ' pray for our Enemies ; we endeavour to convert ' our *Persecutors*, to the End that they may live ' according to the Precepts of *Jesus Christ* (z).'

To the same Purpose *Ignatius* speaks, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians* (which was wrote *An. Dom.* 106) having mentioned their *Persecutors*, he saith, ' Oppose to their proud Boastings, your Humility ; ' to their Injuries, your Prayers ; to their Errors, ' your Stedfastness in the Faith ; to their Brutality, ' your Courtesy.'

Agreeable hereto *Polycarp*, in his Epistle to the *Philippians* (wrote in the Year after Christ 108) saith, ' Pray for *Kings, Princes, Powers*, for those ' that

(z) Vid. *Fleury's Eccles. Hist.* p. 201.

‘ that persecute and hate you, and for the Enemies
 ‘ of the Cross, to the End that the Fruit of your
 ‘ Faith may be manifest to all the World.’

But to suppose, with our *Author*, that *Justin Martyr* designed, by the aforesaid Passage, to oppose *Defensive War*, is to make him inconsistent with himself; for he, in his second Apology, presented *A. D.* 150, plainly manifests his Approbation of it, by addressing the *Emperors* in the following Manner: ‘ We earnestly endeavour every where,
 ‘ and before all other Things, saith he, that the *Tri-
 ‘ bute Money* and Contributions, be brought into
 ‘ those Collectors who are appointed by you, even
 ‘ as we are taught by him (*i. e.* Christ) wherefore
 ‘ we adore God alone, and we gladly serve you in
 ‘ other Things, professing that you are *Emperors* and
 ‘ *Princes* of (*i. e.* among) Men; and at the same time
 ‘ praying that, together with your imperial Power,
 ‘ ye may be found by Experience to possess a sound
 ‘ Mind (*a*).’ Now, does not their Care about the *Tribute-money*, a good part of which was applied to the Maintenance of *Soldiers*, and their Declaration of serving the *Emperors* in other Things, that did not relate to their religious Worship; *i. e.* in all Things of a civil Nature, plainly imply, and evidence the primitive Christians Approbation of a *Defensive War*?

Besides, our *Author's Gloss* upon *Justin's* Words, does not only charge Inconsistency upon that venerable Man, but likewise manifold and palpable Weakness, which is very uncharitable!

I. In

(*a*) ‘ *Vestigalia et collationes, eis qui a vobis sunt ordinati
 ‘ exactoribus, præ omnibus ubique inferre contendimus, quem-
 ‘ admodum ab eo (Christe) sumus instituti. Præinde nos solum
 ‘ Deum adoramus, et vobis in aliis rebus leti inservimus, impe-
 ‘ ratores ac principes hominum esse profitentes, et simul pre-
 ‘ cantes, ut cum imperiali potestate, sanam quoque mentem ob-
 ‘ tinere comperiamini.*’ *Justin Martyr in Apolog. secunda.*

1. In concluding he imagined, that by the peaceable Temper and Behaviour of a few Christians (comparatively) who had then no national Establishment or civil State, either of great or small Dimensions, that the aforesaid *Prophecy*, which speaks of *Nations not lifting up Sword against Nation*, should be fulfilled *literally*; Is a small Number of People, scattered up and down, in various Countries, proceeding from different Nations, and having no Form of civil Government among them, a Nation? And,

2. That in an *Apology* designed to vindicate the Christians of that Time, and obtain Favour for them from the *Emperors*, he should offer any Thing that directly tended to stain their Character, and incite the Emperors Resentments against them, of which kind this Notion of rejecting *Defensive War* intirely most certainly is; for what is it in Effect, but to address the *Emperors* in the following Manner?

‘ *Dread Sirs*, May it please your *Majesties* to consider, that we *Christians* cannot, in a Consistency with the Principles of our *Religion*, assist you, by bearing *Arms* in Defence of your *Crown* and *Dignity*, in the Defence of your *Empire* against your Enemies, however you may command us notwithstanding; tho’ we have a sincere and strong Regard to the *Safety* of your *Person* and *Empire*, yet our *Religion* will not suffer us to express it, in the Protection of either, by opposing Force to Force.’

Now can we imagine that such a Declaration wou’d be a good Expression of *Loyalty* to their *Prince*, or Regard to their *Country*, or that it wou’d have any Tendency to induce the Pagan *Emperors*, to entertain favourable Sentiments of a *Religion*, that equally oppos’d the clearest Dictates of human *Reason*, and the most valuable Interests of civil *Society*, or to shew any Favour to the Professors of it? In a Word, as I humbly conceive, the
aforesaid

aforesaid Gloss turns *Justin Martyr's Apology* for the Christians into an *Impeachment* of them, and *Invective* against them: But for my Part, I know no Reason we have to think, that *Justin* was a Man of such a weak Mind, as to offer a *Satyr* instead of a *Panegyrick*; or to act the Part of an *Accuser*, instead of an *Apologist*. But to proceed: The

4th Instance that our *Author* advances, is that of *Athenagoras*, *V. p. 42, 43.* who in his *Apology* to the *Roman Emperors, M. Aurelius Antoninus, and M. Aurelius Commodus*, declares, ' That they made these Words of our Saviour their *Rules and Dogma's*, namely, *To love their Enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that persecute you, &c.* Agreeable hereto he observes, That the Christians of that Day, lov'd their Neighbours, and exercis'd Innocence and Purity of Life, assuring them, that they cou'd suffer no Evil of their Persecutors, tho' it were to the Loss of their Lives, which cou'd be of any Value, when compar'd to that exceeding great Reward, which God wou'd give them hereafter.'

Ans. This Speech of *Athenagoras*, is very sound and wholesome, and perfectly consistent with our defensive Principles. We bless God we can declare, with the same Truth and Justice as *Athenagoras*, That all who fear God among us, who are for *Defensive War*, make the aforesaid golden Words of our *Saviour*, the Rule of our Conduct likewise, whatever our Author imagines to the contrary notwithstanding; tho' he is pleas'd to put us in the same *Box* as the primitive *Apologists* did the *Pagans*.

' Here, Reader, saith he, *V. p. 43.* were *Disciples*, that instead of construing away the greatest Part of the Force of their Master's *Precepts*, took up their *Cross*, deny'd themselves, and faithfully

Y

' practi-

‘ practis’d them.’ On which Words, allow me to
 ‘ propose a few Queries.

Query 1. Is it then the chief Force of Christ’s
Precepts to abstain from *Defensive War*? But where
 are these *Precepts* to be found?

Query 2. Where is the *Self-denial* and *Cross* in be-
 ing freed from the *Labour* and *Expence* of preparing
 for the Defence of our Country?

Query 3. If the Chief Force of Christ’s *Precepts*,
 the chief Weight of his *Cross*, and of *Self-denial*,
 consist in being freed as aforesaid from *Charge* and
Fatigue; then are not the Difficulties of Religion as
 light as a *Feather*, and very agreeable to the corrupt
 Inclinations of Nature, which verge to *Money* and
Ease?

In the mean Time, we heartily forgive our Au-
 thor’s *Invective*, and pray God to pardon his *Uncha-
 ritableness* and *Persecution*, and bless him with a
 sound Mind, and all other needful Mercies, for
 Time and Eternity.

Now inasmuch as the aforesaid Instance of *Athe-
 nagoras*, expressly respects *Persecution*, it is quite be-
 side the Point in Question, and therefore deserves
 no more Notice; however, I shall beg leave to
 add a few Words.

‘ He complains, says Monsieur *Fleury*, to the
 ‘ two *Emperors*, *Marcus Aurelius*, and *Lucius Ve-
 ‘ rus*, that the Christians are the only People whom
 ‘ they *persecute*, on Account of their *Name*, whilst
 ‘ all others are permitted to live according to their
 ‘ *Laws* and *Religion*.’ ‘ Our *Persecutors*, saith he,
 ‘ are not contented with depriving us of our Goods
 ‘ and Honour, and whatever else the Generality of
 ‘ Mankind look upon as valuable, for we despise
 ‘ it all--But they attack our *Persons* and our *Lives*;
 ‘ ---It depends upon you, most great and wise *Prin-
 ‘ ces*, to defend us by the *Laws* (b).’

I may

(b) *Vid. Fleury’s Eccles. Hist.* p. 208-9.

I may add, that *Athenagoras* is so far from being against *Defensive War*, in his Apology, that he virtually and consequentially justifies it; for in his Answer to the *Calumny* of eating human Flesh, he saith, 'We are not contented with meer *Justice*, in 'returning like for like; but we go farther, and 'propose to ourselves Kindness and Patience. Since 'we hold these Maxims, can we be call'd *Murderers*, 'without the greatest Folly?' And speaking to the *Emperors*, he saith, 'We are alike in every 'Thing, being obedient to *Reason*, without pre- 'tending to master it (c).' Observe, by the by, that *Athenagoras* was far from our Author's Opinion, of judging it to be an Evil in itself, to resist, or to return like for like. For Brevity's sake, I shall offer no more at present upon this Instance, only remember the Reader, that what has been said upon the Instance of *Justin Martyr*, is applicable here: And so proceed to the

5th Instance, that our Author is pleas'd to adduce, which is *Tertullian*, *V. p. 45.* who saith, 'How 'shall he fight, whose Sword is taken from him by 'Christ? Fortho' the Soldiers came to *John*, and 'received a Form of Observation, if also the *Centurion* believ'd, yet Christ, by disarming *Peter*, 'disarm'd every Soldier afterward.'

I Answer, that *Tertullian's* Words, immediately before and after what our Author has cited from him, shew his Meaning, *viz.* That he only oppos'd such *Wars* as involved Persons in *Idolatry*, &c. sinful *Swearing*, or at least endangered their Innocence: His Words are these;

'Hence, lately there arose a Dispute, whether a 'Servant of God, cou'd accept of the Administration of any Dignity or Power, in Case he cou'd

‘ keep himself untainted from all Appearance of
 ‘ *Idolatry*, either thro’ some Favour or Subtlety ?

‘ We grant, *says he*, that he may succeed to
 ‘ some, in case he neither *sacrifices* himself, nor en-
 ‘ courages *Sacrifices* by his Authority, or *places* them,
 ‘ or appoints any to take Care of the *Temples*, or
 ‘ procures their *Revenue*, or puts forth *Shews* of him-
 ‘ self or the Publick, or presides at the *Feasts* on such
 ‘ Occasions, and in Case he pronounces or enjoins
 ‘ no *Anniversary*, and does not *swear*.

‘ But now, *says he*, it is queried whether a faith-
 ‘ ful Person can be turn’d to *War*, or whether *War*
 ‘ even *darkened*, or also *inferior*, to which there is
 ‘ not a Necessity of *Sacrifices*, or capital Punish-
 ‘ ments, may be admitted to *Faith*; it doesn’t suit,
 ‘ *says he*, to join a divine and human *Sacrament* ;
 ‘ the Banner of *Christ*, and the Banner of the *Devil* ;
 ‘ the Camp of Light and of Darknes ; one Soul
 ‘ cannot be bound to two, *God* and *Cæsar*’ --- *Then*
 ‘ *he expresses what our Author has cited, and after-*
 ‘ *wards says*, ‘ But also when the Conversation of di-
 ‘ vine Discipline is not only endanger’d by Deeds,
 ‘ but by Words.---He has fallen therefore into *Ido-*
 ‘ *latry*, who has honour’d an Idol with the Name
 ‘ of *God*.---But I speak truly, it is a customary
 ‘ Fault, thro’ the Ignorance of some, who are ig-
 ‘ norant that they must *swear* by *Hercules* : Moreo-
 ‘ ver, what is *solemn Swearing* against a Thing, by
 ‘ those you have excepted against, but a betraying
 ‘ of *Faith* with *Idolatry* ? Who doesn’t honour
 ‘ those by whom he swears (d) ?’

‘ Upon

(d) ‘ Hinc proxime disputatio oborta est, an servus Dei ali-
 ‘ cujus dignitatis ut potestatis administrationem capiat ? si ab
 ‘ omni specie *idololatriæ* intactum se, aut gratia aliqua, ut astu-
 ‘ tia etiam prestari possit.

‘ Cedamus itaque succedere alicui posse, neque *sacrificet*, ne-
 ‘ que *sacrificiis* auctoritatem suam accommodet, non hostias lo-
 ‘ cet,

Upon the aforefaid Words of *Tertullian*, I wou'd obferve briefly thefe few Things ; namely,

1. That he puts military and civil Offices upon a Par, and informs us that they were both queftion'd at that Time ; I mean the Lawfulnefs of both ; and no Wonder, feeing finful Terms were propos'd, fuch as *fwearing* by *Hercules*, or by the *Emperor's Genius*, which *Tertullian* fays in his *Apolo-gy*, was, in Effect, to give divine Honour to *De-vils* : He likewife obferves, in the Words I have ci-ted, that the *Oath* of Fidelity to *God*, and to the Prince, were, under fuch Circumftances, inconfi-ſtent Things. But,

2. He ſpeaks not a Word of the Unlawfulnefs of *Defenſive War*, in its own Nature. And there-fore,

3. The Words cited by our *Author*, muſt be taken in a reſtrained Senſe, as ſignifying Chriſt's prohibiting our Uſe of the *Sword*, at ſuch Times when it involves us in *Idolatry*, or endangers our Innocence.

The

‘ cet, non curas templorum deleget, non veſtigalia eorum pro-
‘ curet, non ſpectacula edat de ſuo ut de publico, ut edendis
‘ preſit, nihil ſolenne pronunciet vel edicat, ne *juret* quidem.---

‘ At nunc de iſto queritur, an fidelis ad militiam converti
‘ poſſit, et an militia ad fidem admitj, etiam caligata vel infe-
‘ rior quoque, cui non fit neceſſitas immolationum vel capitali-
‘ um iudiciorum ; non convenit *ſacramento* divino et humano,
‘ *ſigno Chriſti* et *ſigno diaboli*, caſtris lucis et caſtris tenebrarum :
‘ non poteſt una anima duobus deberi, Deo et Cæſari.

‘ Sed enim cum converſatio divinæ diſciplinæ non factis tan-
‘ tum, ſed verbis periclitetur ;---cecidit igitur in *idololatriam*,
‘ qui idolum nomine Dei honoraverit.

‘ Ceterum conſuetudinis vitium eſt, me Hercule dicere, acci-
‘ dente ignorantia quorundam, qui ignorant jurisjurandum per
‘ *Herculem*, porro quid erit dejeratio, per eos quos ejerati,
‘ quam prevaricatio fidei cum *idololatria* : quis enim per quos
‘ dejerat non honorat.’ *Tertull. de Idololat. p. 116, 117. Edit.*
2. *Parif. Notis Rigaltii.*

The Sense our Author puts upon *Tertullian's* Words, concludes as much against civil as military Offices, ; for *Tertullian* speaks of both in the same Series of Discourse, and shews that *swearing* by the *Heathen Gods*, and all Approaches towards *Idolatry*, were equally unlawful in both : Besides it contradicts what I have before cited from his *Apology*, where he *prays* for the Success of the *Emperor's Troops*, and declares in the Name of the *Christians*, as their *Apologist*, that they *bore Arms* ; nor does it agree with the general Scope of the Book upon *Idolatry*, out of which it is taken ; or with the Passages that immediately go before, and follow after ; all which plainly direct to a limited Sense.

The next Passage from *Tertullian*, that our Author has advanced, is from his Book against the *Soldier's Crown* (the Occasion of which has been before-mentioned) the Words are these ; ‘ Can a
‘ Soldier's Employment be lawful, when Christ has
‘ pronounced, That he that uses the Sword, shall
‘ perish by the Sword ? Can *one who professes the*
‘ *peaceable Doctrine of the Gospel be a Warrior ?*’
The Original Words, truly translated, are, Shall a Son of Peace, be engaged in Battle ? *Et prelio operabitur filius pacis.*

I Answer that what goes before, and follows after the Words our Author has cited, plainly shew, that they are to be taken in a restrained Sense ; and that *Tertullian* was not against *Defensive War*, under a proper *Authority*, when it cou'd be carried on without incurring the Guilt of *Idolatry* : For thus he speaks ;

‘ Nothing indeed is more unclean than *Idols*,
‘ and so the *Crown* is made a Thing sacrificed to *Idols*, for truly by this Rite, Habit and Ornament,
‘ the Founders thereof did sacrifice to an *Idol* ;
‘ more-

‘ moreover the Apostle cries aloud, *Fly Idolatry in every Instance of it.*

‘ But that I may enter upon the Case of the *military Crown*, I think it proper first to search diligently whether *Warfare* is *wholly suitable to Christians*? In Answer to which he says, ‘ Do we believe that it is lawful to put a human upon a *divine Sacrament*, and to answer or agree with another Lord after Christ, and to except against Father and Mother, and every Neighbour, which the Law commands us to honour and love after God-----Then he uses these Words which our Author has cited; after which he saith, ‘ Now he must keep *Centry* for others more than for *Christ*, even on the Lord’s Day, and watch before the *Temples*, which he has renounced, and *sup* where the Apostle has forbid, and defend those *Demons* in the Night, which he has exorcis’d in the Day--and *burn* according to the Discipline of the Camp, what it is not lawful for a Christian to burn (I suppose he means *Incense* to *Idols*) and how many other Faults are there in the Business of Camps, which are to be call’d Sins.---Certainly if any *believe* after they have engaged in *War*, their Case is different, as of those that *John* admitted to *Baptism*, and the *faithful Centurion*, whom *Christ* approved of: Having undertaken and sign’d, nor should they *desert* immediately, as many do; nor *cavil* every Way, least any Thing be committed against God, which are not permitted by War itself; but lastly, they must suffer for *God*, which even the *Faith* of the *Pagans* equally appoints; nor indeed does the *Warfare* promise the Impunity of Offences, or the Immunity of *Martyrs*; a Christian is ever the same.---For tho’ one be prest by the Necessity of Torments or Punishments, to *sacrifice*, or directly to deny; nevertheless the *Discipline* of the *Church*

‘ will

6 will not connive at him, on Occasion of that Ne-
 6 cessity ; moreover, concerning that first Kind of
 6 Question of unlawful *War*, I shall not add more,
 6 that the Second may be dispatched ; least if I
 6 should with all my Force reject War, I should in
 6 vain challenge to a *Dispute* about the *Soldier's*
 6 *Crown* ; therefore, *finally judge, that War is law-*
 6 *ful even to the Case of the Crown. (e).'*

Here I would beg leave to observe, that the a-
 atorefaid

(e) ' Nil autem immundius idolis, ita et corona idolothetum ef-
 ficitur, hoc enim ritu et habitu, et apparatu idolo immolatur
 auctoribus suis : propterea apostolus inquit : fugite idolo-
 latriam omnem utique et totam.

' Etenim, ut ipsam causam coronæ militaris aggrediar, puto
 prius conquirendum, an in totum christianis militia conveni-
 at.---Credimusne humanum sacramentum divino superduci li-
 cere, et in alium Dominum respondere post Christum ? Et e-
 jerare patrem et matrem, et omnem proximum, quos et lex
 honorari, et post Deum diligi precipit, licebit in gladio con-
 versari, &c.---Jam stationes, aut aliis magis faciet quam Chri-
 sto ? aut et dominico die, et excusabit pro templis quibus re-
 nunciavit ? et quos interdum exorcismis fugavit, noctibus de-
 fensabit,---et cremabitur ex disciplina castriensi Christianus, cui
 cremare non licuit ;---quanta alia in delictis circumpici pos-
 sunt castriensium munium transgressione interpretanda ?---plane
 si quos militia preventos fides posterior invenit, alia conditio
 est, ut eorum quos Johannes admittebat ad lavacrum, ut cen-
 turionem fidelissimorum, quem Christus probat, dum tamen
 suscepta fide atque signata, ut deferendum statim sit, ut a
 multis actum : ut omnibus modis cavillandum, ne quid ad-
 versus Deum committatur, quæ nec ex militia permittuntur ;
 at novissime perpetiendum pro Deo, quod eque fides pagana
 condixit, nec enim delictorum impunitatem, aut martyrio-
 rum immunitatem militia promittet, nusquam christianus aliud
 est,---nam et ad sacrificandum et directo negandum, necessitate
 quis premitur tormentorum sive penarum : tamen nec illi ne-
 cessitate disciplina connivet : de prima specie questionis, etiam
 militiæ ipsius illicite plura non faciam, ut secunda reddatur,
 ne si omne ope expulero militiam, frustra jam de coronâ mili-
 tari provocarim ; puto denique licere militiam, usque ad causam
 coronæ.' *Tertull. de Coron. p. 127, 128.*

aforefaid Words of *Tertullian*, exprefly prove thefe Things following ; namely,

1. That the Reason why he oppos'd the Soldier's *Crown*, was becaufe he reckon'd it *idolatrous*.

2. That the Kind of *War* which he oppos'd, was fuch as involv'd Perfons in finful *Oaths* (which he calls *Sacraments*) and other criminal Compliances.

3. That he was fo far from being againft a lawful *War*, that he finds Fault with Perfons fuddenly *deferting* of it, and *cavilling* againft it : And juftly obferves, That if he rejected *War* altogether, his *Dispute* about the Soldier's *Crown* would be in vain.

He likewife infinuates, that the *Discipline* of the *Church*, inflicted no *Censure* upon fuch as behaved inoffenfively under that *Character* ; who neither *facrificed* nor *deny'd their Redeemer* ; and in a Word, he pofitively declares, *That War is lawful even to the Cafe of the Soldier's Crown* ; which he had before fignified to be *idolatrous* ; *i. e.* in other Words, That it is lawful for *Chriftians* to carry on *War*, if *idolatrous Terms* be not impos'd ; now what can be plainer than this ? Well, fhall we believe our *Author* or *Tertullian* himfelf ? Let the Reader Judge. But I haften to the

6th Instance that Mr. S. brings, which is *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *V. p. 49.* who faith, ' Neither are the Faces of Idols to be painted, which fo much as to regard, is forbidden ; neither Sword nor Bow to them that follow Peace.'

I Anfwer, that I have before proved *Clemens Alexandrinus* to be for *War*, to which I refer the Reader ; and therefore think it needles to add here, unlefs it be juft this, That the Words our Author has cited, are fo general and indefinite, that they prove nothing, unlefs it be this from their Connection, that the primitive Chriftians were againft paint-

ing *Swords* or *Bows*, which I think is beside the Question in debate.

In the 35th *Canon* of the *Council* of *Elvira* in *Spain*, *A. D.* 300, all *Painting* in *Churches* was prohibited, lest that which was painted on *Walls*, should be worshipp'd; to this probably the Words of *Clemens Alexandrinus* relate; who, as *Mr. Smith* informs us, flourish'd at this Time. *Fleury's Eccles. Hist. Book 9. p. 173.*

As to what our *Author* cites (from *Barc. Apol.*) of *Tertullian* against *Marcion*, viz. 'That *Christ* teacheth a new *Patience*, even forbidding the revenging an *Injury*, which was permitted by the Creator; and *Lib. de patien.* That the *Law* finds more than it lost, by *Christ's* saying, *Love your Enemies. V. p. 44.'*

I Answer, that the Design of the aforesaid *Book*, is to vindicate the *Law* against the Objections of *Marcion*. Accordingly *Tertullian* says in it, 'That *Justice* is necessary to suppress *Evil*---If *Injustice* be *evil*, *Justice* must necessarily be *good*, and consequently all the Effects of it, as *Severity*, *Anger* and *Jealousy*---The *Justice* of *God* is prior to that *Severity* which *Sin* occasioned; *Punishment* is an *Evil* in respect of him that suffers, insomuch as it torments him; but *good*, inasmuch as he is thereby corrected; and *good* absolutely, in respect to him who justly appoints it. *Lib. 3. C. 2, 12, 13, 14, 16, 26.* He observes that the *Prophets* taught these *Maxims*, *Take away all Malice from your Heart, learn to do well.*---He likewise asserts, that the *Law* taught *Charity* and pardon-
ing of *Injuries. Lib. 3. C. 19. Lib. 4. C. 16.*

From what has been said, it is evident, that *Tertullian* can consistently mean no more, by the aforesaid Passages, than this, That the *Gospel* forbids private *Revenge*, and recommends *Patience* and
Love

Love by new Arguments, all which are exceeding agreeable to *Defensive War*. The

7th Instance our *Author* brings, is of the *Emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus*, *V. p. 49.* who says, ‘ I pray’d to my *Country Gods*, but when I was neglected by them, and observed myself pressed by the *Enemy*, considering the Fewness of my *Forces*,---I entreated those that are called *Christians*, and I forced them with *Threats*, therefore they betook themselves neither to the Use of *Darts*, nor *Trumpets*, for they use not so to do, for the Cause and Name of their *God*, which they bear in their *Consciences*.’

Ans. If I am not mistaken, our *Author* has been so kind as to furnish us with an honourable *Testimony* for *Defensive War*; the Substance of his Citation seems to be this, That there was a great Number of *Christian Soldiers* in the *Emperor Antoninus’s Army*, who were so faithful to the true *God*, that when the *Emperor* went about that *idolatrous* wicked Work of praying to his false *Gods*, neglected or left him, and that very justly, and when he wou’d force them to the same evil Practice, they nobly laid down their *Arms* (as many did for the same Reason in those primitive Times) from a Regard they had to the Name and Cause of their *God*; a noble Example indeed, well worthy of our Imitation: What I have before mentioned from *Austin*, concerning the usual Practice of the primitive *Christian Soldiers*, gives farther Light and Force to what has been now observed. The

8th Instance our *Author* is pleas’d to advance, is the Words of *Martin* to *Julian*, as related by *Sulpitius Severus*, which he says are very full and positive; ‘ I am a *Soldier of Christ*, therefore I cannot fight.’

Ans. Our *Author* hasn't told us in this, and some other Instances, where to find the Words he cites, which puts no little Difficulty upon the Respondent.

However I hope Mr. S. will excuse me, in signifying, that I cannot be of his Opinion about this Instance, which he thinks is full and positive; to my Apprehension, it proves nothing at all to his Purpose, if these Things following be considered, which are mentioned by *Sulpitius Severus*; namely,

1. That he bore *Arms* in his Youth, both under *Constantine* and *Julius Cæsar*---three Years before his Baptism---and almost two Years after it.

2. That the Reason why he quitted the *military Business*, was not that he judged it sinful in itself, of which there is not a Word in his whole Life; but because from his Infancy he rather 'breathed after a 'divine Service;---when he was twelve Years old, 'he desired a desert or solitary Life, and had made 'a *Vow* to this Purpose; and hence he undertook 'the Life of a *Soldier* at first unwillingly,---and so 'embraced the first Opportunity that presented of 'quitting it; which was this, while the *Barbarians* 'invaded *France*.

'*Julius Cæsar* having gathered together his *Army* 'near a City in *Germany*, began to give a *Donative* 'to his *Soldiers* according to Custom, for which End 'they were all summoned till it came to *Martin's* 'Turn; who, judging it a proper *Season* in which 'he might ask a *Dismission*, nor did he think it right 'for him to receive the *Donative*, seeing he did not 'purpose to continue in the *military Service*; he said 'to the *Emperor*, Hitherto I have warred for you, 'suffer me now to war for God; let him that is to 'continue in the War receive your *Gift*; I am a 'Soldier of Christ, it is not permitted me to fight. 'From hence having left the Warfare, he went to

'*Hilary*

‘ *Hilary*, the *Bishop* of the *City*: So that *Martin’s*
 ‘ Meaning, in the Words aforeſaid, is no more than
 ‘ this, that his continuing in the martial Buſineſs,
 ‘ was inconſiſtent with his Purpoſe and Vow to de-
 ‘ vote himſelf to the ſolitary Life of a *Monk* (f);’
 but in the aforeſaid Words he approves of others
 continuing in the War.

The ninth Inſtance produced is *Origen* againſt
Celſus, V. p. 50, 51, the Subſtance of which is,
 ‘ That they aſſiſted the *Emperor* in his juſt Engage-
 ‘ ments, by their *Piety* and *Prayers*, more than o-
 ‘ thers by *Fighting*; but that they could not bear
 ‘ *Arms* under him, tho’ he compelled them to it.’

I answer, that *Origen* does not introduce the Diſ-
 courſe of *Celſus* upon this Head, by way of *Objection*
 againſt the Chriſtians of that Day, but by way
 of *Entreaty* to them; ‘ Finally (ſaith he) *Celſus*
 ‘ entreats us to help the *Emperor* with all our
 ‘ Strength, and to carry on juſt and pious *Wars* un-
 ‘ der his *Divination* or *Conduct* (g).

Farther,

(f) ‘ Ipſe armatam militiam in adoleſcentia ſecutus, ſub rege
 ‘ *Conſtantino*, deinde ſub *Juliano Cæſare* militavit. Non
 ‘ tamen ſponte: quia a primis ſere annis divina potius ſervitute
 ‘ ſpiravit. Cum eſſet annorum duodecim ærem concupivit:
 ‘ feciſſetque votis ſatis, nec tamen ſtatim militiæ renuntiavit.
 ‘ Interea irruentibus intra *Gallias barbaris*, *Julianus Cæſar*, co-
 ‘ acto in unum exercitu, apud *Vangionum* civitatem, donativum
 ‘ cepit erogare militibus: ut eſt conſuetudinis, ſinguli citaban-
 ‘ tur, donec ad *Martinum* ventum eſt; tum vero opportunum
 ‘ tempus exiſtimans, quo peteret miſſionem (neque enim inte-
 ‘ grum ſibi fore arbitrabatur, ſi donativum non militaturus acci-
 ‘ peret) hætenus inquit ad *Cæſarem*, militavi tibi: patere ut
 ‘ nunc militem Deo: donativum tuum militaturus accipiat;
 ‘ Chriſti ego miles ſum Pugnare mihi non licet; exinde reli-
 ‘ cta militia, ſanctum *Hilartum* epiſcopum civitatis expetivit;
 ‘ ut non tamen præpoſitum monachi deſereret.’ Vid *Sulpicii Seve-
 ri Oper.* p. 297-8, 302-3-4, and 314, Edit. Lipſ.

(g) ‘ Poſtremo hortatur nos *Celſus*, ut opem feramus impe-
 ‘ ratori totis viribus, ut geramus ejus auſpiciis, juſta piaque bel-
 ‘ la.’

Farther, another Passage in this Speech of *Origen's*, is not translated in our Author's *Citation* with its full *Force* and *Energy*: The Words are these: 'We wrestle in Prayer with God for the lawful *Emperor*, and for the *Soldier* that carries on a pious and just War (*b*).'
Observe, *Reader*, here are two Arguments of *Origen's* Opinion in favour of defensive War, *viz.* 1st, He acknowledges it to be *pious* and *just*: And 2d, *Prays heartily* for the *Success* of *Soldiers* engaged in it. This is wholesome Doctrine indeed. The Christians of that Day were so far from reckoning defensive *War* to be an *Evil* in itself, as much greater than private *Injury*, as a *Camel* is to a *Gnat*, that they esteemed it to be *pious* and *just*.

The *Reason* why some declined these Offices, *Origen* expresses in the following Manner: 'Nor do the *Christians* this, says he, because they *fled* away from the publick Offices of *Life*, but because they keep themselves for *more Divine* and *more necessary Offices* of the *Church*, in order to promote the *Salvation* of Men (*i*).'
Observe, *Reader*, that *Origen* here acknowledges also the *Divine Original*, and *Necessity* of *warlike Offices*; for of these he had been speaking before: 'But if *Celsus* enjoyns us to execute for our Country the Office of *military Lieutenancies*, let him know that we will do it also, but not in the Sight of Men, for the Sake of vain glory (*k*).'

And

(*b*) 'Decertantium autem fufis ad Deum precibus, pro legitimo imperatore; et pium justumque bellum gerente milite.'

(*i*) 'Nec hoc faciunt Christiani, quod ista publica vitæ munia refugiant; sed quod se fervent diviniioribus et magis necessariis muniis ecclesiæ, ad salutem hominum.'

(*k*) 'Quod si Celsus jubet nos etiam præfecturis militaribus fungi pro patria: sciat nos quoque facere, sed non in conspectu hominum ad captandum inanem gloriam.' For the aforesaid Passages, *Vid. Origen. contra Cels. Lib. 8. p. 427. Edit. Cantabrig. a Spencere.*

And in another Part of the same Treatise against *Celsus*, he saith, ‘ By considering the *Bees*, they may learn to *obey Magistrates*, and to dispense among their Fellow-citizens such *Labours* and *Offices* as tend to conserve the *publick Safety*; perhaps, also, their *Wars* teach us to carry on *War justly*, if the Case so requires (l).’

And in another Part of the same Treatise against *Celsus*, he says, ‘ That the Doctrine of Christianity was so far from *Sedition*, that the *Lawgiver* of the Christians has prohibited them from committing any Sort of *Murder*,---even against the most wicked of Mankind. He wou’d have them suffer Death like Sheep, rather than defend themselves against their *Persecutors* (m). *Political Laws* were necessary for the *Jews* while they composed a *Body politick*, which they were *obliged to defend* against *Strangers* from *without*, and punish the Crimes that were committed within themselves; but the *Christians* living under the *Roman Empire* had no Occasion for particular *Laws* in regard to their temporal Affairs (n).’ Here *Origen* expressly acknowledges the Necessity of *War*, by *States* or *Bodies politick*, for the Defence of *Civil Government*, which is the labouring Point; and excuses the Backwardness of some Christians from engaging in it, partly because they were no State, and therefore had no *Laws* of their own to defend, and partly because they were *persecuted* by those in the Government.

And

(l) ‘ Apes autem considerando, discant parere magistratibus, et ad publicam incolumitatem conservendam, dispensare inter cives functiones et operas: fortassis etiam earum bella docent nos juste bellum gerere, si res ita postulet. *Pros to dicaious, kai tetagmenous polemous, eipote deoi ginesthi, en anthropois.*’ *Origen* cont. *Celsum*, Lib. 4. p. 227, Edit. Cantab.

(m) Lib. 3. p. 115.

(n) Lib. 7. p. 349.

And elfewhere he faith, ‘ That they carefully pre-
 ‘ ferv’d the *Bands* of *Civil Society*, which is *Justice*,
 ‘ and they practis’d Goodness and Humility (o).’
 But I haften to the

10th Instance, namely, of *Marcellus*, the Cen-
 turion, *V. p. 51.* ‘ who (as *Ruinart* informs us) went
 ‘ and laid down his Arms before the Ensign of the
 ‘ *Legion*, and having thrown away his military *Belt*,
 ‘ declared, before all the *Soldiers*, that he was a
 ‘ Christian ; for which he was put to Death.

I would beg Leave to answer this *Objection* in
 the Words of *Monfieur Fleury*, who fays as fol-
 lows ;

‘ It was in the Year 298, under the Confulship
 ‘ of *Fauftus* and *Gallus*, that the Christian *Soldiers*
 ‘ began to be perfecuted by *Veturius*, Commander
 ‘ of the *Militia*. We may alfo fix the Date of for-
 ‘ ty Christian *Soldiers*, at the fame Period of Time ;
 ‘ who fuffered great *Torments* at *Lauriac* in *Norica*,
 ‘ a City that is now ruined, feated on the River *Ens*,
 ‘ near the Place where it runs into the *Danube* :
 ‘ They were joined by *Florian* their Fellow-*Soldier*,
 ‘ whom the *Prefect* or Lieutenant *Aquilinus* com-
 ‘ manded to be beaten with *Clubs*, and afterwards to
 ‘ be thrown into the River *Ens*.

‘ At *Tingi*, or *Tanger*, in *Mauritania*, near the
 ‘ Streights, while every one was employed in feafting
 ‘ and Sacrifices, it being the Emperor’s Birth-day,
 ‘ *Marcellus* a *Centurion*, in the *Legion* of *Trejan*,
 ‘ looking upon thofe *Feafts* as *prophane*, took off
 ‘ his

(o) *Lib. 4. p. 147.* But tho’ *Origen* feems to be found in
 this Point of *Defenfive War*, and is doubtlefs to be commended
 upon fome Accounts, yet it muft be confefled, that being too
 much addifted to *Plato’s* Opinion, and giving a Loofe to *Al-
 legory* and myftical Sente, he run into fome inconfiftent Senti-
 ments, for which he was cenfured by divers of the Fathers ;
 the Confideration of which fhould deter us from tampering too
 much with *Types* and *myftical Sente*, left we run wild.

' his *military Belt* before the whole *Legion*, and
 ' cry'd aloud, I am the *Soldier* of JESUS CHRIST,
 ' the eternal *King*. He immediately threw down
 ' his *Vine Branch* and his *Arms*, and added, I will
 ' not fight any longer under the *Banners* of your
 ' *Emperors*, or serve your *Gods* of *Wood* and *Stone*,
 ' that are deaf and dumb *Idols*. If the *Condition* of
 ' a *Soldier* is such, that he is obliged to *sacrifice* to
 ' *Gods* and *Emperors*, I abandon the *Vine Branch*,
 ' and the *Belt*, and quit the *Service*.

' We plainly see, saith *Fleury*, the *Cause* that
 ' forc'd the *Christians* to *desert*, viz. Their being
 ' oblig'd to partake in their *idolatrous Worship*.
 ' We are to observe (saith he) that the *Belt* where
 ' the *Sword* hung, was the *Characteristick* of a pri-
 ' vate *Soldier*, and the *Vine-Branch* that of a *Centurion* ;
 ' for they employ'd them in beating the
 ' *Soldiers*, and never struck them with any Thing
 ' else.---For this being sent under a strong *Guard* to
 ' *Mauritania Tingitana*, he was bro't before *Au-*
 ' *relian Agricolaus*, and was accused by an *Officer*,
 ' as follows ; *Anastatius Fortunatus*, *President* of
 ' the *Legion*, sends to you *Marcellus* the *Centurion*,
 ' who now stands before you ; I have here the *Let-*
 ' *ter* which he hath written to you upon that *Subject*,
 ' which I will read if you command it. *Agricolaus*
 ' reply'd, let it be read ; whereupon an *Officer* said,
 ' This *Soldier* hath thrown away his *military Belt*,
 ' has own'd himself a *Christian*, and has uttered se-
 ' veral blasphemous *Expressions* against the *Gods*,
 ' and *Cæsar*, before all the *People*, which is the *Rea-*
 ' *son* of his being sent to you, that you may direct
 ' what shall be done with him. When the *Letter*
 ' was read, *Agricolaus* said, Did you, *Marcellus*, speak
 ' these *Words* before the *President* ? To whom *Mar-*
 ' *cellus* reply'd, that he had spoken them. *Agricolaus*

A a

' said

said, Was you a common *Centurion*? *Marcellus* an-
 swered him, that he had been so. *Agricolaus* said,
 What Fury cou'd inspire you to throw away the
Tokens of your *Oath*, and to utter such Expressi-
 ons? *Marcellus* answer'd, Those who fear *God*
 are not inspir'd with Fury. Then *Agricolaus* said,
 did you repeat all those Words that are mentioned
 in the Acts of the *President*? To which *Marcellus*
 answered in the affirmative. *Agricolaus* continued,
 Did you throw down your Arms? *Marcellus* re-
 ply'd, I did; and that because a *Christian*, who is a
 Servant of *Jesus Christ*, cannot fight, for the *Dis-*
orders of this *World*.---Upon which *Agricolaus* or-
 dered him to be put to Death, in consequence of
 which he was beheaded: Thus he died laying down
 his Life for the Sake of *Jesus Christ*. *Cassianus*,
 the *Register*, who wrote the Sentence, seeing the In-
 trepidity of *Marcellus*, cry'd out aloud that he was
 shock'd with that Sentence, and immediately threw
 down his *Wax Tables*, and the *Stile* or Pin with
 which he wrote: All the *Officers* were in great Con-
 sternation; but *Marcellus* smiled; the *Judge* rose
 from his *Seat*, in a great Passion, and ask'd him,
 why he had thrown away the *Tables* with so disdain-
 ful an Air? Because, saith *Cassianus*, you have pro-
 nounc'd an unjust Sentence; upon which he imme-
 diately commanded him to be seiz'd, and cast into
Prison. *Cassianus* likewise some Time after obtain'd
 the Crown of *Martyrdom* (p). I proceed to the

11th And last Instance that our *Author* advances,
 which is *Maximilian*. This he is pleas'd to intro-
 duce with a very confident Air, as if it was an im-
 pregnable *Bulwark* to his *Cause*, by saying, ' And
 farther

(p) Vid. *Fleury's Eccles. Hist.* p. 503-4-5. Edit. *London*,
 1727.

farther to prove beyond all Contradiction, that it
 was held unlawful for a Christian to bear Arms
 and to fight, not only in the Days of *Tertullian*
 and *Origen*, but later down, even to the *Emperor*
Dioclesian's Time: I shall produce the Testimony
 of one *Maximilian*, who suffer'd Death under that
Emperor's Reign, for refusing to bear Arms. He
 frequently told the *Proconsul, Dion*, that he must not
 fight because he was a Christian.' See *V. p. 51,*
52, 53, 54.

I answer, that this Instance, tho' plausible and po-
 pular, hath nevertheless, in my Opinion, no Force
 at all in it, to prove the Point our Author brought
 it for, if it be considered,

1st. That *Dioclesian* being enraged at the Pre-
 sence of some Christians at their *Sacrifices*, and hind-
 ring their *Divination*, 'Had, as *Fleury* observes,
 'commanded in a Rage, that not only they who were
 'present at the *Sacrifices*, but likewise all that were in
 'the *Palace*, shou'd be compelled to sacrifice to the
 'Gods, and such as refus'd shou'd be scourg'd with
 'Whips; he wrote also to the *Officers* of his *Troops*,
 'to constrain all the *Soldiers* under his *Command* to
 'sacrifice to the *Gods*.---By this Means many volun-
 'tarily resign'd their *Commands*, rather than re-
 'nounce their God. Thus the *Persecution* began,
 'first with those that were in the *Army*, afterwards
 'upon this Answer of *Maximilian*, *It is not allowed*
 '*me to bear Arms, because I am a Christian*; Mon-
 'sieur *Fleury* observes, Now it was not the *Professi-*
 '*on of Arms*, that the Christians particularly rejected,
 'but the *Idolatry* that was inseparable from it, after
 'the *Orders Dioclesian* had given, as may---seen
 'in other publick Acts (q).---The *Proconsul* having
 A a 2 ' press'd

(q) *Fleury's Eccles. Hist. p. 500-1. Euseb. Lib. 8. Cap. 4.*
Veget. Lib. 5. Cap. 5. 8.

‘ press’d *Maximilian* several Times, says, in the Army of our Masters, there are *Christian Soldiers* who do Duty. *Maximilian* answers, They know what they have to do; but as for my Part, I am a Christian, and dare not do Ill. What Ill do they do, says the *Proconsul*, who serve in the Army? *Maximilian* says, You know what they do! Here may observe, says Monsieur *Fleury*, that the Christians refus’d not military Service as an Evil in itself, but because it was the Occasion of Sinning under *Pagan* Emperors.’ Of this Kind I have mentioned many Instances in the preceding Page and a famous one just before this.

2. By our *Author*’s Way of Reasoning in this Instance of *Maximilian*, I may prove with equal Force that the *Jews* are against War and Fighting, judging it to be an Evil contrary to their *Religion*. In *Delobella*’s Letter to the *Ephesians*, extant in *Josephus*, the *Jews* desired to be exempted from *military Expeditions*. *Alexander* the Son of *Theodor* being deputed from *Hircanus*, the *High-priest* and *Prince* of the *Jewish Nation*, declared, That his Countrymen cou’d not engage in the Army, or bear Arms, on Account of observing the Rites of their own Law (r).

The same Historian likewise informs us, that for this Reason the *Jews* got Leave of *Lentulus* to be discharged (f).

And in another Place he informs us, that when the *Jews* were commanded to depart from the City of *Rome*, some list’d themselves *Soldiers*, others were punished for refusing to do it, in Reverence

(r) *Antiq. Jud. Lib. 14. Cap. 17. p. 448.*

(f) *Antiq. Jud. Lib. 14. Cap. 17. p. 448.*

