



special
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

T H E

Revolution no Rebellion :

Or, Serious

REFLECTIONS

Offered to the Reverend

Mr. BENJAMIN HOADLY,

Occasion'd by his

Considerations *on the* Bishop of Exeter's
Sermon, *preach'd before Her Majesty,*
March the 8th, 1708.

By a CITIZEN of LONDON: *A Lover of the
present Establishment both in Church and State.*

To which is added a *POSTSCRIPT.*

LONDON:

Printed and Sold by the Booksellers of
London and Westminster. 1709.

1870

1870

REPORT

OF THE

COMMISSIONERS

OF THE

LAND OFFICE

IN

THE

STATE

FOR THE YEAR 1870

S. I. R.

I Need make no Apology for giving you this trouble, since you have done it for me already, in yours to the Right Bishop of Exeter, occasion'd by his Sermon preacht before Her Majesty, on the 8th of March, 1708, and published by Her special Command.

I think the Truths therein of the utmost importance to the Honour of Christianity, and the Security of the Society: *Letter* p. 4. And I have reason to believe the Ministry thought so too. I have diligently read over the Sermon, and your Considerations also, and have here sent you some Remarks made as I went along, which convince me that the Cause you have been for some time engag'd in, and which you still prosecute, *Letter*, p. 1. & 2. is not Good, however O'd it may be.

You seem to insinuate, as if his Lordship had deliver'd something in this Sermon, inconsistent with a former; I don't find it; but if it had been so, that is not my concern, I am not vindicating my Lord Bishop of Exeter, (tho' I reverence him sincerely) I am only seeking for Truth, and in order to that, I come to your first Consideration, which is, That his Lordship argues, From the Magistrate being called *the Minister of God* by *St. Paul*, that he hath none above him upon Earth, to question, censure, or punish him, and that he is accountable to none but God. *Letter*, p. 8.

In answer to this, you i. Put his Lordship in mind how *St. Paul* hath guarded his own Expression, viz. That *he is the Minister of God for good*. Sure you think his Lordship hath a very short Memory, to forget part of his Text; no, you may see he does not, for on these last Words he grounds the second General Head of his Discourse; and the second Inference from it is, *That Subjects should be obedient unto their Lor. and pay a willing cheerful Obedience*. *Sermon* p. 23. This is a natural Inference from these Words, the Magistrate being God's Minister, set to govern in his Word, it is our Duty to be obedient and God having instituted this for the good of

Mankind, it is our Interest to be obedient ; this I think the plain meaning of the Apostle, so that his inculcating God's gracious Design in appointing Government, and Governours, is not a Limitation of his Exhortation to Obedience and Submission, but an Enforcement of it. That this Opinion is not new, I appeal to the Book of *Homilies*, which you did acknowledge, ' Contain'd a godly and wholesome Doctrine, necessary for these Times, *Article 35.* when you took possession of your Living. In this Book, (to which I think there is no Answer come out) it is affirmed, *That Kings and Princes, as well the evil as the good, do reign by God's Ordinance, and that Subjects are bounden to obey them.* Homily, p. 343. Many places of Scripture are brought to prove it; but two special places in the *New Testament*, may stand instead of all other; then after quoting at large *Rom. 13.* and *1 Pet. 2.* it thus applies 'em: *By these two places it is most evident, that Kings, Queens, and other Princes, are ordained of God, are to be obeyed and honoured of their Subjects; that such Subjects as are disobedient, or rebellious against their Princes, disobey God and procure their own Damnation. Fãther, if Servants must obey bad Masters, as well as good, much more must Subjects submit to evil Princes* p. 344.—Goes on, p. 345. to show the Happiness of being governed by good Princes, and the obligation Princes, lie under to imitate God their King. Afterwards it shows the Misery of being under evil Princes, from *Eccl. 10. 16.* and *Prov. 28. 15,* and 16. Verses, whence arises this Question, *What shall Subjects do then? Shall they obey good Princes, and contemn, disobey, and rebel against indiscreet and evil Governours? God forbid.* Homily, p. 345. *This is a perilous thing, to make Subjects Judges of their Prince, which Prince is good, and which bad*—And in p. 346. *Is not Rebellion the greatest of Mischiefs? And who are most likely to do the greatest of Mischiefs, but the worst of Men? Rebels are aptest to rebel against the best of Princes, especially if they be young in Age; Women in Sex, or gentle and courteous in Government. Rebellion is worse than the worst Government.*

God placeth as well evil Princes as good ones, p. 347. *Will you procure or continue a good Prince? be obedient; would you be eas'd of the Mischiefs of a bad one? repent and amend.*

St. Paul exhorts Timothy to pray for those in Authority, which was either Caligula, Claudius or Nero.

Were these bare Affirmations, they should not be contradicted by those who have acknowledg'd 'em to be godly and wholesome Doctrines, unless they do not continue to think them so, and then methinks they should relinquish the Advantage they reap by that Acknowledgement. But these are far from bare Affirmations, they are backt with such good Reason, and so many plain Texts of Scripture, that I don't doubt but they may be of good use to convince any impartial Reader, that the supreme Magistrate receives his Commission from God, and is to be obey'd and submitted to as his Vicegerent; and that to leave People at liberty, to disobey or resist, when he acts beyond, or contrary to his Commission, and to leave this to the People's Judgment, is to leave it to their Choice, whether they will obey or no.

2, You put his Lordship in mind, ' That every Person ' in the World, who is the Instrument of Good to us, is ' the Instrument of God to us for good. *Letter*, p. 10. Now,

Though it should be so, it does not follow, but some may be entituled to a greater regard than others, as will further appear, in my *Remarks* on your third Answer. 3. Wherein ' You beg leave to shew, that the Magistrates receiving a Commission for one particular Work, ought not ' to be an Argument, to prove that there is none upon Earth ' that may question, censure or punish him; and that his ' Lordship contends, p. 16. that his Commission is not absolute ' and unlimited.

'Tis true, the Magistrate is limited by God, whose Servant and Vicegerent he is; and therefore, as his Lordship argues, 1. He ought to make God's Honour his main Design: *Sermon*, p. 10, 11. And, 2. He should comply with the Design of his Commission, remembering he must be accountable to God, for to him only he is a Servant; as is plainly proved in these Words, ' 'Twould be absurd to say, that he is their ' Servant over whom he bears rule, because that would ' be in effect to say, that it is all one to command, and to obey, ' to have power over, and to be subject to. p. 6. This is plain

Restoring such as becomes Truth, but Schemes that are
 but only Suppositions, need fifty Pages full of Words to ob-
 scure it.

The Magistrate is appointed for this very thing, *i. e.* to
 govern, therefore the People must needs be subject: This
 Argument holds very good, tho' the Magistrate, (as such)
 has no commission to preach the Gospel, or Minister the
 Sacraments.

I am heartily sorry his Lordship's Fourth Inference is so
 very reasonable, *Sermon*, p. 14. to 23. and much more so,
 to see any of the Clergy cavil at a Discourse, which clearly
 confutes some of the most important Errors in one of the
 most pernicious Books this Age hath produced, fruitful as
 it is of such monstrous Productions: To make the Magi-
 strate's Superiority cease, when he acts beyond his Commis-
 sion, and to leave the People to judge when he does so, is to
 set them above him, the Mischiefs and Incongruity of which
 are largely set forth in the First Part of the *Hobbes* againk
Religion. The Case of a Mayor, *Letter*, p. 13. *Sermon*, p. 7.
 (by which you say his Lordship very unfortunately endea-
 vour to illustrate his Position) do's what he brought it for
 next year, it ev'it shows that an Officer may have his No-
 mination from one, and receive his Authority from ano-
 ther; it's true, if he acts beyond his Commission, he is ac-
 countable, but it is to his Superior, and so the chief Magi-
 strate is also, and who his Superior is, I need not remember
 to you, if any, that (if he does his Duty) daily ackn-
 owdges, in a serious solemn manner, that * God
 is the only Ruler of Princes.

Letter, p. 14. As to your Fourth Answer, That
 St. Paul might intend his Exhortation to have respect to de-
 puted Magistrates, as well as the supreme — p. 15. And that,
 it is observable, (what hath been often quoted by the Patrons
 of Passive Obedience) that our Lord told Pilate, that his Pow-
 er was from above.

I need only remind you, that inferior, subordinate Ma-
 gistrates, receive their Power mediately, as the supreme do
 theirs immediately from God, and are to be obey'd and reve-
 rend'd accordingly, this is, (I think) a strong Argument for
 sub

subjection: If *Pilate's* Power is to be submitted to because it is from Above, much more is *Cæsar's*.

5. Your Fifth Answer, at first sight, seems an Agreement, that the Magistrate is not accountable, censurable, or punishable. If you were really of this mind, what need had you to contend at all? But you say, 'All that is contended for, with any Zeal, is this, That there should be a Right left in the govern'd Society, to preserve it self from Ruin and Destruction, which is a Point his Lordship hath not touch'd upon. p. 15.'

The Word Right is of an ambiguous Signification, (the Learned say) if I apprehend your Meaning, it must be here taken for a Power to secure it self, and a Privilege to use that Power. Again, by *Right to secure it self from Ruin*, you must mean, a Right to resist the Magistrate, when it judges it necessary so to do, in order to its preservation, or else your contest with the Bishop had been needless: for I believe all agree in these two Things, 1. *That all Persons and Societies, have a Right to secure themselves by all lawful Means.* And, 2. *That none have a Right to do it by unlawful Means.* I look upon the the Thing in dispute to be, *Whether resisting the Magistrate be a lawful means, or no?*

The Negative his Lordship asserts in the Third Inference from his First General Head, p. 13. and proves it by two Texts of Scripture, p. 14. therefore it lies upon those who dissent from him, to prove that the govern'd Society hath a Power to secure it self, and a Right to use that Power; for unless it hath both, neither of 'em single will be of any use to it. It is very plain, that Right, without a Power to assert it, will do 'em no good, and it is as plain, that a good Man, though he have Power or Strength, yet if he have not Right to authorize him, cannot use it: I say cannot, for he lies under a moral, as the other does under a physical Inability. To illustrate this Matter, the Second Part of the *Humily* against wilful Rebellion, *Humily*, p 352. furnishes me with a very pat Example out of the First Book of Kings. *David* being persecuted causelessly by *Saul*, and having it in his power to secure his own Life, by giving consent only to *Saul's* Death; 1 Sam. 24. yet, though he knew *Saul* to be under God's Displeasure, and that he himself was anointed to succeed him, yet, not-

withstanding all this, he was so far from laying violent Hands on him, that he expresses an Abhorrence of so foul a Fact. From which History the *Homily* goes on to answer the most plausible Pleas for *Rebellion*, *Homily*, p. 354.

* *From line* and proves plainly, * (I think) that we may
 7. *to the 19th.* not Rebel, tho' the Prince be hated of God,
 and God's Enemy; hurtful and pernicious to
 the common-wealth; nor tho' he be unmindful of the Service
 of his faithful Subjects, negligent of the Welfare of them,
 and their Posterity; nay, though he were their known mortal
 Enemy that fought their Lives.

Object. But notwithstanding this Instance, and the many plain Scriptures are named in the *Homily*, to prove that Subjects may in no case resist their Prince, yet some may think what Mr. *Hoadly* contends for, may nevertheless be the just Right of the govern'd Society; for tho' particular Persons may be oblig'd to submit to the supreme Magistrate, in actually obeying what his Laws enjoin and where that can't be comply'd with, in patiently submitting to the Penalty; yet Magistracy being ordain'd for the good of the Society, if the chief Magistrate should so act as to endanger that Society, 'tis his Duty to secure, that then the govern'd Society may secure themselves, and this may be so, notwithstanding these positive general Prohibitions; and there is a Reason urg'd, p. 49. because several general Prohibitions in Scripture, are taken in a limited Sense; so all Separation is not Schism; all Church-Reformation is not Church Destruction; all Killing is not Murder, &c. In answer to this,

Answer. I pray consider what will be the consequence of this way of arguing, viz. because some Prohibitions, tho' express'd in a general, are to be taken in a limited Sense, therefore all may be so; thus because all Killing is not Murder, therefore all Adultery is not Sin; and because all Evil speaking is not Slander, therefore all Stealing is not Sin. I think I need say no more to confute this loose way of Reasoning; if it were necessary, I could easily show, that in all the general Prohibitions you have instanc'd, there is in the Scripture either a Command, or an Allowance, which stands as an Exception to the general Rule, take one for Instance, *Thou shalt not kill*, Exod. 20. 13. yet in *Rom.* 13. 4. it is said of the Magistrate, that he *beareth*

beareth not the Sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil: And in Gen. 9. 6. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; by which it is plain, that notwithstanding the general Command, *Thou shalt not kill*, the Magistrate may, and ought to punish Murderers with Death.

I must observe, That by thus pleading for a Limitation of this Prohibition of resisting Governours, you own, that without a Limitation, the general Prohibition is against it; therefore in order to prove that the govern'd Society have a Right to secure themselves, by resisting their Governours, (for such a Right you plainly contend for) in order to prove this, I conceive you ought to bring plain Texts of Scripture, which command, or at least allow this Privilege to all govern'd Societies, or else I can't see but this general Prohibition binds the whole Society, and every individual Member, from resisting the Magistrate; moreover, in order to make use of this Right, there must be some Judge when is the proper time for it. Now whoever are Judges of this, whether the whole People, or chosen Representatives, they are in this point superior to the supreme Magistrate; which is in effect to say, that he is their Subject, over whom he bears Rule. In short, the general Commands and Prohibitions of Scripture, you own to be at least seeming against the *Resistance* we are treating of, and we have no Scriptures brought, that command or allow this *Resistance* to any Persons or Societies in any case therefore all must be concluded under these general Rules. But if this *Resistance* were allow'd in some Cases, I can't perceive the advantage of it, unless 'twere known where the Right is plac'd, and who must judge when it is to be us'd, which neither this, nor any Book I have yet seen, gives me any satisfaction in; therefore how vain is it to contend with so much Zeal for an imaginary Right, which we know not where to find, nor when to assert?

If there be any such reserv'd Right, surely it must be taken notice of in the *Original Contract* you mention, p. 22. and therefore it is to be hop'd, in the next Edition of your Measures, you oblige the World with what that *Original Contract* says on this Head, and if it be back'd with as good Reason, and as many and plain Texts of Scripture,

as the *Homily* bring to prove that the Magistrate's Power is from God, and that we Christians are bound to obey evil as well as good Princes; I don't know but it may do your Cause more good, than all the rest of Mr. *Hoadly's* Works.

As for your Case of habitual or actual Madness, I think neither Divines nor Lawyers so proper to prescribe what is fit to be done in that Case as Physicians: But, (by my Lord *H—*'s Rule, *That what has been, may be*) it is possible the People may be mad, how shall the Nation be secur'd from ruin then? Why, he that stills the raging of the Sea, can cure the Madness of the People, and of the Prince too, and will do it when he sees fit. This Thought should silence all our Complaints, when we reflect upon our inability to secure our selves from ruin; and make us adore the Wisdom and Goodness of that All-wise and Gracious God, who hath plac'd us in this dependent State——. God, (says the *Homily*) *maketh a wicked Man reign for the sins of the People*, Job 34. 10. *Homily*, p. 346. and again, *God giveth a Prince in his anger*; Hof: 13: 6. meaning an evil One. If this be one of God's ways of correcting us for our Faults, and reclaiming us to our Duty, 'twill be better for us, to improve it to that purpose, than by contending for a Right to secure our selves from ruin, to harden our selves in Sin and Impenitency: for had we both Power and Right to secure our selves against this Stroke of divine Vengeance, God hath several other ways, no less severe, to punish sinful and rebellious Man. Those Sacred Volumes, which this licentious witty Age treat with such Derision, inform us of exemplary Punishments inflicted upon daring Sinners enough to make us tremble at the thought of 'em: Fire and Brimstone rain'd down upon *Sodom* and *Gomorrab*, to punish the filthy Sins of their impure Inhabitants; and the Earth opening and swallowing up *Corah* and his Company, are Instances of God's Almighty Power and Justice, amazing in themselves, and ought to be very awakening unto us, who live in an Age wh^o the Sin of the former is acted, and that of the latter deny'd, with an unusual Impudence.

But I proceed not to examine your other Considerations distinctly, is not because I think them unanswerable, but I don't think it necessary, for in handling this First, I have quored places out of the *Homily* and Scriptures therein mention'd,

that (I think) answer the other Three but if you continue of another Mind, be pleas'd to read over the *Homilies*, concerning *Obedience*, and against *wilful Rebellion*, impartially, and ~~if~~ if you are not thereby satisfied, I may give you, and my self some further trouble, tho' I am not fond of it.

As to your Address to his Lordship, p. 44. wherein you insinuate, as if the Doctrines preach'd by him, and which I hope I have prov'd to be consonant to Scripture, and the Doctrines of the *Church of England*, as by Law established, were inconsistent with the *Revolution*.

Permit me to speak a little freely, with all the deference due to your holy and honourable Employment. You do great Injustice both to the Revolution, and the whole Nation, in that unfair Insinuation: You cannot but know, that the Accession of King *William* and Queen *Mary* to the Throne, was founded upon the *Abdication* of King *James*, and not upon any *Deprivation* of him for Male-Administration, as will evidently appear by the Proceedings of the Convention. And as for what you affirm, without any proof, That 'those of the highest, as well as holiest Rank, and of the best Quality, invited over a Prince with armed Men, to awe their legal King, and force him into a Compliance; and this they did in their private Capacity. *Letter*, p. 45. These are your own Words, which I desire you well to note, for if I should say so, I should be called an Enemy of the *Revolution*, and I think justly.

I must observe to you, that you own this *Invitation* was not a National Act, but made in their private Capacity, so that your Inference drawn from it, in 47 and 48, that it was more a National Act, than the Murder of King *Charles I* is not well-grounded, tho' I think, there have been some weekly Writers labouring to prove it so: But I don't so much wonder at them, they must write as their Masters desire to them. But that a Clergyman of the *Church of England* should so far forget the Doctrine of that Church, as to advance Notions contrary to her *Liturgie* and *Articles*, and in their consequence destructive not only of Monarchy, but of all settled Government; this puts me in mind of the Words of the *Prophet*, He that hath eaten my bread, hath despised my name.

I believe those Persons of the *biggest* and the *holiest* Rank; who, (as you say) sent to invite over the Prince, did not make you their Confident, tho' you so roundly affirm, *it was to awe their legal King.* Letter. p. 45. I must remind you, this is barely affirmed, therefore were any Consequence to be built upon it, it would be necessary to prove it.

I don't wonder, when you have thus endeavour'd to prove the *Revolution a Rebellion*, you proceed in p. 48. to call it so :

What I wonder at, is the Clemency of our Government, that takes no notice of it; for whether it be design'd to run down the *Revolution*, or to make *Rebellion* appear reputable, it must have an ill influence upon our establish'd Government: But the further Prosecution of these momentous Points, is too large a Field to enter upon at the end of a Letter. (already longer than I design'd) were I equal to the Work; but Mr. Attorney-General is better able, therefore to him I leave it; only this I must take notice of, that by your thus making *Revolution* and *Rebellion* stand for the same thing, I am instructed what some Men mean, when they say, they are of *Revolution Principles.*

When all's said, let all judicious Men judge, who act most for the Honour of the Church and Christianity; Letter, p. 51. those, who after the Example of *Christ* and his Apostles recommend *Obedience* and *Patience*, *Meeckness* and *Submission*, both by their Preaching and Practice; or those, who contrary to the Design of their Office, and to Doctrines which they themselves have assented to, encourage People to censure and oppose their Superiors by their Writings and Example

As for the Preachers of this peaceful Doctrine, which you very respectfully call, *The Doctrine of Servitude*, Letter, p. 50, 51. I hope they are not startled at you Threats, when you tell 'em, there will be a Spirit to oppose 'em; they have always found it so, and I fear will, till that cursed Spirit, who first rebell'd-himself, and drew Man into the same Sin, be confin'd for ever to that dismal Abode prepar'd for him; but for their comfort, as they have a Spirit to oppose them, so going on in their Duty, they have a Spirit to assist 'em, and greater is he that is with them, than he that is in the World.

SIR, Tho' I differ from you in Opinion, I have a respect for your Order, and desire to have so for your Person.

May the good God, who directed the Stone from David's Sling, and often effects great things by weak and contemptible Means, so prosper these my weak, though well-meant Endavour's, that they may penetrate not only into your Head, but into your Heart, that being converted, you may strengthen your Brethren, by putting them in mind to be subject to Principalities and Powers, to obey Magistrates; to be ready to every good work.

I am

S I R,

Your—

N. B. The Book of *Homilies* I refer to, was printed in *Folio*, 1676.

The *Bishop's Sermon* is the *Octavo* Edition.

Mr. *Hoadly's* is the first Edition, three Sheets and a Quarter.

F I N I S.

POSTSCRIPT.

IT is objected, you say, That I had not read Mr. *Hoadly's Measures of Submission*, when I wrote my *Reflections* on his *Considerations*, &c. which I offer'd to him by your Hand. It's true, I had not; and if that be a Fault, I beg his pardon, and I hope I may the more easily obtain it, because if I had read that Book, I must have remark'd upon the many Things he offers in answer to the Twenty sixth Objection; * and in doing this, I conceive, I should have been, in Justice, oblig'd to say some things which would not have been for Mr. *Hoadly's*

* *Measures of Subm.* p. 152. to 168.

Reputation. If it be a Fault not to have read Mr. *Hoadly's* Book, I believe some of his Friends are guilty of it, or else they would (for his sake) not make this Objection; for I dare leave it to any impartial Reader to judge, whether what I have quoted from the *Homily*, p. 343, 344, 345, and 347. be not directly opposite to Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine; and so, then the *Ditto*, p. 155. ' *Homily* do's condemn the Resistance he defends, and recommends the Submission he condemns, tho' he hath writ 17 Pages to prove the contrary; and that those who will may the easier judge in this important Affair, I shall briefly set down Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine, and the contrary, that by comparing them with the *Homily*, they may see which agrees with, and which contradicts it.

Mr. *Hoadly's* Doctrine, which he taught my Lord Mayor, and which he has writ so much in Defence of, is this, *viz.* That *Ditto*, p. 9. ' St. Paul don't recommend a passive Submission, when a Prince contradicts the Design of his Institution; and that so acting he may be opposed, without the shadow of a Crime; nay, with Honour and Glory.

And further That Submission is due to Governours, merely for the sake or publick Happinets—and must degenerate into a Crime, when it forsakes the View of that, and betrays it into the Hands of Ambition and Violence.

The contrary Doctrine is as follows, viz. ' It is our Duty to obey our Governours in whatsoever they command, that is not contrary to the divine Law—and in case the Magistrate does so exceed his Commission, yet there is a Duty lying on Subjects, not to oppose or resist, but quietly and patiently to suffer the Penalty of those Laws, which they can't, without sinning against God, yield an active Obedience to. *Bishop's Sermon*. p. 13. 14. This is the Doctrine the Bishop of *Exeter* preach'd, which Mr. *Hoadly* opposes, and which I (in my manner) have bore Testimony to: not because his Lordship preach'd it, or because Her Majesty approv'd of it, but because I believe it agreeable to Scripture and Reason, and the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as deliver'd in the *Homilies*, and confirm'd by divers Passages in her excellent *Liturgy*. This is so evident, that I dare leave it with an impartial Jury, which of the Two Doctrines is contrary to the Doctrine of the *Homilies*, for, sure I am one of them must needs be so, unless the *Homilies*, like Answers from the *Heathen Oracles*, may be taken in contrary Senses. I beg no favour of those who will enquire further into this Matter, but for the Truth's sake, and for their own sakes, I do require this, that they will proceed impartially, and not rely on Mr. *Hoadly's*, or my Word, but read the *Homilies* themselves which they will find well worth their while, they teaching us in a very plain way, what we are to believe, as well as what we are to do, in order to our Soul's Health. I am sorry so few of our Churches are furnish'd with this Book; I am upon enquiry what Churches in *London* have it, and which want it, in order to inform the Publick, that good People may know where to go to lay in a Stock of useful Knowledge; for tho' we have much good Preaching, there are some useful Truths treated of in that Book, which are but seldom heard of from some Pulpits. I have another Design also in publishing what Churches have not the Book of *Homilies*, viz. That either the Parishes, or some good People, may provide some for them.

But not to digress any further: If either Mr. *Hoadly*, or his Friends, think I have not done him Justice with respect to the *Homilies*, I will, (God willing) go on to compleat my *Remarks* on his many Pleas he offers in answer to the Twenty Sixth Objection, * with all convenient speed, and communicate them to him, either privately or publicly, as he and you see.

* *Measures*
of *Subm.* p.
152,

London. May the 23^d.
1709.

Advertisement.

THE Lord Bishop of *Exeter's* Answer, to Mr. *Hoadly's* Letter.

A Vindication of the Lord Bishop of *Exeter's* occasion'd by Mr. *Hoadly's* Reflections on his Lordships two Sermons of Government, &c.

Tom of Bedlam's answer to Mr. *Hoadly's*. &c.

Some Reflections humbly offer'd to the Lord Bishop of *Exeter*, &c.

All Printed and Sold by *H. Hills*, in *Black-fryars*, near the Waterside.



