

THE

PROPERTY

OF

David Sands M.D.

408 G. S. 17th St. N. Y.



UNIVERSITY
OF PITTSBURGH
LIBRARIES



DAR.RM.
BX7617
B28
v.3

THIS BOOK PRESENTED BY
Friends'
Historical Society of
Swarthmore College

Truth Triumphant,

Through the

SPIRITUAL WARFARE,

Christian Labours

A N D

WRITINGS

Of that Able and Faithful

Servant of JESUS CHRIST,

Robert Barclay.

Who Deceased at his own House at URY,
in the Kingdom of SCOTLAND, the 3d
Day of the 8th Month, 1690.

V O L. III.

Heb. xi. 4. *He being Dead, yet Speaketh.*

L O N D O N: Re-printed and Sold by the
Assigns of J. Sowle, at the Bible in George-Tard
in Lombard-Street, 1718.



A True and Faithful Account of the
Most Material P A S S A G E S
 O F A
DISPUTE

Betwixt some *Students of Divinity* (so called) of the University of *Aberdeen*, and the People called *Quakers*; Held in *Aberdeen* in *Scotland*, in *Alexander Harper* his Close (or Yard) before some Hundreds of Witnesses, upon the 14th Day of the *Second* Month called *April*, 1675. There being

Opponents { *John Lestp,*
Alexander Shireff, } Mast. of Art
Paul Gellie. }

And Defendents upon the *Quakers* Part,
Robert Barclay and **George Keith.**

Præses for Moderating the Meeting chosen by them, **Andrew Thomson**, Advocate:


And by the *Quakers*, **Alexander Skein**, sometime a Magistrate of the City.

Published for preventing Mis-reports, by *Alex. Skein, John Skein, Alex. Harper, Thomas Merjer* and *John Cowie.*

To which is added, *Robert Barclay's* Offer to the Preachers of *Aberdeen*, Renewed and Re-inforced.

Acts 4. 27. *For of a Truth, against thy holy Child Jesus, whom thou hast Anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the People of Israel were gathered together.*

L O N D O N: Printed by the Assigns of
J. Sowle, in the Year, 1717.



T H E
E P I S T L E.

Friendly Readers,

FOrasmuch as Our Opposers threatened, they would Print an Account of the Debate, and boasted of a Victory ; We thought it our Concernment for the Truth's Sake, and to undeceive those that may be abused by such Reports, to give this True and Faithful Account of what pass'd ; which we are confident, all the Impartial and Attentive Auditors will affirm it to be a true Account : Neither is there any One Argument omitted, that We can remember of, or any thing added. There were many things spoken extrinsick from the Matter ; and sometimes confusedly, Two or Three of Our Opposers speaking often at once, and also some others, that were not concerned ; as particularly, one Brown, the Bishop's

*Chaplain, who though he refused to
Subscribe the Articles, and so was ex-
cluded from speaking, did often most im-
pertinently interrupt and intrude him-
self: But these being only transient,
and no Arguments insisted on, We have
not inserted them; studying to keep to
the Matter. And We do faithfully
declare, that We have herein dealt im-
partially, according to Our Memory;
as We hope, such serious Auditors, as
may read this, will acknowledge. So
leaving You to the Perusal hereof, We
rest*

Your Souls Well-Wishers,

ALEXANDER SKEIN,
JOHN SKEIN,
THOMAS MERCER,
JOHN COWIE.

An Account of a

Dispute at Aberdeen.

In the first Place the Articles were Read,
which are as followeth,

I. **I**T is hereby declared, That this is to be a Private Conference betwixt the Students of Divinity (so called) of the Colledges of Aberdeen, and the People called Quakers, as a fulfilling of any Challenge, wherein these Students may be included within the Theses set forth by Robert Barclay (or may have received from any of that People) but abstract from the Publick Challenge given to the Preachers in General in the End of the English Theses; because it is offered with Particular Condition, of having the Publick Places to dispute in, before the Auditories, before whom they conceive they have been mis-represented.

II. It is provided, That when any of either Party is speaking, if any of their Company offer to speak, he that is speaking, is to be silent; but if two of a Party speak at once, he that is seen to obtrude himself, shall be judged Impertinent, and excluded thereby from farther Access.

III. That each Speaker on any of the Sides have full Liberty and Time to speak, without Interruption of the contrary Party; and that he that interrupts, shall be debarred from farther speaking.

IV. That each Side abstain from School-Terms and Distinctions (as much as possible) but if any use them, that they may be opened to the People in plain English; so that any of ordinary Capacity

1675. that are not Educated in Colledges) may understand them.

V. As for Retortions, they must not be impertinent, and from the Purpose; and none shall be so insisted on, as to divert us from the Point, or turn the Opponent into the Respondent.

VI. The Day appointed for the Conference, is the Fourteenth of April, in the Year One Thousand Six Hundred Seventy Five, (being the Day called Wednesday) the Place is to be at Alexander Harper's House or Close (in Case the Gray-Fryers Church (so called) cannot be obtained) and that the Conference is to continue from Two to Five a Clock in the Afternoon.

VII. Both Parties shall endeavour to procure a Praesides to Moderate, but not to have any Decisive Judgment; yet if such a One cannot be procured, the Conference is not to be broken up.

VIII. And it is hereby declared, That both Parties intend this for Mutual Edification; and therefore intend to abstain from any thing, that may obstruct so good an Event.

IX. It is likewise agreed, That none shall have Liberty to speak, but those that have, or shall subscribe, before the Dispute begin, these aforesaid Articles.

Here Alex. Skein, one of our Friends chosen Praeses for Us (because we could not at that Time procure another) standing up with the other Praeses——

Student. It was condescended, That no Quaker should be a Praeses.

Quaker. We are wronged; for we never condescended to any such thing: And seeing ye have chosen one of Your Way, how can we be hindred to chuse one of Ours?

And.

Andr. Thomson (their *Præses*.) There needs no Debate in this Matter; for we are chosen not to have any *Decisive Judgment*, but only for the *Moral Part*, to take Notice if the Rules be observed; or whether we keep to the Purpose. 1675.

Then *John Leslie* had a long and tedious Discourse, concerning what was fit to be done, and how we ought to dispute.

G. K. Præses, I suppose we came not to this Place to hear from this Young Man a long *Logick Discourse*.

R. B. I desire to be heard: We being a People so generally Misrepresented, as *Heretical* and *Erroneous*, did conceive our selves obliged to give a True and Faithful Account of our Principles, which I did in a certain Paper now under Debate. And, that our Innocency therein might appear, there was a Challenge added to the End of it, offering to defend these our Principles, if we might be allowed so to do, in these Publick Places, where we have been so much misrepresented, and against these Persons, who had there so often traduced us. To which having received no Answer, some of the Students of Divinity came to us, and signified, that they looked upon themselves as concerned; because Mention is made of such in the Beginning of that Paper. To whom we answered, That they were not the Persons Challenged by Us; as not being the Publick Preachers that had Misrepresented Us: But seeing they were desirous to debate the Matter, we were not unwilling to render to any a *Reason of the Hope that is in us*; and therefore should not decline it. And forasmuch as some did object, that we were at a Loss, as engaging with them; because there would be little Advantage, in Case we had any Victory; and a greater Reflection, should we appear to be at any Loss. To such we had, and have this to say, That as

1675. we are not afraid to meet with the Greatest and Ablest of the Preachers themselves; so the Truth leads us not to despise any. As *R. B.* was going on, he was interrupted.

Alex. Shirreff. If it were pertinent, I could easily disprove much of what is said; but to be short: *R. B.* having given *Theses*, provoking all the Scholars of *Europe* and *Great Britain* (though *R. B.* pretends in his Preface to be against *School-Divinity*; yet his *Theses* are full of it: And there are many other Contradictions, which I will not now take Notice of) The Preachers and Ministers of the Word not finding themselves concerned, we Young Men, and but Students, have offered to dispute. In the Articles the *Quakers* have been very unreasonable; and particularly *G. K.* did refuse, any Article should be put in against *Railing*; because he said, That might be *Railing* in me, which was not in him, because he (to wit, *G. K.*) was immediately led by the Spirit. We have concluded, that being Young Men, in Case the *Quakers* should have any Advantage, it will not be of great Consequence; and if we have Advantage, we hope it may be useful: because these are the great Prophets and Preachers of the *Quakers*.

G. K. I could take Notice of many things not true in that young Man's long Discourse; as particularly, That *R. B.* hath provoked all *Europe*: But I pass them by, because I am here exceedingly abused; and therefore desire to be heard. For I declare in God's Fear, and in Singleness of my Heart, I never said any such thing, as is by that Young Man alledged upon me; as I can appeal to the Auditors, who were there present. But what I said was this; *I cannot bind my self not to rail, because I'm bound already, that I should not rail, by the Righteous Law of God in my Conscience; and may perhaps speak that,*

And it may here be observed, that afterwards *F. L.* speaking fleetingly against the *Quakers* said, It was no *Railing* to speak the Truth; which was all he pleaded for.

that, as believing it to be true, which ye may call Railing. 1675.

A. Shir. I being chiefly concerned, and having mostly occasioned this Debate, am employed by the rest to speak first; and therefore I will impugn the *Second Thesis*. Which *R. B.* read, and is as followeth:

Seeing no Man knoweth the Father, but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth him, Mat. II. 27. And seeing, the Revelation of the Son is in and by the Spirit; therefore the Testimony of the Spirit is that alone, by which the true Knowledge of God hath been, is, and can be only revealed: Who, as by the Moving of his own Spirit, converted the Chaos of this World into that wonderful Order, wherein it was in the Beginning, and created Man a Living Soul to rule and govern it; So by the Revelation of the same Spirit he hath made manifest himself all along unto the Sons of Men, both Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles: Which Revelations of God by the Spirit, whether by outward Voices and Appearances, Dreams, or inward objective Manifestations in the Heart, was of Old the formal Object of their Faith, and remaineth yet so to be, since the Object of the Saints Faith is the same in all Ages, though set forth under divers Administrations. Moreover, these Divine Inward Revelations, which we make absolutely necessary for the Building up true Faith, neither do, nor can ever contradict the outward Testimony of the Scriptures, or right and sound Reason; yet from hence it will not follow, that the Divine Revelations are to be Subjected to the Examination either of the outward Testimony of the Scriptures, or of the Natural Reason of Man, as to a more Noble, or certain Rule and Touchstone. For this Divine Revelation and inward Illumination is that, which is evident and clear of it self; forcing by its own Evidence and Clearness the well-disposed Under-
stand-

1675. *standing to Assent, irresistably moving the same thereunto, even as the Common Principles of Natural Truths move and incline the Mind to a Natural Assent.*

R. B. People, this is that which we affirm, and which these young Men are about to dispute against, as false. Notwithstanding that *A. Shir.* had thus offered himself first to dispute, yet *F. L.* intruding himself, put him to Silence, beginning as followeth :

F. L. That which is not to be believed, as the Rule of Faith, is not to be the Rule of Faith :

But
The Spirit is not to be believed, as the Rule of Faith ;

Therefore
The Spirit is not to be the Rule of Faith.

R. B. (Having repeated the Argument) I deny the *Minor*, or Second Proposition.

F. L. I prove it ;

That which hath not a sufficient Evidence, to Evidence it self to be a Rule, is not to be a Rule :

But
The Spirit in the Quakers hath not a sufficient Evidence, whereby to evidence it self to be a Rule ;

Therefore
The Spirit in the Quakers is not to be our Rule.

R. B. (Having repeated the Argument) I distinguish that Second Proposition, If thou meanest any Spirit in the *Quakers*, which they peculiarly assume to themselves, as *Quakers*, or say, they have as a-part of themselves, or of Man's Nature ; we concede, that such have No Evidence ; neither do we say, that any such Spirit is to be our Rule. But if thou meanest that Universal Spirit of God, a Manifestation whereof is given to every one to profit withal ; we affirm, it hath a sufficient Evidence in us, and in all Men.

F. L.

J. L. I urge that Distinction ;

If the Spirit hath a sufficient Evidence, either this Evidence is from your own Declaration, or some other.

But It is neither from your own Declaration, nor from some other ;

Therefore It hath not a sufficient Evidence.

R. B. It is from both.

J. L. What is it then ?

R. B. That it teacheth us to deny Ungodliness and Worldly Lusts, and to live soberly, righteously and godly in this present World: This is an Evidence to all Men.

J. L. I prove, that is not a sufficient Evidence ; Thus :

That is not a sufficient Evidence, which Hereticks may pretend unto, as a sufficient Ground for their Heresy :

But Hereticks may pretend this as a sufficient Ground for their Heresy ;

Therefore It is not a sufficient Evidence.

R. B. I answer this first by a Retortion ; this is the same Argument upon the Matter, which the *Jesuite, Dempster*, used against your Master, *viz. John Menzies* : For the *Jesuit* pressing him to assign a Ground for the Protestant Religion, which *Hereticks* could not pretend unto ; *J. M.* named the Scripture : And the *Jesuit* further urged, That *Hereticks* could and did pretend unto the Scriptures. Now, what Evidence can ye give from the Scriptures, which we cannot give ? Yea, and greater from the Spirit, that *Hereticks* cannot justly lay claim to.

Stud. (With one Voice) We will not have *Retortions*.

R. B. *Præses*, Read the Articles, which contain a particular Provision for *Retortions*, as being Lawful, if not insisted too much on.

So the Fifth Article above-mentioned was read.

G. K.

1675. *G. K.* I offer to Answer directly to his Argument without *Retortion*, though I pass not from the *Retortion*; for it stands over your Heads, which ye will never get over. Then I say, we have a *two-fold Evidence*, which no *Heretick* can justly lay Claim to. The one is, the inward Evidence of the Spirit of God, by its own immediate Testimony in our Hearts: The other is, the Testimony of the Scriptures, which I affirm in the Name of the People called *Quakers*, is the best external and outward Evidence and Rule, that can be given. And my Reason, why we have the Testimony of the Scriptures, as an Evidence, that we have the Inspiration of the Spirit is this:

All Men have a Measure of the Inspiration of the Spirit of God according to the Scriptures Testimony, That *Christ the true Light enlightneth every Man, that cometh into the World*; and that a *Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal*: But this universal Illumination or Manifestation is *Inspired*; and if *All Men* be in Measure *Inspired*, then consequently *We*, who are *Men*, are *Inspired*.

F. L. I prove, ye have not the Testimony of the Scriptures for a sufficient Evidence:

That which is fallacious, is not a sufficient Evidence:

But The Scriptures Testimony, according to the Quakers, without the Indwelling of the Spirit, is fallacious;

Therefore The Scriptures Testimony is not a sufficient Evidence.

R. B. (Having repeated the Argument) I deny the Second Proposition.

G. K. The Argument is wrong in its Structure, and vicious, as consisting of *Four Terms*, which no right *Syllogism* should have.

Stud.

Stud. Is it not *in Forma*? For it hath not 1675.
Four Terms.

G. K. It hath *four Terms*; and this I offer to prove before either your Masters, or any other judicious *Logicians* of any University in this Nation. I say it hath *four Terms*, because it *subsumes* that in the *second Proposition*, which was not in the *first Proposition*.

I appeal to all *Logicians*, if when any thing is *Subsumed* in a *Syllogism*, which is neither in the *first Proposition*, nor in the *Conclusion*, whether that *Syllogism* hath not *four Terms*?

At this the Students fell a laughing, and so provoked the People to Lightness.

Al. Skein (one of the *Preses*) I am sorry to see those, who profess to study *Divinity*, behave themselves so *lightly*, and so far from *Seriousness* in such weighty Matters, as concern the *Truths* of God.

G. K. I am ready still to prove, that the *Syllogism* hath *four Terms*: But this being not so proper here for this *Auditory*, ye proceed to prove the *second Proposition*, which *R. B.* hath denied.

J. L. I prove the *Second Proposition*;

That which may beguile a Man, is fallacious:

But

According to the Quakers, the Scriptures may beguile a Man, without the Indwelling of the Spirit:

Therefore

'According to the Quakers, the Scriptures are fallacious.

G. K. This Argument is also wrong in the *Structure*, having *four Terms*.

R. B. But waving that, I deny thy *second Proposition*: For the *Scripture* cannot *beguile* any Man, although Men may or have *beguiled* themselves by a wrong Use of it.

A. Shir. Take Notice People, The *Quakers* say, The *Scriptures* cannot *beguile* you.

R. B. Speak lowder yet; for we do and have constantly Affirmed it: And we hope, it will help to clear us of those *Mis-representations*, as if we *despised* or spake *Evil* of the *Scriptures*.

G. K. I

1675. G. K. I would, my Words could reach from the one End of the World to the other, when I say, *The Scriptures cannot beguile any Man*: For the *Scripture* is Innocent, and a true Testimony in it self; but *Men* do *beguile* themselves oft, by making *perverse Glosses* upon the *Scriptures*: The *Scripture* cannot be fallacious, because according to you, it is your *Principal Rule of Faith*; and if we can prove from your own *principal Rule*, that we are *Inspired*, then the *Scripture's-Testimony* is not *fallacious*, else your *Principal Rule* would be *Fallacious*.

Stud. But that is not according to your *Principle*.

G. K. But it is an Argument *ad Hominem*, which ye know, is lawful: And besides, though we do not acknowledge them to be the *principal Rule* of our *Faith*; yet we Affirm, that they are a True Testimony, and the *best outward Testimony* and *Rule* in the World. And besides, there is a *Manifestation* of the *Spirit* in many, where there is not an *In-dwelling* of the *Spirit*, and by this *Manifestation* of the *Spirit* all Men may understand the *Scriptures*, as they do improve it.

Stud. We will go to another Argument.

R. B. People take Notice, this Argument is left upon this Point, that according to the *Quakers* Principle these *Young-Men* say, *The Scriptures may beguile People*; which we utterly deny, as proved, or that that can be proved.

Al. Shirreff: I argue against the latter part of the *Second Thesis*, where ye affirm; *That inward Immediate Revelations are necessary to the building up of true Faith*. We confess, That *Subjective* Revelation is necessary; but we deny, that *Objective* Revelation is necessary, which ye Affirm.

G. K. Explain, what ye mean by *Subjective* and *Objective* Revelation, that the People may understand according to the *Articles*.

A. Sh. I

A. Sh. I explain it from this Scripture, Luke 1675. 24. 17. *And beginning at Moses and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself.* Here is the *objective Revelation*, to wit, the *Scriptures*, so that they needed not any new *objective Revelation*, but only that which was before; but needed a *Subjective Revelation*, or *Divine Illumination*, to make them understand the *objective Revelation*, to wit, the *Scriptures*.

G. K. That is not a sufficient Explanation of *Objective* and *Subjective Revelation*; therefore I desire to be heard, that I may open it more sufficiently, according as is provided in the *Articles of Agreement*.

Objective Revelation, or the *Object* of our *Faith* is twofold, to wit, *first*, the *Material Object*; *secondly*, the *Formal Object*.

Stud. Do the People understand this?

G. K. I shall explain to them, for it is necessary to the Matter in Hand. The *Material Object* is that, which is to be believed; the *Formal Object* is that, for which principally we are to believe, or the *Principal Motive of Credibility*. Now to apply, I say; The *Scriptures* are the *material Object*, or a Part of the *material Object* of our *Faith*; but not the *formal Object* of our *Faith*.

A. Shir. I prosecute my *Argument* against such *Objective Revelations*, as being necessary to *Faith*.

G. K. We confess, the *Scriptures* are sufficient to move us to an *Historical Faith*, and that to a more excellent Degree of *Historical Faith*, than any other Book in the World; because it hath more excellent outward Motives of Credibility, as the *Consent* of all *Ages*, since they were written, and of all *Christians*, however differing among themselves, &c. But they are not sufficient to beget in us a *Saving Faith*, without *Inward Objective Revelation*.

A. Shir.

1675. *Al. Shir.* I prove, such *Inward Objective Revelations* are not necessary to beget *Saving Faith*, by this Argument:

If there be no such Seed in Men, as the Quakers maintain, then there are no such Revelations, as the Quakers maintain.

But there is no such Seed in Men, as the Quakers maintain:

Therefore there are no such Revelations, &c.

R. B. (After he had repeated the Argument) I deny that *second Proposition.*

Al. Shir. I prove it.

If there be such Seed in Men, as a substantial, living Principle, distinct from the Soul, that can be heard, seen, savoured, tasted and felt, then there is no such Seed in Men, as the Quakers maintain:

But the first is true; Therefore the last.

And then the said *Alexander Shirreff* read a Passage at length out of *G. K.* his Book of *Immediate Revelation*, Page 6, 7. That the Seed was such a living, substantial Principle, and that in the Seed these Revelations were only received.

R. B. This is a Digression from the Matter, and a passing from the *Theses* (which should have been the Subject of this Day's Debate) to *G. K.* his Book of *Immediate Revelation.*

G. K. I must now appear to defend my Book, and apologize to *R. B.* because I am necessitated to put my Hand in another's Harvest: Therefore I distinguish upon the Word *Such*, in the *first Proposition.* If by *such*, thou meanest a *Substantial Principle*, &c. I say, that is altogether *Extrinsic* to the Subject of the Debate; and besides it will engage us into the greatest Nicities and Obscurities of *Philosophy* and *School-Divinity*, that is not proper for this Auditory: But if by *such* thou meanest, an *Universal Principle* of *God's Saving Grace* in Men, whereby they are capacitated

tated both to know and do the *Will* of God ; I Affirm and am ready to maintain, there is such a *Principle In All MEN.* 1675.

Al. Shir. But I prove, *That that Seed in Men is not of a Substance, or Substantial Principle.*

G. K. I am ready to defend, That it is a *Substantial Principle* ; But that belonging to the *Second Proposition*, we ought not to come to it, before the *Distinction* of the *First Proposition* be discussed. Here the *Students* made a great Noise ; and *G. K.* appealed to the *Præses And. Thompson* : Who answered discreetly, That *G. K.* did not refuse to defend, That the *Seed* of God was a *Substantial Principle* ; but this was not its proper Place, until the *Distinction* of the *former Proposition* be discussed.

A Shir. I shall wave the Word *Substantial*, &c and I offer to prove, That there is not a *Seed* of God in Men, as the *Quakers* Affirm :

If there be such a Seed, it is either Created or Uncreated,

But it is neither Created, nor Uncreated ;
Chuse you whether.

G. K. (After he had repeated the *Argument* :) I distinguish the Word *Seed*, as being either a *Concrete Term*, or an *Abstract Term*.

J. L. Doth the People understand this *Distinction* ?

G. K. I hope ye understand it ; and I shall explain it to them, who understand it not. A *Concrete Term* comprehendeth *two* things ; the one *in Recto*, (as they say) the other *in Obliquo*, that is to say, the *one* hath the *other* belonging to it. As *Merciful* is a *Concrete Term*, which is as much as to say, *One* that hath *Mercifulness* in him ; and so *Mercifulness* is the *Abstract*, which signifieth that *one thing* belonging to the *Concrete*. Now to apply : If we understand *Seed* as the *Concrete*, it is both *Uncreated* and *Created* ; for it is God

1675. himself discovering himself to the *Creatures* Capacity in his *Work of Manifestation*, which *Work is Created*: but *He*, who doth manifest himself in that *Manifestation*, is *Uncreated*. And because he manifests himself at first in a low and small Degree unto the Soul; therefore he in that *Manifestation* is compared unto a *Seed*; even as *Clemens Alexandrinus* saith, That Christ compared himself to a *Grain of Mustard-Seed* in his Inward Appearance in Men's Hearts.

Alex. Shir. The *Seed* is not a *Substantial Principle*, because it is the *Manifestation* of God: But the *Manifestation* of God is not a *Substantial Principle*, but *Accidental*.

G. K. That may be *Substantial* or a *Substance*, which in another Respect is *Accidental*; as *Gold* is a *Substance*, so *Silver, Houses, Lands* are *Substances*; but they are *Accidental* to me, because I may want them.

Al. Shir. He saith, his *Seed* is a *Substance* or *Substantial Principle*.

G. K. This is an Abuse: I speak not of *my Seed*, or of the *Seed of Man*; but of the *Seed of GOD* in Men.

A. Shir. I prove, that *Manifestation* is not a *Substance*.

R. B. That brings us again into a *Philosophical Debate*, which is here to be avoided.

J. L. I prove, that *Manifestation* is not *Created*.
Whatsoever is of God, is God: But
This Manifestation is of God,
Therefore it is God.

G. K. Take Notice of this *Young-Man's Blasphemy*; for if *whatsoever is of God, be God*, then all the *Creatures* are *God*, as *Stones, Horses, &c.* For the Scripture says; *Of him, and through him, and to him are all things.* Here the *Students* made a Noise, and fell a *Laughing* to cover this: Some of them speaking *Irreverently* of *God*.

G. K. I be-

G. K. I beseech you, yea, I charge you all in 1675.
 God's *Fear*, that when you speak of that *Holy and Dreadful Being*, ye do it with *Fear and Reverence*.

A. Shir. Ye say then, This *Seed* is *God* in a *Manifestation*: I prove, it is not.

That is not God, which can be measured in Measures, and can grow from a lesser Measure to a great, can be formed and grow up in Men.

But God cannot be measured in Measures, nor grow, &c.

Therefore this Seed is not God in a Manifestation.

G. K. (After he had repeated the *Argument*) I answer; God as in himself, or as in his own *Being*, cannot be *measured* or *grow up*, it is true; but as in *Respect* of his *Manifestation*, *quoad Nos* (or *as to us*) that is to say, as he comes forth *as to us*, discovering himself, *He* or his *Spirit* may be said to have *Measures*. And this I shew from *Scripture*: As where it is said in *John* concerning *Christ*; *God gave not the Spirit by Measure unto him*; implying, he gave it forth in *Measures* unto *others*: And where *Elisha* said unto *Elijah*, *Let a double Portion of thy Spirit be upon me*.

J. L. He saith, *God* cometh forth into the *Creatures*: I prove, he cannot come forth into the *Creatures*, because he is *in himself*.

G. K. He doth *come forth* into the *Creatures*, and yet is still *In himself*; for he is not limited, as *Creatures* are, who go from one *Place* to another: But he is *In all Creatures*, and *In Himself* also. But this *Young-Man*, as I perceived by him the other *Day*, is a *Nullibist* in his *Opinion*, as they term them: So that according to his *Principle*, the *Soul* of *John Lesly* is as much in *France*, even now, as in his *Body*, or in this *Place*; that is to say, neither *here*, nor *there*. But herein I

1675. speak according to *Scripture-Words*, which saith; *God boweth the Heavens, and cometh down*: Yet not that he leaveth his one *Being*; but it is spoken after the Manner of Men, who is *every where* in all his Creatures; but manifesteth himself in several *Measures* unto them.

Al. Shir. There is nothing in the *Seed*, but *God*; therefore *God* in his own *Being* is *measured* forth according to the *Quakers* Doctrine; for the *Seed* is nothing, but *God* and his *Manifestation*.

G. K. The *Manifestation* is *in its self*, and not *out of it self*. Can *Al. Shir.* be *out of himself*? Or can any thing be *out of it self*?

R. B. If some of them be not *without themselves*, it is like they are *beside themselves*.

G. K. In a Moral Way of Speaking, when a Man is a *Mad-man*, or beside his Purpose, he is *beside himself*. Upon this the *Students* fell to debate among themselves, Whether they should prosecute the *Argument*, or not, some being for it, and some against it: And those who were for it, boasting of their *Advantage*?

G. K. I see no *Strength* in your *Reasoning* to *Glory* in, it hath not the *Strength* of a *Cobweb*; but if you think it hath, produce it: And if any more *Water* remain in your *Bottle*, bring it out.

A. Shir. Yea, we have *Water* enough yet in our *Bottle* to quench your *Spirit*.

R. B. Come on with it then.

We will go from this to the *Eleventh Thesis*, which *R. B.* read out, and is as followeth.

All true and acceptable Worship to God is offered in the inward and immediate Moving and Drawing of his own Spirit, which is neither limited to Places, Times, or Persons. For, though we be to Worship him always, in that we are to fear before him; yet as to the outward Signification thereof in Prayer, Praises or Preachings, we ought not to do it, where and when we will, but where and when

we

we are moved thereunto by the secret Inspirations of his Spirit in our Hearts, which God beareth and accepteth of, and is never wanting to move us thereunto, when need is; of which he himself is the alone proper Judge. All other Worship then, both Praises, Prayers and Preachings, which Man sets about in his own Will, and at his own Appointment, which he can both begin and End at his Pleasure, do or leave undone, as himself sees meet, whether they be a prescribed Form, as a Lyturgy, or Prayers conceived ex Tempore, by the Natural Strength and Faculty of the Mind, they are all but Superstition, Will-worship, and abominable Idolatry in the Sight of God, which are to be denied, rejected and separated from in this Day of his Spiritual Arising. However it might have pleased him, who winked at the Times of Ignorance, with Respect to the Simplicity and Integrity of some, and his own Innocent Seed, (which lay, as it were, buried in the Hearts of Men under the Mass of Superstition) to blow upon the dead and dry Bones, and to raise some Breathings, and answer them; and that until the Day should more clearly dawn and break forth.

A. Sh. By this Thesis ye affirm, That no Man ought to go about any Duty without a particular Impulse of the Spirit,

R. B. Impulse is not a Word used by me, but an obscure Word; therefore say, Inspiration or Influence.

A. Sh. Either this Inspiration ye have it in all things, or in somethings: Chuse you Whether.

R. B. We have it in these things relating to our Duties of Worship towards God.

Al. Sh. This contradicts G. K. who in his Book of Immediate Revelation saith, That in all things whatsoever, we ought to have an Inspiration of the Spirit for the doing of the same; otherwise we cannot do in Faith.

1675. *R. B.* This is another Digression and going from the Purpose: For the *Question* is not, How far I contradict another; but what in Reason ye can say, against what I have here affirmed? For when I shewed you before, how you *Contradicted* your *Master*, viz *John Menzies* in another Matter, ye would not admit it as *Relevant*, tho' the Case be alike; alledging, it was a *Retortion*. Ye undertook to *Dispute* against the *Theses*; but it seems you find not Room enough there, but ye must run to *G. K's* Book for further Matter.

Note divers of the Auditors were displeas'd with their going from the *Theses*.

G. K. I see it is more against *G. K.* than *R. B.* his *Theses*, that you set your selves: and therefore *G. K.* must defend *G. K.* But I say, in this there is no *Contradiction* between *R. B.* and me; for there is a two-fold Sort of *Inspirations* or *Influences*, the one *General*, the other *Special*. The *general Influences* are given in *general* or *common*, for the doing of all *common* and *ordinary* Actions; and by the *special Influences* of the *Spirit* we are enabled to go about those *special Duties*, as of *Prayer*, *Thanksgiving*, &c. Now of these *special Inspirations* or *Influences* *R. B.* in his *Theses* is to be understood; and thus there is no *Contradiction* betwixt him and me.

R. B. To which I have this to add; there is a Difference betwixt the *Influences* of the *Spirit*, as we are *particularly* acted by them in singular and particular Acts of *Worship*, and as we are *generally Influenced* by the *Spirit*, in so far as we come habitually to *live* and *walk* in the *Spirit*: For in that Respect we may be said to do every thing in the *Spirit*, as we grow up into that State; though there be more *particular Influences* requisite in Matters of *Worship*.

G. K. I say further; *particular Influences* or *Inspirations* of the *Spirit* are of several Sorts, which are *Analogous* or proportional to the several Sorts of

of Duties: As *Preaching* and *Praying* are several Sorts of Duties: Now the particular Influence to *Pray*, it not to *Preach*, and so on the contrary. Also the Influences, which serve to Duties only *Inward*, as to *Wait*, *Fear* and *Love* God, do not serve without a superadded Influence to the Performance of *outward Duties*. Therefore every *Influence* is to Respect the *Duty*, that it is given unto. 1675.

A. Sh. I prove, that such *particular Influences* are not needful to Acts of *Worship*, Thus:

If such particular Influences of the Spirit were needful unto outward Acts of Worship, then they were also needful unto inward Duties, as to waiting, desiring, loving and feeling God: But

The last is absurd; Therefore the first.

R. B. (Having repeated the *Argument*) I deny, that the *last* is *Aburd*.

G. K. Come on with that *Argument*: I confess, it hath some *Acumen* or Sharpness in it; but *ex tua Pharetra nunquam venit illa Sagitta*, this Arrow hath not come out of thy Quiver, but out of thy Master's, who hath formerly used this *Argument* against us.

A. Sh. I prove the *last* is *absurd*:

If the Inspirations of the Spirit be necessary to Inward Duties, as to Wait, desire, &c. then we must not Wait without them;

But this absurd; Therefore is the other.

G. K. (Having repeated the *Argument*) I deny, that this is *absurd*: For we cannot suppose, that ever at any time an *Influence* or *Inspiration* can be wanting to *wait* upon God, to *desire*, and *fear* and *love* him, and the particular Influences to particular Duties, such as, *Praying*, *Preaching*, *Thanksgiving*, is not wanting, whenever the Season cometh to go about them.

A. Sh. If ye have these *particular Influences*,

1675. Why do ye not make Use of them? Why do ye not say the *Grace*?

R. B. It will not follow, That we do not *Pray*, nor make Use of those *particular Influences*, because at sometimes we do not take off our *Hats*, or speak *Words*, which are not *Essential* to true *Prayer*.

J. L. I prove, That that Distinction concerning *general* and *particular Influences* is not sufficient.

That which maybe a Ground for an Heretick to forbear Praying for a whole Year, is not a sufficient Distinction; But This may be a Ground for an Heretick to forbear Prayer for a whole Year; Therefore It is not a sufficient Distinction.

G. K. (Having repeated the *Argument*) I deny the *second Proposition*.

J. L. I prove it; for an *Heretick* may pretend, He hath not those *particular Influences* for a whole *Year*.

G. K. Though an *Heretick* may pretend, yet he hath no Ground from our *Principle* to pretend to any such thing, because these *particular Influences* cannot be wanting, neither for *one Year*, nor for any *Time*, that the *particular Duties* ought to be gone about; and if any did pretend the Want of *Particular Influences*, to *pray*, &c. they are to be judged as *guilty* and *Deceitful*, as giving that for an *Excuse*, which is not sufficient, although all have not the *Utterance* of *Prayer*, so as to pray in *Words*; nor can any *Pray truly* in *Words*, but by a *Particular Influence*.

A. Sb. This *Influence* or *Inspiration* is either *commanding* or *forbidding*; so G. K. understood it; but because of the great *Confusion* or *Noise*, he cannot certainly say: And upon this *Understanding* G. K. answered, *It is not a sufficient Enumeration; for there is a Midst*.

Præses,

Præses, A. T. Master Keith, ye know we say, 1675.
Non datur Medium.

Students. There is no *Midst* betwixt *Contradictory Propositions*.

G. K. But these *Propositions* are not *Contradictory*; for there is a *Midst* betwixt *Commanding* and *Forbidding*.

A. Sb. Either he doth *Command*, or not *Command*; there is no *Midst* here, chuse you whether.

G. K. He doth not *Command* us in all things, in which we are *inspired*; for some *Inspirations* are *Mandatory* and *Commanding*, some *Permissory* or *permitting*; and some *forbidding*; so betwixt *commanding* and *forbidding*, the *Midst* is *Permitting*.

F. L. But a *Permission* cannot be an *Inspiration*, otherwise ye might say, A *Stone* doth inspire you as much as *God*, because a *Stone* doth *permit* or not *hinder* you.

G. K. I deny the *Consequence*; for I offer to shew from *Scripture*, That *Paul*, when he did a thing by *Permission*, was *inspired*: As when he said; *I speak this by Permission, and not by Commandment*: Here he was writing *Scripture* by *Inspiration* in the very *Time*. And again, where he said; *I assayed to go to such a Place, but the Spirit permitted not*.

A. Sb. This was not a *Permission*, but a *Hindring*, or not a *permitting* him.

G. K. But I gather out of these *Words* by the *Rules of Contraries*, That if the *Spirit* did not *permit* *Paul* at sometimes, it did *permit* him at other *Times*; and this *Permission* was by *Inspiration*: And I hope, it is lawful for me to make this *Observation* or *Note* up this *Scripture*, seeing, your *Masters* will make *half a Dozen* not so much to the *Purpose*. But for the further opening of this *Matter*, I distinguish of *Permission* thus: There

1675. There is a *Negative Permission*, and a *Positive Permission*. A *Negative Permission* is a simple Forbearance, or not meddling in any Case; and such a *negative Permission* is no sufficient Warrant to us to do any thing. The *Positive Permission* is, when God by some *inward Evidence* or Signification of his Spirit by Words or otherwise, maketh us know, That he *Alloweth* us to do such a thing, although he *Command* it not. As for Example; if a *Scholar* should go forth, out of the School, without getting of his Master's Leave, this is a *Negative Permission*, and is not a sufficient Ground for the *Scholar* to go forth: But when the *Scholar* cometh, and saith; *Let me go forth*: and the Master answereth, *Thou may'st go*: This is a *Positive Permission*, and not a *Command*.

Præses, And. Thomf. Examples are not Demonstrations.

G. K. But they may be used to *Illustrate*.

Præses, A. Th. But the Master saith to the *Scholar*, *Exi, go forth*, which is in the *Imperative*, and that signifieth to *Command*.

As in the 3
Person in the
Imperative,
Exeat Let
him go, is
Permissive.

G. K. That is but a *Grammaticism*: for the *Imperative Mood* doth not always signify to *command*; but sometimes to *command*, and sometimes to *Permit*: Which I refer to the Judgment of School-Masters, who teach the *Grammar*.

A. T. Præses. This is rather like a Debate about *Grammatications of Imperative Moods*, than about the Matter intended; therefore come to the Purpose.

A. Sb. In the Prosecution of this Argument against this *Thesis* alledged on G. K. *He will not pay his Debt, because he may pretend, he wants an Inspiration to do it.*

G. K. I hope, none can blame me for refusing to pay my Debt; and I pay my Debt, as well as any of you; nor can any be supposed, that Men can want

want an Inspiration to do any such thing. And we refer our selves to the Judgment of Discretion in all sober Persons here present. 1675.

Paul Gelly. I have an Argument to propose for Water-Baptism.

R. B. Then let me read the *Thesis*; which was read, and is as followeth:

As there is one Lord, and one Faith, so there is one Baptism, Ephes. 4. 5. which is not the putting away of the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience before God, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, 1 Pet. 3. 21. And this Baptism is a Holy and Spiritual Thing (to wit) the Baptism of the Spirit and Fire, by which we are buried with him, Col. 2. 12. That being washed and purged from our Sins, we may walk in Newness of Life, Rom. 6. 4. of which the Baptism of John was a Figure, which was commanded for a Time, and not to continue for ever. As to the Baptism of Infants, it is a meer Human Tradition, for which neither Precept nor Practice is to be found in all the Scripture.

R. B. What hast thou against this *Thesis*, is it not the express Words of Scripture?

P. G. It is true, and therein we agree; but I oppose your Meaning of it.

R. B. We make no *Meaning* in the Case, for the Scripture declareth our Meaning.

G. K. Ye have a large Field to dispute in, in the last Part of the *Thesis*, if you please, where he positively affirms, *That Sprinkling of Infants is a meer Humane Tradition.*

Students. We will not meddle with that at this Time.

P. G. Either you mean by this *Thesis*, That *Water-Baptism is ceased, or not ceased.*

R. B. Come on, we mean, *It is ceased.*

Note, That while this young Man was prosecuting his Argument, J. L. did insolently intrude himself, and interrupted him, and they spoke of them three at some times.

P. G.

1675.

P. G. I prove it is not ceased, thus:

If the Presence of Christ is to continue with his Church for ever, then Water-Baptism is to continue for ever.

But the first is true: Therefore the Second.

G. K. People, take Notice, he saith, *Water-Baptism is to continue for ever*; if so, then we must be Baptized in Heaven after this Life with Water-Baptism.

Stud. He means by *for ever*, to the End of the World.

R. B. (Having repeated the Argument) I deny the Sequel of the first Proposition.

P. G. I prove it from *Matth. 28, Go Teach and Baptize all Nations, &c.* Here Christ commanding them to *Baptize*, sheweth, *he will be with them to the End of the World*; therefore as long as he was to be with them, that Baptism was to continue.

R. B. I grant the whole: But the Question is, *If that Baptism be by Water?* which I deny.

P. G. I prove, it was by *Water*.

If the Apostles Baptized with Water, then they were commanded to Baptize with Water.

But the Apostles Baptized with Water: Therefore they were commanded to Baptize with Water.

R. B. (Having repeated the Argument) I deny the Consequence of the Proposition.

P. G. I prove it thus, *Either the Apostles did Baptize with Water by the Command of Christ, Matth. 28. Or they were ignorant of the Meaning of that Command*; Chuse you whether,

G. K.

G. K. It is not a sufficient Enumeration; for 1675. they might have known the Meaning of the Command, and yet Baptized with Water, not for that Command, but in Condescension to the Weaknesses of the *Jews*.

P. G. If they Condescended to Baptize with Water for the Weakness of the *Jews*, though without a Command, then ye ought to Baptize now with Water, to Condescend to Peoples Weakness now; seeing ye confess, that there are, who are Weak both among us and your selves.

G. K. That will not follow, more than in the Case of *Circumcision*; For the Apostle *Paul* did Circumcise without a Command in Condescension to the *Jews*, yet it followeth not, that any now should Circumcise to Condescend to the People, who should require it.

Stud. The Parity is not alike, because Baptism with Water was commanded to the Apostles, so not Circumcision; for *John Baptist* was sent to Baptize with Water.

R. B. *John Baptist* was not an *Apostle*, and so not concerned in that Commission, *Matth.* 28. And his Baptism was to decrease, that the Baptism of Christ by the Holy Ghost might increase.

Al. Shir. It must be *Water-Baptism*, because the Baptizing of the Holy Ghost is ceased now.

G. K. People, take Notice, he saith, *The Baptism of the Holy Ghost is ceased now*.

Al. Shir. It is ceased to be given by Men; for do ye give the Holy Ghost by the Laying on of Hands?

G. K. The Holy Ghost may be given without the Laying on of Hands; and Holy Men now are Instruments in conveying the Gifts of the Holy Ghost to others.

R. B. Did not *Paul* say, *Rom.* 1. 11. *That he longed to see them to communicate some spiritual Gift?* And besides, as to the Matter of Condescendence,

1675. scendence, Abstaining from Blood and Things frangled, though particularly commanded by the Apostles, yet is not now to be practised by any Condescension, as your selves confess.

G. K. Hear what *Augustine* saith in the Case of *Circumcision, Observing of Meats, Drinks, Washing, Sacrifices, &c.* They are to be considered in a threefold Respect, *viz. First, as living under the Law; Secondly, as dead, after the Death of Christ; Thirdly, as deadly, as being once buried; and being once buried, they are not to be again raised up out of their Grave, out of Condescension to any.* So I say the same, as of *Water-Baptism*, it being once *Dead and Buried*, is not again to be raised up now, after the Apostacy.

P. G. I prove, That *Water-Baptism* was thought needful even to those, that were Baptized with the *Holy Ghost*: *Can any Man forbid Water, &c.* as *Paul* said *Acts 10.*

G. K. Say *Peter*, not *Paul*.

P. G. *Peter*, I say, not *Paul*.

R. B. That proves not at all, that it was done by Necessity; but to condescend to their Weakness.

About this Time the *Præses, And. Th.* going forth, said, *It was now five a Clock, the Time appointed for the Continuance of the Dispute; and so went away: Nor was there any Argument farther urged.*

G. K. *Præses Al. Skein*; I see there is like to be no more here, but Confusion, seeing the other *Præses* is gone. I shall only propose this just and reasonable Desire to these Students, that since we have given them a fair Opportunity to Impugn and Oppose our Principles, they also will promise us another Day, to Impugn and Oppose theirs.

Stud. When we set out *Theses*, then ye shall have an Opportunity to impugn them.

G. K.

G. K. Your *Theses* are set out already, for your Confession of Faith is your *Theses*, which I offer to impugn. 1675.

Stud. Our Faith is Established by the Law of God, and of the Nation, and therefore ought not to be called in Question.

R. B. That it is Established by the Law of God, is the thing under Debate; And as for the Law of the Nation, so is the *Popish* Faith in *Italy* and *Spain*, and *Mahometanism* in the *Turks* Dominions; will it therefore follow, that *Poperly* and *Mahometanism* are not to be called in Question or Oppugned?

Stud. We will come to your Meetings, and debate further with you.

R. B. Our Meetings are not for *Debate*, but to Wait upon God and Worship Him; but if ye please to meet us here again to Morrow, we are satisfied.

Stud. We will not.

R. B. It seems, ye need a longer Time to prepare you; for your present Strength is all Exhausted.

Stud. We will come to your Meeting, and wait till it be done, and then Oppose you.

R. B. I have told you before, That is not proper; but on this Condition I will admit it, that when I see meet, I may have the like Opportunity to come to your Meetings, and when your Preachers have done, that I be allowed to Oppose and Impugn your Principles.

Stud. No, no.

The Confusion and Tumult increasing, through the Removing of the *Præses*, *A. Th.* and divers of the soberest People: And the Students vainly Boasting of their Victory, Laughing, Clamouring and making a Noise, and telling, They would cause to be Publish'd in Print their (imaginary) Victory, occasioned such Lightness and Rudeness in a Rabble of the grossest Sort, that were with-
out

1674. out the Bar, that laying hold on a Heap of Turffs, they threw many of them against us, without offering the least Violence to our Opposers on the other Side. So that having beat divers with hard Turffs, Peates, and also with Stones, R. B. with divers other *Friends*, received several Knocks in his Head, and was wounded in his Hand with a Stone; while as the Students (the *Masters of Art*) and their Companions, who had been Disputing in Matters of Religion, instead of interposing themselves to prevent, stood divers of them Laughing, Hollowing and Clamouring thereat; and so the Meeting broke up. G. K. said to others more sober, that were present, *These are your Church-Members.*

This True and Impartial Account (which was offered to be read to their *Præses*, *Andrew Thomson*; but he declined it, alledging, The Matters treated of were so extrinſick from his Employment, and thoſe Things that took up his Head, and he ſo apt to forget ſuch Things, that though the Matter might be True, he could not Atteſt it, neither for us nor our Opposers. It was alſo read in Writing to ſome Judicious and Unprejudicate Perſons, that were preſent, and are not of our Way; and acknowledged by them to be according to their beſt Memory, *A full and Ingenuous Account*: As may be further proved, in Caſe it be called in Queſtion) will, we hope, ſerve to appeaſe theſe empty Clamours, which the Students vain Oſtentation, and the Ignorance and Prejudice of others might have raiſed; ſome of whom did ſo little, or at leaſt will needs appear ſo little to underſtand the Matter, as to affirm, *The Quakers were all Routed; for they could prove nothing*: Whereas we were by Mutual Agreement to be meer *Defendants*; and not to be admitted at all to Prove, but only to Answer. And whether

ther we Answered not all was urged, will by 1675.
 this Account appear; where none of the Arguments are omitted, nor any whit of the Strength of them concealed.

As for what was or may be accounted *Reflections*, we have not put them in the Body of the Dispute; because we remember not particularly, at what Time they were spoken: But that we may not seem designedly to conceal any, as tending to our Disadvantage; so far as we remember, they were as followeth.

That *G. K.* said to *J. L.* *He spoke more with his Fingers, than his Tongue; after, What need he make such a Work with his Finger, and affect a Canting Tone, like his Master J. M? That his Head was too full of Mercury, and his Heart in his Tongue; whereas a Wise Man's Tongue is in his Heart.*

Now whether *J. L.*'s extravagant Behaviour did not deserve such Checks (while he oftentimes would be speaking, when his Companions were; and put them by with both his Elbows, that he alone might be heard: To which add his Forwardness in his Blasphemous Assertion above observed) let the discreet and judicious Hearers judge.

A. Shir. said, *He would overturn Quakerism; and he hoped in so doing to have his End.*

J. L. That he might not miss to hit, as he thought, *G. K.* said, *It seemed, he was an Aberdeen's Man, and would take his Word again* (which was noted by *G. K.* as being a Reflection upon the City, where *J. L.* himself was born, which *G. K.* was not). Also,

A. Shir. Laughing and raising Lightness, called upon *G. K.* (speaking some Words) *If there was a Notar, that he might take Instrument?*

To which *R. B.* answered; That he desired the *Notar* might take Instruments, how *Divinity*

Students and Masters of Arts, that were preparing themselves for the Ministry, were so Light and Unserious in Religious Matters, &c.

But however, if they have gotten such a Victory, as they boast of, how is that Consistent, with what we are Informed of, and is noised up and down in the City, *That Jo. Menzies, their Master, went within a Day or two, to desire the Bishop to Complain to the Primate and King's Council, and procure us to be punished for holding the Dispute; And an Order, That none such further be admitted?* And indeed, if the Scholars have proved so good Disputants, we think, the Masters cannot in Reason refuse this following OFFER.

R. B. *His Offer to Jo. Menzies, Professor of Divinity (so called) George Meldrum, Minister at Aberdeen, and William Mitchell Catechist, at Foot of Dee.*

Challenge.

AS in this late Rencountre it was specially provided, that it shall be abstract from the Challenge made to you, and so no fulfilling of it; so now this being past (of which you have here presented to you a good and faithful Account, which we hope, being seriously weighed by your more Mature Judgments, may allay any hasty Joy, that might have proceeded from the windy Triumphs, the Students might have possessed you with a Belief they had obtained; who at every turn, to the nauseating of the more Serious and Impartial Auditors, were proclaiming

claiming themselves Victors) We think you more concerned : And indeed, we are the more desirous to Meet and Debate it with your selves. For either this is all ye have to say, which ye have put in their Mouths ; or ye have more to say : If this be all, then indeed it may be your Wisdom, not to accept this Offer ; but if ye have more, we shall be willing to hear it, and endeavour to answer it. And as your Appearing your selves would be more Satisfactory to the People, and is most desired by them, as well as us ; so divers Inconveniencies, that have in this, or may fall in the like. would be avoided.

For *First*, It being in your Publick Houses, Reasons. there would be less Occasion of Tumult ; because the House is capable to hold divers Thousands. *Secondly*, As it is probable, ye would not so readily be put to a Stand as they : If it should happen, ye were ; we are hopeful, ye would not by raising a Laughter and Clamour amongst the People, and crying out Three or Four at once, seek to cover it, or boast of Victory, and cry out, *Your Argument is pungent*, before we have Time allowed us to answer it. *Thirdly*, You engaging, we are hopeful to procure Discreet, Learned, and Persons every way Considerable, to be *Judges Consultative* upon our Part (though not Professing our Way) to help to Moderate and keep good Order. *Fourthly*, It is probable, That by the Solemnity of such an Action and the Influence of your Presence, as well as other Persons of Condition being there, might secure us from the Hazzard of Clods and Stones: For I do truly assure you, I conceive my self more able to Answer the most pungent of your Arguments, than defending my self from the Stones and Blows of your Unreasonable and Brutish Church Members. It is by some of your People objected to us (Objections. whether it come from you or not, I will not affirm)

1675. *That it is below you, to engage with us: But as this is altogether unfutable to Christian Ministers, whose Master disdained not daily to Debate, and Answer the Questions of such, as Opposed themselves unto him, and taught his Disciples to leave the Ninety and Nine, and go and seek after the Odd One. Next, It is most Unreasonable; for since ye take Liberty to speak against us in your Pulpits, and particularly to design us, yea, and sometimes to speak Untruths of us, I desire then to know, Whether it be agreeable to the Rules of Christianity, or even of Common Honesty, to take Liberty to speak ill of Men behind their Backs, abuse their Principles and Reputations, and yet say, It is below them to prove these Charges to the Mens own Faces? Secondly, It is Objected, That it is against the Laws, to call the Faith established by Law into Question. But may not the same be said against Protestants in those Nations, where Popery and Mahometanism are Established by Law? Yea, is not this the very Pretence and Put-off, which the Papists both in Germany and France gave the Primitive Protestants, when they desired Publick Conferences with them? And was not both the Emperor Charles the Fifth, and his Brother Ferdinando sorely check'd by divers Bishops of Rome, for granting these Conferences? And the Queen Mother of France openly reprov'd and cried out against by Cardinal Turnon and other Clergy-Men, for giving way to that of Poissy, as suffering the Universal Faith of the Church to be called in Question; which had been established by many Laws, and for a far longer Time, than the Profession we Oppose. It seems, ye defend your selves chiefly by Popish Weapons; as will anon further appear: In Order whereunto I shall speak a Word or two to John Menzies, and so make an End.*

The greatest and frequentest Argument, that 1675.
 both thy Scholars and others make against us, is, *That we have no certain Evidence, by which we can be known, That we are led by the Spirit, that Hereticks and others cannot pretend to.* Now if this may be admitted as Relevant or Strong against us; I desire, thou wouldst be pleased to shew me, How thou canst extricate thy self out of the same Difficulty, when urged by the Jesuit *Dempster*; *That the Scripture, which thou assignedst as the Ground of the Protestant Religion, is an Evidence for you, seeing all Hereticks also pretend to it?* Let me see, what Difficulties occur in our Case, as to the *Spirit*, which likewise occur not in the same very Way in Yours, as to the *Scripture*? For (besides that we have as good Ground to lay Claim to the Scriptures, as your selves, and are ready, and I hope able to prove our Principles from them, as well as your selves) If ye say, *Men may be deceived by a Seducing Spirit*; What then? Will it therefore follow, That the Spirit of God will deceive any? Or that Men ought not to be guided by it, more than because many Men have been and are deceived by a Misunderstanding and wrong Use of the Scripture; that therefore the Scripture doth deceive People, or ought not to be the Rule? If it be said, *Divers Men pretending to the Spirit, Contradict one another*: Doth not the same recur as to the *Scriptures*? What greater Contradictions can there be, than there are betwixt certain Churches, both acknowledging the Scriptures to be the Rule? Hast thou forgotten (*John*) how thou and thy Elder Brother *Andr. Cant*, who both Affirmed the Scripture to be the only Certain Rule, and yet oftentimes before the same Auditory, in the same Pulpit, did from the very same Verse of Scripture, *Psal. 93. 5. Holiness becometh thy House, O Lord, for ever*, draw differ-

rent

Scholars
 chief Argu-
 ments a-
 gainst us.

1675. rent and Contradictory Doctrines, Uses and Applications? If *that* then will not infer according to you, the Scriptures to be an Uncertain Rule; neither will the other, as to the Spirit. If it be said, *That the same Man pretending to be guided by the Spirit, hath been of different Judgments;* doth not the same also recur as to the Scriptures.

Or need we go further, *John*, than *Thy Self*, to prove this, who hast all along acknowledged the Scripture to be the Rule; and yet sometime judged the Congregational Way to be preferable to the *Presbyterian*? And then the *Presbyterian* better than the *Independent*? And now the *Episcopal* preferable to both? Or tell me, *John*, honestly, did the Scripture *deceive* thee, when thou preachedst upon that Text, *Why mournest thou for Saul?* If thou sayst, Thou only here mis-understood the Place, and mis-appliedst it; yet is the Scripture for all that True and Certain: May not the same be said, if one pretending the Spirit to be the Rule, should fall in the like Error, that the Spirit were not to be blamed, or thence termed uncertain? But the Man that mistook the Voice thereof, or took his own Imaginations instead of it, as thou didst thy Misapprehensions for the Sence of that Scripture? If thou canst extricate thy self out of these Difficulties, so as to satisfy me, or any other Rational and Indifferent Person, I may seriously say to thee according to the Proverb, *Eris mihi magnus Apollo*; and really, thou may'st not be without Hopes of making a Profelyte. But if it appear to all Judicious and Unprejudicate Persons, That *John Menzies's* Arguments against the *Quakers*, are no other than the *Jesuit's* against him; and whatever Way he can defend himself against the *Jesuit's*, so the *Quakers* can do against him, and impugn and straiten him the same way: So that
his

his Argument is like the *Viper's Brood*, that destroys him that brings it forth; I say, if this appear, what may Candid Persons judge of *John Menzies's* Honesty, that has asserted in Print, *That Quakerism is Popery under a Disguise*; and the *Papists* and *Quakers* are one? 1675.

The State of the Controversy in the first Place then both upon Our Part and Yours is *in Thesi*, and not *in Hypothesi*; That is, Not, *Whether or not we be truly ruled by the Spirit, or can give an Evidence of it*, more than *Whether ye be truly led by the Scriptures, or can give any Evidence that ye are?* But, *Whether we do well in saying, The Spirit is the Principal Rule of Faith?* For though divers Sects now, to wit, *Lutherans, Calvinists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Antinomians, Arminians, &c.* do all quarrel with one another, each laying Claim to be led by the Scripture, and denying it of the other; yet do they all agree in this, *That the Scripture is the only Rule*: Will it therefore follow, That the Scripture is not the Rule, or certain, because none of these can give a Certain Evidence convincing their respective Opposers, that they are led by it? So on the other Hand, though such as affirm the Spirit to be the Principal Rule, cannot give any Evidence to convince their Opposers, that they are led by it; it will not follow, that it is not the Rule, or that they err in Affirming it so to be.

1675.

A POST-SCRIPT.

AS the Apostle *Paul* said concerning the Spirit of God, That *That there are Diversities of Operations, but one Spirit, and one Body of Christ, which is his Church*; So I may say concerning Antichrist, and his Spirit and Body. The Body of Antichrist is but one, having many Members; and the Spirit of Antichrist is but one in the Root, though in different Operations and Appearances. And what is this Body of Antichrist, but all these (whether *Papists* or others, though pretending to Reformation, under whatsoever Designation, as *Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent, Anabaptist*, or any else) who oppose the Spirit of Christ in his Spiritual Appearances and Operations in the Body of Christ, which is his Church? A manifest Instance of the Truth of this, I myself of late have been an Ear and Eye-Witness of. For not many Months ago I had Occasion at *London*, both to see with my Eyes, and hear with my Ears, how the People called *Anabaptists*, some of their Chief Teachers opposed, denied, slighted and (by all Means their Earthly and Devilish Wisdom could invent) laboured to make of none Effect the Inward Evidence of the Spirit of God in his People; Alledging openly in the Face of Thousands, *That whoever could not give an Evidence to their Adversaries, that they were inspired with the Spirit of God, such as no Hereticks could pretend to, were no Christians, but Deceivers*. So these *Anabaptists* lately argued against us at *London* in an Open Assembly. And so now since in my own Native Country within these few Days, I have seen the same Spirit to appear in Men, professedly very much Differing

Differing from *Anabaptists*, and slighting them as a *Sort of Hereticks*, yet one with them in the Ground; and in this particular Work and Service also, to carry on the great Design of Antichrist. 1679.

These are some *Masters of Arts, Students of Divinity* (as they call themselves) in the University of *Aberdeen*, who openly in the Hearing of divers Hundreds of People, (some whereof were Sober and Judicious) did Oppose the Inward Evidence of the Spirit of God in his People, as not being a sufficient Evidence unto them, unless they could give an Evidence of it unto others, even their very Adversaries, that they were *Inspired*; and so if we the People called *Quakers* could not give an Evidence of this unto these our Opposers, we were but Deceivers. After it had been shewn them, That *Papists* and *Jesuites* used the same Arguments against all the *Protestants*, that indeed did more militate against them out of the *Papists Quiver*, than out of these our Adversaries Quiver against us. I produced the Testimony of the *Scripture*, as the Best and most Convincing Outward Evidence that could be given, as a Witness to the Doctrine and Principle of *Immediate Revelation*, and *Inspiration* of the Spirit of God, owned by us, as being in all Men in some Measure, and consequently *in us*. This is, I say, not the best and most principal Evidence, nor the greatest that we have unto our selves, or unto one another, who are gathered into the same Faith, Spirit and Power, (for that is the Immediate Evidence of the Spirit in our Hearts, which witnesseth both to our selves, and to one another, that we are the Children of God) but it is (I mean the *Scripture*) the Greatest Outward and Visible Evidence, that can be given unto our Adver-

1675. Adversaries, who in Words own the Scriptures, as their only Rule and chiefest Evidences.

And in doing so I followed the-Example of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who while he Reasoned against the Jews, who professed to own the Scriptures, but denied Him, he brought a Testimony for himself out of the Scriptures, which they in Words owned as their Rule: *Search* (says He, or, *Ye Search*) *the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have Eternal Life; and these are they which testify of me.*

Now though Christ his own Immediate Testimony should have been received, as greater than any of his Servants, such as *Moses* and the Prophets were; yet he used this, as an Argument against them, as bringing them to their own Rule: *And, said he, had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for Moses wrote of me.* And he said again, *I have a greater Testimony than that of John; and yet John was the greatest of all the Prophets.* So in like manner we say, We have a greater Testimony to Christ Jesus by his Spirit and Power Revealed in us, than the Testimony of *Moses* and the Prophets, even than *John*, who was the greatest.

But when we produce the Testimony of *Moses*, and the Prophets and Apostles, as an Evidence to the Truth of what we affirm, I say, it should be received by our Adversaries, who own the Scriptures as their Chief and Only Rule. For either they should Receive it, or not Receive it; If they should Receive it, then they are faulty, who in the late Dispute at *Aberdeen* did refuse to Receive the Evidence of the Scriptures, as from us, only because we say, We have a greater, to wit, that of the Spirit within us: Although we own the Scripture, as the greatest Visible and Outward Evidence, that we can give
to

to our Adversaries. If they should not receive the Scripture-Evidence and Testimony as from us, because we say, we have a greater, to wit, That of Christ himself immediately in us by his Spirit; then they must needs also say for the same Reason, *That the Jews ought not to receive the Testimony of the Scriptures, as an Evidence for Christ, because he said, He had a greater:* And certainly, he had a greater, though they would not receive it; nor could not, as they stood in their Prejudice and Malice, wherewith they were filled against him, who did not receive him. 1675.

Now, this I say with Freedom and Boldness of Spirit to all those, whether *Papists, Anabaptists, Prelatical or Presbyterian* Professors, who with one Mouth require of us an Evidence, that we are *Inspired*, or have a Measure of the Inspiration of the Spirit of God and Christ in us; I Offer unto all of you the Scriptures for an Evidence of this Truth, *viz.* That the *Quakers* (so called) have a Measure of the Inspiration of the Spirit of God and Christ *in them*. For according to the Scriptures-Testimony, Christ the true Light *enlighteneth every Man that cometh into the World*; and his Illumination is his Inspiration.

I profess sincerely in God's Fear, That the Scriptures-Testimony is to me as full and plain, and Convincing to prove this Truth, *viz.* That an Illumination, Manifestation and Inspiration of the Spirit of God is given to every Man, is in every Man; as to prove this Truth, That Christ, who according to the Flesh was born of the Virgin *Mary*, was the Promised *Messiah*.

Now, if we can prove from Scripture, That all Men have in them a Measure of this Divine Illumi-

1675. Illumination and Inspiration by the Spirit of Christ, we have gained our Point, which is; That we have also a Measure of the same in us: for *ALL MEN* doth comprehend Us called *Quakers*, as well as other Men: I see not, what our Adversaries can with any Colour Object against this Evidence from Scripture, but this; That they will deny, that the Scripture bears Testimony to this Universal Illumination or Inspiration of the Spirit of God in Men.

But this brings the Matter of the Debate from being Personal to be Doctrinal, and so puts us upon equal Terms at least, with all our Adversaries, especially *Prelatical*, *Anabaptist* and *Presbyterian*, and *Independent* Opposers whatsoever, who say, *The Scriptures are their Chief and Only Rule*. And though our Adversaries say, *The Scripture doth not testify to that Universal Inspiration of the Spirit of Christ in Men*; that moveth us not more, than when the *Jews* denied, *That the Scriptures bore Testimony to him, that was born of the Virgin Mary, to be the Christ*.

We are able, by the Help of God, to prove from Scripture the Truth of this Doctrine of Divine Illumination and Inspiration in all Men, and consequently in the *Quakers*, as much as they, or any Professing Christianity upon Earth, can prove any Principle or Doctrine of their Faith.

Secondly, We are able, and do Offer, by the Grace of God, against all our Opposers whatsoever, to prove from the Scriptures-Testimony, That this Universal Inspiration and Illumination of Christ by his Spirit in Men, is a sufficient Evidence of Truth, and Rule of Faith and Life in all Men, and consequently in us called *Quakers*.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, That this Divine Inspiration and Illumination, where it is not wilfully resisted and rejected, but regarded and attended, is a *greater Evidence*, than the Scripture is, and witnessed by the Scriptures. 1679.

Fourthly, And yet the Scripture is the greatest Visible and Outward Evidence, that either we or they can give of their Rule.

I shall conclude with a Reasonable Demand to these Young Men, *Masters of Arts*, their Masters and Teachers, which is this :

Whether they own these Assertions, Affirmations and Arguments of their Scholars in the late Dispute, as followeth, *viz.*

That whatever is of God, is God ?

That the Scriptures according to the Quakers are fallacious, and can beguile us ?

That the Baptism with the Holy Ghost is ceased ?
And the rest of their Discourse inserted in this foregoing Treatise ?

If *Yea* ; Let them declare so much to the People, who are greatly stumbled at these their Expressions, even divers of their own Church. If *Nay* ; then let them publicly Reprove and Disown those Words : Otherwise not only we, but many others will say, *Ye have both taught and allowed them so to Affirm.*

G. K.

Quakerism

QUAKERISM Confirmed :

OR, A

VINDICATION

Of the Chief

Doctrines and Principles

Of the People called

QUAKERS,

FROM THE

Arguments and Objections of the
Students of Divinity (so called) of
Aberdeen, in their Book, intituled,
Quakerism Canvased.

By { Robert Barclay,
AND
George Keith.

2 Tim. 3. 9. *But they shall proceed no further :
For their Folly shall be manifest to all Men, &c.*

L O N D O N: Printed by the Assigns of
J. Sowle, in the Year, 1717.

T H E
P R E F A C E
T O T H E
R E A D E R.

Friendly Reader,

HAD we not more regarded the Interest of the Truth, for whose sake we can shun no Abasement, than the Significancy of those, with whom we have this Rencountre, we should have rather chused to be silent, than Answer them; they being of so small Reputation among their own, that neither Teachers nor People will hold themselves accountable for any of their Positions, and seem zealous to have it believed, they would not bestow Time to Read it, nor yet hold themselves obliged to Approve it. However, since we certainly know, That

D

in

1676. *in the Second Part of their Book (to which this Reply is) they have scraped together most of the Chief Arguments used against Us, and borrowed not a little from G. M's Manuscripts (with whose Work (that yet appears not) we have been these Seven Years menaced) Which, like the Materials of a Building managed by Unskilful Workmen, though they be by them very confusedly put together; yet being the Chief Things can be said against Us, we have thoroughly handled for the Reader's Satisfaction; which may be serviceable to the Truth, without Respect to the Insignificancy of those, against whom it is written.*

As for the First Part of their Book, we have also Answered it, but distinct from this; it consisting of many Particularities of Matters of Fact, which perhaps might have proved tedious to many Readers, that may by This be Edified; and think it of no great Consequence, that the Students are proved Lyars, which even many of their own Party think, is not any Spot in their Religion

Religion : so little are they looked upon among their own : Yet those that are Curious, may also have that First Part. 1676.

As for this Second Part, wherein our Principles are handled, we judge, we deal with the Clergy in General; however they seek to shift it, and hide themselves, since their Book is Licensed by the Bishop of Edinburgh; and he being Challenged, said, He did it not without a Recommendation from Aberdeen.

So that no Man of Reason can deny, but they are accountable for the Errors and Impertinencies, which we have herein observed; which we leave, Reader, to thy serious Examination, remaining

Thy Friends,

R. B.

G. K.

The Contents.

C O N C E R N I N G SECTION I.
Immediate Revelation.

S E C T. II.
The *Students* Argument against the *Spirit's*
being the *Rule*, proved one with the *Jesuit*
Dempster's.

S E C T. III.
Concerning the *Supper*, *Perfection* and *Wo-*
men's Speaking.

S E C T. IV.
Concerning the *Necessity* of *Immediate Revela-*
tions to the Building up of *True Faith*.

S E C T. V.
Concerning *Worship*.

S E C T. VI.
Concerning *Baptism*.

S E C T. VII.
Concerning the *Ministry*.

S E C T. VIII.
Concerning *Liberty* of *Conscience*.

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

Wherein their *Observations* upon *R. B.* his
Offer, and their last Section of the *Quakers*
Revilings (as they term them) are Exa-
mined.

QUAKERISM

Confirmed, &c.

SECTION I.

Concerning Immediate Revelation; wherein the Second Part of the Students Book, from Page 44, to Page 66. is Answered.

IN their first Section they alledge, We do wick-
edly put many Indignities upon the Holy Scrip-
tures; and that we monopolize the Spirit to
our selves: Which are gross Lies; but that they
are against the Spirit, is no malicious Accusation,
but a Truth, as will appear to any true Discer-
ner. Their comparing us, when we plead for the
Spirit, to them who cried, *The Temple, The Tem-
ple*; is unequal and profane: They that cried,
The Temple, the Temple, rejected the Spirit of
God, and relied too much on the Temple and
outward Priviledges; but dare they blame any,
for relying too much on the Spirit of God? A-
gain, in their first Sub section they commit a
gross Deceit, in which they follow *G. M.* their
Master (who useth the same in his Manuscript to
us) in alledging, *They are more for the Spirit than
we*, because they affirm, *That the Efficacy of the
Spirit is Insuperable*. For we do affirm, *That
the Efficacy of the Spirit is in a true Sence In-
superable*, as namely, where the Mind is well
disposed: See *R. B.* his *Thesis*, where he useth
the Word *Insuperably*. But that the Spirit doth
insuperably move, or irresistably force the ill-
disposed

Operations
of the Spi-
rit may be
resisted.

1676. disposed Minds of all, in whom it operates, is false and contrary to Scripture, which saith, That *Some resist the Spirit*; yea, and is contrary to the Experience of all, who are acquainted with the Spirit's Workings; that know, that the Spirit many times worketh so gently, that his Operation may be resisted: Therefore said the Apostle, *Quench not the Spirit*. Now that Doctrine, which is contrary both to Scripture and Experience, is not for the Spirit, but against it.

Again, How are they more for the Spirit than we, seeing they affirm, *The Spirit's Influence is but only Effective, as having no Evidence in it self sufficiently to demonstrate, that it is of God*: We say, it hath; as being both Effective and Objective. 2. They say, *The Influence of the Spirit is only given to some*: We say, To all. 3. They say, *It is so weak, that it can bring none to a perfect Freedom from Sin in this Life, though never so much improved*: We say, it can. Yea, 4. They say commonly, *The Influence of the Spirit cannot keep the best Saint one Moment from Sin*: We say, It can keep them for whole Days; yea, always, if they improve it as well as they can. 5. They say, *A Man may and ought to pray without the Spirit*: Which we deny. And so we leave it to the Judicious, if here they do not commit a gross Deceit. Lastly, in their stating the Question, they accuse us falsely, as if we did hold, *That all Men ought to judge and examine all the material Objects of Faith, and Articles of Religion by inward Revelations*; As if all Men were bound to an Impossibility. All Men have not all the Material Objects of Faith propounded unto them; for some of the Material Objects of Faith are meerly Accidental unto all Men's Salvation: As to believe, that *Abraham* begat *Isaac*, and *Isaac*, *Jacob*, &c. Others though not Accidental, yet are but Integral Parts, and not Essential

Accidental
Objects of
Faith.

Essential of Christian Religion; such as the Outward History of Christ, &c. and so by this Distinction divers of these Arguments are answered, without more ado; especially the first two, where they spend much Paper fighting with their own Shadow, telling us; *That the Heathens have no Revelations shewing the Birth, Passion, Resurrection, &c. of Jesus Christ*; Which we do grant: For the Belief of such things is only necessary to them, to whom they are propounded; and the Scriptures alledged by them, at most prove no more.

It were a needless Labour, and not worth the Pains to answer particularly to all their *Impertinencies, Follies and Blasphemies*, which they obtrude upon us as Arguments; and in the Issue, their last Probations resolve into meer Assertions, as much denied by us, as the things they undertake to Refute. Therefore upon each *Section or Subsection* we shall but take Notice, what their Arguments Resolve into at last; and as there is Occasion, set down some Propositions, that may serve as a Key, to open the Reader's Way through all these Heaps of *Confusion and Blasphemy*, where-with they fill their Pages. As for the Scriptures brought by them, *Arg. 1.* as *Isa. 9. 2. Matt. 4. 16. Psal. 147. 19, 20.* These prove not, that they had no *Light*, for *the Light shineth in Darkness* John 1. And *Prov. 29. 18.* doth not import, That People have wanted *Vision* from the Beginning; but that for some time they may want it, *to wit,* when their *Day of Visitation is over*; which we deny not. And whereas they tell us, That the *Greek Particle ἐν* is often to be translated *among*, therefore so to be *Col. 1. 26.* and other Places alledged by us; we deny this Consequence. And that they say, *The Apostle is speaking of the outward Preaching of Christ, Col. 1. 26.* is their bare Assertion without any Proof. Also

1676. in their first Argument they alledge a gross Untruth upon G. K. as if he did hold in his Book of Immediate Revelation, Page 11. That the Jews generally under the Law had no immediate Revelation in the Seed: Let the Place be read, and it will clear G. K. where he distinguisheth a Two-fold Sort of Revelation in the Seed, according to a Two-fold Condition of the Seed. The first Sort Revelation is more hid and obscure, the Seed not being compleatly formed; but as under Ground: The second is more manifest and clear, so as with open Face to behold the Glory of God. The first Sort of Revelation is given universally unto all, both Jews and Gentiles; but the second is only given to the Saints, in whom the Seed is compleatly formed and brought forth. As to their Queries, we answer, That Conscience and Reason are distinguished from the Saving Light of Christ in All Men, and the Revelation thereof, as a Natural and Supernatural Principle are distinguished; and it was the Natural, which Pelagius did exalt too much: As our Adversaries also do, who affirm, That Men may be Lawful Preachers, without being renewed by the Super-natural Principle of God's Saving Light and Grace.

In the Prosecution of their Second Argument.

1. They deny the Inward Blood and Sufferings of Christ, referring us to their Proof afterwards; which we shall in it's Place examine. 2. They alledge, That we hold an Heavenly and Spiritual Nature in Christ, which is distinct from the Godhead on the one Hand, and from the Manhood on the other, which they call a Third Nature in Christ. But this their Alledgance is false; for that Heavenly and Spiritual Nature is not a Third Thing distinct from both the Godhead and Manhood of Christ, as shall be afterwards shewn. 3. They alledge, That the Apostle doth not speak of any inward Hearing or Word, but of the outward: The

The Inward
Hearing of
of the Word
asserted.

Con.

Contrary is manifest from the Apostle's own Words in the same Chapter; *The Word is nigh thee, in thy Mouth and in thy Heart.* Nor is their Reason valid to prove it; for the Words, Verse 14. 15. are not Arguments made by *Paul*, but Objections adduced by him; which he afterwards answereth: And this is usual with *Paul* in this Epistle. As to their Question; *Wherein consists the Nature and Essence of Faith?* We say, It is a Receiving of Christ, laying hold upon Him, according to whatsoever Revelation he makes of himself in Men's Hearts; which is in some greater, in others less, but in All is in some Degree.

In their *Third Argument* they undertake to prove, *That according to us the Scriptures are not necessary secundum quid, or profitable:* But all in vain. As for their Example, as they know, *Examples prove not;* so is it vain and impertinent: for we never compared the Scriptures to a mutilated and dim Copy; they are a clear and perfect Copy, as to all Essentials and Necessaries of Christian Religion: But they are not the *Original.* And seeing we have answered them so many Questions; let them answer us this One: *Are not all these Divinity-Books and Commentaries on the Scripture made by Men not divinely Inspired, as a mutilated and dim Copy in Comparison of the Scripture, and whether is the Scripture or these Books more perfect?* If they say the Scripture is more perfect; then what need they the mutilated and dim Copy of these Divinity-Books? Or what Profit can they have by Them, which they cannot have rather by the Scripture? Again, here they confound the Material and Formal Object of Faith; as if we did hold, *That inward Revelation without Scripture did propound unto us the Material Objects of Faith;* which is False: For there are many of the Material Objects, which are only propounded by the Scripture, to

The Scriptures a perfect Copy but not the Original.

wit,

1676. wit, such as the Historical Part of the Scripture; and in this Respect we do not plead, That Inward Revelation is the Material Object, but the Formal.

Not the Letter, nor the outward Law, but the Spirit convinces the Conscience.

In their *Fourth Argument* they are so blind, as not to take notice how we can give the same Answer, that they give, concerning the *Law*, That *we, who are under Grace and Obedience to the inward Law, are dead as to the Condemning Power; but not as to the Commanding Power thereof.* But

that it is not the Letter, or any outward Testimony of the Law, that doth so Powerfully Convince a Man's Conscience, as of other Sins, fo of Covetousness, as the Spirit of God doth in his inward Convictions and Smitings upon the Conscience, is clear from the Experience of all those, who have known and passed through the State, which the Apostle spake of, when he said; *I was alive without the Law; but when the Commandment came, Sin revived, and I died.* Yea, What Law is that of the Mind, whereof he makes Mention, *Rom. 8.* but an inward Law, by which the Knowledge of Sin comes, and through which both the Knowledge and Remembrance of Sin sticks more closely to the Soul, than through any Outward Law it can? And did not Christ say, That the Spirit should *Convince the World of Sin?*

The Heathens instantiated.

Yea, how many of those called *Heathens*, who had not any Outward Law, have declared, That Inward Concupiscence was a Sin? As for their malicious Accusation against us, of our Lust and Covetousness, we reject, as not worth the noticing; seeing they assert it without any Colour of Proof: But it seems, they have learned that wicked and devilish Maxim, *Calumniare audacter, aliquid adhaerebit*, i. e. Calumniate boldly, that something may stick.

Their *Fifth Argument* is answered in the First, as being a Branch thereof.

Their

Their *Sixth Argument* is built upon a false Supposition, that according to our Principle, *All would be Prophets, and that no Difference could be assigned betwixt Prophets, and Pastors and Teachers; seeing Prophets and Teachers teach both from the Spirit.* The First is answered at large in the End of G. K's Book of *Immediate Revelation.* To the Second we answer; That by Prophets in the strictest Sence are meant those, who Prophecy of things to Come, as *Agabus* was; by Teachers, they who Instruct the People in Doctrine: And this is a manifest Difference; although in the large and common Sence Prophecying and Preaching are one thing.

Their *Seventh Argument*, they pretend to build on that Scripture *Jud. 19.* but it is easily answered: That Men in one Sence may be said *not to have the Spirit*; and in another *to have it.* Even as a Rich Man, who improveth not his Money, both Hath, and Hath it Not, in divers Sences: According to which Christ said; *From him that hath not, shall be taken away that which he hath.* And whereas R. B. doth grant, That they, whose Day of Visitation is come to an End, *have not the Spirit, so much as to invite and call them unto God:* Here they insult, as if all were granted they seek: But they are greatly deceived. For though he grant, *That some have not the Spirit to call and invite them;* yet he granteth not, *That they have not the Spirit to Reprove them:* For even the Devils and Damned Souls of Men and Women Sin against the Spirit of God, witnessing against them in their Hearts, which is in them a Law of Condemnation: as *David* said; *If I go down into Hell, thou art there.* Yea, do we not read not only, *That God spake unto Cain,* a most wicked Man, but also unto *Satan,* Job 1. which Speaking of God to Satan, we suppose, the *Students* will not say, was by an Outward Voice,

1676.
Prophets
& Teachers
distinguish'd

The Re-
ports of the
Spirit Inter-
nal.

1676. Voice, and consequently it was Internal. But we ask them, If all wicked Professors of Christianity should burn the *Bible*, and destroy all outward Rules and Means of Knowledge, *Should they by this Means cease to Sin, because they should have no Rule? Or should they be excused from Gospel-Duties, because they have no Rule,* by this Supposition (according to the *Students*) to require them?

In their *Second Subsection* they spend both their Strength and Paper, in labouring to prove some things, which we no wise deny; as the Sequel of their Major, §. 14. But in the Proof of their Minor, where the whole Strefs lieth, they utterly fail in both its Branches, as we shall briefly shew. As to the first, they argue thus; *They know no such inward Objective Evidence of inward Revelation themselves; therefore they have none such.* We deny the Consequence; they see it not, nor know it, because they will not: Their Prejudice against the Truth doth blind them, and indispose their Understanding. Yea, might not the unbelieving *Jews* have reasoned the same way against Christ, when he was outwardly present with them: *We do not know him to be Christ; Therefore he is not Christ?* Again, whereas they query in a scoffing way, *Can a thing, that is Self-evident, be hid from the whole World, except a few Illuminados?* We answer, If it were hid from the whole World, except a few in Comparison of others, it is no more than what the Scripture saith; *That the whole World lieth in Wickedness:* And their Wickedness blindeth them, that they do not see the Light that is in them. Yet we could Instance many, who are not *Quakers* (so called) both Christians and Gentiles, who have acknowledged the Evidence and Certainty of Divine Inspiration in all Men, as the surest Ground of Knowledge: But we need not digress into this here; we have

The Self-Evidence of Inspiration.

have enough besides to stop their Mouths. For 1676. do not they say, *That the Scriptures have a Self-Evidence?* And yet, are not the Scriptures and the Truths declared in them hid from the greatest Part of the World? The *Mahometans* reject both Old and New Testament, and the *Jews* the New; although they read them: And yet according to our Adversaries, they have Self-Evidence. So that it is evident, the same Argument is as much against the Scripture, as the *Light within in Point of Self-Evidence*; and indeed much more, seeing many, who deny the Self-Evidence of the Scriptures, even *Heathens*, have a Knowledge of the Self-Evidence of Divine Inspiration, as *Secrates, Plato, Phocylides, Seneca* and many others. And here in the Close, being sensible of their Weakness, after they have laboured to prove the Negative, they tell us; *That seeing the Negative is theirs, they are not bound to prove it*: And so would roll it over on us to prove the Affirmative against their own Law; which would have us to be meer Defendants. As to the Maxim, *Afirmanti incumbit Probatio*, it doth not help them; for they have affirmed a Negative, and have been at great Pains to prove it: But all in vain. And why may we not put them to prove their Minor, being a Negative, as well as their Master *J. M.* put the *Jesuit Dempster* to prove his Minor; which *John Menzies* affirmed to be Negative?

In their Prosecution of the *Second Branch*, they Affirm, *That the Q. cannot give any sufficient Evidence of their Revelations.* This we deny, and put them to prove it: But how shamefully they fail here, is apparent. For instead of proving what they Affirm, they put us to prove the Contradictory; and so contrary to their own Law, would urge us to be Impugners and Defenders at one time: A silly Trick, they learned from the *Baptists* in their Dispute at *London*; as indeed the

1676. the *Students* Argument about an Evidence is the same upon the Matter with that, which the *Baptists* used against us at *London* long before them, and which the *Jesuit* used against *J. M.* long before them both. So that we may see, what Sort of Patrons the *Students* here follow. But it is well to be observed, That when they seek an Evidence from us, they tell us, Page 57. *They mean not an Evidence, which will actually and de Facto Convince a pertinacious Adversary; but an Objective Evidence or Clearness in the thing it self, which is apta nata, fit of its own Nature to Convince, and will really convince the well-disposed.* Very well! this their plain Concession destroyeth their whole Building. For seeing, they press upon us by way of *Dilemma*, *Either we have the Spirit of God, or we have it not*; (which is *J. L.* his Argument) We may very lawfully by his own Example press him and his Fellow *Students* with the like Argument; *Either they have a well-disposed Mind, or they have not.* If they say, *they have not*, then they confess, they are a pertinacious Adversary, and so not capable to be convinced of our Evidence: And surely, it were great Folly in us, to seek to Convince them of the Truth of a thing, who are not in a Capacity to be Convinced. If they say, *They have a well-disposed Mind*; then let them prove it to us, or give us an Evidence of it: Seeing by their own Rule, *Affirmanti incumbit Probatio.* Who is so weak, that doth not see, that they are intangled in the same Difficulty, they would urge upon us? Yea, into a far greater: For they cannot so much as pretend to any *Objective Evidence*, whereby to Convince us, that they are Well-disposed; seeing they altogether deny such a thing. If they Answer; That they are not bound to say either the *Affirmative* or *Negative*; but require of us to prove the *Negative*; Who seeth not, that we have

The Spirit's
Real and
Convincing
Evidence.

have the same Reply unto them, when they urge us, *Either the Q. have the Spirit, or they have not*; that we are not bound to say either the Affirmative or Negative? For although *to have*, and *not to have* are Contradictory; yet to say, that *we have* the Spirit, and that *we have not* the Spirit, are not Contradictory, being both Affirmative. And indeed, when we assert a thing only *in Thesis*, we do not say, either that we have, or have not the Spirit; but this we say, and we are able to prove from Scripture, That all good Christians have the Spirit of God immediately to teach and guide them into all Truth; and all Men have it so far, as either to justify or condemn them. By this we stand, and are able to defend it through the Help of God, as consisting both with Scripture, and sound Reason, and Testimonies of the Antients. But if they think with their little Craft to bring us down from the *Thesis* to the *Hypothesis*; they must know, the same will bring them down to it also. For seeing it is a Truth acknowledged both by them and us, That *all true Christians and Children of God have the Spirit of God*, working in them at least as the Efficient Cause; from this we urge them thus, *Either they have the Spirit of God working in them as an efficient Cause, or they have not*; If they say, *they have not*; they confess, They are not true Christians, or Children of God, which we suppose they will be loth to say. If they say, *They have the Spirit of God, as an Efficient Cause of Faith working in them, and subjectively enlightening them*; let them prove it, or give us an Evidence of it. Who doth not see, that, Poor Men; they are taken in their own Snare? We know, all Rational and Sober Men will acknowledge, that we are not bound to receive their Affirmations without Proof, more than

1676.

The Spirit's
working in
us, as an ef-
ficient Cause

1676. than they are bound to receive ours; nor indeed so much: we being, as the Case stands, but Defendants.

As touching their Answer to R. B. his Retortions about an Evidence, it shall be examined in the next Section.

In Page 60. they tell, That we assign them at last some Shadows of Evidence; namely, 1. our own Declaration. 2. The Scriptures. 3. The immediate Testimony of the Spirit. But that these are not Shadows, will appear to the Judicious and well-disposed, if they consider these two things.

A Declaration proceeding from the Spirit. no Heretick has it.

1. That by our Declaration, we mean not a bare verbal Declaration, having no Virtue or Manifestation of Life in it; for we confess, such might be as good a Ground for an Heretick in way of Evidence: But by our Declaration we mean such a Declaration as doth really proceed from the Spirit of God in us; and is therefore a living Declaration, having a Manifestation of Life in it and with it, and which is not only in Words of Life, or Living Words uttered through us from the Spirit of Life, but also in Works of Life or Living Works, which are the Fruits of the Spirit, as said Christ, *By their Fruits ye shall know them.* Now such a Declaration can no Heretick have, however he may pretend to it. If our Adversaries say; *That we only pretend to such a thing;* We answer them with their own Rule, *Affirmanti incubit Probatio,* i. e. The Affirmer ought to prove: Let them prove us only to be Pretenders; which yet they have not done, nor can do. And indeed, such a Declaration from the Spirit of God in the Apostles, as when *John* said, *We are of God,* &c. was an Evidence, That no Heretick could justly pretend to.

2. It is a most Unjust and Unreasonable thing, to require of us any other Evidence of our having the Spirit, than that, which every true Christian are

may and ought to give ; seeing we pretend to no other Spirit, but that which every true Christian hath, nor to any Revelations, but these, which are the Priviledges of all true Christians ; nor to any Doctrines, which are not conform to the Scriptures of Truth : As we are ready to prove, and as G. K. hath already shewed in his Book of *Immediate Revelation*, which neither the Students nor their Masters have given us any Refutation of.

1676.

Now, have not all good Christians these three Evidences for them ? And we can prove by the Help of the Lord, that they are as applicable to us, as to any upon Earth. And here note, that when we say, *The Scripture is the best outward Evidence that can be given*, we mean it not, as a particular Evidence, but as a general, common to all good Christians. For we grant, That the Scripture cannot prove, that any particular Man hath the Spirit of God in such a Way, as true Christians have it ; but it proves in general, that all true Christians have it, yea, and all Men, to convince them at least.

The Scrip-
ture an Evi-
dence.

In Page 61, 62. They reject the Scriptures Testimony, as an Evidence to us, *Because, according to us, the Scriptures Testimony hath no Evidence without the Spirit*. In answer to which we say : But it hath an Evidence with the Spirit, his Inward Evidence going along with it ; which Inward Evidence, we say, doth go along with it, sufficiently to convince every well-disposed Intellect : And this we can prove from the Scriptures Testimony. Nor is this to commit an unlawful Circle, as they foolishly alledge ; which is but an old, thread-bare Alledgance of *Papists* against the *Protestants*, as *Turnbull* alledged on *Paræus*, *That he proved the Spirit by the Scripture, and the Scripture by the Spirit*. Some *Protestants* in our Days do miserably seek to extricate them-

1676. selves of that Circle, that they know the Spirit by the Scriptures objectively, and they know the Scriptures by the Spirit effectively: And so indeed they get free of the Circle, as not being *in eodem genere*, i. e. in the same Kind. But they affirm a gross Untruth, That the *Spirit's Influence* is only *Effective*, and *ex parte subjecti*, whereas we know it is Objective, and can prove both from Scripture and *primitive Protestants*: See G. K. his Book of *Immediate Revelation and Quakerism no Popery*, where the same is at length proved. But we have a most clear Way to extricate our selves of that Circle, imposed on us by *Papists* and these Students, to wit, That we know the Scriptures Testimony by the Spirit, *tanquam à priori*, as we know the *Effect* by the *Cause*; and we know the Spirit's Testimony by the Scriptures, *tanquam à posteriori*, as we know the *Cause* by the *Effect*: And so both are *Objective*, and yet in a divers Kind; because the Objective Evidence of the Spirit is a Self-Evidence and *primary*, the Objective Evidence of the Scripture is but derived and *secundary*.

The Scriptures Testimony known by the Spirit, &c.

In their Answer to G. K. his Retortion from the Practise of Christ, *who though his own immediate Testimony was to be received, referred them unto the Testimony of the Scriptures*, They most miserably betake themselves to their Old Trade of Affirming Things without any Proof; and yet on the Proof of these Things the whole Strefs of their Answer lieth. As 1. they say, *The Jews rejected only the Outward Immediate Testimony of Christ*: However dare they say, but that the outward immediate Testimony of Christ was to be believed? And yet he referred them unto the Testimony of the Scriptures. 2. They say, *They have no such Testimony themselves, as the Inward Objective Testimony of the Spirit*. 3. They say, *According to Christ the Scriptures were the Rule*,
 meaning

meaning the Primary Rule ; and so they set the Scripture above Christ his own immediate outward Testimony: A most gross Disorder! All which we reject, as meer Affirmations without any Proof. 1676.

Their Insinuation, That G. K. acted the Part of a cunning Sophist, when he spake these Words repeated by them, pag. 4. Is no less without any real Proof: For it is a Truth, That no Scripture Truth can be savingly believed, but by the Illumination of the Spirit, which is Objective.

In Paragraph 28. they think to evade G. K. his Argument, *That we have Inspiration, because all Men have it ; that then Papists, Mahumetans, Pagans and Men bodily possessed have Inspiration :* Which we do affirm, viz. That these have it so far, as to Convince them, and is sufficient to be a Law of Condemnation, and render them without Excuse for their Sin : And this all Men have not only within their Day, but after their Day of Visitation is expired. But as to their imposed Glosses and Senses, which they say, their *Divines* have already Vindicated on these Scriptures cited by G. K. for *Universal Grace and Inspiration*. As they refer us to their *Divines*, so we refer them to our Friends, and our Books, where their silly and weak Reasons are answered against this Gospel Truth. As for the Word *EVERY*, we acknowledge, it is not taken always *Universally* ; but seeing it is taken so most frequently, it lieth on them to prove, that it is otherwise taken in the Places cited.

Before we close the Answer to this Sub-section, we propose further unto the Reader these two Considerations. 1. That when we say, *Inward Divine Revelations in the Seed are self-evident*, Revelations self-evident. we do not mean it always in Respect of the Material Objects of things revealed ; but in Respect of the Formal Object, or Revelation it self. 2.

1676. Although we Affirm, That the Illumination and Influence of the Spirit in Men's Hearts, is both Effective and Objective; yet we do not affirm, That they are two distinct things, but one and the same thing under different Respects: So that we do not plead for another Influence, than that which in Words they seem to grant. But we say, it is a more Excellent Thing, than they acknowledge it to be, as being in it self perceptible, and having a Self-Evidence; whereas they will have it only a *Medium incognitum*, a thing altogether undiscernible and in-evident of it self, so as to convince or satisfy the Understanding, that it is of God. And thus according to our Adversaries Sence, and upon their Principle, this Inward Illumination of the Spirit may be said to be *fallacious*, for want of Evidence; seeing, according to their own Argument, That *which bath not a sufficient Evidence, is fallacious*.

But whereas the Students in their Account grant in Words, *That the Soul bath Spiritual Sensations, and that the Work of Grace may be felt*; This Confession destroyeth their whole Superstructure. For if the Work of Grace can be felt, or is perceptible, then it is Objective; for whatever is perceptible, is objective. And seeing they grant, *That the Soul bath Spiritual Sensations*; we ask them, What are the Objects of the Sensations? Are they only Words and Letters? Or Things, such as God Himself, in his heavenly Refreshings, Waterings and Bedewings? If the first, it is most unreasonable; for it would make the Spiritual Senses to fall short of the Natural, seeing the Natural Senses reach beyond Words to Natural Things themselves. If the second, they must needs with us acknowledge *inward objective Revelations*; for by them we understand no other thing, but as God, and the things of His Kingdom are felt in us by Way of Object.

11676.
w

SECTION II.

Where the Students Chief Argument against the Spirit's being the Rule, is proved to be one upon the Matter, with that the Jesuit, Dempster, used against their Master J. M. and the same Way answered, and their weak Endeavours to evite it, Examined and Refuted,

THere hath enough been said heretofore to demonstrate the Fallacies in the Form of their Arguments, in which also it resembled the *Jesuits*; which to avoid Repetition, we shall now omit. Their Medium against us is, *That we cannot give an Evidence of our being led by the Spirit, but that which may be as good an Evidence for Hereticks*: For thus they Word it in their Account, alledging, *We wronged them in saying, They used the Words, which Hereticks may pretend to*: Yet abstracting from this false Charge, we shall take it, as they now express it, being indeed Equivalent. To prove, that it may be as good an Evidence for Hereticks, they make *J. L.* argue thus; *Other Hereticks declare and say, they have the Spirit of God, teaching them as well as you: Therefore if your saying, you were so taught, were a sufficient Evidence, &c. then their declaring, &c.* Now let the Reader judge, whether this Argument amounts to any thing more, than that; *That is not a sufficient Evidence to the Quakers, which other Hereticks may pretend to?* Thus the Students dispute against the Quakers; let us hear, how the *Jesuit* disputes against *J. M.* their Master. *Pap. Lucifug.* Pag. 3. after the *Jesuit* had repeated his Argument, he adds, "*May it please the Answerer of this Syllogism to remember, That the Ground or Principle, which he*

Hereticks Pretences to the Spirit.

1676. "shall produce to prove the Truth of his Religion,
 " must have this Property, that it cannot serve nor
 " be assumed to prove a false Religion; as the
 " Grounds and Principles that one produceth, to
 " prove that he is an Honest Man, must have this
 " Property, that it cannot serve nor be assumed to
 " prove a Knave to be an Honest Man, &c. Let
 the Judicious Reader consider, whether there be
 any material Difference betwixt these two Ar-
 gumentations? But to proceed, and shew, that
 their Arguments are no better than the *Jesuit's*
 against their Master, and our Answers no worse,
 than their Master's against the *Jesuit*, we shall
 place them together.


J. M. Answereth the *Jesuit* thus, pag. 5. of
 his *Pap. Lucifugus*.

Our Answer to the *Stu-*
dents, as themselves ac-
knowledge it p. 59. is,

J. M.'s An-
swer to the
Jesuit com-
pared with
ours,

" The true Religion
 " hath sufficient Grounds
 " in it self, to manifest it
 " self to be the true Re-
 " ligion, if it meet with
 " a well disposed Intel-
 " lect. For (to use your
 " own Similitude) an ho-
 " nest Man may have
 " ground enough to shew
 " a Distinction betwixt
 " him and a Knave, albe-
 " it a Fool cannot dis-
 " cern it; so the true
 " Religion may have
 " Ground enough to prove
 " it self True (which the
 " false Religion hath not)
 " though an Infidel or
 Here-

That the Evidence of
 the Spirit cannot be as-
 signed, but to the well-
 disposed Understanding.
 This they call a pitiful
 Subterfuge; alledging,
 that then this Evidence
 can only be assigned to
 such, as are of the *Qua-*
ker's Mind, but not to
 others; and that any
Heretick in the World
 may deny Evidences up-
 on the same Account.
 Now let the Judicious
 Reader determine, whe-
 ther, if this Answer be
 a pitiful Subterfuge, the
 Students with the same
 Breath

“ Heretick, whose fool- | Breath do not declare 1676.
 “ ish Mind is darkned, | their Master’s to the
 “ Rom. I. 21. cannot | Jesuit to be the same.
 “ take it up. 

And when they write next, let them shew the Difference ; which they have not yet done.

In Answer to this Retortion they alledge, pag. 67. That R. B. said, their Master, Jo. M. would not assign the Jesuit a Ground, to prove the Truth of the Protestant Religion: And therefore, say they, R. B’s Practices agree exactly with the Jesuit’s Morals, and give an egregious Specimen of his Jesuitical Honesty, which makes us suspect him to be a Jesuited Emissary. This is a false Calumny disproved by their own Account, where pag. 8. upon this Occasion they confess, R. B. said only, that their Master desired the Jesuit to prove, that the Protestant Religion had no Ground for it. Will they deny this ? Let them read the very first four Lines of their Master’s first Answer to the Jesuit’s Paper, Page 3. and they will find, he put the Jesuit to prove his Minor, which was, That the Protestant Religion had no such Ground. As it doth not therefore follow, that J. M. assigned not afterwards a Ground ; so neither will R. B. his repeating this, infer, that he said, he did not assign such a Ground. Yea, in Contradiction to themselves, Page 60. They acknowledge he told, their Master named the Scripture as a Ground, &c. So it is manifest, they have given here a Specimen of their Jesuitical Honesty. And because they could not Answer, they forged Lies to fill up the Paper, and things not to the Purpose, as Page 57. where offering to reply to this Retortion, they say, But for Answer, it is well known, R. B. was brought up in a Popish Colledge, and it is thought by many, that he is a Jesuited Emissary, &c. Is not this a pungent Answer, Reader?

1676. *R. B.* was educated in a *Popish* Colledge; *Ergo*, say the Students, *Our Answer is not that, which the Jesuit used against our Master.* It seems, the Students are offended, that *R. B.* hath forsaken *Popery*; or otherwise their Charging him with his Education must be very impertinent: as indeed it is no less Foolish, than if we should upbraid *Luther*, *Calvin*, and all the first Reformers as *Papists*, for being so Educated. And though it is no Wonder, their Folly and Malice led them into this Impertinency, yet it might have been expected, that their Gratitude to the *Bishop of Edinburgh*, who was pleased to permit their Book to be Printed, might have hindered them from this Folly, seeing he was Educated in the same *Popish* Colledge *R. B.* was, and owes some of his Philosophy to it; whereas *R. B.* Learned only there a little *Grammar*, and came thence in his 15th Year: but the *Bishop* was there Professing *Popery* in his more mature Age. So if this reflect any thing upon *R. B.* it will much more against the *Bishop*; which they will do well to clear; and before not to omit, when they write next, or else acknowledge their impertinency herein.

It seems they wanted Strength of Reason to evite the Retortion, which makes them thus rove; Offering also to prove, *That their Master did assign a Ground*; which was never denied, and that he was Defendent; so was *R. B.* also: What is that to the Purpose, unless to make the Retortion the stronger, and shew, they cannot get by it? But Page 60. they say, *That whereas the Jesuit pressed their Master, that Hereticks did say, their Religion was conform to the Scripture, as well as he; and so the Scripture was no peculiar Ground for him, more than for Hereticks.* They say, their Master answered, *That it was not a pretended, but real Conformity unto the Scripture, that demonstrates a true Religion, &c.* and upon this

this they enquire, *what follows?* Alledging, They 1676.
 agued from being as good, and not pretending; and so fall a Railing, saying, *That the Light of our Consciences is eclipsed by a new-found Light, and that we misrepresent them maliciously.* This Railing is for want of better Reasoning; but seeing they are so blind, as not to see, whether they will see it or not, we shall tell them, and we hope, let the Reader see, what follows here from *J. Menzies*, the Students Master, who saith to the Jesuit, *It is not enough, that Hereticks say, the Scripture is a Ground for their Religion, unless it really be so; and that other Hereticks saying so, doth not infer, that it is as little a Ground for his own (to wit, J. M's) Religion.* Very well! The Quakers tell the Students, That it is not enough, that *Hereticks* declare, they have the Spirit, unless it be really so, and their saying, *they have it*, while they have it not, doth not infer, that our saying, we have it, is as little a Ground for us. Who but such as are as *Childish*, as the Students, will affirm, there is here any Difference? But further, they confound most Ignorantly the *Internal Testimony of the Spirit* with the *Declaration of having the Spirit*; which are two different things. It was incumbent upon them to have proved, that the *Internal Testimony of the Spirit* is as good an Evidence for *Hereticks*, as for us; which they have not offered to do.

The Internal Testimony of the Spirit is above the Pretence of Hereticks unto it.

Next, they have not proved, that the Declaration of *Hereticks* is as good as ours, neither can they, unless they can prove ours to be false; which they neither have nor can do. But they have egregiously fallen in that Inconveniency, they would fix upon us, *pag. 58, 59.* where in answering *R. B's* Retortion, shewing them, *That if Men's being deceived, contradicting themselves or one another, who say, the Spirit is a Rule, did infer,*

1676. *infer, the Spirit not to be a certain Rule; than Men's being deceived, contradicting themselves and one another, who say, the Scripture is the Rule, would the same Way infer, that the Scripture is not the Rule.* Here they are miserably put to it, and therefore not ashamed to deny, that they plead not against the Spirit's being a Rule for these Causes: The contrary for which is known to all, that are acquainted with these Controversies. And for Example let them Read their so much applauded *W. Mitchell his Dialogue and his Sober Answer* (so called) where he makes this the chief Cause, yea, themselves for the same Reason within two Pages (to wit, p. 60, and 61.) plead against the *Teaching of the Spirit*, affirming, that ^{*} *Because the Georgians, Familists, and pretended Saints, as Francis and Loyola, &c. pretended the Inward Teaching of the Spirit, and had an outward Shew of Godliness, therefore the Spirit's teaching to deny Ungodliness, is as good an Evidence for them, as for the Quakers.* Who but the Students would run themselves into such miserable Contradictions?

But to give the Reader an evident Demonstration of the Students Gift of Contradicting themselves, take one here in their own Words; they say, *this above-mentioned Retortion doth not meet their Argument; why? Do we conclude, that the Spirit is not the Rule of Faith, because they cannot give an Evidence, which will actually convince, that they are led by the Spirit? No such thing.* Compare this with *J. L's Medium* of his second Argument, where he undertaketh to prove, *That the*

The Students contradicting themselves about the Rule of Faith.

* But besides, will not their Master's Answer above-mentioned meet well with them here, that since these Sects and Saints did (as both they and the Quakers confess) but pretend to the Spirit, that because they did but pretend, therefore the Quakers do but pretend also; no more than because some Hereticks do pretend, their Religion is conform to the Scripture, therefore J. M. doth so too?

the Spirit is not the Rule of Faith, (as it is expressed by themselves) because there can be no Evidence given of it in the World. But if they think to creep out here, that there may be Evidences given, though not such as do actually Convince, because of the Want of a *Subjective Evidence*, or Disposition of the Mind (as they afterwards add) and that we can give no Evidence of this last Sort: It remains then for them to prove, that their Minds are *well disposed*, seeing they are the *Opponents*, and we the *meer Defendants*; and that the Evidences assigned by us, or such as are not manifest even to the *well-disposed* (yet to go round) pag. 59. Paragraph 19. They account this of the *well-disposed Mind ridiculous*, though it was the best Answer their Master could give the *Jesuit* in the like Case, as is above shewn. But thou may'st perhaps judge, Reader, that these that are so nice and scrupulous in receiving Evidences from others, would give some very solid Ones for their own Rule, when pressed the same Way to give us an Evidence, that they have the Scripture to be their Rule from God, and that they have the true Sense of it. Take then notice of them here, Reader, and see, how satisfactory their Answer is.

Now (say the Students, pag. 59.) *the Solution is easy; for they who make the Scripture their principal Rule, are either our own Churches, or they are Sects dissenting from us. If the first; have not our Divines frequently proved both from the intrinsic Characters of Divinity, that appear in the Scriptures themselves, and also from the outward Motives of Credibility, that we have these Scriptural Revelations from God? And have they not often assigned sufficient, objective Evidences and Proofs of the Senses of the Scriptures taught by our Churches, as to every Point controverted by us, and all Sects whatsoever? So that Dissenters remain*

1674. *remain Unconvinced for want of subjective Evidence, and Disposition of Mind; and really ought to believe us, teaching such Senses of Scripture, &c.* Is not this rarely well solved? Do the Students give any better Evidence for all this, than their own Declaration? And is not this (according to themselves) as good for other *Hereticks* as for them? Is it not strange with what Confidence they should print such Stuff? Besides, as to the first Part of it, it is manifestly false; For *Calvin* the Chiefest of their *Divines*, hath in plain Words asserted,—*viz.*

Calvin's Testimony for the Spirit.

That all Objective Evidences and Motives of Credibility are not sufficient to establish the Conscience in the Belief of the Scriptures certainly, and that thereunto is necessary the secret and inward Testimony of the Spirit; yea, that the same Spirit, that was in the Prophets and Apostles, enter into the Heart, &c. So say all the Publick Confessions of the *Protestants* Abroad. And seeing of this, according to the Students, there can be no *Objective Evidences in the World* given; then neither can there of the *Scripture*, which they confess is their Rule.

So the Reader may see, that their Work is like the *Viper's Brood*, that destroyeth it self; and tends to overturn the Certainty of all *Christian Religion*, landing in *Scepticism*. Which because they cannot shun, they end their Section in vain Boasting and Railing, saying, *pag. 77, They provoke all the Papists and Quakers of the World to argue against them so, if they can.* Here are high Words indeed; but seeing, they are so busy in Boasting, we accept the Challenge, and offer to prove before as publick an Auditory, as the last Dispute was, that their Arguments against the *Quakers* are no better, than the *Jesuit's* against their Master. And here to conclude, they add; *Let the Reader therefore judge, whether Railing*
Robin

Robin *shews forth more of an As's than of a Viper's Nature*; where he brands our Argument with the black Mark of Popery. Well! we leave to the Reader's Judgment, who also may judge if this be not *Railing*? And if the Students, who talk at this rate, be to be trusted in their Preface, saying, *That they have abstained from all Personal Criminations, and have not rendred Evil for Evil.* And what may be thought of Men that are not ashamed thus to bely themselves?

SECTION III.

Wherein the Students Arguments concerning the Supper, and against Perfection and Women's Speaking are Considered and Answered; contained in their Sub-section 3. from pag. 66. of their Book to pag. 78.

First, They say, *They might argue, that the Quakers have not Revelations from the Spirit, because of their Mad and Impious Practices*: And then they turn this Assertion into a Question, asking, *Have not the Quakers committed such Practices, saying; they were commanded by the Spirit?* And for this they refer the Reader to several Books writ against the *Quakers* by their declared Adversaries: Which signify nothing, unless they will prove, that these Men spake Truth; which they neither have, nor can do: And so are no more valued by us, than *Cocblers's* Lies against *Luther*. But to confirm this, they place at large a Citation out of *H. More*, whom they say, *The Quakers have reported to be a Quaker.* This is a false Calumny, which they are dared to prove. That *H. More* hath in a Letter to *G. K.* owned some of the *Quakers Principles*, is true;
as

Lying Books
writ against
the Quakers

1676. as particularly that of *Immediate Objective Revelation*, called by them *The Head of the Monster*; and that the Seed is a *Substance*; which they count one of the *Quakers grand Errors*. As for that Citation of *H. More*, he wrote it upon Trust, and was not an *Eye-Witness* of these Things; and it recurs upon him and them to prove the things true. The Story there mentioned of *J. N.* seeing it was at that very time disowned by the *Quakers*, and since condemned by himself, militates nothing against us; no more than other horrid things, yea, that which (in the Students own esteem) is down-right Treason, being done by some of the Chief of their Ministry, as commanded by the Scripture, doth against them.

In Conclusion they give a Proverb used by *Will. Dundas* in a Book of his as a further Instance, which they call *A Bundle of Ridiculous and Non-sensical Expressions*. But will they deny, but the *Presbyterian General Assembly*, of which *W. Dundas* so writes, was a *Mingle-mangle of Omni gatherums*? Particularly that *Assembly*, that Excommunicated and gave to the Devil *B. Spotwood*, and these other called *Reverend Prelates* of the Church the Students own? Or let the Students tell us, whether in their Esteem they deserve a better Designation? Now that to use Proverbs in things written even from the Spirit of Truth, is no Inconsistency, let them read *Tit. 1. 12. Evil Beasts, slow Bellies.* 2 Pet. 2. 22. *The Dog is returned, &c. and the Sow to the Puddle.*

To use Proverbs is not inconsistent with Truth.

But to proceed, they offer to prove, *The Spirit* in the *Quakers* not to be the *Spirit of God*, because it teaches *Doctrines contrary to the Scriptures*.

The first Instance of this is, *The Quakers denying the Necessity of the Continuance of the Use of Bread and Wine, as an Ordinance in the Church*; which they alledge Pag. 67. is commanded, *Mat.*

26. 26. *Mark* 14. 21. *Luke* 22. 19. But the Students may look over these Places, and find (if they can) any thing in the first two of *Matth.* and *Mark* like a *Command*; but only a meer Narrative of the Matter of Fact. In that of *Luke* these Words are added, *Do this in Remembrance of me.* They proceed to prove, that this is not ceased of its own Nature; carping at these Words of *R. B.* (in his first Answer to *W. M.* pag. 54, 55. where he saith, *The very Institution intimates the Abolishing thereof at Christ's Coming*) insinuating, as if he had mistaken himself: *For his Words* (say they) *allude to Paul's*, 1 *Cor.* 11. *and not to Christ's.* But while they take a Liberty to judge of his Thoughts, they do but shew their own Forwardness to Mistake. For either these Words of Christ's in *Luke* above-mentioned, do import, *They should do that in Remembrance of him, until he came*; or they do not: If they do not; the Students give away their own Cause; If they do, then he might allude to that, as being there included, though not expressed.

They urge; *The Coming of Christ mentioned, must be his Coming to Judgment*; because these, to whom Christ was come in Spirit, do use it: But this proves not, That they then practised it by way of Necessary Duty, more than their practising other things, which our Adversaries themselves do acknowledge, do not continue, nor are not Binding.

But they proceed Pag. 69, to prove it *Com-
manded since, from the Apostle's Words*, 1 *Cor.* 11. And to prove that this was not a meer Narrative of a Matter of Fact (as we truly affirm) but a *Com-
mand*, they affirm, first, *That he often gives the
Title of the Lord's Supper to it, even as received
by those Corinthians.*

For Answer; The Students must needs be like themselves; and as they often belied us, so they
use

1676.
The Use of
Bread and
Wine dis-
continued.

As often,
&c implies
no Continau-
ance.

1676. use the Apostle the same Way: For not only in this Chapter or Epistle, but in all *Paul's Epistles*, these Words (*The Lord's Supper*) are only once mentioned; so not often. Secondly, Verse 20.

And the Syriack Copy hath not in that 20th Ver. nor elsewhere, these Words *The Lord's Supper* at all, but in lieu of it, *When then ye meet together, not as ye ought to do in the Day of the Lord.*

where he useth these Words thus; *When ye come together therefore into one Place, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper*; It is so far from making for them, that it makes clearly against them. For the Apostle clearly here asserts, that the *Corinthians* in their using of Bread and Wine, *did not eat the Lord's Supper*: He says not they did not eat it; as they ought.

Secondly, they urge, That *the Apostle received of the Lord a Command to take, eat, do this*. This is strongly alledged, but we deny it; and let them prove it: For Proof they give none, unless we may take an Example for a Proof, in which they beg the Question. For unless that alledged *Minion of the King* should tell these Citizens he came to, that he had received Order to Command them to obey the Decree, repeated by him, the Example says nothing: But that the Apostle has signified any such thing to us, we deny; and it remains for them to prove.

Thirdly, They alledge, That *since the Apostle reproves them for Abuses in the Use of this, and to rectify those, brings them back to the Institution, the Duty of Receiving it may be much more concluded from the same Institution*.

Answer. This is their bare Affirmation: The Abuses committed in Practising a Ceremony, may be regulated by telling the proper Rise, Use and End of it; and yet the Using it may not be an absolute Duty. The Apostle says, how those that observe Days, ought to *do it to the Lord*; it will not therefore follow, that the Observation of Days is a Duty incumbent upon all: Yea, the Apostle in that Place expressly asserts the contrary.


Their

Their Fourth Reason is yet more ridiculous; 1676.
The Apostle insinuates, that it is a Duty, because of the first Word, FOR that which I have, &c. Who but the Students would argue at this Rate? Such kind of Reasons serve to shew their Folly, not to confirm their Opinions: As do these that follow, with their Old Example of the *King's Minion*. In all which they miserably beg the Question, taking for granted, *That it is a standing Statute*: Which is the thing remains to them yet to prove. In the End of this Page they desire to join the Word *OFTEN*; which, say they, *evidenceth, it was a Practise to be continued in*. And here they insult, because that *R. B.* in an Answer to *W. M.* arguing thus from this Word *Often*, did Reply, That thence it would not follow, That *As often as a Man sins, he offends God*, did import, *we should sin often*. Here they say *R. B.* egregiously shews his Folly and Impiety, because they never did argue from the Word *OFTEN* precisely: But their Brother *W. M.* to whom he then answered, did precisely Argue from it; whose express Words in his pretended *Sober Answer* are, Pag. 92. *It may be observed, That the Corinthians were to be often in the Use of it, because it is said, As often as ye eat, &c.* So since he Argued from the Word *Often*, his Answer was proper; nor have they brought any thing to weaken it. And whereas they add, *Who will say, that ever Sin was Instituted by God?* *R. B.* never said so; but yet that weakens not his Retortion, nor strengthens their Argument from the Word *Often*: As may appear in a thing truly Instituted by God, and yet unlawful; else as often as a Man *Marrieth*, he is bound to his Wife, might be said to import, that it were a Duty incumbent upon Men to *Marry often*, or *unlawful to forbear*.

1676. Their Fifth Reason is, because *the Apostle prescribes the right Method of using it.* For they alledge, *If it had been indifferent, he would have rather forbidden it, as useless, &c.* This is no Argument, but their bare Conjecture, in which they would be wiser than the Apostle: And we have answered it before, shewing, the Apostle gives Rules to rectify the Observation of Days; which yet imports not a Duty to observe them.

A Regulat-
ing Prescrip-
tion is no
Command-
ing Injun-
ction.

Their last and chiefest Reason is, as they say, *The Apostle's express Command for it: Let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat.* The Students affirm, (and do but affirm) that to say, *This is only a Permission, is a desperate Shift.* Let us hear how they prove it: *Let a Man examine himself; this is without Doubt a Command; therefore, Let him eat, must be a Command also.* We deny this Consequence; and it remains for them to prove it. And though this were enough in Strictness, yet we shall give a Reason of our Denial; because their Proposition (whatever it may do in some Cases) holds not universally true. As to Instance from an Example or two: *Let a Man Marry in the Lord, and so let him marry:* The first is a Command here, but not the second. *Let a Man speak in Religious Things, as the Oracles of God, and so let him speak:* The first is a Command, but not the Second. Many more might be named, which import only a Conditional Command; not that there is a Necessity upon all to Marry, or upon all to Preach: But if a Man *Marry*, let him do it *in the Lord*, and if a Man *Preach*, let him do it as the *Oracle of God.* Also see a most plain Example of this, *Rev. 22. 11. He that is filthy, let him be filthy still, and he that is just, let him be just still:* They are both in the *Imperative Mood*, yet the one is a *Duty*, the other but a *Permission*, not moral and positive, but physical and negative. So if a Man
partake

partake of the Ceremony of Bread and Wine, *let him examine himself.* Seeing then their Proposition holds not universally true, it remains for them to prove, That in this particular Place it is so. 1676. 

They bestow their 34th Paragraph, pag. 70, 71. to no Purpose, in missing the Controversy. For whatever we understand by the *Substance, which who so enjoyeth, needs not the Shadow*; We do not deny, but these that had the Substance, made use of the Shadow at times: For *Paul purified himself according to the Law of Moses*, after he had been long an Apostle. But the Question is. *Whether that oblige us now?* This the Students have forgot to prove, and will do well to advert to it, when they publish their next Volume, omitting needless Homilies not to the purpose. And thus we hope the Reader may see, that the Things we bring to prove this Ceremony is ceased, are not Shadows; but rather that what they bring to confirm it, is nothing but Shadows. Paul purifying himself according to the Law of Moses.

Page 71. They go about to answer an Argument used by R. B. against this Ceremony, drawn from the Apostle's Words, 1 Cor. 16. 16. in his first Answer to *W. M.* p. 64. where he shews, that since the *Bread* is but one, which must needs be the *Inward*; the *Outward must be ceased*. And to this they answer, saying, *The true and genuine Sence of the Place is,* &c. So go on, as they were Dictating and not Disputing, without adding any Probation.

But *Secondly* they proceed, saying, *That seeing the One Bread is the Saints, though the Apostles were truly this one Bread; yet Christ instituted his Supper without any Contradiction, or making them not one Bread.* For Answer; were that Practice of Christ of the Nature they would have it, then should they say something; but while they suppose it so, and Argue from it, they do but beg

1676. the thing in Controversy. For the Apostles both then and after that time used many Legal and Typical Observations; and yet they would Argue ill, that would infer from thence, because they did so, and that without Contradiction to their being Christians. and under the Gospel Dispensation we ought to do so too.

The One Bread.

As for that Bread spoken by the Apostles in the 16 and 17 Verses, we acknowledge it to be the *Spiritual Bread*, to wit, the *Spiritual Body* of Christ, of which the Saints feed, which makes them one, and is one with them, as the Apostle himself wordeth it, *ver. 17*. Now what signifieth all this to prove, That the *Outward Bread* is the *One Bread*? Hear, how the Students evince it. *But thirdly, we say, That the One Bread spoken of ver. 17 is both the outward and the inward Bread, yet but one Sacramentally; And is not this rarely well argued, We the Students say so? As to the Reason afterwards insinuated, as Christ saith of the Bread, that it is his Body; they should have shewn, how it follows. Christ, as Protestants well argue against Papists, calls himself a Door, a Rock, &c. what then? Is Christ and a Rock one? Christ and a Door one Door? Let them shew us, if they can, in all the New Testament so much as one Word of this Figment of a Sacramental or Symbolical Union. And whereas upon this Occasion R. B. argued in his Truth clear'd of Calumnies, pag. 64. * That if the Outward Bread were to be called the One Bread, as signifying it, the Sacrifices of the Law might be called One with the one Offering of Christ, mentioned Heb. 10. 14. and so continued. This, they say, signifies nothing, because these are abrogated. Then until they prove, this continues by Virtue of a Gospel Command (which they have not as yet done) the same Reason will hold against it.*

* See above P. 64, 65.

To another Reason given of the Discontinuance of this Ceremony, from *Gal. 2. 16.* *Let no Man judge you in Meats, or Drinks; They say first, That then it had not been lawful for the Apostle, to have reprehended the Corinthians for the Abuses in this Matter.* This is a poor Shift indeed: though they should not have been reprehended for laying it aside altogether; yet seeing, they used it as a Religious Duty, they might well be reprehended, if they did it not Religiously.

1676.

Meats and
Drinks used
in Religious
Acts.

Secondly, they say, *That then Gluttony, &c. ought not to be reprov'd: And that the Quakers, e're they miss to pull down Christ's Ordinance, will make way for Gluttony and Drunkenness.* Answer, Here is but a silly malicious Reflection instead of a Reason: The Apostle is speaking here (as the Students themselves afterwards acknowledge) of *Meats and Drinks used in Religious Acts*, and if the Proposition holds true in this Respect, it will answer the End, and not of Natural Eating, &c.

Thirdly, they say, *It must only be understood of the Legal Ceremonies, because of the 14th Verse, asking, If the Lord's Supper was contrary unto us, or was nailed to the Cross? What then? The Students are over-hasty, and should have looked to the 21st and 22d Verses; Touch not, taste not, handle not; which all are to perish with the Using: And do not Bread and Wine? which perish in the using, and are therefore here included. As for the Absurdity insinuated by them, How could that be Nailed to the Cross, that was but instituted two Days before? Will they say, That abstaining from things strangled, and from Blood, was Nailed to the Cross, which was commanded long after Christ was Crucified? And yet some of their Divines (as they call them) use this Scripture for a Repeal of it.*

1675. Their second Charge against the *Quakers*, and to prove, *they are not led by the Spirit*, is, because *They assert a Possibility of not sinning upon Earth*: Which they say, is expressly contrary to the Scripture. As first, to *Isaiab 64. 6. We are all an unclean Thing: All our Righteousness are as filthy Rags.* But they should have proved, that the Prophet speaks here not only of the *Legal Righteousness* of the *Jews*; but even of the *Righteousness* wrought by Christ in the Regenerate under the Gospel; which they have not so much as attempted to do; and therefore prove nothing. Yea, the Chiefest of their Divines (as *Calvin, Musculus, Corretius*) deny this Place to be understood of the *Righteousness* of the Saints under the Gospel; but only of the *Legal Righteousness* of the *Jews*: Whom we leave them to refute or reconcile themselves to. And proceed to their second Argument from the Words of the Prayer, *Forgive us our Sins*; But Men may pray for *Forgiveness* of Sins past, though they sin not daily; and this is the Thing in Question. Likewise this Argument drawn from these Words, doth militate no less against *Perfect Justification*, than it doth against *Perfect Sanctification*; as *G. K.* hath at more length in his *Quakerism no Popery* in Answer to their Master *J. M.* pag. 41. They argue from the Words of the Apostle *Paul, Rom. 7. 18, 20, &c. To will is present with me, &c.* but they should have proved, that the Apostle wrote of his own present Condition, and not as personating the Condition of others. For the Apostle in the same *7 Ch. ver. 14.* faith of himself, *But I am Carnal, sold under Sin*: But who will say, That the Apostle, as to his own present Condition, was then Carnal? Or if he was, was there no Spiritual Men then? Or was he none of them? But *Fourthly*, they urge *1 Job. 1. 8. If we say, we have no Sin, we deceive our selves, &c.* and here they are offended *R. B.* should say,

A Legal Righteousness distinguished from the Gospel Righteousness.

Freedom from Sin demonstrated by Scripture Testimonies.

say, *This is Conditional*, like the 6th Verse, which they confess is so: For (say they) at the same Rate he might alledge, all the rest of the Verses of the Epistle to be Conditional. But if it refer or allude particularly to the 6 Vers. the Reason will hold as to it, though not of the rest, that both they and the rest of the Verses of this Chapter do allude to the fifth. The Supposition [*If*] so often repeated, doth shew, they are angry, that *R. B.* should alledge, *WE* here doth not include *John* more, than the Apostle *James* 3. 9. *With the Tongue Curse we Men*, doth include *James*: For first the Students will have *James* here included; alledging it is spoken of *Excommunication*. And here they take Occasion to upbraid *R. B.* with Ignorance in *Ecclesiastical Discipline*; but surely, they have been either Dreaming or Doating when they so wrote. For had they read the following Verse, they might have observed the Apostle condemning this *Cursing*, saying, *These things ought not so to be*: And we suppose they judge not their *Ecclesiastical Discipline* to be unlawful. But being (it seems) ashamed of this Shift, they give another Interpretation, which destroyeth their own Cause, alledging, *James might have understood it of himself, before his Conversion, while perhaps he was a Curser*. Very well; then let them give us a Reason, why the Apostle *John* might not also have understood, *If we say*, &c. of himself also before his Conversion? But are not these, thinkest thou, Reader, Learned Divines, who to evite the Strength of a Scripture, give it within the Compass of one Page two Contradictory Expositions, affirming them both; and yet if the one be true, the other must be false: And then can shake them both off, alledging, They may render the Word by way of Interrogation, *And do we therefore Curse Men?* Are not these rare Interpreters? Because the Apostle useth an Interrogation else-

1676.

The Tongue,
&c. there-
with curse
we Men;
how inter-
preted by
the Students.

1676. where in this Chapter, therefore this may be so done also? But what then becometh of their Church Discipline, and other Interpretation? These must be shut out of Doors. Are not these like to be stable Preachers, who give three different Interpretations to one Text? If any one of which be true, the other two cannot be admitted. It seems these young Men think to make a quick Trade of the Bible, *Cauponari Verbum Dei*, who can thus play fast and loose with it at Pleasure.

Their Plea for Sin, from an Error in the Translation of the Text.

But to proceed, they alledge, *Ecclesiast. 7. 20. There is not a just Man upon Earth, that doth good, and sinneth not*: This Argument is built upon an Error of the Translation; it should be translated, *Who may not sin, qui non peccet*: So *Junius* and *Tremellius*, *Vatablus*, the Vulgar *Latin*, and almost all the Interpreters have it; and our *English Translation Psal. 119. ver. 11. tranlateth* the same *Hebrew Word* so, being in the same Tense, which is the *Second Future*; *I have bid thy Word in my Heart, that I may not sin against thee*. A Second Place, *Jam. 3. 2. In many things we offend all*: What then, it followeth not thence, that we offend at all Times, or we can never but offend; which is the thing under Debate.

But to conclude, they confess, we have other Exceptions, which themselves, it seems, take no Notice of; because *they are solidly refuted by their Divines*: And therefore (say the Students) the *Quakers* herein teach a *Doctrine contrary to the Revelations of God's Spirit in the Scriptures*.

Ans. A quick way to dispatch Controversies indeed, if it could hold; but at present it may serve to shew the Students Folly, not to refute our Principles: If their Divines have already done the Business so solidly, might not they have spared their Labour? Which some of their own think had been their Wisdom.

Their

Their Third Instance against the *Quakers*, is 1676.
 Pag. 74. their allowing of *Women to Preach*, al-
 ledging, *It is directly contrary to 1 Cor. 14. 34,*
35. Let your Women keep Silence, &c. and 1 Tim.
2. 12. Let the Woman learn in Silence, &c. Here
 to begin like themselves, they say, *G. K. is too*
much addicted to Women; but they are dared, if
 they can, to produce any real Ground for this
 malicious Insinuation. *G. K.* besides the Testi-
 mony of a good Conscience hath the Testimony
 of Hundreds, who have known his Manner of
 Life and Conversation from his Childhood to this
 Day, that it hath been honest and of good Re-
 port; so that he feareth not, that the Lying Re-
 ports, which the Malice of his Adversaries may
 raise, can hurt him. Yet these are Men, that
 solemnly profess, they have *abstained from Per-*
sonal Criminations; but seeing they have belied the
 Apostle *Paul*, as is above observed, *G. K.* may
 take it patiently to be treated at this Rate by Men
 of such Circumstances. But if they think to
 infer it, because *G. K.* doth plead for the Liber-
 ty and Priviledge of Women, they might as well
 plead, that *G. K.* is too much addicted to a *Per-*
fect Holiness, because he doth plead for it; or
 that the Students are too much addicted to Sin,
 since they plead for the Continuance of it for
 Term of Life. They are little less than enraged,
 That *G. K.* should have alledged the Testimony
 of *Augustine* and *Bernard*, interpreting this Place
 of the *Flesh*; and therefore they labour, like Men
 in a Sweat, for a whole Page against this to no
 Purpose; the only Reason of *G. K.*'s citing them
 being, because some of their Preachers cried out
 against this Allegory, as a horrid abusive Thing
 in some *Quakers*; to shew them, it is none of
 the *Quakers* Coining, but already used by Men
 by themselves applauded and commended. Up-
 on this they ask, *Have not some of our Antago-*
nists

G. K. vin-
 dicated from
 their insinu-
 ations.

1676. *nists been observed to make a Welchman's Hose of the first Chapter of Genesis? If they mean us, let them prove, we have so done; as we have already proved, they have used the Apostle James with their three-faced Interpretation. And again they ask, Have not some Quakers been bold to aver, that there was never any such real Tree, as the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil? If they have, let them instance and prove, by whom it was spoken and writ? And then they shall have an Answer.*

Womens
Speaking in
the Church,
Lawful.

As they proceed, they give an egregious Specimen of their Folly, alledging, *That if it did hold, (as G.K. affirms) that Women are not allowed to speak by Permission; then a fortiori, it is unlawful for them to speak by Commandment.* Who but the Students would talk at this Rate? As if a Commandment might not authorize a Man to do that, which a bare Permission will not? G.K.'s Arguments drawn from their own allowing *Whores to speak, and Women to sing, they call Quibbles, because they cannot Answer; which they reply to only by Questions, Do they allow Whore's Authoritative Preaching, affirming, Women may sing? Very well, whether it be Authoritative, or not, whatsoever way they speak, they keep not Silence: And so the Apostle's Words are not taken strictly and literally; which gains us the Cause, and shews, our Doctrine is no more directly against the Apostle's Words, than their own.* Besides, from this it followeth by the Students Confession, that Women may as lawfully speak in the Church, as the *Licentiate Students*, whom the *Presbytery* permits to speak in the Church, before they are Ordained. They pass our chief Objection very overly drawn from *1 Cor. 11. 5.* where the Apostle gives direct Rules, how Women should behave themselves in their Publick *Praying and Preaching*, alledging, *There are*

are Rules given in Scripture concerning Things, 1676. that were never lawful, but only permitted, &c. as of Polygamy under the Law: But they should have remembered, that these are Rules given by the Apostle to the Christian Church of Corinth. And seeing, the Students suppose, That the Apostle gave Directions to the Church of Corinth, not only of things that belong not to them now, but which are not lawful for them, (a Doctrine, we question if their Masters will approve of, or of the Consequence of which themselves are aware) it remains for them to prove, That these Two Rules forbidding Women's Speaking belong to us, or is not of the Number of these useless Rules, more than that other concerning the Manner of their Preaching. So we hope, this Solution it Impugned; and desire, they may be sure not to forget to bring us this Reason, when they write next.

SECTION IV.

Concerning the Necessity of Immediate Revelations to the Building up of True Faith, containing an Answer to the Students second Section, from pag. 78, to pag. 92.

IN their stating the Controversy, they say, *These Inward Revelations are not subjective Revelations, or Divine Illuminations.* This is false; for as we have above shewed, one and the same Illumination, that is Effective or Subjective, is also Objective; and the Objective is Effective. Again they say, *The Question is not, if immediate Objective Revelations be possible, or be sometimes made to some de facto:* This Concession will overthrow much of all their own Work. For if they admit,

1676. admit, that any Person in our Time hath *Immediate Objective Revelations*, admit *Peter* or *John*, their former Argument will as much militate against this *Real, Immediate Objective Revelation* granted by them, as against those, which they do not grant. Seeing *Pag. 7.* at the Letter *A*, they say, *Suppose that the Spirit reveals the Objects of Faith immediately, none will deny, that he is a Rule, (or rather Ruler) to them who have him so.* A good Concession, but which quite undoes their own Cause. For now let us apply their former Argument against this *Real Objective Revelation* granted by them, as thus:

Immediate
Objective
Revelation
asserted.

*We ought to believe, That as the Rule of Faith, of which there can be no Evidence given :
But,*

*There can be no Evidence in the World given of the Spirit, that is in Peter and John ;
Therefore, &c.*

Again ; If *Peter* and *John* say, they can give an Evidence of the Spirit of God in them, to wit, their own Declaration in Life and Power, as also the Immediate Testimony of the Spirit, or the Scriptures Testimony ; let us apply in the last Place their Argument used against us, and see, if it will not be as good against *Peter* and *John*, whom they grant *de facto* (according to their *Hypothesis*) to have *Immediate Objective Revelation*. The Argument is this :

*That which as really agrees to Enthusiast Hereticks, as to them, can be no Evidence :
But,*

*That Evidence, to wit, their own Declaration and saying, that both they and their Adversaries have the Immediate Testimony of the Spirit witnessing to the Truth of it, would as really agree to Enthusiast Hereticks :
Therefore, &c.*

Yea,

Yea, not only might they thus Argue against 1676. any Men's having *Immediate Objective Revelation* in our Days, but against the Prophets and Apostles having it; seeing, the Argument might every way be as strong against *their having it*, as against *our having it*; especially at such Times as they wrought no outward Miracles in the Sight of the People, to whom they were sent, as oft they did not. When the Lord sent *Jonas* to Preach to the *Ninivites*, he wrought no Miracle in their Sight. Now let us put the Students in the *Ninivites* Place, and we shall find, they could Argue as stoutly and hardily against *Jonas*, as now they do against any *Quaker*: They could tell him, *He could give no Evidence of the Spirit of God in him, giving any such Message: As for his Declaration, it would not suffice, because his saying, he had the Spirit, would be as good a Ground for any other Enthusiast Heretick.* But further, these stout and hardy Warriors could have used these same Arguments against the Prophets, when they wrought Miracles: For they could have alledged, The Miracles were not true Miracles, but false; and such as may be done by the Power of the Devil. And so if any could produce Miracles now (as there have been) they would no more be believed, than the Unbelieving *Jews* believed the Miracles wrought by Christ and his Apostles: For they still looked upon them to be Deceivers. It is clear from Scripture, that Antichrist shall be permitted to work false Miracles; but that they shall so counterfeit the true, that it will be hard to discern the one from the other, without God's Immediate Direction and Teaching. And therefore the Preaching of sound Doctrine, accompanied with a Holy Life, is a better Evidence of a true Prophet, than all outward Miracles whatsoever: As Christ said, *By their Fruits ye shall know them*: He

Outward
Miracles dis-
cussed.

The Fruits
prove the
Doctrine.

1676. He doth not say, by *their Miracles*, but by *their Fruits*. Now we are most willing to be tried by this Rule, if both our Doctrine, and Life, and manner of Conversation be not answerable to that of the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles, then let them say, we have not that Spirit, which was in them: But if they cannot make out this, they but fight, as Men beating the Air.

Pag. 80. They Argue;

That there is no Substantial, living Principle in Man, that is the good Seed, because then the evil Seed or Principle should also be Substantial.

But this is absurd; Therefore That this is Absurd, they argue; For then it should be Created by God, and so God should be the Author of Evil and Sin; or it should be Uncreated, and consequently God.

To this we Answer: The same Argument militates as much and rather more against their own Principle; for seeing, they hold *Sin* to be somewhat, (whether a *Substance* or an *Accident*, is all one as to the Argument) we Argue by a Retortion against themselves; *Either it is Created, or Uncreated*: And so the same Inconvenience would follow. But to answer directly, we say; *Sin* considered in its Formal Reason, is rather a *Privation*, than any *real Being*; as Blindness or Lameness in a Man's Body, or Corruption in Wine, or any other Liquor. But if they enquire about the *Subject* of this *Privation*, *Whether it be a Substance?* We answer; It is: And it is clear from the Scriptures Testimony, that as *Christ* rules in the Saints, so the *Devil* rules in the Wicked, and is in them; and as God hath his Seed and Birth in the Saints, so the Devil hath his Seed and Birth in the Wicked, which is of the

Sin a Privation in the Subject.

the Devil's Nature. But if it be asked further, Whether it is a *Substance*? We Answer *first*, with inquiring at them another Question, and Retorting the Argument upon them; Whether the *Devil* is a *Substance*, yea or nay? If yea, either he is *Created*, or *Uncreated*; if *Created*, then *God* is the *Author* of the *Devil*: If *Uncreated*, then *He* should be *G O D*; Their *OWN* *Consequence*: which is *B L A S P H E M Y*. But 2. The true Answer to both is, that *He*, who is now the *Devil*, was *Created* of *God* a *good Angel*; but by his own *Voluntary FALL* he hath reduced himself to be a *D E V I L*, not by any real *Creation*, but by a *Degeneration*: And as is the *Devil* himself, so is his *Seed*, a *Corrupted*, *Degenerated Principle*, from what it was *Originally*, before The Seed of Sin. *Sin* was, But if we take the *Seed* of the *Devil* distinctly, as distinct from himself, we do not say, it is any *Percipient Principle*, that *Seeth* or *Knoweth*, &c. for it is rather of the *Nature* of a *Body*, than of a *Percipient Intelligent Spirit*; and the *Scripture* calleth it a *Body*, to wit, *The Body of Death*. But whether the *Seed* of *Sin* be a *Substance*, or not, the *Students* *Argument* is altogether *impertinent* to argue that; because the good *Seed* is a *Substantial*, *Living Principle*, &c. then the evil *Principle* or *Seed* should also be *Substantial*, *Living*, &c. for the same *Reasons*. We deny this *Consequence*: for there are greater *Reasons*, whereby to prove the one, than the other. If they think to argue from the *Rule* of *Contraries*, they think *foolishly*; for it would as much follow, that because a *Man* is a *Substance*, who *Seeth* and *Heareth*, &c. that therefore a *Man's* *Blindness*, and *Deafness* and *Lameness* are also *Substances*, and that *Blindness* *seeth*, *Deafness* *heareth*, *Lameness* *walketh*: Do they not know the *Maxim* in *Logick*, that
tel-

1676.

1676. telleth them; *Substantia Substantiæ propriè non contrariatur*, i. e. One Substance properly is not contrary to another. But last of all we may retort this Blasphemous Consequence upon many of their own Church, who hold, *That God stirreth up the Devil and all wicked Men unto all their wicked Actions, by an irresistible Motion or Quality, which he infuseth into them, commonly called, Prædeterminatio Physica.* Is not this to make God the *Author of Sin*? As also many of them teach, that *Original Sin* is a positive Quality, infused into the Souls of Men at their Creation: Concerning which *positive Quality*, we thus argue; *Either it is Created, or Uncreated, &c.* and so the Inconveniences of their Argument will fall much more upon their own Heads: for they cannot alledge, that this positive Quality at its First Creation was first Good, and afterwards became changed into Evil, because no Quality can admit any such Transmutation. As for Example; *Whiteness* can never become *Blackness*; nor Sweetness, Bitterness, nor Streightness, Crookedness: although a Substance that is *white*, may lose its Whiteness, and may become *Black*; and that which is Sweet, may become Bitter; and that which is Streight, become Crooked.

Original Sin
so called.

In the Prosecution of their *Second Argument* they bring their Matter to this Issue; That *G. K. holds the Seed it self to be contra-distinct from the Manifestation, because the Manifestation is in the Seed*; but we deny the Consequence. Do not they say, that the *Manifestation of God's Will is in the Scripture*? And also that the *Scripture it self is the Manifestation of God's Will*? That *G. K. calleth the Seed both a Substance, and a Manifestation, is as reasonable, as to say*; There are outward Manifestations of God's Goodness, Power and Wisdom in the Heavens and Earth; and yet the Heavens and Earth are the very out-ward

Their Arguments about
Manifestation of the
Will of God
Answered.

ward Manifestations themselves. Are not our 1676.
 Meat, and Drink and Cloathing natural and out-ward Manifestations of the Goodness of God to us? And are not these things Substances? And doth not God manifest his Goodness also in them? What blind Reasons are these, which those poor, blind Men bring forth against the Truth? Again they Argue; *That this Manifestation* (which we say is a Substance) *depends not a solo Deo, cannot exist without a Subject; nay, not without the Understanding, to which it is made:* All which they barely assert, but do not offer to prove. Again they say, It is but a *meer Action, and Applicatio agentis ad passum:* But how do they prove it? Here they are as dumb, as Stones. Perhaps they think to prove it, because Manifestation is a *Nomen verbale*, which commonly being derived from the Active Verb signifieth an Action; but this is meerly to play in Words, and not to Dispute; for they may as well say, because the whole World is called the Creation (for Creation is an Active verbale) therefore the whole World is a *meer Action, or Applicatio agentis ad passum.* We deny not, but the Action or Motion, which proceeds from the Spirit of God, may also be called a Manifestation; but we say, the Seed it self is also a Manifestation, and those inward heavenly Refreshments, which God ministers unto the Souls of his Saints, are as real, substantial, spiritual Manifestations of his Goodness, as the outward, earthly Refreshments, to wit, Meat and Drink, are real, substantial, natural Manifestations. *Lastly, They query, If the Manifestation be a Substance, whether is it One Manifestation, or All the Manifestations?* To this we Answer; They that please to call the Action or Motion (which proceeds from the Spirit of God, as an Efficient Cause) a Manifestation, may easily distinguish Manifestation, as it is a Principle, or


1676. *quid permanens*, or as it is an Action, or *quid transfrens*. Now to apply, we say; The substantial Manifestations of God inwardly to our Souls are many, as they are *quid permanens*, and *per Modum Principii*: for as God nourisheth our outward Man, not with Bread and Drink Once only, but Often (and many are our outward Refreshments, all which are Substances, agreeing in this, that they are Manifestations and Pledges of God's Bounty unto us) so doth he nourish our Inward Man with spiritual Bread and Drink not Once only, but Often, giving us daily the Super-substantial Bread; as the Words in the Prayer may be translated, and have been by some Learned Men. And thus we have answered their *last Argument* in their §. 5. without recurring to any *Idea Platonica*; a Term they vainly bring into their Argument, to move People to laugh at their Folly. And thus we hope it is apparent, that we have no need to retract our *Answers* given in the *Dispute*, as they vainly imagin.

It would be more Labour, and Expence of Time and Paper, than the thing is worth, to answer them in all their Pitiful, Ridiculous Reasonings in these Matters, in every Particular: Therefore not to weary the Reader, nor mispend Time, we shall set down some few, clear, distinct *Propositions*, which shall clearly Answer any seeming *Difficulties* alledged by them in this whole *Section*, as in Relation to *Christ*.

Prop. I. 1. *Proposition*. The *Word*, or Son of God hath the whole intire Nature of Man, Spirit, Soul and Body United to him in the Heavens, and he is the same in Substance, what he was upon Earth, both in Spirit, Soul and Body.

Prop. II. 2. *Christ in us*, or the Seed, is not a Third Spiritual Nature, distinct from that which was in the Man Christ Jesus, that was *crucified* according to the Flesh at *Jerusalem*: For the same that is *in us*,

was

was and is *in him*; and as it is in him, its the Fulness or *Spring* of the same in us, as the *Stream*; nor is there any *difference*, but such as is betwixt the *Spring* and the *Stream*, which are one in their Nature and Substance. 1676. 

3. We say, that the same Seed and Life is in us which was in Him; and is in him in the Fulness, as Water is in the Spring; and in us as the Stream: and this Seed and Spiritual Nature, which is both in him and us, doth belong to him, as he is the *Second Adam*, or Man Christ. Therefore this Seed being in us, the Man Christ is in us; not according to his whole Manhood, but according unto that, which is proper unto it: and yet without all Division. As the Natural Life is in all the Members, but more principally in the Head and Heart without any Division; so this Spiritual Life and Nature is both in Christ our Head, and In Us, by which he dwelleth *in us*, as the Spirit of Man doth in the Body; and we eat and partake of his Flesh. Prop. III.

4. But if they argue, that at least Christ hath Three Natures in himself; we say; Their own Principle will Conclude that, as much as ours. For the Godhead is One Nature; the Nature of the Soul is a Second, and the Nature of the Body is the Third: And our Adversaries themselves Teach, that as *God is Three Persons in One Nature, so Christ is Three Natures in One Person*. Prop. IV.

5. Although the *Word* or $\Delta\lambda\gamma\Theta$ should assume *in-Union* with it self not only *two Natures*, but *three*, it should not make either *two*, or *three Christs*, but *one*. For they grant, that the *Word* hath assumed *two*, to wit, the *Soul* and *Body* of the *Man Christ*; and yet he is not *two Christs*, but *One*: even as the *King* is but *one King*, although he possess *three Kingdoms*; for *Ad Multiplicationem Obliquorum non multiplicantur Concreta*: As your *Logick* teacheth. Prop. V.

1676. 6. The Seed and Spiritual Body of Christ both
 Prop. VI. in him, and in us, belonging to Christ, as he is
 the Second Adam, is as really and immediately
 united unto the Word, as his outward Body was:
 for the whole Manhood of Christ was united to
 the *Logos*, and the *Logos* to it, and in it; there-
 fore the Sufferings of this Seed, and Spiritual Bo-
 dy of Christ in us, are as really his Sufferings, as
 these He accomplished at *Jerusalem*.

Prop. VII. 7. This Seed is not our Souls; but is a *Medi-
 um* betwixt God and us: and our Union with God
 is but Mediate through this; whereas the Union
 of God with This is Immediate. Therefore none
 of us are either Christ, or God; but God and
 Christ are In Us.

Prop. VIII. 8. Seeing this Seed and Spiritual Nature of
 Christ is one and the same, both in him, and in
 us, it is most unreasonable to argue, that there are
 as many Christs, as Men; as it is unreasonable
 to argue, that because the Soul of Man is in all
 his Members, that *therefore, as many Members,
 as many Souls*. The Element of the *Air* is but one
 only Element, although it fill the whole Uni-
 verse, betwixt the Stars and the Earth. And the
 Element of *Water* is but one, although it fill ma-
 ny Channels.

Prop. IX. 9. Christ *outwardly* died but Once, but *inwardly*
 he dieth in a Spiritual and Mystical Sense as often,
 as any crucify him to themselves by their Unfaith-
 fulness and Disobedience, as the Scriptures declare.


Prop. X. 10. As for the *Satisfaction* of Christ *without us*,
 we own it against the *Socinians*, and that it was
 Full and Compleat in its Kind; yet not so, as to
 exclude the real Worth of the Work and Suffer-
 ings of Christ in us, nor his present Intercession.
 For if Christ his *Intercession without us* in Hea-
 ven, doth not derogate from his Satisfaction, but
 doth fulfil it; no more doth his Intercession and
 Sufferings *in us*.

11. The *Sufferings* of Christ in Men are *Voluntary*, and yet without *Sin*; as his *Sufferings* at *Jerusalem* were *Voluntary* and without *Sin*: for as he joined not with them, who outwardly Crucified him, in any *Active* way to concur with them or *Countenance* them; so nor doth he *Inwardly* join with Men to countenance or concur with them, when they Crucify him by their *Sins*. Prop. XI. 1676.

12. As there was no need, that the *Jews* should have Crucified Christ *outwardly*, so as purposely to *Sin*, that Christ might Suffer for *Sin* outwardly; (although the *Prophecies* of Christ's *Sufferings* and God's *Foreknowledge* were certain) so there is no need, that Men should now *Sin* to Crucify Christ *Inwardly*: for if there be any *Difficulty* in the One, it recurs in the Other much more. Now, either Men *Sin*, or *Sin* not; If they *Sin*, Christ suffers by it; If they *Sin* not, he doth not suffer: (nor is it needful, that he Suffer, when Men *Sin* not) But *all Men* have sinned, and Christ hath suffered for and by the *Sins* of All, both *without* and *within*.

13. Christ's *outward Sufferings* at *Jerusalem* were necessary unto Men's *Salvation*, notwithstanding his *inward Sufferings*, that he might be a *Compleat Saviour* in all *Respects*. For it behoved Christ not only to Suffer in the *Members* of his *Body*; but also in the *Head*; so that it is a most foolish and unreasonable *Consequence* to argue, that Because Christ suffereth in the *Members*, therefore he needed not to suffer in the *Head*: Whereas the *Sufferings* of Christ in the *Members* are but a *small Part*, of what he Suffered in the *Head*, by being *Offered up once for All*: Yet a *Part* they are, as serving to make up the *Integral* of his *Sufferings*.

14. The *Doctrines* of the *Incarnation*, *Sufferings*, *Death* and *Resurrection* of Christ, &c. are necessary every where to be preached. and being

1676.  preached, to be believed and improved; as being of, and belonging unto the Integral Parts of Christianity, and Christian Religion. Even as the Arms and Legs are integral Parts of a Man, without which (though it is possible that a Man may be, and live; yet) he is not a Compleat Man as to all his Parts: even so, though one may be a Christian, and Partaker in Part of Christianity, and in that State be accepted of God (as is clear in the Case of *Cornelius*) without the express Knowledge of the outward Birth, Sufferings, &c. of Christ; yet without the same he is not a Compleat Christian, as wanting the Knowledge of that, which serveth to the Perfection and Accomplishment thereof.

The Students grofs Lies and Perversions.

Before we close this Particular, we cannot omit to take Notice of two most horrible Perversions, committed by the Students, *Sect.* 2. The one is *Pag.* 83. where they alledge out of *G. K.* his Book of *Immed. Revel.* *pag.* 7. *That G. K. holds, that when Christ suffers by Man's Sin, that he joins with Man:* Which is a most abominable Lye and Perversion. The Second Perversion of the Students, which is no less abominable, is in *pag.* 79. of their Book, where to cover their other Perversion, they cite most falsely and perfidiously a Place in *G. K.*'s Book, where they bring him in saying, [*Though it may be Hurt and Slain, by joining with the contrary Seed, before it come to its perfect Formation.*] And thus they would prove, That according to *G. K.* Christ joins with Man, when Man sinneth. Now we beseech the Reader to look to *Pag.* 7. in *G. K.* his Book of *Immed. Revel.* and he will find, that the Words of *G. K.* are thus, [*Though till it comes to its perfect Formation, it can suffer Hurt, so far as to be slain through Man his joining unto the Contrary Seed and Birth.*] Mark, Reader, *G. K.* saith, *Through Man his joining;* but the Students purposely to deceive

deceive the Reader, have left out the Word *Man*, 1676. that the Reader may understand it of *Christ* his Joining; a thing never entred into *G. K.* his Heart to think, far less to write.

This abominable Perversion of the Students is enough to make all sober Men abhor them, as Wilful and Impudent Liars; for such a manifest and visible thing could not be done in Ignorance.

But are not these Students rare Disputants, who thus argue against the *Quakers*, pag. 83. l. 5, 6. *Either he (to wit, Christ) suffereth within willingly, and so he Sins, it being by the Sins of Man, that he suffers, and is crucified within.* For by this Argument it will follow, not only, that all the Martyrs, when they suffered willingly, did sin; but also that *Christ* himself, when he suffered willingly, by the Sins and wicked Hands of the *Jews*, that Crucified him outwardly, did sin: Which is the highest Blasphemy, and naturally follows by the Students Argument. But it seems, these Students have no Mind to suffer willingly for Righteousness sake, seeing they are Men of such Principles, that think, when any doth suffer willingly, he Sins. We leave the Reader to judge, whether such Stuff and Work of the Students be *Quakerism Canvased*, and a *Confutation of the Quakers Errors*? Or rather, whether it be not a manifest *Betraying of the Truth, and declaring themselves guilty of highest Blasphemy, Lying and Confusion*? And whether these Men, who are guilty of such Confusion themselves, are fit to accuse others, as not writing perspicuously and clearly, as they do *G. K.* for his Book of *Immed. Revelat.* Pag. last of their Preface? But *G. K.* doubteth not, but that his Book will be acknowledged to be *Clear and Perspicuous*, where it meets with Men of a Clear Understanding; such as the Students (to be sure) are not.

-who think it a Sin to suffer willingly.

1676.



 F. N's Re-
 pentance.

As for those Stories about *F. N.* they have been long ago answered by our Friends; who judged both him, and them that joined with him in that Particular: As he also judged and condemned himself, and was by the Mercy of God reduced to a sober Mind.

As for that Passage in *Christopher Atkinson's* Book, we can say nothing to it unless we saw the Book, which is in *G. M.* his Custody: (which shews, That the Students have plowed with his Heifer) who refused to let us have the Use of it, to see, whether the Place was perverted? And we did not know; where to have it any where else. But it is incumbent on them to prove, Whether *C. A.* or his *Book* was owned really by the *Quakers*? For we can prove, he was denied by them: And if he denied, that *Christ* is *Man*, we deny him and his *Book* both: For we truly believe, that *Christ* is both God and Man.

The Hea-
 thens Book
 of Nature.

In the Prosecution of their Second Argument, *Sect. 2.* They take great Pains to prove, *That Heathens have the Law and Book of Nature; and from exercising their Reason and Understanding naturally, they may know many things:* Which we do not deny, and so they might have spared that Labour, But whereas they alledge, *That there is nothing needful to be known and believed by the Heathens, but what the Book of Nature, and their Natural Understanding, and Reason as Men can teach them, according to the Quakers Principle; and consequently the Heathens need not these Supernatural Revelations;* This they affirm without any Proof: We shall give manifest Instances to the contrary. For the *Quakers* say, All Men need both to have and to know a Supernatural Influence and Work of the Spirit of God, in Order to their Salvation: And this also our Adversaries grant. Now the *Heathens* need a Divine Revelation to make this known to them: For the

Heathens
 need a Di-
 vine Reve-
 lation,

Book

Book of Nature, or the meer Natures of Things being considered, cannot teach Men, what is Supernatural; and so it cannot teach Men, that in all their Actings they are to have a Supernatural End: Nor can it teach them, that they are to Love, Fear, Serve and Worship God from a Supernatural Principle of God's Grace; which are the greatest Duties required of Man: And if it cannot teach Men, and convince them of their greatest Duties, it followeth, that it cannot convince them of the great Sins, that are contrary unto those Duties. Also Nature cannot teach Men of the Mystery of *Regeneration*; which yet is needful to be known: For Men, who are but too much addicted to Natural Reason, and Searchings into the *Book of Nature* (and despise the Divine and Supernatural Illumination of Christ in them) think *Regeneration* a Fiction, or unnecessary Thing.

1676.

Other Instances could be given; but lest they should call them the *Quakers Errors*, we shall forbear, contenting our selves with such, as our Adversaries acknowledge to be true, But 2. If it were granted, That the *Book of Nature* could in some Sort discover all things necessary to Salvation (without Supernatural Light) which yet we deny; it doth not follow, That therefore *Divine, Supernatural, Objective Revelation is not necessary*: Because the Discovery that the *Book of Nature* and *Natural Reason* gives to Men of Divine Things (as of the Power, Wisdom, Justice, Goodness, Love and Mercy of God) is but Dim, Weak, Faint and Barren; and is no more a proportionate Object to the Spiritual Sensations of the Soul, than a Report of Meat, and Drink, and Cloathing are a suitable or proportionate Object to the Taste and Feeling of the outward Man. The Souls of Men need not only to be convinced, That there is a God who is Good, Loving, Merciful,

The Book of Nature is short of Divine Things.

1676. ciful, Powerful and Just; but they need also in Order to their Salvation, to have a Feeling of his Divine Power, to see and taste that he is Good, to handle that Word of Life, to know Christ in themselves, to have the Love of God shed abroad in them by the Holy Spirit; which Love is a sensible and perceptible Object, and so is *Objective*. For if the *Scriptures* be not a *sufficient Objective Revelation of God*, and the Things of His Kingdom, much less the *Book of Nature*, &c. But the first is true; therefore the Second is true also.

Now that the *Scriptures* are not a *Sufficient Objective Revelation of God*, &c. G. K. hath proved at large in his *Book of Immediate Revelat.* and we need not produce any New Arguments here, until the Students or their Masters Refute those already set down in that Book. Only this we say in short, Nature and Scripture tell us, *There is a God*; but they can neither give us a Sense, Sight or Tasting of Him, or of his Love, or of his Spiritual Judgments, as these Things are inwardly Experienced, where God reveals them. Nature cannot Refresh or Comfort the Soul, nor pour in Wine and Oyl into it, when it is wounded with Sin: And although it could tell, that God can do this; what Comfort could that be to the Soul, unless God himself do it, and make the Soul sensible of his Hand reaching unto it the Spiritual Things themselves, that Nature cannot afford? Also Nature cannot discover the Spiritual Judgments of God in the Soul, whereby he cleanseth it from Sin, as by Water and Fire.

Now as to the Second Branch of their Argument, *That the Scriptures are a sufficient objective Revelation of all Things necessary to Salvation*; This we altogether deny, as is said. For although the Scripture is a full-enough Declaration of

of all Doctrines and Principles both Essential and Integral of Christian Religion; yet the Scripture doth propose Divine Things and Objects, but as a Card or Map doth a Land, and the Fruits of it to the outward Eye. Now as this is not a *sufficient objective Proposal*, because we need to see the Land it self, and to taste, and eat and drink of the Fruit of it; so our Souls need a more near and Immediate Discovery of God, than the Scripture, which is but a Report of him, that he may Feed and Nourish us by his Divine Manifestations. And here in the Prosecution of this Argument, they are at great Pains to prove; *That the Scriptures are given from God*; which we deny not, although some of their Proofs be weak: But whatever Reasons can be brought to prove, That the Scriptures are given from God, if the inward Testimony of the Spirit of God be not believed and received, these Reasons cannot beget any Divine Saving Faith, (whereof only we speak) but a meer Human and Natural Faith or Conviction.


As to that Place of Scripture, 2 Cor. 4. 3, 4. *If our Gospel, &c.* that is, say they, the *Outward Gospel*. But doth *Paul* say so? Nay; Look the *Greek Text*, and you will find the contrary, that the Gospel he spake of, was *hid in them that are lost*, so the *Greek* *: Therefore it was *Inward*. And this Scripture they bring to prove, That the Scriptures have *Objective Evidence* and *Perspicuity* in themselves; whereas *Paul* doth not say of the *Scripture*, but of the *Gospel*, which is the Power of God. And whereas they query; *If a Person may have Immediate Objective Revelations, who hath not his Mind well disposed? And if so, what Advantage would he have by them, which he might not have without them by the Scriptures?* We answer; Much every way: Because the Scripture is not able to dispose his Mind, as our Ad-

1676.

The Scrip-
ture, a Map.If our Gos-
pel be hid,
&c.

* εν τοις

απολλυ-
μένοις.

1676.  versaries grant; but these Immediate Objective Revelations are also really *Effective*, and have sufficient Power and Ability in them to dispose his Mind, if he do not resist them. Again, whereas they query; *May a Person be well disposed who hath not such Revelations?* We answer; No: Yet he may want some, and have other some; but if he may, yet there is need of such Revelations. Even as if a Man's Eye or Taste were never so well disposed, he needeth the Objects themselves: And as painted Bread, or a Discourse of Bread cannot satisfy the Natural Taste and Appetite; no more can the Scripture-Words satisfy the Taste and Appetite of the Soul.

A Discourse
of Bread sa-
tisfies not
the Hungry.

They cite 2 *Tim.* 3. 15, 16, 17. to prove, *That the Scriptures of Old and New Testament are the Principal, Compleat and Infallible Rule of Faith and Manners:* But this Place doth not say, that they are so. The Scripture we grant; but deny their Consequence: which is meerly begged without a Proof. They confess, pag. 90. *That the Scriptures are not sufficient every way, so as to exclude the Inward Efficiency of the Spirit, and the Concurrence of other Causes.* Very well; enough to overthrow their whole Argument. For among other Causes *Divine Inspiration* is a Main: For indeed, the inward Efficiency of the Spirit, is that *Objective Revelation* which we plead for; only they deny it to be *Objective*, whereas we say, it is both *Effective* and *Objective*. As if a Man should grant, that the Light and Heat of the Fire doth both enlighten us, and warm us; but deny, that either that Light or Heat of the Fire is *Objective* to our Discerning, or perceptible by themselves; which were Ridiculous, And as Ridiculous is their Conceit of an Influence of the Spirit, that is meerly *Effective* and not *Objective*. *That the Books of the Old and New Testament are called the Scripture by way of Eminency,* we deny not

Inward Re-
velation
both *Effec-
tive* and
Objective.

1676.


not (although the Name is given at times to other Writings;) nor doth this Refute G. K. his Translation of that Scripture, 2 Tim. 3. 16. which is confirmed by the Syriack, which hath it thus; *In Scriptura enim, que per Spiritum scripta est, utilitas est ad Doctrinam, &c.* i. e. *For in the Scripture, which is written by the Spirit, there is Profit.* But their Reason from the Conjunction [and] is both foolish and blasphemous. For if the Words be rendered thus [*All Scriptures given by Inspiration is and profitable*] is no more Nonsense, than divers other Places in the Scripture, where the Conjunction [and] seemeth to be redundant. As in that Place, Job. 8. 25. where the Greek hath it thus, τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι ἔκ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, i. e. *The Beginning (or from the Beginning) the same which and* I speak unto you.* Now if the Conjunction [and] render not this Place Nonsense; no more doth it render that in Timothy: But the Students Ignorance renders them rather Blasphemers, and their Arguments blasphemous against the Words of Christ. Moreover the Conjunction ἔκ may signify a strong Affirmation, (as to say, *even, truly, indeed,*) as both our English Translation hath it, Job. 8. 25. and Schrevelius in his *Greek Lexicon* doth render it: And thus the Words have good Sense, *All Scripture (or Writing) given by Inspiration, is even (or indeed) profitable.* And whereas they say, *None but a Quaker or Jesuit would so interpret the Place;* They declare their Malice and Ignorance. For *William Tindall*, that Famous Protestant Martyr, in his Translation of the Bible (for which the Papists burnt him) did Translate it, as G. K. doth; whom we think, the Students dare not accuse, as a *Jesuit*: That he was a *Quaker*, in so far, as he held divers of our Principles condemned by the Students, we shall not deny. As for us, we bless the Lord, our Faith stands not on such a small

All Scripture given by Inspiration, &c. Controversied.

* Or, also.


Nicity,

1676. Nicity, as the Want of an [*is,*] or the Redundancy of an [*and;*] let them look to that, whose Faith knoweth no other Foundation, but the Letter: It doth nothing hurt our Faith, nor lessen the due Esteem of the Scripture to us, if peradventure an [*is*] hath been lost, or an [*and*] hath crept into the Text, since the Original Copies were lost. This we know, and can prove, That the Scripture cannot profit any Man unto Salvation without the Illumination or Inspiration of the Spirit; which is both *Effective* and *Objective*, and which our Adversaries grant at least to be *Effective*. And if they make one Exception, why may not we make another? Or if they say, the Spirit is necessary one Way, why may not we say, It is necessary another Way? *But then the Scriptures, say they, would not be profitable at all in any Manner or Kind;* We deny the Consequence: For it is profitable, yea, and necessary *in genere objecti materialis*, i. e. As the Material Object in Relation to all Historical Truths; and divers other Dogmatical and Doctrinal Points, which perhaps we would not have known without the Scripture, although we had had the Spirit in as large a Measure as Men now have it. Again, The Scripture is profitable *in genere Objecti remoti & secundarii*, i. e. by way of a Remote and Secondary Object and Rule: even as in Relation to Testimonies of Life and Experience, which may be known without the Scripture; yet the Scripture is a Secondary Confirmation and Help; even in that Case, as a Card or Map of a Land is unto a Traveller, that travels through the Land it self, and seeth the Highways: who will not throw away his Card, because he sees the Land it self; but will both delight and profit himself to compare them both together. Other great and weighty Uses we could

Unprofitable
Nicies of
the Letter-
Mongers re-
prehended.

The Scrip-
ture is pro-
fitable.

The Map
compared
with the
Land in Pos-
session.

could give; but these suffice, to serve as Instances 1676.
against their weak and sorry Argumentation. 

Their last Argument is from *Job.* 12. 48. *The Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last Day.* But how prove they, That this is the Letter of the Scripture, much of which was not then writ? And although this Word were not Christ himself; yet it may be an Inward Testimony spoken by Christ in Men's Hearts: Here they meerly beg, and prove not. But 2. Suppose it were the Scripture or Written Law, as that cited by them *Rom.* 2. 12. it will only follow, That the Scripture is a Secondary Law or Rule: which we willingly grant, and that by it Men, who have the Scriptures, shall be judged; but not by them only. For if the *Gentiles*, who have not the Written Law, shall be judged by the Law in the Conscience; so shall these also, (who have both Inward and Outward) be judged by both, and consequently their Damnation shall be greater.

SECTION V.

Of Worship; being an Answer unto their Third Section, concerning Inspirations to DUTY.

IN their stating the Controversy in this particular, they grossly prevaricate in divers Things. As where they say, N. 2. *The Question is not only about Duty on the Matter, videlicet, The Act of Prayers, &c. as separated from the right Manner, viz. Sincerity and Truth; whereas indeed the Question betwixt them and us is about Prayer, as separated from the Right Manner, viz. Sincerity and Truth.* For they say, *God requires Men to pray*

Prayer without the Spirit not acceptable.

1676. pray without any Inspiration, or gracious Influence of the Spirit : So that such a Prayer is an answering of the Obligation to the Duty upon the Matter, although it be separated from the right Manner: And accordingly they do both require and allow Men to pray, when they have no gracious Influence or Motion thereunto; telling them, *That even such Prayers are required; and that they do better to give such Prayers, as want Sincerity unto God, than not to pray at all; seeing such lifeless and spiritless Prayers have the Matter of True Prayer, although they want the Right Manner.* Whereas we on the contrary affirm, that Lifeless Prayers have neither the *Right Matter and Substance*, nor yet the *Right Manner of Prayer*; and therefore are not at all required in Scripture. Yet we deny not, but many times, when Men want an Influence of Life to pray, they are still under the Obligation; and at such Times it is their Sin, not to pray, because they ought to have suitable Influences to *Prayer*: which would not be wanting, if they were faithful unto God. But when through Unfaithfulness they want them, it doth not excuse them from being under the Obligation; yet still when they want the Help of the Spirit, they ought to pray by the Spirit, because they ought to have it. Even as when one Man oweth unto another Man a just Debt in Money, the Debter ought to pay the Money, although he have no Money to pay it with; for his Want of the Money doth not excuse him from the Obligation to pay it; yet he ought to pay the Debt only with Money, or the Equivalent of it. But if he should offer to pay it with any thing; that is not Money, nor Money's Worth, as suppose with a few Counters; this is no answering the Obligation either in the *Right Matter or Manner*: And so it is in the Case in Hand.

Again,

Again, N. 8. They fall into the like Prevarication, in alledging; *The Question is not about a New Heart, and Spiritual Principle of Obedience;* for they own that as *Indispensably necessary for acceptable Performance.* But do not they say, That when Men pray without a New Heart, they do in Part answer the Obligation? And do not they encourage them to pray, even the most Wicked? This is denied by the People called *Quakers*, and is a great Part of the Question. We say indeed, Wicked Men ought to Pray, but not remaining wicked; but that they ought to forsake their Wickedness, and have a new Heart, and therewith to pray. Moreover, whereas they say, *The Question is not about every Performance, but about acceptable Performance:* Herein they most palpably contradict themselves, N. 9. where they grant, *That no Act of Worship can be acceptably performed without these Influences;* and they well know, that the *Quakers* say the same. The Question then is not about acceptable Performance, seeing both they and we grant, that no Duty can be acceptably performed without the Spirit: So that if the Students had understood their Matter, they would have said, *The Question is not about acceptable Performance, but about simple Performance, whether there be any Obligation to perform Duty, that is not acceptable;* which they affirm, and we deny. For indeed, Unacceptable Performance, is as good as no Performance, but rather worse: As if under the Law the *Jews* had offered up a Dog's Neck in Place of a Sacrifice, it had been a greater Sin, than not to offer at all; as it is a greater Offence for a Man to offer to pay his Debt with Counters or Pennies made of Slait-Stone, than not to pay at all.

Another gross Error they commit in alledging, *The Question is about preparatory Motions, previous in Time.*

1676.
 Isa. 1. 10—
 c. 55. 7.
 c. 59. 2.
 Ezek. 8. 18.
 Prov. 15. 8.
 29. c. 21. 27.
 Joh. 9. 31.
 c. 4. 23.

Unaccept-
 able Per-
 formance,
 no Perform-
 ance.

1676. This is a Lye: We Challenge them to shew us any such thing in our Books. We do not require *Motions of the Spirit previous in Time*, (although they are oft given,) it sufficeth, that they are previous in Order of Nature, as the Cause is previous unto the Effect, which is not always in Time, but in Nature. But the Question is indeed about the Necessity of Motions to, and in the Performance of Duty, so as the Performance is to be in, by, through and with the Spirit; which may well be without a Previousness in Time, as to inward Duty at least. And if the outward can be simultaneous with the Inward, it may also be as to the outward: but if it cannot be so soon as the Inward in some Cases, the Reason is not for want of the Motion; but because the Bodily Organs cannot so hastily answer the Motion, as the Mind it self can: And it sufficiently answereth the Motion, that the Mind answer it first; and then the bodily Organs, as soon as their Nature can permit.

There is yet another great Error they commit, in alledging *Such a lively and spiritual Disposition, as being necessary in our Sense*; whereas we do not lay it upon such a *lively, &c.* as if we required such a Degree of Life: For the least Measure of Life, that is but able to carry forth the Soul in any living Measure of Performance, is sufficient; where the Soul keepeth to the Measure, and doth not exceed, or go beyond it.

In the Prosecution of their Arguments they are no less unhappy in the Stating of the Question; as will shortly appear. *Pag. 95, 97.* they bring in *R. B.* and *A. Sk.* denying their Sequel; which they labour to prove: (but how unsuccessfully, we shall see anon) because as Angels and Brutes agree, in that they are both Substances; so Spiritual Duties, and other Duties agree, in that they are both to be performed in the Spirit. But what

what then? Yet the Difference is still great betwixt those Duties, that as to their Matter are Natural and Civil; and those which as to their very Matter are Spiritual. As for Example, To Eat, to Plow, to Pay a Debt, are not Spiritual as to their Matter; but only as to their Manner and End, when acceptably performed: And therefore the *Matter* of those Duties, and whole Substance of them may be without any gracious Motion of the Spirit. And in that Case the Performances themselves are really profitable in the Creation among them; and consequently do answer the Obligation in Part: But *Prayer* and *Thanksgiving*, &c. are Duties wholly Spiritual, both as to Matter or Substance, and as to Manner and End; so that whose essayeth to do any of them without the gracious Motions of the Spirit, he leaveth not only the *right Manner*, but the very Matter and Substance of the Duty behind him, and bringeth the meer Accidents along with him; which have no Profit nor Use to Men, nor are any wise in the least Part an Answer to the Obligation.

And as to that Scripture cited by them, *The Plowing of the Wicked is Sin*, Prov. 21. 4. they do not prove, that it is meant of *outward Plowing*: The Margin of our *English* hath it, *The Light of the Wicked*; and *Arius Montanus* renders it on the Margin, *Cogitatio*, the *Thought*. That the *Plowing of the Wicked is Sin*, in Respect of the Manner and last End, we grant; but that the Action *materially considered* is Sin, we altogether deny, even in a Wicked Man. For the Outward Mechanick and Bodily Act is good in its Nature, and profitable; as also in so far as it may be for the Maintenance of his Family, it is good. So that in Respect of the Matter and subordinate End, there is no Difference betwixt the Plowing of a Good Man, and a Wicked; whereas the

1676.

Duties natural and spiritual differ.

The Plowing of the Wicked is Sin.

1676. *Prayer of a Good Man by the Spirit, and the Prayer of the Wicked Man without the Spirit, differ materially in their very Nature and Substance; the Good Man's Prayer by the Spirit is true and real Prayer; but the Wicked Man's Prayer is no true Prayer at all, but a dead Image of it. Nor is the Wicked Man a true Worshipper: for he only is a true Worshipper according unto the express Doctrine of Christ, Who worships the Father in Spirit and in Truth; whereas a Wicked Man's Plowing is as real and true, and good as to the Matter and Nature of the Outward Action, as that of the Good. It doth not therefore follow, That (according to the Quakers Principle) because a Man is not to pray without the Spirit, that therefore he is not to plow without the Spirit in Respect of the Matter; although in Respect of the Defect in the Manner and last End, which should be the Glory of God, he sins, when he Plows, as when he Prays; but yet not so much in the one, as in the other: for in the one both Matter and Manner are wrong; in the other not the Matter, but Manner. But if a Man be faithful to God, he may as certainly expect the Divine Assistance of the Spirit to help him to Plow, as to Pray; although that Assistance to Pray is greater, and of another manner, than that to Plow: As is obvious to any that hath Spiritual Experience.*

The True
Worshipper
distinguished
from the
False.

And whereas, *A. Sk.* inferreth upon them, "Their going about these Spiritual Duties in a Carnal Manner, &c. This they call an Impudent Calumny: But in this the impudent Calumny is their own, not his. For dare they deny, but they are for going about Prayer and Praise (which are Spiritual Duties) without the Motion of the Spirit? Which is as much as to say, in a Carnal Manner; for what is not done by the Spirit, is done but in a Carnal Manner. And whereas they call

call his second Answer, *A Clear Confession, &c.* 1676. yet they tell us nothing of it, pag. 96. They are no less disingenuous, in alledging, That *G. K. dissenteth from R. B. and A. Sk.* (whom in their airy and frothy Minds they call *his pretended infallible Brethren* :) For as *G. K.* requireth Inspirations to the Acceptable performance of other Actions; so doth *A. Sk.* and *R. B.* Yet we all say, Wicked Men may very lawfully go about Natural and Civil Performances, as to Plow, to Eat, to Pay Debts, as they are materially considered without Inspiration; and in so doing (although they fall short of acceptable Performance for Defect of the right Manner, and the End) they sin less, than to omit those Actions, and indeed sin not at all, as to the Nature and Substance of them; as they do, who pray without Inspiration.

As for *G. K.* his Distinction of *Mandatory and Permissory Inspirations*, it holds good, notwithstanding all their Idle, Foolish and Impertinent Cavilling at it. From the Words of *Paul*, that he essayed to go to *Bithynia*, but the Spirit permitted him not; *G. K.* inferred by the Rule of Contraries, That the Spirit sometimes permitted him: To evade this they are sorely pinched. In their Account of the Dispute, pag. 30. they grant his Consequence, That *Paul at sometimes had a Permission; but they deny it to be an Inspiration.* But here in this new Assault they deny, That any Permission followeth by the Rule of Contraries from *Paul's Words*; alledging, That he permitted him, and he permitted him not, are not Contraries. But *G. K.* did not alledge these to be Contraries; for they are flat Contradictory: But these we say are Contraries, *The Spirit permitted not Paul to go to Bithynia; therefore he permitted him to go sometimes to some Places*: This is a plain Inference from the Rule of Contraries by Contraries. We mean not Contraries in the strict Logical Sence,

Inspirations mandatory and permissory.

Propositions Contrary and contradictory distinguished.

1676. as when the *Contrariety* is betwixt *two Universals*; but *Opposites*, which in the common Way of Speech are called *Contraries*, and in the *Logical Sence* may be called *Sub-Contraries*: Which do infer one another not to be true always *simul & semel*, at one Time and Place; but at divers Times and Places, &c. As for Example; If there be a South, there must be a North; if a Time to come, there is a Time to be past: If some Things be Hot, and not Cold, other Things must be Cold, and not Hot. And to use a more near Example to the Matter in hand: If when a River is not permitted to run by Reason of an excessive Freezing, that bindeth it up at one Time; it followeth, that it is permitted to run at another Time, when there cometh a Thaw: Or yet to come nearer; If the Wind do not permit a Ship to sail Southward at one Time, it doth permit her at another Time to sail Southward. We would not have insisted on such Rudiments, had not the great Ignorance of the Students occasioned it.

Pag. 97. They close their §. 9. most pitifully. After having failed to refute G. K's Distinction of *Permissory* and *Mandatory Inspirations*, they say, *They leave it to be proved by G. K. That the simple permitting of him* (meaning *Permission* not joined with a *Command*) *hath been by Inspiration.*

Here they shamefully desert their Undertaking, which was, to Refute *Permissive Inspirations*; but when they fail to do this, they put G. K. to prove them: Whereas they ought to remember, that G. K. is not bound by the Law of Dispute to prove any thing, being a meer *Defendent*; yea, when he offered *ex abundanti* to prove something in the Dispute, they blamed him for so doing, being but a *Defendent*. And now they would have him leave *Defendent*, and become *Opponent*. This is a pitiful Confutation of the *Quakers* Principles,

The Student's
Evasions and
preposterous
Demands.

ciples, that when they fall short in their Proofs against us, put us to prove our own Principles. But seeing, they are so beggarly, as to beg from G. K. a Proof of this, he shall give it unto them, and it is this.

Admit then, that according to the Students Supposition, *Paul* was permitted to go unto a certain Place without any Command of God, and that *Paul* did this acceptably, or without Sin, as to the thing it self, which they must needs acknowledge he might; it follows then by their own Argument, that he walked this *Journey in the Spirit*: Seeing they themselves plead, *That Men ought to walk in the Spirit*, (meaning *outward Walking*.) And seeing they grant, *That whatever Act a Man doth acceptably, he must do it to the Glory of God*; and that a Man can do nothing to the Glory of God, but as he doth it from a Good Principle, (yea, the Glory of God being a *Supernatural End*, must have a *Supernatural Principle*, which is the *Spirit of God*;) it manifestly followeth, that *Paul* his *Journeying* by a *Permission* was by *Inspiration*. For whatever is done in the Spirit, is done by *Inspiration*; *Inspiration* both in the common Sense, and here particularly signifying any *gracious Motion, Influence and Assistance* of the Spirit. In their Answer to that other Scripture, 1 *Cor.* 7. 6. compared with *Ver.* 40. they fall into their old Way of Asserting barely without any Proof. They tell us, *That the Permission falls upon the thing spoken, and not upon the Speaking it self*: But how prove they it? Here they are quite Dumb, and say nothing for Proof. And indeed, it is as manifest, as a thing can be, that the *Permission* doth no less fall upon the *Speaking*, than upon the *thing spoken*; and they do most presumptuously contradict the Apostie, when they say, *Paul was commanded to speak*

1676. *this* : Whereas *Paul* said expressly, he *spake* by *Permission*, and not of *Commandment*.

Permission
positive and
negative.

In the Prosecution of their second Argument, they bring in *G. K.* distinguishing betwixt *Privative* and *Positive Permission*; where they give the Lie to their own Account, which saith pag. 30. *That G. K. distinguished Permission into Positive and Negative*, as indeed he did. Now *Privative* and *Negative* differ widely: For the Want of Sight in a Stone is not *Privative* (as in a Man) but *Negative*: And surely there is so little Wit, or Acumen in this Argument of the Students, and their Prosecution of it, that it proves them to be liker Stones, than Men of Reason and Solidity.

And here they tell us that *G. K.* (whom in their vain Minds they call this *Great Inspired Rabbi*) was very unfortunate in Explaining this Distinction, and Assigning its Ground; as may be seen in their Account. But, alas for them, poor Men! they have egregiously baffled themselves in that very Matter in their Account: as is shewed in our Answer thereunto. But behold, what dull and heavy Disputers these Men are! *If positive Permission were Inspiration*, say they, *then a Man might inspire us, for he might positively permit us.* This Consequence is as dull and heavy as a Stone, although the Weight of it falls not upon us, but upon themselves to prove them altogether impertinent. For their Argument proceeds from a wrong Supposition, that according to *G. K.* all positive Permissions are Inspirations; a thing *G. K.* never dreamed of: But only that some positive Permissions (to wit, those of God) are Inspirations, as he by his Spirit doth permit Men, or allow them to do or use some things. As when God said to *Adam* in the Garden, *Of every Tree in the Garden thou may'st freely eat, save one*; This was a positive Permission, and also (if God speak this to him inwardly, as is most probable, and as *Augustine*

gustine supposeth) an *Inspiration*. Also when the Lord said unto *Ezekiel*, Chap. 4. 15. *Lo, I have given thee Cows-Dung for Man's Dung*; This was a Condescendence, and *positive Permission*, and also an *Inspiration*. 1676.

But the Students proceed still more and more to baffle themselves, (instead of Baffling the *Quakers*) and shew their Ignorance and Sottishness. For thus they argue, *pag. 99.* in prosecuting their Third Argument: *Every Inspiration* (say they) *puts us out necessarily to the Doing of the Thing inspired*; and so commands us *virtually*: And upon this bare Alledagnce the whole Superstructure of this Argument stands; which yet is a manifest Untruth, and suffereth many undeniable Exceptions. For many times Things inspired are not at all of the Nature of Things to be done; but are simply Things to be believed. As when God inspired the Prophets with the Knowledge of Things to come; which neither could nor ought to be *done by them*. And as when *Daniel* was inspired to know Things; which he was so far from being commanded to write, that he was *forbidden*, Dan. 12. 4. Again, some Inspirations are meer inward Consolations, and Spiritual Refreshments and Renewings of Strength only to enable us in general to serve God (as Meat and Drink is unto the Body) and that sometimes without Words, and sometimes with Words by way of Promise. As when he spake to *Noah*, *Gen. cap. 9.* from *ver. 8.* to *ver. 18.* where there is not any Command given to *Noah*, but only Promises; and yet *Noah* was inspired by the Lord, as all the true Prophets were.

Things Inspired are either to be done, or simply to be believed.

Which are either of Command, or of Promise.

And whereas they alledge, *That Inspiration includes in its Notion an insuperable Putting and Prompting out to the Things Inspired in all Authors, both Sacred and Profane*; is meerly precarious. For sometimes indeed it signifieth to Command;

1676. as where the Inspiration is Mandatory : But at other Times it signifieth to Comfort, Refresh, Quicken, Influence and Assist us, without any particular Command to any particular Action. Yet we acknowledge, the Nature of all Divine Inspirations in the Children of God is to Incline, Lead, Move, Draw and Guide them up more and more into Unity with God, and so unto a further Degree of Holiness; but not to determine them unto all particular Actions.

And thus also their fourth Instance is disproved, where they alledge, *That all Inspirations of God determine us to one Extream* : Which is false, if they mean an Extream in the particular Act : If they mean an Extream in the General, as to do all in Charity, and to the Glory of God ; we grant it : But this doth not militate against what we affirm.

Their other two Instances are but the former upon the Matter, repeated in a Tautological Way for want of new Matter ; and are sufficiently answered above. And thus their Silly and Faint Reasonings in this Argument are answered without any Necessity of G. K. his returning to his Bag for new Distinctions ; as they scornfully, but foolishly insinuate.

Pag. 99. §. 15. The Students tell us, *That G. K. finding himself beset with these inextricable Difficulties, as it seems, misplaces this Distinction in their Account, and gives in another Distinction of Particular and General Inspirations.* This is but their meer Alledgance : The Distinction was right enough placed ; as any may see by the Nature and Coherence of the Account : Nor did G. K. see any Difficulty in their Argument at all ; as indeed there is none in it. But let us see, how they Refute this Distinction of *General and Particular Inspirations or Influences.* First they say, *He shall never be able to produce a Ground for this*

this Distinction out of Scripture. A learned Re- 1676.
 futation indeed! and like unto their old Way, of putting us to prove, what they cannot dis-
 prove. May it not as well suffice us to say, *They shall never be able to produce a Ground out of Scripture against it?* And the rather, since we are Defendents.

Secondly: *That which is called a general Inspiration, could not put us out to any particular Thing,* say they. Answer; If by *putting out*, they mean, *determine us insuperably or irresistably thereunto*, we grant; but this is no Absurdity. Thirdly, *They would always leave us undetermined.*

Inspirations
 General or
 Particular.

Answer: Nor is this absurd. For in things that are *permissive*, and left to our Freedom in the Lord to do them, or not to do them, we need not any thing to determine us, as to the particular Act; but may determine our selves, being free Agents: although as to the Nature and Kind of the Act in General, that it be in true Love to God and to his Glory, we are determined by the Lord.

Pag. 100. They are no less unsuccessful in managing their other Argument, in *Comparing inward Duties with outward.* For, whereas they alledge for a Proof of their Minor, *That if we were not to go about Inward Duties without a previous sensible Inspiration, there would be a Progressus in Infinitum.* This hath been sufficiently answered above in the Dispute; that as to that *Inward Duty of Waiting* we cannot suppose, that ever at any time an Influence or Inspiration can be wanting: And this we say still; we mean to true Christians, who are faithful unto God, and do faithfully improve his Influences. As for others, if they want Influences either to *inward* or *outward Duties*, the Cause is their Unfaithfulness: And so the Way to have them upon all Occasions, is to be faithful to answer God's Call, who

Unfaithful-
 ness wants
 Influences to
 Duties.

1676. who doth oft invite and call upon them who are unfaithful. But if they mean *All inward Duties*, as Meditation in many Cases upon particular Subjects; we deny, that even true Christians have always particular Inspirations thereunto: Nor is there any Necessity to assert them.

Now let us take Notice, how they refute the Distinction of *General* and *Particular Inspirations*. First, say they, *There are no General Inspirations, as we have shewed already*. But that they have shewed no such thing, is already made apparent. Secondly, *Supposing them; yet they being but General, would not be a sufficient Ground for the Particular inward Duties of Waiting, Desiring*. But how prove they this? No wise, but meerly affirm it; only they confound Waiting, Desiring and Meditating together; whereas Meditating is of a larger Extent, and sometimes, yea, oft-times requireth a Special Inspiration. Thirdly, say they, *The Scriptures produced by the Quakers prove alike, as to outward and inward Duties*. To this we answer; That as to some outward Duties, it is true; as to others false. As for Example: To be clear in all outward Conversation, is a Continual Duty; and therefore we can never want an Influence thereunto, if we be faithful: But to Preach and Pray in the Church or Assembly with audible Words, is not a continual Duty, nor yet a General to all Christians; and therefore it hath not always an Influence to assist thereunto.

Preaching
and Praying
audibly is
from a par-
ticular In-
fluence.

And here let the Reader note, That by a *General Influence* or *Inspiration* we mean only such an Influence, as serveth in general for all ordinary Actions, that are to be generally performed in an acceptable Manner: As the same Spiritual Influence, that sufficeth me to Eat in Faith, Fear and Love, sufficeth me also to Plow, or do any other Mechanical Work: But the same doth not suffice

suffice me to preach, or expound Scripture; otherwise any ordinary Christian might do so at any Time: Which our Adversaries will not acknowledge. 1676.

Now that *Preaching* and *Praying* in particular require a Super-added, Spiritual Influence and Inspiration, we prove thus:

If Men may have an Influence or Inspiration of the Spirit to wait, fear and love God, and yet want an Influence or Inspiration to Preach or Pray Vocally; Then the Influence and Inspiration to Preach and Pray vocally, is a distinct, super-added Influence, &c.

But the First is true; Therefore the Second.

The Consequence of the first Proposition is clear from that Maxim, *Quorum unum potest esse absque alio, &c. When of two things the one can be without the other, the two are really distinguished.* The Second Proposition is proved,

1. Because all true Christians have an Influence and Inspiration to Wait, Fear and Love God; but all true Christians have not an Influence and Inspiration to Preach and Pray vocally in the Church: This our Adversaries cannot deny.

2. Even a true Gospel Minister may at Times want a Door of Utterance, when in the Time of this Want he hath an Influence or Inspiration to Wait, Fear and Love God: Therefore these two are distinct.

The Antecedent is clear in the Case of *Ezekiel* (Chap. 3. 15, 16.) *Who sate seven Days with the Elders, having nothing to speak unto them from the Lord, until at the End of the seven Days the Word of the Lord came unto him. And Ezra sate silent, till the Evening Sacrifice, and then he kneeled down and prayed, Ezra 9. 5. Also Paul desired* Ezekiel sate seven Days with the Elders in Silence. And Ezra sate silent, &c. the

1676. *the Colossians* to pray for him, that Utterance might be given him: Which clearly imports, That he had it not at *all Times*; although at all Times he had an Influence or Inspiration to Wait, Fear and Love God. And *David* prayed, That *God would open his Mouth, and his Lips should shew forth his Praise*: *Isaiab* said, That *God had given him the Tongue of the Learned, &c.* Christ promised, That *he would give his Apostles a Mouth and Wisdom, which all their Adversaries should not be able to resist*: All this signifieth an Influence of the Spirit to speak; which was not general to all, nor permanent or perpetual with them, who had it. As is clear in the Case of *David*, who declared, That *he was silent, and held his Tongue even from Good, until the Fire kindled in him, and then he spake with his Tongue*, P^{sa}. 39. 3. Yea, what signifieth the *Coal*, wherewith *Isaiab* his Mouth was touched, but an Inspiration or Influence of Life, superadded unto that General Influence, which he had before?

Now if our Adversaries say, *This was given unto those Men in an extraordinary Way, as being Prophets and Apostles; but is now ceased, since the Apostles Days.*

To this we Answer, 1. This is a plain Acknowledgment, That general Influences common to all Christians are one thing, and particular Influences given to holy Men to Preach and Pray Vocally, are another. But 2. That all Influences and Inspirations or Motions of the Spirit to enable Ministers to Preach and Pray *Vocally*, are not ceased since the Apostles Days, is clear from *Rev. 11. 3. And I will give Power unto my two Witnesses, and they shall Prophecy*: And it is said, That *if any Man will hurt them, Fire proceedeth out of their Mouth*: Which must needs signify a Special Influence of the Spirit given them to Prophecy or Preach; which is not common to all


Inspirations
to Preach
and Pray vo-
cally, not
ceased.

all Christians. Also what are these *Gifts given unto Ministers for the Perfecting of the Saints?* 1675. But such special Influences to enable them to Preach, which are not given to all. Yea, do not the National Preachers desire in their Publick Prayers some special Assistance and Help of the Spirit, to carry them forth in their Ministry, which they have not before? For if they had it before, why do they seek it? From all which it is manifest, that as there are general Influences given to all, and at all Times; so there are particular and special given only to some, and but at some times.

Moreover, that there is a greater Influence of Life required to *Vocal Prayer*, when it is acceptable, than unto some meer *Mental Prayer* (a thing expressly denied by the Students, pag. 100. §. 16.) is clear, because all true and acceptable *Vocal Prayer*, hath *Mental Prayer* going along with it, as its Cause and Spring. And so when any Man prays *vocally*, (if his Prayer be true and acceptable) he prayeth also *mentally*; and so he doth two things together: Whereas when he prayeth but *mentally*, he doth but one thing. Now common Reason teacheth us, that more Strength is required to do two things together, than to do but one of them. And seeing the *Vocal Prayer* hath not any Life or Virtue in it to reach unto God's Throne, or yet unto the Hearts of his People, to quicken and refresh them, but as it receiveth that Life from the Life, that is in the *Mental Prayer*, it is clear, that a greater Measure is required to both, than simply to the One.

Now although *Mental Prayer* (as to the Disposition and Frame of the Soul at least) be always in and with Good Christians, and hath always some Measure of Life in it; yet that Measure is sometimes so weak and low, that it cannot go forth

Mental Prayer the Cause and Spring of *Vocal Prayer*.


1676. forth unto the Words without Hurt or Prejudice.  And at other times, although it be able and strong, yet it will not answer the Motion of Man's Will, so as to be drawn forth thereby; but it only abideth or goeth forth into the *Vocal Prayer* according to the Will of God, as He pleaseth to move it. Therefore the free Motion of the Life it self, as it pleaseth God to bring it forth, is to be attended in all Outward, Spiritual Performances.

But here let the Reader note, that we have said, *Vocal Prayer requires more Life than some Mental Prayer*; we do not say, *than all*: For some Mental Prayer may be Stronger, than that which is a Complex of *Mental* and *Vocal*, as gathering the whole Strength of the Complex into that which is solely and entirely Mental: According unto that common Saying abundantly confirmed by Experience, *Vis unita fortior; United Strength is the stronger*. As when the Beams of the Sun are united into a small Point, they have more Force than when they are diffused; and for this Cause it is, that we are so much for Mental Prayer, as knowing the great Good of it in our Experience. And from what is above said, it is clear, that we need another Influence, wherewith to Pray *vocally*, than to Eat, Plow, Walk, &c. because these Natural Actions may be done sufficiently in a Spiritual Manner, by the Help of that General Influence, which doth always attend Good Men to Fear and Love God. For the Principle of Divine Life, which is the Living and Powerful Word of God in Men's Hearts, is never idle, but is always Operative and at Work; especially more abundantly in them who join with it; being as a most Rich and Living Spring, that is continually flowing and sending forth its Streams, according to *Joh. 4. 14*. But to Pray *vocally*, requireth an Influence
of

The Principle of *Divine Life* is never idle.

of Life to flow forth into the Words, that it may in a Living and Powerful Way reach the Hearers; but that Plowing, Eating, Walking, &c. need no such Emanating Influence, is certain; and will be acknowledged by our Adversaries. But perhaps also they will deny, that any Life or Virtue doth flow forth into Mental Praying and Preaching, even when these Duties are acceptably performed. But this is contrary both to the certain Experience of many Thousands, and also to the Scriptures Testimony in many Places.

I. It is contrary to the Experience of many Thousands, who can declare (whereof we are some) that the Declarations, Testimonies and Words of the Servants of God in Preaching and Praying have a real Life and living Virtue in them, whereby their Souls are exceedingly Refreshed, Quickned and Strengthened; which Life and living Virtue is a thing as distinct from the bare outward Words, which the Natural Ear can hear, as Wine is distinct from the Vessel that carrieth it: Therefore if another Man, that hath not this Spiritual Ability, should pronounce the same Words, they have not any Life or Virtue at all. And that God had given this Spiritual Discerning to many, before the People called Quakers were raised up, is manifest from divers in our own Nation, who cared not to hear Men, who could speak never so good Words, if they wanted Life; and in that Day they could and did distinguish betwixt dead and living Preachers, as also betwixt a Living Testimony and Preaching, and a Dry Discourse: See for this the Book called, *The Fulfilling of the Scriptures*. And this was the Express Testimony of that Philosopher, who was converted by the means of a few Words spoke by a certain Old Man (who was a Christian,) at the Council of Nice; *Out of the Mouth of that Old Man (said he) there went forth a Vir-*

1676.

 I.
 The Life in the Words of the Servants of God witnessed by Experience.

1676. *tue, which I could not resist*: These were his very Words; as *Lucas Osiander* relates them in his Epitome of the Church-History, *Cent. 4. lin. 2. cap. 5.*

II. It is contrary to the Scriptures-Testimony in many Places; *The Mouth of the Righteous is a Well of Life*, Prov. 10. 11. This must be understood in Respect of the Influence of Life, that cometh out of his Mouth, as Water doth out of a Well; and not barely in Respect of the good Words, which a wicked Man may speak. According to this Christ said to his Disciples, *The Words that I speak unto you are Spirit and Life*: And as it was then, so it is now; for at this Day he speaketh in his Servants, and will to the End of the World; and it is He only, who hath the Words of Eternal Life, which he speaketh in his Servants. And as in the Days of his Flesh he was said to speak with Authority or Power, and *not as the Scribes*; and the People *wondred at the gracious Words, which proceeded out of his Mouth* (all which import a living Influence and Virtue in the Words of Christ, which the Words of the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* had not) so it is at this Day: For Christ doth as really speak by his Spirit in his Servants, as he did in his Body of Flesh: So that *Paul* said, *he spake in him*; and therefore his Preaching was *in Demonstration of the Spirit and Power*. And for this Cause true Preachers and Prophets are called *good Trees, of which Men gather good Fruit*; whereas bad Men or Evil Trees have no good Fruit, although they have the Prophets and Apostles Words. Also they are compared (to wit, the False Prophets) to *Clouds without Rain* and *Wells without Water*, although they have *good Words*, yet they have no Rain nor Water: Their whole Ministry is dry, and empty of Life and Virtue. But the True Prophets Ministry is as a Shower

—And testified unto by Scripture.

True Prophets and Preachers distinguished from the false.

a Shower of Rain, *Deut.* 32. 2. And sometimes it is compared unto *Fire*; as it is said in the Psalm, *He maketh his Angels (or Messengers) Spirits, and his Ministers a Flame of Fire*: And Fire was said to go out of the Mouths of the two Witnesses. Also the *Influences of Life*, that go forth through the true Prophets in their Ministry, are compared to *Golden Oyl*, and the Men are compared unto *Golden Pipes*, *Zech.* 4. 12. And therefore the Apostle *Peter* exhorted the Ministers in his Day, *To minister of the Ability which God giveth, as good Stewards of the manifold Grace of God*; so they ministered not only Words, but Grace. Many other Testimonies might be cited to prove this Truth.

Another Instance brought by the Students, is, *That an Heretick forbearing Prayer a Year or two, or his whole Life time, may justify himself by this Doctrine*. To this it was answered; That tho' he may pretend, yet he hath no just Ground from our Principle: For we believe, that all Men are bound to *pray often* unto God, yea, *daily*; and that God doth inwardly call and move all Men often unto Prayer, during the Day of their Visitation: And when that is expired, or when at any other time they want that *Inward Call or Influence* through Unfaithfulness, they are still bound: And if they *pray not*, they sin; because they ought to have an Influence. But that our Account saith, All have not Utterance to pray in Words, is no Excuse for Hereticks: For they must needs acknowledge, as well as we, that all have not *Utterance*, who may be *good Christians*, seeing some that are naturally dumb, may be *good Christians*, and yet they must confess, these have not *Utterance*. Also many *good Christians* who have no Natural Impedement, do want Utterance in a *Spiritual Way*, to *speak or pray* vocally in the Hearing of others at some times; although

1676.

All Men are bound to pray often;

Utterance of Words in Prayer.

1676. we believe, it is given at times to all that are faithful (who have no *Natural Defect*) that they may *pray vocally*, or in the Hearing of others: But *how oft*, it is more than we can determine; seeing it is not revealed. But if any fail of this Utterance through Unfaithfulness, their sin is nothing the less, if they omit Prayer.

And thus their last two Instances are answered. For we do affirm with great Freedom, That all who are faithful to the Lord, never want *sufficient Inspiration* or *Influence* to wait upon God, fear him, love him, desire his Grace, and divers other Inward Duties. We say not *All*: For some Inward Duties, such as *Meditation* on a particular Subject or Place of Scripture are not always required, more than it is always required to speak; but if they be unfaithful, we deny not, but they may and will want them. And in that Case, although they want Inspirations and Influences, they are bound to *pray*, yet not without them, but with them. As a Man, that wanteth both *Money* and *Goods* to pay his Debt, yet is bound to pay his Debt; yet he must not, nor ought to pay it without *Money* or *Goods*. The Example is clear, and the Application is easy.

As for that Story they bring in concerning *T. M.* which (that their Deceit may be the more hid) they do not positively affirm; but only propose by way of Question, *Have not Quakers declared to People, &c.* To which we answer; That we know not, that any *Quaker* ever declared any such thing; and we believe, divers things in the Story are utterly false. If *T. M.* or any other of our Profession, having none in the Family, that can join with them in the true Spirit of *Prayer*, but are professed Opposers of the *Quakers Way*, be not so frequently heard pray by them, is excusable by your *own Way*; who will not readily pray in our Hearing, when they have none

The Story about *T. M.* answered for not praying in the Family, as pretended.

none to join with them. And indeed, the want of that true Unity on the Part of those, who are not of our Faith, doth oft hinder our Freedom to pray in their Hearing; (unless we have some of our Faith present to join with us:) We may *pray for them*, as it pleaseth God to move us in their Hearing; but we cannot so properly *pray with them*, as not being in Unity with them. *Where two or three* (said Christ) *agree together to seek any thing in my Name*: But let our Adversaries, if they can, shew us, where in the Scripture it is commanded for any Man to pray in the Hearing of others, where all present have *no Agreement* with him? Yet we deny not, but that God upon some solemn Occasion may move to such a thing, especially when a *publick Testimony* is required: As in the Case of *Stephen*, who *prayed audibly* in the Hearing of others; all which were so far from having any Agreement with him, that they were at that time stoning him to Death, *Acts 7*.

Moreover, we could easily upon a more just Ground *Retort* the Question upon your own Church-Members. How many of *your own Church-Members* were not only for a *Twelve Month*, but for *many Twelve Months* never heard Pray, and yet they pass among you for *good Christians*? It is well known, that although ye hold *Family Prayer Morning and Evening* to be a Duty, and the want of it a great Sin; that yet many Thousand Families in the Nation, who belong to your Church, want it: And many whole Families are so grossly Ignorant, that none in the Family can go about it, even in that Natural Way, which ye plead for. As for us, it doth suffice unto us, that *God* God heareth Prayer in secret. *heareth us in secret*; although *Men* do not so frequently hear us. Yet we own with all our Hearts *publick expressive Prayer*, as it is performed in Spirit and in Truth; and all of us have our Share

1676. and Testimony therein, as God moves thereunto :
 Even those who are *outwardly silent*, as these who
speak ; when as both agree together in one Spi-
 rit, and with one Heart and Soul join together
 in the same.

SECTION VI. OF BAPTISM.

*Wherein their Fourth Section concerning Water-
 Baptism is Answered.*

IN their stating the Question, they say ; *The
 Question is not, Whether Infants ought to be
 Baptized? Or who have the Power of Administring
 Baptism?* Whereas indeed these Two are a great
 Part of the Question betwixt our Adversary and
 us. For as touching *Infant-Baptism*, R. B. his
Thesis doth expressly say, *It is a meer Humane
 Tradition* ; and it is well known that all the
Quakers (so called) are of the same Mind : And
 do not the Students undertake to Confute the
Quakers Principles ? How is it then, that they
 leave out so considerable a Part of *Quakerism*,
 as they call it ? Is this *Quakerism* *Canvased*, to
 pick and chuse at some, and pass by others ?
 Yea, *Infants-Sprinkling* with Water on the Fore-
 head, is so considerable a Part of the Question
 betwixt them and us, that if that be disproved,
 or if they cannot prove that to be a *Gospel-In-
 stitution*, they fall short exceedingly ; seeing,
 that is the only *Baptism* in Use among them of
 the *National Church*.

Again, it is so great a Part of the Question,
Who have the Power of Administring Baptism?
 That by this the Controversy stands or falls ; for
 one of our main Arguments against *Water-Bap-
 tism*,

*Infant-Bap-
 tism an hu-
 man Tradi-
 tion.*

tism, as remaining a Duty upon all Christians, 1676. is, That *none are to be found, that have the Power to administer it*: And the Administration cannot be without a Lawful Administrator. The Question then really is, Whether these, who have no Immediate Call to administer *Water-Baptism* (as *John* had) have Power to administer it? Again, *Whether those, who have no other mediate Call to Baptize, but what they have by the Church of Rome, which is no true Church* (as the best Protestants affirm) *have Power to administer Baptism?* And this Question is the more proper in this Place, seeing *F. M.* the Students Master confesseth, *his and his Brethrens Call and Ordination to be by the Church of Rome, and that they have no other, but what is conveyed down to them from the Apostles Times by that Apostate Church.* But let us now Examine their Arguments for *Water-Baptism* in general. The First is,

Baptism with Water is to continue in the Church, as long as Christ's Presence is to continue with his Apostles, and them, who teach the Doctrine that they taught: But, Christ's Presence is to continue with his Apostles, and them, who teach the Doctrine, that they taught, to the End of the World; Therefore, &c.

The Students Arguments for its Continuance.

Where it is to be observed, That they think, all is safe as to the *Minor*; and therefore they altogether pass it by. Now although it is sufficient to invalidate the Argument, if the *Major* be false; yet we have somewhat of great Moment to say to the *Minor*, that is enough to overturn any Baptism that they have. For we put them to explain, who these are, *That all along since the Apostles have taught the Doctrine, which the Apostles taught?* For the Words are li-

1676. able to divers Senses. If they mean the Church of *Rome*, and her Bishops and Teachers, we altogether deny, that they have taught the same Doctrine, which the Apostles taught: And we suppose, the Students, if they follow their Master *J. M.* will not affirm it. And indeed, for the same Reason the best *primitive Protestants* denied, that the Church of *Rome* in their Day had any *Lawful Ordination* at all; seeing she continued not in the Apostles Doctrine and Faith, as that famous Protestant *Sadeel* doth argue at great Length, *Lib. de legit. voc. min.* where he affirmeth, “*That the Succession of Faith is as the Soul, which gives Life to the Succession of the Bishops, as unto a Body; but that Succession without this Faith, is a dead Thing, and unfitable Carcase.*” Now the same Reason doth militate as strongly against *Water Baptism*, and that also called the *Supper*, upon our present Adversaries Principle, *That none have Power to administer the one or the other, but those who have a mediate outward Call conveyed down from the Apostles by a visible Succession of Ordained Bishops and Presbyters.* For we say, There hath been no such visible Succession, nor visibly Ordained Bishops and Presbyters, who all along have had the true Faith, and taught the true Doctrine of the Apostles; therefore their Ordination and Power to administer the Sacraments, is void and null.

And this is further confirmed by the Authority of *Cyprian*, who taught with great Earnestness, *That the Baptism of all Hereticks was void, and no Baptism:* But so it is, by our Adversaries Confession, That the Church and Bishops, and Teachers of *Rome* have been Hereticks for many Hundred Years before the Reformation: Therefore, &c. We say then, the Argument is fallacious as to the *Minor*, supposing, what is not to be

Sadeel's Testimony concerning a Succession of Faith from the Apostles.

Cyprian of *Baptism.*

be supposed in their Sence, *viz.* That either the Teachers of the Church of Rome, or any other claiming a *Visible* and *Mediate* Call from the Apostles Times conveyed through a Visible Church unto them, have taught the Doctrine, which the Apostles taught; a Thing we altogether deny: And it lieth on them to prove. But that Christ hath had some all along, who have both believed and taught the Doctrine of the Apostles, and that his Presence has been with them, we acknowledge; but we deny, that these have been all along a visible Church and Teachers, having a *Mediate* Call and *Ordination*: And in this we agree with the best Protestants. For indeed, the True Church hath been hid, even as a few Grains of Corn among an exceeding great Quantity of Chaff and Stubble; and she who hath called herself the Church by reason of her Outward Succession, was not the True Church, though some of the True Church lay hidden in her, as Corn is hid in a great Quantity of Chaff. And that the Church is properly to be placed in the alone Grains of Corn, and not in the Chaff, *Sadeel* doth also shew out of *Augustine*, Ep. 48.

1676.

The True Church hath been hid.

Another Fault we find in the Students Argument, that supposing *Water-Baptism* had been commanded to the Apostles by Christ, *Matth.* 28. (which yet we altogether deny) it insinuateth, That it was as long to continue, as Christ's Presence with his Church. For if Teaching had continued, though *Baptism with Water* had discontinued (as our Adversaries grant, That *Anointing with Oyl* and *miraculous Curing the Sick* is discontinued) yet the Promise was Ground enough to encourage them: And if all be still binding, that Christ Commanded to his Apostles, why go they not forth, (we mean the *National Teachers*) into all the World, and teach the Nations, who do not so much as believe the Gos-

The Partiality of the National Teachers concerning Water-Baptism.

1676. pel Historically ? If they say, This was a Command to the Apostles, and not to them ; why are they so partial, as to take one Part to them, and reject another ?

But we shall now come to a more particular Examination of their *Major*. We have told them, That the *Apostles* baptized some with *Water* out of a Condescendency (as *Paul* circumcised *Timothy*) and not from that Command, *Matt.* 28. which saith nothing of *Water-Baptism*.

Their First Reason against this is, *They should have Baptized with Water of their own Will, and without any sufficient Authority*. But we deny this Consequence, and they themselves have furnished us with a sufficient Answer, where they say, *Paul Circumcised Timothy, but not without a Command ; for the Law of Charity and other general Precepts obliged Paul so to do, though it was a thing indifferent of it self*. The same we say as to their *Baptizing with Water* : The *Jews* having so great an Esteem of *Water-Baptism*, and thinking it necessary, the *Apostles* used it (although it was a Thing indifferent of it self after *Christ's* Ascension, and giving of the Holy Ghost) the Law of Charity, and other general Precepts obliging them : But this proveth not, That the *Apostles* had any Command from *Matt.* 28. or any such Command any where else, that made *Water-Baptism* of it self to be a Necessary Duty to the End of the World.

And whereas they query, *Will G. K. grant, that it was once lively ?* We answer, Yes, under *John* : Yet it followeth not, that it was to Continue ; because *John* had no Commission to the Nations, but only to the *Jews*. And that the *Apostles* Baptized whole Families and Thousands (if they so did) will not prove, that it was necessary of it self, more than that *Circumcision* was ; and yet even then many Thousands of Believing *Jews* were

were zealous for *Circumcision*, see *Acts* 21. 20, 21. 167. Yea, many *Bishops* of *Jerusalem* were Circumcised after this, as *Eusebius* relates. The Reason therefore was, That People were zealous of *Water-Baptism*, because of *John*, and therefore the Apostles condescended to it out of the Law of Charity.

A Condescension in the Apostles by Water-Baptism.

Another Question they make, *Where is Water-Baptism buried?* We answer; where the other Shadows are Buried: For it was but a *Shadow* and *Carnal Ordinance*, *Heb.* 9. 10. the *Greek Word* is βαπτισμῶν. Again: The true *Water-Baptism* hath been out of Use all the Time of the Apostacy; for the Apostate Church hath had no true Baptism; and so in that Respect it hath been Buried. And being but a Shadow, is not to be raised up again. And it is observable, That in the *Revelation*, where it is Prophefied of the Return and Restauration of the Church, there is not any thing mentioned of the Restoring either *Water-Baptism*, or the Use of *Bread* and *Wine*, as Signs &c.

And so their Second Reason is answered, That *Water-Baptism* is no more to be used out of Condescendency to the Weak, than *Circumcision*, because both are long ago buried: And what is buried, is *deadly* to be raised up again, as *Augustine* taught.

Their Third Reason is built on a Mistake, That *the Godhead of Christ, or Names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were a stumbling-block to the believing Jews*; For of these only we are to be understood. Also, That *the Apostles used the Words Father, Son and Holy Ghost, when they baptized*, cannot be proved; far less used they the Word *Trinity*, which was not invented long after the Apostles Days.

Their Second Argument, That the Baptism Commanded in *Matth.* 28. 19. is with *Water*, resolves

The Effect
ascribed un-
to the In-
strumental
Cause, which
is the Princi-
pal.

1676. selves at last into this, *That it is God only, and not Man, who baptizes with the Holy Ghost; because he is only the proper, immediate, efficient Cause of Baptism with the Holy Ghost*: But we deny the Consequence, as weak and false. For there is nothing more usual, than to ascribe the *Effect* unto the *Instrumental Cause*, as truly as unto the *Principal*. Paul was sent to turn or convert the *Gentiles* from *Darkness to Light*, and to *open their Eyes*; and yet God only was the proper and immediate *Efficient Cause* of this. Many more Examples could be given, yea, the same Reason of the Students would militate against *Teaching*: For even outward Teaching, which is by the Motion of the Holy Ghost, hath a Power and Virtue in it; whereof the Men who teach, are but the *Instrumental Conveyers*, that is only from God, as the *Immediate Efficient Cause*.

Another Reason they give to make all sure, as they say is, *That it is only Christ, as he is God, and mightier than John, who baptized with the Holy Ghost*, Matth. 3. 11. where *Baptism with the Holy Ghost* is peculiarly attributed to Christ. But this makes their Matter nothing more sure; for although that *Baptism with the Holy Ghost* be peculiarly attributed to Christ, as the principal Cause; yet it hindereth not, that Men are the *Instrumental*: Even as Christ said, *It is not ye that speak*; and yet they also spake, as *Instruments*. It is true, that *John* did not Baptize with the Holy Ghost, as the Apostles did (or rather Christ through them) because *John* had not so Powerful a Ministry given him, as the Apostles; of whom Christ said, that *they should not only do as great Works as he, but greater*, to wit, by his Power.

Again they argue, *That giving and not granting, that Baptism with the Holy Ghost could be administered*

ministred by Men, yet it is not Comanded here ; 1676.
for the Words then would be full of needless Tautologies. To this we answer ; That this doth not follow. For suppose, That by *Teaching* and *Baptizing* were meant one thing ; how usual is it in Scripture to express one thing under divers Names without any *Tautology* ? However we believe, That by *Teaching* and *Baptizing* are meant two several Things, both which require the *special Operation* of the Holy Spirit. For a Man through *Teaching* by the Concurrence of the Holy Ghost is first of all Convinced of the Truth, and hath a Ground laid in him to believe ; and then he is Baptized with the Holy Ghost, upon his *believing* and *obeying*, in what he is convinced of. Nor is this to confound the *Command* with the *Promise*, for the Sence of it is this ; *Go ye, and Baptize with the Holy Ghost (Instrumentally) and I shall be with you, as the Principal Cause to concur and assist you :* And thus there is no *Tautology*, the *Command* and the *Promise* being in *diverso genere*, id est, *in a different kind.*

Their next Argument to prove, That *Water-Baptism is to continue to the End of the World,* is, *That God sent John to baptize with Water ; and Christ caused John to baptize him, and commanded or caused his Apostles to baptize with Water ; and these Commands were never formally Repealed, nor ceased of their own Nature :* Therefore, &c.

But to this the Answer is easy. For *John's Baptism* was no Part of the Gospel-Dispensation, as serving only to prepare the Way to Christ ; and he was sent only to Baptize the *Jews*, that *Christ might be manifest to Israel,* *John 1. 31.* And it is called *John's Baptism*, in Distinction from that of Christ ; for some were baptized with it, who had not received the Holy Ghost. And that Christ was baptized with *Water*, proveth not its Continuance ; no more than that he

was

1676. was *Circumcised*, proveth the Continuance of *Circumcision*. That Christ Commanded his Disciples to baptize with *Water*, we find not; and though it were, it is but as at that Time, being under *John's Dispensation*. But unless they can prove, That Christ commanded to baptize all Nations with *Water*, and that to the End of the *World*, they gain nothing. For what was commanded only as toward the *Jews*, doth not reach us *Gentiles*; and so we need seek no Repeal, there not having been any such Command.

In their Answering our *Retortion*, as touching *Washing the Feet*, *Anointing the Sick with Oyl*, and *Abstaining from Blood and Things strangled*, They say, 1. *This Retortion hath a damnable Tendency, for Enthusiasts may arise and plead the same Way against the most necessary Truths, &c.* We answer; They have no Ground from our *Retortion* so to do; because these things above mentioned are but *Figures*, and such as have no Inward, or Intrinsic Goodness or Righteousness in them, as the other things have, which are most necessary. 2. Whereas they say, *If these things had been Commanded, and never Repealed, it were better to admit and observe them, than to reject Baptism, &c.* We answer, if by *Repeal* they mean a *formal Repeal*, we deny, that it were better; for all being but figurative Things, and such as the Inward Law of God writ in our Hearts (which is the *New Covenant Dispensation*) doth not require of us, they cease of their own Nature, and carry a *virtual Repeal* in their Bosom, although it be not formally expressed in the Scripture, as to every Particular. For all the Things of the Ceremonial Law are not one by one particularly *Repealed* in the New Testament; but together in one Body: For the Law it self being changed, the Things required by it (if

Washing of Feet and Anointing with Oil, &c. abolished.

The outward Law being changed.

(if they have no other Law to require them) do
 Cease. 3. They say, *That Christ in Washing his* 1676.
Disciples Feet, did two things. 1. *To seal up to*
his Disciples their Part in Him. 2. *He intended*
to leave them one Example of Humility; and it is
only this second thing, which he commanded to his
Disciples, to wit, that they should perform Acts of
Humility one to another. But we miss their Proof
 there altogether, that he only Commanded *this*,
 and not the *Washing one another's Feet* in parti-
 cular: yea, this Gloss expressly gives the 'Lye to
 Christ his own Words, *John 13. 14. Ye also ought*
to wash one another's Feet; where not only an
 Act of *Humility* is signified, but an Act of *Love*:
 And also by the outward Washing of the out-
 ward Feet is signified, how we ought to contri-
 bute to *wash one another's Feet* in a spiritual
 Sence, that is to say, by seasonable Reproofs and
 Exhortations to help on one another unto the
 Sanctification of the most inferior Affections,
 that are, as it were the *Feet*. And that Christ
 pointeth at such a Mystery, is clear from *ver. 10.*
He that is washed, needeth not, save to wash his
Feet.

A Spiritual
 Washing of
 Feet pointed
 at by Christ.

Again, they alledge, *That this Act is put Synec-
 dochically for all other Acts of Humility:* But ad-
 mit, that it be so; this proves not, that this
 particular Act was not Commanded, when Christ
 Instituted the Breaking of *Bread* at Supper: A-
 mong other Ends it had this also, to signify the
 Unity of Christians, and how they ought to
 love one another; shall we therefore say, it is
Synecdochically put for all Acts of *Love*, but is not
 particularly Commanded? And indeed, as *Wash-
 ing of Feet* was in Use in these hot Countries, be-
 fore that Christ did wash his Disciples Feet, and
 Commanded it to them; so was that in Use,
 the Chief in the Family to take Bread and break
 it, and give to every one, saying, *Take, eat:*
 This

1676. This was in Use among the *Jews* before Christ did so; as divers Historians relate, particularly *Paulus Riccius de Cælesti Agricultura*.

Again, whereas they say, *If he had commanded so, some would have observed it.*

To this we answer; *Some, yea, many* did observe it, as they grant *Ambrose* and the Church of *Millain* did: For if they used to do so in the Eastern Countries, where there was need for it, because the People ordinarily did go barefoot; the Christians in that Country would use it the rather, that Christ commanded it. Yea, it doth appear, that it was a most ordinary Thing in the Primitive Times, from *Paul's* Words *1 Tim. 5.*

Washing of Feet observed by Christians in the primitive Times.

10. where it is numbred among other Commanded Duties; *If she hath washed the Saints Feet.* If it be said, *That they used it, but not as a Sacrament:* We answer; We read not of the Word *Sacrament* in the Scripture; it is enough, that they used it, and were Commanded so to do by Christ: And it had a Spiritual Signification, as well as those Things they call *Sacraments*. It is needless for us to insist more on this Particular, so as to refute Arguments of their own making, which are none of ours, wherein they fight with their own Shadow; where we leave them, and proceed to the other Particulars.

They tell us, *That the Command to Anoint the Sick with Oyl carries a Repeal in its Bosom;* so, we say, doth *John's* Baptism with *Water*, as preparing the Way to Christ; who is now come. And so we may return them their Axiom, *Cessante sine Legis, cessat & Obligatio.* But that *Anointing with Oyl* was only in order to Miraculous Cures, they say it, without giving any Proof, *Jam. 5. 14.* For although it were confessed, that it were in Order to Outward Healing or Curing; yet it is clear from the Text, that it was not Exclusive of all other Things:

For

For it is not only promised, That *he shall be saved*; but if *he have committed Sins, they shall be forgiven him*. And this *saving* seems rather to be Spiritual, than the Restoring the Body to Natural Health; otherwise it being absolutely promised, all sick Persons in the Church should have been always restored to Natural Health, and so none should have died. 1676.

And we find *Anointing with Oyl* joined with *Prayer*, yea, *We are bidden, pray one for another, that we may be healed*. Nor is this ceased; but that by the Prayers of the Godly for one that is sick, and bodily diseased, it pleaseth God at Times so to answer them, that they are restored to Health by the Lord: And we dare our Adversaries, if they will deny this altogether; and this is in a true Sence *Miraculous*. Yea, Instances of this kind have been even among the People called *Quakers*: And if it were altogether ceased, according to the Students Argument; *Prayer* (at least, so as to pray to God to heal any sick Person) should cease also: It is better therefore to say, *That Anointing with Oyl is ceased, as being but a Figure*.

Their *Repeal of the Command to abstain from Blood and things strangled*, is not sufficiently proved from 1 Cor. 10. 25. For let any read the whole Chapter, and he shall find nothing said in it of *Blood* or *Things strangled*. That was not the Subject, he was upon; but *Things offered to Idols*, which we read not, that they used to strangle. The Sence is plain, *Whatsoever is sold in the Shambles*, (whether offered to Idols, or not) *that eat*; asking no *Question*, if it be offered to an Idol, or not. Beside, it is not usual to sell *Flesh of Beasts strangled*, in the Shambles; for they kill them otherwise, than by *strangling*, which is hurtful to the Meat: And if selling of *strangled Flesh* had been usual, it would have

Abstaining from *Blood* and *Things strangled*, the Ceremonial Law, ceased.

1676. been no Transgressing the Apostle's Rule, if they had any Doubt, to have asked, *If it was strangled*: For many will not eat Flesh, that is strangled, because it is not so good Nourishment; although they have no Scruple of Conscience. Yea, the Primitive Christians even in *Tertullian's* Time, (as he sheweth in his Apology) *Abstained from Blood and things strangled*; wherein there was a great Providence of God to clear them of that horrid Falshood, as if they did *drink the Blood of Children*. By which it is clear, they did not understand *Paul's* Words, 1 Cor. 10. 25. to be any Repeal. It is therefore more safe to say, that it being a *Part of the Ceremonial Law*, it is *repealed with the other Figures*.

The Decrease of *John's* and Increase of *Christ's* Baptism.

The Words of *John*, *He must increase, but I must decrease*, Joh. 3. 10. they will not have to be understood of *John's Baptism*; wherein they are not only contrary to many of their own Church, (as could be shewn) but also to the Scripture it self. For it is most clear, That *John* spake this with a particular Relation to his Baptism: When they came to him, and told him, *That Christ Baptized*, &c. On this he said, *That Christ was to increase*, meaning *Christ's Baptism*, not with *Water*, but with the *Holy Ghost* (for *Christ baptized none with Water himself*) and he, that is, *his Baptism must Decrease*, not his true Honour and Virtue: And the Disciples he gathered, was unto *Christ*. But that *John's Baptism* was much practised, proveth it no more a standing Command, than other Things of the Law.

Peter's Commanding *Cornelius* (and them) to be Baptized, answered.

In the last Place they alledge, *That Peter commanded Cornelius and others with him to be baptized, out of a necessity arising from a Divine Precept*: But their Proofs are weak. For 1. We ought to do all things in the Name of the Lord, when we eat, or drink, or journey: But yet all things

things are not commanded; but some left to our Freedom. 2. Peter in his Sermon told *Cornelius* nothing of *Water-Baptism*; and when after he spoke of it, he did not tell him, That he ought to do it out of a *Necessity arising from a Divine Precept*: let them prove it, if they can. 1676.

3. Whereas they alledge, That Peter was accused by the Disciples for Administring *Water-Baptism* to *Cornelius*, from *Acts II.* It is a manifest Untruth: for there is no such Thing, either in their Accusation, or his Answer, as may be seen, if any will read the Chapter. They accused him for going in to them, and eating with them; and this was all the Accusation: And though they had, the Students Consequence doth not follow; for if the Law of Charity obliged him to Baptize them, his Refusal would have been a withstanding of God.

SECTION VII.

Of the MINISTRY.

Being an Answer to their Fifth Section, concerning the MINISTRY.

IN the first Part of their Section they plead, That a Man who is an *Hypocrite and Graceless*, may be a true and lawful Pastor; yet they grant, That none ought to be admitted into the Ministry; but such as *ex Judicio Charitatis, id est*, out of the Judgment of Charity is to be esteemed truly pious. By which Acknowledgment they destroy with their own Hands any seeming Strength, that lies in their own Arguments, as will appear by a particular Examination of them. Their First Reason is taken from *Many Jewish Priests and High-Priests, and many Scribes and Pharisees in Christ's Time, who were Ministers of God's* Word;

1676. *Word; and yet who will say, they were endued with sanctifying Grace? To which we answer; That they were Ministers of God's Word, or of the Gospel, is denied; for they were but Ministers of the Law, and Legal Performances, Types, Figures and Shadows: And as that Legal Dispensation was but Imperfect in Respect of the Gospel, so the Priesthood and Ministry of it; therefore both were to pass away.*

Ministers of the Gospel, and of the Law and Shadows differ.

So that to argue from the Law to the Gospel, is not equal, more than to argue, That because the *Ministers* of the Law were *Ministers* of the Figures and Types, that therefore the *Ministers* of the Gospel should be the same; yea, we may draw an Argument from the Outward and Legal Qualifications of the Priests, that none but *truly Holy* should, or ought to be Ministers under the Gospel. For as under the Law none were to be *Priests*, but those, who came of *Levi*, a *Figure of Christ*; so under the Gospel none are to be *Ministers*, but who by a Spiritual Birth and Nativity are of *Christ*. And as under the Law, none that were *Lame and Blind Corporally*, were to be *Legal Ministers*; so under the Gospel, none that are *Lame and Blind Spiritually*, are to be *Gospel Ministers*. But all, that *want true Holiness*, are lame and blind *Spiritually*; Therefore, &c.

Levi a Figure of Christ.

The Lame and Blind no Legal Ministers.

Again; Many of these *Jewish Priests, Scribes and Pharisees* were openly and manifestly *Impious*, especially in the Time of Christ his being in the *Flesh*, and could not be esteemed *truly Pious* in the *Judgment of Charity*; and so if the Argument hold, it proves, that Men may be admitted and owned to be Ministers of the Gospel, that are not Pious in the *Judgment of Charity*.

The Students plead for a Graceless Ministry.

The like may be said of *Judas*, whom they take in their Second Argument to Patronize a *Graceless Ministry*. For if *Judas* was a *Devil from the Beginning*, certainly, Christ did know him

him to be so; and therefore could not in the *Judgment of Charity* esteem him to be truly *Pious*: How could he then admit him? But as for *Judas*, they alledge indeed, That *he was a Devil from the Beginning*; but they have not proved it. It is said expressly of him, That *he fell from his Ministry by Transgression*; we read not, that he was degraded his Office any other way, but simply by his Transgression, which was his *Betraying Christ*. Again, it is written of him, *Let his Habitation be desolate, and let no Man dwell therein; and his Bishoprick let another take.* Psal. 109. But they, who plead for a *Graceless Minister*, would put another in *Judas' Habitation*, and so would hold up a Ministry of Covetous Men, as he was, who to satisfy their Covetousness, will *betray Christ*. For suppose, that a Man have all other Qualifications requisite, and yet be openly and notoriously a *Wicked Man*, he may plead his Right to be admitted; and if admitted, to be Continued to be a *Minister*: What Ground have his *Brethren* out of Scripture to depose him, according to the Students Argument (which is indeed the *General Argument* of the *Clergy* (as they are called) seeing he hath all the Essentials of a *Minister*? If they say, *Paul requireth, That a Bishop or Deacon be found blameless, not covetous, but vigilant, sober, &c.* then it will follow as much, that he, that is not *really Pious*, ought not to be admitted; as he, that is not *seemingly Pious*: For the Apostle doth not say, he must be *seemingly* so; but simply, that he *must be so*. And indeed, to expound all these Qualifications of a *seeming*, and no *real Holiness*, is to mock the Scripture: For they might as well say, That *seeming Holiness only, and not real, is required indispensably of us in Order to Salvation*; for the Scripture as positively *requireth*

Holiness
requisite in
a Preacher.

1676. *Holiness* unto the Function of a Bishop, as it doth require it unto Salvation.

There is yet another thing, which they have to prove concerning *Judas*, viz. That *Christ* sent him to preach the Gospel. He sent him indeed to work Miracles, heal the Sick, and to say, *The Kingdom of God is at hand*, that is to say, *the Gospel Dispensation is approaching*; but that *Judas* was a Minister of the Gospel, which is the Power of God unto Salvation, we require them to prove: For it was after his Removal, that *Christ* sent the Apostles to Preach the Gospel.

Their Third Reason is, That *the Efficacy of the Words depends not upon the Worthiness of the Preachers*, 1 Cor. 3. 7. We grant the Antecedent, but deny the Consequence. For although it depend not upon the Worthiness of the Preacher, yet it may and doth require *Holiness*, as a Qualification indispensably necessary in him; even as they grant themselves, that *none are justified without Faith*; yet they deny, that the *Efficacy* of Justification depends upon the *Worthiness* of him that believeth. And the *Efficacy of good Wine* depends not upon the *Worthiness* of the Vessel that bears it; yet none will put good Wine in a leaky Vessel, or unfit: And indeed, as unfit as a leaky, unclean Vessel is to receive good Wine; a *Graceless Man* is as unfit to receive the Dispensation of the Gospel, which is compared to *New Wine* in the Scripture. And, said Christ, *No Man putteth New Wine into Old Bottles*: for indeed the Ministration of the Gospel is a Ministration of Life and Grace, and none can Minister that, which they have not.

Their Fourth Argument depends upon a Proposition, which they lay down, and offer to prove, but fall short in, viz. That *they cannot know, who have true Grace*. This we deny. For if they would believe in the *Light*, wherewith Christ

The Efficacy of the Word preached.

Christ hath enlightned them, they should receive 1676.
 the Anointing; and by it their Eyes should be opened to know, who are *Gracious*, and who not.

But let us see, how they prove it. 1. Say they, *We cannot know it immediately*: That is granted. 2. *Nor can we know it by their Outward Works, unless it be out of the Judgment of Charity, which may deceive us; for all the Works which a Godly Man can do, may likewise be performed, as to the outward, by Hypocrites,*

To this we answer; If by *Outward Works* they mean such, as come under the outward Observation of the meer outward and bodily Senses, we grant; but there are Works, which are the Fruits of the Spirit, which, although they remain in the Souls of Holy Men, yet send forth a Savour of that Life and Spirit, or Spiritual Principle, that is the Root of them, through the Outward Works and Conversation, which can and do reach unto the Spiritual Senses of others, where they are. And this Savour and Manifestation of Life can no Hypocrite have; but it is an Infallible Evidence of Sanctification in Measure, where it is; and where the Sanctification is greatest, the Savour or Manifestation of Life is there greatest also. According unto this Paul said, *We are a good Savour*, &c. and Paul said of the *Corinthians*, That *they were the Epistle of Christ*: John said of the Saints, That *the Name of God, and of the Lamb shall be in their Foreheads*.

The Fruits of the Spirit are a Savour of Life, which Hypocrites have not.

2 Cor. 2.
15, 16.
C. 3. 3.

Many other Testimonies could be brought to prove this; we shall only add that of Christ, *He that believeth in me, out of his Belly shall flow Rivers of Living Water*. So here is an Evidence that no Hypocrite can have. Now what are these *Rivers*, but the Influences of the Spirit? And seeing, they are said to *flow out*, they may

1676. be discerned by others. It is true, the *Natural Senses* cannot discern them; but the *Spiritual Senses* can. And seeing, the Students grant *Spiritual Senses*, if they grant them to be True and Real, they must grant also *Spiritual Sensible Objects*, which may be as certainly apprehended and discerned by our *Spiritual Senses*, although the Objects themselves be without us, as Natural Objects without us may be apprehended by the Natural Senses.

Natural and Spiritual Senses discerning their proper Objects.


3. *Nor can we know it, say they, by Revelation.* But how prove they it? They only suppose they have proved already, that there is no such thing; but how weak and impertinent their Proofs are, is above shewed. But here note, that by *Revelation* is sufficiently understood the Revelation or Discovery, which the Fruits of the Spirit, or Spiritual Life give forth in Holy Men one to another: for as the Savour of some sweet Oyntment is a sufficient Revelation of it to the Sense of the Natural Smell, so the Spiritual Savour of the Spiritual Oyntment is such to the Spiritual Smell.

Lastly, Whereas they say, *The Gift of Discerning Spirits was never common to all.* This we deny, nor doth that Scripture cited by them prove it, 1 Cor. 12. 10. Otherwise they might as well say, *That Faith was not common to all True Christians*, because it is said, *To another, Faith.* But as by [*Faith*] here must be understood some Extraordinary Degree of *Faith*, or the *Faith of Miracles*; so the *Discerning* must be some Extraordinary Degree, or as in Relation to Miracles; seeing, there were *Spirits of Devils* that wrought false Miracles. And such a *Discerning* as to that, we do not plead for, as *Common to all*; but that a *Discerning of Spirits*, so far as to discern betwixt them, who were Godly and Wicked, and who were Ministers of the Spirit, and who not,

The Discerning of Spirits is common to all True Christians.

was

was *Common to all*, we prove. Because it is promised as a *General Priviledge*, Mal. 3. 18. *Then shall ye return, and Discern between the Righteous and the Wicked, &c.* Again, all are commanded *To try the Spirits*, 1 John 4. 1. Therefore all have a Measure of *Discerning*, whereby to try them; otherwise they were required to do an Impossible Thing, which is absurd. If it be said, *He giveth a Rule whereby to try them, viz. Every Spirit, that confesseth, that Jesus Christ is come in the Flesh, is of God*, ver. 2. To this we answer. The *Rule* is one thing, the *Discerning* is another; and differ, as the *Object* and the *Eye*. Now, the *Eye* is as much required to see, as the *Object*; Therefore all need a *Spiritual Eye*, to apply the *Rule* in a suitable Manner, so as to know, who do *truly confess Christ come in the Flesh*. For *John* cannot mean a bare *Verbal Confession*, because *Antichrist* himself may have that: Therefore he meaneth a *True Living Confession* in *Life and Power*, which no *Hypocrite* can have.

1676.

 The Spiritual Eye sees and discerns the true Confessor from the false.

Having thus answered all their Arguments, we shall conclude this Particular with one Argument against them; one Part of which is their own Confession.

They who can be certainly *known* and *discerned* to be *Impious* and *Unholy*, ought not to be admitted into the Ministry:

But *Impious* and *Unholy Men* can be certainly known to be *Impious* and *Unholy*:

Therefore they ought not, &c.

The first Proposition is proved, and sufficiently confirmed from their own Confession, That *None ought to be Admitted, but who in the Judgment of Charity are to be esteemed truly Pious*: There-

1676. Therefore they, who cannot be so esteemed, ought not to be admitted. But if they be certainly known to be Impious, they cannot be so esteemed; Therefore, &c. The Assumption is proved above, partly by Arguments, and partly by the Refutation of what they have said against it.

Divine In-
spiration.

In the Second Part they Dispute against an *Immediate, Enthusiastick Call* (as they call it) by way of *Inspiration*, being necessary, and for the Necessity of a *Mediate and Outward Call*. And because we plead for the *Blessed Inspiration of the Spirit of God*, they call us *Enthusiastical Impostors*, and if the Apostles themselves and primitive Christians were now living, they would give them the same Name: For we plead for no other *Inspiration*, but that which was given unto those Holy Men.

(Enthusiasm
its proper
Significati-
on.)

But seeing, they use the Word *Enthusiasm* so much in a Way of *Reproach*, it is fit, that it be opened. Let them tell us then, if they mean any other thing by it, than *True Divine Inspiration*? If they mean another, it concerns us not, for we plead for no other. But if they mean that (as the Word properly signifies, being derived from a Word, that signifies, *God within*, as the best *Greek Dictionaries* shew) they should not *Reproach* us with that, which was the *Glory of the Primitive Christians*, and by which the Scriptures were writ, to wit, *Divine Inspiration*. And here they tell us of an *Inward Call*, which consists in the *Disposition of the Soul*; but they will not have it to be an *Inspiration*: But if by this *Disposition* they mean any *Spiritual or Supernatural Gift*, they must needs acknowledge, that it is an *Inspiration*, at least in the *general Sence*. For how can it be *Spiritual*, unless it be *Inspired*? Is not every good Thing, that is *Spiritually Good*, from the Spirit? Surely the *National Confession of Faith* published in *Knox's Time*,

Time, doth expressly say, That *Faith is the Inspiration of God*. But if they say, they deny not *Subjective*, but *Objective Inspiration*, we put them to prove this unnatural Division and Separation: As if there were Inspiration in Men's Souls, that is not *Objective*; which we altogether deny.

But as to this *Inward Call*, we ask them, If it hath not in it the Nature of a *Command*, so that he, who hath it, is bound to obey it? If they say not, then a Man may lawfully disobey it, and resist it, although it be of God: If they say *It is a Command*, then it is *Objective*: for it is the Nature of all real and true Commands to be *Objective*.

The Call of Ministers.

Again; If by *Disposition* they mean the meer *Qualification*, that enables a Man to be a *Preacher*, how can that be a *Call*? Seeing a Man may be fit or able for an Office, that hath not a *Call* thereunto, being already in another Office, that he is fit for also. So that they bewray gross Ignorance, in confounding the *Ability* and the *Call*, which are distinct things. And here they require of us to prove our *Immediate Call* by Miracles, or any extraordinary thing, which can only be from God; and so cannot agree to *false Teachers*. And it having been told them by *R. B.* that the *Papists* made the same Objection against the *first Reformers*, they call this an *Impertinent Prating*; but for all the Disparity they shew, the *Impertinent Prating* falls upon themselves. They confess, The *first Reformers* had an extraordinary *Call in Respect of their Heroick Gifts*; yet they also had a *Mediate Call*: They owned the *Holy Scriptures* for their principal Rule, and Preached no other Gospel, &c. To this we answer, that all of them had a *Mediate Call*, is a meer Alledgance without any Proof; yea, the History of the Reformation sheweth the contrary.

First Reformer's Call.

Again,

1676. Again, it is abundantly evident out of their own Writings, that the most Eminent of them did lay no Weight upon that *Outward Call*, which some of them had from the *Popish Church*; but did plead, that seeing the *Visible Succession* of the Church and Ministry was interrupted by the *Apostacy*, that they needed no *Outward Call*, but did betake themselves to the *Extraordinary*.

Sadeel de Voc. Min. See for this *Sadeel de Legit. Vocatione Ministrorum*; and when they used any Argument of a *Mediate Call*, it was but by way of *Arg. ad Hominem*: As now, if any of us called *Quakers* had ever had the *Mediate Call* from the *National Churches*, as some in *England* indeed had, namely *S. F.* who was a *Parish Priest*. Nor will it prove, that the *first Reformers* had an *Extraordinary Call*, because they owned the *Scriptures* as their principal Rule, and preached no other Gospel; otherwise all the *National Preachers* now would have an *Extraordinary Call*, because they pretend to own the *Scriptures* as their principal Rule, and to preach no other Gospel. Yea, we own the *Scriptures* as much as the *first Reformers* did; and we do acknowledge them, that they are the *Principal External Rule*, and to be preferred to all other outward Writings and Testimonies; but we cannot prefer them to the *Inward Testimony* and *Word of God* in our Hearts, as neither did the most Eminent of these, called *Reformers*; but indeed preferred the *Inward Testimony* and *Word* to the *Outward*: As is proved in the Book called *Quakerism no Popery*.

The Scriptures an External Rule.

Now, whatever Proof or Evidence the *first Reformers* could give of their *Extraordinary Call*, the *Quakers* can give the same. That which they mainly insisted on, was the Soundness of their Doctrine, accompanied with the Holiness of their Life, and good Effect of their Ministry, whereby Souls were converted unto God, as *Sadeel*

deal in the Treatise above-mentioned *De Legit.* 1676. *Voc. Min.* sheweth at length. And let our Adversaries disprove this Evidence, if they can; which we say, is as good an Evidence to us, as it was to them: And though false Teachers may pretend unto the same, yet it can be proved, that it doth not justly belong unto them. As for *Popery* and *Mahometanism*, it can be proved, that they are contrary to Scripture; but our Adversaries have not proved, nor can, that our Doctrine is so; and we are most willing to bring the Matter to this Issue; we doubt not, but to give better and stronger Evidences from Scripture and Reason to Convince Gainsayers in a Rational Way, than our Adversaries can. But that we make the Efficacy of our Doctrine (taken precisely by it self, and without being accompanied with the Soundness of it, &c.) an Evidence of our Call, is a meer Calumny of the Students.

Popery and Mahometanism not ours.

Now let us see, what they have to say for *Their Outward and Mediate Call.* They cite divers Scriptures to prove, that the *Apostles Ordained Elders*; but doth this prove, that their *Ordination*, which they derive from the Apostate Church of *Rome*, is a *true Ordination* and necessary? Yea, it is clear, and confessed by the most Judicious *Protestants*, that true and lawful Ordination and Succession hath not continued in the Church since the Apostles Days; but hath suffered an Interruption by the general Apostacy, that as a Flood overflowed the Earth. And that although God still *preserved a Church*, yet she had not a *Visible Outward Succession*; because she was not visible all along her self: And before our *Adversaries* can make the Half of their Argument good, they must prove, that not only a *True Church* hath continued ever since the Apostles Days, but that she hath been *Visible*, having a *True Visible Succession of Visible Teachers*, who were

The Students derive their mediate Call and Ordination from Rome.

1674. were good and faithful Men all along to convey it down to this Day. But to infer, that *Ordination* hath continued, because of the *Command*, (if the *Command* hath been *Universal*) doth not follow; seeing many things commanded may be *Unpractised* through *Unfaithfulness* to the *Command*. Now it is certain, that generally the *Visibly Ordained Bishops* have not been faithful Men for many Hundred Years, and so kept not to the Substance of that *True Ordination* that was in the *Apostles Times*; but lost it through *Unfaithfulness*, and set up a *Shadow* in its Room: The like may be said of other Things. And the *Ordination* being once lost, it cannot be *recovered* again from a meer *Scripture-Command*; otherwise all may pretend to a *Power to Ordain*: For the *Scripture* doth not command one more than another. Yea, we find no general *Command* in *Scripture* for *Ordination*, only that it was *practised*, which we deny not; and with it there was a *Spiritual Gift* of the *Holy Ghost* conveyed: Which was the main and only Thing, that made the *Ordination* and *Laying on of Hands* effectual, and without which it is but a *Shadow*. As may be seen at this Day in the *National Church*: for who among them dare say, that they either *Give* or *Receive* that *Spiritual Gift* of the *Holy Ghost*, which was then *Given* and *Received* therewith? 1 *Tim.* 4. 14.

Ordination
and laying
on of Hands.

Their Second Argument is from *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. whereby they would infer, That *Laying on of Hands* is a Part of the *Foundation of Christianity*; but that *Scripture* saith no such thing. For the *Doctrine of Baptisms*, and *Laying on of Hands* relates to the third Ver. as a thing that the *Apostle* intended to open; And this (said he) will we do, if *God permit*; whereas he had laid the *Foundation* already: Therefore the *Doctrine of the Laying on of Hands* belongs not to the *Foundation*; but

but to the Superstructure. But however it doth 1676.
 not follow, that *Laying on of Hands* it self is a Thing to continue: For he speaks of it but as of a Doctrine, as that of *Baptisms*, which we confess doth continue; as the *Doctrine* of the *Figures, Types, Ceremonies* and *Sacrifices* doth continue to this Day: And the Apostle opened them largely in that Epistle; yet the *Figures* themselves were not to continue. Besides, how do they prove, that this *Laying on of Hands* is *Ordination*, and not that used in *Confirmation*? Here they miserably stick; only they alledge, it is *ceased among many, and is not so necessary*: But how prove they, that it is not so *necessary*? Shew us, where it is repealed more than the other; seeing, it was as generally practised, yea, and more; for many received it, that were not *Preachers* nor *Elders*?

In the last Place they plead, *That Preachers should have a Maintenance*; which we deny not, if they need it: But may not Men be *Preachers*, who need no Supply from others? But many have, wherewith to be Hospitable unto others, without taking, far less forcing others to give them.

The Maintenance then, that we are against, is, 1. A *Superfluous* and *Unnecessary Maintenance*. 2. A *forced Maintenance*. 3. Such a *Maintenance* as *Preachers* Agree with and Contract for. 4. A *Taking it from them, who are not worthy*. 5. A *Taking it from them, who do not acknowledge them to be true Preachers*. Now, none of all the *Scriptures* or *Reasons* brought by them prove any such Maintenance; nor do we read, that ever the Apostles received it; or that they received any *Tythes*, which was the Maintenance of the Law, and not of the Gospel. And that the People ought to contract with *Preachers*, will not follow, *because they are bound in Charity to supply their*

The Preachers
 Maintenance.

1676. *their Wants.* For we are bound in Charity to supply the Wants of the Poor, according to our Ability; yet it doth not follow, that we are to contract with them, or that they can force it from us.

Freely Give. As for the Words of Christ, *Freely Give:* As they import, that they were not to make Sale of the Gospel; so also, that they were not to force or compel Men to give them any thing, as a Recompence for Preaching the same. For how can we give freely that, which we force others to Recompence us for? And here they cry out upon the *Quakers*, as a *Sacraligious Crew*, for denying such unlawful Maintenance, as the Priests generally have. It seems, the Young Men are greatly concerned, they love so well the *Wages of Unrighteousness*; for against no other Thing do we contend.

Again, they alledge, That we bely them, in saying, *They think, that the Preaching of the Gospel can be sold for any Earthly Wages.* The Reason they give is weak: For although there is a vast Disproportion and Inequality in Worth betwixt the same, yet a Thing may be sold for less than the Worth of it; yea, when the Worth is infinitely greater. For did not *Judas* sell Christ for *Thirty Pieces of Silver*? And do not they plead, That Greedy and Covetous Men ought to be received and paid, until divested? And are not such guilty of *Simony*, and *Selling of Preaching*? Which they confess themselves: Therefore the *Quakers* in this do not belye them. Yea, do they not well know, that it is a most ordinary thing in Young Men, (and it is well, if some of these be not guilty of the same) to go unto *Patrons*, and offer them Money for Presentations unto Parish-Churches? Than which we know no greater *Simony* used in the Church of *Rome*? And as for the *Hospitality of Preachers*, it

Priests sell the Gospel.

Judas-like.

Guilty of Simony.

it is also required in Deacons, and all good Christians; will it therefore follow, that all good Christians must have set *Stipends*? Or if Christians are to work with their Hands, that they may have wherewith to be Hospitable; why may not Preachers also? They cite *Paul*, telling, *That he had Power to forbear working*: But they know, *That Paul* was an Apostle, and claimed that Power not as an *ordinary Preacher*, but as an Apostle, like unto the other Apostles: Mark these Words. For as touching the Apostles, they had that Power, because of a *more universal Charge* incumbent upon them, than *ordinary Pastors*; so that they could not so attend to *work with their Hands*, as others could: And yet even *Paul* wrought with his Hands, which is more than any of the National Teachers will do, to spare the Receiving from them, who are not able. And it is to be observed, how the National Teachers plead stoutly for their forbearing of Working, from the Power of the Apostles; but when we tell them, *That the Apostles travelled from one Nation to another, and took great Pains to plant the Gospel in many Places, and hazzarded their Lives to Preach it among the Heathens*; they answer, *That is not required of them*. So they would take the Apostles to patronize them in forbearing Working, and taking Maintenance; but not in being at such Pains and Jeopardies for the Gospel's sake, as the Apostles, which is not equal. Also when we tell them, *The Apostles preached by Inspiration, and had an Immediate Call from Heaven*; they tell us, *that is ceased now*: But why tell they not, that the Power to forbear working is ceased also? Surely, the Continuing of Inspirations, and Immediate Calls to the Ministry seemeth a more needful thing than their *Stipends*.

1676.

Paul
wrought
with his
Hands.

1676.

SECTION VIII.

Of Liberty of CONSCIENCE.

Wherein the Students Sixth Section concerning the Civil Magistrate his Power in Punishing of Hereticks, and also what they say in their Eighth Section concerning the Tendency of Quakerism to Anarchy and Treason, and Denying the Necessity of Christianity, is Considered and Answered.

*Persecution
the Students
last Refuge.*

After that the Students have laboured what they can to overturn the *Quakers*, they betake them to *PERSECUTION*, as their last Refuge; thinking, if they can but prevail here, and get the Magistrates to cut off the *Quakers*, as *Blasphemers* and *Traytors* (for such they have designed them in their Title-Page) they will be eased of the troublesome Task of Disputing any more with them.

And here, not to be unlike themselves, they begin with a Lye, saying, [*They had a Dispute concerning this with the Quakers, the first of June, 1675.*] Whereas one of them (to wit, *J. L.*) was not present; and the other two proposed not one Argument in that Matter: But what was spoken was by another; who being earnestly desired by them to concur in the Account of it with them, utterly refused; as judging, neither he nor they could give a true Account of it, and absolutely discharging to meddle with that in their Book. Which yet they are not ashamed falsely to ascribe to themselves, which that young Man upon sight of their Book from one of us, declared to be a Lye; asserting, what is above written in this Matter, before several Witnesses of their own Profession; particularly *P. D.* one of the Students

The Students declared Liars in their Account of the Dispute.

dents Atteftators. And therefore ſince he judg-
eth himſelf, (as he declared) abuſed in this Affair
by them, as well as we, we ſhall not take notice
of what paſſed at that Time betwixt him and us,
((it being alſo his Deſire;) but betake our ſelves
to this Theam, as it is now propoſed and urged
by the Students: Wherein how miſerably they
are pained, the very ſtating of the Controver-
ſy ſhews, in which they have given away their
Cauſe.

1676.

1. They ſay, *They ſpeak only of Real Hereſies, and not what others call ſo.*
2. They ſay, *They ſpeak not of Inward Aſts and meer Exercifes of the Mind, becauſe it belongs neither to Church, nor Magiſtrate, To judge of hidden Things.*

To which we anſwer. That ſince the Students
acknowledge, that both their Church and Magi-
ſtrate are liable to *Error*, yea, and that neither
of them is to be ſuppoſed *Infallible*, and there-
fore cannot certainly and infallibly diſcern,
what is *Hereſy*; neither ought they to take up-
on them to puniſh for *Hereſy*. And that *de facto*
Proteſtant Churches have thus *Erred*, their Maſter,
John Menzies and many of his Brethren can bear
Witness; who have cried out againſt that for *Er-
ror, Antichriſtianity* and *Hereſy*, (cauſing Men to
be grievouſly perſecuted for it) which now they
allow, as *Chriſtian* and *Orthodox*. But we ſhall
improve this more hereafter, and now proceed to
their Arguments.

Their
Church and
Magiſtrate
cannot Infal-
libly diſcern
Hereſy (they
ſay) then
ought not to
judge it.

1. They argue from *Deut. 13. 5. Exod, 22. 20. Levit. 22.* but the Queſtion is, *Whether theſe Commands, given particularly to the Jews, belong to us?* (for that of *Levit. 22.* is only concerning the *Prieſts* and *Levites* touching the Holy Things, with their Uncleanneſs upon them; and is wholly

1676. Impertinent to this Purpose.) For if these be Obligatory upon us; so will also many other: As, that a Man may immediately with his own Hand kill him, that has killed his Kinsman, unless he get to the City of Refuge; seeing there is no particular Repeal of that, more than of the former. Yea, and that of *Deut. 5. 9.* saith expressly, That the Brother, Husband or Father of him, that consenteth to serve other Gods, shall kill him with his own Hand; which our Adversaries will not deny to be Murther. And let them shew us, where the one Part of this Command is repealed, more than the other? Or how the one Part is lawful for us, and the other unlawful, seeing both were Commanded and Lawful to the Jews? For their meer Assertions as to this (*pag. 126.*) are not to be regarded.

Particular
Commands
given to the
Jews, whe-
ther now
Obligatory
upon us.

They are offended, that *Matth. 5. 29.* should be given for a Repeal of this; alledging, That belongeth only to private Persons, and not to Magistrates; else it should be unlawful for Magistrates to punish Transgressors, &c.

Ans. The Consequence will not hold. For we are not speaking of things Civil, but of things Religious; though it may be lawful for them to Resist Evil in the one, yet not in the other. But that Christian Magistrates are here included, is easily proved. If this belong to all Christians, then it belongeth to all Magistrates, if they be Christians: for to say, that a Christian, by becoming a Magistrate, is dispensed of these Obligations he is particularly tyed to, as a Christian, is most absurd: Yea, if Christian Magistrates be bound to suffer for Righteousness sake, then they are not to resist Evil in Matters of Religion: But the first is true; for how could they enjoy the Blessing of those that suffer for Righteousness sake (*Matth. 5. 10, 11.*) if they still resisted? At this Rate none should suffer for Christ, who could by

A Suffering
for Righte-
ousness in
Magistrates.

by any Means shun it by killing those that make them suffer; and who would then be those that *Suffer willingly*? And it seems, according to the Students, if a Man be a Magistrate, he ought not any more to suffer for Christ; which is as much as to say, That so soon as a Man becomes a Magistrate, he ceases to be a Christian. 1676.

The great Noise they make of the *Two Dispensations of the Gospel*, mentioned by G. K. doth but manifest their own Weakness and Folly. For themselves will not deny, but that *where-ever Faith in Jesus Christ is professed, and he owned as the Saviour and Son of God, there is a Dispensation of the Gospel; as in the Greek, Armenian, Ethiopian, yea (and in their Account) in the Romish Church also*: Yet will they not deny, but that *that Dispensation is more Legal and Obscure, than that themselves are under; as having many Ceremonies and Shadows not necessary*. And so here is a *Twofold Dispensation* acknowledged by themselves; seeing, they will not affirm, that the Use of all these Ceremonies is absolutely sinful in these Churches, who are not as yet convinced of it, though it should be unlawful for them to use them. And seeing, the purest and most Excellent Dispensation of the Gospel is to be like unto Christ, who *Resisted not Evil*, though he was powerful to do it; and that we are bound to be like Him, then there is a Dispensation of the Gospel, in which *Evil is not to be resisted*. But further, if there be such a Dispensation of the Gospel, as *Men shall beat their Swords into Plough-Shears, and their Spears into Pruning-hooks, and not learn War any more*; then there is a Dispensation, in which *Evil shall not be Resisted*. The Consequence cannot be denied; the Antecedent is the express Words of the Prophet *Isaiah 2. 4.*

Besides, this *Twofold Dispensation* is proved out of *Bishop Forbes of Aberdeen* his Exposition upon

1676. the Revelations, where he affirms, *That the two last Chapters of the Revelation are understood of a Church upon Earth*; in which Church it cannot be supposed, that Evil should be resisted by an Outward Sword.

Magistrates
are not to
bear the
Sword in
vain.

Pag. 121. They argue from *Rom. 13.* where *the Magistrate is not to bear the Sword in vain*; Hence they conclude, *They ought to resist Evil*: But this saith nothing as to Matters of Religion. They shew as well their Malice as Disingenuity here, insinuating, we *denied that Place to belong to Magistrates now*, which we never did, nor do: Only G. K. said, *He would be glad to hear, how they could prove, that it did belong to Magistrates now?* And indeed, were we not otherwise perswaded of it, their Arguments could not in Reason convince us, which is, *That the Scripture is written for our Cause*; and *these Epistles are to be received and obeyed by us*. But they have overturned all these themselves (as is above observed) where in their Answer to the Apostle's Rules about *Women's Praying and Propheying with their Head covered*, they suppose Rules given by the Apostle in his Epistles of Things, that not only are not pertaining to us, but even unlawful. And so unless they make us a clear Distinction of these Rules, and that by some evident Demonstration; to argue from *Our Duty to obey these Commands*, signifies nothing. But while they take up the Paper to prove that, which they cannot say we ever denied, they most shamefully omit our Chief Answer to this; which could they have replied unto, they would not have dropped thus. And therefore we shall return it upon them, that they may not forget it, when they write next.

That of the 13 *Rom.* cannot be understood of the *Magistrates punishing Men for Matters of Conscience*, because it being written to the Church
of

of *Rome*, to shew them their Duty towards their present Magistrate, which was *Nero*, that Cruel and persecuting Emperor: And then it would follow, That *Nero* had had a Lawful Power and Authority to punish even Christians for *Errors in Matters of Religion*, though himself was a professed *Infidel*. And seeing, the Magistrate is to Exert his Power according to his Knowledge, it would follow, that *Nero* exercised a lawful Power in causing to kill the Apostles, and persecute the Christians: which will make that horrid Crime very Slander, seeing it was no more according to the Students, but the Exercising that lawful Authority, he had received from God, according to his Knowledge.

1676.
Not to punish Men for Religious Matters; like *Nero* that persecuting Emperor—

Pag. 122. They build an airy Triumph upon their own Mistake, alledging, *That since their Magistrates are not under that pure Dispensation, it is Lawful for them to Resist Evil: And so that of Matth. is not a Repeal to them.* But they have here either wilfully, or ignorantly forgotten the other Branch of the Distinction: For granting, their Magistrates may (as we deny not) and that Lawfully *Resist Evil in Civil Matters*; yet not in *Matters of Conscience*: And this is that, which was incumbent upon them to have proved.


—But for Evil in Civil Matters.

But it may be worth the Reader's Pains specially to notice their Reasonings in this 122 p. in Answer to that Objection given in by us from the Parable of the Tares, *Matth. 13. where the Servants are expressly forbidden to pluck them up.* Here they play fast and loose to purpose; and to facilitate their own work, make no Difficulty to fasten Contradictions upon Christ himself.

Tares what they are.

1. They say, *It is clearly Repealed; because Murderers, Witches, Traytors are Tares, as well as Hereticks; and if the one were to be eximied*, so would the other.* Is not this the Way to argue

* Exempt, Or Excepted

1676.  gue against Christ, and to charge Contradictions upon him, not upon us? Wherein they fasten an Absurdity upon him, who gave this Command: Or else they must acknowledge, that by these Tares are to understood some sort of *Evil-doers*, with whom the Magistrates are not to meddle. But since the Students say, *This is Repealed*; they must confess, it sometimes stood in Vigour, it being once commanded; we would willingly be informed then of them, (and they may remember it, when they write next) *How long this Command stood, and to whom it belonged, since it had its Rise from Christ, and was none of the Old Covenant Precepts? Or if it be one of those useless Gospel Commands they dream of, which it is unlawful for us to obey?* But to go on, they say, *That by the Tares is to be understood* bemasked Hypocrites; *who being scarce discernable from the Wheat, are therefore not to be meddled with.* Very well then, where the Magistrate cannot discern *Heresies*, according to themselves he is not to punish. And then what comes of that *Authority*, was acknowledged *Nero* had, from *Rom. 13.* who was as incapable to discern *Hereticks*, as *Hypocrites*? And then seeing, as before is said, *They are not to Judge of hidden things*, Experience hath abundantly shewn, how much the true Discerning of *Heresy* is both uncertain and difficult even to *Protestant* Magistrates, who have called that *Wheat* to Day, which they have called *Tares* to Morrow: And therefore ought (according to this Rule) to forbear Medling in such Matters.

No Discerning, no Judging.

Sundry Religions may live in Peace together.

Their *Second Argument* Page 122. drawn from *Rom. 13.* and *1 Pet. 2. 14.* (which is parallel with it) is before Answered. Afterwards they go about to play the *Politicians*, shewing both here, and in the following Page, *How the Publick Peace is disturbed by suffering of sundry Religions:* And this

this they reckon so Certain, that they conclude, *It is known by all, that are but indifferently versed in Histories, &c.* Now if this Conclusion hold true, it is impossible either for *France, Germany, Holland or Zwisserland* to be in Peace, without either the *Papists* rise up, and cut the *Protestants* Throats, or the *Protestants* theirs: And who but such as the *Students* can be Ignorant, that after much Blood shed and Contention (who should Oppress and Destroy each other) they have learned by *sad* Experience, That it is Safest, and most conducive to the Peace, and contributes most to the Publick Benefit, **Not to meddle with each others Consciences**; Notwithstanding that these pitiful Statesmen can prattle to the Contrary: Who have shewn themselves in this to be very *indifferently versed in History.*

But they proceed Affirming; That *since the Magistrate is Keeper of both Tables, to whom is entrusted not only the Care of Men's Bodies, but Souls; he ought to punish not only for Evil, but also for Religious Offences.* If all this were confessed, Would it follow, that he were to punish *Religious*, as *Civil* Offences by a *Civil Censure*? Surely nay, no more than he must punish *Civil* Offences by an *Ecclesiastick* Censure. Now it remains for them to prove, That Offences in things purely *Conscientious* should among Christians be punished by the *External Sword*? Which they have not as yet done. And let it be here Observed, that notwithstanding all their Clamours for the Magistrates Priviledge, and that the *Quakers* detract from him; All the Power, Dignity and Honour they put upon him, is, *To be the Clergy's Burrow*: For as they allow him not Authority to judge, who are *Hereticks*, and who not; So he must only serve to be their Executioner, and persecute such, as they find prejudicial to their Interest. For though they will have it to be lawful for

Civil Offences require a Civil Censure; and Religious Offences an Ecclesiastick Censure.

Preach-

1676. Preachers (such as their Bishops) to be Magistrates, as *Chancellor, Counsellor, Judge, &c.* yet no Magistrate, nay the King himself must take upon him to be a Preacher; though we could never see any thing in all the *New-Testament* making this *Unlawful*: yea, and *David* and *Solomon* in the *Old*, who were not of the Tribe of *Levi*, were both *Prophets* and *Preachers*, and *Penmen* of the *Scripture*. This Trick even the *Protestant Clergy* have learned from their Father the *Pope*, who shewed the Clergy long ago the Way to make themselves *Princes* and *Judges*, but to be sure to shut out the Magistrate from meddling with their Function. So it may be easily seen here, whether the *Quakers* or the *Students* be the greatest Friends to the Magistrate. Lastly they Conclude, that since those that broach Heresy, do Evil, and that the Magistrate is the *Executor of God's Wrath upon him that doeth or acteth outwardly Evil without any Restriction, &c.* it is not lawful for us to add a Restriction, where the Spirit of God hath put none.

Priests shut out the Magistrate from meddling with their Function.

Parcs.

Who can but admire the Impudency of these *Students*, which do that, which in the following Line they Affirm is *unlawful*, by adding [*Outwardly*] which is a *Restriction*! For the Words in the Text are not [*Outwardly Evil*] but *Evil*; which being taken without any Restriction, comprehends *Inward* as well as *Outward* Acts of Evil. Seeing then, they put a *Restriction*, (though to their own Self-Condernation they confess it to be *Unlawful*) which they are forced to do, else *Hypocrites* would be comprehended, whom they Confess to be *Tares, that are not to be meddled with*; We that judge it no wise *unlawful* (because without other clear Texts be Contradicted, there must be here a *Restriction*) may restrict it to things *Civil* and *Moral*, excluding Matters of *Worship* and *Difference in Opinion*, for the Reasons often be-

before-mentioned. Their third Argument wholly misses the Matter, which is, *The Practice of many Princes even approved of God, in Coercing Idolatries, &c.* For since all the Examples they give, are of the Kings of *Judah* and *Israel* under the *Law*, it no wise meets the present Controversy, which is concerning the *Power of Christian Magistrates under the Gospel.*

Lastly, they Argue, *That the Prophets of the Old-Testament have prophesied, that it should be the Office of Christian Magistrates to Coerce false Prophets;* for which they alledge *Deut. 18. 20.* *He that shall speak in the Name of other Gods, shall die.* Very well, he saith not, *shall be put to death in a Judicial Way:* It is said, *The Soul that sinneth, shall die;* it will not therefore follow, that *Every Soul that sinneth, shall be killed by the Magistrate.* But though it be understood of putting to death, it reacheth not the *Case*, we being under the *Gospel*, not under the *Law*; where also it was not lawful so to do for different Opinions and Interpretations of the *Law*, but only for *Rejecting* the True God and his *Law*, and introducing New and Strange Gods. Their other Proof is from *Zech. 13. 1, 2, &c.* where it is said, *That the Fathers and the Mothers of the false Prophets shall say unto them, Thou shalt not live, and thrust them through, when they prophesy:* This is so far from being taken literally, that the *Students* dare not take it so themselves; else the *Father* and the *Mother* might do the *Business* without troubling the *Magistrate.* And afterwards the *Text* speaks of those, *Who were not to live, of their having Wounds in their Hands, and being alive;* which shews, the *Understanding* here is to be *Spiritual.* And seeing, the *Students* do not understand it literally of the *Persons*, to whom the *Text* ascribes this *Coercing*, and that there is not the least Word of

1676. of a *Magistrate* in the Place; for them to affirm, that it is not to be understood of the *Magistrate*, is but miserably to beg the Question.

They begin their 8th *Sect.* Page 126. Affirming, *That Quakerism tends to Anarchy and Confusion, and Treason*, alledging, *We would pull down the Magistrate, if we could; and set up our own Spiritual Magistrates: as John of Leyden, &c.* For this malicious Insinuation they give no Reason, but such an one, as destroys it, to wit, *Our giving in [Resist not Evil; pluck not up the Tares] as Repeals of some Laws in the Old Test.* Now let Men of Reason judge, whether *Treason* be the Tendency of these Men's Principles, that affirm, *Evil is not to be resisted?* Or how these can do Violence to the *Magistrate* without Contradicting their Principles: And then it cannot be the Tendency of them. And whereas they conclude, saying, *That Quakerism, as they conceive, beyond all Doubt tends to Anarchy, Confusion of State and Treason;* Their Conceptions are very false in this Matter; and we may upon far better Grounds Retort this upon the *Students* Confraternity, the Clergy, who thro' their Ambition and Turbulency did from the Pulpits blow the Trumpit of all the late Confusion and Treason in the Civil Wars, and shew themselves Exact Disciples of *John of Leyden*, acting his Pranks upon the Stage of *Great Britain*; a Charge, they have not to lay to the *Quakers*.

Their next *Effort* is to prove, *We deny the Necessity of Professing Christianity, because we believe those not bound to believe the History of Christ, from whom God hath necessarily withheld the Knowledge of it:* For they confess, *That we believe those obliged to believe them, to whom they are Revealed.* But they must here also Act like themselves, in making that a Horrible Crime in us, which their own Chief Doctors Affirm; who

be-

Quakers are not against Magistracy.

The Fraternity of the Students, Trumpeters of Wars and Confusions.

being pressed by the *Arminians* with this Argument, [That whichevery Man is bound to believe, is true. But every Man is bound to believe, that Christ died for them; Therefore it is true.] They deny the *Minor*, plainly Affirming, that those, that have not heard of Christ, are not bound to believe, he died for them: So according to the *Students*, themselves are guilty of denying the Necessity of Professing Christianity, as well as we. But further they say, We are guilty of this, because we set up a New Christ in every Man, that is born, and grows up into a perfect, substantial Birth. As their First Charge in this Matter hits at their own Doctōrs; so this Second is common with us to the Apostle Paul, (for the *Students* Dispute, like blind Men striking at Random, that heed not, what they hit) seeing the Apostle calls Christ within, of which we speak, the Hope of Glory, which is neither a New Christ, nor yet another, than He, that died at Jerusalem; who did travel, that he might be brought forth in the Galatians, and calls him, the New Man, born in, and put on by others. So if in This the Apostle did not deny the outward Sufferings of Christ, neither do We; unless the *Students* can shew, how our Doctrine differs from his, or Contradicts it: which they have not yet attempted to do. As for that Question of *J. Pennington*, How can outward Blood Cleanse? We refer them to his own Book in Defence of that Expression, as quarrelled by *J. Hicks*, called *The Flesh and Blood of Christ*: Of which there were divers Printed Copies at *Aberdeen* before the *Students* Book was put to the Press.

Christ within is no New Christ.

1676.

The CONCLUSION.

Wherein their *Observations* upon R. B. his Offer, and their last Section of the *Quakers Revilings* (as they term them) are Examined.

IN the End of the Account of our *Dispute* I renew'd an Offer to the Preachers of *Aberdeen*, as being the Persons, we were principally concerned withal; giving the Reasons therefore, and shewing the good Effects, that might proceed there-from: as in the same Offer may be seen. At this the *Students* seem to have gone Mad; and Fret and Fume, like Persons Possessed, alledging, *I betake my self to Railing, as my last Refuge*: But whether there be any Railing in that Offer, is left to the Judicious Reader to Examine. The *Students*, notwithstanding their Clamours, give not one Instance of it; but whether they have any better Reason to Answer it withal, than Railing, let the Reader judge. For upon this Occasion, Page 127, 128. they call me *Vain and Arrogant, like a very Thraso; Ignorant and Foolish; one whose Weakness and Ignorance is renowned; a bold Barker, but a soft Biter*. These are the *Modest Young Men*, that profess to be against *Railing* (that say in their *Preface*, They have abstained from *Personal Criminations*, and have not rendred *Evil for Evil*). And with this their unreasonanle *Railing* they mix in a Company of *Lies*; as that *Insinuation*, *As if the Theses had been written by G. K. which is a false Calumny they are dared to prove*. Like unto which is what follows: *That I provoked all Europe; sought Dispute in divers Places from any, who would, without Distinction; Upon the Account of this Printed Provocation boasted and gloried, that I had*

The *Students* railing Expressions: and Lies.

got no Dispute : Which contain as many Lies almost as Words; for which they offer not the least Proof. Afterwards, as an Instance of my *Cowardliness* and *Vain-boasting*, they say; *I with G. K. fled, and deserted a Dispute appointed betwixt us and R. G. my Uncle, at the Cross of Elgin: Which is utterly false; neither G. K. nor I ever spake with R. G. about such a Matter, nor made any Appointment with him: Yea, R. G. hath under his Hand declared, that being by a Friend of his desired, he refused to Debate with us in Relation to these Theses; nor was there any such Appointment ever made known to us. So the Reader may see, whether these Credible Witnesses, that Attested their Accompt, be any better here, than those Credible Informers, from whom they had this great Untruth. As they proceed, they give themselves the Lie; for after many needless Words (of which it is hard to make Sense) they Conclude, *That this late Engagement* (meaning the Dispute with themselves) *is a fulfilling of the Offer in the End of the English Theses: Notwithstanding they subscribed the Articles, whereof the First expressly bears, That it is Abstract from it.**

But *First* they say, *The Ministers are not concerned to meet with the Quakers; because the Report of the Victory is already gone upon their Side, who are but Young-Men, and cannot do so well as their Ministers, who are more Learned, and Grave: And yet a little after* (that they may not omit here to give them themselves the Lie) they say, *That such a Dispute would be a Means to stumble the Weak, barden the Fallen, and dishonour God, rather than the Contrary. What Confusion is here! They are but Young-Men, and their Masters more Learned, Grave and Able, their Dispute* (if they be to be believed) *has done Good, Established many Inclining to Quakerism: And yet their Ministers*

1676. *nisters Disputing would be a Mean to stumble the Weak? &c.* They conclude, that we are *not to be sought after*, because we are Goats and Wolves, and not *strayed Sheep*: We could produce enough under their Masters Hands to Contradict this, if it were worth the Pains. They fill up the Rest of the *Sett.* with alledging, *That publick Disputes are against the Law: upbraiding me as a Rebel, for offering one*; alledging, that it is not lawful for *Protestants* neither in the *Turkish* nor *Popish* Dominions to Offer to Dispute against the Publick Religion authorized by the Magistrate; though they may Privately call it in Question, and dissuade from it: Whereby they openly Condemn as Rebels the Apostles and Primitive Christians, yea, and the Primitive *Protestants*; as by many Instances both at Home and Abroad could be shewn. And whereas they say, *We profess to Oppose their Religion and not Papists*: It is another Falshood: for some of us of late Years have lost their *Lives*, and others deeply Suffered for Opposing *Popery* at Rome it Self; a Task, the *Students* so long as they can sit at Ease, and Buy a Benefice at Home, will as unwillingly undertake, as another *Dispute* with the *Quakers*.

The *Stu-*
dent's Con-
demning the
A. poffles, &c

They begin their *last Section* most Impudently, alledging; That *they have passed by, as much as they could, personal Criminations*: How great a Lie is this, the *Reader*, by what is above-said, will Observe. They are Angry, we should alledge, That *their Ministers had put Arguments into their Mouths*; Though we can shew them of the Closest of them in Manuscripts sent by them to us. And to disprove, they say, *They faithfully declare it to be Lies*: But what Men of Faith they are, is above shewn: Let it be left to the *Reader* to judge, whether they be more to be Trusted in saying, *The Arguments they brought, were their own*; than when they say, *They had a Dispute with the*
the

the Quakers the 1st of June, 1675. Though one 1676.
of them was altogether Absent; and the *other*
two were but meer Hearers. What Reason is
there, they should be believed in saying, *The Ar-*
guments they used, were their own; though per-
haps they only Repeated them? as when they
positively Affirmed, *That they disputed with us*;
though they were meer *Auditors*? And to this
they add another great Lie, saying; *That the*
Quakers affirmed in their Contra-Remonfrance,
that this is G. M's Work under their Cover :
Whereas the Words are; *It is strange, that they*
(to wit the Students) should undertake so hastily,
what he has been so long Advising; unless this be
his Work under their Cover! But a Supposition is
not a positive Assertion : It is not said, *This is*
his Work, as the *Students* have perverted it; who
are so accustomed to Lie, that such kind of Per-
versions pass with them but for small Escapes.
They are offended *W. M.* should be called a *Cate-*
chist; though the *Bishop* their Ordinary is not
pleased, he should have a higher Designation:
and themselves cannot deny it. And whereas they
say, *This is done exceeding maliciously; for he of-*
ficiated at the foresaid Place for a short Space, and
long before the Publishing of their Pamphlet : They
would do well to shew, wherein the Malice of
this lieth; and to examine, Whether he did not
exercise that Office longer, than he has done any
since? But it is their Custom to speak at
Random.

They cry out against our saying, *We are in-*
formed, that their Master had gone to the B. to di-
fire him to complain to the Council, &c. Alledg-
ing, *That though we say, we are informed; yet*
they insinuate, it is a Lye of our making: Because
it is usual for us, that are damnable Hereticks, to
spread a false Report our selves, and then say,
we heard it. Let them instance any Report (if
M they

Their Mas-
ter com-
plains to
the Bishop a-
gainst the
Quakers, &c

1676. they can) raised up by us, for which we cannot give them Authors of their own Religion; whereas the most of their Reports against us have no Authors, but our Enemies. But for Answer let them know, that the same was told to R. B. by G. M. and J. S. two Chief Citizens of their own Profession; the last of which constrained him to stand upon the Street, until he should tell it him. And whereas they add, *That if they would follow our Foot-steps, they could cast many horrid things in our Teeth.* *Answ.* It is one thing, To receive Information against a People, and report things as true, spoken or written by their professed Enemies, as the Students do in their Citations out of *Clerk's Examples, Hicks and Faldo*; and another, to report things spoken by Members of their own Church; who if they have belied them, let them reckon that among themselves.

Lastly, They accuse me, *As having impudently Aspersed their Professor J. M. with Scurrilous Revilings, and Malicious Calumnies*; Of which, they are so impudent, as not to give one Instance, and are thereto dared, when they write next, to name them; or instance one Calumny or Scurrilous Reviling, wherewith I asperse him; or else be accounted impudent Lyars.

Whereas they say, *These Calumnies we borrowed from the spiteful Jesuits, and like Vipers spouted them out*; again they declare their Folly. The Jesuit accused him of *Treason*, and the Students following his Example, do us; but so not I, who only minded him, that seeing he, who says, *The Scripture is his Rule*, has been deceived, in pretending the Scripture said that, which now he confesses to be an *Error*. If the Spirit were to be rejected from being the Rule, because Men pretending to it have been deceived; so should the Scripture also. In which Instances if he

he or they dare say, I have Calumniated him, 1676. Let them name Wherein? and I shall prove all I have asserted in that Affair, and that without Recurring to the *Jesuit's Testimony*, having my Information from better Hands. And to augment their Lies, they say, *It tends to his Advantage to be calumniated by such as the Quakers*: They have not proved, that we have calumniated him. And we may justly retort, That he may rather be troubled and shamed, to find himself so fawningly Flattered and Commended by such as the Students; like the Philosopher of Old, that was troubled, when spoken well of by a Profligate Person.

Lastly, They go about to Apologize for the Long Time their Book hath been a coming out, because of their Difficulties at the Press: Which Difficulties were not such as we meet with, to have their Papers surpris'd and stop'd, as they sought to do ours; but because they could not perswade a Printer to be so foolish, as to print them without due Payment. But it is like, the Contriving and Patching it together hath been as great a Cause of Lett; since when it was out, and came from *Edinburgh* to *Aberdeen*, and after we had bought one intire Book at *Edinburgh*, they kept it up at *Aberdeen* several Weeks, advising and consulting about it: And upon Notice of some gross Contradictions in it (which we had observed to some of their own Way) They caus'd the Printer there to patch two Pages to it, to help them: By which they have but rendered their Weakness more obvious. For whereas to solve that gross Contradiction before observed by us, of their making us speak in their Account one after another, and yet saying; *The Auditors can testify, That we are Lyars and never spake so*, They say, *Their Meaning is not, that we did not speak one after another.* What means

1676. the Word *never* then? This Apology amounts to no more, but that the Students intended not to contradict themselves; and instead of Bettering themselves by this Addition, they have given away their Cause. For whereas they before make a great Clamour against G. K. for asserting *Permissive Inspirations*, as if it had been some great Absurdity; themselves here affirm the same thing, saying, *The Apostle by these Words, [it is good for a Man not to touch a Woman] doth not Command, but only Permit, (he himself nevertheless being Inspired by the Spirit of God so to do.)* Is not this then a *Permissive Inspiration*? So that these things will but make their Folly manifest, as also their further frivolous Apologies in that *Additional Advertisement*; which to the truly Judicious doth not cover, but rather discover their Weakness.

Seeing it may fall out, that this Tract may arrive at the Hands of many, who perhaps may not see those Sheets, in which we have disproved the Students Calumnies and Lyes in Matter of Fact, as in Relation to the Dispute we had with them; we thought fit here also to insert the Certificate of four Students present at the Dispute, and since come among us: Three of which were at that Time actual Students of Philosophy in the University; and the other had been in the Class with one of the Disputants.

R. B.

1676.

WE Under-Subscribers, late Students of Philosophy in the University of Aberdeen, being present at the Dispute, do faithfully declare, That the Students have grossly belied the Quakers in their Account, making them speak that which they spake not; and also forging Arguments and Answers not mentioned upon the Place. And though we had no Intention at that time to own the People called Quakers; yet we dare not but declare. That their Answer and Behaviour had no small Influence upon us, to make us in Love with their Way, and to search after it more diligently: As also the Students Arguments and Lightness did not a little tend to make us disgust them and their Principles. And albeit that inward Peace and Satisfaction of Mind, which we enjoy in the Truth we now profess with that Despised and Injured People, doth make us bless the Day, in which it pleased God to bring us among them, yet we are not a little confirmed in the Belief of this Reproached Testimony and Witnesses, that we find, the strongest Arguments their Adversaries have against them, are Lies and Calumnies. And this we Testify for the Truth, whom the Truth hath taught not to Lye.

R. S.

J. A.

And I also declare, who (being a Student at that Time in the Old-Town-Colledge) was present at the Dispute, and heard the same with Attention, that the Students have grossly belied the Quakers in many things in their Account: And although that since it hath pleased God to join me unto that People, yet at that time I had no Mind to be of their Way: However when I saw their Account, I did

1676. approve it, as Ingenuous, as now also I do; and disapprove the Students, as false in many things.

Alexander Seaton.

And I likewise (being a Student in the New-Town-Colledge) at that Time was present at the Dispute, and do declare, That the Students Folly and Lightness had no small Influence upon me, to search more narrowly into the Way of that People: Which it pleased the Lord to bless unto me, so that the Eyes of my Understanding came to be opened, and I came fully to be convinced of the Truth of their Principles and Way, to which now by the Mercy and Goodness of the Lord I am joined; and do find, by comparing the two Accounts together, that the Students have wronged the People called Quakers in divers things, as the Students Self-Contradictions do sufficiently shew.

Alexander Paterfon,

Universal Love

CONSIDERED,

And established upon its

RIGHT FOUNDATION.

Being a Serious Enquiry how far

CHARITY

May and ought to be Extended towards

Persons of different Judgments

I N

Matters of Religion.

A N D

Whose Principles among the several Sects of
Christians do most Naturally lead to that
due *Moderation* required.

Writ in the Spirit of Love and Meekness, for the Removing
of Stumbling-Blocks out of the Way of the Simple ;

By a Lover of the Souls of All Men,

ROBERT BARCLAY.

I Joh. iv. 16. *God is Love, and he that dwelleth in Love, dwelleth in GOD.*

I Joh. v. 2. *For this is the Love of God, that we keep his Commandments.*

L O N D O N: Printed by the Assigns of
J. Sowle, in the Year, 1717.

Universal Love, &c.

SECTION I.

The INTRODUCTION.

Giving an Account of the Author's Experience in this Matter; with the Reasons moving him to Treat thereof.

Albeit it were very desirable, that Man could from his very tender Age upwards receive so Living an Impression not only of the truest and surest Principles of the Doctrines of Christ, but also of the Life and Power of Godliness, to leaven the whole Mind and Affections unto the pure and holy Nature of Jesus; yet seeing, that this Happiness befalls to few (most of Men being by the Prejudice of Education either pre-possessed, or defiled with wrong Notions) or else those who come to receive even at first a right Impression in their Understandings, as to Opinion or Principle, do either by the Power of inward Corruption working upon their Natural Complexions, or by other Temptations from without, oftentimes fall exceeding short of this pure Life; the best Way to redeem the Time, and to repair that Loss is from the Experience we have had of the Evil, and the Memory we retain of how far we have been wrong, to Confirm and Strengthen our selves in the Good now Revealed and Embraced: Which by the Powerful Working

Godliness from a tender Age, is the Happiness of few.

ing

1676. ing of God's Infinite Goodness turning all to the Advantage of those, that Love and follow Him, makes the Ministry of such the more Effectual; as in the Example of *Paul* and others was manifest.

It being then so, that the Condition of my Life hitherto (albeit I as yet am but a young Man) gives me Experience more, than perhaps to many others, to treat of this Subject: Therefore finding a true Freedom and Liberty in my Spirit, I have willingly undertaken (for the sake of Some) to write something briefly, and yet I hope clearly thereof: that my Experience herein (if the Lord will) by His Blessing may be made Useful to others.

The Au-
thor's Edu-
cation and
Experience.

My first Education from my Infancy up fell among the strictest Sort of *Calvinists*, those of our Country being generally acknowledged to be the Severest of that Sect, in the Heat of Zeal surpassing not only *Geneva*, (from whence they derive their Pedigree) but all other the Reformed Churches abroad (so called:) So that some of the *French Protestants* being upbraided with the Fruits of this Zeal, as it appeared in *Jo. Knox*, *Bucanan* and others, do (besides what is peculiar to their Principles of this Kind) alledge, the Super-abundance thereof to proceed à *servido Scotorum Ingenio*, i. e. from the violent Complexion of our Countrymen.

I had scarce got out of my Childhood, when I was by the Permission of Divine Providence cast among the Company of *Papists*, and my tender Years, and immature Capacity not being able to withstand and resist the Insinuations, that were used to Profelyte me to that Way, I became quickly defiled with the Pollutions thereof; and continued therein for a Time, until it pleased God through his Rich Love and Mercy to deliver me out of those Snares, and to give me a clear

clear Understanding of the Evil of that Way. 1676.

In both these Sects the Reader may easily conceive, that I had abundant Occasion to receive Impressions contrary to this Principle of Love herein treated of; seeing the Straitness of several of their Doctrines, as well as their Practice of Persecution, do abundantly declare, how opposite they are to *Universal Love*; as shall hereafter more at large be shewn. And albeit the Time it pleased God to deliver me out of these Snares, I was so young, that it may be presumed, my Observations could be but weak, and consequently my Experience Inconsiderable; yet forasmuch as from my very Childhood I was very Ambitious of Knowledge, and by a certain Felicity of Understanding (I think, I may say without Vanity) successful beyond many of my Equals in Age (though my Observations at that Time were but weak) yet since I have with more Leisure and Circumspection gathered thence so much Experience, as I am confident, will serve for a sufficient Foundation to any Superstructure I shall build upon it in this Treatise.

The Time that interviened betwixt my forsaking of the Church of *Rome*, and joining with those, with whom I stand now engaged, I kept my self free from joining with any Sort of People; though I took Liberty to hear several: And my Converse was most with those, that inveigh much against *Judging*, and such kind of Severity; seeming to complain greatly for want of this Christian Charity among all Sects. Which Latitude may perhaps be esteemed the other Extream opposite to the Preciseness of these other Sects; whereby I also received an Opportunity to know, what usually is pretended on that side likewise; and thence can say somewhat experimentally on that Part also.

His Hearing
several Sects.

1676. As for those I am now join'd to, and whom I justly esteem to be the *True Followers* and *Servants of Jesus Christ*, the World speaks diversly of them, as to this Matter; some highly accusing them of the Want of Charity, and quarrelling with them as such, who peremptorily Condemn all but themselves: Others have a Contrary Conceit of them; each according as they are Prejudicater and Informed. What may be truly said in the Case, shall after appear. I myself have been diversly censured in this Matter, being engaged in Controversy; which as they can be scarcely handled without something of Sharpness, so are seldom managed by any so successfully, as not to bear the Censure of some or other in this Respect.

People's various Judgments of the Quakers.

Having then upon the whole Matter observed, that this *Want of Charity* is that, for the Want of which each Sect accuses the other, and yet are most averse to see this Defect in themselves; and that some do accuse All Sects, as guilty of this Crime; I have judg'd it meet to commit my Sense hereof to Writing, according to the Purpose signified in the Title afore-mentioned.

S E C T. II.

The Nature of Christian Love and Charity demonstrated; the Consistency of True Zeal therewith: Its Distinction from false Zeal.

THE Nature of *Christian Love and Charity* is fully and abundantly described in the Holy Scriptures, where it is preferred before all other Virtues and Properties whatsoever; as that which comprehendeth in it all other Perfections, and is the Root and Spring of them. For there

The Nature of Christian Love and Charity.

can

can be no true Virtue, but that which proceedeth from Love; hence God himself is called *Love*, 1 *Job.* 4. 7. as being that, under which all his Innumerable and Unutterable Perfections are Included. By this *Love* we are redeemed from the Corruption of our Nature, and have received the Benefit of a Mediator; *Job.* 16. This is the Banner, wherewith God covereth his Children, *Cant.* 2. 4. This is that, which constrained our Lord *Jesus Christ* to lay down his Life for us, *Joh.* 15. 13. The Exercise of this is given by Christ, as the principal Token of his Disciples, *Joh.* 13. 35. It is numbered as the first Fruit of the Spirit, *Gal.* 5. 22. It is called the Fulfilling of the Law, as that, wherein all consisteth, *Rom.* 13. 10. For to *Love God above all things, and our Neighbour as our selves*, is the Sum not only of the Law, but of the Gospel also, 1 *Cor.* 13. 13. Therefore the Apostle *Paul* giveth to this Love or Charity the Precedency before either Faith or Hope; in which Chapter he doth briefly, but very Emphatecally describe it. For having first shewn, that the *Speaking with Tongues of Men and Angels*, that the *Gifts of Propheying, Understanding and Knowledge*, that the *Faith, that even could Remove Mountains*, and the *Giving of all to the Poor*, yea, and the *Body to be burnt*, is nothing without it: He proceeds to the Description of it thus: *Charity suffers long, is kind; Charity envieth not, vaunteth not it self, is not puffed up, does not behave it self unseemly, seeking not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no Evil, rejoyceth not in Iniquity, but rejoyceth in the Truth; beareth all Things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, never faileth*, albeit other Gifts have, 1 *Cor.* 13. from the first Verse.

As by this the Excellency of Love is shewn, so the Necessity of pressing after it, and living in it will be readily acknowledged by all: but

seeing

1676.

The Excellency of Love and Charity, and Necessity of pressing after it,

1676. seeing, the Sum of this Love, as well as the Perfection thereof consists in *Loving God above all*; so whatever diverteth in any thing therefrom, is not to be accounted Love, though the same Word be used to express it, and that in the Scripture it self; such as the Love of *Self*, the Love of the World, the Love of any Creature. Hence for the Attaining of the true and excellent Love, the Love of all these other things is not only to be laid aside, and the Love of God preferred to them, but they are to be hated, as Christ himself phraseth it, *He that hateth his Life*, Joh. 12. 25. Yea, he useth it so, as to speaking of *hating Father and Mother*, Luk. 14. 26. Though when the Love to such is truly Subordinate to the other, it is both commended and commanded.

The Testimony of the Love of God is to keep Commandments.

The Testimony, which is required of our really being in the Love of God, Christ himself signifieth to us, *If you love me, keep my Commandments*: and as the beloved Disciple *John* said in the Case of *Knowledge*, shewing us the Falseness of such, as pretend to know God, and yet do not so; saying, *He that says, he knows God, and keeps not his Commandments, is a Lyar, and the Truth is not in him*, 1 Joh. 2. 4. So may be also said, He that saith he loves God, and keeps not his Commandments, is a Lyar, and the Truth is not in him; according as the same Apostle saith, 1 Joh. 5. 3. *For this is the Love of God, that we keep his Commandments*. Hence it is apparent, that Love without Purity is but a false Pretence; and that whatsoever hinders from the Practice of this Love of God, or withdraws from the Obedience of the Least of his Commands, is to be denied, and no ways to be entertained; as being either the Love of the Devil, the Love of the World, or the Love of Self, and not the Love of the Father. And as from the True Love of God (having

(having taken Place both upon the Understanding and Will) there ariseth a great Fervency and Desire of Mind, that it may be wholly United with the Lord, and made conformable unto his Will in all things. 1676.

So from hence ariseth also a certain Averſion from, Indignation of, and even Hatred to whatsoever is contrary thereunto, or has a Tendency to lead from it, which is commonly called *Zeal*. Which *Zeal* having a right Bottom and Foundation, and proceeding purely from the Love of God, is a great Virtue, greatly to be commended and preſſed after; and the Defect thereof is juſtly reproveable in a Chriſtian. That *Zeal* then, thus conſidered, is a thing Excellent, Pure and Holy of it ſelf, appears, in that it is aſcribed to God himſelf, *2 Kings* 19. 13. Where the Performance of the Bleſſed Evangelical Promiſes is to be performed by the *Zeal* of the Lord (*Iſa.* 19. 17.) He is ſaid *to be cloathed with Zeal, as with a Cloak*; and *63.* 15. His *Zeal* is numbered with his Bowels and Mercies. Next *David* recommends himſelf to God, for that the *Zeal of his Houſe had eaten him up*, *Pſal.* 69. 9. and 119. 139. And *Paul* commends the *Corinthians* for their *Zeal*, *2 Cor.* 7. 11. *1 Cor.* 14. 12. And for this End has the Grace of God appeared unto all, that there might be a People gathered *Zealous of Good Works*, *Tit.* 2. 14. And as this is commended and recommended on the one Hand; ſo is the contrary thereof (to wit, *Indifferency* and *Lukewarmneſs*) reprov'd and rebuked, as a Thing Diſpleaſing to the Lord. Of many Inſtances whereof, that might be given, that unto the Church of *Laodicea*, may ſerve at preſent, *Revel.* 13. 15, 16. Becauſe for a Remedy againſt this Evil ſhe is exhorted, *Verſe* 19. To be *Zealous and Repent*.

The True
Zeal pro-
ceeds from
the Love of
God.

But

1676. But as there is a *True Zeal*, so is there a *False* one; and it is not more needful to have the One, than it is to avoid the other. Now as the *True Zeal* proceedeth only from the *pure Love* of God, and single *Regard* to his *Honour* and *Glory*; so the *False Zeal* proceedeth from the *Love* of something else, and the *Regard* to other *Things*. And of this *False Zeal* there are several *Kinds*, as well as *Degrees*: all of which, though they ought to be shunned; yet some are far more *Hurtful* and *Pernicious* than others. The *Worst* and *Highest* of these is, when as *Men* through the *Hight* of *Pride*, *Lust*, *Ambition* or *Envy* shew themselves *Furious* and *Zealous* to satisfy and fulfil their *Desires* and *Affections*; This is the *Highest Zeal* for *Self*: From this *Zeal* did *Cain* slay *Abel*; *Ishmael* mocked *Isaac*, and *Esau* hated *Jacob*; *Pharaoh* Persecuted the *Children* of *Israel*; *Saul*, *David*; and *Jezabel* the *true Prophets* of the *Lord*.

The False Zeal, its Kinds and Degrees.

1. A Furious Cain's Zeal.

2. A Wicked Persecutor's Zeal.

A *Second Kind* is, when as *Men*, that are not *True* and *Faithful* even to those *Principles* of *Religion* they profess themselves to acknowledge as *True*, as being *Conscious* to themselves, and also *publickly* known to be such, as are *Vicious* and *Profligate*; yet do *violently* *Persecute* and *Oppress* others, that differ from them; though they be not only *Equal* to them, but even by their own *Acknowledgement* exceed them in *Temperance* and *Virtue*: having nothing to charge them with, but that they *Agree not with them in Judgment and Practice in Matters of Religion*. This apparently is a *False Zeal*, and not of *God*; for if it proceeded from the *True Love* of *God*, it would first *Operate* in themselves to the *Removing* all those *Things*, which they acknowledge to be *Contrary* to this *Love* of *God*, before it exerted it self toward others; seeing, as the *Proverb* is, *Charity begins at Home*. And like unto this was the *Zeal* of the *Scribes* and *Pha-*

Pharisees, who Persecuted Christ for a Breaker of the Law, which themselves did not fulfil: As is also the Zeal both of the *Papists* and *Protestants* in their Persecutions at this Day. 1677.
Scribes and
Pharisees
inflanced.

A *Third Sort* is of such, who do indeed walk strictly and closely to their own Principles, making Conscience of their Way; but yet being Blinded in their Understanding, do Persecute Truth, supposing it to be Error. Of this Number was *Paul* before his Conversion, *Being as to the Law Blameless*, and Persecuting the Saints out of Zeal, *Acts* 22. 3. *Gal.* 1. 14. And therefore in this Class he numbers his Country-men, saying, *They have a Zeal for God, but not according to Knowledge*, *Rom.* 10. 2. And perhaps among these such may be numbred, of whom Christ speaketh, saying to his Disciples; *And when they kill you, they shall think to do God good Service.* 3. A blind
Religious
Zeal.

A *Fourth or Last Sort* is, when as Men being truly Enlightened in their Understanding, but their Will, Heart and Affections not being thoroughly leavened with the Love of God, do Condemn things justly Reproveable, but not out of the pure Drawings of Divine Love; but even from a Mixture of Self in the Forwardness of their *own Will*, as not suffering any to be Contrary unto them. 4. A Rasha
Self-willed
Zeal.

This is the most Innocent Kind of *Wrong Zeal*; yet not so, but that it ought to be watched against: And of these few that are guilty of it, it were fit, they waited to be Redeemed from it. But the pure, Undeiled Zeal, that is acceptable to God, is that, which proceeds not only from a pure and clear Understanding, but also from a Renewed and Sanctified Will, which moves not of nor from Self, but from and for the L O R D. The pure
and Un-
deiled
Zeal.

1677.

SECTION III.

The Controversy Stated with Respect to the different Sorts of Christians, how it is to be fetched from the Nature of their Principles, and not from the Practice of Particular Persons.

True Christian Love the most Excellent Virtue.

THE Sum of what is said, is, That true *Christian Love* and *Charity* is the *most Excellent of Virtues*, most needful to be sought after and attained; that it is never joined, but with *Purity*, which it naturally leads to; and therefrom doth consequentially arise an *Indignation* and *Zeal* against *Unrighteousness*; which *True Zeal* is justly *Commendable*, and really distinguishable from all *False* and *Ignorant Zeal*.

For the more clear Stating of the Controversy in proceeding in this Matter, these following *Affertions* relating thereto may be Proposed and Affirmed.

Affertions taken for granted by all Sorts of Christians.

- I. That whatsoever *Love* is Consistent with the True Love of God, may be safely exercised towards all Sorts as well of Men, as Christians.
- II. That whatsoever Love or Charity really conduceth to the *Salvation* of their *Souls*, and so far as they are capable thereof, may and ought to be shewed towards them.
- III. That therefore the *Good* in all ought to be Commended, Encouraged and Loved, and no True Good either Denied, Rejected or Despised, because of any *Errors* peculiar to respective Sects.
- IV. That the *Evil* either in Opinion or Practice ought neither to be Spared, Encouraged nor Fomented under any Pretence of Love whatsoever.

These

These I shall not enlarge, nor yet offer to prove (studying to avoid Prolixity) because I presume, they will be readily granted and assented to by all: That then, which principally comes under Consideration, is to Consider and Examine,

Which of all the several Sorts of Christians at this Day, do most truly observe these Rules, and shew forth most of the true Love and Zeal of God in their Way and Principles, avoiding that, which is Contrary thereunto?

Wherein that I may proceed clearly, there are some Things previous to be warily and Seriously Weighed. As—

First; When I speak of the *Charity* of the several Sorts of *Christians*, I speak of such as are settled in their respective Principles, as persuading themselves certainly in the Truths and Soundness of them: So that their Love and Charity is really to such, as they judge and believe are Wrong. Seeming to have Charity to all, and be afraid to judge them from an Unsettledness in ones Self, as not knowing which is Right, or which is Wrong, is a Virtue of Necessity and not of Choice; and proceedeth no ways from the Love of God, neither has any Resemblance thereunto: For God loves and compassionates Sinners, and such as are out of the Way, not as being Ignorant or Doubting, whether they be such; but as really Knowing them. It were indeed the Height of Madness and Folly for these Unsettled, Uncertain and Straggling Souls to take the Liberty to judge others for being Wrong, while they profess, they know not yet, who is Right, and who is Wrong; being only sure of this, that themselves are not come to Rights: For they could not in so doing but be Self condemned.

I.
Unsettled
Men judging
others, are
more repro-
vable than
those others:

1677. Not but I believe, that the Condition of such, if they be truly Forbearing, and ready to embrace the Good, when seen by them, is both more Tolerable to others, and Safe for themselves, than those, that are hardily Confident in a wrong Belief, from thence forwardly Judging others. But this I mention for the Sake of certain Men of loose and uncertain Principles, Who being really Conscious to themselves of their own Unsettledness, finding themselves at a Loss as concerning many of the Controverted Principles of the Christian Religion, which is Right, and which Wrong; and not finding a ready Way to come to any certain Determination therein, and being perhaps unwilling to undergo the Trouble and Difficulty of such a Serious Search and Enquiry, as well as desirous to avoid these troublesome Circumstances, or other Inconveniencies, which may seem to them necessarily to accompany their Imbodying themselves with any particular People or Fellowship, and therefore find it more easy to satisfy and please themselves with some general Notions of practical Truths commonly acknowledged by all, and therefore Cover themselves by Condemning that Heat, Asperity and severe Censuring, that is among the several Sorts of Christians one towards another, as not Consistent with, nor suitable to that *Love*, which ought to be in all *Christians*: Whereas poor Men! they mind not, how much they fall in this Crime, and that in a Degree far more Reprovable, than those they thus Accuse. For—

1. *First*: Are not they found guilty of the Want of this Christian Love and Charity, that do judge and condemn all those several Sorts of Christians, as *Defective* in this so principal and necessary a Christian Virtue, whereby they do indirectly shut them out from being Christians or Disciples of Jesus? For if they judged it an Error In-

Different Opinions in religious Censuring and Judging each other for that they are found Guilty of themselves.

con-

consistent with Christian Love and Charity, to 1677.
Condemn or Accuse one another for difference in O-
pinion; Why are they found themselves so guilty
of it? For since this Censuring and Condemning
of one another amongst the several Sorts of
Christians is practised by them as their Duty,
and a necessary Consequence of their Doctrine,
Why should these Judge them for it? If they
say, *They Condemn them for it, because they be-*
lieve it to be a wrong Principle; Shall not others
be allowed the like Liberty to condemn Princi-
ples they likewise believe to be Wrong? *One of*
two then must of Necessity hold, Either that
Wrong Doctrines or Opinions may be justly Re-
proved, Confuted and Condemned without Breach
of Christian Love and Charity, and therefore
the *so d. ing* amongst the several Sorts of Christi-
ans (upon their own respective Principles in it
self simply considered) not Evil or Reproveable,
and therefore these Men Wrong in Judging it so;
Or it is an Evil, and inconsistent with Christian
Love and Charity to Condemn any Sort of Christi-
ans for their Doctrines and Opinions: And if
so, these Men fall toully in this Crime, that
do Accuse all others for this Judging of Princi-
ples; and yet themselves Judge them for their
Principles herein. And—

Secondly: Their *Envy* in this is of an higher
Degree by their own Sentence, than those others
thus Judged by them: Because the others proceed
upon a certain Belief and firm Perswasion, that
they are in the Right, and those they Condemn,
Wrong; and so proceed rationally Consequential
to their own Principles: But these Men, albeit
they be Conscious to themselves, that they are
not come to a Determination of what is Right,
and what Wrong, and remain yet in Doubt for
want of a clear Understanding, what to Ap-
prove, and what to Condemn; do nevertheless

2.
Unstable
Judgments
and Consci-
ous, to them-
selves.

1677. most Irrationally (and inconsequentially to their own Affirmations) Reprove, Censure and Condemn All others, as destitute of, or at least Defective in a Virtue and Quality so Necessary and Essential to all Christian Societies. To whom therefore may be fitly applied the Saying of the Patriarch *Jacob* to his First-born *Reuben*: *Unstable as Water, thou shalt not Excel*, Gen. 49. 4. And that of the Apostle *Paul* to the *Romans*, Rom. 2. 11. As also that other Saying of the same Apostle to the *Galatians*, *For if I Build again the things that I have destroyed, I make my Self a Transgressor*, Gal. 2. 18.

Secondly, To make a Judgment of the several Sorts of Christians, we must fetch it not from the Practice of particular Persons; but from their Respective Principles, by enquiring, how far they naturally lead to, or draw from this *Universal Love*? Because that it cannot be denied, but that among all and every Sort of the several Sects of Christians, there are Men of divers and sundry Humours and Complexions, some more hot, violent and froward, who prosecute what they judge Right, with great Zeal, Hast and Fury; others of more Calm, Meek and Loving Dispositions, who though they be not less desirous to advance their Way, yet do it in a more complacent, Assailable and Deliberate Manner: Some there are, that are naturally of a Careless, Indifferent, *Gallic-like* Temper in such things, and therefore behave more forbearingly and civilly towards such as Dissent from them; not because of any Virtue, but because such things do not much trouble or touch them. Neither then of these Virtues, as they are incident to particular Persons, are so justly Chargeable upon a Sect or People, as from thence to make a positive Judgment of their Universal Charity or not, seeing, these are not the Consequences of their Principles, or that which

neces-

II.

A Religious Society is judged from its Principles not from particular Persons Practices.

1677.

necessarily comes from them, as relating to this or that Society; but the meer Product of their Natural and Private Humours. How far any particular or singular Persons among the several Sects have attained to the Performance of that true Love and Zeal formerly described, I shall not determine; neither does it necessarily belong to this Question: For if any should be found to do any thing, which were so far from being the Consequence of their Principles, as to be quite Contrary, their Brethren would not suffer their Principles from thence to be dis-approved; so neither can the Excellency of any singular Person's, while not proceeding upon their Principles, approve them as Justifiable in this Respect. As for Instance; where it is the Universal Principle and general Practice of a Sect, to Persecute even to the utmost those that differ from them (as in the Church of *Rome*) should there be found One or Two, or a very few of a more moderate Spirit, that should profess an Aversion from such Sort of Severity, and also practise it in their Station according to their Capacity, who would ascribe this Moderation and Charity to the Church of *Rome*, would take his Measure but badly. And on the other Hand, where it is the Universal Principle and general Practices of a People, not at all to Persecute for the Matter of Conscience, should any private Persons of that Society be carried by their Fury and Heat to the Practice of any such thing, though directly Contrary to their Principles; who would charge this upon the whole People, and thence measure them, would make also a bad Consequence. Nevertheless I shall not deny, but some Principles are so Pernitious, and so strait and narrow, that they seem by a certain Malignity generally to Influence all their Followers, as shall after be observed: But I shall now proceed to the fore-mentioned *Examination*.

1677.

S E C T. IV.

An Examination of the Principles of several Sorts of the so called Christians Compared with this Universal LOVE, and found Defective: As 1. Of Papists. 2. Of Protestants in general: 3. Of Socinians.

Universal Love consists in

AS there are *two Ways* chiefly, whereby a People or Society do signify their *Charity* or *Love* towards others, that Differ from them; so by these Two also is signified their *Contrary Principles* and *Practice*.

1. A Charitable Judgment,

The *First* is by a Favourable and Charitable Judgment of the Condition of Men's Souls, albeit of Different and Contrary Principles from them, in supposing, or at least not absolutely denying, but that they may even upon their own Principles, if faithful thereto, obtain Peace with God, and Life Eternal.

2. A friendly Deportment,

The *Second* is by a Friendly and Neighbourly Deportment towards Men's Persons, in not seeking to Ruin and Destroy them, whether in Life, Liberty or Estate: albeit their Judgment concerning God, and Things Spiritual in the Nature and Manner of the Exercise of their Worship be both Contrary and Different: Where the Defect of any of these Two is, there of Necessity must be wanting *Universal Love* and *Charity*.

1. Uncharitable Judgment.

For thou, that hast bound up and tied the Means of Salvation to thy Principles and Doctrines, so as to Exclude from Salvation all that differ from thee, or contradict thee, hast certainly declared, thy Charity exceeds not the Limits of thy own Form; and that the best Opinion and highest Esteem thou hast of any that differ from thee, for any Virtues or Excellencies that may

may appear to be in them, resolves at last in no better than this Conclusion; *For all this they must be Damned.* Neither will it serve to prove the Universal Charity of any People in this Respect, that some of them may Problematically Affirm, *That Salvation may be possible to some such Dissentors living in remote Parts, who are excluded from the Benefit of all Means of knowing their Principles,* making this Possibility only as an Effect of God's Omnipotency, and so purely Miraculous; alledging, *They will not deny, but God in a miraculous and extraordinary Way may bring some to Heaven.* For this shews no Charity at all either in the Principle or People; but is only a meer seeming Acknowledgment of God's Omnipotency from a Sight of the gross Absurdity, that would follow from Affirming otherwise. Those only can be esteemed Charitable in Point of Doctrine, and truly to commend the Love of God, whose Principle is of that Extent, as naturally to take in within the Compass of it both such, as have not arrived to their Discoveries, and who are also Different in Judgment from them, and that without any extraordinary and miraculous Conveyance; as being the common Means and Order of Salvation appointed by God for All, and truly Reaching All.

Moreover in the *Second Place*, far less canst thou pretend to have Charity for me, that wilt rob me of my Life, Goods or Liberty, because I cannot jump with thee in my Judgment in Religious Matters: To say, *Thou dost it for good, and out of the Love thou bearest to my Soul,* Is an Argument too Ridiculous to be Answered; unless that the so doing did infallibly produce always a Change in Judgment: The very Contrary whereof Experience has abundantly shewn, and to this Day doth shew; seeing such Severities do oftner Confirm Men in their Principles, than drive

1677.



1677.

2. Uncharitable Deportment: To destroy Men for Conscience, an Act of Malice.

Magistrates putting to Death Malefactors for their Crimes is no Example to them to kill good Men for Matters of Conscience.

drive them from them. And then by thy own Confession thou dost not only destroy my Body, but my Soul also; and canst not avoid thinking upon thy own Principle, but I must be Damned, if I persist in my Judgment: Which for thee to be the very Immediate Occasion and Author of, is certainly the greatest Act of Malice and Envy, that can be imagined; seeing thou dost what in thee lieth, thro' thy Heat of Zeal and Fury to Cut me off from obtaining that Place of Repentance; which for ought thou knowest, it might please God to afford me, were not my Days thus shortened by thee. To alledge the Example of putting to Death Murderers and other such Profligate Malefactors (which is Allowably done by the general Judgment of almost all Christians) from thence urging, *That as this is not accounted a Breach of Christian Charity. so neither the other;* will no way serve the Purpose; nor yet be a sufficient Cover for this Kind of Unchristian Cruelty; because the Crimes, for which these are thus punished, are such, as are not Justified as Matters of Conscience, or *Conscienciously practised;* which are unanimously condemned not only by the Consent of All Christians, but of all Men, as being Destructive to the very Nature of Mankind, and to all Humane Society: And 'tis confessed even by all such Malefactors themselves, I know not if One of a Hundred Thousand can be Excepted; and the Punishment of such is Justifiable, as all generally acknowledge. But to kill *Sober, Honest Good Men* meerly for their Conscience, is quite Contrary to the Doctrine of Christ; as has been elsewhere upon other Occasions largely Demonstrated.


This being premised, I shall briefly Apply the same to the several Sorts of Christians, that thence may be observed, whose Principles do most exactly agree

agree with, and lead to that *Universal Love* and *Charity*, so much in Words commended by all; and for the Want of which every Sort take so much Liberty to Judge and Condemn each other. There are many other Particulars, by which the several Sects may be Tried in this Respect; but these Two fore-mentioned being the Principal, I shall chiefly insist upon them in this present *Application*. 1677.

To begin then with the *Papists*, there is nothing more commonly acknowledged and assented to among them, than that Maxim, *Extra Ecclesiam nulla Salus*, without the Church there is no Salvation; which Maxim in a Sence, I confess to be true, (as shall hereafter appear) but according as it is understood among them, it does utterly destroy this *Universal Love* and *Charity*. For by this Church, *without which there is no Salvation*, they precisely understand the Church of *Rome*; reckoning, that whosoever are not of her Fellowship, are not saved. And this must needs necessarily follow upon their Principles, seeing, they make the Ceremonial Imbodying in this Church so necessary to Salvation, that they exclude from it the very Children begotten and brought forth by their own Members, unless formally received by the Sprinkling or Baptism of Water. And albeit they have a certain Place more tolerable than Hell for these Unbaptized Infants; yet hence is manifest, how small their Charity is? And how much it is confined to their particular Ceremonies and Forms? Since if they think Children born among them for want of this Circumstance are excluded from Heaven, albeit never guilty of Actual Transgression; they must needs judge, that such as both want it, and also are guilty of many Sins (as they believe all Men are, who are come to Age, especially such,

The *Papists* Maxim; Without the Church is no Salvation.

Their Children not Excluded from their Rigor.

1677. as are not in the Church) go without Remedy to
 Hell.

The Pope's
 Yearly Cause
 and Excom-
 munication
 of all with-
 out them.

Secondly, All *Dissenters* and *Separatists* from the Church, *Infidels*, *Turks* and *Hereticks*, which (in short) are all that profess not Fellowship and Communion with the Church of *Rome*, and own her not as their Mother, are in a most solemn Manner Yearly Excommunicated by the *Pope*: And it were a most gross Inconsistency to suppose, that such, as are so Cursed and Excommunicated, and given over to the Devil by the Father and chief Bishop of the Church, can in the Judgment of the Members be saved; especially while they think, he is Approved of God, and led by an Infallible Spirit in his so Excommunicating them.

The Founda-
 tion of the
Romish
 Church, the
 Superiority
 of *Peter*.

And *Lastly*, To suppose any such Universal Love or Charity, as extending to Persons either without the Compass of their own Society, or Dissenting and Separating from them, so as to reckon them in a Capacity or Possibility of Salvation, were to destroy and overturn the very Basis and Foundation of the *Roman* Church; which stands in Acknowledging the Superiority and Precedency of *Peter* and his Successors, and in believing that Infallibility is annexed thereunto.

Now, such as are not of the *Roman* Society, cannot do this; and those that do not thus, are such, to whom the Church of *Rome* can have no Charity; but must look upon them as without the Church, and consequently as incapable of Salvation, while there abiding.

Object.

If it be Objected, that the Church of *Rome* professeth Charity to the *Greek*, *Armenian* and *Ethiopian* Churches, albeit vastly differing in many things from them.

Answer.

I Answer, that whatsoever Charity the Church of *Rome* either doth, or ever hath professed to
 any

any of these, shall be found to be always upon a supposed Acknowledgment made by them to the See of *Rome*, as the *Mother-Church* and *Apostolick Seat*, from thence seeking the Confirmation and Authority of their Patriarchs, at least, as the *Romanists* have sought to make the World believe (how true, is not my present Business to enquire) And all these Differences of Ceremonies, that are betwixt them, are only approved by the *Romanists*, as such which are indulged to them by the *Pope*, who pretends out of a Fatherly Care and Compassion to yield these things unto them: Which, if it be true, is done by him rather to uphold the Shew of his Authority, and because Distance of Place and other Incommodities hinder him from pressing more upon them; since in Places nearer Hand, and where fitter Opportunities have been presented, he hath shewn himself very Zealous and Violent to bring all to a ready Obedience to the least of his Commands: As by many Examples could be largely proved. Yet some are of the Mind, that all these Stories, and pretended Acknowledgments of *Patriarchs* to the *Romish* See, are but the meer Effects of the Policy of that Court to uphold their Grandure, and nothing better but pretty Comedies to amuse the *Vulgar* and Credulous, and augment their Reverence towards the *Pope* and his Clergy: But whatever be in this, it is abundantly manifest, That there can be nothing more contrary to this Universal Love and Charity, than *Romish* Principles, and that no Man of that Religion, without deserting his Principles can pretend to it.

As to the other Principle of *Persecution*, how much it is preached and practised in the Church of *Rome*, will need no great Probation: Those that are acquainted with, or have heard of the *Spanish Inquisition*, of the many Inhuman Butcheries

1677.

The Church of *Rome* professing Charity to some

Persecution practised and Wars fomented in the Church of *Rome*.

1677. eries and Massacres committed both in *France* and the *Netherlands* upon Men, meerly for the Matter of their Consciences; the many Plots, Consultations, Combinings and Wars contrived, fomented, and carried on by the Bishops of *Rome* themselves, and the chief of their Clergy yielding large and voluntary Contributions thereto, for to Ruine and Root out the Dissenters from the *Romish* Society, after *Luther* appeared; cannot but see, how natural and consequential it is to *Romish* Principles so to do? And thence also observe, how contrary and opposite these things are to *Universal Love* and *Charity*? And how much they act the Hypocrite, when they pretend Christian Charity to any, that differ from them?

And this manifestly appears in these two, which none of them that has Understanding to know, or Honesty to confess their Principles, can deny. I might also add a Third, which albeit by some *Popish* Doctors in some Nations it be denied; yet is no less firmly believed and contended for by other Eminent Persons among them, especially *Bellarmino*, and approved by the Pope himself, to wit, *The Popes Power to depose Princes in Case of Heresy, and give their Kingdoms to others: Allowing them upon that Account to fight against them, and accounting their so purchasing of them Lawful.* Small Offences heretofore would have provoked to this Sentence, as appeared in the Example of *Hildebrand* and others; but of late he is more sparing and deliberate in his Denuntiations, finding his Authority less regarded, and his Power to bring to Obedience much Abbreviated. But surely, this Principle cannot consist with *Universal Love*, when that, which by all is acknowledged to be an Ordinance of God, doth not secure the Lawful Administrators thereof from the Bitterness of it: If you will not allow
a King

The Pope's
(abbreviated)
Power of
Deposing
Princes in
Case of He-
rel'y.

a King to be a King, albeit his Right and Title so to be is every way as good, as such among your selves, unless he be of your Mind; certainly there is but small Hopes of your Charity to other Persons? There might be much more said and enlarged as well upon this as other things, which sufficiently evidenceth, *The Church of Rome can have no just Claim to this Universal Love*; which I purposely, to avoid all manner of Prolixity, do omit.

The great Variety of Doctrines among *Pro-* Protestants
testants (so called) will make it somewhat harder Principles.
to decipher them particularly in this Matter; yet to take first Notice of those, who by their most publick Confessions, as well as by their Possession of whole Nations, are most commonly and universally understood to bear that Name, (to wit) the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* seems most regular. i. Lutherans and Calvinists.

And because of their Unity, as well as of several others in that Doctrine and Practice of *Persecution*, I shall make my first Observation Persecution their Doctrine and Practice.
from thence; which being not only held by them, but also by several others dissenting from both of them, may be termed (the more the Pity) *A General Doctrine of Protestants*: How far this contradicts *Universal Love*, is before-mentioned. But as to them, it has this additional Aggravation (which is very considerable) *That they do*, and that upon their owned Principles, *so rigorously Persecute one another*, not permitting one another the free Exercise of their Conscience in their respective Dominions; albeit they acknowledge, that they agree in Fundamentals, and that they have both upon the same Design of Reformation departed from Antichrist. How then can these Men pretend to any thing of *Universal Love* or *Charity*, who upon so small Difference, by themselves not esteemed Fundamen-
tal,

1677.

England
influenced at
Variance.

tal, do deny one another the very common and natural Benefits of the Creation? And of this the Island of *Great Britain* can give good Evidence. For albeit the *Protestants* there be in a Sence all *Calvinists*, or at least not at Variance in that, which was and is the great Controversy among the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* abroad; and that their Difference lies only in the Matter of the Government of the Church, and some other Ceremonies; many of which *Calvin* himself confesseth not to be of that Consequence, for which the Godly should be at Variance; yet how little *Charity* they have to one another, and how great and irreconcilable Prejudice and Malice, is openly known to the World!

Excommu-
nicating one
another.

Wars and
Bloodshed.

So that upon this Account the Prelatick Party has persecuted the *Presbyterian*, and the *Presbyterian* them, as they respectively found themselves in a Capacity to do it; not only to the Ejection of the *Clergy* for this Difference out of their Function, and the Excommunication and publickly Cursing one of another; but also to the turning in and out of *State-Officers*, to the Imprisoning, Forfeiting, Banishing, yea, and Judicial Execution both of private and publick Persons. Not to mention the horrible Devastations and publick Wars, whereby this Island became as a bloody Tragedy to the Ruin of Thousands of Families; which took its Rise from their Differences, and was carried and fomented from the very Pulpits under this Notion. Also those common and usual Denominations, wherewith they used (and yet do design on) one another, are not unknown, as, *Self-seeking* and *self-separating Hypocrites*, *seditious Incendiaries*, *presumptuous Rebels*; and on the other hand, *Proud and Bloody Prelates*, *Ignorant and Ungodly Curates*, *Wicked and Hateful Malignants*, *Idolatrous* and *Superstitious*.

I could


I could also (were it not both tedious and troublesome to repeat such stuff) give Instance of not much less Severity and Reproaches very near of the same Quality, that have passed betwixt other *sub-divided Species of Calvinists*; as betwixt the *Remonstrants* and *Contra-Remonstrants* in *Holland*, upon the Difference of their Principles, albeit they agree in the Matter of Government; and the *English Presbyterians* and *Independents*, who quarrel not much (at least the Generality of them, as themselves are willing the World should believe) about Principles, but only in a small Circumstance of Government. All which doth well witness, how void those Men are of *True Charity*! And how far from that *True, Universal Christian Love* so much commended and pretended to by them? Especially considering, that these are not only some Personal Infirmities, or Escapes of private Persons among them; but the universal, necessary and consequential Effects of their respective Principles, which proceed from them as Men so circumstantiated and related to such and such Fellowships and Societies.

There is another Principle not only common both to *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, but even to those *sub-divided Calvinists* (I mean the *Episcopalians* and *Presbyterians*) which cannot but obstruct and necessarily hinder this *Universal Love*; to wit, *The pressing after, and seeking to establish a National Church*; whereby upon the Magistrates, or great Part embracing any Religion, they distribute the whole Kingdom into several Parishes or Congregations, and appoint Preachers of that Way to them all: So that a Man cannot be a Member of the State, without he be a Member of the Church also; and he is robbed of the very Priviledges, which he ought to enjoy as a Man, unless he will agree (albeit against his Conscience)

1677.

Severity and
Reproaches
betwixt Re-
monstrants,
&c. and
Presbyteri-
ans and In-
dependents

The Evil
of National
Churches,
Parishes and
Preachers,
&c. set up
and Estab-
lished.

1677.  ence) to every Circumstance of that Church, which is Established in the Country he lives. For the making of which the more effectual, the Law in our Country provides, that when a Man is Excommunicated or cast out of the Church, he is also cast out of the State. So that a Man upon the Churches Censure for a Matter meerly Consciencious, incurs the same Hazzard of the Loss of his Estate and Liberty, as if he had been guilty of some hainous Crime towards the State. But how can those pretend to *Universal Love*, that have thus confined all, both Spiritual and Temporal Blessings to their Sect, that they think not Men worthy to live as Men, or breathe the common Air, unless they will *subscribe* to all their Sentiments? Surely, this is far from the Nature of God's Love, that causes his *Sun to rise both upon the Just and Unjust!* Thus far as to Persecution, and what depends upon it.

Excommu-
nication, the
Evil thereof.

I observed before, that the general Defect of this *Universal Love* did proceed from wrong Notions concerning the Love of God; for such as confined God's Love, did consequentially confine their own.

Now the chief Way, whereby Men by their own Narrow Opinions seek to limit and confine the *Universal Love* of God, is by proposing the necessary Means of Salvation appointed by God, as not reaching to all; for such, to whom they reach not, we cannot suppose to have any real Love extended to them: In this the Generality of Protestants are deficient; albeit some exceed others in a particular Respect, as shall be hereafter observed.

Lutherans
&c. hold, No
Salvation
without the
Knowledge
of Christ and
the Scrip-
tures.

That wherein they are generally wanting, is by affirming, *That there can be no Salvation without the explicit Knowledge of Christ, and Benefit of the Scriptures.* This is held both by *Lutherans, Calvinists* and *Arminians*, I mean, by these Churches

Churches ; whatever may be the private Sentiments of particular Persons among them. 1677.

Now whereas all these do acknowledge, *That many Thousands, yea, whole Nations have been and are Excluded from the Benefit of this Knowledge ; they must necessarily conclude Salvation impossible to them, and so they can have no Charity for them, so as to suppose a Possibility of Salvation to them. And this goes directly against, and destroys the Nature of Universal Love ; which cannot be entertained towards any, but upon the Supposition, that they are under a Possibility of being Saved ; or that those Circumstances they are under, not being in themselves (simply considered) sinful (as being such, as are not in them to help) do not absolutely exclude them from it. I confess, that I cannot have Charity to a wicked Man, that he can be saved, so long as he continues wicked ; and if thence they should seek to infer, That so likewise—*

We cannot have Charity to those Men, that want the Scriptures and the Outward Knowledge of Christ, that they can be saved, so long as they want that : Therefore as the one is not contrary to Universal Love, neither is the other.

Object.

I answer ; The Comparison holds not at all ; because the Ground of my not having Charity to him, is his continuing in a Thing, which himself knows to be displeasing to God by the Law of God, which he has revealed to him, and acknowledges to be Good ; and therefore the Ground of my Hopes of him, that he may be Saved, if he Repents, is, because he *knows the Means how to repent, and be converted.* So my *Universal Love* reaches to him not only in that I believe, 'tis possible for God to bring him out of his Wickedness ; but in that I acknowledge, that God in order thereto has actually made manifest to him the Way, how he may be converted :

Answer

The Ground of our Universal Love.

1677. And so I exclude him not from the *Universal Love* of God, which I suppose in that Manifestation of his Will to have already really touched and reached him. But the other Case has no Parity with this. For first, That Defect of the Scriptures and outward Knowledge of Christ in the *Indians* is providential. an *Indian* or *American*, &c. is no wilful, malicious Act of them against any Law known to them; but is the meer Providence of God by them inevitable: Neither is it unto them any Moral Evil, that they are *born* or *brought up* in these Parts, or come not to those Places, where they may learn and find that Knowledge. If I then judge, that God's Love reaches not any such, whom by this Providence he has permitted to be thus *Born* and *Educated* in Order to Save them, my *Universal Love* can no ways reach to them, so as to *suppose Salvation possible* to them, not because they refuse or resist the Means of Knowledge and Salvation appointed to them of God; but because they want it by the Will of God, who thought not meet to give it to them. I look not upon it as my Work in this Treatise, to refute this Doctrine, and shew its Contrariety to Truth and Scripture, having done that largely else-where, (as in my *Apology Expl.* of the 5th and 6th Proposition;) it is enough here, that I shew, that such as hold this Opinion cannot justly pretend to *Universal Love*: As doth evidently appear by what is said, and needs no further Question.

Perhaps the *Socinians* may step in here, or others of more general Principles, who will Affirm, *They do not believe, that the want of this Explicit Knowledge doth necessarily Exclude Men from Salvation.* It is true, there are some of that Mind; but it were hard to rank them under any particular Denomination: It being rather a Notion of those Men, of whom I made mention

tion before, that are uncertain in their Principles, and join with no People absolutely; than acknowledged by a People or any publick Confession of any United or gathered Church and People. 1677.

The Socinians generally lay very great Stress upon the outward Knowledge of Christ, and do believe, the outward Knowledge of Christ, or of the Resurrection at least, to be absolutely needful, holding the Sufficiency of that alone upon Rom. 10. 9. But passing that, and taking it for granted, that the Generality of Socinians, and several others with them (who being all taken in *Cumulo*) may pass; for as much as a whole Body of People do believe and affirm Salvation even possible to such, as are by an inevitable Fate excluded from the Benefit of that External Knowledge, in that they say,

Socinians
Belief of the
Outward
Knowledge
of Christ, and
Resurrection
as necessary
to Salvation.

That such, as will improve that Light of Nature, which all Men have given them of God, and Exercise that common Principle of Reason, may from the Works of Creation and Providence certainly conclude, That there is a God, forsake many Evils, and do much Good; and that such as do thus improve this Natural and Common Light, do obtain of God to send them miraculously either some Man or Angel to signify to them the Outward Knowledge or Resurrection of Christ, that they may believe it, and be saved. Object.

I Answer: This doth not reach the full Extent of *Universal Love*; because it still limiteth it to this *External Knowledge*, and supposeth no Means of Salvation without it. And next, because it supposeth somewhat Miraculous; which as has been before observed, is a Limitation not to be admitted in this Case. But if any would affirm, That the Improving of this Natural Light proved to them a Means of Salvation, without supposing any Necessity of having the Outward Knowledge of Christ at all; albeit

Answer.

1677. it would seem by the Extent of their Charity, that their Love were very Universal; yet they do not establish true Universal Love, more than the other. Because nothing is true Universal Love, but that which naturally proceedeth from the true Love of God, and is founded upon good and sound Principles deduced therefrom, and which hath not its Rise from the Love of Self, or from a Selfish Principle: Which though it may have a Shew of Universal Love, is not really such; else he that would affirm, *He believed, that all Men, as well the Wicked as the Godly, the Unbelieving as the Believing should be saved, and that no Wickedness can hinder a Man from being Saved*——Might be said to be a truer Preacher of *Universal Love*, than any, and most Charitable of all Men; and yet how would this be justly condemned by all Christians? There can then be no true *Universal Love*, but that which is built upon the Love of God, and is pure, and of the Nature of it.

So then, those that affirm, *That Men may be saved, even without the Outward Knowledge of Christ, and of the Scriptures, if they improve the Light of Nature*; Whether it be that they judge, that the Light of Nature can carry them through to the End, and accomplish the Work; or that they suppose, the Improving of it will procure any such Miraculous Revelation; do not truly Preach or Establish *Universal Love*, because the same is not founded upon the true Love of God, but is an Exalting of the Nature and Reason of Man, which is really defiled, and proceeds from Self. Since these Men for the most part do look upon Grace, or the Operation of the Spirit in the Saints, as but a meer Fancy. So I say, these Men do not commend the true Love of God, which is contrary to Self; but only their own corrupt Nature and Reason: And do therefore really

The Light
of Nature
in Order to
Salvation, an
Exalting of
corrupt Reason,
not true
Operation.

really oppose and slight the *Universal Love* of 1677. God, in that they suppose Man capable of himself to save himself without Christ the alone Mediator; in and by whom the *Universal Love* of God to all is only extended. For whom-ever God loves, he loves them in Christ, and no other ways; and this Love of God in Christ cannot be truly received and entertained to the Salvation of the Soul, but as the Old Man, the first Man with his Deeds (which are altogether corrupted, and can claim no share in Man's Salvation) is put off and done away; and as the New Man, that proceeds from a Divine Spiritual Seed, which is not of nor from Man's Nature, comes to be born and brought forth in the Soul.

But much more do they contradict and declare themselves void of and Strangers to the *Universal Love*, who hold the precise Decree of Reprobation, with the other Principles depending there-upon, in believing, *That the far greater Number not only of Mankind, but even of those that profess the Name of Christ, are necessarily damn'd, and that by Virtue of God's Absolute Decree, who from all Eternity-ordained to create them for that very End, and appointed them to walk in such Wickedness, for which he might condemn them, and punish them Eternally: So that not only such, as are ignorant of the History of Christ, and of the Scriptures, are certainly Damned; but even most of those who have the Benefit of this Knowledge, are notwithstanding Damned also, for not right using and applying the same, which miserable Crime they necessarily fall in, because that God, albeit He publickly and by his Revealed Will doth invite them all to Salvation, yet by a secret Will unknown to Men, He doth withhold from them all Power and Grace so to do.*

The Principle of Absolute Reprobation is contrary to God's Universal Love and Invitation.

Now I say, whoever are of this Mind (as all Calvinists generally are) cannot justly pretend to

1677. *Universal Love*; for seeing they limit the Love of God to a small Number, making all the rest only Objects of his Wrath and Indignation, they must by Consequence so limit their own Love also: For God being the Fountain and Author of Love, no Man can extend true Christian Love beyond his; yea, the greatest and highest Love of any Man falls infinitely short of the Love of God, even as far as a little Drop of Water falls short of the great Ocean.

Now, none of these Men, without manifestly contradicting their own Principles, can pretend to have Love to any of those, that are thus predestinated to Death: For what Sottishness were it, and Inconsistency to pretend Charity to such, so as to suppose a Possibility of Salvation for those, whom God hath appointed to be Damned, and to be Sons of Perdition? For to say, *We ought to have Charity to all, because we know not, who is appointed to Life, or may be called to it*, saith nothing to solve this Difficulty.

Reasons.

1.

Because even to such, as may be supposed to be Elected, I am not to have Charity, so long as I see them in Wickedness, and in any Unconverted State; for that were to walk against all true Judgment, and a putting Light for Darkness, and Darkness for Light; a calling Good, Evil; and Evil, Good, which is expressly forbidden.

2.

Next, This were to make true Christian Love as *blind*, as the *Heathens* supposed their god of their *Lustful Love* to be: For I ought to love Men for some Real Good I see in them, as feeling them to partake of, and grow in the Love of God; and not upon a meer *perhaps God may do them good, perhaps they may be called*; unless I believed, there were something of God in all, given them in order to call them.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, Seeing these Men do believe and affirm, *That as God in this Case appoints the End, so he doth the Means also*; They are not only obliged upon their Principle, without all Charity to conclude as Damned, and appointed to Damnation all such, as have not the Benefit of these Means they think needful; but even all such among themselves enjoying these Means, in whom appear not (according to their Notion of it) True and Convincing Tokens of Conversion. And as this Doctrine naturally leads from any thing like *Universal Love*; so (as I observed before) it so leaveneth and defileth with an Unlovely Humour such, as strictly and precisely hold it, that for most Part they are observed to be Men of peevish and persecuting Spirits.

For these two Principles, to wit, *That of there being no Salvation without the Church among Papists* (as precisely understanding it of the Church of Rome) and this of *Absolute Reprobation among Protestants*, are the very Root and Spring, from whence flows that Bloody and Antichristian Tenet of *Persecution for the Cause of CONSCIENCE*; and therefore both it and they are directly contrary and diametrically opposite to the *True, Catholick, Christian Love of God*.

1677.
3.
The Root of that bloody and Antichristian Principle of Persecution.

1677.

S E C T. V.

Some Principles of CHRISTIANITY proposed, as they are held by a great Body of People, and whole gathered Churches in Britain and Ireland; which do very well agree with True Universal Love.

Such as most commonly complain for the Want of *Universal Love*, do alledge this Defect to proceed from the Nature of a *Sect*, unto which they think this Want of *Charity* so peculiar, that from thence they conclude, that it is impossible either for any *Sect* universally to have this *Universal Love*, or for any Member of a *Sect*, so long as he stands to his Principles, or is strictly bound up and tied to a *Sect*, to have this *Universal Love*. And indeed, this in a great Measure is too true, if the Nature of a *Sect* be rightly understood; and therefore to avoid Mistakes, it will be fit to Inquire somewhat in this Matter.

A *Sect* is commonly and universally taken in the worst Part, and always so understood, where it is mentioned in the Scripture; as being either really understood of such as are Justly so termed, *Acts* 5. 17. *ch.* 5. 5. *ch.* 26. 5. or Reproachfully cast upon such, as ought not to have been so denominated, *Acts* 24. 5. *ch.* 28. 22. For a *Sect* is a *Company of People following the Opinions and Inventions of a particular Man or Men, to which they adhere more, and for which they are more Zealous, than for the Simple, Plain and Necessary Doctrine of Christ.* But such as are not a *Sect*, nor of a *Sect*, are those, *That follow the Faith and Doctrines of Christ, and receive and believe the same, as purely Preached and held forth by*

A *Sect* justly
so called.

The Follow-
ers of Christ
are of no
Sect.

by him unto them; and not as by the Recommendation of Man, as clouded and incumbred with their Interpretations and Additions: And so are meer Christians, and yet true and Faithful Ones too; yea, the most True and Faithful. 1677.

Now, which of the several Sorts of Christians are to be accounted Sects, and which not, is a great Question; and would take a larger Discourse, than is proper to be inserted in this Place, truly to inquire into it: And therefore it shall suffice me at this Time to have asserted this in general, which, I judge, will be generally accorded to by *All*; and leave the Application to each understanding Reader: For the Clearing which there may several weighty Observations fall in hereafter. Probably this will be almost granted by *All*, and I am sure, may be truly affirmed, That *Whatsoever People hold forth and preach Doctrines, which in the Nature of them contradict and are inconsistent with true Universal Love, such may truly be termed a Sect*; Which may be easily applied to those heretofore mentioned: And so consequently, *Whoever hold forth Principles and Doctrines consistent and agreeable thereunto, are and may truly be esteemed meer Christians, and no Sect.*

Societies
contradicting
Universal
Love are
truly termed
Sects.

Next, The Nature of a People's Society, and the Causes drawing them together, with the Method of their being gathered, does much contribute to Evidence, whether they are to be esteemed a *Sect* or not? *First*, Whose Fellowship stands meerly in *Judgment*, and in that which reacheth the Understanding, and so are joined together in and for *One Opinion*, are only to be esteemed a *Sect*, however true their *Notions* may be supposed to be. For the true Principles and Doctrines of Christ albeit they do truly reach the Understanding, and require its Assent; yet they are of an Operative Nature: However they may be held

r. Mark
of a Sect.

True Principles are of an operative Nature to Conversion, the False not so.

1677. by one or two Members of the Church, without working upon their Hearts; yet cannot be held, nor never was by any entire Society, without Purifying their Souls, and reaching to and working upon their Hearts to a True and Real Conversion, I mean, upon the greatest and most considerable Part: But false Doctrines may be firmly believed by a whole Society without having any Operation. For the Gathering of the Apostles and Primitive Christians was an Uniting of Hearts, and not of Heads only; Those *Three Thousand Converts* were pricked in their Hearts, and not in their Heads only: Yea, where there may be a Dissent in some things in Point of Judgment, if there be this Unity of Heart through the Prevailing of the same Life of Righteousness, yet the true Fellowship is not broken: As appeared in the Example of the Apostles themselves.

Now these People, who hold forth the Principles and Doctrines hereafter to be mentioned, were not gathered together by an *Unity of Opinion*, or by a tedious and particular Disquisition of *Notions* and *Opinions*, requiring an Assent to them, and binding themselves by Leagues and Covenants thereto; but the Manner of their Gathering was by a secret Want, which many truly tender and serious Souls in divers and sundry *Sects* found in themselves: Which put each *Sect* upon the Search of something beyond all Opinion, which might satisfy their weary Souls, even the Revelation of God's Righteous Judgment in their Heart to burn up the unrighteous Root and Fruits thereof; that the same being destroyed and done away, the inward Peace and Joy of the Holy Spirit in the Soul might be felt to abound, and thence Power and Life to follow him in all his Commandments. And so many came to be joined and united together in Heart and Spirit in

The Gathering of the true Church its Rise and Foundation.

this

this One Life of Righteousness, who had long been wandering in the several Sects; and by the inward Unity came to be gathered in One Body: From whence by Degrees they came to find themselves Agreed in the plain and simple Doctrines of Christ. * And as this Inward Power they longed for, and felt to give them Victory over Sin, and bring the Peace that follows thereon, was that, whereby they were brought unto that Unity and Community together; so they came First thence to Accord in the Universal Preaching of this Power to All, and directing all unto it: Which is their First and Chiefest Principle, and most Agreeable to this *Universal Love*, as I shall hereafter shew.

And it is very observable, that as those, whose Gathering and Fellowship arises from this meer Unity of Notions and Opinions, do usually derive their Name and Designation from their First Authors, Inventors and Fomentors of those Opinions (as of Old the *Arians, Nestorians, Manichaeans, &c.* and of Late the *Lutherans, Calvinists, Armenians, Socinians, Mennonites, &c.*) so those People, whose Unity and Fellowship did arise from their Mutual Sense of this Power working in and upon their Souls, that Society derives not their Name from any Particular Man; and therefore are providentially delivered from that great Mark of a *Sect*. But as the Ungodly will be always throwing some Name or Reproach upon the Children and Servants of God; it being

* Which External Agreement as well in Doctrines as in the Practices necessarily following thereupon, became as one External Bond and Tye of their Outward and Visible Fellowship obvious to the World, whereby they are Distinguished even to the Observation of Man from the several Sects Professing the Name of Christ; as the True Christians of Old were by their Adherence to the Orthodox Principles from other Hereticks, that laid Claim likewise to be Christians.

1677. *observed, that through the deep and inward Operation of this Power in them a Dread took hold on them, not only to the begetting of God's Fear in their Hearts, but even to the Reaching and Instructing of their Outward Man; hence the Name of Quakers or Tremblers hath been Cast upon them: Which serveth to distinguish them from others, though not Assumed by them. Yet as the Christians of Old, albeit the Name of Christian was cast upon them by way of Reproach, gloried in it, as desiring above all things to be accounted the Followers of Christ; so they also are glad, the World Reproacheth them as such, who Tremble before the Lord, and who work out their Salvation in Fear and Trembling. And truly, the Lord seems by his Prophets of Old to have foretold, that his Children should be so Reproached; as Isa. 66. 5. Hear the Word of the Lord, ye that Tremble at his Word; your Brethren that hated you, that cast you out for my Name's Sake, said, Let the Lord be Glorified, and He shall appear to your Joy, and they shall be ashamed: Where a Joyful Appearance of God is promised to these Hated and Reproached Tremblers or Quakers. And Jer. 33. 9. does more clearly Prophecy, how this Reproachful Name, when cast upon his Children, shall be Owned and Countenanc'd by the Lord, in these very plain and comfortable Words: And it shall be to me a Name of Joy, a Praise and an Honour before all the Nations of the Earth, which shall hear all the Good, that I do unto them, and they shall Fear and Tremble (or Quake) for all the Goodness and for all the Prosperity, that I procure unto * it*

The Honour where-
with the
Lord will
Honour his
despised Peo-
ple.

* *Aliae,*
Them.

2. Mark
of a Sect.

As the Nature of a *Sect* ariseth from the Love of Self and its Production, so in the *Last Place* there can be no more signal or certain Mark of a *Sect*, than *When a People seek to advance and propagate*

pagate their Way in the Strength of their Own Spirits, reckoning the Preaching and Publishing thereof by their own Natural, or Acquired Parts, without the Necessity of the Inward Motion of the Holy Spirit, both lawful and commendable; and not only so, but the Advancing and Establishing of the same by Outward Force and Violence. For here is Man working without God or the Guidance of his Spirit in his own meer Strength and Will, to set up his own Images and Inventions under a Pretence of Truths and pure Christianity: But those that dare not seek to Advance even that, which they are perswaded is Truth, in their own Will and Spirit (far less by outward Force and Violence) but in and by God's Spirit, as he leads and moves to it by his Life and Power, shew, that such are not a *Sett*, nor Followers of Man's Inventions, but of Christ alone, waiting to follow *Him*, as He acts and moves them by his own Spirit and Power. And therefore are no *Sectarians*, but meer *Christians*.

1677.
A *Sett* arises from the Love of Self;—

—But the Truth from the Denial of Self.

The Chief and First Principle then held by those Christians, which (as I observed before) naturally ariseth (and was assented to by them) from their *Inward Sense*, that Tied them together, is

I. That there is Somewhat of God, his Life and Light in All Men able to bring them to Salvation.

‘ That there is Somewhat of God, some Light, some Grace, some Power, some Measure of the Spirit, some Divine, Spiritual, Heavenly, Substantial Life and Virtue in All Men, which is a Faithful Witness against all Unrighteousness, and Ungodliness in the Heart of Man, and leads, draws, moves and inclines the Mind of Man to Righteousness, and seeks to leaven him, as he gives Way thereunto, into the Nature of its Self; whereby an Inward, thorow and real Redemption may be wrought in the Hearts of All Men, of whatsoever Nation, Country or Kindred they be, notwithstanding whatsoever

‘ Out-

1677. ' Outward Knowledge or Benefit they be by the
 ' Providence of God necessarily deprived of: Because whatsoever they want of that, yet such a Measure of this Light, Seed, Life and Word is communicated to all, as is sufficient truly to Convert them from the Evil of their Ways, purify and cleanse them, and consequently bring them to *Salvation*. And in the Affirming of this, they do not at all Exalt *Self* or *Nature* (as do the *Socinians*;) in that they freely acknowledge, That *Man's Nature is defiled and corrupted, and unable to help him, or further him one Step in Order to Salvation*; judging nothing more needful, than the full and perfect Denying and Mortification of *Self* in Order thereunto. Nor do they believe, this Seed, Light and Grace to be any Part of *Man's Nature*, or any thing, that Properly and Essentially is of *Man*; but that it is a Free Grace and Gift of God freely given to All Men, in Order to bring them out of the *Fall*, and lead them to Life Eternal. Neither do they suppose, this Seed, Word and Grace, which is sufficient to lead to *Salvation*, to be given to Men *without Christ*; for they believe it to be the Purchase and Benefit of *Christ's Death, who tasted Death for every Man*: So that they Confess all to be *derived* to them in and by *Christ, the Mediator*, to whom they Ascribe all. Yea, they believe this Light, Grace and Seed to be no other, but a Measure of that Life and Spirit, that was In *Christ Jesus*; which being in Him, who is the Head, in the Fulness of it, is from Him (in whom it Resideth) as He is Ascended up unto, and Glorified in the Heavens, *Extended to all Men*, in Order to Redeem them from Sin, and Convert them to God.

Thus according to this Principle, without attributing any thing to *Self*, or to the Nature of *Man*, or Claiming any Thing without *Christ*,
 The

The *Universal Love* of God to *All Men* is Exhibited: whereby the Means of Salvation by Christ, and Reconciliation unto God is so Asserted, that *No Man* is altogether Excluded from it; but each so Reached, as puts him in a Capacity to be Saved. Such then, as Believe and Preach this Doctrine, must of Necessity be esteemed great Advancers and Assertors of *Universal Love*, as those that truly Establish it not through any Uncertainty or Doubtfulness in themselves, but upon their own Firm and Acknowledged Principle; since that doth necessarily Extend their Charity to the not only Supposing, but even *Concluding Salvation possible* not only to the several Sorts of Christians, but even to such, who by the Disadvantage of Education, and the Remoteness of their Habitation are Ignorant of the Name of *Christ*. Providing, that this Seed, Grace, Word and Light, which is in them All, and the Free Gift of God to them all, *Receive Place in their Hearts*, so as to work out the Fruits and Nature of Unrighteousness; and to beget them unto Righteousness, Purity and Holiness: Which according to this Principle is believed to be very Possible, where the External Knowledge is thus unavoidably Wanting. For albeit those, who hold this Principle, do believe, that the Outward Knowledge of Christ, and those other Advantages, which from the Use of the Scriptures are enjoyed among Christians, are very Comfortable, and conducing to facilitate Salvation; yet they reckon them not absolutely Needful, holding them only to be Integral, and no Essential Parts of Christianity: For they place the Essence or Being of Christianity only in the True and Real Conversion of the Heart, by vertue of the Operation of this Light, Seed and Grace there.

1677.

Salvation possible to Heathens in the most Barbarous and Unciviliz'd Places of the World.

1677.

* Even as the Essence and Being of a Man Consists in the Unity of Soul and Body, which is enough to Denominate One a Man, albeit he should want a Leg or an Arm, an Eye or an Ear, or have some other Defect, or even should be destitute of some of the Faculties of the Mind, as of the Memory, &c. that other Men have; yet such a one would still, and that truly be called a Man, albeit not a compleat and entire Man. Yea, those that live in the most Barbarous and Uncivilic'd Places of the World, where they are destitute and ignorant of all the Liberal Arts and Sciences used among us, and of all those Conveniences, which so much Conduce to the facilitating of *Humane Society*, and accommodating of Mankind in their Living together; I say, those are still truly accounted Men, as having that which is truly Essential or Constitutive of a Man, as such. In like Manner, this Principle supposeth the Possibility of *Salvation* both to those commonly called *Heathens*, and to many among the Dark and Erroneous *Seets* of *Christianity*, in that this *Essential* Part of *Christianity* is Extended to them, albeit they want those other *Integrals* and Comfortable Parts, which may in and with Respect to the *Spiritual Man* be fitly Compared to these Defects, that those *Barbarous Nations* want, which we Enjoy, as to the Natural Man. As none can deny, but this *Principle* is most Agreeing to *Universal Love*; so the Practice of all even of those that deny it, doth evidence and

* Let not the Reader think strange, that I Assert this Principle, and enter not upon the Probation of it (having done that largely else-where, as in my Apology) it not being my Business here so to do; but only to shew, how such and such Principles do not agree with *Universal Love*: As on the other Hand, when I make mention of other Principles, I do not offer to Refute them; it being enough here to Demonstrate, that they are Contrary to *Universal Love*.

shew,

shew, how agreeable it is as well to the *Love of* 1677.
God as to *Right Reason*, where, when ever any of
the *Sects* come to deal with the *Heathen* or any
such, against whom they cannot urge any thing
from *Scripture* or *Tradition*, as being *Principles*
not acknowledged by them; then they are al-
ways forced to recur to an *Inward, Innate Light*
in the *Soul*, to which they labour to make mani-
fest their *Principles*: Albeit they differ about the
Nature and *Sufficiency* of it: yet they are forced
to Concede, *That this is God's Love to Man-kind,*
and that *in this the Universal Love of God is Ex-*
tended to A L L. So that to every one, to
whom they come to Preach, they may find Some-
thing, by which they may urge or commend
their *Doctrine*: Of which I shall give one singu-
lar Example out of the Words of *Franciscus Xa-*
verius, a *Jesuit*, whom that Tribe for the high
Esteem they have of him, term the *Apostle* of
the *Indies*; as it is Recorded in *Barnhardus Vane-*
rus his *Descriptio Regni Japoniæ*, P. 195. Cap. 8:
where he puts down the Words of *Francis Xavi-*
er's Letter thus, (p. 247.) *The Amargurians,*
' before they received Baptism, were straitned
' with an odious and troublesome Scruple, to wit
' That God seemed not unto them Merciful and Be-
' nign, who had Condemned all the Japonians before
' our coming to Eternal Punishment; especially, who
' ever did not Worship God, according as we
' Preached: And therefore they said, that He (to
' wit God) had wholly neglected the Salvation of all
' their Predecessors, in permitting, that these Miser-
' able Souls should altogether be destitute (to their
' utter Ruin) of the Knowledge of Saving Truth.
' This most odious Thought did much draw them back
' from the Worship of the True God; but by the
' Help of God this Error and Scruple was taken
' from them. For we First did demonstrate unto
' them, that the Divine Law was the Oldest of all;

Franc. Xa-
xavier his Let-
ter of the
Conversion
of the Ja-
ponians.

1677. *yea, before any Law was made by the Antients.*
 Taught by Nature not to Kill, &c. *The Japans knew by the Teaching of Nature, that it was unlawful to Kill, Steal, Forswear and other things contained in the Ten Divine Laws; as was evident in that, when any of them Committed these Crimes, they were Tormented by the Pricks of their Consciences: That hence Reason its self doth Teach to flee the Evil, and follow the Good; and therefore was Implanted in the Minds of all Men by Nature: So that all have the Knowledge of the Divine Law from Nature, and of God the Author of Nature, before Discipline be added. Of which, were it doubted, Trial might be made in some body altogether Void of Discipline, who has been Educated in some Mountain or Wilderness without any Knowledge of the Laws of his Country: For if such an one, thus altogether Ignorant and Unacquainted with Humane Discipline, were asked, Whether to Kill a Man, to Steal, and these other Things, which the Law of God forbids, were Sinful or not? Or if it were not right, to forbear these things? Truly, I say, such an one utterly Ignorant of Humane Discipline, would so answer, that it would easily appear, that he were not Void of the Law of God. From whence then shall we judge, he has drawn his Notion, unless from God himself, the Author of Nature? If then this be manifest in Barbarous Men; how much more in Men Civiliz'd and well Educated? Which being so, it necessarily follows, that the Divine Law was Implanted In Man's Heart, before all Laws made by Man. This Reason was so manifest to them, that they were fully satisfied; and so being delivered from these Snares, did easily subject themselves to the sweet Yoak of Christ. Thus far Xaverius.*

Thus it may seem, that to satisfy these Japonians, that their Fore-fathers were not all necessarily

ly

ly Damned; and to shew, that the *Universal* 1677. *Love* of God reached unto them to put them in a Capacity of *Salvation*; This Cunning *Jesuite* could not find an other Way, than by Asserting this Principle: Albeit it be no ways Congruous to the Doctrin of the Church of *Rome*. For these Antient *Japonians* could not be esteemed Members of the Church of *Rome*; and as not being such, according to the *Romish Principle* (who say, *There is no Salvation without the Church, that is, without the Church of Rome*) must needs have been Damned.

Secondly: That Notion and Definition of a Church, which naturally arises from this Principle (and is accordingly believed by the Assertors of it) doth also both very well Agree to and Establish this Doctrin of *Universal Love*. For by vertue of this *Seed* and *Light* Extended by Christ unto the Hearts of all, it being supposed, That Men may thereby be truly Converted, and consequentially United to Christ, it naturally follows, That such may become *Members* of the Church: Else none of Old, but the Families of the *Patriarchs* and of the *Jews* could have been judged to be *Saved*; nor yet any, during all the Time of the *Apostacy*: Which as it is False in its self, will be hardly Affirmed by any. And therefore since such might be *Saved*, they must be esteemed Members of the Church; *without which* (in this large Sense) *there can be no Salvation*, as including the *whole Body* of Christ: Of which Body who are not, are certainly *Excluded*. And therefore it is, that the *Church Catholick* or *Universal* is not so Confined to any *Sect*, *Form* or *External Profession*, as that those, that are not Initiated in those Forms, are Excluded absolutely from being Members of the Church; unless it be upon *Refusal* or *Resistance* of the *Will* of God really manifest to them, as drawing them to the

II.

That by
Virtue of
that Light
Men may be
Converted,
and become
Members of
the Church,
without
which is no
Salvation.

1677. Practice of particular Things. For it hath pleased God at several Times to Require several things both of Particular Churches and Persons, which he has not of others: As to the *Jewish Converts*, To *Abstain from things strangled and Blood*; and to the Churches of the *Gentiles*, *Not to Circumcise*; (which was permitted to the *Christian Jews* for a Time): And from particular Persons many particular things have been Required: Which, albeit they were not *general Obligations* upon all Christians; yet in so far as manifested to, and Required of them, were sufficiently Obligatory: And their *Disobedience* to them should have been in them a *Breach* of their General Obligation of Obedience (which we owe to God in all things He *Requires*) and consequently *Pernicious*; however *others*, to whom they have never been Revealed nor Required, might have been *Saved* without them.

III.

That God
by his Spirit
Reveals his
Will Imme-
diately in
the Hearts
of all true
Christians.

Thirdly: As the *Asserting* of Principles, which commend the *Love* of God, and shew the Great Extent of it to Mankind, do most agree with *Universal Love*; so this *People* in another Chief Principle of theirs do greatly shew it. For as by the Preaching of this *Universal Principle* of the *L I G H T*, they shew the *Extension* of God's *Love* to All; so by Preaching, that God both doth, and is willing to *Reveal* his Will *Immediately* by his own Spirit in the Hearts of all those, That Receive his *Light*, that so they may be guided, acted and led thereby, and know the Mind of God thus *Inwardly Immediately* in themselves; they hold forth the *Intension* of God's *Love* to all those, that follow and obey him: so that they neither bind up this *being led by the Spirit of God* only to themselves, nor stint it to singular and *Extraordinary Occasions*; but hold it forth as a Common and *Universal Priviledge* to all true Christians and Members of the Church.

Now

Now this *Doctrine* greatly commends the *Love* 1677.
of God, and Establisheth the Principle of *Uni-*
versal Love, in that it shews, how universally God
hath offered this blessed Priviledge to all, in that
He hath given his Light unto all; upon the re-
ceiving of which this *Immediate Guidance* of the
Spirit followeth, as a necessary Concomitant:
For such as deny this *Immediate Revelation* of
God's Will by his Spirit in the Hearts of his
Children, to be a *Common* and *Universal Priviledge*
to all true Christians and Members of the Church,
must needs suppose the Knowledge of his Will
necessary for them, to be communicated to them
by some other External Means, as by outward
Writings and Precepts; insomuch, that all such,
as are robbed of this Benefit, are necessarily Ex-
cluded from partaking of the *Universal Love* of
God, in Order to the Salvation of their Souls.

Fourthly: As the Confining of the Gifts and
Graces of God to certain external Forms and
Ceremonies, are directly opposite and contrary
to *Universal Love*, such as the Limiting of the
Work of the *Ministry* to *Outward Ordination*, and
to a particular Tribe of Persons; The making
Humane Parts and Arts more necessary thereto,
than the *Grace of God*, so that the *Grace of God*
is not judged sufficient to make a Man a *Mini-*
ster, or to priviledge him to Preach without those
other Artificial and Ceremonial Things; so I say
on the other Hand, those People to the Com-
mending of the *Universal Love* of God to all,
but especially to the visible Church, do Affirm,
That as this *Light and Grace of God* is given to all
in order to Save them; so whoever finds himself
truly called in his Heart thereby, and fitted to Mi-
nister to others, may lawfully Preach and Declare
to others the good Things that God has done for
his Soul, and Direct and Instruct them, as by the
same Grace he is enabled, how they may come to

IV.

That the
Work of the
Ministry is
not limited
to Outward
Ordination
and Litera-
ture.

1677. *the Experience and Attainment of the same things; albeit he have no Outward Ordination or Call from Men; be not initiated in their Ceremonies and Orders, nor yet furnished with their Learning and School-Education.* This greatly commends and holds forth the Love of God, because it does not confine the Ministry unto such a narrow Compass, as by the several Sects it is done; but supposeth, that among those that had not the Scriptures and outward Knowledge, there might have been Ministers or Preachers of Righteousness: as it was said of * *Noah*, that he was one, who was, ere the Scriptures were writ; and *Job* was another: Besides *Socrates* amongst the *Greeks*, *Pythagoras* amongst the *Latines*, and several others that might be named among the *Arabians*, *Indians* and *Ethiopians*. And this Doctrine doth very much hold forth the *Universal Love* of God in the *Visible Church*, in that it excludeth none from Ministering his Gift, as he hath it, albeit a poor Tradesman, or Mechanick Men; as is done among the far greater Parts of the Sects of Christendom by the Presumptuous Usurpation of them.

Fifthly: These People do greatly commend and hold forth the Universal Love of God to all, *In Denying the Use of Outward, Carnal Things, which perish in the using; such as Washing or Sprinkling with Water, or Eating of Bread and Wine, to be the Seals of God's Covenant with Man, or to be the Means or Channels, by which Grace and Spiritual Refreshment is ministred to the Soul.* For thereby they confine not God's Love in the Communicating of his Gifts and Graces to the Application, or not using of Elementary Things, which may be as truly (as to the Matter of them) performed by the most Wicked and Greatest Hypocrite of the World, as by the most Godly and Sincere; as do the greatest Part of the Sects a-

mong

* *Noah*,
Job, *Socrates*,
Pythagoras, several
Arabians,
Indians, *Ethiopians*,
Lovers of
Righteousness.

V.
That *Washing* or
Sprinkling,
and *Bread*
and *Wine*,
are not the
Seals of
God's Covenant
with
Man,

mong Christians, who make such a Noise of the Sacraments and Ordinances, and do so quarrel and jangle about their Matter and Manner of Performance: But do affirm and believe, that Increase of Grace, and Refreshment in and by the Life of Christ is conveyed unto the Souls of all those, that are faithful, as this Seed receives a Place, and grows up in their Hearts, without these outward Ceremonies. This cannot be performed, but by such as are Sincere and Godly indeed; for such can only be truly faithful, and wait in that Place, where Grace and Refreshment, Strength and Power, Wisdom and Courage, Patience and all other good Gifts are received.

Sixthly: These People do much establish Universal Love, in that they affirm, *Persecution of Men for the Matter of their Consciences to be Unchristian and Unlawful*; believing, *That as God can only inform and enlighten the Conscience, so it is contrary to the Universal Love of God, for Men to seek to force and restrain it*: As hath hitherto been sufficiently shewn.

Lastly: They do very truly and observably Establish *Universal Love*, in that they *Preach Love to Enemies, and the Necessity of bearing and suffering Injuries without Revenge*; holding it *Unlawful for Christians to Fight or use Carnal Weapons even to Resist such as Oppose them, and wrongfully prejudice them*. As this is most agreeable to the Doctrine and Practice of Christ, so is it to the *Universal Love* of God, whose Long suffering Patience even towards the Wicked, Stiff-necked and Rebellious after many Provocations, doth above all declare his Love; in which they cannot pretend to be Followers of him, who believe it lawful for them to Revenge every Injury, to give Blow for Blow, and Knock for Knock (and so know not, what it is patiently to receive and suffer

VI.

That Persecution for Conscience is Unlawful.

VII.

That Wars and Fightings for Christians are unlawful.

1677. suffer an Injury) if they have any Opportunity of Revenging themselves: And so consequently cannot have *Universal Love*, which necessarily supposeth and includes Love to Enemies. And he that will beat, kill, and every way he can, destroy his Enemy, does but foolishly Contradict himself, if he pretend to Love him: And those that do not Preach and Practise Love to Enemies, but that which is quite contrary, cannot justly pretend either to the Doctrine or Practice of *Universal Love*. Wherefore I desire, the Reader may make Application hereof, as to the several *Sects* of Christians, and Examine, Whose Principles and Practices do most Agree herewith? And seriously consider, Whether there be any Intire, United Body of Christians, except these here mentioned, who do Unanimously hold forth so many Doctrines, so directly Establishing and Agreeing to **True Universal Love**?

*Written in Aberdeen-
Prison, the First
Month, 1677.*

A N
Epistle of Love
A N D
Friendly Advice,

TO THE
Ambassadors of the several PRINCES
of *Europe*, met at *Nimeguen*, to
Consult the Peace of *Christendom*,
so far as they are concerned.

W H E R E I N
The True Cause of the present *War*
is discovered, and the Right Remedy
and Means for a firm and settled
P E A C E is proposed.

By R. BARCLAY.

A Lover and Traveller for the *Peace of Christendom*.

Which was delivered to them in *Latin* the 23^d
and 24th Days of the Month called *February*,
167⁷/₈. and now published in *English* for the Sa-
tisfaction of such as understand not the *Language*.

Psal. 2. 10. *Be wise therefore, ye Kings, be instructed, ye Judges
of the Earth; serve the Lord with Fear, and rejoyce with
Trembling.*

*Kiss the Son, lest he be Angry, and ye perish from the Way,
when his Wrath is kindled but a little: Blessed are all they
that put their Trust in him.*

LONDON, Printed by the Assigns of *J. Sowle*,
in the Year, 1717.

A N

Epistle of Love, &c.

To the Ambassadors and Deputies of the Christian Princes and States met at Nimeguen, to Consult the Peace of Christendom, R. B. a Servant of Jesus Christ, and hearty Well-wisher to the Christian World, Wisbes Increase of Grace and Peace, and the Spirit of sound Judgment, with Hearts inclined and willing to Receive and Obey the Counsel of GOD.

LET it not seem strange unto you, who are Men Chosen and Authorized by the Great Monarchs and States of *Europe* to find out a speedy Remedy for the present great Trouble (under which many of her Inhabitants do groan) as such, whose Wisdom and Prudence, and Abilities have so recommended them to the World, as to be judged fit for so Great and Difficult a Work, To be Addressed unto by one, who by the World may be esteemed Weak and Foolish; whose Advice is not Ushered unto you by the Commission of any of the Princes of this World, nor Secoded by the Recommendation of any Earthly

Earthly State: For since your Work is that, which concerns all Christians; why may not every Christian, who feels himself stir'd up of the Lord thereunto, contribute therein? And if they have Place to be heard in this Affair, who come in the Name of *Kings* and *Princes*; let it not seem heavy unto you to hear him, that comes in the Name of the *Lord Jesus Christ*, who in the truest Sence is the Head and Governor, and Chief Bishop of the Church, the *Most truly Christian and Catholick King*: Many of whose Subjects are concerned in this Matter, and the Blood of many in Hazzard, for whom he hath shed his precious Blood. And yet who shall not seek to obtrude upon you the Belief of the Truth or Certainty of his Commission because of his own Testimony; but leave it, as well as the Things he therein delivereth, to the holy and pure Witness of God in all your Consciences, to be Received or Rejected by you, as it shall there be Approved, or not Approved.

Know then, *My Friends*, that many and often times my Soul has been deeply bowed down under the Weighty Sense of the present State of Christendom; and in secret before the Lord I have mourned, and bitterly lamented because thereof. And as I was Crossing the Sea, and being the last Summer in *Holland*, and some Parts of *Germany*, the Burthen thereof fell often upon me, and it several Times came before me to write unto you, what I then saw and felt from God of these Things, while I was in those Parts. But I Waited, and was not willing to be Hasty; and now being returned to my own Country, and at my own Home, I chearfully accept the fit Season, which the Lord has put in my Hand, and called me to therein, to signify unto you those Things, which in His Name and Authority I am commanded to do.

The Burthen that was upon the Author in this Matter.

And

1677.

And for this End the Lord has shewn me, what the Causes are of all this Mischief and Confusion, and Desolation; which are necessary to be made known unto you, and deeply and seriously to be Considered by you; Else ye can never be able to Apply the Right Remedies. I speak of the *Primary and Original Cause*, as it proceeds from him, and is hatched by him, who is the Author of all Mischief, and the great Enemy to, as well as Envyer of the true Peace and Prosperity of all good Christians; and who sows in Men's Hearts that Evil Seed, and fomenteth that bad Ground, from which all Evil riseth. For unless this be seen, discovered, and removed in the Ground, although the *Secondary and more Immediate Causes* be seen, (to wit) The Projects, Designs and Councils of Men, and in Part be answered and removed by giving way to some, and taking from others, according as they are more or less Formidable and Considerable, Measuring these Things by the Rules of Humane Wisdom, and Carnal Prudence and Policy; yet that is not sufficient: That may Allay the Heat for a Time, but will not remove the Evil; and you in so doing, will prove but like those Physitians, that do mitigate the Pain and Violence of a Disease for a Time, but do not take away the *Ground and Cause* of it: So that it shortly again returns, and in the End destroys him that is afflicted with it.

The Primary Cause of Mischief first to be removed.

Christians in Name, and not in Nature.

The *Chief Ground, Cause and Root* then of all this Misery among all those called *Christians*, is, Because they are only such in Name, and not in Nature, having only a Form and Profession of Christianity in Shew and Words, but are still Strangers, yea, and Enemies to the Life and Virtue of it; owning *God and Christ* in Words, but denying them in Works: And therefore the Lord

Je-

Jesus Christ will not own them as his Children, 1677.
 nor Disciples. For while they say, they are his *Followers*; while they Preach and exalt his Precepts; while they Extol his Life, Patience and Meekness, his Self-denying, perfect Resignation and Obedience to the Will of his Father; yet themselves are out of it: And so bring Shame and Reproach to that Honourable Name, which they assume to themselves in the Face of the Nations, and give an Occasion for Infidels (*Turks, Jews and Atheists*) to Profane and Blaspheme the Holy Name of *Jesus*. Is it not so? While so much Ambition, Pride, Vanity, Wantonness and Malice, Murther, Cruelty and Oppression, yea, and all Manner of Abominations abound and are openly practised; yea, while those that should be Patterns and Examples of Justice, Virtue and Sobriety to others, do for the most Part exceed most in those Things. So that the Courts of *Christian Princes* (who while in Words seem more to glory in being *Professors* and *Protectors* of Christianity, than in their *Outward Crowns*) which should be Colledges of Virtue and Piety, are mostly Scenes of greatest Wickedness, and Nests and Receptacles of all the *Buffoons, Stage-Players*, and other vilest Vermin not fit to be mentioned. I say, Is it not so? While upon every slender Prætext, such as *Their own small Discontents*, or *That they judge, the present Peace they have with their Neighbour, cannot suit with their Grandeur and Worldly Glory*, They sheath their Swords in one another's Bowels; Ruine, waste and destroy whole Countreys; Expose to the greatest Misery many Thousand Families; Make Thousands of Widows, and Ten Thousands of Orphans; Cause the Banks to overflow with the Blood of those, for whom the Lord *Jesus Christ* shed his Precious Blood; and spend and destroy many of the good Creatures of God. And all this while they pretend

Abominations abound in the Courts of Christian Princes.

War's Calamities.

1677. tend to be *Followers of the Lamb-like Jesus*; who came not to destroy Men's Lives, but to save them; The Song of whose Appearance to the World was, *Glory to God in the Highest, and Good Will and Peace to all Men*: Not to Kill, Murther and Destroy Men; not to hire and force poor Men to run upon and murther one another, meerly to satisfy the Lust and Ambition of Great Men; they being often-times Ignorant of the Ground of the Quarrel, and not having the least Occasion of Evil Will or Prejudice against those their *Fellow - Christians*, whom they thus Kill; amongst whom not one of a Thousand perhaps ever saw one another before. Yea, is it not so, that there is only a *Name*, and *nothing of the True Nature* of Christians especially manifest in the *Clergy*, who pretend not only to be *Professors*, but *Preachers, Promoters* and *Exhorters* of others to Christianity, who for the most Part are the greatest Promoters and Advancers of those Wars: and by whom upon all such Occasions the Name of God and Jesus Christ is most horribly abused, prophaned and blasphemed, While they dare *Pray to God, and Thank him for the Destruction of their Brethren-Christians*, and that for and against, according to the Changeable Wills of their several Princes: Yea, so, that some will join in their Prayers with and for the Prosperity of such, as their *Profession* obliges them to believe to be *Heretical* and *Antichristian*; and for the Destruction of those, whom the same *Profession* acknowledges to be *Good* and *Orthodox Christians*. Thus the *French*, both *Papists* and *Protestants*, *Join in their Prayers, and Rejoyce for the Destruction of the Spanish Papists and Dutch Protestants*. *The like may be said of the Danish, Swedish and German Protestants, as respectively concerned in this Matter*. Yea, which is yet more strange, if either *Constraint* or *Interest* do engage

Luk. 2. 4.

The War-
riors are
forced to
Kill of their
Fellow Chri-
stians, whom
they never
had Evil
Will against.

Preachers
the War's
Promoters.

The Priests
Confusion
and Instabili-
ty in their
Prayers.

engage any Prince or State to change his Party, while the same War and Cause remains; then will the Clergy presently accommodate their Prayers to the Case, *In Praying for Prosperity to those, to whom instantly before they wished Ruine*; and so on the contrary: As in this present War, in the Case of the *Bishop of Munster* is manifest. 1677.

Was there ever, or can there be any more horrible Profanation of the Holy and Pure Name of *God*, especially to be done by those, who pretend to be Worshippers of the true *God*, and Disciples of *Jesus Christ*? This not only Equals, but far Exceeds the Wickedness of the *Heathens*: For they only Prayed such Gods to their Assistance, as they fancied allow their Ambition, and accounted their Warring a Virtue; whom they judged Changeable like themselves, and subject to such Quarrels among themselves, as they that are their Worshippers: But for those to be found in these Things, who believe, there is but *One only God*, and have, or at least profess to have such Notions of his Justice, Equity and Mercy, and of the Certainty of his Punishing the Transgressors of his Law, is so horrible and abominable, as cannot sufficiently be neither said, nor written. Worse than Heathens.

The *Ground* then of all this is the Want of *True Christianity*, because the Nature of it is not begotten, nor brought forth in those called *Christians*; and therefore they bear not the Image, nor bring not forth the Fruits of it. For albeit they have the Name, yet the Nature they are Strangers to: The Lamb's Nature is not in them, but the Doggish Nature, the Wolfish Nature, that will still be quarrelling and destroying; the Cunning, Serpentine, Subtle Nature, and the Proud, Ambitious, Luciferian Nature, that sets Princes and States a work to contrive and ferment Wars, and engages People to fight together,

1677. some for Ambition and vain Glory; and some
 for Covetousness and Hope of Gain: And the
 same Cause doth move the Clergy to concur with
 their Share in Making their Prayers Turn and
 Twine; and so all are here out from the State
 of True Christianity. And as they keep the
 Name of being Christians; so also upon the same
 Pretext each will pretend to be for Peace, while
 their Fruits manifestly declare the Contrary.
 And how hath and doth Experience daily discover
 this Deceit! For how is Peace brought about?
 Is it not, when the Weaker is forced to give way
 to the Stronger, without Respect to the Equity
 of the Cause? Is it not just so, as among the
 wild and devouring Beasts? Who when they
 Fight together, the Weaker is forced to give way
 to the Stronger, and so desist, until another
 Occasion offer? So who are found Weakest, who
 are least capable to hold out, they must bear the
 Inconveniency; and he gets the most Advantage,
 however frivolous, yea, unjust his Pretence be,
 who is most able to vindicate his Claim, and
 preserve it not by Equity, but Force of Arms:
 So that the Peace-Contrivers Rule is not the
 Equity of the Cause, but the Power of the Parties.
 Is not this known and manifest in many,
 if not most of the Pacifications, that have been
 made in Christendom?

It is therefore in my Heart, *In the Name and
 Behalf of the Lord Jesus Christ*, to warn you to
 consider of those Things: And therefore be not
 unwilling to hear One, that appears among you
 for the Interest of Christ his King and Master.

Not as if thereby he denied the *Just Authority of
 Sovereign Princes*; or refused to acknowledge the
 Subjection himself owes to his Lawful Prince
 and Superior; or were any ways inclined to fa-
 vour the Dreams of such, as under the Pretence
 of *Crying up King Jesus*, and the *Kingdom of
 Christ*,

The Clergy's
 Prayers turn
 and twine.

which Ca-
 tionny some
 have been
 apt to throw
 upon us, by
 Reason of
 some in
 those Coun-
 treys, that
 have so af-
 firmed.

Christ, either deny, or seek to overturn all Civil 1677.
 Government; Nay, not at all: But I am one, who do Reverence and Honour Magistracy, and acknowledge Subjection due unto them by their respective People in all Things Just and Lawful; knowing, that Magistracy is an Ordinance of God, * and that Magistrates are his Ministers, who bear * Rom. 13.
 not the Sword in vain. Yet nevertheless I judge ^{1. 4.}
 it no Prejudice to Magistracy, nor Injury to any, for one that is called of the Lord Jesus, to appear for him in this Affair; for he is not a little concerned, as by all their Confession, so by Right are his Subjects (unless they wilfully render themselves to another, even to the Adversary) for He is Heir of All, and therefore it is fit, that they, who speak in his Name, be heard; for his Honour and Glory is concerned: His Authority has been contemned; his Laws broken; his Life Oppressed; His Standard of Peace pulled down and rent; his Government incroached upon: What shall I say! His precious Blood shed, and himself a fresh Crucified, and put to open Shame by the Murders and Cruelties that have attended those Wars. If then ye come not under a deep and weighty Sense of those things, so as to apply your selves to seek after some Effectual Way to remedy these Evils; however you may seek to please Princes and States, by patching up a Reconciliation, and troubling your selves to satisfy their Covetous and Ambitious Wills, who make such a Noise and Stir in the World about their Glory, and do not mind the Glory and Honour of the Lord Jesus Christ, so as to give him the Right, that is due unto him in the first Place (not in a bare Sound of Words; he will not accept of such a Complement, while the Evil Works remain;) I Testify in his Name, and Power and Authority, Your Work will be Imperfect, and not prosperous.

1677. For although those Kings and Princes, that are now at Variance, may be by your Means brought to lay down Arms, and appear to be good Friends and dear Allies; yet unless the Lord Jesus Christ can be restored to his Kingdom in their Hearts, and that evil Ground of Ambition, of Pride, and Lust, and Vain Glory be removed, that so they may Rule in the Wisdom and Power of God, and not according to their Lusts; that Evil Ground and devouring Nature being still alive and predominant in them, will quickly stir some of them up again, so soon as Opportunity offers fit for their Advantage: They will kindle the Flame again, and all your Articles will not bind them; but they will break them like Straws: And their Counsellors, who flatter them, and seek to please them, will quickly find out a Pretext for a Breach, such as have taught them these Hellish Maxims, *Qui nescit dissimulare, nescit regnare*, i. e. *That such, as make Conscience to Lye (or serve the Devil) but to Obey Christ, are not fit to rule; and that Kings must not be Slaves to their Words.* And perhaps, if they find it difficult to hit upon any probable Ground or Pretence; if they judge themselves strong enough, they will neither trouble themselves, nor the World to give a Reason, but tell, *That to be at Peace is no longer consistent with their Glory: And when they have brought about what they have determined, they will let the World know the Reason of it.*

Hath not manifold Experience proved those Things to be true? And seeing it is so, there is nor can no settled, firm, established Peace be brought to Christendom, until the Devil's Kingdom be rooted out of Men's Hearts, from which Wars come, as the Apostle *James* testifies; and the Kingdom of Jesus come to be established in the Hearts of Kings, and Princes, and People, whose

The World's
Peace is soon
at an End.

Jam. 4. 1, 7.

whose Kingdom is a Kingdom of Righteousness and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Spirit : Until he come to Rule in and among them, and his Enemies, viz. Every Evil Lust be thrown out from him, so that his Heavenly Wisdom may take Place, which is pure, and peaceable, and easy to be intreated. And therefore to bring this about, is the One and Great Thing needful to be minded and considered of, and effectually to be pressed after, as that, by the Accomplishing whereof the present Evils can alone be Cured and Removed.

Therefore be not mistaken, neither deceive your selves to think, *Ye can Accomplish this Work by your Worldly and Humane Wisdom*; the Wisdom of the Flesh will not do it, neither that of the first Birth, which must Die and be Crucified, e're the Heavenly Wisdom, the Beginning whereof is the Fear of the Lord, be revealed, by which alone this Work can both be truly begun and finished. For the Worldly and Carnal Wisdom is the Cause of the War: It is by it, that Men have been, and are stirred up to it, even the Wisdom of the first fleshly Birth, which leads Men not to be content with their own, but to Covet their Neighbour's, and to Quarrel and Fight in Hopes of Advantage. Therefore that Wisdom, which is the Cause of the Mischief, will, nor can never Cure it.

Try and Examine your selves therefore seriously in the Sight of God, whether you be Led, Acted and Influenced in your present Negotiation by the Wisdom of this World, the Wisdom of the first Birth, which is Sensual, Devilish and from below; or by the Heavenly and Pure Wisdom of God, which is from above, and is the Fruit of the second Birth, the New Birth by Jesus Christ formed and brought forth in the Soul, and the Light of Jesus Christ in you, which shews you all your Thoughts, and has reprov'd every one of you for

1677. *your Unrighteousness, even from your Childhood*
 up: That will manifest unto you (if you mind it,
 and heed it) which Wisdom you are acted by;
 and discover to you, whether it be your *Thoughts*
 and *Purposes*, to *Glorify God over all*, and to *Re-*
 move, so far as in you lies, what is contrary to
 his Holy and Pure Will; and whether you be
 more concerned for the particular Interest and
 Interests of your several Princes, to satisfy or
 obviate their Designs, or to bring about that, by
 which *God's Holy Witness* in every Conscience
 may be answered, and the Pure Life of Jesus:
 That by these Doings the *Oppressed* may be eased,
 and suffered to arise.

The Glory
 of God, and
 Ease of the
 Oppressed to
 be minded.

For if this be little in your Minds, as a thing
 not much regarded, but neglected by you, I must
 intimate to you in the Name of the *Lord*, that
 your Work will not be blessed by Him; neither
 will it prosper: For although you may make
 Peace for a Time; yet (as I have afore said) it
 will not be firm, nor of any long Continuance;
 but the *Old Root* still remaining, will send forth
 its Evil Fruit again, and all your Labour will
 quickly be undone.

In the
 peaceable
 Wisdom of
 God a last-
 ing Peace
 is Establish-
 ed.

Let me Exhort you then seriously to Examine
 your selves by the Light of Jesus Christ in you,
 that can alone discover unto you your own
 Hearts, and will not flatter you (as Men may)
 Whether you be fit for this Work you are set a-
 bout? Which you cannot be, until you have se-
 riously applied your selves to the Killing and
 Crucifying of that Nature in your selves, from
 which all this Evil flows. If the Warring Part
 be removed out of you, and the *Corrupted Wis-*
dom done away, and the *Peaceable Wisdom brought*
up, then are you fit to consult and bring about
 the Peace of Christendom. But this cannot be
 accomplished in you, until you have first believ-
 ed in the Light of Jesus Christ, wherewithal you,

as well as all Men, are enlightned ; and which is given you as a sufficient Guide and Leader, to lead out of Darknes, to lead out of Strife, to lead out of the Lusts, from which the Wars come, unto the Ways of Righteousness and Peace ; which leads not to destroy, but to Love and Forgive Enemies.

It is the minding of this, and being led and guided by it, that only can fit you for so *Great and Good a Work* ; for this is the Fruit of the Father's Love to Mankind, and the Gift of God, even Christ Jesus, who was *given for a Light to enlighten the Gentiles, and for his Salvation unto the Ends of the Earth.*

So it is by turning to this, and following it, and obeying it (in which is Sufficiency, and which gives Power to the Receivers of it to become the Sons of God) that the true Nature of Christianity can be *brought forth and Restored* ; and by which Kings and Princes, Rulers and People may be *brought out* of Lust, Envy, Warring and Strife, to true Peace with God, and *one with another.*

And therefore the *Cause* of all the Mischief, that is in Christendom, is, *Because this Light has not been minded, nor regarded in the Heart ; but has been bated and overlooked, as a low and insufficient Thing* : And therefore the Seed of the Kingdom, this Gift of the Father's Love, this little Leaven, this Pearl of great Price, and this Talent being hid in the Ground, Condemned and Despised, and the World and Worldly Mind being set over it, notwithstanding all the Preaching and Praying, and Professing of Christ in Words (that has been only one outward Shew and Appearance, by which Men might the more easily be deceived, and live more securely in their Wickedness) the Innocent Life of Christ hath not been known, and all Christendom hath not

1677. been known, and all Christendom has brought forth bitter and fower Grapes under all their Talk and Forms of Worship; and not the sweet and Peaceable Fruits of Righteousness: Which can never be brought, until all come to him, to the Light of Christ in their Consciences, to follow and obey it, and acknowledge it, as that which is given them of God, and sufficient to lead them to Life and Salvation. For as this is thus received and entertained, the true Nature of Christ will be begotten and brought forth in People; and then the contrary Nature, in which the Enmity and Strife is, will die and pass away: And so Truth and Peace will come to be settled and firmly Established.

The Light
of Christ
lead. to Life
and to Truth
and Peace.

And for this End the Lord God Almighty is arisen, and arising in his own Power and Glory, who out of his infinite Compassion, having regard to the present distracted and desolate Condition of Christendom (as seeing them Strangers to his Life and Power, and led and guided at Will to the utter Ruin and Destruction both of Body and Soul, by the Adversary of Mankind's true Happiness) that he might Reveal the Light of his Truth, even of *True Christianity* to those, who have the *Name* only, hath turned many, who are Strangers and Enemies thereunto in their Minds by wicked Works, to this precious Light, by which *Judgment has been laid to the Line, and Righteousness to the Plummets in them*, and the Evil Works and Nature in them have been judged and condemned; and they have willingly abode under it, until it hath been *brought forth to Victory in them*, And many of them, who have been Wise according to the *Wisdom of the World*, have learned to lay it down at the Feet of *Jesus*, that they might receive from him of his *Pure and Heavenly Wisdom*; being contented in the Enjoyment of that by the World to be accounted

Fools:

1sa. 29. 17.
Matt 12 20.

Fools : And also many of them, who were *Fighters*, 1677. and even renowned for their Skill and Valour in Warring, have come by the Influence of this pure Light to *Beat their Swords into Ploughshares, and their Spears into Pruning-hooks, and not learn Carnal War any more*, being redeemed from the Lusts, from which the Fighting comes. And there are Thousands, whom God hath brought here already ; who see to the End of all Contention and Strife, and that for which the World contends : And albeit the Devil be angry at them, and rage against them in the meer Nominal and Literal Christians, because he knows, *they strike at the very Root and Foundation of his Kingdom in Men's Hearts* ; and therefore he prevails in his Followers, to wit, in these Literal, Nominal Christians, to *Persecute, Kill, Beat, Banish and Imprison*, and many Ways *Vex* them : Yet because the Lord has Chosen them to be a *First Fruit* of that *Glorious Work*, which he is bringing about in the Nations, therefore they hitherto have, notwithstanding of all that Opposition, and yet shall prosper : By a patient Enduring in the Spirit of Jesus they do and shall *OVERCOME*.

The Rage of the Devil against the Lord's Chosen.

And therefore there is nothing can so much tend to the *Good and Universal Peace* of Christendom, than for all and every one to mind this Gift of God in themselves ; and not only to suffer, but to rejoyce at the Preaching and Promulgating of the Universality of this *Glorious Light*, whereunto God is now calling many : For as the Resisting and Slaying of this in themselves, as well as in those, who come in the Name of God to declare it, is the Cause of all the Mischief, that Christendom labours under ; so also its being received and taking Place, would remove and do it away.

Be not therefore easily engaged by the Enemy to slight and reject those things as foolish and weak,

1677. weak, and *too low* for you to consider, or give Place unto; for thereby the Enemy always laboured to veil and darken the Counsel of God, and hindred it from being received by Men.

1 King. 2. 8. Thus the King of *Israel* despised the Counsel
 Luc. 21. 2. of *Micah* at the Instigation of his *Mocking Pro-*
 Mat. 27. 20. *phets*; but remember, that you profess to be
 Job. 18. 40. *Followers of Jesus*, who was loaden with many
 Reproaches, accounted a Disturber, and to whom
Barrabas a Murtherer was preferred, by the Coun-
 sel and Advice of the wise *Rabbies* and great Pro-
 fessors among the *Jews*; and remember, that you
 profess your selves to be Owners of that Gospel,
 whose first and chief Ministers and Preachers
 were accounted *Foolish and Illiterate Men, Movers*
 Acts 2. 7. *of Sedition, Idle Babblers and Turners of the*
 ch. 4. 13. *World upside down*: And therefore be not easily
 ch. 17, 18, *frighted by these and such like Reports and Re-*
 19, 20. *proaches from hearing those, whom God hath*
 ch. 21, 28. *Called and Chosen, that in and amongst them*
 ch. 24. 5, 6. *he may be glorified, and by them may restore*
 ch. 25. 7. *that in Reality in the (so called) Christian World,*
 which for several Generations they have only
 had the Shadow of, but have not enjoyed in the
 Substance.

And because many are the Calumnies, that such are Reproached withal, as *holding forth strange and pernicious Doctrines*; therefore I have herewith sent you a large *Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, held forth and preached by them; That therein you may see, how the *truly Christian Principles*, which have been lost in the Apostacy, while the Life of Christianity was not to be found, is Restored by their Testimony: Desiring you seriously to Read and Consider the same, as well as Transmit it to the several Princes you are Employed by; that both you and they may see, That *the Day of the Lord*

is Dawned ; and may *Learn to Walk in the Light* 1677.
of it ; which would bring Peace and Quietness, and Felicity to all, both outward and inward : And thereby all may be stirred up to receive with Gladness such, as the Lord will move to Preach and declare this Day, as it is dawned and made manifest in them ; following the Apostle's Rules *In Receiving Strangers willingly* ; for that some in Heb. 13. 2.
so doing have entertained Angels unawares. And that none of you may be like the *Pharisees*, who cried, *Crucify Him* : Nor like those, who intreated him to *depart out of their Coasts* ; and like those who would have *none of him to Rule over them* ; lest with them ye receive the like Condemnation. However, I shall be clear of all your Blood, in so far as *I have faithfully answered, what God required of me towards you, and Discharged my Conscience in Love to your Immortal Souls* ; as well as to the *Common Peace and Good of Christendom.* Whereof, and of all those that Profess the Name of Christ, I am

A True Friend, and

Heartly Well-wisher,

ROBERT BARCLAY.

This came upon me from the Lord to write unto You at Ury, in my Native Country of Scotland, the Second of the Month called November, 1677.

1677.

m Copies of the foresaid Epistle in *Latin*, were upon the 23d and 24th Days of the Month called *February*, 1678. delivered at *Nimeguen* to the *Ambassadors* of the *Emperor*, of the *Kings* of *Great Britain*, *Spain* and *France*, *Sweden* and *Denmark*, of the *Prince Elector Palatine*; as also of the *States General*, and of the *Duke of Lorain*, *Holfstain*, *Lunenburg*, *Osnabrug*, *Hannover*, and the *Pope's Nuncio*, to wit, One to each *Ambassador*, and one to each of their *Principals*; together with so many Copies of the Book, whereof the *Author* makes mention in the *Letter*, the *Title* whereof is,

Roberti Barclaii *Theologia verae Christianae*
Apologia, *Carolo secundo*, *Magne Britanniae*, &c. *Regi oblata*.

Robert Barclay his *Apology* for *True Christian Divinity*, Offered to *Charles the Second*, *King of Great Britain*.

Typis Excusa, 1676.
 pro *Jacob Claus*, *Bibliopola habitante Amstelodami*.

Printed 1676. for *Jacob Claus*, *Bookseller* at *Amsterdam*.

R. B's
A P O L O G Y
FOR THE
True Christian DIVINITY
V I N D I C A T E D
FROM

*John Brown's Examination and pretended Con-
futation thereof, in his Book called,*

Quakerism the path-Way to Paganism :

In which V I N D I C A T I O N *John Brown his
many Gross Perversions and Abuses are Dis-
covered, and his Furious and Violent Rail-
ings and Revilings soberly Rebuked.*

By ROBERT BARCLAY.

Whereunto is Added

A Christian and Friendly *Expostulation* with
Robert Macquare, touching his *Postscript* to
the said Book of *J. B.* Written to him, by
Lillias Skein, Wife of *Alexander Skein*, and
delivered some *Months* since at his House
in *Roterdam*.

*Isaiah 51. 7. Hearken unto me, ye that know Righteousness,
the People, in whose Heart is my Law, fear ye not the Re-
proach of Men, neither be ye Affraid of their Revilings.*

*Matth. 5. 11. Blessed are ye, when Men shall Revile you, and
Persecute you, and speak all manner of Evil falsely against you
for my Name's Sake.*

L O N D O N: Printed by the Assigns of
J. Sowle, in the Year, 1717.

T H E

Preface to the Reader.

Serious R E A D E R,

I Shall not need to trouble thee here with a Long Preface, most of what is commonly Inserted in such Epistles being proposed to thee in the First Section; only I will take Occasion here Ingeniously and Solemnly to profess, That no Delight in Controversy hath Induced me to undertake this Treatise, but pure Necessity to Vindicate the Truth professed by me, from the many gross Perversions, wherewith this Author hath Abused It. For as for his personal Reflections at me, which are very frequent, and whereby he labours to represent me to his Reader, as the Veriest Fool, Ignorant, Senseless, Non-sensical, and yet Proud, Presumptuous and Blasphemous Miscreant (for such are his Expressions) that can be imagined; I should not have troubled my self nor the World with a Vindication: Being perswaded, none, who truly knows me, will believe him; and that none of Solidity and Judgment, who knows me not, will so easily Agree to this Censure. As for such credulous Creatures, if his Book find any such (for I have heard of several of the same Faith with him, who much Condemn his Railing Style) who will judge of me upon so small and suspicious Evidence, I must be Contented (as many better Men have been before me) to abide the Rash Judgment of those Inconsiderate Souls. As for the Book, from which he Assumes and Pronounces this Character of me, thou wilt find it here Vindicated, and see that hideous Mask, wherewith he laboured to Vail it, that he might Rail the more securely,

curely, Taken off. I could easily shew the Lightness of his Judgment, by filling the other Scale with a pressed-down Measure of the Testimonies both by Word and Writ of several Persons at Home and Abroad, who are not Quakers; and yet such, to whom without Disparagement he must give the Precedency both for Parts, Piety and Learning: but I desire not to Raise my Reputation that way, it is his Work, that needs a Postscript of that Nature. And truly, he hath saved me this Pains, while at other Times he manifestly Implies a Contradiction to this Character, while he perswades the Reader of the Necessity he was under to write so great a Volumn; as if the whole Christian Commonwealth had been in Danger to be Overturned, and many Souls in Hazzard to be Hurt by the Quakers (among whom both he and his Brother R. M. C. give me and my Writings a Chief Place, as their Goliath, Patron, Sharpest and Neatest Pen) if not seasonably supplied by this his Antidote. For sure, had it been so Inconsistent and Contradictory a Peice of Work, as he sometimes Represents it to be, as being written by so silly and pitiful an Ignoramus (as he is sometimes pleased to term me) there could not have been so great Cause of Fear, nor such need of a great Volumn, especially to such, as could not understand mine; being not yet Extant in a Language they Skilled, to whom he principally directs his: And though they had, could have no great Hurt; if he speak true, when he represents me frequently to write things Unintelligible: And yet he is so Wise as to Apprehend, he has Refuted, what he confesses he doth not Understand. But the Reason of his thus Contradicting Himself is, that albeit his Malice to the Truth and my self was such, that he could not say enough to Render both It and me despicable; yet forgetting himself at other times, he was forced to Ac-

know-

knowledge, what I say, Considerable, that he might render his own Work of some Value, and himself a Champion: Which he could never have done, albe it he might be supposed to have Rebuked and Refuted a Piece of pitiful Non-sense. Thus the Man, while he stretcheth to Exalt Himself, and Abuse me, overturns on the one Part, what he Affirms on the other. But if he can have so far Pity upon himself, as to think it time of Repenting, I do with my whole Heart freely forgive him; and whether he do, or not, I can Assure him, as I should never have valued my self upon his Commendation, so I am nothing moved by his Abuses, save only to Pity and Commiserate him. I must Intreat this of the Reader, that, if he desire to be fully informed in this Controversy, he will be pleased first to Read my Apology; which for his Benefit will, I hope, be Extant in our Language, e're this comes to his Hands: And then perhaps he will little need an Antidote against the pretended Confutation: But if any Scruple there remain, it will easily be Removed by seriously perusing this Vindication. And because before his Book he placeth a great List of that he accounts the Blasphemous Assertions of the Quakers, that so he may prepossess his Reader with Prejudice at the very Entry; to Remove them, thou wilt find Inserted at the End a List of so many of them, as are utterly False: Besides many of them are Perversions, and not owned in the Terms he Asserts them: And yet a great Part of them he pretends not so much as to Deduce from any Words written by me; but has fished for them in the Writings of others of our Adversaries: Which Piece of Injustice is in the last Section Demonstrated. Not desiring to Detain thee any longer, I shall only Wish The God of all Grace to Minister to thee such a Measure thereof, and give thee such Light and Under-stand-

standing by the Holy Influence of his Divine Spirit, that thou may'st for his Glory and thy Soul's Salvation make a Right Judgment of the present Controversy, and come truly to Discern, which Doctrine it is, and Who, that speaks most Consonantly to the Holy Scripture.

So Wiseth he, who is a Real Friend to all Men.

R. B.

A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

IT is hoped, That the more Moderate, Sober, and Serious among the Presbyterian Preachers, and who have a true Regard as well to the Peace of their own Consciences, as to the Christian Reputation of their Cause and Interest among Sober and Honest Christians, will shew their Readiness to do Justice to themselves, as well as Right to the Injured Author of this Treatise, not only in Respect to the Appeal added to the End of the last Section; but also to the many other gross Abuses, Falshoods and Railings Detected herein, to be most Impudently Asserted by **John Brown**; since he comes forth under no less Character, than a Presbyterian David, and that given him by so Eminent a Man, as Robert Macquarie is Reputed among them. Which Justice is also the more hoped for, since the more Moderate Presbyterians have themselves felt the Fruit of J. B. his Violent, Furious and Unchristian Temper in his Fomenting Divisions among them, and encouraging Cameron by his Letter; whom they repute an Heady, Turbulent Incendiary, and the Effects of whose Work strengthened by J. B. have produced no small Mischief both to the Cause in general, and to many poor People, who have been thereby Ruined; if the Occasion some of themselves Represent of the late Rising in Scotland, be True.

R. B's

R. B's

A P O L O G Y

F O R T H E
T R U E*Christian Divinity*

V I N D I C A T E D

F R O M

J. B's *Examination* and pretended *Confutation*
thereof in his Book, called*Quakerism the path-Way to Paganism.*

S E C T I O N I.


Containing the Introduction, and the Method, the Author proposeth to himself in this Treatise; with the Reasons, Wherefore? Together with some general Considerations Relating to J. B's whole Book; and Remarks on his Epistle to the Reader.

¶ I. **A**MONG the many Evils, that abound amongst those, that bear the Name of *Christians*, this is a great One, that in the *unhappy Difference* they have among themselves, there appears so much *Malice*, *Bitterness* and *Envy*, and so little

1670. of that *Candor* and *Sincerity*, True and *unmixed Zeal*, and of the Meekness, Peaceableness and Gentleness of Jesus: So that there is often-times observed an eager Willingness to represent their Opposites other ways, than they are. But among all Sorts of such, as profess Christianity, I know none have more Reason to Complain of this Abuse, than we: Who, albeit we have not a little Laboured to make known to all the plain *Truth* held by us; yet our Words have been most miserably Perverted upon many Occasions, and we most horribly Mis-represented. As is abundantly manifest to many, who are acquainted with the *Books writ against us*, and our *Answers*; wherein many, if not most of the Arguments used against us, are not Levelled at those things we *truly hold*, but at the Monstrous and horrid *Conceptions*, which our Adversaries have framed to themselves, and them would needs fasten upon us, as our Principles and Doctrines. Many of us have been thus exercised in the Controversies, wherein we have been Concerned; and I my self, in some small *Rencontres*, that have heretofore fallen to my Share, have had my Part; but I confess, Inferior to many of my Brethren: But now that *J. B's* Work appears, I think (considering the *Bulk* and *Nature* of It, hereafter more particularly to be Viewed) I may come up with most. For I scarce think, that ever a Man's *Words* were so Horridly and Constantly throughout *Perverted*, or that ever a Book of *Controversy* of it's Bulk, to wit, (as I take it) betwixt 70 and 80 Sheets of Paper, was so Stuffed with a Continual Strain of *Railing*, from the very first Page unto the last: Yet, when we consider the Man's *Design*, which appears from the Nature of his Work, perhaps there will be less Occasion of *Wonder*,

Our sad Sufferings by our Adversaries mis-representing us and perverting our Principles and Doctrines.

¶ 2. For either he, or some Brother of his Abroad, having without any Provocation from us, the People called *Quakers*, fallen into the most Gross and Vilest Sort of *Railing* against us in a *Postscript* to *S. R's Letters*, and that without the least Offer of Probation; it seems, they judged themselves concerned to give the People some Reason for their so doing. And there could not be a finer Knack to beguile the Credulous and implicite Multitude, than to *Answer* a Book writ in *Latin*, and not Extant in their *Mother Tongue*; for there a Man, as to them (who cannot Read, Understand and Compare it with that, to which it relates) may *pervert Words* as he will, draw Consequences at pleasure, and make to himself what *Monsters* best please his Fancy, or like his Humour best to batter: And yet he cannot find in it (by all his *Perverting*) enough to make us so *black*, as he would have us; so that he is oftentimes constrained to Fish for this, by citing the Writings of some, that have writ *against* us, and brings us up some of their *Old, Thread-bare Calumnies*, long ago Answered by us: In which his *Injustice* shall be afterwards observed. And so he, being thus furnished, can the more easily *Abuse*, especially while he is almost Secure, that the Generality of those he writes to, are such, as will not call in Question, as to the *Truth* of it, what is said by one esteem'd by them a *precious and gracious Minister, and Sufferer for the good Cause to boot*. But blessed be God! the Number of such *Implicit Believers* groweth daily *less*, and many, that had wont to do other-wise, begin to *love to see* with their *own Eyes*, and not to Pin their *Faith* so much upon the *Clergy's Sleeve*, as they had used formerly to do. For this Cause, had I to do only with the more *Judicious* and *Learned*, who could have well understood the *Latin Edition*, I should have thought my self

1679.

 The Advantage *J. B.* has upon his *Implicit Believers*.

1679. the less Concerned to have said any thing to this *Answer*: but knowing, that *his* may come to the Hands of many, and maybe Read by them, who do not understand *Latin*; and that not a few, who do understand it, love rather to Read and Consider things in their Own *Language*; this made me hasten an *English* Edition (not one *Sheet* whereof was Committed to the *Press* several *Weeks* after *J. B's* Book came out) And now it being Abroad, as to those, who are diligent and Judicious, and willing seriously to Compare as to the *Argumentative Part*, I should not be so much concerned to *Answer* him; judging the *English* Edition with all such a sufficient *Reply* to this pretended Examination. However, he oftentimes sings a Triumph to himself, saying in many Places, *What will our Quaker say now?* Contrary to the Rules of Sobriety, and to what the Scripture teaches him, saying; *Let not him boast, that puts on his Armour; but he that takes it off*: Besides what his Brother in a most fawning, flattering Manner adds in his *Postscript*, (to which something may be said hereafter.) But because too many out of Malice, Prejudice and Ignorance may be too apt to Credit him, I resolve here to take notice of his gross *Perversions* and *Abuses* upon every *Thesis*, and of his most Unreasonable and Brutish *Railing*: Which being subjected to the Reader's View, will give him a great In-sight in the Matter, and let him see, what kind of Man this is, and what kind of Work it is that comes from him? And likewise in respect he Insults very much; I may labour to Allay it, in taking notice of his Chiefest Arguments, that are any ways to the Purpose. This, I know, will satisfy the Moderate and Judicious, who bring not a long with them an Understanding already Prepossessed; but are willing patiently to

hear

J. B's singing a Triumph before the Conquest.

hear both Parties, and then make a Judgment accordingly. And as for others, who are wholly Prepossessed with Malice and Prejudice, and have no Ears to hear, but (according to the Author of the *Postscript* his Advice) *Avoid the least of that Kind, as Poyson*; I say, as for such, I wish the Lord open their Eyes, and give them a Heart more Just and Equal, I shall not be much concerned, if my Writing have no great Influence upon them at present.

¶ 3. But if any Strange, that so small a Treatise, as this may seem to be, should *Answer* so great a Bulk; the Considering of these Particulars following will easily remove that Wonder.

1. If we Consider, how much is taken up in meer *Railing*, of which few Pages are found free; and sometimes takes up near the whole Page besides that almost every Paragraph ends with a Dish of this Desert, saying; *O what Hell-hatched Heresies these abominable Quakers maintain!* And the like: Besides many little Sentences, such as, *This is an Answer fit for a Quaker: This is like the Quakers Non-sense: I see the Quakers can dream waking,* and such like Stuff. I need not set down Pages to prove this; for as thou wilt find a Specimen of it in the first Half side to the *Reader*, so indeed thou'lt scarce open the Book, but thou wilt meet with it: So that I may safely say (to speak within Bounds) there are 20 Sheets (if it were all put together) that are meer *Railing* neither by way of Admiration, Detestation or Execration; which have nothing of Argumentation either from Scripture, or Reason, but the meer strong *Affirmo* of the *Assertor*. All which (albeit I may Remark it, as I go on) I think not my self concerned to *Answer*; nor do I Conceive, will any sober Man Judge, I am: And my *Answer* thereto, as now to the Bulk of it, so may perhaps prove not much more all along, than,

The Railing
Expresions
of J. B's a
great Part of
his Book.

1679. *The Lord rebuke that Railing Spirit in thee J. B. and, If it may stand with his Will, Redeem thee from it, that thou mayst learn Sobriety of that Grace of God, thou so much fightest against? It is a Trade I love not, nor do I skill or think to learn it; I will readily grant him both the Preference and Victory in this Art of Billings-gate Rhetorick, or (to speak yet more plain to all our Scots Capacities) of Rail Wives Oratory: So I say, Let all this Railing in his Book be laid aside. And whereas he would Insinuate in several Places, as if there were much Railing in my Apology, saying, I Rage, and such like Expressions: How great an Abuse this is, I leave to the Judgment of the Intelligent Reader.*

J. B's Ex-
cursions and
regions
Preachments

2. If all his *Excursions* be laid aside, wherein he runneth out often-times into long *Homilies* by way of Explanation of their Judgment, descanting upon the several Opinions of their *Divines* (as he calls them) in which he often-times not only bestows several Pages, but sometimes divers Sheets, as in its Place may be observed: In all which Tedious Preachments (some whereof are may be *Shives* of *Old Rusty Sermons*, that have been lying by him) I think my self no more concerned, than if the Man had writ a great Volume of their *Divinity*; which I should not perhaps have bestowed the Pains to Read, far less look'd upon it as my Business to *Answer* it.

His other
Helps and
Irrational
Proofs.

3. If all his Citations out of *Hicks*, *Faldo* and others, that have written against us (all which are long ago answered, though not heeded by him) were laid aside, which is not only most impertinent, but likewise unjust; (as shall be after more particularly observed :) And likewise his long Citations out of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, and larger Catechism (a good Part whereof he hath transcribed, and inserted in his Book; Albeit it had been a great deal easier, to have cited

cited the Chapters, and referred to them, the Book being so common ; but it seems, it pleaseth the Man's Humour to see a great Bulk go under his Name, however it be filled up.) And—

4. *Lastly*, If his many Perversions be considered, wherein he either wilfully or ignorantly mistakes my Meaning, and sets up to himself a Man of Straw, and then batters at it ; I say, this being laid aside, which takes up no small Part of his Work, will make a considerable Abatement. Now all these things considered, and all this superfluous and chaffy Stuff being laid aside, which is little or nothing to the Purpose, the Reader will find, that what remaineth, will go into a pretty narrow Compass, and bear no great Disproportion, if any at all, with these my Observations.

¶ 4. But e're I make an End of this Section, I judge it needful to take some Notice of his Epistle, where the manner of his Introduction is very odd. Men use to be sober and moderate, that write Controversies, in the Beginning at least, and not seek to prepossess the Reader with Prejudice against their Adversaries, until by the Strength of their Reasons they have proved them to deserve it ; but this Man is so full fraughted with Malice, and so in Love with *Railing*, that he cannot forbear the first Page, where we have him calling us, *Locusts, of whose Ministry the Devil makes Use, only Masculine in Malice against Christ, &c.* — — — *Breathing forth nothing, but that putred Poyson, that innate, Serpentine Venom, &c.* And of this Strain is the Whole of his Epistle, where we are termed *Apostate-Quakers, Renegado-Quakers, &c.* But methinks, it should have been more Rational to have forbore this, until he had proved us such ; and not to have begun thus to Rail without the least Probation : But however this may take with Malicious or

1679.

J. B's Introduction with malicious Railings.


pag. 2, & 3.

Credulous

1679. Credulous Persons. it will give the Judicious a sufficient Taste of the Nature of his Work; and we are not afraid of great Prejudice by this kind of Arguing. But as he goes on, he gives us a clear Specimen of what Spirit he is of; and abundantly shews, that if either he had Power, or were able to influence the Magistrate thereunto, he would have saved himself the Labour of all this Confutation, by making short in Cutting us all off. For since he represents us not only as the worst and Vilest of Hereticks, but as the *Sworn and most desperate Enemies of Jesus Christ* in all his Offices; we need not doubt, considering his Judgment expressed in the Case of *Liberty of Conscience*, what he would have done with us. And albeit it might have been Judged, that in Prudence he should have let it alone, until that Place; where it seemed to be most proper, and only might be inferred by way of Consequence: Yet in this, as in most other things, his Malice outdoes his Prudentials; and therefore he cannot let three Pages pass, and that in the Epistle, till he discover his Temper in this. For there he tells a Story of a *Turk, who caused punish a Jew for Blaspheming of Christ, to the Shame of Christians, who have not so much Zeal, &c.*— and a *Redress of this* (saith he) *is called for at the Hands of one and other, according to their Place and Station.* The Language of this is sufficiently understood, and beareth no small Reflection upon Magistrates, as not being so forward to Persecute, as *J. B.* would have them. And if we consider that Flood of *Railing*, that follows, the Application is easy; and then, as he goes on, he takes a very convenient Way, that he may Rail securely and Calumniate without Fear of being discovered. For he would *Fright People from so much as coming near us; yea, he will have all fleeing from us more hastily, than from Persons having*

His Persecuting Spirit

ing

ing the black Botch (such is his comely Expression) 1677. 

yea, and under the dreadful Hazzard of incurring Anathema Maranatha, so much as to enter into a Friendly Communing with us, giving us the least token of Kindness and Affection by Word or Deed! (What; not feed us, if ready to Starve? Or cloath us, if Naked? Which Christ commands all his Disciples to do to their greatest Enemies) But how would this Man have a Husband be having towards his Wife, or a Wife towards her Husband? If turning Quaker they must shew one another no Token of Kindness and Affection either in Word or Deed; when the Apostle encourages Christian Husbands and Wives to live with one another respectively, if they be willing, albeit professed Heathens and open Idolaters; But with him they must not so much as shew a Token so much as by one Cast of the Eye, far less by more Homely Discoursings. And after the same Manner a little after he would have all forbear so much as looking into our Writings; to which, according to his ordinary Style, he gives such Epithets as his Railing Genius affords him: A very ready way for him to Bely and Calumniate us at Pleasure. But upon this Occasion I would ask him this Question, If he judgeth it reasonable, that he, that readeth his Examination, should look into the *Apology*, to which it relates, or unto that which is said by way of Reply to it, or if he would have them taking all upon Trust from him? Were not this a brave Way of Examining Controversies? And doth not this fairly lead to the *blind Ignorance and Implicitness of the Church of Rome, and to the Custom of the Turks and Mahomet's Rule?* (whom he hath so often in his Mouth.) I would willingly know, if the Man would avow himself so Irrational, as to require or desire this of any Body in their Wits? And yet he must be so Irrational, or otherwise allow

Prov. 25.

ver. 21.

Mat. 5. 44.

Rom. 12. 20.

Rom. 7. 2.

Eph. 5. 2-25.

1679. allow the breaking of the Rules he so earnestly preffeth.

¶ 5. After he has proceeded at the same Rate of Railing, accusing us of *Devilry*, and what not, (as for the Number of the poysonous Assertions, which he saith he has gathered together, it shall be spoken of hereafter, and his gross Abuse therein detected) he comes at last to apprehend, That *some will think he is too large*; but he has a quick Way of solving that Difficulty, by Answering himself with a contrary Apprehension, That *more will blame him for not being larger*: And so this Objection is easily dispatched. As for the Reason he gives of his Prolixity, to wit; *Because of the Temper of the Quakers, who would have been ready to Vaunt and Triumph, if he had Omitted any thing*: But for all this Boast it shall be shewn, that several times (as large as he is) he hath omitted whole considerable Paragraphs, where he found he would be Pinched, and that the Matter was too hot for his Fingers, that he durst not meddle with it. At last he comes to an honest and ingenuous Confession, That *in most of the Heads he hath adduced for Confirmation only their Confession of Faith and Catechism*: A very plain Acknowledgment of the Nature of his Work; for he is very good at Begging the Question, and proceeding upon Principles denied by him he hath to do with. But the Judicious Reader may judge, whether his Proofs be very Valid and Binding, which are only confirmed by that, which is denied by me; and which needs to be confirmed no less, than the Arguments deduced from it; since I account it no Confession of the *True Faith*: This is just, as if a *Papist*, Arguing against a *Protestant*, should tell him, *He useth only for Confirmation the Decrees of the Council of Trent*. How ridiculous this

7. B's Reason for his Prolixity.

His Proofs from Westminster Confession and Catechism, preferring them before Scriptures.

this is, any Judicious Man may judge. But since 1679. he hath so great a Veneration of the *Confession of Faith*, and also such an Itch of *Scribbling*, methinks, he should not suffer it to lie so long under the Censure of that *Examen*, which was written several Years ago; and lieth yet (for ought ever I could learn) Unanswered: All the Notions of which, albeit I will not espouse, yet I think, all *F. B's* Clergy and Reason will not solidly reply to it: And I am well assured, it hath disgusted Hundreds of that Confession, who are not *Quakers*; and also how weakly the Confession is confirmed, and how grossly the Scriptures are perverted to make them serve it, I have given a Taste in the last Chapter of my Book, intituled, *A Catechism and Confession of Faith*: which is not only extant in *English*, but he will find it also Printed in *Low-Dutch*; and should in Reason have been removed by him, e're he had used it only for Confirmation in Controversy against me. But there is something more in this Expression: For *when the Confession of Faith and Catechism is only adduced for Confirmation, what becomes of the Scriptures, that in Words are so highly exalted?* It seems, notwithstanding all these Verbal Commendations he has no more Use for them, than for an Old Almanack: The Confession of Faith and Catechism is that, which is to be minded. It seems, what he brings of them in this Controversy, is only *pro forma*, for the Confession of Faith is only adduced for Confirmation; it is the good Antidote against the many Errors of the Times: And whereas he speaks of *Apposite Passages of Scripture*, those that will compare them with the Things they are pointed to prove, will find in most not the least Correspondence: Of which I have given some Proof in that Place before-mentioned.

1679.

¶ 6. But indeed, he hath spoken out the Truth of the Matter. For all their great Talk of the Scripture, it is manifest to such as will narrowly look into it, that not the Scripture, but the Confession of Faith and Catechism is their Rule of Faith and Manners: For the Scriptures must serve the Confession of Faith, not the Confession of Faith answer the Scriptures; which must be turned, twin'd and wrested to suit the Confession of Faith. Hence if a Man believe the Scriptures ever so firmly, and square his Faith accordingly, unless he agree to every Point of the Confession of Faith, all is to no Purpose, he must pass for an *Heretick*.

At last to conclude, he having, it seems, said all he has to say, makes Provision not to be put upon the Necessity to Vindicate his gross Perversions and Calumnies. As for his Comparison of *Rats and Mice, their Dealing with Books*, he must know, I intend not to square these Observations to gratify his Humour; it will be enough for me to satisfy the Candid and Judicious Reader. He doubts not to make a Judgment of Things not yet in Being, and therefore *Expects no Answer, that shall favour of Reason, Religion, Candor and Plainness*: We have seen that of him, which gives us Ground to believe, he has had enough Thoughts of us: But however he must not expect to be Judge in his own Cause. And whereas he saith, *He will not be troubled at our Railings and Barkings*; one may wonder, the Man has the Confidence to accuse others, of what himself is so highly guilty of: But he shall not need fear to be troubled with such Stuff; and whether he gives or gets most of that, is referred to the Judicious Readers, to whose Judgment and Censure, whether he will or not, as his Writings will be liable, so to them, and to their Christian Consideration I freely submit, what is written in these Observations.

S E C T.

J. B. pre-
sumes to be
Judge in his
own Cause.

1679.

S E C T. II.

Wherein his Two First Chapters, containing Remarks upon my Preface, and the First These Of the true Ground of Knowledge, are Considered.

¶ 1. **U**Pon the *Preface* of my *Theses*, which is but about half a Dozen of Lines, he bestows no less than Twelve Pages; all which being either bare Assertions, or Railing (as cannot escape the Diligent Reader's Observation) will therefore require the Shorter Reply. He hath not got the Length of a Dozen of Lines, when with a Piece of Confidence he will seem so Modest, as *Not to Præ-occupy the Reader's Judgment*, by calling the *Theses*, *Ethnicall* or *Diabolicall*; but methinks, if he has not forgotten his *Epistle*, which we in Reason suppose the Reader to have first viewed, in which (as is above observed) there is enough of that sort said to Pre-occupy his Judgment: So that he must needs put out his Eyes, that doth not see, that his pretended Modesty and Forbearance is not Real.

7. B's vain
Pretence to
Modesty.

¶ 2. *Next*, because these *Theses* are directed by me to *Clergy-men of all Sorts in the Christian World*, he will needs have it, that I acknowledge a *Christian World*, to which my self, and those I patronize, do not belong; but how he makes this Consequence appear, he leaves us to divine: For there is no Proof brought for it, but his own Assertion. He needs not wonder, that I acknowledge a *Christian World*, unless he had known me somewhere to deny it; for in Respect of *Profession* (which Distinction himself elsewhere useth) all these may be accounted of it, who make an *Outward Profession* of Christ: Besides that I have

The *Chri-
stian World*
so called
from its out-
ward Pro-
fession of
Christ.

suffi-

1679. sufficiently acknowledged my Belief, that in several of them the *Inward Life* of Christianity is to be found. As for what follows, he needs not doubt, but I am as much against the Distinction of *Laity* and *Clergy*, as himself can be: But since I writ to such, many whereof own it, my Using it to them for Distinction's sake, will not infer my Approving of it. With his usual Candor he will have this Direction to import no less than a *Chartal*, to provoke all those it is directed to, to a *Dispute*; as if a Man for removing of Mistakes and Mis-representations could not give an Account of his Faith, without it be esteemed a Provocation to Dispute: If he really believes I intended so, I must tell him, he is greatly mistaken; and I apprehend, I should know my own Intentions large as well as he. He is offended, that our Doctrines should be thought as different from *Papists*, as *Protestants*; but with how little Ground, will after appear: And he also refers it to a fitter Probation. Then, after he has knocked as hard as he can upon me, for my Confidence, he tells me, *That there is little said by me, but what was Refuted, e're I was born, by the Orthodox Writings against Pelagians, Socinians, Arminians, Enthusiasts, Anabaptists and Papists*: But methinks then there was the less need of troubling the World with his Volume. Yet he has for that a ready *Salvo*, He must *Answer a Fool according to his Folly, lest he be wise in his own Conceit*. Some other Reasons he adds for Ingaging in this his Work, which the Reader may judge of, whether they be of any Weight.

¶ 2. As he goes on, he is greatly offended, I should style my self a *Servant of the Lord*; and will have it to be upon no better Ground, than *Thomas Muncer and the Anabaptists of Munster*; But because all this is founded upon the Supposition of my being a *false Prophet, and Preaching another*

The Word
clergy used
by the Au-
thor for Di-
stinction's
sake.

another Gospel than the true, we must leave it to the Reader's Judgment, after he has taken Time to consider of the whole Debate. But because he speaks here of the *Producing Credentials*, I would willingly have him producing his Credentials for being a *Minister of the Gospel*; and it may be then seen, if I cannot produce as valid, for any thing I style my Self: Only he must remember, That as his must have something more than his own Affirmation, or those of his Party; so he must overturn mine with some stronger Arguments, than meer Railing.

¶ 4. He needs not apprehend (as he would insinuate) *That the Omission of any Words in the Theses prefixed to the Apology, proceeds from my being ashamed of the Name QUAKER*; since himself bears witness in the very same Page, that I fully acknowledge it in the Explanation of the Eleventh Thesis. Here he has a Descant upon *Trembling*, and seems to strange, that any Quaker should bring the Example of *Moses* and *Habbakkuk*, to shew, *That such a thing was not so much to be wondred at in the Saints*; but why this should be esteemed impertinent by him, he doth not tell us. As for the *Foaming at the Mouth* he talks of both here and elsewhere, it is returned upon him as a Calumny, and he is desired to prove it; but it must be by some more credible and impartial Testimony, than his *Mr. Stalham*: for Parties use not to be admitted as Witnesses. For his denouncing us by that Name of Distinction, I shall not quarrel: But as for his Insinuation in the Beginning of pag. 5, where he saith, *It is like, we would gladly have them casting away their Bibles, as no more to be regarded than the Turks Alcoran*; it bespeaketh the Height of Malice: As to which I shall only say, *The Lord forgive him for so gross a Calumny*, which he, that is the Searcher of Hearts, knows to be a most horrible Lye! He goes

1679.
Which are the Priest's Credentials for his Ministry pretended.

7. B's malicious Insinuations against our own of the H. Scriptures and Schools of Learning.

1679. goes on after his usual Manner, saying, *I inveigh against all Humane Learning, that hath been any ways made Use of in Theology*; but where he finds this asserted by me, I know not: Whether the Words he would deduce it from, to wit, (*That Man has rendered the plain and naked Truth obscure and mysterious by his Wisdom*) will bear such a Consequence, is left to the Reader's Judgment. But he thinks he has found out our secret Design of being against *Learning and Schools of Learning* (which is neither our Affirmation, nor Principle, but his own false Supposition.) *We would* (saith he) *have all those banished, that we might the more easily prevail with our Errors*: But methinks, the Man should be more wary in venting his own false Imaginations, unless he could bring some Ground for them: For his Assertion is so far untrue, that if he had been rightly informed, he might have known, that we have set up *Schools of Learning*, for Teaching of the Languages, and other needful Arts and Sciences, and that we never denied its Usefulness: Only we denied it to be a Qualification *absolutely necessary for a Minister*; in which Case alone we have opposed its Necessity.

¶ 5. He confesseth, I speak not amiss, in saying, *The World is overburthened with Books*; but thinks, that my *Apology* of Fifty Sheets adds some considerable Weight. But methinks, he of all Men should have here been silent, who has troubled the World with an *Examination* of it a great deal larger; albeit he confesseth, All that is in it hath been refuted by the *Orthodox* long ago: And not only so, but since that he has written a Book near twice as large upon one Point, to prove the *First Day* of the Week to be the *Christian Sabbath*; and yet is but the *First Time*, and seems but to be the *Porch*, of what he intends upon that Subject. With his usual Can-

Candor he saith, *I am against Disputes and Debates, or Books written of that Nature*: But to infer simply, That I am against all such, because I reprove the Vain Jangling, that hath been and is among the *School-Men*, is an ill Consequence. He shall not find me any where speaking against useful and solid Controversies for Clearing and Maintaining of Truth. He seemeth not to disapprove, what I speak against *School-Divinity*, confessing the abuse of it; albeit he thinks, it hath been of Use. And as for this Imagination of my being acquainted with it, we will place it among his other Mistakes. He proceedeth pag. 8. to say, *I am against the Labours of those, that have writ Commentaries*; but his Conclusion here is like others of this Nature. When I mention *Commentaries*, it is with Relation to what goes before: He will not deny, but *Many Books are written under the Notion of Commentaries on the Scripture, by which the Truth has been more darkened, than cleared*; will it therefore follow, that he condemns *Commentaries* indefinitely? As for such Writings tending to the *Opening of the Scripture*, in which the Authors are Acted and Influenced by the *same Spirit*, from which the *Scriptures* came, and which alone can give the True Meaning of them, I am so far from Condemning them, that I highly approve them, as very Beneficial to the Church of Christ. As for his Talk here of our *Disrespect to the Scriptures*, I shall have Occasion to take Notice of it, where they are particularly treated of: But he is Apt to think, that the Real Ground of my Prejudice against such Books is, because so much is to be found in them against my Old Errors; for I cannot but know (saith he) that whoever reads these, must see my Nakedness and Folly without much Study: As for his Imagination we must take it with much more, upon Trust; but this helps

1679.
Solid Controversy for clearing the Truth, useful.

1679. to prove the Needfulness of his large Examination.

¶ 6. At his usual Rate of Perverting he goes on to say, *That the Account I make of all the Learned Men of the World, is, that they are Scribes and Disputers of the World, &c.* But for Proof of this we have nothing: He confesseth, the Words to be those of the Apostle; and how he proveth, that I have a different Meaning from the Apostle, I know not. After he hath commended his Learned Men, and loaded the *Quakers* with Reproaches, he concludes this Paragraph, pag. 8. with another Falshood; and yet he will have it remarked, to wit, *That according to my Judgment, the Pure and Naked Truth of God was never unfolded nor declared, until the Generation of the Quakers arose.* But where he finds me saying so, he tells not, and indeed cannot; since such a Thing was never asserted by me. For Answer to my saying, *That God has laid aside the Wise and Learned, and made Use of Illiterate Men, as to Letter-Learning;* after he saith, *It is Affirmed without Proof,* (not considering, how improper it was, not to expect any formal Probation upon the Occasion and Manner it was delivered) he gives us divers Citations out of the Apostle *Paul*, warning against *Seducers*: All which I acknowledge to be true; but the Question lieth in the right Application. And yet since, (albeit he believes, they very appositly agree to us) he thinks it not his present Business to demonstrate it; it will need no Reply. After he has proceeded in his Tenth Page, according to his usual Sort of Railing, affirming the great Difference betwixt our Doctrine, and that of the Apostles, he brings forth a mighty Charge, *That I usurp the Throne of God, and Judge of Men's Hearts and Intentions:* (but how Guilty himself is of that Crime, hath been in
Part

Part already shewn, and will hereafter more appear) But why do I so? Because I say, *The Clergy have clouded the Truth, that the common People might Maintain and Admire them*: But have not Protestants, and that truly Asserted this of the *Papish Clergy*? And is not the *Thesis* directed to such? Will it not then hold true (according to his own Judgment) of a great, yea, the greatest Part of those, to whom it is directed? What then will become of his Clamours? Yea, If it were needful I could give Instances of very mean Thoughts he and his Party have of many of the *Protestant Clergy*; yea, and Reflections not much (if any thing) inferior to this, to verify, with how little Ground he quarrelleth with me here. As for his Malitious Aspersions, *That there are shrewd Presumptions, our Stock lies at Rome*; he should have produced some of them, if he could: We could never yet obtain for this Old Calumny from our Adversaries the least Probation; and it will be found as hard for him to prove it, as he may think it for such, who strongly affirm, *Their Great IDOL, the COVENANT, was contrived at Rome, and came from thence*. As for his Reflection upon our Church, as being *All Eyes and Ears*; it will be proper to speak of it in its own Place. Next, to prove the Positions of the *Quakers* to be such, as *overturn and destroy the Gospel*, he bringeth (Page 11.) divers Citations out of Mr. Norton and Mr. *Stalham* (as he terms them) adding, *More may be had out of Mr. Hicks*: But such Witnesses will have small Credit with impartial Readers: If he himself had dealt impartially, he should have first Read our Answers to them, e're he had given them such Authority. It were easy for me, by way of Reply to Transcribe, what our Friends have written particularly by way of Answer to them, did I as much affect to

1679.
The Clergy clouding the Truth, that the People might admire and maintain them.

J. B's
False Witnesses contributing to his bulky Book.

1679. have my Writings bulky, as it seems he doth. He clofeth up this with a Fit of *Railing*: And after he has quarrell'd with me, *pag. 12.* for *having an high Conceit* (as he imagines) of *my Thefes*, he falls fresh to that Work again, telling, *They have Weight to sink into the bottomless Pit the poor Soul that embraces them.* I never fought, any should receive Doctrines as Truth upon my bare Testimony; and therefore he needs not upbraid me with so doing. And whereas on the contrary (as himself immediately observes) I leave what I say, to the *LIGHT* in every Man's Conscience; it shews, with how little Reason he made his former Allegiance. After he has pleas'd himself with making an impertinent Conjecture of the Import of these Words, that so he might, if he could, render them Ridiculous; he cometh at last to the true Understanding of them: And truly, he needed not *fear at my being offended, that he should make a Judgment of what I writ, according to his Conscience*; but he went the wrong way to work, when his Labour is to pervert and wrest, and make them speak, what they do not. This apparently proceeds from Malice and Prejudice; and the *Light of his Conscience*, if he had minded it, would never have prompted him so to do. Thus I am come to the End of the First Chapter.

¶ 7. In the Second Chapter, intituled, *Of the true Ground of Knowledge*, I find, he cannot contradict what is asserted by me; only he must be Carping, he makes a Noise, that *Joh. 17. 3.* cited by me, *So much of the Sentence was not set down in the First, as Second Edition.* What a pitiful Cavil this is, the Reader may easily judge; since the Place was noted, it was enough, though never a Word had been set down; but this with him is a *bad Omen*. Let the Judicious judge of this Man's Judgment in the Matter. But because
he

he cannot Quarrel at what is said, he will quarrel, *That so much is not said, as he judged meet*: 1679.
 But he may be pleased to understand, that I judged my self under no Necessity to advise with him, what was needful for me to write. *But* (saith he) *since I take upon me to Teach the whole World*, (it is strange, it should be so natural for this Man to write Untruths, since I direct my *Theses* only to the *Christian World*: But if it may render me Odious, such *Peccadillo's* pass with him, it seems, but for *Piæ Fraudēs* :) *I intended never to write of those Things, concerning which we do not differ from others.* But let me see, wherein he accounts me Defective. I have *Written nothing* (saith he) *of the Nature and Attributes of God.* I write not to *Atheists*, but *Christians*, who already acknowledge; and I judge it not my Work to write Books to perswade Men of that, they already profess to believe. But I write not Expressly and Distinctly of the *Trinity*; yet himself after acknowledges (*pag. 24.*) Trinity (so called) spoken of by the Author.
That it would seem, I am Orthodox herein; that he finds not any clear Ground to the Contrary. I writ as Expressly and Distinctly of that, as is Expressed in Scripture; which I hope, *J. B.* will not say is defective in sufficiently Expressing this *Article of Faith.*

¶ 8. The Third Challenge is, *I speak nothing of God's Decrees, by which some are prædestinated to Life, others Fore-ordained to Death*; (for the Man without Ceremony takes the Doctrine for granted :) But if I have spoken nothing of this, (though perhaps not in the Method he would) how extravagant must he be, that writes a whole Chapter upon *Reprobation*, as pretending to Refute what I have said concerning it. With the like Confidence (not to say Impudence) he accuses me of Silence in Relation to the *Covenants*; to the *Redemption purchased by Christ*; his taking *Flesh*

1679. *Flesh upon him; to the Work of Grace and Sanctification; to Obedience to the Law of God: Which grofs Abuse any one that reads my Book, will easily see; considering, how much, and how particularly these things are spoken to in the Explanation of the 5, 6, 7, and 8 Thefes.*

Resurrection
of the Body
owned by us.

Last of all he accuseth me for giving no Account of the *Resurrection of the Body*: But do I not expressly in my Conclusion affirm, That those that accuse us of Denying of it, belye us? And doth not that clearly import an Owing? But as to that Matter (because I love not Repetitions, as he doth, who will be upon one Matter often, and out of its proper Place) I will refer, what further I have to say, until I come to his last Chapter. At last, after he has Confessed in Part to what I affirm, he *craves Liberty, because some may put a wrong Foundation for the right, to Examine, what by me is placed for it*; which Liberty is freely granted him: (For I am a great Enemy to *Implicit Faith*, as well the *Popish*, as *Presbyterian*, who in that are much-what alike) And I will take also Liberty, to Re-examine his *Examination*, that I may free my self of those many Abuses, wherewith he has injured me.

S E C T. III.

Wherein his Third Chapter of Inward and Immediate Revelation is Considered.

¶ I. **T**HAT I may not trouble the Reader with a long and tedious Pursuit of *J. B.* in all his Extravagant Rambles and Unreasonable Railings (wherein he accuses me as an *Ignoramus*, writing *Non-sence and Confusion*, pag. 39. (more of that kind in pag. 31.) while yet to his own
Con-

Confusion (pag. 40, 41.) he saith, *He knows not what I mean, nor what I would prove; nor what my Arguments must conclude:* Wherein if he speak true, he declares himself Uncapable to judge of, and far less to Answer my Arguments) a large Disquisition of his Impertinency in which Things I willingly omit; and will consider this his Chapter, as well where he misses, as where he truly in any Measure urges the Matter. And first to dispatch what is superfluous, all that is said by him against *False Revelations* and *Delusions of the Devil* (against which he speaks sometimes more largely, sometimes more overly in pag. 21, 22, 34, 35, 36, 47.) no Judicious Reader will think, is any thing to the Purpose; since I never did plead for *False Revelations*, but for the *Necessity of the True Revelation of the Spirit to all real Christians*. And though it could be proved, that either I, or any other *Quaker*, (so called) were deluded by a *false Revelation*; yet it will not thence follow, That our Asserting the Necessity of *True Revelation* to the Building up of *True Faith*, is Erroneous, more than in *J. B's* own Sense the *Arminians* or *Socinians Asserting false Doctrines*, pretending to have for them the Authority of Scripture, will make him Judge, that their *Asserting the Scripture to be the Only and Adequate Rule of Faith*, is false in his Judgment, since he therein agrees with them. And therefore his Disingenuity, as well as Weakness doth notably appear, pag. 46, 47 and 48. where coming to take Notice, of what I have said, in shewing, how the same may be returned upon such, as own the *Scripture, Reason and Tradition* to be the Rule of their Faith, he gives it no Answer; and most Effrontedly comes up with his oft-reiterated Story of *John a Leyden* and *Munster* (with which we are less concerned, than himself.) Notwithstanding that I shew, that

1679.

The Priests professed Ignorance.

False Revelations and Delusions disowned by the Quakers.

even

16-9. even Men pretending to the Scripture, and to be led by it, and in particular his own Brethren, had done no less vile Actions, than those of *Munster*; and yet he would not think it well Argued to infer thence, that it were *Dangerous to follow the Scripture, as the Rule*. To all this he returns no Answer, which takes up six Pages in my *Apology* (Lat. Edit. pag. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31.) unless it be a sufficient Answer to say, *He needs not take Notice of my Trifling Answers, and that it is a meer Rhapsody*. But the Truth is (to use his own Expression) *It was too hot for his Fingers*; and therefore he judged best to shuffle it by so easily. But his Unfairness in this is so much the more considerable (where the Pinch of the Question lay, and his own and his Brethren's Reputation was so highly concerned, as being charged as Guilty of no less Abominations, than the Monsters of *Munster*) in that he boasts in his Epistle to the Reader, *That he hath Examined every thing asserted by me, particularly; which he gives as the Reason of troubling him with so Prolix a Treatise*.

J. B. finds it too hot to touch with Truth.

¶ 2. Now albeit I might in Reason pass his new-inforced Objection till he have satisfied to this so shameful an Omission; yet lest he should fancy any Strength in it, and to shew him the Silliness of it, I will here consider and Remove it. It runs thus, Pag. 46.

'7. B's Argument.

If, since the Apostles and other Extraordinary Officers fell asleep, and after the Cannon of the Scriptures was Completed, All that have pretended to Immediate Revelation, have been led by a Spirit of Error, Then that is not the Way of Christ.

But the former is true:

Therefore so is the other.

Ans.

Such an Objection is not like to signify much, where in both *Propositions* the Question is most miserably

bly *begged*, and the thing in debate taken for granted. For albeit the Connexion of the *Major* should be granted; yet the *Question* is there in a great Part of it *begged*, to wit, that such *Officers* in the Church, as were the Apostles, are not now, neither as to the Nature of their Office, nor Manner of their being led by the *Spirit*. Next, That *the Cannon of the Scripture is Completed*: That is to say, *No Writings are ever hereafter to be expected or believed to be written by the Spirit*; both which I deny, and he has not so much as offer'd to prove: and therefore his Argument, if I should go no further, can conclude nothing. Next, his *Minor*, to wit, That *All pretending to Immediate Revelation, have been led by a Spirit of Error*, is not at all proved by him: For albeit it might be said of all those Old Sects named by him, and of the *German Enthusiasts*; yet that is not sufficient Proof, unless he can make it appear, that there was never any other, but *were so also*: which yet remains for him to prove, and will trouble him to Effect. For to Affirm, there were *never any*, because he has never heard nor read of them, were an Argument a great deal more Ridiculous, than Rational. And for his Challenging me to shew them, (albeit the Instance of the *Quakers* be enough to spoil all his Argument, as will after appear) yet by his good Leave, I am not bound; *Affirmanti incumbit Probatio*. And that this *Answer* is sufficient, I have the Testimony of his learned Brother *John Menzies*, Professor of *Divinity* at *Aberdeen*, in his Book Intituled, *Papismus Lucifugus*, where he Answers the *Jesuit's Minor* the same way, and proveth it to be *sufficient*. And surely, he has not taken notice, that by this he has Condemned, as led by the *Spirit of Error*, all the *Primitive Protestant-Martyrs*, that *Prophesied* at any time; such as *John Huss*, and *George Wishart*

1679.

F. B. Argues without roof.


1679. *our Country-Man*; and many others, by reason of whose *Prophefying J. B.* and his Brethren have valued their *Cause*: since these Prophefies were said by them to proceed from *Inward and Immediate Revelation*, and so they pretended to it; albeit not as the Ground of their *Faith* and *Obedience* in all Matters of Doctrine and Worship, yet as the Ground of that *Faith*, by which they believed these *Revelations* to proceed from God, and not from the Devil; and of that *Obedience*, by which they Published and Declared these things. Moreover he overturns all by the last Instance, which he gives to prove it, to wit, That *the Quakers, who pretend to Immediate Revelation, are led by a Spirit of Error*: For Proof of which we have only his bare Affirmation; and yet till this be proved, his *Objection* is naught. For indeed, this is a rare Way of Debating with an Adversary, to make use of an Argument, by which he must be Concluded already as *Erroneous*, in order to Convince him, that he is such: If this be not, as they say, *To put the Plough before the Oxen*, I know not, what can be said to be so. For *J. B.'s* Argument, to make it plain, amounts to this;

J. B.'s Argument against immediate Revelation.

*If the Quakers be led by a Spirit of Error,
Then the Quakers Err in Affirming, Inward and Immediate Revelation to be the Ground and Foundation of True Faith:
But The Quakers are led by a Spirit of Error:
Therefore, &c.*

Which is just, as if I should Argue, thus:

*If J. B. be a Knave, a manifest Lyar and Calumniator, Then he is not a true Minister of Christ, nor fit to write in Religious Matters:
But J. B. is such:
Therefore, &c.*

Is not this a notable Way of Arguing, and a quick Way to despatch *Controversies*? What faith *Robert Macquarie*? Doth not this well become his *singularly Acute, solidly Learned, and truly gracious Author*? (Postscript Pag. 559. 1679. )

The next Thing to be considered, is, *His Stat- ing the Controversy*; Where, according to his Custom, he all along *begs* the Question. For having writ down his Opinion, and taken it for granted, without offering to prove it, he goes on and builds thereon without more Difficulty, as if it were not to be further questioned. This appears in Pag. 20, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 43, 44. in which Places he states his Opin- ion of the *Immediate Revelation of the Spirit*, as not being such, *as presents any Truths to be believ- ed* objectively; *but only in removing the Veil of the Eye of the Understanding, and spiritually Illuminat- ing the Mind, and working effectually upon the Heart, to embrace and receive the Truth already revealed and proposed in the Scriptures.* Now for not using this Distinction and holding *Reve- lation* in this his Sense, he greatly blames me, *as jumbling things together, and darkning and pre- judging the Reader*; and bestows upon me ever and anon many Railing Words: with the Repeti- tion of which I will not trouble the Reader. And yet notwithstanding this Accusation, in Contra- diction of himself he cites me Pag. 42. and 28. taking notice of this very Distinction, as used by some, and also Refuting it: Surely, the Man must have miserably forgot himself; and will verify the Proverb: *Liars should have good Memo- ries.* Next: Since he judges *I err, in not holding this Manner of Revelation*; and that he builds all his Superstructure upon it, as the *Truth*; he should have offer'd to prove it to be Such: For since he saith, *They willingly grant to these Scrip- tures noted by me, As many as are led by the Spi- rit*

What J. B. will have Revelation by the Spi- rit to be?

1679. rit of God, &c. Rom. 8. 9, 14. together with
 1 John 2. 27. Joh. 6. 45. Joh. 14. 16, 17. By
 which Scriptures he cannot deny, but the *Manner*
 of the Apostles being led, as well as of *AllChristi-*
ans, is Included; since some of them were dire-
 cted to the Apostles particularly: In all which
 there is no Ground for his a Distinction and Af-
 fertion. It is not said, *The Comforter, that I*
will send, shall lead you, the Apostles, Immediate-
ly, by proposing Truth to be believed objectively to
you, and this shall be accounted Extraordinary; but
after you it shall only lead other Christians by Illu-
minating their Understandings, and that shall be
the Ordinary Leading. And since then it is a
 Rule granted by all, that we must hold to the
plain Words of Scripture, unless an Urgent Ne-
 cessity force us to the Contrary; he should shew
 us, where this Necessity lies? and prove, his Af-
 fertion to be the *true and genuine* Meaning of
 the Words; and that we ought not to take them,
 as we do, according to their plain and Naked
 Signification and Import. For I would willing-
 ly hear any Ground from Scripture of this Na-
 ture of *Extraordinary and Ordinary Revelations*,
 as pertinent to this Debate: For albeit Things ex-
 traordinary may be Reveal'd to some, and not
 to others, that only respects the *Things Revealed*,
 not the *Manner* of Revelation. For a Man tel-
 ling me Extraordinary things, and Ordinary,
 albeit the things may *differ* in their *Nature*, yet
 neither my *Manner of Hearing*, nor his of
Speaking do thence necessarily *differ*.

¶ But perhaps the Man doth Apprehend, that
 what he saith, Pag. 20, 30, 31, 40, 44, 45. is
 some Proof of his Assertion; (which if he do,
 the Reader may easily observe his Mistake) where
 he would Insinuate: As if *the Manner of Imme-*
diatè Revelation by the Spirit (asserted by me)
rendered all other Means, even those of Teaching
 and


and Exhorting (which are appointed by God) use- 1679.
 less, and took away all Obligations of Obeying the
 Commands of God conveyed by others. And yet he
 taketh notice, Pag. 23. that I acknowledge O. Mediate In-
 ther Means of Knowledge as profitable; neither struction not
 has he ever heard me deny: But Men are obliged Inconsistent
 to obey the Commands of God through one another, with Imme-
 as well as in themselves; as the Children of Re-
 rael were those of Moses and the Prophets, and velation.
 the Christians those of Christ and his Apostles.
 But I suppose, he will Affirm with me, That no
 Man's Obedience to any Command will avail him a-
 ny thing, unless upon Inward Belief and Conviction,
 that the thing commanded is of God; since what-
 soever is not of Faith, is Sin. If he say, That al-
 beit I do not deny such an Obligation; yet
 it necessarily follows from my Principle: That this
 is untruly Alledged, will easily appear; since I
 suppose, he will Deny, but the Rest of the Apo-
 stles, who were alive, when Paul's Epistles were
 written, were obliged to receive them, and Obey
 them, as the Dictates of the Spirit. yea, and
 were Benefitted by them; and so the Apostle
 Paul by others: Albeit on both sides he will ac-
 knowledge them to have had such Revelations;
 as he accounts Immediate and Extra-ordinary.
 And so we see, that to have such Revelations,
 and yet to be mediately Instructed, are not Incon-
 sistent; nor do they render one another Useless:
 And indeed, to affirm they do so, is rather a
 presumptuous Accusing of God, who has Ap-
 pointed both in their Order for the Edification of
 his Church, than a Refuting of such that Assert
 them. Such are his Reasonings, Page 45. Besides
 that, this Objection may be easily refuted: for
 since J. B. Affirms, (as particularly Pag. 42.)
 That the Scripture is a Compleat Rule in all things
 concerning Faith and Manners in reference to Sal-
 vation;

1679. *vation*; Might it not be said, that this takes away the Use of all Commentaries and Expositions, and other Books, especially, since he and his Brethren do withal Affirm, that it is *Clear and Intelligible to all, in things Essential to Salvation*? Let him shew, how this is *weaker* as to him, than *other*, as to me. With the like Presumption he *Blasphemously* Asserteth, *That even these Revelations* (which he himself calleth and acknowledgeth to Inward, Immediate and Extraordinary) are *Uncertain* for this Reason, *because many Men have been deluded by the Devil*: On which he also insists in the following Page. And Pag. 34. and 48. where he sums up his Matter in this Question, *How comes it, that others pretending to Revelation as much as I, have been deceived?* But as I said before, *How comes, that others pretending to be led by the Scripture, as the Rule, as much as J. B. have been deceived, since the Scripture declares nothing but Truth?* But how silly this is, I have above shewn; and more largely in my *Apology* in those Paragraphs, which I observed, he most foully Omitted. And indeed, this is a fine Argument he has provided for *Atheists* and *Scepticks*; for it renders all Faith, even that of the *Patriarchs*, *Uncertain*. For since the Ground and Warrant of their Writing the *Scriptures* was (in his own Account) *Inward, Immediate and Extraordinary Revelations*, and if such be as he Affirms, *Uncertain*, then the *Truth* of the *Scriptures*, which depends upon *such*, must necessarily be *Uncertain*; since the Stream cannot be more *pure*, than the Fountain, nor the Superstructure more *sure* than the Foundation. And therefore most weak is his Reasoning, Pag. 46. where he pleadeth, *That such Revelations cannot be more sure than the Scriptures, which are the Objective Revelations of the Apostles written down*; since the Certainty of these Writtings depends upon the Certainty

Then J. B's
&c. Exposition
and
Commentaries
are of
no Use:

J. B. Affirms
Revelation to be
Uncertain.

tainty

tainty of these Revelations, by which they were Written. And certainly, if in any Case that *Maxim* of the Schools do hold, it must in this; *Propter quod unumquodque est tale, illud ipsum est magis tale.* 1679. 

¶ 5. It will not be amiss here in the *Third Place* to take notice of his most Uncharitable and Unchristian Insinuations, contrary to all Christian and Fair Rules of Debate, As first, Pag. 24. where he will needs infer our Denying of the *Trinity*: Albeit he cannot deny, but he finds it *owned* by me; groundlessly coupling us with the *Socinians*. And to help him in this, he brings in the Testimony of one Mr. *Stalham* (as he terms him) an open *Opposer* of ours; which Witnesses to receive against us, is most Unjust. But I desire here in the Entry, that it be observed, that I intend to take little or no notice of his many *Citations*, to prove what we Hold, out of the Writings of our open *Opposers*; and shall give such a sufficient Reason for my so doing, 'ere I make an End, as I am hopeful, shall satisfy all *Judicious Readers* as well of our Innocency, as his *Injustice* therein. But by this the Man's Temper may be seen, and that his Design is not so much to Refute, what we *truly hold*; as to make the World believe, that we Hold what we do not, to render us the more *Odious*. And thus he proceedeth also basely to Insinuate, *That I deny* Jesus of Nazareth *to be the Son of God*; albeit he doth not so much as pretend to any Colour for it from my Words: Only he finds, *Some Quakers give an Indistinct Answer in this Matter*; but *who* they are, or what their Answer is, he tells not. In Pursuance of this in the following Page he Insinuates, *As if I mean'd not the First, but the Second Creation*; and so joined with *Socinus*: Which is a gross Calumny, like the former: As

J. B's Enforcing false Beliefs and Doctrines upon the Quakers from the lying Books of their Opposers.

also

1679. also is, what he saith Pag. 31. Num. 18. where he Raileth against me, as *Writing things contrary to the Scriptures, and as one, whose Revelations are not from God, but from Satan.* For all this the only Proof is, [*J. B.* saith so:] which I must plainly tell him, is with me of no Weight at all. Of the same Nature is, what is Asserted by him Pag. 23. N. 20. wherein he insinuates, *That we Contemn the Scriptures;* telling a lying Story from his Author Mr. *Hicks* of one *Nicolas Lucas*: Which I desire him to prove the next time not by *Hicks* (for he is an *Accuser*) but by some more indifferent Witness; else to be justly held as a *Calumniator*. And whereas he saith, *We should not obtrude any thing upon them without Scripture:* This is another Lying Insinuation. For where do we obtrude any Doctrines without offering to Confirm them by *Scripture*, as much as he and his Brethen? For if he say, *That our Confirmations are not Valid;* that is not to the Purpose: We can easily say so of his, and do as truly believe it. But the Question is, *Whether we obtrude any Doctrines upon any to be believed, telling them, they ought to believe it; albeit we either will not or can not Confirm them by the Scripture?* Now he knoweth in his Conscience this to be a Lye; since I Affirm of the *Scriptures*, *Apol. Lat. Ed. p. 47. & n. 60.* *That they are the most fit Outward Judge of Controversies;* of which himself also taketh notice in that Place. And *Lastly*, of the Nature of these Malitious Insinuations is, what he saith Pag. 48. and 49, and *last Paragraph* of this *Chapter*; where, after he has Repeated, what he terms my *Monitory Conclusion*, he infers; *That I mean, that a Man should believe, that Nature's dim Light is the Spirit of God and the Holy Ghost; and that he may burn the Bible, and with Confidence assert, he is Led by the Holy Ghost; whatever Scripture or Common Sense say to the Contrary.*

J. B.'s Calumnious Meaning he puts upon the Author.

This

This is all Affirmed by him without the least Proof; which as it is the Height of Injustice, so it is with respect not only to my Words, but Belief and Intention, (God the Searcher of Hearts knows) a most-horrid Falshood and Calumny. 1679.

¶ 6. Now, albeit what is said, may seem sufficient for a Reply to this *Chapter*, and is indeed enough to give any Sober Man a Disgust of it; yet that he may not have Reason to Complain, that any thing, wherein he may judge there is Weight, and is directly to the Purpose, is Omitted; I will now in the *last Place* Consider and Answer, what he saith against the Validity of my Arguments, to which an Answer hath not been Included, in what is already said. To begin then like himself (which to be sure is with some Calumny or other) he saith Pag. 14. *I stigmatize with the black Mark of being Carnal and Natural Christians, all that assent not, to what I say: But he takes no time to prove it, and indeed cannot. For albeit I say, that It is like, many Natural and Carnal Christians will condemn, what I say; yet it will not follow, I account them all such, who will not fully agree with me in this Matter. Of the same Kind is his Calumny p. 22. n. 5. where he alledgeth, The Citations of the Fathers (so called) prove no more, than his Sense of Revelation above expressed: But whether he speaks true here or not, the Reader may judge by seriously reading over these Citations; and then let him see, if they do not hold out An Inward and Immediate Teaching of the Spirit of God in the Soul, as the firm Ground of Knowledge, without which all outward Teaching is in vain. But to infer this, he tells, They writ against such, as being Impostors and led by the Spirit of the Devil, pretended to Revelations. What then? Cannot Men write against false Revelations, without they deny the Necessity of true Ones? That is an odd Conclu-*

1670. sion: If *J. B.* were well acquainted with the Writings of the *Quakers* (so called) he would find them as much against False Pretenders, as any other. But Pag. 24. and 25. he findeth fault with my Argument deduced from these Words, *That there is no Knowledge of the Father, but by the Son*; because I take notice, as a first Instance, of *God's creating all things by Jesus Christ*; adding, *Was this so difficult a Point to be proved, that I was constrained to go back to the first Creation for an Argument?* Answ. No: But I judged it not improper (however he may) to shew First, as Preparatory, God's more general Way of working by his *Son Jesus Christ*, 'ere I come to that, which is more particular; and this was the Reason as well of my putting these *Propositions* into that Order as of my using of that Instance, by which that pretended Abomination, which he pretends *lurks under Words*, vanisheth. For the Man is very good at drawing Inferences from other Men's Words, which they, that spake and wrote them, never thought of; as I for one can very well witness, since the least can be allowed me, is to know my own Thoughts and Purpose; which how he should come to Assure himself, *he knows better than I*, is more than I can fathom. For the same Reason above-mentioned I used the Instance of *God's moving in his manifesting himself in his Creatures, and of the Spirit of the Lord moving upon the Face of the Waters*; which p. 26. he flouts at, but doth not Answer. And it is strange, that he of all Men should be offended with such preparatory Considerations, where the Matter is in a few Pages after closely come to; who has used so many Remote Arguments and several not Pages only, but Sheets, yea Quires of Paper in order to prove *the First Day of the Week to be the Christian Sabbath*. He Objects Pag. 26. against my Affirming, *That God's Communion with*
Man

Man was by Immediate Manifestation of the Spirit, 1679
 from Adam to Moses, because so few are mentioned; and he supposeth, *the Rest not mentioned: had it only by their Instruction: But since these few, that are mentioned, are said to have had Immediate Revelation, and that the Rest had no written Rule, as J. B. will Confess, it seems, there was more of God's Immediate Revelation in those Dark Times (even by his Confession) than now under the Gospel, where the Chief Pastors of the Church, according to him, are to Expect no such thing.* Neither is it proved, that Others not mentioned, had no Immediate Revelations; albeit they might have been Instructed by these Patriarchs: Which I have shewn before to be very Consistent. And thus may be easily Answered (setting aside his Railing) what he saith Pag. 27. against my Urging the Frequent Revelations, that Men had during all the Time of the Law, betwixt Moses and Malachy, (by which himself confesseth, the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to have been Written) that *that doth not prove, that everyone had such Revelations: What then? I lay not the Stress of the Proof of Every one's having Immediate Revelations upon this; but this is clearly proved from it: That since Immediate, Inward and Objective Revelations were so frequent during all the time of the Law, which was the less-glorious Administration, and that of the Letter; it is grossly absurd to say, as J. B. and his Brethren do, that they are now Ceased under the Gospel, which is said to be more-Glorious, and the Pouring forth of the Spirit more abundant and Universal; and that not only for a little time, to wit, to the Apostles, with Restriction to them and their Times, (for which he never produc'd the least Proof from Scripture) but to the End of the World. And if so, that*


Immediate
 Revelation
 under the
 Law not
 Ceased under
 the Gospel.

1679. *Immediate Revelation* be not ceased, there is a great deal of the Point gained; albeit *J. B.* confidently affirms, That there can be proved nothing by these Reasonings, but what no body will deny; since the *Divines* of *Westminster* have denied, and *J. B.* no doubt, with them will deny, That *Immediate Revelation* now is; since they positively say, *That it is ceased*: And *James Durham*, whom *J. B.* applauds as a Reverend Brother and Pastor of the Church, hath most absurdly affirmed in his Treatise upon the *Revelation*, *That when John finished that Book, God spake his last Words to his Church.*

¶ 7. When he cometh, pag. 28. to my Proposition, Asserting, *That these Revelations were of Old the formal Object of Faith*, he beginneth to enquire and Conjecture, *what I mean by the formal Object?* And upon that he bestows the following Page. For answering then his Scruples in that Matter, I say, In a *Divine Revelation* two Things are to be considered, 1. *The Thing Revealed*, and 2. *The Revelation*. The Thing Revealed is indeed the *Material Object*; the Revelation is the *Formal Object*: In which may be considered not only the Manner of the Revelation, that is, The Voice or Speech of God unto the Soul, or his Imprinting in the Soul by a Divine Manifestation the Things revealed; but also God himself so Operating: both which, to wit, *Deus loquens*, id est, *God speaking*, is the formal Object of Faith; He Himself, his Veracity is the Original Ground of our Faith; His Voice, Holy Influence and Manifestation, by which he expresseth himself, gives us the Certainty and Assurance, that it is He; and is very distinguishable by those of a *Spiritual Discerning*, from the most subtil Appearance and Transformations of the Devil: Since Christ saith, *My Sheep hear my Voice,*

J. B. believes, God spake his last Words to his Church at the End of the Revelations.

The Material and Formal Object of Faith distinguished.

Voice, and will not hear that of a Stranger. Even 1679. 

as the Voice and Appearance of two Men of the most contrary and different Humours, Statures and Complexions, are different and distinguishable by a Man of a sharp Sight, to whom those Men are well known. But of this I wrote more largely in my Letter to a certain Ambassador, Printed the last Year at *Roterdam*, at the End of the Letter written to the Ambassadors at *Nimeguen*, whereto I refer him for further Satisfaction. But I wholly deny the Consequence deduced by him, That if God's Veracity, (because it is God that speaketh and commandeth) be the formal Object of *Faith*, therefore it is all one, whether it be mediate or immediate: Since albeit that be the Original Ground; yet the Immediate Revelation is necessary, that we may certainly know that it is He. For what avails it me to believe, That all that God commands is true, and ought to be Obeyed; if I do not certainly know the things I believe as Truth, do come from him? And the Question is, Whether certain Knowledge can be had without Immediate Revelation? And therefore to this his Question, in the following page 30. *What was the formal Object of the Faith of the People, to whom the Patriarchs and Prophets said, [Thus saith the LORD?]* I answer, The Inward Testimony of the *Spirit* in their Heart, assuring them, That the Things spoken were from the Lord, and not the *Divinations* of the Men's Brains that spake them; and therefore *inclining* their Hearts to receive and acknowledge these Things as the Commands of God unto them: Since, as *J. B.* confesseth, *They were not to believe them, because spoken by those Men, but because of the Authority of God;* It must be, that which wrought this Perswasion and Assurance in them, was the *formal Object* of their *Faith*, as the Things spoken were the Material: Even as the Light

1679. serves by way of *formal Object*, to make us see, what is propos'd unto us.

¶ 8. Pag. 31, and 32. he acknowledgeth, *That Divine and Inward Revelations need not be tried by the Scripture, as a more Noble Rule, by him who hath such a Revelation; but by those, to whom he delivers it: And then giveth the Instance of the Beræans being commended. To which I shall willingly assent; judging, no Man that delivers or declares a Revelation to another, ought to be offended, that he try it by the Scripture; which no true Revelation can contradict. But that such may not also try it by the Testimony of the Spirit of God in their Hearts, I cannot deny; and that it is the More Noble Rule, as being most Universal: Since some Divine Revelations, such as Prophecies of contingent Truths, or Things to come, cannot be tried by the Scriptures; as was that of George Wishart concerning the Cardinal's Death: For had another taken upon him at that Time to Prophesy the quite contrary, I would willingly be informed, by what Scripture it could be deduced or known, that the one was false, or the other true? Yet who will be so absurd, as to deny, but that it could by the Immediate Testimony of the Spirit? As for his Proof, That the Scripture is the most certain Rule, taken from those Words, 2 Pet. 1. 19, 20. We have also a more sure Word of Prophecy, &c. It is but a Begging of the Question, in supposing, That Peter by this understood the Scripture; and indeed is most Ridiculous to affirm. For since the Apostle reckons this Word more sure, than the Voice they heard with their outward Ears, and the Vision they saw with their outward Eyes; it were absurd to affirm, That the Description or Narration of a Thing were more sure, than the Immediate Seeing and Hearing it. Can any Description I may receive of J. B. however true, give me so certain a Know-*

The Spirit of God in the Heart to try Revelations by, is a more Noble Rule than the Scriptures.

J. B. pleads the Scriptures to be the more sure Word of prophesy.

a Knowledge of him, as if I saw him and spake with him? Yet without any Absurdity it may be said, That the Inward Word or Testimony of the *Spirit* in the Heart is *more sure in Things Spiritual*, than any thing that is objected to, or conveyed by the Outward Senses, as that Vision was, of which the Apostle there speaks; since the *Inward and Spiritual Senses* are the most proper and adequate Means of Conveying *Spiritual Things* to the Soul, by which the Saints, after they have laid down this Body. and have no more the Use of Outward Senses, which are seated in it, do most surely enjoy the Blessed Vision of God, and Fellowship both with him and one another. As for that of *Isa. 8. 20. To the Law and to the Testimony*, &c. and that of *Job. 5. 39. Search the Scriptures*, &c. mentioned here by him, I shall have Occasion to speak of them hereafter. It's true, We are not to *believe every Spirit*; but it will not thence follow, that the *Scripture* is a more sure Rule, than the *Spirit* for such a Tryal. Page 35. He thinks, my saying, *That the Divine Revelation moveth the Understanding well disposed*, Confirmeth what he saith, and spoileth all my Purpose; because then *Every Revelation pretending to be Divine, is not to be submitted to*: But where did ever I say so? What he talks further of this *well-disposed Intellect* (pag. 36.) I spake to in my Answer to *Arnoldus*, pag. 18. 19. to which I refer. For I believe, All Men in a Day have, by the Gracious Visitation of God's Love, an Understanding *well disposed* to some *Divine Revelations*; which becomes disposed for others, as these are received: Which will after in its Place be discussed. And some *Divine Revelations*, which are Prophetick of Things to come, may so far manifest themselves by their Self-Evidence even to Men not Regenerate, as to force an Assent; as in

1677.

1679. the Case of *Balaam* mentioned by him, did appear. What he saith further, *pag. 36 and 37.* inquiring, *How and after what Manner these Revelations were the Object of the Saints Faith of Old!* Is easily answered, by applying it to what is before mentioned in Answer to his Queries and Conjectures of the *formal Object*. For those of Old, that had these Revelations *Immediately*, the *formal Object* of their Faith was God manifesting himself and his Will in them, to them by such Revelations: And those, who received and obeyed the Things delivered by the Patriarchs and Prophets, those Things so delivered (as he confesseth) were not the *Formal*, but *Material Object of their Faith*; but the *formal Object* was GOD, by the Secret and Inward Testimony of his Spirit, perswading them in their Hearts, that these Things declared to them were really his Command, and thence inclining and bowing their Minds to an Assent and Obedience to them. And albeit *pag. 38.* he terms this a *Wild Assertion*; yet he hath but said, and not proved it to be so; and till he prove, he needs no further Refutation. Neither is it *Non-sence*, nor yet a *destroying of the Cause*, as with the like proofless Confidence he affirms, *pag. 37.* *That where Revelations are made by outward Voices, or in a Manner objected to the outward Senses, the Cause or Motive of Credibility is not so much, because of what the outward Senses perceive, as because of the Inward Testimony of the Spirit, assuring the Soul, that it is GOD so manifesting himself.* Which Testimony, to answer his Question, is distinguishable from what is objected to the outward Senses; albeit it go always along with it *simul & semel*, as they use to say: Since he with me accounts it a serious Truth to say, *The Devil may delude the External Senses*; and he can far more easily deceive them, than the True, Inward and Spiritual Senses of the Soul,

The Material and Formal Object of FAITH.

by Counterfeiting the Inward Testimony of the Spirit : Since by that the Apostle saith, *We know and partake of that, which neither Eye hath seen, nor Ear heard.* 1679.

¶ 9. Page 39. He confesseth with me, *That the formal Object of the Saints Faith is always the same* : But yet, that he may say something, he spendeth the Paragraph in *Railing*, accusing me, *As writing Non-sense*, and being an *Ignoramus* ; because I bring Instances, which relate to the *Material Object*, which himself Confesseth also to be the same in Substance: But by his good Leave for all he is so positive in his Judgment, I must shew the Reader his Mistake. For those Examples of *Abraham* and others, are adduced by me to shew the Oneness of the *formal Object* ; The Formal Object of Abraham's Faith. neither has he shewn, that they are impertinent for that End : Since as the *formal Object* of *Abraham's* Faith was God's speaking to him by *Divine Revelations*, so is the same the *formal Object* of the Saints now ; and therein stands the Unity or Oneness of our Faith with him, and not in the *Material Object*, which often differs: For to offer up his Son was a Part of the *Material Object* of his Faith, which is none of ours now. And so farasmuch as he desires to know of me, *What was the Material Object of Adam's Faith before the Fall?* (A Question not to the Purpose) he must first tell me, why he so Magisterially and Positively denies Christ to have been the Object of his Faith? And then he may have an Answer. And whereas he flouts at that Reason, *That Actions are specified from their Objects*, as Non-sensical; he should have proved and shewn, wherein? And then I might have answer'd him : He might have Wit enough to know, that no Man of Reason will be moved by his bare *Railing* Assertions (*pag. 40.*) besides a deal of *Railing*, wherein he accuseth me of Confusion and Darkness. He accounts my
Argu-

1679. Arguing for *Immediate Revelation* from the Revelations the Patriarchs and Prophets had, Imper-
 tant ; to which I Answered before : The Sum
 of which is, that since these *Immediate Revela-*
 tions were so frequent under the Law, it must be
 very absurd to say, *They are ceased under the*
Gospel. He himself proveth, pag. 41. that under
 the *New* there is a *more clear Discovery*, according
 to that of *Paul*, 2 *Cor.* 3. 18. *But we all with open*
Face beholding as in a Glass the Glory of the Lord,
&c. which being brought by him, albeit against
 himself, I leave him to Answer. In this Page
 and in the next 42, he alledgeth the Say-
 ings of Christ and his Apostles brought by me,
 and my Arguments thence do prove no more than
 he confesseth. But whether they prove not all I
 plead for from thence, is left to the Reader's
 Judgment. Here, according to his Custom, (tho'
 I Condemn the *Socinians*) he will be insinuating
 that I *Agree with them*, to whose Notions of the
Spirit, albeit I assent not ; yet I desire to know
 of him, in what Scripture he finds these Words,
That the Spirit is a distinct Person of the Trinity ?
 For I freely acknowledge, according to the Scrip-
 ture, *That the Spirit of God proceedeth from the*
Father and the Son, and is God. And by what
 Authority he seeks to obtrude upon others Ex-
 pressions of the chief Articles of Faith not to be
 found in Scripture, or to accuse such as will not
 accept of them, and assent to them ; or whether
 any has Reason to think, he truly makes the
 Scripture the Rule of his Faith (notwithstanding
 his Pretence) when he either will not or can not
 find Words in it to express the chief Articles of
 his Creed ?

Revelations
 frequent un-
 der the Law.

That the
 Spirit is a
 distinct Per-
 son in the
 Trinity, no
 Proof in
 Scripture
 for it.

¶ 10. Pag. 43. By a strange Mistake he would
 have me prove, *Since I make Use of these Promises*
of Christ relating to the Spirit, I would prove, that
all

all have Warrant to write Scripture : As if no Man could have Immediate Revelation, without he write Scripture ? Whereas himself confesseth, that many of the Patriarchs had it before *Moses*, who yet wrote no Scripture ; yea, and *Cain*, whom I suppose he judgeth to have been no Writer of Scriptures. And by the like Mistake, pag. 55. He confesseth all I plead for ; and contradicts all he has been fighting for, in affirming, *That Believers now have free Access to Christ, the great Teacher of his People, always to get his Mind known and written in their Hearts ; but not to get Prophetick Revelations.* But where doth he find me plead for *Prophetick Revelations*, as common to all ? And whether the former Words do not grant *Immediate Objective Revelation*, in the largest Sence I plead for it, I leave the Reader to judge. Here he accuses me of *speaking basely of the Scripture* ; but neither tells me *where* ? Nor what I say ? Which is indeed a base Way of Reviling, though familiar to him. To my last Argument, pag. 49, § 35. he answers little, but Railing. *The Minor* [to wit, *That whereas Protestants call the Scriptures their Rule, yet if asked, why they believe them ? Do say, because in them is delivered the Will of God, which was Revealed Objectively and Immediately to Holy Men*] he saith, *destroyeth the whole Argument* : But *why* ? I know not ; since surely that proves, They at last recur to the Immediate Testimony of the Spirit, as the Certain and Infallible Ground of Faith, which is my Conclusion. That I thence infer, *That Protestants are for the Uncertainty of Immediate Objective Revelation*, is most falsely and disingenuously Asserted by him : For I seek not to infer any such thing from the Medium of that Argument, but having shewn thereby, how they are forced to recur to this *Revelation*, as the primary Ground of their Faith, I add, *That it's strange then, they should*

1679.

J. B's Self-Contradiction in granting Revelation.

1679. *should seek to represent that as dangerous or uncertain, which they are thus forced to recur to.* And whether he doth not so, ever and anon repeating the Story of *Delusions* to Nauseating, thro' this Chapter, and they that read it, may see and easily perceive his base Disingenuity in that Part: As also in the following Lines, where he saith, *Their Concession makes nothing for the falsely pretended, Immediate and Objective Revelations, which Quakers boast of*; For where doth he find me pleading for any such? Neither is it the Question, *Whether the Quakers do falsely pretend to Immediate Revelation, yea or nay?* But, *Whether Quakers do well, and are sound in believing, that Immediate, Divine, Inward Revelation is necessary to every Believer for the Building up of true Faith?* But it is usual with him, where he cannot Answer, to turn by the Question, and fill up the Paper with Railing and Reviling!

S E C T. IV.

Wherein his Fourth Chapter of the Scriptures is Considered.

¶ I. **W**E may Judge of this Chapter of the Scriptures by the first Sentence, which contains a Lye, saying, *He finds the Third Thesis in some Things altered, and more clearly set down in the Apology, than in the Single Sheet*; whereas there is not one Word of Difference, but the Mis-placing of a Word by the Printer: But it is become so familiar with him to speak Untruth, that he cannot forbear it! Indeed, this whole Chapter is a Complex of Railing, Calumnies, and Malitious Groundless Insinuations. And
indeed

indeed the Man is so troubled, that he cannot find any thing in what I write, (which he ought according to his Title and Undertaking only to Examine and Confute) that instead of that he bestows several Pages out of *Stalham* and *Hicks*, and his Considerations upon them; whose Lyes and Calumnies are long ago answered, and unreplyed to by them. So that the Parties concerned having already Vindicated themselves, it is not my Place to meddle in it; and if *J. B.* would do any thing in this to the Purpose, he should take up this Debate, where his Friend *Mr. Stalham* and his Brother *Mr. Hicks* the *Anabaptist* (whose Authority he useth so often, and to whom he gives so much Credit) have given it over, by a Reply to these Answers. Having so placed himself in the Repetitions of these Men's Calumnies (for that appears to be his Delight) he digresseth to prove *The Scriptures to be the Word of God*: But if they be granted to be the *Words of God* (which no *Quaker*, that ever I knew of, did or will deny) wherein are they derogated from, since they are *many Words*, and not *One*? But if he will plead. *They are the Word of God* καὶ ἐξοχὴν, or *per Eminentiam*: To say so, seeing, the *Word of God* is ascribed to *Christ*, must either Equal them with him, or speak Nonsense; seeing, that one Epithet cannot be predicated of two Things καὶ ἐξοχὴν, without a gross Contradiction. That the Word of the Lord came to the Prophets, and that what they spake, was the Words that came from that Word is granted; nor was it ever denied by us, who are against all false Revelations and lying Fancies of Men's Imaginations, as much as he, which he here in this Chapter repeats over and over again to Nauseating: But it will not thence follow, that the Word spoken of by the Apostle, 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. is the Scripture; which he has not yet proved, and

1679.



J. B.'s
Authors for
his Lies and
Calumnies,
&c.

The Scrip-
tures are the
Words of
God; and
Christ the
Word.

1679. and I have shewn the Contrary in the former
 Section.

J. B. Con-
 tradicting
 himself.

¶ 2. At last, pag. 54. n. 5. he comes to Treat of the *Divine Authority of the Scriptures*, and reckons it Confusion and Self-Contradiction in me to assert, *That the Authority of the Scriptures doth not depend upon any Efficacy or Virtue placed in these Writings; but is wholly to be ascribed to that Spirit, from whence they came;* and yet within Half a Dozen of Lines he confesseth the same, saying, *We stoop unto the Authority of the Scriptures of Truth, because delivered by the Inspiration of God:* So the Confusion and Contradiction is his own. Yea, the Examples he brings of the *Acts and Statutes of Parliament*, do very well prove what I say: For we do not submit to these Statutes, because of the Matter in them, or Things Commanded; but because of the Authority Commanding. For when the Parliament by an Act appoints a Tax of so much Money to be levied from the Subjects, it is not the Matter or Substance of this Act, that makes us Obey it; but because of the Magistrates Authority. But he saith, *They are Divine Revelations, and therefore must have the Stamp of Divine Authority.* Answ. The *Stamp of Divine Authority* lies not in the Things revealed; but in the Manner of the Revelation, as being the Voice and Manifestation of God; else great Absurdity would follow. As I shall briefly shew, being to pursue him in this Point, as he has it lying up and down in his Rambling Discourse: Whose Way is not to follow one Matter to a Period; but to touch it here and there, Intermixing other Things: That so his nauseating Repetitions and oft-reiterated Railings may be the more Covered. And therefore I intend not to tie me self to follow him Page after Page immediately, lest I should Embark my self in the like Disorder, and make such

a Confused Hodg-Podg, as he has done; but to follow every Matter, as he has it scatter'd up and down: And of this I thought fit to acquaint the Reader in this Place once for all, as being the Method I propose to use throughout this Treatise. So from this 55 Page we have him not upon this Matter, until Page 61, where he takes Notice of my Citations out of several *Protestant* Confessions, and *Calvin*, and will not have them to favour me; giving most disingenuously as one Reason, because they expressly say, *That the Work of the Spirit is by and with the Word, and not an Inspiration distinct and separated from it*: Thereby he would make his Reader believe, as if this were said by all of them; whereas it is only said by the *Westminster-Divines*, of whom I particularly observed, that they spake not so clearly as the other. The *French Confession* saith, *It is by the Inward Perswasion of the Holy Spirit*; and the *Belgick*, *That it is by the Testimony of the Spirit in our Hearts*; and *Calvin* saith, *The Spirit of God must inwardly Teach us, that Moses and the Prophets spake from God*. But that Testimony of the Spirit, which is in our Hearts, and by which the Spirit teacheth us there, albeit it be not different from and contrary to the Things it teacheth us of; yet it is certainly distinct and separate; albeit all the Things taught were the very same, which here is not. Else because a Man may be taught that by a *Jesuit* at *Rome*, which *J. B.* may teach another Man in *Holland*; therefore that *Jesuit* and *J. B.* are not distinct and separate. Are these good Reasonings? But let us now see, whether these be any better, by which in the two following Pages (62, and 63.) he prosecutes the same Matter; the Sum whereof amounts to this, *That there are such evident Characters of Divinity in the Scriptures, which do as manifestly prove them to be of God, as the Sun doth*

1679. *its shining to a Man, whose Eyes are opened; and that the Work of the Spirit is only, to take the Vail from off Men's Eyes, that they may see these Characters of Divinity, and not, that the Spirit by any Inward, Immediate Revelation doth signify to the Soul by way of Object, that these Books proceeded from the Dictates of the Spirit of God: In which he places the Difference betwixt himself and the Quakers.* Now whether these aforesaid Testimonies of Calvin and the rest do not confirm this last, rather than the other, I leave the Reader to judge. But further, it's like the Man has not been aware, into what inextricable Difficulty he has run himself by his Reasoning here. For if this Opening of the Eyes by the Spirit, be needful to perceive these *Divine Characters*, as the Opening of the Natural Eyes is needful, to see the Outward Sun; then the Characters cannot be seen, but by those whose Eyes are thus opened, that is to say, who have a well-disposed Intellect. And thus recur upon himself all the Difficulties and Absurdities he would urge upon me in his former Chapter, for saying, That *Divine Revelations* are evident to a well-disposed Intellect. For it may be query'd, Whether all have this well-disposed Intellect, their Eyes thus opened? If yea, then all Men have *Subjective Revelation*; yet at other Times he accounts this a *Privilege* of the Saints, and thence denies it, in Confessing (Pag. 63.) That *some are blind, and see not.* And then again the Question recurs, How a Man knows he has it; so that he may not think, he sees it, and has it, when he has it not? This cannot be decided by the Scriptures, for they are the Matter under Debate; and that were to run in a Circle. And since, as he saith, *The Devil is God's Ape*; and that there are so many Delusions of the Devil, and false Imaginations of the Fancy, which Men are subject unto, as he has


What is the Spirit's taking off the Vail, but a Revelation or Opening by the Spirit?

Some imagine they see, when they are blind.

told

told over and over again: How is he sure, that he is not thus Deluded by the Devil, and abused by his Fancy, in *imagining he seeth*, when indeed he is *blind*? And to give him his own Argument and Query, since some, and even **Protestants* have affirmed, Books denied by him to be of the *Canon*, such as the *Wisdom of Solomon* and *Esdras*, and to have these Divine Characters; and **others* deny some to be of the *Canon*, and to have these Characters, as the *Epistle of James*, which he saith, *has it*: How is he sure, that they are blind and deceived, and not *He*? So that he must either Confess *all his former Reasonings* (as also here Pag. 83, 86.) to be to *no purpose*; or else acknowledge, that all he saith here for the Scriptures, is of *no Force*: and that he has no better Certainty nor Ground for his Faith of the Scriptures Verity (to give him back his own Dirty Example he throws at me p. 64.) than for the *Turk's Alcoran*. And thus is dispatched also, what he saith p. 66. n. 18. where he confesseth; Some approved Books, which others Rejected. And whereas he saith (86, and 87.) *That sad Experience has taught the World, what Devilish Doctrines have been invented under the Notions of New Revelations*: Of which after he gives a List (*since the same sad Experience has taught the World, what Devilish Doctrines have been taught under the Notion of being Revealed in the Scripture*) such, as (in his own Account) those of the *Socinians, Arminians, Antinomians* and present *English Anabaptists* (to wit, his Author *Hicks*, and his Brethren:) And yet what will more follow from the One against the Spirit's Revelations now, than from the Other against the Scriptures?

¶ 3. Like to this are his Reasonings Pag. 87, concerning the *CANON of the Scriptures*, that there are just *so many Books*, neither more

1679. 
* The Examiners of the Westminster Confession.

* Some Literatus.

F. B. brings his own Author in for Devilish Doctrines.

1679. *nor less.* For I have proposed this to be proved by Scripture, it being an *Article* of their *Faith*, since they judge, all such should be proved by Scripture: To this instead of offering any Scripture-Proof, he saith; *They have the Characters of Divine Light*: The Weakness of which is above observed. And then he brings two Examples, one of the *Acts of Parliament*; another of a *Man's writing Ten Letters to his Wife*: But Examples are poor Arguments, especially to prove Articles of Faith; when not One Scripture can be brought to do it by such as say, *The Scripture is the Adequate and only Rule of their Faith*. Neither will his Examples do: For if in a Nation one Part should differ from the other, alledging Spurious Acts not made by the *Parliament*, were by the Industry of some, Printed and Recorded with the Right, as the Case is now among the Professors of Christianity concerning the *Canon of Scripture*; the Written Acts could never decide this Question; but either these Legislators, if alive, or a New Parliament, having Equal Authority and Legislative Power with those, that made the former. And if a Woman should doubt, that Five of the Ten Letters subscribed with her Husband's Name, were not his: she could not know the Certainty, but by her Husband's own Testimony: And since he himself has said, That to Discern these Characters, a Subjective Concurrence of the Spirit is Necessary: Which since he saith, *some have not*; they can then not be sure of this *Article of Faith*. His Example of the *Five Fingers* is yet more silly, than the former: And albeit he Confidently Affirms, he *has above shewn this*; we shall by Examining it, shew the Contrary. As p. 74, and 75. answering to that of *mine*, where I shew, that in *Prov. 30. 5, 6.* there is the same Prohibition of *Not adding*, that is in *Rev. 22. v. 18.* and therefore it would follow, *That all written after Solo-*

7. B's
Proofs for
the CANON
of the Scrip-
tures Exa-
mined.

The Prohi-
bition of not
Adding to
Prophecy,
considered.

Solo-


Solomon's time, was against the Mind of God: 1679. To this he gives a rare Answer! *What is spoken of that Book* (I suppose he means the *Revelations*) *and elsewhere of the Commands of God, is consequently to be understood of all*: But this is to Repeat that, against which the Argument is formed, instead of Answering it. Either that of *Revelations* must not be understood, as he doth it; or that of *Proverbs* makes the same Exclusion; since the Words are the same, and the Authority also. But *the Prophecies of the Prophets* (saith he) *were but Explications of the Law of God*: But such Explications go to make up the *Canon*; and will he admit that yet? No. But the *Lord did not* (saith he) *bind up his own Hand*; But has he bound up his Hands now, that he cannot move any of his Servants by his Spirit to Write? I suppose he will not say, *he hath*. He Confesseth, there were *Prophets* after *John's Days*, *who truly foretold Events, but were not to write Scripture*: But is not a Part of that, which he accounts the *Canon*, a Fore-telling of Events? And yet that Excludes it not from the *Canon*. Here, because he is pinched, he takes his usual Retreat by falling a *Railing*, and Comparing us with *Papists*, who, he saith, *use this Argument*: And what then? I could tell him an Hundred Arguments used by him, which the *Papists* also use against us; Will he say, it follows *they are Invalid*? But at last he thinks he has found a *Mysterious Riddle*, that will do the Business; and therefore he leaves it with a *Defiance*: *Let him unriddle this Mystery, if he can*; to wit, *When shall our Canon be Completed? When will there be no more need of Revelations?* But might not this same Question have been proposed to the Christians, that lived, before *John* wrote his Book of the *Revelations*? And as (I suppose) They would have Answered (to many of whom perhaps it was not revealed,

J. B's Query of a complete Canon, and Revelations ended.

1679. that *John* should write such a Book afterwards) so shall I directly Answer his Question; *When it shall please God*: in whose Power it is to Reveal himself, *when, how and so long as he pleases*; and *who* (as he saith) *has not bound up his own Hand*.

¶ 4. I come now to consider, what he saith of the *Perfection of the Scriptures*: And because he is very Clamorous in accusing me, as *derogating* there-from; it will be manifest, whether he has any Reason so to do. P. 55. n. 6. he quarrels, *I forget the Narration of the First Creation; and that the Examples are Instructive*: But who will deny, or when did I, that the Remarkable Providences of God towards his Children are Instructive? Do not I expressly shew, *how they are Instructive* (p. 46. *) which himself also noticeth? And was the First Creation no Part of God's Providence towards Man, who was to Rule over it? Is it not then there Included? But *I make no mention of the Promises and Threatnings*: But are not they any Part of the Doctrines of Christ, nor included in any Part of these Precious Declarations, which I say the *Scripture* Contains? Next, he Carps at my saying [*The Chief Doctrines of Christianity*] asking, *Where we may find the whole Doctrines of the Christian Faith?* I Answer freely, *In the Scriptures*: And let him prove, if he can, this to be any Contradiction; seeing, my saying [*The Chief Doctrines of Christianity*] is *indefinite*, excluding none. And therefore most base and abominable is that *Lye* he makes of me in the last Part of this Paragraph, where he saith; *I say, The Scripture only beareth Testimony to some of them, to wit, of the Chief Heads of Christianity*; which I dare him to prove, ever to have been said or written by me. And of the like Nature are his lying Conjectures, and his malicious Insinuations from my Words in the two following Paragraphs; which I utterly renounce, and

See the Apology, Sect. 5.

return upon him as his own False and Fictitious 1679.  Apprehensions. For do not I declare the Authority of the Scripture, when I testify, *They are from the Spirit*, and that such Commands require Obedience, as has been above shewn? But what he urgeth of this further, p. 57. and 59. from the saying of some *Quakers*, affirming; *That is not a Command to them, which is given to another*: Albeit I might justly reject it, as impertinent, till he prove it, for the Reasons upon this Occasion above declared; yet, because he mentions *Benjamin Furly* in *Roterdam* having some Knowledge of that Matter, I answer: Whether will he say, *All the Commands in Scripture to every Person there mentioned, are binding upon every Individual now*? If he dare not say, *they are*, as I know, he dare not; How must I then distinguish betwixt what *binds me*, and *binds me not*? Must it not be by the *Spirit* (suppose it were only Subjectively, as he will Confess) *Inlightning the Understanding*? To make this Distinction then, it seems it is the Operation of the Spirit, that makes them *know* their Duty; and sure, they cannot Obey, before they know. But if he say, *That though they should want that Operation of the Spirit, and did not know, nor acknowledge them to be their Duty, yet they are binding upon them*; Neither *B. F.* nor any *Quaker* will deny, but even the Commands of God's Spirit, and the Precepts of the Scripture, which now concern *all*, are *binding upon all*; so that they shall be justly *Condemn'd for not obeying*; albeit that by the *Perverseness* of their Hearts and Wills they either Refuse to Obey, or will not acknowledge them. So that his urging of that p. 60. and 61. n. 13. and his pleading for it, is Unnecessary, and needs no Answer; yet who would say, they could Obey to any Advantage of their Souls without this Operation of the Spirit, since *Whatsoever is not of*

The Authority of the Scriptures is from the Spirit.

1679. *Faith, is Sin?* But as to these Words said to be written by *B. F.* he is here Challenged to prove, *They are his*, without adding or diminishing? (and it's well known, the adding or diminishing of two or three Words in a few Lines will quite alter the Sense.) And before he has answered this Challenge, and free'd himself from the just Centure of a Calumniator; albeit he take the Help of his Author *Hicks*, he will find his Folly, in accusing Men at second-hand Proofs, and upon Testimony of their Adversaries. What follows in this Paragraph and *p. 60.* is meer Railing and Perversions, Comparing us with *Papists*, as is before observed, and indeed, all of it is overturned by that one Assertion of mine, that *What Revelations are Contrary to the Scripture, are to be Rejected.*

¶ 5. Pag. 57. *n. 10.* He saith, *I come nearer to the Core of my Design, which is, to set up Enthusiasms, in affirming; That the Scriptures are not the Fountain, but a Declaration of the Fountain:* And yet the Man within three or four Lines confesseth it himself; ascribing it to my Folly to Dream, any Man thinks so: (thus he goes backward and forward!) Which he Illustrates by the Example of Laws: But if it be so, are not they to be blam'd, that account them the *Principal Original of all Truth and Knowledge?* Whether the other Branch of my Deduction follow from this, *That they are not to be accounted the Primary Rule of Faith and Manners,* will appear, when the Arguments and Objections relating to that, come particularly to be mentioned. And whereas he thinks, this is Absurd, and not making for my Design, because *God himself is the Fountain, and yet not the Rule;* he mistakes the Matter, as urged by me: For I Argue, *That the Scriptures are not the Original Ground of Knowledge, but GOD* (not simply Considered, but) as Manifesting himself

The Scriptures are not the Original Ground of Truth, but GOD.

self in Divine, Immediate Revelations in the Hearts of his Children; which being the New Covenant's Dispensation (as in the *last Section* is proved) is the Primary and Adequate Rule of Christians, for I was never so Absurd, as to call God *simply* considered, or the Spirit of God in *Abstracto* (not as Imprinting Truths to be believed and obeyed in Men's Hearts, not contrary, but according to *Scripture*, for He cannot Contradict himself) *the Rule of Christians*: And this may serve to Answer all his Cavils upon this *Theam*. And whereas he wondereth in the following Page 58. *Why any Revelations even from the Spirit should be more Primary, than the Scriptures, since they are confessed to come from the Inspiration of the Spirit*, (for why he useth the *Latin Word Afflatus*, and doth not Interpret it, I know not; unless to fright Ignorant Folk, that they may think, it's a Piece of the *Witch-craft* of the *Quakers*, whom he accuseth) it is strange, he should have so little Sense, as to make it a Matter of Admiration; as if that were not more Primary to a Man, which cometh *immediately* from the Spirit of God *In his Heart*, than that which (albeit it come from the *Spirit*) yet is through *another*, and so must needs be but *Secondary*: albeit it be confessed, they writ them not for themselves, but for *others*; which I deny not. Of the same Nature is, and the same Way is Answered, what he saith *p. 65. n. 19.* to wit, *That I confound the Principal Leader with the Original Rule, because I say, The Spirit is the Prime and Principal Leader*: But I deny his Consequence; neither doth his Example of the *Wind* and *Compass* prove it: The *Spirit* is the Principal Leader, as imprinting upon Man's Soul the Rules he should walk by. But indeed he would prove a very Uncertain Pilot, that had no Compass, but only a Descripti-

1679. on of it; and a Journal, how other Men had
 w Steer'd that Course: And such Pilots is he and
 and his Brethren according to their own Confes-
 sion. But he thinks, I drive at something more
 intolerable, to wit; *That the Revelations the Qua-*
kers pretend to, or the Light within, is to be pre-
ferred, as the more Primary and Principal Rule, to
the Scriptures: If the Quakers did affirm, any
Revelations they speak of, as coming from that
Light, either were or could be Contrary to the
Scriptures, he would say something; otherwise
it will amount to no more, but that Commands,
as they are imprinted upon the Soul, that is, The
Law written in the Heart by the Spirit, is more
primarily and principally the Rule, than the
same things written and received only from ano-
ther. As to which I will only ask him, Whe-
ther those things, which the Apostles received
immediately from the Spirit, commanding them to
go here or there to preach the Gospel, or the like,
were, as to these Ends, more primarily and prin-
cipally the Rule to them, than any thing, that
was Recorded in the Scripture, where they could
not learn their Duty, as to those Particulars?
 And that I make not the Scriptures and the Spi-
 rit all *one*, I have above shewn; and therefore his
 Malicious Insinuations of *Socinianism* falls to the
 Ground. But he thinks, he has found out a mighty
 Dilemma in the End of this Paragraph, P. 66,
 Or will I say, that the Light within me is really the
 Increated Spirit? This (saith he) must be Blasphemy
 with a Witness—to be heard with Horror; and
 therefore needing no other Confutation: Poor Man!
 How apt is he to make a Noise about nothing?
 If there be any Blasphemy, it is his own. For
 what, if I should say, Is not G O D a L I G H T?
 And is not he in every Man? And is not this Light
 within, the Increated Spirit? The Reader may
 judge, how easily these windy Boasts of his are
 blown

The Light
 within, the
 Increated
 Spirit.

blown away. How the Spirit Ruleth us, and yet is not confounded with the Rule, I have above shewn; so that what he saith to that in the rest of this Page, where he Vapours and Rails, is but Superfluous. Next, after he has a little plaid the *Pedant* upon the Words *magis Originaliter*, he concludes his 22. Paragraph with asking me; *Why the Revelations I pretend to, should be accounted more One with the Spirit himself, than these Revelations, by which the Scriptures were dictated?* But this is his Allegiance, none of my Affirmation. Next, I never said, that the Revelations, by which the Scriptures were Dictated, were *less Primary*, than any other whatsoever; albeit no Revelation, which is written and transmitted to a Man only by the Report of *another*, can be so Primary and Immediate to him, as that which he *Receives in himself*. He confesseth here with me, p. 67. *That the Spirit is the Prime and Principal Leader*; whether that makes for my Cause, as also what follows, will after in its Place be Examined.

¶ 6. But because he foundeth his Assertion of my *detracting from the Perfection of the Scriptures*, because I deny them to be the Primary and Original Rule, (for he acknowledgeth, that I confess them to be a Secondary One) I will Examine the Ground, by which he goes about to prove it; as also his Answers to my Arguments, proving the Contrary. His *first* is from the Parable *Luke 16. 31.* where it is said; *They have Moses and the Prophets, whom if they hear not, neither will they be perswaded, if one be raised from the Dead:* But this proves only, that *one raised from the Dead* is not able to Convince those, that will not hear *Moses and the Prophets*; not that the Scripture is a more Primary and Principal Rule, than what the Spirit Immediately Reveals in the Soul: For that Consequence will not, nor doth follow,

1679.

7. B's
Proofs for
the Scrip-
tures, to be
the Primary
Rule.

I.
Moses and
the Pro-
phets to be
heard, An-
swered.

1679. nor is in the least proved by him, neither can be, unless he first prove, that, albeit the Testimony of *one from the Dead* be less powerful to persuade, than the Scriptures, yet it is more than the Immediate Testimony of the Spirit in the Heart; which I deny, and rests for him to prove, before he conclude any thing from this Place. *Next*, this Parable was used by Christ to the *Jews*, to shew them their *Hypocrisy*, who, albeit they deceitfully pretended so much to Reverence and follow *Moses* and the *Prophets*, (as many now a-days do the Scriptures;) yet they did not really hear them, else they would have acknowledged *him*, of whom *Moses* and the *Prophets* did so clearly write: Since He also did as great and convincing Miracles before them, as if they had the Testimony of *One raised from the Dead*. And this leads me to take notice, of what he saith p. 68. n. 24. in Answer to my Argument drawn from the Difference betwixt the *Law* that is *written without*, and the *Gospel* that is *written within*; where he Accuseth me of Contradiction, because of my Argument drawn from the Revelations, that were under the Law and the Sameness of the Object: But I have Answered this Cavil in the former Section. Yet since the Strength of this resolves in his supposing I Affirm, *There is no written Rule under the Gospel*, which he after Concludes; the whole falleth to the Ground: For I never denied the Scripture to be a Secondary Rule, and that is some Rule; for to say, I Affirm, *There is no written Rule*, because the *Written* is not the *Primary*, is a wild Conclusion. And therefore all the rest of his Talk to prove, *That Christ Inspired the Apostles to write things to be a Rule to Christians*, is meerly superfluous; since that, that is a Rule, though not the Primary, was never denied by me: And it may
be

be here observed, that all his Arguments to prove the Scripture to be a Rule, unless they prove them to be the Primary and *Principal One*, Conclude nothing; and are against me to no Purpose.

¶ 7. His *Second Argument* is deduced from 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. where he cites the Apostle saying of the Scriptures, *They are able to make wise unto Salvation, and to make the Man of God perfect*: Where is first to be observed his *perverting* of the Apostle's Words by an Addition of his own (and therefore no Wonder, that he so frequently *pervert* mine.) For the Apostle saith not, *They are able to make the Man of God perfect*; but, *All Scripture given by Inspiration is, that the Man of God may be Perfect*; that is, *Contributes* in its Kind and Order towards the Perfection of the Saints: But it follows not thence, that they are the Primary Rule; no more than though *J. B.* will Affirm, that his *Book is written, That the Man of God may be perfect* (that is, to help him to *Perfection*) that thence it is to be Esteemed the Primary and Chief Rule. Thus is Answered that of *John* 20, 31. *But these are written, that ye may believe, &c.* cited by him *p.* 74. for his *Book* is also written for that End; yet the Consequence will not follow. That *they are able to make wise unto Salvation*, is not denied, in so far as they declare of the *Grace that brings Salvation*, and direct to the Light, which leads to it: But how he thence Inferreth, *They are the Primary Rule*, he must inform us the next time, since he has forgotten to do it now. And this may serve to Answer those Places, where he (according to his Custom) Repeats it over and over again, as *p.* 74, 77, and 82. where he hath again the fore-mentioned Perversion, and enumerates the particular Uses applied to the Scripture, he concludeth its *Perfection*, as wanting nothing. Now I deny not, that every Book as well as Chapter and Verse

1679.

II.

Their making
Wife to
Salvation
and Perfection,
Answered.

1679. of Scripture is Perfect, as to its End, that is, so far to Express the Mind of God, as he was pleased at that Time; and also with a Respect to its Author, as being written by the Dictates of the Spirit; but that Place will not conclude its Perfection, either as the Primary, only, or Adequate, that is Entire Rule: Else all the Other Scriptures, which were written after that Epistle of *Paul*, (as he will not deny, but there were some So written) must be Denied being any Part of the Rule, and so to be any way necessary for that End. The like Absurdities follow upon his using 2 *Cor.* 3. 14. where the Apostle speaks of a *Testament*; since he dare not deny, a great Part of that Testament was written afterwards. And thus is also Answered, what he urges from *Psal.* 19. 7. (Pag. 74 and 79.) *The Law of the Lord is Perfect*, &c. and from other Scriptures of like Import: For if he understand Perfection in the first Sense, it is not denied; if in the Second (which indeed is the Question) it concludeth nothing, without rendring all the *Scripture written afterwards, no Part* of the Rule or Canon (to use his own Term.) As for that of *Peter*, which he insists upon in the End of his *Paragraph*, (p. 70.) I deny it to be understood of the Scripture; and gave my Reasons before: and yet the Man takes that for granted, and thence Argues from it; which is a most silly Manner, albeit very Familiar to him to beg the Question.

¶ 8. Next, he comes to Consider my Answer to their *Objections*; but he Removes them, may be judged by the First he Observes p. 71. where, instead of Proving, That *these Words of Isai.* 8. 20. usually brought by them, *To the Law and to the Testimony*, &c. are meant of the Scripture; which I desire, e're any thing could be Inferred from it; He Answers: *As if any, that ever read the Bible, could be ignorant, what is all along mean-*
ed

ed by these Words. Is not this a goodly Proof, Reader? I am one, that have read the Bible, and know, by the [Law] is sometimes meant the Outward, sometimes the Inward; and Thousands more are yet to be convinc'd, That that Place speaks only of the Outward: And will need some better Argument, than this of his, e're we Change our Judgment. But to proceed: He thinks, my saying, *That the Law was in a more special Manner given to the Jews, and more principally than to us* to be a Railing and Roving, and a Contradicting, what I said in the former These: But this Cavil, often repeated before, I did Answer above. The like he Judgeth my arguing there-from, *That as they were to Try all things by the outward Law, so we are to Try all in the First Place by the Word within*: But here his base Disingenuity appears: For he has left out these Words [*in the first Place*] that he might introduce the better the Difficulty he fancieth to himself to have brought me to afterwards; for by this Argument (saith he) *I prove more, than I ought, to wit, That the Scriptures shall not be so much as a less principal Rule*. Who will be so foolish, as to Conclude, that the saying, *Things ought [in the first Place] to be tried by the Word within*, excludes things [*in the second Place*] to be Tried by the Scriptures? And is not that still to own it as a Secondary and Subordinate Rule? And so he may see, my Feet here are easily rid; and that he held them not so fast, as he fancied. And as for the other Part of his Alternative, the Consequence is of the like Nature, *That what was a Principal Rule then, is now only Subordinate*: For albeit I said, it was more Principal to them, than now to us; yet I said not, it was the *most principal* to them, or then *more principal*, than what came *immediately* from the Spirit, which he confesseth to have been frequent under the Law, yea more frequent, than now according to his Principle:

1679.

J. B's
goodly Proof
for what is
meant by
Law and Te-
stimony.

The Scrip-
tures a Se-
condary and
Subordinate
Rule.

1679. ciple: And my saying so could only infer that
 ~~~~~ Consequence. He Rejects, what I urge from the  
 Version of the *Septuagint*, as Spurious; but for  
 that we must take his Word, else want a Proof.  
 And then because he cannot come off better, ac-  
 cording to his Custom he Concludes with a gross  
 Perversion and Falshood, saying; *It is my Opin-*  
*ion, that the Law, id est, the outward Law, was*  
*given the Jews for a Rule even above the Spirit's Re-*  
*velations: Which if it be mine, (as I utterly*  
*renounce it) I desire to know, where I have Af-*  
*serted it? He might have been at the Pains to*  
*mark it; but he knew (it's like) it was not Con-*  
*venient. Next, he comes to prove, that these*  
 Words, *Search the Scriptures, &c. John 5. 39.*  
 do Evince, The Scriptures to be the Primary and  
 Adequate Rule; because if Christ's Doctrine  
 should be Tried by them, much more private En-  
 thusiasms: But who denies that? Yet he doth  
 not thence prove, that the Scriptures are the Pri-  
 mary Rule, by which *all things must be tried in*  
*the first Place, which is the thing in Question.*  
*Secondly; I wou'd ask him, Whether the Words*  
*Christ spake to the Jews, which are Recorded in*  
*Scripture, were less a Rule to them, or less binding*  
*and obliging upon them, than the Sayings of Mo-*  
*ses and the Prophets? If he say, they were less; then*  
*he overturns all his own tedious Reasonings, by*  
*which he labours to prove the Obligation, of what*  
*Christ and the Apostles delivered, (p. 84. at the*  
*End) as well as what Moses and the Prophets,*  
*without the need of a New Obligation: And*  
*likewise he must shew us, How these Sayings*  
*come to be as binding upon us now, as Moses and*  
*the Prophets? or how they acquired a greater Au-*  
*thority, after Christ spake them, than they had*  
*then? Or why they wanted then that Authority?*  
 If he say, *They were binding and obliging to the*  
 Jews,

Scriptures to  
 be searched  
 makes them  
 not the Pri-  
 mary Rule.

Jews, *because spoken by Christ*; then his Proof 1679. falleth to the Ground. He is Angry, that I say, *The Words may be interpreted, Ye search the Scriptures, as well as Search the Scriptures* (albeit the <sup>Ερευνᾶτε</sup> *Greek Word signify the one as well as the other*) <sup>Ye Search and Search</sup> and for Answer very Magisterially tells, *It is quite contrary to the very Words of Command, Search the Scriptures: But the Question is, Whether that be the Words?* And that was, what he should have proved. But he makes no Bounds of begging the Question, telling; *Tolet and Maldonat say; It is so taken by all the Fathers, except Cyrill.* And what then? Did I undertake to Subscribe to all these Authors Writings? He must give me a Reason, *Why?* e're I do it: And let him deny it, if he dare, that the *Greek Word signifies, Ye Search the Scriptures, as well as, Search the Scriptures?* And if it do, before I conclude the One more than the Other, I must have some better Argument, than his bare Affirmation. But to finish this, he will conclude all by the Words of the Apostle *James, Chap. 1. Ver. 25.* where he saith: *The Apostle calleth the Scriptures the perfect Law of Liberty*; But that doth not prove them to be the Primary Rule. Suppose it were granted, the Apostle meant the Scriptures, which remains yet by him to be proved; and is not done, by what he citeth Chap. 2. 8. by his denying them to *Fulfil the Royal Law, according to Scripture, Thou shalt love thy Neighbour as thyself*; which proves it not at all: Yea, to understand it of the Scripture, were to make the Apostle's Words scarce good Sense; as if he had said, *Fulfil the Scriptures according to the Scriptures*: Whereas it futes the Place much better, that the Apostle meant, *They should fulfil the royal Law in their Hearts*, which was one with the Scriptures, that also command the same thing. That the Apostle means the Outward Law, and not that *Written*


The perfect Law of Liberty, the Royal Law in the Hearts

1679. *in the Heart*, Chap. 4. 12. he hath affirmed, but not proved. Next, he comes to the *Beræans* being commended for *Searching the Scriptures*, Acts 17. 11. But this is the same way answered, as the former. For if the *Beræans* were obliged to believe and receive *Paul's* Testimony, because he preached the Truth to them by Authority from God; then their Using, or his Commending them for using the Scripture, will not prove the Scripture to be the Primary Rule; yea, more a Rule, than the Doctrine, they Tried by it. In the rest of what he saith in this n. 28. he but fights with his own Shadow; for I never said, *They excluded the Law of Nature*, in affirming, *the Scripture to be the Rule*; or did I ever deny, but that *the Scripture reveals things, which Nature could never have Discovered?* But the Question is, *Whether that Truth, that Man is the Off-spring of God*, from which the Apostle argues with the *Athenians*, was discovered to any by *meer Nature*, or by a *Divine Principle?* And this is that he should have proved; and therefore yet remains for him to do: But to be like himself, he concludes this also with a gross Lie, saying, *I affirm, the Scripture to be no more our Rule, than the Heathen-Poets*; which no ways follows from my Words, neither hath or can he ever prove it.

¶ 9. He thinks, *The Scriptures not determining of many things, nor having any Rule for them* (which he seems to acknowledge) *is no Argument against their being the Primary and Adequate or Only Rule, for that* (he apprehends) *no rational Man will think needful to a Compleat Rule, [Why?] because General Rules are enough*: And thence he thinks it would follow, *That the Quakers must have a new, particular Revelation for every Act and Word, such as Eating, Drinking, Walking, &c.* But I deny this Consequence. These Acts, as simply Considered, are Natural; and it will



will not follow, because to Spiritual Acts, relating to *Faith* and my Immediate Service towards God, I need a Spiritual Motion and Influence of the Spirit; that therefore I need such a thing to Natural Acts. If he say, *These Natural Acts under some Circumstances may be Sin or Duty*: I Confess, then the Revelation of the Spirit is needful. For if I be *sitting, sleeping or eating in one Place*, when it is the Mind of God, I should be *preaching and praying in another*; I do Sin: But how can the Scripture give me a Rule here? All that he answers to this, p. 76. 77. resolves into this: *That all such Doubts may be solved, applying the General Rules of Scripture by Christian Wisdom, Prudence and Discretion, &c.* But how shall I know, that I truly make this Application? And (to give him his own often-repeated Argument in the Case of Revelation) have not some thought, they have made this Application by Christian Prudence, when they did not? And not to go further, than *J. B's* own Brethren, the *Presbyterians*, yea, the Chief and most Eminent Teachers among them, Did not some of them judge it Christian Prudence according to the Scripture-Rule, to draw near and Adhere to the *Remonstrants*, which others, called *Publick Resolution-Men, denied*? Do not some of them think it Christian Prudence, to go here the *Bishops Curates*, which others Deny? Did not those Chief Men among them (as *George Hutcheson* and others) think it Christian Prudence, to Accept of the *Indulgence* Anno 1668. in Entering, according to the Limitations proposed by the Council, to their Places, which others, especially of the *Banished Brethren*, and perhaps Himself was highly offended at? Whence these Men were termed *Council-Curates*: Other Instances among them I could give. But how shall all this be Decided? What

1679.  
  
 Spiritual Acts and Motions distinguish'd from Natural.

*J. B's* Christian Prudence (so call'd) doubtful and uncertain.

1679. Scripture-Rule can he assign, that clearly do it? Let him Answer this distinctly, and not pass it over; lest he be suspected to Leap, where he cannot Step. He confesseth to my alledging 1 Cor. 12. and Rom. 12. and after a little Railing he tells, *p. 78. That he that is to Rule, is to do it with Diligence, &c. but that the Scripture saith not, that James or Peter should take on this or that Office: By which Confession he distroys all; since the Question is, How James and Peter knew, they should take upon them to Rule? This he saith he has shewn above; but how Insufficiently, my Reply will Evidence. He thinks no less Impertinent (p. 78.) for me to Argue against their being a Rule as to all things, because they do not tell a Man, that he has the Marks of true Faith, upon which Knowledge the Assurance of Salvation is founded: As if I must think, the Laws of the Land must prove, that R. B. is a Quaker; or that if R. B. had murder'd a Man, it is a sufficient Defence to say, The Law doth not name R. B. But such Examples are poor Arguments, and do miserably Halt: R. B. confessing himself to be a Quaker, acknowledging every one of their Doctrines, is enough to prove him One in the Sense of the Law of the Land; and the Judge to Condemn him a Murderer, if Convict by Witnesses, that he really did the Deed. And both these relate to outward things, which can be proved by outward Testimonies; for without the Certainty of the Evidence the Judge cannot pronounce his Sentence. But is a Man's own Confessing or Affirming, he hath the True Marks of Faith, enough to prove, he has them? And what are the Witnesses (to apply the Example of committing the Murder) by which a Man shall know, he has these Marks? And who must Examine the Witnesses, and judge of the Certainty or Clearness of their Evidences? Must it be the Man, that is Accused? Who useth that Method? Doth*

J. B's  
He uses Ex-  
amples to  
prove True  
Faith.

not the Man see, how miserably his pitiful Example claudicates? 1679.

¶ 10. To my Objection against the Scriptures being the *Only and Adequate Rule*, the Example of deaf Persons, Idiots, Infants, such as cannot Read, and are ignorant of the Original Tongues, so called (all which in some Measure, less or more, are deprived of the Benefit of the Scriptures, so as to apply them to themselves immediately and effectually for a Rule) he asketh, *Whether if any such Person in a Land should kill a Man, or do any Thing contrary to the Law, would it not punish them?* (and this he repeats n. 35. in other Words) Which urgeth nothing; but upon Supposition, that the Will of God cannot be known otherwise, than by the Scripture: which Supposition is false, and therefore his Argument concludes nothing: Yea, himself confesseth, that some things, and in particular, *Murder*, may be known by the Light of Nature; and so overturns his own Argument. But he asketh, *What Use can Children, or Idiots, or Mad-men make of the Light within?* Answ. The *Light within* being affirmed by us to be a *Living Principle*, that quickens the Soul, may Influence such Persons; but so cannot any Writings. As for his Learned *Dr. Owen's Book*, which he recommends; he may find it answered long ago by *Samuel Fisher a Quaker*: Which because the Doctor found too hot to reply to, *J. B.* that is so busy a Body, may supply that Want. But most Rare of all is his Answer (pag. 80.) to my Conclusion; [*That Christ would not leave his own to be led by a Rule obvious to so many Doubts*] which is, *And yet we see, he hath done it.* If this be not to beg the Question in the highest Degree, the Reader may judge. He confesseth, *The Spirit is the chief Leader*; but to seem to come off with some Credit, he falleth a Railing upon me for not *Distinguishing, but Confounding*

Deaf Per-  
sons, &c.  
the Light  
may Influ-  
ence, which  
Writings,  
&c. cannot.


J. B. Con-  
fesses to a  
Rule obvi-  
ous to many  
Doubts.

1679. *the Spirit's Work and the Scriptures*: And then bestows many Words to prove, they are *distinct*; with a Heap of Citations in the next p. 81. All which he might have spared, until he had proved first, that I denied, they were *distinct*, or shewn, where or when I confound them? What he writes (n. 38, and 39. p. 82.) is meer *Railing*, as the Reader by looking unto them may observe. He flouts there at my Affirming, [I knew one, that could not Read, discover an Error in the Version] saying, *But the good Luck was, himself was Judge*. What he would infer hence, I see not; unless that their Version is free of Errors: which if he will adventure to affirm, his Mistake may be shewn by the Testimony of Learned Men among themselves, and his own Correcting it divers times; which will after be observed. He saith; *My speaking soberly of the Scriptures is only out of Policy; because the Quakers could not effectuate their Point, which was, To have the Scriptures quite laid by, as an Old Almanack*: But such malicious Lies and Railings need no Answer. To this he adds two other gross Calumnies to conclude his Paragraph, *That it is the Quakers fixed Opinion, that the Scriptures are not to be made use of in their Assemblies; it being below them to Expound any Portion of it there, or to adduce any Testimony there-from for Confirmation of their Assertions*. This can be proved to be a manifest Untruth by the Testimony of many, that are not *Quakers*, who have been Witnesses of the contrary. The other (which he calleth *Their constant Opinion*) is, *That when one cometh to hearken to the Light within, he hath obtained the whole End of the Scriptures, so that they become wholly useless to him*. This is also a horrid Calumny.

¶ 10. In his Examining of what I assert, to be the End and Usefulness of the Scriptures (p. 83, 84.) he cannot find fault, with what I ascribe

7. B's gross Calumnies, denying our using Scripture Testimonies.

to them ; but that I give them not all; and whether I do wrong, denying that to them, which he would seem to give, the former Debate will shew. But that he may be here like himself, he seeks to infer from my Words most gross and malicious Consequences, which are utterly false; and till he prove them, they need no other Answer. but to observe them and deny them, which I utterly do: Such as, *That albeit Christ has Ordained Pastors, and the Scriptures under the Gospel, to make the Man of God perfect; yet the Quakers think, they may be both laid aside, as useless: That, according to me, the Scriptures are not so much as a subordinate Rule: That the Quakers would have all others, save themselves, to look upon themselves as not concerned in the Scriptures; that so they might be the sole Keepers of these Oracles: And then (he saith) they shall quickly know, what shall become of them. And that the Quakers always suppose, that what the Spirit within them saith, cannot contradict the Scripture; and therefore what they say contrary to the Scripture from the Spirit within, must be supposed to be seeming, and not real* (This he repeats again according to his Custom in the next Page.) If he mean the Spirit of God, I hope, he will not deny it; and if he mean any other Spirit, we deny it: But he would be fastening that upon us here, which may be justly said to them of their Exalting their Confession of Faith above the Scriptures; as in the first Section upon his Preface I observed. But he hath an Objection which he urgeth pag. 67: and by which he thinks to overturn all; asking, *If I believe the Testimony of the Scriptures to be true? Yes, I do believe them; because the Testimony of the Spirit in my Heart obligeth me so to do: and therefore being perswaded they are true, I make Use of them, though, in Respect to my self, not*

1677.   
*J. B's false  
 Insinuations  
 against our  
 Asserting the  
 Usefulness  
 and Truth  
 of the Scrip-  
 tures.*

1679. in the first and primary Place, but in the secondary, next to the *Spirit*: Yet as to him, I may urge them every way, because he accounts them so. And as to their Testimony for the *Spirit's* being the *Principal Leader*, upon my using of which he founds his Objection, (albeit, since he acknowledgeth it, he has the less Reason to carp at it) I believe it from the Scripture-Testimony; but not as the *Primary Ground* of my Faith, which I derive from the *Spirit* it self: yet as a Ground, and that a very weighty One. As for his other Question, *Whether I be of the same Mind with other Quakers, of whom Mr. Hicks reporteth?* I answer; That what is there reported by *Hicks*, is false; and I here dare *J. B.* and his Author *Hicks* to prove it, to have been said by any *Quaker*: Which till they can do by good and sufficient Proof, they are both to be held as Lying Calumniators.

---

### S E C T. V.

*Wherein his Fifth and Sixth Chapters, imitated by him, Of Man's Natural State, and Of Original Sin, are Considered.*

¶ I. **A**fter he has repeated some of my Words, he complains, *I speak darkly*; and having given his usual Malicious Insinuations; that *I do it of Design, and have some Mysteries under it*; he takes upon him to endeavour to guess at my Meaning, and bestows many Pages to frame one Conjecture after another: and then spends many Words to refute these Shadows, and Men of Straw of his own Making. And yet at the End of all he confesses, *He doubts, whether he*

has got or bit my Meaning; and to be sure then, he must be as uncertain that he has refuted it: And therefore knoweth not, but all his Reasonings against his own Conjectures are impertinent. For after he hath written one Conjecture, and bestows much Labour in Refuting it; his own Words are (*p. 91. n. 5.*) *If this be not his true Meaning, let us try another Conjecture:* Which shews, he knows not whether what he said before was to the Purpose. Thus he spendeth *Pag. 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98.* in which last Page he is very *Angry, that I should condemn the Socinians and Pelagians;* but the Reason is manifest, because he would so willingly have it believed, that I am one with them. And albeit I could not in Reason be obliged to say any thing more to these Pages; yet that none of these fictitious and false Conjectures may catch any unwary Reader, I do freely affirm, that I believe, *Man fell,* and was degenerated both as to Soul and Body: And I understand, the *first Adam,* (or Earthly Man) to Comprehend both. But that there was something in *Adam,* which was no Part of his Soul and Body, nor yet Constitutive of his being a Man (in my Judgment) which could not degenerate, and which was in *Adam* by the Fall reduced to a Seed, and could never have been raised in him again to his Comfort, but by a New Visitation of Life, which from Christ by the Promise was administered unto him, and is to all Men in a Day, (for to say, the affirming such a Seed remained in *Adam* when he fell, doth infer, his Understanding was not hurt; and, as he doth *p. 94.* is a Consequence I deny, and remains for him to prove) That to believe, there was such a thing in *Adam,* which the Scripture calleth *Spiraculum Vitarum,* the *Breath of Lives,* is no New-coin'd Doctrine; as those may see, that will read

1679.

J. B. Confesses himself in the Dark with Trying his uncertain Conjectures.

The Fall of Man, and the Breath of Lives (Spiraculum Vitarum) remaining in Adam.

1679. *Athanasius de Definitionibus*, and his *Third Dialogue de Trinitate*, and *Fourth Oration* against the *Arians*, and *Cyrillus Alexandrinus* in his *Treatise upon John*, lib. 2. and 3. and lib. 8. 47. and in his *Theaurus* lib. 4. and others that might be mentioned. As for his Arguing (p. 96.) that because I affirm, *The Seed of God is a Substance, therefore (according to me) the Seed of Sin must be a Substance also*; which Consequence I deny: And therefore what he builds against me upon that Supposition, falls to the Ground. What he saith here and there scattered in these Pages of the *Light*, will in its proper Place come more fully to be considered.

¶ 2. Pag. 98. n. 17. after he has saluted me with the Titles of *Effronted* and *Impudent*, he will have me one with *Socinians* and *Pelagians*, because I deny, *Outward Death to be a Consequence of the Fall*; but where he proves I do so, I see not. It's true I say, *The Death threatned* (Gen. 2. 17.) *was not outward Death*; for *Adam did not so die the Day he did eat*; and I do still believe so; neither offereth he me any thing to give me Ground to alter my Mind: But to conclude thence, I deny *Outward Death to be a Consequence of the Fall*, was too hastily inferred. But what! if I were undetermined in this Matter, and that it remained a *Mystery* to me? (For I believe not the being positive therein *Essential* to *Salvation*) which if I were, truly, what he saith seems not to me sufficient to *Profelyte* me to his Opinion. For albeit I willingly confess with him, That *Sickness* and all the other *Miseries* attending this *Life*, yea, and *Death* it self, considering the *Anguishes* wherewith it is now generally accompanied, are the *Consequence* of the *Fall*, and of *Sin*; yet I see not how it would thence follow, that *Adam* should not have died; seeing *Death* to him, if he had not fallen, would have

Adam did  
not die an  
outward  
Death, the  
Day he did  
eat.



have been freed of all these Miseries, and rather a Pleasure, than a Pain : Which has been known to have befallen many Saints. As for his *n. 19.* he confesseth ; the Matter of it is left to the next Chapter, where I may meet him. 1679.

¶ 3. *Pag. 100. n. 20.* He goes on at an high Rate of Perverting. For after he has said, *Who would suspect, but I mean honestly ?* He applieth to me the Saying of Solomon, *He that hateth, dissembleth with his Lips, we must not believe him ; for there are seven Abominations in his Heart.* But why am I with him guilty of this great Charge ? Because albeit I affirm, That Man is wholly degenerate ; yet I say, Whatever Good Man doth in his Nature, that doth not proceed from him, but from the *Divine Seed* in him. Answ. These Words are none of mine, but a Forgery of his own ; so incident it is for the Man to lie and pervert : And therefore all his Vapouring and absurd Inferences drawn from this throughout this Paragraph, fall to the Ground. My Words are, *That the Nature, by which the Apostle saith, The Gentiles did the Things contained in the Law, cannot be understood of the proper corrupt Nature of Man, but of a Spiritual Nature, which proceedeth from the Seed of God, as he receiveth a New Visitation of the Divine Love :* Where it is very plain, I consider Man as *visited a-new,* and that in the Strength of that Grace thereby received (not of his degenerate Nature) he doth that which is good. Nor do I any where say, as he falsely insinuates, *That this Spiritual Nature is in all Men ;* though I do say, *That all Men are visited by God, in order to beget this Spiritual Nature in them ;* As will after come in its Place to be spoken of. Now all his battering of this my Assertion in the three following Pages depends upon this Supposition, *That the good Acts done by the Gentiles, are not done by Virtue of any such* *Visita-*

How the  
Gentiles did  
the Things  
of the Law ?

1679. *Visitation, but only by a Light of Corrupt Nature, which remained in them after the Fall.* So that it is but a meer begging of the Question, until that be first debated. But he thinks, he has brought me under a great *Dilemma*, p. 103. urging, *That since I say, All their Imaginations are Evil, I must say, Every Heathen has this Spiritual Nature in him, yea, and the Devils must be Partakers of it; because they believe, there is a God, which is a good Thought.* *Ans.* He is too hasty in his Reasonings; for that the Knowledge a Man may receive from the *Divine Seed*, makes him instantly to partake of the *Divine Nature*, is not proved by him; and he knows, I believe all Men to be Visited by this *Divine Seed*, which may give them an Head Knowledge, which they may retain (as some Men do the Truth) in Unrighteousness; and yet not receive it in the Love of it: So though they have it from a *Divine Seed*, yet it will not follow they must necessarily so receive it, as to become Partakers of the *Divine Nature*. And as for the *Devils*, he will confess that once they had this Knowledge from a *Spiritual Nature*; and though they have fallen, yet they may retain the Memory of it: for that their Fall and Man's is every way alike, he will not affirm. He saith, p. 102. *That to believe Good done by Heathens (that is, by such as have not the Benefit of the outward Knowledge of Christ) is done in Virtue of a Divine Seed, overturns the Gospel;* but he leaves the Confirmation of it to the Sequel, where I shall attend him. N. 25. he tells me very fairly, *The Apostle doth not contradict himself;* as if I had ever imagined he did: But the Question is, Whether the Meaning he gives the Apostle's Words, implies not a Contradiction? Which indeed he can no ways reconcile, but upon the Supposition above denied: And the Reader may Judge, whether he or I do most fully acknowledge *Man's Fall*, and most truly exalt the Grace of God; he that affirmeth,

*That*

The Difference between Head-Knowledge and the Partaking of the Divine Nature.

That Man, notwithstanding the Fall, yet retaineth 1679.  
 some Reliques of the Image of God, yea so, that the  
 Law of God, which is Holy, Just, Good and Spirit-  
 ual, is written in his Heart, pag. 105. and all  
 this considered as fallen Man, without receiving any  
 Grace and Benefit from Christ: Or I, who affirm  
 That Man by the Fall was wholly degenerated,  
 retaining nothing of the Image of God; in whom  
 albeit there remained a Seed of Righteousness, yet  
 no otherways, than as a naked Seed in barren  
 Ground, in Virtue of which he can do nothing,  
 until visited by a New Visitation, which he re-  
 ceives by Virtue of Christ, as Mediator. And yet  
 while he ascribeth all this to unregenerate Men, he  
 saith in a few Lines, *That the apostle and all Re-*  
*generate Men are in a certain respect Carnal*: So  
 his Divinity will run thus: *The Devil and all Un-*  
*regenerate Men are in a certain respect Spiritual,*  
*and the Apostle and all Regenerate are in a certain*  
*respect Carnal.*

7. B's false  
 Assertions,  
 That Man  
 retained  
 some Reli-  
 quies of the I-  
 mage of God  
 in the Fall.

¶ 4. But he thinks, in the following Page 106.  
 he has gotten me in a notable Contradiction; so  
 that he concludeth, if I may have Occasion to  
 Contradict the Truth, I care not, how often I  
 Contradict my Self; and that is, by asking me  
 this Question: *Wherein appeared the Wisdom of the*  
*wise Men among the Greeks, if not in the Know-*  
*ledge of the Things of God?* I answer: In the  
 Wise and Prudent Management of worldly Af-  
 fairs; For he hath not proved, that is necessari-  
 ly united to a Knowledge of God and Things Spi-  
 ritual; since it is said of some Beasts, that they  
 have something of this, such as Bees and Ants,  
 &c. And whereas he asks, *Wherein Men differ*  
*from Brutes then?* I say, In many things; as in  
 the Knowledge of Numbers, and Mathematical  
 and Mechanical Demonstrations: Is the Know-  
 ledge of such natural Truths (as 2 and 3 makes  
 5: And the whole is greater than the Part, and all  
 that's

The wis-  
 dom of the  
 Greeks ap-  
 peared in  
 their work-  
 ly Affairs.

1679. that's deduced therefrom) the Knowledge of the Things of God? And yet is not this further than what Beasts know? And to shew him his Forwardness in this, let him shew me, if he admit not this, how the Wisdom of this World is Foolishness with God, and the Wisdom of God Foolishness with Men? At last he comes, p. 107. and to the End of this Chapter, to prove, *That there doth remain in Man some Reliques of the Image of God, notwithstanding the Fall*; Which he builds upon that saying of the Apostle, *Rom. i. 19. Because that which may be known of God, is manifest in them*, and the Reason he urgeth, is, *Because it was known not to a few only*. Answ. This is very true, but makes nothing for him: for here (as for the most Part elsewhere) he with an unparallel'd Confidence (not to say Impudence) every where begs the Question. *First*, in that he supposeth that this τὸ γνωστόν, or *what is to be known of God*, is somewhat, that Man retained in the Fall, and no New Visitation of Light and Grace, which he knows I deny. And *Secondly*, That it must be so; because all Men have it: where he supposeth, that all Men receive not such a Visitation; which he knows I also deny: and yet he concludes, without offering to prove either of them. Who but one Desperate, and that cares not how Ridiculous and Absurd he be, if he can but heap together a Company of Railing Words, would urge his Adversary by *Mediums*, which he knows he denies; without first proving them, or at least Attempting so to do?

*That which may be known of God, &c. are not J. B's Relicks.*

¶ 5. Next followeth his Sixth Chapter, Intituled, *Of Original Sin*: in which nothing of what he saith can touch me; but so far as he proves, *That those who never actually sinned (such as Infants) are guilty of Adam's Sin*: Therefore what he saith of others, who affirm, *That Man sustain-*  
ed

ed no Hurt by Adam, but by Imitation, Concerns 1679.  
 me not; since I say no such thing: And yet he thinks it a Paradox for me to say (albeit he cannot deny but it is true) that I deny the Errors of such. And of this Nature is what he writes in the first four Pages of this Chapter; in the last of which he goes (after his Custom) as it were, to pump for the Meaning of my Words, that he may insinuate to the Reader, as if *I wrote all in the Dark*, and had great Mysteries under them: Whereas any one that reads them, may see, they are so plain, that they need no Commentary. For who is so weak, as not to understand me saying, *That the Seed of Sin is not imputed to Infants, until they actually join with it?* He comes, p. 114. n. 8. to Examin, what he saith, I say in Defence of this Error: And first he will take Notice of what I say of *Augustin*, whom he alledgeth I abuse, because I say, *That he was the first among the Antients, that opened the Way to his Opinion in his declining Age, out of Zeal*: But will he deny, that *Augustin* wrote most zealously against *Pelagius* in his declining Age? Next he shews here his great Disingenuity: For while he names many of the Antients, as being of the same Mind, and whom *Augustin* also cited against *Pelagius*, he gives none of their Words; that it might have been seen whether it was in this that they Condemned him, to wit, *That Infants are not guilty of Adam's Sin*. For these Citations may relate to that, which was accounted indeed *Pelagianism*, to wit, *That Man by Nature without the Grace of God could fulfil the Law, yea, that he needed not Grace to perform the Will of God*; which was the Thing for which *Pelagius* was Condemned by the *African Synod*. As for the Citation he gives of *Augustin*, saying, *He was of the same Mind since the Beginning of his Conversion*; seeing in this Place *Augustin's* Words, which he saith he has held, are

That the Seed of Sin is not imputed to Infants until they actually join with it.

1679. no more than the express Words of the Apostle, *Rom. 5. 12.* which *J. B.* has not yet proved to import, That *Infants are guilty of Adam's Sin*: So if he has no better Way to prove *Augustin's* positive Judgment in the Case, than this, he doth but give a Token of his own Effronedness and shameless Boldness, not of Mine. But since he seems so great an Admirer of *Augustin*, as an honoured Instrument of the Lord, and an Holy Father (as he terms him) then I desire to know, Whether he will agree to all that *Augustin* hath written? Which if he will not do, he doth ill to accuse me for Condemning *Augustin*, as Erroneous in some Things: And if he will, I may then shew him, That *Augustin* both Commended and Practised Things, which he and his Brethren cryed out against as *Superstition, Will Worship* and *Abominable Popery* and *Idolatry*; and for far less than which they have Excommunicated their Fellow-Preachers. Which shews in Effect meaner Thoughts of him than I have yet expressed. My Argument drawn from *Ephes. 2. 3.* (where the Apostle ascribes the Reason of *Men's being Children of Wrath* to their *Evil Deeds*) he saith, was the Fathers against *Pelagius*. And what then? Doth that render it null? But his own Answer to it is Rare, saying, "He thinks, I put out my "Eyes, that do not observe, how the Apostle "changes the Second Person, saying, [*Among "whom also we all had our Conversation in Times "past,— and were by Nature the Children of Wrath*] Whence the Man wisely infers, That *Paul and the Jews were the Children of Wrath*; which is not denied: But they must have quick Eyes indeed, that see it from thence to be inferred, that they were such, ere they Committed any actual Sin; since the Apostle expressly mentions his and their having had their Conversation among the World, as a Reason of their having been in the same Con-

Children  
of Wrath  
are so for  
their Evil  
Deeds.

Condition. He saith further, I confess 1 Cor. 2: 1679. that *ψυχὴς* is to be understood of the Rational Soul: And what then? Therefore so soon as they partake of the Rational Soul, they become Children of Wrath; This is indeed a rare Consequence: But he must excuse me for not admitting it, till better proved. It would seem much more rational to say, that so soon as they come to the Exercise of their Rational Soul, and then do Evil, they become guilty; for he cannot deny, That the Gospel nor Condemneth, nor Threatneth any Man, but him that has Actually Sinned: And whether this destroys not his Cause, the Reader may judge. That, *Except a Man be born again, he cannot enter the Kingdom*, I never denied. Albeit Children be capable of Death, yet it will not follow, that they are Guilty of Sin, since Death is no Punishment, but rather an Advantage to such; to whom it's a Transition to a better Life. He thinks, p. 117. that my saying, *Such as homologate their Fathers Sins, God will visit the Iniquities of their Fathers upon them*, is not worth Noticing; but whether his Answer be worth noticing, the Reader may judge, which is: *That Adam's Sin was not a personal Sin, as other Mens are, and his own After-sins*, but the Man forgot to prove this, and therefore may do it next. But he thinks, the Children of Core, Dathan and Abiram, of Achab and the Sodomites, were judged guilty of their Fathers Sins; for unless he proves that, he saith nothing: But for what Reason, I know not; unless that they were outwardly Destroyed: But until he prove, that infers Guilt, he must forbear making his Conclusion. He is highly offended I should say, *Their Opinion is Contrary to the Justice and Mercy of God*; alledging, *It is without Proof*: But if to account one guilty for a Sin committed by another Thousands of Years, e're they had a Being, and to punish for it, be not against Justice, and inconsistent

The Children of Core; &c. Instantiated.

1679. *flent with Mercy, I desire to know of him, what is more Unjust and Unmerciful? To say, that this is an Accusing of God, is but a silly begging of the Question, until he has first proved his Opinion to be True: It's no Accusing of God to Condemn Mens Opinions, when contrary to his Nature. He will have it to be a Rapsody of Non-sense when I say, 'This proceeds from Self-Love founded on their Opinion, of Absolute Reprobation; but whether it be, or not, the Reader may judge: Sure, his saying it, makes it not so. That this of Infants being guilty of Adam's Sin, and therefore many of them being damned, depends upon their Doctrine of Reprobation, no Man of Sense, that knows their Doctrine, will deny; since they say, Some Infants are saved. because elected: Are not the Rest then (according to them) damned, because reprobated? He gives me nothing here in Answer, but Railing; and so concludes this Paragraph with this notable Saying; Wo, I say (that is, J. Brown forth) and thrice Wo to such, as drink in this Man's Doctrine, and live and die accordingly (p. 118. n. 14.) He thinks, my saying, Papists are more charitable in allowing a Limbus to Children, shews my Affection to them; but he has not heard me allow of their Notion of a Limbus, as he does (in the Chapter of Justification, p. 310.) of the Opinion of a certain Popish Cardinal; preferring it not only to what is said by William Forbes, a Protestant Bishop, but even (as it would appear) to Richard Baxter, his ancient Presbyterian Brother: And in Pursuance of this he asks, How they come to Heaven (meaning Children) who have nothing to do with Christ? But then what will he say of those, he accounts elect Children? Go they to Heaven without Christ? It not, the Difficulty is the same way resolved. To prove Children are under a Law, and subject to Transgression, he*

Some Infants Elected, some Reprobated, J. B's Opinion.

gives



gives the Common Practices among Men, who forfeit Children; yea such, as are *unborn*, with their Fathers for great Crimes: But in what Country do they use to *kill all the Children*, when the *Father is put to Death for a Crime*? And unless this were done, his Comparison infers not the Point. His plain Answer (he saith) is, *Adam his being a Publick Person*; of which hereafter. To my Citation *Ezek. 18. 20. The Son shall not bare the Father's Iniquity*, he preaches at large upon the Words, alledging, his *Meaning is, that those Persons he wrote to, had so much Sin of their own, that God might justly judge them; albeit he did not visit them for their Fathers Iniquities*: And this is the quick Dispatch he saith this Place receives: It is a quick Way to dispatch indeed, if it were Valid, to make the Meaning destroy the Text; but Men of Sense use not to be sudden in receiving such Dispatches. The Words are plain and positive, *The Son shall not bear the Father's Iniquity*; therefore, until he give Ground from plain Scripture to take it away, it must stand to the *Overthrow* of his Doctrine: For the greater Sinners those Men were, the more justly and deservedly might their Father's Iniquity be laid upon them.

¶ 6. Pag. 120. n. 17. He cometh from my Confession, *That Adam was a Publick Person*, to infer, *That the Guilt passeth from him to all*: And first in this Page he affirmeth, *That this Sin of Adam's, from whence Original Sin proceeds, is the Sin of the whole Nature of Mankind, and not like Adam's After-Sins, and the Sins of other Men; which he confesses, are not the Sins of the whole Nature*. And because upon this dependeth much, of what he infers; he had done well to have proved this in the first Place by some Scripture: Till which time his Inference is not to be received. For did *Adam* Cease to be a publick Person, after he had Committed that Sin? If he say, *Yea*,


The Son shall not bare the Father's Iniquity, how Explained by J. B.

J. B. infers Original Sin from Adam's being a publick Person.

1679. let him prove it by plain Scripture; for I deny it: If not, then his other Sins must be Imputed to all Men (which he denies) or else nothing can be urged from his being a *publick Person*. And while to urge it, he asketh, *Did ever any bear one stated as a publick Person, whose Failings could have no Effect, until the Persons represented did testify their Approbation of it?* For here speaking of Failings, he must either Conclude in Contradiction to himself, *That Adam's Sins are laid to the Charge of his Posterity*; or his Instance is wholly Impertinent. And yet (to go round again) he takes notice, p. 125. *That the Apostle names One Offence in the singular Number*, as if thence he would infer, *that one Sin is only transmitted*: But how he proves his Consequence thence, he has not shewn. For albeit by that First Offence he gave Entrance for Sin, that being his first; yet it will not follow, he then Ceased to be a publick Person: and if not, nothing can be proved from granting him to be such, as is above observed.

*Next*, the Words are, *The Offence of one*, and not, *One Offence*, as he would insinuate; which (though in the singular Number) may include many, yea All his Offences. For whatever way he seeks to urge this from this Place as to *Adam*, the Parrallel will allow it to be interpreted of *Christ*; where the Apostle speaking of his *Righteousness* useth also the Singular Number: and thence according to him we might say, that it is only the *first Act* of *Christ's Righteousness*, that is Imputed unto us, and none of the Rest; so that we have nothing to do with his *Death, Sufferings* and *Resurrection*. What thinks he now of his own Divinity? Let him loose his Knot the next time (to give him one of his own *modestest* Proverbs.) The Absurdity he seeks to draw from denying this Consequence of his being a Publick Person, *That if Adam had stood, Infants should have no Advantage*

As by the  
Offence of  
one, &c. ob-  
jected.

tage by him, since they have no Hurt by his Fall, 1679.  
 Toucheth not me at all; who no where say,   
 That Infants have no Hurt by Adam's Fall. Adam Adam by his Fall be-  
came obnox-  
ious to  
Temptations  
 by his Fall lost his Glory, his Strength, his Do-  
 minion, by which he could have easily withstood  
 the Devil; and came under great Weakness,  
 whereby the Enemy's Tentations had a ready Ac-  
 cess to him, and he became very obnoxious to fall  
 under them: And so all his Posterity are come  
 under the same Weakness and Obnoxiousness to  
 the Enemy's Tentations, who influenceth them  
 by entring into them, and powerfully inclining  
 them to Sin; and this Malignant Influence is  
 that Seed of Sin in all Men, whereunto they be-  
 come obnoxious by reason of the Fall: which  
 though in itself really Sin, yet is it not Man's,  
 but the Devil's, until Man give way to it. But  
 I deny not, but the least Yielding is Man's Sin;  
 among which I reckon *Concupiscence* to be one;  
 and so differ from *Papists*. For albeit the Tenta-  
 tion simply considered, or as presented by the  
 Devil, be not Man's Sin: yet if he have the least  
 Love or Desire to it, albeit he join not Actually,  
 that shews, his Mind is already Defiled and cor-  
 rupted, and that he is become a Partaker of it. Thus  
 are answered his Reasonings and Questionings,  
*How this Seed of Sin can be,* and yet not the Per-  
 sons Sin? p. 121, 122, &c. as the Reader by  
 Comparing may observe. Only it is remarka-  
 ble, p. 121. where he seems to put a great Stress  
 upon the Judgment of *Augustin*, and citing him,  
 he brings him in saying these Words (among o-  
 thers) concerning Infants; *Shall they sin, that are* Infants are  
under no  
Law.  
*under no Command?* Now since they, who are un-  
 der no Command, are under no Law (for every  
 Law imports a Command) How will he reconcile  
 this Saying of his Holy Father, which he brings  
 as a Matter of Authority, with his accounting it  
 both foolish and strange in me p. 119. to prove,  
 Y 3 Chil-

1679. *Children are under no Law?* So that either the Authority of *Augustin* he brings, is not to be regarded; or his Reasonings to prove *Children under a Law*, that is, a *Command*, must be naught: let him chuse which he will, and clear himself of Impertinency. His Argument in this Page, That *as the Seed of Grace denominates a Man gracious, even while not exercising Works of Grace; so the Seed of Sin must denominate a Man sinful*, is but a begging of the Question: as in its Place will appear, when I come to treat of the *Seed of Grace*.

W  
 F. B. taken  
 in his own  
 Snare.

As Christ's  
 Righteous-  
 ness, so A-  
 dam's Un-  
 righteousness  
 is not  
 Imputed to  
 Men, before  
 actual join-  
 ing with ei-  
 ther.

¶ 7. When he cometh *p. 123. n. 18.* to Reply to my Answer to their Objection, *Rom. 5. 12.* among his preliminary Observations the first is very proper, where he saith; *It is observable, the Apostle makes Comparison betwixt Adam and Christ.* I Answer; It is indeed so: for as the *Righteousness* of Christ is not Imputed to Men for *Justification*, until they Actually Join with it, or apprehend it by Faith, (as himself will acknowledge, for I suppose, by his accounting the *Antinomians* Hereticks, he will not with them affirm, That Men are Justified, before they Believe;) so neither is the *Unrighteousness* and Disobedience of *Adam* Imputed to Men for *Condemnation*, until they Actually Join with it: But this Comparison spoils all his Doctrine. Then after he has beg'd the Question a while by meer Allegations, affirming; his *Doctrine to be so clear from the Apostle's Words, that it cannot be Contradicted, without doing Violence to the Text*; he forms an Argument thus:

*That Sin, which is so described to us by the Apostle, that he saith, it brought Death upon all Men; that Men sinned by it, and were made Sinners, even they who could not as yet actually Sin; that thereby all became guilty of Death and of Condemnation;*  
 that

that Sin by Imputation is the Sin of the whole Nature, included in Adam, and rendereth the whole Nature obnoxious to Death, and to Condemnation. 1679.

But The first Sin of Adam is described to us by the Apostle, &c.

Ergo That Sin is the Sin of Nature, &c.

This Argument may perhaps satisfy such, as are already Profelites of this Theam: but will not Convince one, that either believes other ways, or doubts; since the *Major* is a meer begging of the Question. And if any thing be a *foisting-in* of Words to the Text, this must be it: since he *foists-in* the Thing in Debate, and Words not in the Text, such as [*Even they, who could not as yet actually Sin*] and joineth them with the Words of the Text without distinction, and not as an Interpretation; that his unwary Reader may Conclude them to be of the Text. And yet the Man has the Impudence in the same Page to Accuse me of Intolerable Boldness, as *foisting Words into the Text*, while I expressly shew, it is but an Interpretation, by saying, *That is, &c.* so much is he blinded with Self-Interest: But I am Content, there be neither Addition, nor so much as Consequence made use of. Let him shew me the plain Scripture, that saith, *Infants are guilty of Adam's Sin?* If he say, *It must be necessarily inferred from these Words [in whom all have sinned]* I say, it as necessarily follows, that it is only to be understood of *all that could sin*, which *Infants could not*; as not being under any Law, as I have above proved, and *Augustin* (whom he so much Reverenceth) doth affirm, if his Citation from him be true. And therefore finding this to pinch him, he brings it up again p. 126. where bringing me in saying, *Infants are under no Law*, he answers; *But the Apostle saith the Contrary: He*

f. B. foist's  
in Words of  
his own to  
deceive his  
Reader.

1679. would have done Charitably to have told me *Where?* That I might have observed it. What he saith in this, as well as the former Page in answer to my Affirmation, that *ἐφ' ᾧ* may relate to *Death*, and that it's understood [*upon which Occasion Man sinned*] urging Absurdities by the like Application of Christ's Righteousness; is solved by a serious Observation of the Comparison, as stated by me betwixt Christ and *Adam*. His arguing from Children's Dying doth not conclude, until he prove *Death simply considered, necessarily to infer Guilt in the Party dying*, of which I have spoken before. P. 126. n. 20. to my Answer to *Psal. 51.* 5. alledged by them, wherein I shew, that *David* saith not, *My Mother conceived me sinning*; and therefore it proves not his Assertion. His Reply is (after he has given a Scoff) *It quite crosseth David's Design*: But why so? because in that Psalm he expresseth his Sorrow and Humiliation for his Sins? And what then? Might not *David* Lament upon that Occasion, that he was not only a Sinner himself, but also came of such, as were so? But when I urge this Place further, shewing, their Interpretation would make Infants guilty of the Sin of their Immediate Parents, since there is no mention here of *Adam*; His Answer to this is a Repetition of his own Doctrine: A rare Method of Debate, very usual to him! And then taking it for granted, he asks me; *Whether this originated Sin* (of which he supposed *David* spake, for he never offers to prove it, though it be the Matter in Debate) *came from an other Original than Adam*? What he affirmed here of my insinuating Marriage-Duties to be Sin, is but a false Conjecture: But as to the Hurt, and Loss, that Man got by *Adam*, which I ascribe to no other Original (as being no *Manichee*) I spake before. But he should first prove, before he obtrude such things upon others (and I desire

J. B's  
proofless Af-  
firmation of  
Infants under  
a Law.

Whether  
Childrens  
DEATH  
argues Guilt  
in them.

fire yet to be informed of him) In what *Scripture* he reads of *Original Sin*? And whether, if the *Scripture* be the *only Rule*, he cannot find Words in it fit enough to Express his Faith? Or must he shift for them else-where?

¶ 8. Pag. 127. N. 21. He urges *Paul's* saying, *The Wages of Sin is Death*; and to my saying [‘ This may be a Consequence of the *Fall*; but that thence it cannot at all be Inferred, that Iniquity is in all those that are subject to Death ] he saith; *It is in plain Terms (but my Modesty dare not speak it out) to say, the Apostle speaketh not Truth.* Answ. Is not this to take upon him to judge of another Man's Heart, which elsewhere he counts a great Presumption? And why takes he no notice, or gives he no Answer to the Absurdity I shew, followed from thence, since the whole Creation received a Decay by *Adam's* Fall, and yet we say not, *Herbs and Trees are Sinners*? And while he would make-out this great Charge of my Contradicting the Apostle, he forgets the Half of his Business, which is *To prove, the Apostle meant in that Place Natural Death, and not Eternal, since the Apostle opposeth it there to Eternal Life*: And *Eternal Death* he will confess, is the *Wages of Sin*, which the Apostle shews they shun by *Jesus Christ's* obtaining *Eternal Life*; whereas *Natural Death* they do not avoid. Likewise he should have proved, that all the *Scriptures* mentioned by him, p. 128. are meant of *Natural Death*; which he will not find very easy. As for his citing *Death*, as mentioned by the Apostle, *1 Cor. 15.* the Apostle's Words, Ver. 56. Confirm, what I say, That *Death* is only a Punishment to the Wicked, not to the Saints: For the Words are, *The Sting of Death is Sin*; so where *Sin* is taken away, there *Death* has no Sting; and that is the Saints Victory. Now he cannot apply this to *Infants*, without supposing, that

1677.

The Wages  
of Sin is  
Death, pro-  
ved Eternal.

1679. that they have Sin; which were to beg the Question. And whereas he asks, *Whether Death be NO Punishment for Sin?* I answer, that I said not so; neither is that needful for me to affirm, seeing it is sufficient, if it be not always a Punishment of Sin: Which if it be not, it cannot be Concluded, that because *Infants die*, therefore they must be Guilty of Sin. Since then the Absurdities he after urges, follow from his Supposition, That *Death is no Punishment for Sin* (which I say not) they do not touch me. He judeth, p. 128. n. 22. That *I run wilder, than Papists, in saying, 'We will rather admit the supposed Absurdity of saying, All Infants are Saved, 'to follow from our Doctrine, than with them 'say, That innurable Infants Perish Eternally, not 'for their own, but only for Adam's Fault: This he reckons a Contradicting of my Doctrine of Christ's dying for all, saying, I here grant, That all Infants will be saved without Christ.* What horrible Lie is this? Where say I, *That all Infants will be saved without Christ?* If he say, it is by Consequence, that I say so, (which he must needs do, or else be an impudent, unparallel'd Lyar) then he infers it either from my saying, *Christ died for all:* Therefore if all Infants are Saved, it must be *without Christ*; or that, *If all Infants be saved, Christ cannot have died for All:* for one of these two must be, If I Contradict my self. But such Consequences are only fit for such an Author, as seems to have abandoned all Sense of Honesty and Christian Reputation, and resolves *per Fas aut nefas*, and *without Rhime or Reason* (as the Proverb is) to bespatter his Adversary. As for his adding, *They that have no Sin, have no need of a Saviour to save them from Sin,* He overturns it all by asking me, (in which also lies the Pinch of his Matter) *Since I affirm they have a Seed of Sin in them,*

Infants Saved without Christ, J. B.'s horrible Lie.



them, which is called Death and the old Man, how can they put-off this, and sing the Song of the Redeemed, which all that enter into Glory, must do? Does not this then shew, I believe, they have need of Christ, as a Saviour, who died for them, to deliver them from This? And is not the Contradiction his own in urging this Question? Which I thus Answer: How are those he accounts *Elect Infants*, Saved, whom he affirms to be really Guilty of Adam's Sin, and so in a worse Condition, than I affirm Infants to be? (for he will not say with *Papists* and *Lutherans*, that the Administring of that they call the Sacrament of *Baptism*, does it?) When he Answersthis, he will solve his own Argument. To insinuate, That some Infants are damned, he asketh me; What I think of those of Sodom, Jude v. 7. the Words are these: *Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the Cities about them in like manner giving themselves over to Fornication, and going after strange Flesh, are set forth for an Example, suffering the Vengeance of Eternal Fire.* But it is strange, the Man should be so desperately audacious, as to proclaim his own Sottishness to the World: Is there a Word here of *Infants*? Is not the very Reason of suffering the Vengeance of *Eternal Fire* given, because of their giving themselves over to *Fornication*? Which Reason could not touch Infants. Pag. 129. he thinks, I wrong *Zuinglius* upon the Credit of the *Council of Trent*; but if the *Council of Trent* wronged *Zuinglius*, in Condemning him for that he was not guilty of, He and his Brethren have the Honour to have their Judgment approved by that Council, while ours is Condemned: And let him remember how he useth to upbraid me with Affinity with *Papists*; yea, in this very Chapter upon less Ground. Pag. 130. he goes about to prove his Matter from several Scriptures; but how shallowly the Reader may easily observe. (I.) He citeth

1679.



Infants are Saved by Christ, who Died for them.

Sodom's Children, &c. not guilty of their Fathers Transgressions nor of Adam's.

1679. *Gen. 6. 5. Man's Thoughts are evil continually:* What then? Are Infants therefore Guilty of *Adam's Sin*? That's the Thing in Question? But the *Hebrew* signifies a *puritiis*, from their *Infancy*: What then? How proves that the Case? I do not deny, but *Children* may become guilty of Sin very early; but the Question is, *Whether they be guilty of Adam's Sin even in their Mother's Womb?* And hereby we may see, he thinks not their Verfi- on so exact, but *J. B.* must take upon him to correct it, to help himself at a *dead List*, as they say. The same way is Answered the other Scriptures, that follow, *Ezek. 16. 4. Matth. 15. 19. Eph. 2. 3.* which are yet more impertinent; as the Reader by looking to them may see, and I might easily by examining them particularly shew; if it were not, that I study Brevity, and delight not to glory over the Man's Impertinency. And though Infants Perished in the Flood, and that was brought upon the Men and Women that Sinned, for their Iniquities; yet it will not follow thence, that Infants are Guilty of Sins, until he better prove, that Natural Death is *always*, and *to all*, the *Wages of Sin*: Albeit I confess with the Apostle, *Eternal Death* is. And indeed, if these Infants were punished at all, it must have been for the Sins of their Immediate Parents; which he will not affirm, since the Flood is not said to have come for *Adam's Sin*, but for their own; So this Instance clearly overturns his Assertion. I leave to the Reader's Judgment the Scriptures not mentioned at length, but set down by him, in this to judge, whether they prove the thing in Debate, to wit, That *Infants are guilty of Adam's Sin?* The Citations out of *Augustin* and *Origin* brought by him in the next Page 131. the Reader may also judge of, (in case they be truly cited, which I cannot Examin at present) whether they have

Infants Per-  
ishing in the  
Flood, proves  
not them  
Guilty.

Weight enough to overturn, what has been here proved from Scripture. The Words of *Eliphaz* (*Job* 15. 14.) speak of a Man, not of a Child; and therefore not to the Purpose: Neither do I believe, though the Spirit of God gave a Relation, of what *Eliphaz* said, that we ought to build our Faith upon his Affirmations. Next he urges *Gen. C. 5. V. 3.* And Adam—begat a Son in his own Likeness, after his Image; but this would prove Adam's Sons as Guilty of all Sins, as that first, which he denied; or let him shew a Ground for such a Distinction. And thus is further answered, what he saith next Page. *Gen. 17. 14.* where it is said, *The Man-child that is Uncircumcised, shall be cut-off*; which he thinks so strong, that in a Vapour he desires me to Chew my Cud upon it: For if this Cutting-off was a Punishment of these Children for Sin, it must be for that of their immediate Parents, who neglected to Circumcise them; which Adam could not do, and therefore could not Sin in omitting it: And since he will not say this, he can Urge nothing from that Place. He saith, *The Fathers used to make use of the Words of Christ, Joh. 3. 5. Except a Man be born of Water, &c.* But their using it was upon their Mistake, that *Baptism* took away Original Sin; and that therefore Infants Unbaptized could not be Saved. That *Regeneration is needful to Infants*, I deny not; and whereas he asks, *How they are Regenerate?* I answered that before, asking him, *How those he accounts Elect Infants, whom he confesses to be guilty of Adam's Sin, are Regenerate?* He confesses, *The Fathers Argument, taken from sprinkling Infants with Water, (which they and he fallely call Baptism,) will conclude nothing against me.* But since he names here *Initial Sacraments* in the Plural Number, which the *Fathers* made use of; it seems, they had some more, than *Baptism*: And since he and his Brethren

1679.

Circumcision argues not Infants Guilty.

Regeneration of Infants.

1679. *th*ren make use of no more as *Initial*, but *Baptism*, it seems he differs from them, in what they judg-  
 ed Needful here, as well as the *Quakers*. I have  
 shewn above, how I Evite both Contradicting my  
 self, as to Universal Redemption, and Excluding  
 Infants from the *Benefit of Christ's Death*. And  
 as for his last Question, *Wherein did Christ Excel  
 other Infants, if they be born without Sin?* (he  
 should have said, *not guilty of Sin*;) I Answer:  
 In that he had no *Seed of Sin* in him, as other In-  
 fants have; and that not only, but he had no-  
 thing of that *Weakness and Propensity* to yield to the  
*Evil Influence* thereof, as other Infants: But was  
 in greater *Strength, Glory and Dominion* over It,  
 than *Adam*, even before he Fell. This shews  
 his *Priviledge* above *others*, and in nothing Con-  
 tradicteth, what I have said before.

Christ's  
 Birth with-  
 out Sin, and  
 the Birth of  
 other In-  
 fants differ.

---

## S E C T. VI.

*Wherein his Seventh and Eighth Chapters of  
 Reprobation and Universal Redemption  
 are Considered.*

¶ I. **I**N his *Seventh Chapter* of *Reprobation* he  
 Exspatiateth himself at great length in  
 large and tedious Homilies, which will make  
 my Reply the shorter, who look not upon it as  
 my Concern to answer them; because these Con-  
 troversies are largely handled by others, and what  
 is said by him, is abundantly Answered: Yet if he  
 will affirm, he has said something that is new upon  
 this Theam, and point to it, it is like, it may  
 not want an Answer. And indeed, the *Reader*  
 may observe him much pained and strained to  
 put a fair Face upon these foul Doctrines; and  
 though what he saith here, may be, and (it is  
 most


most probable) is to be understood of the Reason 1679.  
 he gives in his Epistle, in being so large, because of the Opposition of others besides *Quakers* (and also, because I touched these Things but passingly, as being a *Theam* much Debated, and Common to us with others) I might pass it by, with a Reference to those Authors, who largely Treat of them; yet I will take notice, of what he saith in direct Answer, to what by me is Affirmed. And *first*, as for his Accusation of me, *as not being positive and punctual enough, in setting down my Judgment of the Decrees of Election and Reprobation*, It is of no Weight: All do at times confess, *That it is not safe nor proper, too curiously to Inquire into the Decrees of God*; though this Man dive into them, and be as positive in telling the several Causes of them, as if he were upon the Secret Council of the *Almighty!* I judge, I have said that which is needful and sufficient, to wit, *That God calleth Every Man Every where to Repent and be Saved through Faith in Jesus Christ, who tasted Death for Every Man, and is given for a Light to enlighten the Gentiles, and to be God's Salvation to the Ends of the Earth*: And therefore that Every Man ought to apply himself to Repent and Believe, and Obey, without believing that God has *fore-ordained* him to be *Damned*; and therefore has with-held from him Grace and Power to do, what he finds himself Comanded and *Obliged to do*: Which if it were true, as he supposeth it to be of *most Men*, there can be no Reason, *Why they ought not to believe the Truth*. If he say, they either *ought or need not*, because they *know it not*; Let him remember, what Pains he has been at in the former Chapter to prove, *That Ignorance of a Truth doth not take away the Obligation of believing it*: So he must either overturn all, or be Content, this Absurdity stick to his Doctrine. As for his saying, *That*  
*the*

God calleth every Man to Repentance and Salvation, who has not fore-ordained any to be Damned.

1679. *the Opposers of it do arraign God, and give a Sign of their Pride and Arrogancy, because they cannot comprehend it with their corrupt and Blind Understandings; it is but a silly begging of the Question: And supposing it to be true, thus every Impostor might Intrude upon Sober Christians; Wild, Absurd and Non-sensical Notions, Contrary to God's Justice and Mercy; and because they would not accept of them, tell them, They arraign God, are proud and arrogant, and not receiving the Truth, because not Comprehended by their corrupt Understandings: Would not this, thinks he, be wisely Reasoned? But pag. 135. n. 3. he thinks, I run so furiously against this Doctrine, that I run my self Blind: And why so? because I say, They affirm, That God did predestinate to everlasting Damnation the most Part of Men, without any Respect had to their Sin, only to demonstrate the Glory of his Justice: And upon this he Rants, as a ridiculous and false Representation of their Meaning: But this Storm is quickly blown away, for all his great Noise. For their Westminster Confession of Faith saith Chap. 3. expressly; 'That G O D ordained such, as are not Elected, for Dishonour and Wrath, to the Praise of his glorious Justice: And the same Confession saith in the same Chapter; 'That nothing future, or what was to come, even as fore-seen by God, was the Cause of God's Decree: and this himself also affirms p. 137, 138, 139. What then is become of all his Boast? But if he place it here, and say; Sin became the Cause, so soon as, To demonstrate the Glory of his Justice, became the End; and therefore (they say) It was for their Sin he so decreed: This may serve for a Rattle to please Fools and Children; but not such as are spiritually Wise, and look more narrowly unto things: since they so manifestly contradict themselves, telling; Sin, nor any future thing is not the Cause of*

*Westminster  
Confession  
falsely says,  
That some  
are Ordain-  
ed by God  
for Wrath.*

*God's*

God's Decree; and yet in a few Lines, *That God 1679.*  
*Ordained or Decreed Men to Wrath for their Sin,*   
*to manifest the Glory of his Justice:* Which is  
 as much as to say, *God decreed Men to be damned*  
 without respect to *Sin*; and yet he decreed them  
 to be Damned for their *Sin*: How makes he this  
 hang together by Scripture-Proofs? Besides all  
 will confess, that the Cause of all God's Decrees  
 is his own Glory, which is exerted in his Divine  
 Attributes, whereof *Justice* is one, so that this  
 must be a Cause, before *Sin* can have any Place to  
 be a Cause; since they deny, it has any. He  
 tells me, *p. 136. n. 5.* That *the Orthodox have writ-*  
*ten copiously on this Subject, and very far above my*  
*Reach*; There was the less need then for him to  
 write so many Pages upon it: which must be lit-  
 tle, but a Transcribing out of their Writings;  
 unless he think, he has written more accurately  
 and copiously than any of them (which I judge  
 he will hardly affirm.) I might easily, if I  
 would, trouble the *Reader* with a tedious Dis-  
 course, also transcribe an Answer out of those,  
 who write Copiously against these his supposed  
*Orthodox* (but truly *Heterodox*) Men; but I rather  
 chuse to pass it by, (not affecting to be Admired  
 for the Bulk of my Writings) but to come to what  
 he saith directly in Answer to me, which is the  
 Business properly in Hand.

¶ 2. After he has premised, what he thinks  
 meet, he comes *p. 143. n. 12.* to take notice of  
 what I say; and *first*, wherein I *misrepresent them*,  
*in which*, he saith, *he has found no less than twelve*  
*Untruths*: But how untrue this Assertion is, shall  
 shortly appear. The *first* is, that I say, *God*  
*for perfecting of this* (that is, for bringing this  
 Decree to pass) *did appoint, that these miserable*  
*Souls should necessarily sin*; this he saith is a *Mis-*  
*take*: But if the Testimony of *Calvin, Zanchi-*  
*us, Piscator* and others cited by me (whose Testi-

1679. monies must have more Weight than His, to prove the *Calvinists Principles* in this) do not prove this to be a Mistake, then I may Conclude, that 2 and 3 makes not 5. *Calvin* saith, That God *not only predestinated Men to Sin, but to the Causes of it, which is Sin*: The Reader may look the other Passage of it in my *Apology*. Several of his other *Untruths* (p. 144.) he builds upon supposing, that I insinuate, That they believe, the Gospel is once *preached to every Person*; That *every Reprobate had the Knowledge of Christ*, and that *God had given to every one, that heareth the Gospel, sufficient Grace to embrace it*: But truly, I was never so Mad, as to Insinuate, *they believe these things*; for *not believing* of which I Condemn them. Neither will his *Pedantism* upon the Word *Subtrahendo* make it out; since to *Withdraw* or *Withhold* may be said of things that Man *never had*, without any great Impropriety: And yet, according to him, all Men had a Will and Power to obey God's Law in *Adam*; so his Ordaining, *Adam should Fall*, was even in that Sense a *Withdrawing* of what they *once had* in their *Federal Head*, according to his Phrase and Notion. Another of his alledged Mistakes is, that I say, *They affirm, God did decree, Men should not obey*; but whether these Passages I cited out of their Authors, do not make out this, the Reader may judge; yea, his *Confession* doth ascribe the *Withholding of Mercy, which is the Means, to Agree to the Decree of Reprobation*; so that all the *Fig-leaf-Coverings*, whereby this Man would fain shelter this Opinion contrary to their *Publick Confessions of Faith*, and positive Sentences of their Chief Doctors, are too short and narrow to hide the Ugliness of it. He Confesseth, the *Antients* say little of this, before *Augustin*: I never so used their Testimony, as to build my *Faith* upon it, or to reject their Doctrine meerly  
for

Calvinists  
Principle,  
That God  
Predesti-  
nates Men  
to Sin, and  
to the Cau-  
ses of it.



for it's Dissent from them, which he Insinuates; and yet to his own Self-Contradiction confesseth I say, *I would not much regard all that, if it had any Ground in Scripture.* And he denies not his Union with the *Dominicians*: And that he may shew, how little he cares for good Company, he willingly Rejecteth the Chief and First Reformers, to wit, the *Lutherans*; whom (according to his Charity) he denieth so much as the Name of *Reformed Protestants*.

1679.  
J. B. Rejecting the Chief and First Reformers.

¶ 3. Page 146. n. 16. He cometh to prove, *That this Doctrine maketh not God the Author of Sin*; but he laboureth here like a Man in a Sweat, and giveth so little of a direct Answer, as scarce deserves a Reply: Such as amounts to this, being by way of Retortion, *That if I acknowledge, God fore-saw Sin, permitted it, and might have hindred it; I will make God the Author of Sin 100: But I deny the Parity*; and he has forgotten to prove it. His other Answer is from the Authority of *Cicero* and *Plautus*, who oppose *Author to Dissuasor*; and then he asketh, *Whether they say, God perswadeth any Manto Sin?* But *Zanchius*, one of their Doctors, saith, *He moves the Thief to kill; and that he sinneth, God putting, yea, forcing him to it*: And sure, that's more than *perswading*. But the Poor Man must be at a low Ebb, when he is forced to go to the *Heathens* (of whom he has expressed, he has so mean Thoughts) for a Shelter to his Doctrine! At last, to come off with some seeming Credit, he desires me to Confute the Apostle, *Rom. 9. 11, 12, 13.* because that he thinks, from *that*, as much as from their Doctrine this Charge may be Inferred; but here he doth only beg the Question. He and I do both Agree, *That the Apostle makes not God the Author of Sin*; but it doth not thence follow, *That their Doctrine doth not Infer it*; since from the positive Saying of their Doctors and the Doctrine it self

Zanchy's erroneous Doctrine, *That God moves the Thief to Killing.*

1679. it is manifest: as is more largely shewn in my *Apology*; and this remains yet by him to be Removed. For his desiring me to Refute the Apostle, is no more Answer, than if to all his Arguments in his Book I should only say, *Confute the Scripture, which Contains our Doctrine; and therefore dispute no more against us, until thou first do that*: Would he reckon this sufficient? As for their Misapprehensions of *Rom. 9.* he may find them Refuted in many Authors, that have written upon that Subject; particularly in the *Examination of West. Confest. of Faith*, Chap. 3. to which I refer him. To the Citations I give him of their Authors, *making God the Author of Sin*, he saith; *If they give more Ground, than the very Expressions of Scripture, he will not own them*: And what then? The Consequence is but very small; whether *he will* or not. It is enough for me, that I have shewn the *Absurdity* of their Doctrine, which even by the Testimony of their Chief Doctors makes *God the Author of Sin*; unless he will reply, *All this is nothing, because I, J. B. will not own them*: And if to say, *He that forceth another to do a thing, is the Cause and Author of it*; Who, without Contradicting their own Reason, can deny, they make God the Author of Sin? As for the many Testimonies of Scripture brought by him, I own them; and both *Agree*, they make not God the Author of Sin: But that the Saying of their Divines doth it, what is above said doth Evince. Page 149. He cometh (but as may be observed, Unwillingly) to Vindicate the *Twofold Will* they ascribe to God, the one Revealed, by which he commands Men to *Repent*; and the other *Secret*, and quite *Contrary*: How is he pained here, the Reader may observe by his *Is*s and *And*s, thinking to turn it by without any direct Answer. The Sum of what

Calvinist's  
Distinction  
between the  
Revealed  
and Secret  
Will of God.

what he saith, resolves in this, *That the Purpose of God is not of the same Nature with his Command: But what, if that should be granted? The Question is, Whether they be quite Contrary, and that in respect to one and the same Subject? So that, when a Man is Commanded by God to do a thing, by his secret Purpose he is forced to do the quite contrary? P. 150. n. 19.* He comes to answer my saying, That their Affirming, *Man sinneth willingly,* will not avail; because, according to them, *his Propensity of Inclination to Sin is necessarily Imposed upon him by God: To this instead of Answer he refers me to Rom. 9. of which before; and for want of Reason he falls a Railing, calls me a proud Quaker, saying, I Agent the Devil's Cause: But whether that be to Remove my Objection, or Vindicate their Doctrine, the Reader may judge. Page 151. n. 20.* In Answer to my shewing, their Doctrine is *Injurious to God,* because it maketh him *delight in the Death of a Sinner* (Contrary to *Ezek. 33. 11. 1 Tim. 2. 3. 2 Pet. 3. 9.*) he saith nothing directly; but would be Retorting, *That if I prove any thing from this, then I must say, That God did absolutely decree, that all Men should be Saved; but I deny this Consequence.* Albeit it is Injurious to God, to say, *He decreeth that, which he declareth to take no Delight in;* it will not follow, that it is Injurious to him, to say, *He permitteth, what he delighteth not in.* For on all Hands it is confessed, he *permitteth Sin;* and yet on no hand, that he *delighteth in Sin:* So that this Injuriousness of their Doctrine to God is no ways removed by him; albeit he would fain be mincing and covering it, saying, *They do not say, That God purposes to punish any not for their Sins, but meerly to satisfy his own Pleasure: But such silly Shifts must only satisfy blind Men. Do not they say, God purposed to damn many to Eternal Torment, and that Sin is no ways the Cause of this.*

J. B's silly  
Shifts and E-  
vasion over-  
turned.

1679. *Purpose?* And will he say, to be Eternally Tormented is no Punishment? And was not this a Purpose to punish Men, and not for their Sin? His alledging in this Page, that this is not Injurious to Christ's *Mediation*, is upon the Supposition, that *Christ died not for All*; which comes after to be Examined.

¶ 4. Pag. 152. n. 22. He comes to prove, *Their Doctrine makes not the Gospel a meer Mock*; as I shew it did, by *proposing the Offer of Salvation to many*, who yet by an Irrevocable Decree are Excluded from receiving any Benefit by It: And to this he gives the Instance of *Moses* being sent to *Pharaoh*, whose Heart was Hardned; and *Isaiab* to the People of *Israel*, to make their *Ears heavy*, and *shut their Eyes*, with others of like Import. But this is easily Answered, considering I grant, many Men Out-live the Day of God's Visitation to their Soul, and are justly Hardned; and yet the Offers of Mercy and Peace is no Illusion, because they were once in a Capacity to have by it Received it. But he thinks here, he has gotten me in a Contradiction; because he supposeth, that I willingly grant, That *the Light within may continue to Exhort such to Repent and Turn, whose Day of Visitation is expired*: But it is no Wonder, the Man's Arguments are weak, that are built upon so groundless Suppositions. For I will never grant, that the Operations of the Light are every way the same in Man *after*, as they were *before* his Days of Visitation were Expired: For albeit *before* they judge, reprove and Condemn for Sin, yet this is accompanied with a gentle Drawing and Invitation to Life; but that he has this *afterwards*, I utterly deny: as is clear by Christ's Weeping over *Jerusalem*. To prove P. 153. that this their Doctrine is not Injurious to Christ's *Propitiatory Sacrifice*, by making it a great Judgment and Plague to many, he asks;

7. B's Instance of Pharaoh's Heart hardned, and Eyes shut, &c.

Must

Must not Christ be for the Fall of many in Israel, 1679. Luk. 2. 34. citing other Scriptures of the like Import: *Ans.* All this urgeth nothing, but upon Supposition, that all these never had a Day of Visitation: So that he doth but beg the Question. His supposed *Contradiction*, which he repeats again here, is before removed. P. 154. n. 25. To prove, *their Doctrine* putteth not Men in a worse Condition than Devils, he saith; Devils are under no Offer of Mercy now, and bear not the Gospel: But is not this a pretty Solution? Whereas he confesseth, this Offer of Mercy and Hearing is no Advantage, nor was ever intended to Advantage those who are Damned; and therefore fore-seeing the Weakness of this, he brings in my Words, where the Pinch of the Matter lies, to wit, Devils had once a Possibility of standing, but so not Men, according to their Doctrine: To this he has no Answer; but That all Mankind once stood in Adam. But did not God decree, that Adam should fall? Let him answer me this directly: Where then was their Capacity of standing, or his either? If he say, *not*; let him take home his own Reasonings, that something came to pass, which God decreed not, and consequently, according to him, fore-saw not. But suppose, this Difficulty were solved; let Men of Sense and Reason judge, Whether Men be not put by their Doctrine into a worse Condition, than Devils, while they affirm, That Devils had once a Standing, and fell by their own, personal Disobedience and Presumption; but Men had only a Standing in Adam, fell by his Act, and not by any of their own, all of them, before they had a Being, and many several Thousand Years before. But to befool his Reader he saith in the End of this Paragraph, Their Doctrine is consonant to that Rev. 22. 17.—and whosoever will, let him take of the Waters of Life freely: and this he repeats in the End of the next Paragraph. But how deceitful he is in this, cannot be hid from the under-

Men put in a worse Condition than Devils by J. B's &c. Doctrine.

1679. standing Reader; since that Invitation signifies nothing to those, that are by an Absolute Decree Excluded from the Benefit of it; and is but to deal with such invited Ones, as the *Poet* feigned of *Tantalus*, who was up to the Chin in Water, but restrained from Drinking: which he takes notice of, as objected by me, p. 155. and labours to remove it, but in vain. What he saith to that End, Resolves in this Question; *Have Heathens or Reprobates as great a Desire to Salvation, as Tantalus had of Drinking?* And what, if they had not? The Comparison is not impertinent: for he, that hath resolved to starve a Man, whether he do it by hindring him to Eat, or by destroying his Stomach, that he has no Appetite, and therefore doth Perish, doth equally contribute to his Death. And the like doth their false Doctrine most Injuriously ascribe to God. As for the Scriptures here brought by him, such as; *All Men have not Faith*, 2 Thess. 3. 2. and others of the like Import, they are not to his Purpose; for the Question is not, Whether All Men have the Exercise of those Gifts, that lead to Salvation? but Whether the *Most of Men* be by an Irrevocable Decree, before they had a Being, yea, from all Eternity Secluded from all Means of obtaining these Gifts, that they may be *Saved*; and that because Ordained to be Damned; albeit by the *G O S P E L* as the *Revealed Will and Command of G O D*, Invited to *Repent* and be *S A V E D*.

¶ 5. Now I come to his 8th Chapter of *Universal Redemption*; where I shall not have much ado for many Pages. For after, according to his Custom, he has Introduc'd himself with *Railing and Reproaches*, and that in the first 4 Pages he has told the Various Opinions of those, that held *Universal Redemption*, and at last his *own*, as conceived in the *Westminster-Confession of Faith*; he goeth about to prove, That there is No *Universal*

The Example of the *Poet's Tantalus* further urged.

The Question Stated.

Redemption, and that upon this *Medium*: That 1679.  
*there was a Covenant betwixt God and the Media-*  
*tor, which would be destroyed by such, as assert*  
*this Universal Redemption; because, according*  
*to them, it might have fallen out notwithstanding*  
*that Eternal Transaction, that not one Person should*  
*be saved.* Upon this he enlarges, endeavouring  
 to shew the Absurdity of it both from Reason  
 and Scripture, unto Page 194. All which touch-  
 eth me not at all, who do not say, That Christ  
 by his Death purchased a *Meer Possibility* (against  
 which he battereth through all these Pages) since  
 I have expressly affirmed, and he himself observes  
 it, that *Christ's Death* purchased not only a Suf-  
 ficiency of Grace for All; but also such a Preva-  
 lency for some, by which they were *necessarily*  
*brought to Salvation*: and yet is so Unjust as to af-  
 firm, That I am for this *Meer Possibility*, say-  
 ing, p. 178. n. 28. *I embrace this Opinion with the*  
*Armenians, and p. 179. n. 20. he saith—Or as*  
*this Quaker saith, who in Effect saith, that it may*  
*so fall out, that there shall be no Application*: Whe-  
 ther this be Malice, or Forgetfulness, himself best  
 knows. But this is sad, he seldom forgets to be  
 malicious; but often to be just: Yet as to the Bulk  
 of his Reasonings of that Matter, perhaps he  
 bestows them for the Confutation of those others  
 he speaks of, besides the *Quakers*, against whom  
 he saith he writes; who, if they judge it their  
 Concern, may Answer it. Yet in this prolix  
 Disputation he has cast in some Arguments,  
 which seem not only to urge against this *Meer*  
*Possibility*, as he terms it; but also against  
*Christ's dying for All* in any Respect (such as from  
 Page 169. N. 19. to Page 175.) But these are such,  
 as His usually are, which only proceed upon the  
 Question's being begged. For whereas he saith;  
*That those, for whom Christ died, he died to take a-*  
*way their Sins*; It is not denied: provided, they re-  
 sist

J. B's  
 Proof against  
 Universal  
 Redemption.

J. B's false  
 Doctrine,  
 That Christ  
 died to take  
 away Peo-  
 ples Sins  
 without Re-  
 pentance.

1679. *sist* not the Grace purchased thereby, so that Faith and Repentance be wrought in them. But he urges this in the following Page (170.) *That since this Non-performance of the Condition is a Sin, if he died for all Sins, he must have died for this also; and if there be another Condition imagined, for that too: and so in Infinitum.* I Answer; This Reasoning would infer those to be Saved by the Death of Christ, who never Repent; especially with those who judge, *Men may sin, yea, must sin all their Life-time, and yet be saved:* Neither doth the Absurdity reach those, who affirm *Christ to have died for all*, as to obtain *Remission* of Sins that are past, and *Grace* sufficient to work Faith and Repentance; yea, and *Restore* those that may Fall into Sin after their Conversion, if not Resisted: And this is sufficient to infer, that *Christ died for all:* Neither can that Absurdity more reach them, than the Apostle, who speaks of such, as *Denied the Lord that bought them.* And since the Evangelist placeth the Benefit upon the Reception, saying, *But unto as many as received him, he gave Power to become the Sons of God;* all these Scriptures afterwards cited by him, signifying the Efficacy of Christ's Blood, is not denied; they themselves Confess, it was Sufficient, and of Value enough to have *Redeemed every Man:* but that doth not hinder it from proving Ineffectual to such, as will not Receive it; as is above shewn. And therefore his Question (p. 172.) *If Christ died for the Sins of all Persons, how cometh it, that they are not all actually pardoned?* is easily answered; Because of their *Non-reception* of the Grace, by which his Death should be made Effectual to them: And albeit this maketh *Free-will* Author of Condemnation, as himself will acknowledge; yet not of Salvation: as shall after appear. His next Argument (p. 174.) is, *That if Christ had died*

Why all are not benefited by Christ's Death.

Christ died for all, yet all are not saved; and why?



died for all Men, all Men should be saved, because 1679.  
 he hath purchased Faith and Salvation for all, for whom he has died; and this he supposeth he has shewn before: But his Confidence in his own Arguments doth not Influence other Men; I am yet to see, where he has proved any such thing. The Scriptures he brings (such as *Rom. 8. 32, 39, &c.*) to prove this, speak of those, who had really received the Grace, and in whom Regeneration was working by it; and do indeed very well prove, that *Christ died for them*; yea, What if I should say, *bath purchased them Grace prevalent to Salvation*? Yet they will not prove, that he has *not died for others* also, also that may miss of *Salvation*. Page 175. N. 25. he saith; *It is considerable, that no where in Scripture we find it expressly affirmed, That Christ died for all Men: Why then is all Trouble made?* But is it not expressly said *Heb. 2. 9.* *That we see Jesus,—That he by the Grace of God should taste Death for every Man?* Let him tell us, what less that Importeth? Yea, if it be not more *emphatick* to say, *Christ tasted Death for every Man*, than to say, *Christ died for all Men*? It is much, the Man would so proclaim his Ignorance!

¶ 6. After more of his tedious and superfluous Reasonings against this *Meer Possibility* (as he calls it) he comes (p. 194. n. 48.) to overturn my Grounds for Universal Redemption; and *first*, in Answer to the *Angels Song* *Luk. 2. 10.* urged by me, wherein they hold forth the Coming of Christ, as *Tidings of great Joy to all People*, *This* (he saith) *is to shew, the Offer was to be made now to all Kindreds, Nations, Tongues and Languages.* And what then? It is not said only so, excluding all Particulars of these, since the Word *ALL*, in the Common Acceptation Comprehends *every Particular*, as well as *all Sorts*; and he should have given some Reason from Scripture, why he restricts it here: But instead of that, he Contradicts

The Angels good Tidings were to all People, as well in general as in particular.

1679 dicth himself in the very following Words, saying; *For he was to Reign over the House of Jacob, Luk. 1. v. 13.* for this, if it urge any thing, it will Exclude his former Concession; if it be not Exclusive, he can prove nothing from it. Neither doth he, more pertinently alledge *Mat. 1. 21.* That *he was to save his People from their Sins*: For that Scripture doth not say, That he purchased not a Capacity for some to be his People, who by their Resisting lost the Benefit offered them: *How often would I have gathered you,—and ye would not?* saith Christ, *Mat. 23. 37. Luke 13. 34.* He saith further, *This would not have been glad Tidings, if it had been a meer Possibility*: But I affirm no such thing. To my urging Christ's Commission, *Mark 16. 15. To preach the Gospel to every Creature*; and that of *Paul, Col. 1. 28.* he saith: *It will no more prove, That Christ died for all Men, than for Devils and Beasts; for they are Creatures*: But how silly and perverse this Answer is, is easily apparent. For is it Lawful to Preach the Gospel to Beasts and Devils? Or is it as unlawful to preach the Gospel to any Men, as it is to do it to Beasts and Devils? But on the Contrary: since he will not deny, but it is a Duty to preach the Gospel to *all Men Indefinitely*, yea, in this Place he acknowledges it, they being the proper Subjects of it; so that of them must be understood [*every Creature*] here mentioned. Page 196. N. 50. To my arguing, *The Gospel inviteth all*; and that it would be a mocking of Men, if *Christ died not for all*, to command them all to *believe*, that *Christ died for them*: He saith; *This is built upon an Untruth, that the Gospel doth not Command all, to whom it is preached, to believe, that Christ died for them*; but only *to flee to an All-sufficient Saviour*. But what's the Preaching of the Gospel (especially in his Sense, even as a little before acknowledged by him) but a Declaring and Offering of *Salvation to all,*

7. 52's Per-  
version of  
Christ's  
Commission  
to preach  
the Gospel  
to every  
Creature for  
salvation.

all, to whom it is Preached, Mercy and Good-will through the Merits of Christ, who died for them? Next, the Argument still holdeth good; If the *Gospel commands* (as he saith) *to flee unto an All-sufficient Saviour*: For unless it be possible for such, who are so Commanded, to do it, the preaching of it to them is a mocking of them, and that to purpose; if this Impossibility be Imposed upon them by him, by whose Command the Gospel is thus preached. The Example of *Moses to Pharaoh*, and *Esaias to the Jews* has been before answered. He ends this Paragraph begging the Question; As if *the Gospel could be said no where to be, but where there is an outward Dispensation of it by the Ministry of Men.*

¶ 7. Pag. 197. n. 51. He confesseth, *There is no Scripture, that saith, Christ has not died for all Men; and there is, that saith, He has tasted Death for every Man*: Which is rather more, and not a Probation by Consequence only; as I have already shewn. Then he cometh to consider my Argument from *1 Tim. 2. 1, 3, 4-6.* shewing, 'That *Salvation cannot be Impossible for all, since we are commanded to pray for all; and that since Christ gave himself a Price of Redemption for all, it cannot be Impossible, that all should be saved*: As is more largely Illustrated in my *Apology*. Now how he is pained in Answer to this, and in his Nibblings about the Particle [*all*] even unto Page 204. the Reader may easily observe. First he distinguisheth upon the Word *Possible*: *It is meant* (saith he) *here of such a thing, as may be, abstracting from the Decree, yea, in respect of the Decree, the Contrary whereof is not decreed by God; but not a thing simply so.* The Man it's like thinks, he has found-out a very subtil Distinction; but it serves for little, save to shew his own Confusion. For *to be possible, abstracting from the Decree, and with a respect to the Decree, is for*

Salvation possible for all, because Commanded to pray for All.

a thing

1679. a thing to be *Impossible*, if God had not decreed the Contrary; and yet to be possible, because God has not decreed the Contrary. But to leave this Piece of confused Pedantry; he denies, That *we may pray for every one*, because *John* saith,—*There is a Sin unto Death, I do not say, ye should pray for it*. But this is in plain Words to say, *The Apostle Paul was deceived; and therefore his Brother John reprov'd him*: For the Man labours more in this to make these Two Apostles Contradict one another, than to Refute me. But for all this we see, they are no ways at Variance: *We may pray for all, because all may in a day be saved*; though when some have out-lived that Day, it may not be fit to pray for them: But if Salvation were by an absolute Decree made Impossible for most of Men, it were Madness to pray for them. He thinks, it may as well be inferred, *That we should give Thanks for all Men*: This I suppose he reckons Absurd; But why so? May not Men give Thanks to God for and in the Behalf of all Men, for his *Grace* that he has given to all Men, and also for his daily Care and good Providence over all Men? That which he saith afterwards in many Words, amounts to this: *That Men have pray'd allowably for that, which by reason of God's Decree was Impossible; and therefore may pray in Faith for that, which is Impossible*. Of this he gives one great Instance from Christ's praying; *Save me from this Hour*: Which is always with a Submission to God's Will. But this may divers Ways be answered: for he has not proved, That *Christ's praying to save him from this Hour*, was in him a *real Desiring*, however *submissively*, that he might not undergo that, which he knew he came into the World to do. Neither can this be Affirmed without importing, *That Christ was unwilling to do his Father's Will, and desirous to shun it*; which to Affirm were *Blasphemy*; to Accuse him

J. B. denies praying for all Men.

and to give Thanks for all Men.

Christ's praying, Father save me from this Hour, &c.

him

him, who in all things was found Willing and Obedient. So that his Prayer was not a Desiring, the thing might not be; but that he might be saved and preserved from being overwhelmed with the Difficulties and Distresses, that in *that Hour* did and might Attend Him: And in This his Prayer was answered; for albeit these Difficulties were not Removed, yet he Triumphed over them. That a Man pray for the Life of his Father or Friend, who notwithstanding dieth at that Time, is not denied; but it will not thence follow, that it was Impossible, that those Prayers could have been Answered. For to conclude from the Events, that *things could not have been other ways*, were to conclude, *all things* came to pass by a *Stoical Fate*: So that God himself were *Agens necessarium*; and to favour of *Spinosa*: Then it had been Impossible for *J. B.* to have omitted (though at the earnest Desire of his Friends) *one Word* of what he has written, or to have added one Word more; and yet he saith in some Places, *He might have said more*. But the Apostle's desiring to pray here, is founded upon the positive Mind of God, *who willetb all Men to be saved*: *This* (he saith) *is most false in the Sense asserted by me; else all Men should be saved*; But I never took it in that Sense. The Question is; Whether in any true Sense it could be said, that he will *all Men to be saved*? and that given as a *Reason*, why we should *pray for all*, if God had made it always *simply Impossible for many to be saved*? To shew, that God's *Will of Precept* (as his Phrase is) may be *impossible* in respect of his Decree, he saith; *God commanded all, perhaps Devils and Damned, to love him perfectly, and yet this is not now Possible*. But this [*perhaps*] spoils all this Inference: For until he be Certain of it, he can conclude nothing from it. He bestows divers Pages upon the Universal Particle *A L L*, to shew, how it is diversly taken; and by an Instance

1679.

The Stoical Fate believes God an Agens necessarium, and all things to come to pass necessarily, after an inevitable and Unchangeable Manner.

1679. stance of several Scriptures to prove, it sometimes is not taken for *All* and *every One*: But in this (had he not loved to be longsom and tedious) he might have spared his Pains; since that was never denied by me. But the Question is, *That since the proper, common and most universal Signification of [all] is to signify every one, Whether in the Places brought by me, the most common Signification should not be made Use of, according to the general Rule of all Interpreters? And therefore if he had said any thing to the Purpose, he should have proved, that in these Places there must be a Restriction, and not have bestowed many Words to prove [all] sometimes to be Restricted; which I never denied: And the Pinch lieth here, wherein I desire to be satisfied; but find not as yet, he has given any Answer. Where*

*J. B. &c.*  
make the Word *All* express of two Numbers the Least, to be Elested.

is *[all]* made use of in Scripture, to express of two Numbers the *least*? Which yet, according to their Principle, they make it to do; since they usually affirm, that the Number of the *Elect* is much *less*, than that of the *Reprobates*. After the like manner, e're he make an end of this, he would turn by the Word *[World]* as being understood of a Part, and not All; but he is mightily pinched upon this Occasion, where he comes *p. 208. n. 64.* to answer, what I Urge from *1 John 2. 1, 2.* where Christ is said to be a *Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World*; and that he may do it the more easily, he omits a long time the Word *[whole]* to shew, that the Word *World* is sometimes taken with a Restriction. And at last he tells us fairly, that the Phrase, *the Whole World*, cannot prove any thing; and that *It is but rational to suppose, that the Whole World here denoteth no more, &c.* and for this he referreth to *Rev. 3. 10. and 12. 9. and 13. 3. &c.* But these Scriptures are so far from hurting me, or making against what I say, that they Confirm it: for I argued,

*J. B. by the Whole World understands only the Elect, falsely.*


argued, that *All* and every One was included by the Apostle in these Words, wherein he saith, *Christ was a Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World*, because he mentions the *Saints* before, — *not for ours only, but also for the Sins of the whole World*; and so it must be the Whole World, as Contradistinguished from the Saints. Now these Places of the *Revelations* cited by him, do denote All and Every one, as Contradistinguish'd from the Saints; which himself, I judge, will not deny: For will he say, That *the Hour of Tentation* (Rev. 3. 10.) came upon Every one, as Contradistinguished from the Saints? And that the *Beast* (12. 9.) did in this Sense Deceive the World, that is, All and every one? And that (13. 3.) *All the World* wondred after him? The other Places marked by him, have no Relation to the *whole World*, in the Sense I here urge it; which is, that the Whole World, when used in Contradistinction from the Saints, expresseth *All* and *Every one*: And the thing he should have done, if he would have truly Refuted me (which he has not so much as attempted) was to prove, *That the Elect, or any Part of them, as expressed by the Word [we] or [us] by any of the Pen-men of Scripture, are contradistinguished from the Elect, or any Part of them, under the Term of the [whole World?]* Until he do which, he no ways overturns my Argument; and therefore what he saith besides this, is beside the Purpose.

¶ 6. Page 204. N. 59. In Answer to *Job. 3. 16.* compared with *1 Job. 4. 9. God so loved the World*, &c. and *God sent his only begotten Son into the World*, &c. he tells; [*Whosoever*] albeit Indefinite, is not Universal, unless it be in a necessary Matter; which this is not. But he should have defined, what he means by a Necessary Matter distinctly; and then proved this not to be such:

J. B's friv-  
lous and  
wicked Ex-  
ceptions a-  
gainst God  
so loved the  
World; &c.

1679. till both which be done, that's now omitted by him, his Answer is deficient. His next *Quibble* is; That the [*World*] in these two Places is not the same; the one being understood of the *habitable* World, and the other of the *Inhabitants*. But the last may be understood of the *Inhabitants*, as well as the first: Where is the Absurdity of saying, *God sent his Son into the World*, that is, *unto Men*, or *among Men*? (3.) He supposeth, I will not say: *God sent his Son into the World, that all Inhabitants might live the Life of Faith*; For all Men have not *Faith*, and all Men will not be saved, or God should be disappointed of his Intentions; and therefore he adds, as his Commentary upon *Rev. 2. 3, 4. What if some do not believe? shall their Unbelief make the unchangeable Purposes of God of none Effect?* No. Answ. I perceive, as most of the Man's Reasonings are built upon Suppositions, so most of his Suppositions are false. For God sent his Son into the World, to put all Men into a Capacity to live the Life of Grace; and therefore who do not, the Fault is their own. Nor are God's unchangeable Purposes of none Effect; since God has not unchangeably purposed to Damn any, which he supposeth, *he did*: And upon this meer and unproved Supposition, according to his Method he builds his Matter. He adds: *John 3. 16. is directly against the Meaning of his Adversaries* (I judge, he means all those, who Assert *Universal Redemption*) *who build much upon it; albeit I had not the Wit to improve it*. But it seems had I had a great deal more *Wit*, than I have, he judgeth himself to have *Wit enough to prove it all to no purpose: Why?* because according to the *Greek* it is; *For God so loved the World, —that all believing* (or all *Believers*, or every one that believeth) *in him, might not perish, &c.* And what then? We must prove, *that either all are or shall be Believers*; and then he will easily grant  
without



without Dispute, that Christ died for them all. 1679. 

But the Man has not here well heeded, what he saith: There is no Necessity of proving, *That all are, or shall be Believers*; it is enough to prove, that, *All are put in a Capacity to Believe*, and that *Faith is not made by an Absolute Decree Impossible to most*: This in Part is done already, and more of it will appear hereafter. That Christ by this Place intended to shew, that his *Death* should not be Restricted to the Advantage of the *Jews* only, is not denied. In Answer to *Heb. 2. 9.* *That he Tasted Death for every Man*, he saith; that the *Greek* here, *for every Man*, importeth, *in their room and stead*; shall we think, that Christ died so for every Man, and yet many of these Men died for themselves? But if any Absurdity be inferred here, it will redound upon himself (no less than upon me) who will Confess (as his after-words make manifest) the saying here, *Christ tasted Death for every Man*, Imports his Dying here for the *Elect*; and yet do not many of the *Elect* die for themselves if he mean a *Natural Death*; but if not, I see no Reason of admitting his Figure: nor is there any Strength in it to prove, that it imports his *Dying in their room and stead*, as he would have it. Here again, he saith, *This sheweth, the Benefit of his Death is not restricted to the Jews*; which is granted: But that proveth not that it is not therefore Universal. Next, he taketh notice of the Context, where it is said, *It became him in bringing many Sons unto Glory*, &c. and therefore these are the *All*, for whom he died: but this is strongly to affirm, not to prove. Albeit *Christ brought many Sons unto Glory*, and called such Brethren, it doth not follow, he *Tasted Death only for such*: The Apostle sheweth us first the general Extent of Christ's Death, in saying, *He tasted death for every Man*; and then sheweth us, how it became Effectual to

1679. many : And yet the Man is so confident (albeit he has urged nothing, but only affirmed) that he adds; *If this Context do not sufficiently confute this Conceit, we need regard the Scriptures no more.* But here he has spoken-out the Truth, as it is: For this evidently shews, that for all their Pre-  
 tence to Exalt the Scriptures, yet they regard it no more, than it favours their Opinion. This is the Account, for which they regard the Scrip-  
 tures; if it favour their Opinion, and confute their Adversaries; but if it do not, *They need no more regard it*; else surely he should have said, *If the Scriptures do not confute that, which he esteems an Error, then he will not judge it so any more, but regard the Scriptures more than his own Judgment*: but on the contrary he is resolved, if the Scriptures do not Confute what he thinks a Conceit, *that he need no more regard them.* Like-  
 wise in the rest of this Page he gives himself a notable Stroke: For to my saying, *That their Doctrine would infer, that Christ came to condemn the World, contrary to his own Words, Joh. 3. 17, 12, 47.* he answereth, *That Prejudice has so blinded mine Eyes, that I cannot see the Beam in mine Eye; for in my Opinion, not one Man might have been saved, because Christ only procured a Meer Possibility, and no Certainty for any one Man, &c.* But as I have above observed, I assert, as my Judgment, the express Contrary, *that Christ has so died for some, that they cannot miss of Salvation*; and this himself also noticeth afterwards, p. 276. I would know then, and let all honest Men judge, if there be any Spark of Honesty left in him, whether himself be not the Man, whom Prejudice has blinded. Almost at the same Rate, p. 207. he asketh me, *If my Argument from 2 Pet. 3. 9. The Lord is—long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should Perish, but that all should come unto Repentance,* do hold; *What will*

J. B. &c.  
 Regard the  
 Scriptures  
 no farther  
 than it fa-  
 vours their  
 Opinions and  
 Confutes  
 their Adver-  
 saries.

will I do with those, that out-live the Day of their Visitation? Is the Lord willing to give them Repentance? I answer, No: And yet no overturning of my Argument: For in respect All had a Day of Visitation, wherein they might have Repented, God may be said to be Long-suffering, and not to have been Willing, any should have Perished, &c. But this cannot be said, if none ever had such a Day or Season, as they Affirm. He would Insinuate, as if *This made all to depend upon Free-Will*; but how Frivolous this Calumny is, will after appear. And whereas both in this and the following Page he Rants at an high Rate, as if I did fight against God's Omnipotency, saying: *God will be God, whether I will or not*; and that *Christ must turn Petitioner, and supplicate Lord [Free-Will,]* exclaiming, *O cursed Religion!* The Man doth but shew his Malitiousness and Weakness. For if God's Omnipotency, because he doth whatsoever he Will, be Urged to prove, that Men cannot resist his Will, and that therefore whatsoever Men do, even the wickedest Actions are willed by God; then Violence is offered to the Will of the Creatures, and the Liberty and Contingency of second Causes are necessarily taken away: Which yet is expressly denied by the *Westminster-Confession*, Chap. 3. Nor will all his Distinctions, far less Affirmations solve this, that *Peter* speaketh only of the *Elect*, because he mentioneth them else-where: unless he prove [*All*] here to be Restricted, is but a begging of the Question.

God's Omnipotency willeth not Wicked Actions.

¶ 8. Pag. 210. n. 65. He quarrelleth my bringing some Testimonies of Antiquity, agreeing with what I say; which he terming a *Fouling of Fingers with humane Writings*, saying; *Himself layeth not so much Weight upon the Authority of Men in this Matter*. And yet afterwards he cites some, as making for his Purpose. He may know,

Testimonies of Antiquity slighted by J. B. as not being for his Turn.

1679. know; I as little build upon the Testimony of the Antients, as he can, for the bottoming of *Faith*: And yet to shew their Agreement with us, and against them, is a good Check to their shameless Objection of Novelty; considering, how the same is objected to them as strongly, and with no less Reason by their Mother, the Church of *Rome*, whom, when pinched by us, they begin to Run to for the Ground of their Church, Ministry and Maintenance. That ever I said, The *Quakers* (whom he terms to be of Yesterday) *have only found the Truth*, is false; albeit I say, they have a more Clear and Full Discovery of it: But one would think (notwithstanding his pretending) he lays little Weight upon the Authority of Antiquity in this Matter, that it is not so; else why doth he so often in this Matter Upbraid us with the Heresy of *Pelagius*, as Contradicting the Sense of the Antient Church and their Doctors? Who are those, whose Testimony he calls the Authority of *Men in this Matter*.

---

## S E C T. VII.

*Wherein his IX. Chapter Of Universal Salvation Possible: his X. Of Universal Grace and Light: XI. Of the Necessity of this Light to Salvation, and his XII. Of the Salvation of Heathens, without Hearing the Gospel, are Considered.*

¶ I. **H**E beginneth his 9th Chapter Of *Universal Salvation Possible*, (according to his Custom) with *Railing*, accusing me of Ignorance, Pride and Pedantry; but he thinks it not worth his Pains to spend Words

to discover it: Yet he gives a main Reason for all, *1670.*  
to wit, *I suppose, our Opinions were never known*  
*in the World, before we were raised up to declare*  
*them: Which being a manifest Untruth, and never*  
*said by me, the Reader may thence judge of*  
*the Grounds he has for this his Railing. How-*  
*ever he supposeth, They are but old Errors cloath-*  
*ed with new Notions; and which himself has suffi-*  
*ciently enough Enervated in his former Chapter of Re-*  
*probation and Universal Redemption: Which be-*  
*ing the Basis of them, is by him (if he may be ad-*  
*mitted Judge in his own Cause) already overturn-*  
*ed. And then he thinks, It was Impertinency*  
*to say, That Quakers can by sensible Experience be*  
*Confirmed in their Doctrine; and so brings to an*  
*End his first two Paragraphs. His next Work is*  
to play the Commentator, and to tell his Reader  
my Meaning, which to be sure is to pervert it  
as he doth in this Chapter throughout: Affirm-  
ing, *It to be my Belief, that every Man has Power*  
*and Ability moral to lay hold of Salvation, and that*  
*there is not requisite thereunto any new Grant of*  
*Grace and divine Help to quicken the Man;—he*  
*has a Stock from his Mother's Womb, which is suffi-*  
*cient: This he calls the proper and native Face*  
of my Doctrine; and this he putteth down as  
my Opinion, and chargeth me with it, p. 214.  
And p. 218. he saith it further, *Without any Con-*  
*currence of divine Grace, p. 220. he saith, I con-*  
*clude, Man has Power to believe and obey the Gos-*  
*pel without the Spirit of God; as also the like p.*  
221. twice. And p. 222. he saith, *I conclude,*  
*That the Wicked have Power of themselves, without*  
*the Spirit of Regeneration and Grace, to do what is*  
*commanded in reference to Life Eternal, and fur-*  
*ther p. 223, 224, and 226. he affirmeth the like*  
of me; which is utterly False, and was never  
Belived nor Asserted by me. And it's observea-

J. B's Com-  
ment and  
; false insinua-  
tion put up-  
on our Do-  
ctrine of  
Grace and  
Salvation.

1679. ble, that in all these Places, where he thus Charges me, he doth not so much as once Point to any one Page in my *Apology*; and not only so, but not so much as from the Words or Writings of any other *Quaker*, borrowed from some of his usual Authors, which is his most frequent Refuge: And therefore the *Reader* may judge, what he builds upon his false Supposition, or batters against it, falls to the Ground, without further Refutation. After he has branded this Brat of his own begetting, p. 214. with *Pelagianism*, *Jesuitism*, *Arminianism* and *Socinianism*, thence accusing the Boldness and Confidence of the *Quakers*, and of my self in particular, in terming it a *New Discovery of ours*; he endeth this Page with a Fit of Railing: And beginneth in his next to Wonder, *how the Heathens can be said to have a Day of Visitation, since nothing can be called a Day of Visitation in reference to Salvation, but what is in and through the Preaching of the Gospel.* But this Wonder is built upon his Supposition, that the *Preaching of the Gospel is nowhere, but where there is an outward Administration of it*; wherein his Mistake will come hereafter to be manifested: Into which Mistake he falls in the next Page, and else-where in this Chapter, where I shall pass it over, until I come to speak of it in its proper Place. In this Page 215. he thinketh, that since I Affirm, their *Doctrine makes God unjust, as denying to some the Means of Salvation; that which I affirm, may be likewise so charged, because some may think, God is unjust, in not granting to all an equally long Day of Visitation.* But the Question is not, *what some may think?* but Whether these Thoughts be built upon Justice and Reason? All Men know, it is manifest Injustice to punish a Man, and torment him for Non-performance of that, which He that Commands him to Perform, has by an invincible Necessity barred

The Heathens have a Day of Visitation.

To none God denies the Means of Salvation.

barred and hindred him from doing; and therefore to suppose this of the most-just God, must be a great Error and Abuse: But it is no Injustice to punish a Man for not performing that, which he had received sufficient Power to do; albeit another had received more: To say so, is like the Labourers, whom Christ Reproves in the Parable for murmuring, that those that came in after them, received Equal Wages with them, *Matth.* 20. 12, 13, 14. That the Preaching of the Gospel is not a Mocking of those, whose Day of Visitation is Expired, as it is to the Reprobates among them; I have in the former Section shewn: But he asketh here, *Whether such become obdured before, or after their Day of Visitation be expired?* What if I should say both, though not in the same Manner and Degree? It was before Removeable, but not after; since albeit simply considered the same, and always pardonable, yet with a Respect to certain Persons and their Circumstances, unpardonable, or not pardonable. That *God permitteth Sin to be in the World*, I never denied; nor accused their Divines for so saying: But whereas he saith, *It is a manifest Untruth, that I would make the Reader believe, they say, God doth Impel Men to sin necessarily;* he seeketh to hide their Doctrine, and beguile the simple Reader: Since *P. Martyr* upon *Rom. 1.* saith expressly, *That God forceth the Will of wicked Men unto great Sins:* And *Piscator* saith, *That the Wicked are absolutely decreed necessarily to sin; and therefore to sin, that they may be justly punished:* Now, these being more Eminent Divines among them, than I suppose *J. B.* presumes (for all his Scribbling) he is to be Accounted; The Reader may judge, and by the Passages else-where cited by me, Whether he doth not here most Untruly Charge me with Untruth? That *the Sins charged upon the Gentiles were only such, as were against*

1679.



Obdurate-  
ness or hard-  
ness of  
Heart, when  
begotten?

Calvinists  
blasphemous  
Doctrine of  
God's forc-  
ing and de-  
creeing Men  
to Sin.

the

1679. *the Light of Nature*, he has Affirmed *p. 217.* but not proved: For the great Reason of their Condemnation is, because *What was to be known of God, is manifest in them;* and that this is not only the Light of Nature, will after appear. If, what he urg s from *Rom. 11.* concerning the *Jews*, and the Imprecation those brought upon themselves, who said, *His Blood be upon us, and upon our Children*, hold True, we must suppose, no *Jew* since that saying of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Act. 13. 46.* to have been really Converted: But how came any of them to be Converted before, since that Imprecation was long before *Paul* and *Barnabas* spake these Words of their Turning to the *Gentiles*? And according to this Reasoning, all the Preaching of the Gospel, which the *Jews* have since heard, and do hear, is in Vain. I have sufficiently explained, what I mean by this Day of God's Visitation to Every Man, in the Explication of the 5 and 6 *Theses* in my *Apology*, n. 17. And albeit he think otherwise; as I know I have satisfied many moderate *Readers*, who are not *Quakers*, so I hope to have satisfied all, that are truly Unprejudicate. After he has (*p. 218.*) given large Citations, to shew their Doctrine out of the *Confession of Faith* and *Catechism*, and thereafter made a kind of Preachment thereupon, he comes at last (*p. 221.*) to Examine the Proofs I bring for my Assertion.

The Day of  
God's Visi-  
tation to  
Man, spoken  
of.

¶ 2. And first to my Argument drawn from the Reproofs in Scripture to Men, for Rejecting of God's Visitation and Love, he answers, That *my Proposition is Universal, and these Complaints and Reproofs only particular;* and so can prove nothing. The like he answereth (*p. 224.*) to what I urge from *Esai. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4.* where the *Vineyard* is Expostulated with; as likewise *Mat. 23. 33. Mark 12. 1. Luke 20. 9.* and *p. 225.* to what I urge from *Mat. 23. 37. Luke 13. 34.* and



and 19. 41, 42. where Christ Expostulateth with, and lamenteth over, *Jerusalem*: But for Answer to all this, albeit these Places were granted all of them to be particular; yet so much is gained by them, that *some*, that did Perish, had a Day of Visitation, in which they might have been saved: And thus his Doctrine, *Salvation was never possible to any, but to such as must necessarily be saved*, is overturned; and he should at least have answered them, as to this. Further, all the Scripture-Proofs and Complaints are not particular, but some of them general; and One general one is enough to prove my Assertion: (albeit as to that, I may see what he saith hereafter to answer that, as to the Universality, it is more particularly proved in my *Apology*) such as *Gen. 6. 3.* which is spoken of Men Indefinitely. And whereas he supposeth, *This Striving of God with Men* to be only by his *Word* and *Servants*, meaning the *outward Word*; he doth but beg the Question. Likewise that of *Mic. 6. 8.* *He hath shewn thee, O Man, what is good; And what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love Mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?* Where the Word [*But*] doth shew, this is *all, that is required*; and that no more is Required, than is shewn to Man Indefinitely: Others might be mentioned. And whereas in this and other Places he saith; *My Argument will not prove, that Men have Power to lay hold on Salvation without the Grace and Spirit of God*; It is true: For as I never affirmed any such thing, as is above observed; so I never intend to bring any Argument to prove it. Page 222. n. 14. in Answer to 1 *Pet. 3. 20.* brought be me, he saith; *I fore-saw, it would be answered, that the long-suffering of God there mentioned, was not unto Salvation*: But the Man is unhappy in his Conjectures of other Mens Thoughts.

Some that did Perish, had a Day of Visitation, contrary to F. B's false Position.

1679. Thoughts. It will not follow, *it was not to Salvation*, because the Parties, towards whom it was, remained obstinate, and so perished: And albeit the Apostle *Peter* (2 Pet. 3. 15.) be speaking to his Brethren, *who might have been advanced in Grace*; yet he shews not, how it thence follows, that the Long-suffering there mentioned, is restricted to them only: The Text saith no such thing. And what, though this Epistle of *Peter* was not particularly directed to the *Romans*, to whom *Paul* wrote; yet this being a general Epistle, Included the Church of *Rome* among the Rest: And *others* had need to have seen *Paul's* Epistles to the *Romans*; since (according to him) it was a Part of their Principle, and only Rule of Faith and Manners. But to overturn, what I observed here from *Peter's* taking notice of some Wrestling *Paul's* Writings, he bringeth nothing, but his own Affirmation. His Answer, to what I urge from the Riches and Bounty of God towards Men, spoken of *Rom. 2. 4.* which could not be, if Salvation were Impossible to them; is, *That the [Riches] there mentioned is understood of the good things of this Life*: Contrary to the Express Words of the Text, which shews, That the Nature of that Riches and Long-suffering is, to Lead to Repentance; and *v. 7. Eternal Life* is proposed, as the Reward of such, as by *not despising of those Riches are led to Repentance, and continue in well-doing*. And whereas he adds, *This cannot be done by the meer Strength of Nature without the Grace of God*; I never said so: And therefore like to this Calumny is what he saith *p. 225.* where, that he may take Occasion to Rail and reflect, he would make his Reader believe, that I argue, *That because Men can do evil, they have therefore a Power to do Good*; then pleases himself to add: *These are Quaker-like Inferences, that want all Solidity, and no little of Sobriety*. At last he desires

J. B's Explanation of the Riches of God's Goodness, &c. contrary to the Text.

me to prove, that by the *Talents* mentioned *Mat.* 1679. 25. 15. is understood *Saving Grace*: But if he think that be not meant by them, I would know of him what is meant? For it is observeable, he doth not (because he dare not) deny, that *Saving Grace* or the Means of Salvation is meant by them. Doth not Christ make Use of this Parable to compare the Kingdom of Heaven to it? And is it not of the same Import with the former of the Ten Virgins, five whereof, who had Oyl in their Lamps, (I suppose he will confess this was *Saving Grace*) entred with the Bridegroom? Is it not said to those that improved their Talents, *Well done, good and faithful Servant, enter into the Joy of thy Lord?* It is much, the Man had Confidence to insinuate so much as a Denial, that *Saving Grace* is here meant. As to what he adds of this being not Universal, and not proving, that Men have Power of themselves without Divine Help and Grace, I have answered it above.

¶ 3. I come now to his Tenth Chapter, intituled, *Of Universal Grace and Light*; where he grows warm to purpose, and rails almost constantly. He is scarce well entred this Chapter, when he accounts the further Piece of our Divinity, (as he terms it) and against which himself writes as *Non sence, and the Foaming of a distracted Brain*; yea, p. 228. *such, as he doubts whether it can be understood at all*: pag. 230. *whose Meaning is unintelligible*. But what need he bestow near Forty Pages to refute unintelligible Nonsense? For if it be so, he cannot be sure he has refuted it; since no Man can be sure he has answered that sufficiently he doth not understand. And his Malice has so over-driven him, that he writeth down his own Judgment, saying, (p. 227.) *Some may justly blame him, for spending Words, and wasting Time upon such a Nonsensical, self-*

The Talents, Saving Grace.

J. B. bestows near 40 Pages to refute Unintelligible Nonsense, as he calls it.

1679. *self-contradictory Proposition*: Yet the Man will be doing that, for which he confesseth he is justly blameable; and so much the more, as he further confesseth, p. 261. That *Non-sense cannot be well answered*. Of this violent Railing take one Instance, p. 248. where (in Answer to my saying, "That the Light of Christ will not consent to any Abomination, but taketh away Blindness, openeth the Understanding and directeth the Judgment and Conscience; *be addeth*, "And while the *Quakers* preach up this, as a sure Guide to Life Eternal, they are abominable *Pelagian* and *Socinian* Deceivers, who should be fled from, as the most impudent and sworn Enemies of the Grace of God and of his Gospel, that ever appeared out of the bottomless Pit; a Company of pure *Pagan*-Preachers, whose Doctrine is *Paganism* and driveth thereunto. The Reader may judge of the rest, which he may find in Terms no less Abusive very frequent, *Pag.* 227, 233, 234, 237, 238, 240, 248, 258, 260, 261, 266. All which Railing, as it occurreth in these Pages, needs no Answer but that of *Michael* to the Devil, who is the Author of such Stuff, *The Lord rebuke thee*. This Method of Answering is no less unreasonable than his Railing; for it is either by supposing things not proved by him, by Concluding things not following from my Assertions, or by manifest Perversions, all improved by the Height of Abuse, to render the Things that displease him absurd and ridiculous: Of these I shall take Notice in Order. *First*, He supposeth nothing to be the Gospel, save the outward Preaching; and that there is no Gospel, where there is not an *Outward Administration of it*: And this he never offers to prove. What he saith, to contradict my Asserting the Gospel to be, where the outward may not be, will after be Examined. Upon this his meer Supposition he accounts

J. B's  
Railing Stuff  
against the  
Quakers.

J. B. sup-  
poses nothing  
to be the  
Gospel, save  
the Outward  
Preaching.

counts me absurd, pag. 226. and upon this Supposition he urges *All Men's not having Grace, as not having the Gospel*, p. 235, 236, 240. That to *Preach the Light within, is to despise the Gospel*, p. 244. That according to me, *The Preaching of the Gospel is not necessary to Salvation*. Another of his Suppositions is, *That because the Light within is common to all, therefore it can be nothing but Nature*. And upon this false and unproved Ground he raileth and enlargeth, p. 229. where he calls it the *Pelagian Grace of God*, that is Man's Free-Will; doubting, whether I will say so much as did *Pelagius*: Which is nothing to the Purpose, neither proveth his Inference, which is false; as the Scriptures brought by me in my Apology to prove, *There is a saving spiritual Grace given to all*, do Evince: What he saith in Answer to any of them, as it occurs, will hereafter be considered. And yet upon this false Inference he concludes, p. 233. *The Height of the Quakers Divinity is but what a Natural Conscience can teach a Man-Eater*; and to the same Purpose, p. 234. and then battereth against it, p. 237. saying, *Christ in the Saints, the Hope of Glory, is not brought about by Nature*: Which I never said; and therefore he but fights with his own Shadow, as he doth upon the like Occasion, pag. 231, 232-236-238, 241, 256. where he saith, "That Men are not made Partakers of the Priviledge of the Saints in their Natural State; and the Scripture saith not, There is any Thing in the Heart of Man by Nature, which produceth Christ in the Soul, &c." Which Things were never asserted by me. More of his Mistakes of this kind may be seen, pag. 257, 262, 265. where he concludeth, *The Quakers Religion and Gospel to be nothing but what meer Nature teacheth*: But it is observable, that in that almost one and only Argu-

1679.

1679. Argument, which he bringeth to make this Inference good, (albeit much of his Work and Exclamations depends upon it) he involves himself in a notable Contradiction. For (p. 234. n. 7.) to prove, *There is no Universal Light, or Seed, that beareth witness against all Evil Deeds*, he asketh, "How came it, that this Light and Seed did not bear Witness against the *Cilicians*, who lived upon Theft? And against the *Messagetians*, who use their Wives in common? — — — And against such as used to kill Men, and eat them?" Now these can make nothing for his Purpose, unless for this Reason, that because these People commonly and avowedly did these Things, therefore they had no Light that reproveth them for them; otherwise their doing of them will not import, the Light did not bear Witness against their so doing: More than Men under the *Presbyterian Ministry* committing Adultery and Murder, will import, there was no Witness born against these Sins by the *Presbyterian Preachers*. But he has overthrown this his Reason himself, by affirming, p. 232, and 235. "That there is a Natural Conscience, or the Law of Nature left in every Man, as God's Deputy, informing of some Good, and testifying against some Evils; of which elsewhere he particularizeth *Murder* and *Adultery*: And yet here he saith, "'Tis observed, there is hardly one Point of the Law of Nature, which some Nation hath not violated, not only by their Customs, but by their very Laws." If then their thus Violating the Law of Nature do not prove, they had not the Law of Nature, or were not reprov'd by it (which he himself has confessed all had) then neither will their Doing those Things prove, they had no Divine Light nor Seed, or were not thereby reprov'd: for if it prove, they had not that,

it

J. B. denies the Light to bear Witness against Evil in the *Cilicians* and *Messagetians*.

J. B. overthrows his former Reason, asserting the Law of Nature in every Man.

it will as much prove they had no Natural Conscience, no Law of Nature; which yet he confesseth is in every Man. 1679.

¶ 4. In this Chapter also he would insinuate and infer, to render that which he writes against odious, *That the Asserting of an Universal Gospel, by which Salvation may be possible to such as want Outward Preaching, renders Outward Preaching needless*: But this Cavil used often before by him, is already answered in the 3 and 4 Sections; and therefore what he repeats of this again here, p. 229, 236, 245. needs no further Answer. And whereas he asks upon this Occasion, p. 244. *How can the Believing of the History of the Gospel be necessary* (as I say it is) *to such as bear it, if they may be saved without it?* Because God commands every one to believe these Truths, to whom he bringeth the Knowledge of them (albeit not them to whom he hath render'd it impossible.) Has he forgotten their own Distinction of some Things being necessary *Necessitate Præcepti*, that are not so *Necessitate Medii*? Neither do I intend by this Belief (which the Proposing of the outward Knowledge requires) a Belief meerly Historical; as he maliciously would insinuate. I shall now take Notice of his gross Perversions and Calumnies, which, as he advances, I observe grow thicker, and are in this Chapter very numerous. As first, from my saying, "That we understand by the Light or Seed, a Spiritual and Heavenly Principle, in which GOD, as he is the Father, the Son and the Spirit, dwelleth:" From this he infers, p. 231. *It may be he doth not acknowledge a Trinity, &c.* But if there be any Ground for such an Inference from these Words of mine, I leave it to all Rational Men to judge. P. 255. Because I say, *It is Christ's Flesh and Blood which came down from Heaven*, he asks, *If Christ had no other Flesh and Blood?* And then, as if I had an-

The History of the Gospel is necessary.

Necessitas Præcepti, & Medii.

1679. answered He had not; he concludes us Deniers of the Incarnation of Christ, asking; *Whether the Death of Christ, his Resurrection and Ascension, and all the History of his Life be but Dreams and Lies?* Which Malitious Insinuation and Perversion is returned upon him, as false and groundless. And whereas he saith here, *He will ask one Word more; Where I read, that Christ's Flesh and Blood came down from Heaven?* (For so my Words should be translated) it seems, he is either very ignorant, or forgetful of the Scriptures; and therefore let him read *John 6. 51.* where Christ saith, he is the *Living Bread that came down from Heaven*, adding, that *Bread* to be his *Flesh*. In like Manner is his other malitious Perversion denied, and returned upon him, where he would infer upon us, *That each of us esteemed our selves as much the Christ of God, as Christ was:* So that the Blasphemy he exclaims against is his own, who speaks Evil of others without a Cause. Another of his Perversions is, *p. 236.* where repeating my Words he rendereth them thus out of the *Latine: This is that Inward Christ, of which we Only and so often speak;* whereas it should have been translated, *Which we so much and so often speak for,* as the English Edition doth verify; the *Latin Word tantum* signifies *so much*, as well as *only*; and was so intended here by me: That it must be so, both the Context and what I say elsewhere sheweth. But he would have it *only*, that he might pervert and rail the more liberally; albeit he cannot be ignorant, that the *Latin Word tantum* signifies *so much*, as ordinary Dictionaries shew; and *Cicero* saying, *Nec tantum proficiebam, quantum volebam, nec quicquam posthac non modo tantum, sed ne tantulum quidem præterieris.* Those who debate fairly, use not to strain their Adversaries Words to abuse them, when they know they may bear a better Interpretation. His next


J. B.'s Ignorance of the Scriptures.

J. B. falsely Translates the Author, to seek Advantage against him.

Per-



Perverſion is yet more groſs and abuſive, p. 238. where from my denying, “ That we equal our ſelves to that Holy Man, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, &c. in whom the Fulneſs of the Godhead dwelt bodily, ” He concludes I affirm him to be no more but a *Holy Man*; and becauſe I uſe the Words *Plenitudo Divinitatis*, that I deny his Deity: which is an abominable Falſhood. I deteſt that Doctrinè of the *Socinians*, and deny there is any Ground for their Diſtinction; and when I confeſs him to be a *Holy Man*, I deny him not to be *G O D*, as this Man moſt injuriouſly would inſinuate: for I confeſs him to be really both true God and true Man. And whereas he rails and exclaims heré and in the following Page at a monſtrous Rate, as if the Compariſon I bring of the Difference betwixt every Saint and the Man Jeſus, from the *Sap its being otherways in the Root and Stock of the Tree, than in the Branches*, did further confirm our Equalling our ſelves to him; he doth but ſhew his Folly: Since Chriſt himſelf uſeth the ſame Compariſon, *Job. 15. 5. I am the Vine, ye are the Branches*, to which I alluded: And upon this he runneth out in a vehement Strain of Railing, p. 239. exclaiming againſt us, as if we denied the Deity of Chriſt and his Incarnation; which is utterly falſe: And therefore his Work there, to prove what I deny not, is in vain. And yet he repeateth this Calumny, p. 242. adding, That my ſaying, “ That we believe what is written of the Conception, Birth, Life and Death of Chriſt, &c. to be true, doth not vindicate us from it; ” And then he ſubjoins, “ Do you believe, that that Body which was Crucified at *Jeruſalem*, roſe again and is now in Glory? Speak your Mind here if you dare? This Deſiance to all Men of Reaſon will inſinuate, as if I did not believe this, or durſt not ſpeak my Mind of it: and therefore if this be found

1679.   
Chriſt true  
God and  
true Man.

1679. false, he must in the Judgment of all Sober Men pass for a malicious Perverter. For Answer then I say; I do believe, that the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was Crucified at *Jerusalem*, was again raised by the Power of God; in which glorified Body the Lord Jesus Christ dwelleth: And I dare him to shew, where in my *Apology*, or elsewhere I ever said or wrote any thing to the Contrary? Of the like Nature to these Perversions is, what he saith p. 264. where from my urging from *Heb. 4. 12, 13.* the Word of God is said to be a *Discerner of the Thoughts of the Heart*, he would infer, *That the Quakers then must know other Men's Thoughts, who have ths in them, and are sensible of it*: But the Absurdity here is his own. Do not they say, *Every true Believer has the Spirit of God in them*? And albeit the Spirit know all things, yet every Believer knoweth not all things. Since he is so ready by Consequences to make Men Blasphemers for asserting Scripture-Truth; how can he avoid passing this Censure upon the Apostle, who saith, *1 Cor. 2. 15. He that is Spiritual judgeth all things*; and no Man can judge any thing but what he knows? And whereas he rails here in saying, *We ascribe to the Light within the Property of God, and have no other Christ*: as also to the same Purpose, p. 242, 237. saying, "The Christ we command to believe in, is not the Christ the Scriptures testify of; but one born with every Man, neither God nor Man, &c." is all answered, and the Absurdity he draws from it removed, by what *George Keith* hath said in his Book, called, *The Way Cast up*; wherein he shews by the Extension of the Soul of Christ, how this is no denying of the *Man Jesus*, but on the Contrary. And if either I, or any other have called the Light within *G O D*, or ascribed to it the Property of God, it is no more upon this *Hypothesis* than they do, who say, *The Man*

Our Belief  
of the Body  
of Christ  
Crucified,  
Raised again  
and Glorifi-  
ed.


He that is  
Spiritual,  
judgeth all  
Things.

Man Christ is God, and by Reason of the Personal Union ascribe sometimes the Actions of the one Nature to the Person denominated by the other; as the *Westminster Confession* it self acknowledges *Chap. 8.* And since *R. Macquaire* hath promised a Refutation of that Book of *G. K.* by *J. B.* in his Name, when we see it, this may be further spoken to, if need be: Upon which also will depend the full Discussion of that Question mentioned, *p. 240, 241. Whether the Seed be a Substance?* Since he will not deny, the Soul of Christ is a Substance, and consequently distinct from Reason: As also that of Christ's being *Crucified in the Wicked*, which *p. 246.* he calls a *Non-sensical Dream*; and of the Seed's being a distinct Principle from the Soul, spoken of *p. 247.* The full Treating of all which being referred, until that promised Work of his appear. As to that I shall only say in short at present, that whereas I say, "This Seed is not the being of God simply considered, he addeth, *p. 230.* "That then all Men are Partakers of the Being of God some other way considered; and what Blasphemy is wrapped up here, he leaves to any that will to judge." But there is no Man of Reason dealing impartially, will judge any Blasphemy to be here, more than in the Apostle's Concession to the *Athenians*, *Act. 17. 28.* *That we are the Off-spring of God, and live and move in him.* And whereas he mocks (*p. 241.*) at my saying, *The Seed is a Substance*, because it abideth in the Hearts of the Ungodly, even while they remain in Ungodliness; asking, *Doth not Pravity, Ignorance, Rebellion, &c. remain in their Hearts? Are these therefore Substances?* But he allays his own windy Triumphs by my following Words; That notwithstanding this Seed is in them, they are not denominated by it, which Wicked Men are by their Wicked-


1679.

The Personal Union is Christ.

That the Seed is a Substance.

1679.  nesses, while they continue in them; and therefore it is a Substance: since no Accident can be in a Subject, unless the Subject be denominated therefrom. To this he asks, *Why a Man in whom this Seed and Grace is, may not be denominated Graced and Enlightned?* And as if it were absurd to deny, they might be so denominated, he concludes, *And thus this Substance shall be turned into an Accidens by this Man's Philosophy.* But the Reason is clear, because they partake not of the Virtue of it, nor have not suffered it to work in them; as by the Example of *Physick* being in a *Sick Man* I did shew: And therefore he has no go-by for this, but a pitiful Impertinency, *That if there be such a Difference betwixt this Seed and Holiness, as betwixt Physick and Health, then it is no Part of Holiness:* For I never said there was such a Difference in every Respect; but only in Respect of the Difference betwixt a Substance and an Accident, for Clearing of which only, the Example was brought. And whereas he would several times insinuate here in this, *p. 232, 233.* my Asserting the *Seed to be in all*, did import *Christ dwelling in all*; that no such Thing followeth, I have shewn in my Apology, which himself elsewhere observeth: for I shew, there is a Difference betwixt meer *Inbeing* and *Inhabitation*; the last imports Union, and not the first. Themselves confess God to be every where; and yet they will not say, *God dwells in the Wicked:* yea, notwithstanding God's Omni presence, it is said, *Some are without God in the World*, by Reason of their being not United to him. And thus are answered his Cavils, *p. 243.* so that I need not further urge (until he has removed this Difficulty) from *Amos 2. 12.* Only it is observable, how great Pains the Man is at here to shew, how faulty their Translation of the Bible is: But how can it

Christ's Inhabitation imports an Union.

it then be a Sure Rule of Faith to any? And 1679.  whereas he saith, p. 236. *That when it is said, The Seed is received in the Heart, it is supposed, it was not formerly there; I deny that Consequence.* Money may be brought unto a Man's House, and yet he not have received it: The Piece of Silver, which the Woman, *Luke 15.* in the Parable had lost, (and to which the Kingdom of God was compared) was in her House; and yet she rejoiced not, until Lighting the Candle, and Sweeping the House she had found it. What he repeats so often (to make an odious Noise) of my making this Grace Universal, *That Turks, Japonians, Cannibals, &c. have it, who never heard of Christ,* is Impertinent; since he has a Chapter afterwards for that of Purpose, where it shall be Examined: As also what he saith p. 245. he thinks strange, *Any such should partake of the Benefit of this Mystery;* for I speak not of their knowing the Mystery: That's one of his usual Tricks, to foist-in other Words, to alter the Matter.

¶ 5. Having thus Traversed his tedious Per-  
 versions unto Page 251. n. 25. where he pretends  
 to have *Traced me to my Den,* while he has only  
*fallen into the Pit of his own making;* I come to  
 Examine his pretended Examination of the  
 Grounds I bring: For this he terms my *wild Af-*  
*sertion.* And first unto *Job. 1. 9. That was the*  
*True Light, which lighteth every Man that cometh*  
*into the World.* Instead of an Answer he tells a  
 long Story of some taking it one Way, some a-  
 nother. Then after he has play'd the Dictator a  
 while, in telling his own Conception, he Con-  
 cludes at last, *That [every one] is not to be under-*  
*stood of [All] without Exception; because the Scrip-*  
*ture tells of many, whose Understandings are*  
*darkned, who are under the Power of Darknes,*  
*who abide in the Darknes.* What then? that will  
 not prove, that Light is not Come to them in or-  
 der

*J. B's*  
 vain Quar-  
 rels and Ob-  
 jections a-  
 gainst the  
 Universality  
 of the Light  
 asserted by  
*John (c. 1. 9)*

1679. der to bring them out of that Darkneſs; ſince  
 Christ ſaith expreſſly *Job. 3.* of ſuch, that *Light is  
 come, but Men love Darkneſs rather*; and thoſe  
 that love it, are under the Power of it: And as  
 they continue to love it, and hate the Light, they  
 abide in it. But it ſeems, not being ſatisfied  
 with his own Answer, he proceeds *p. 252. n. 26.*  
 to confeſs, *All Men are enlightned, but not ſpiri-  
 tually, ſupernaturally and ſavingly*; but for this he  
 giveth no Proof, but his own Aſſertion: And tru-  
 ly, he muſt be much puzzled with this Scripture,  
 for he knows not, what way to take it. *Fiſt*, he  
 underſtands Every Man only of Believers; and  
 then he will have the Enlightning to be Saving  
 and Spiritual: Then he underſtands it of All Indif-  
 ferently; and then he will have it to be Common  
 and not Saving: But with theſe his Gueſſings and  
 Divinings he is not like to ſatisfy any Sober Chri-  
 ſtian. He goes on at the ſame rate of Uncertain-  
 ty, *p. 253.* upon theſe Words; *That the Life is  
 the Light of Men*, doubting, what is the Meaning  
 of them? After he has told *Calvin's*, *Origin's* and  
*Marlorat's* Thoughts, he Concludes; *That though  
 Light be come into the World, yet Men love Dark-  
 neſs better, and none become Children of the  
 Light, but by believing*: And that *all are not Chil-  
 dren of the Light*; which I never denied. He goes  
 on to tell *Calvin's* further Thoughts of the follow-  
 ing Words; all which ſhews, this Place pains him:  
 But overturns nothing, of what I have aſſerted. And  
 then *p. 254. n. 29.* he refers me to his eighth Chap-  
 ter, to prove, *That [ Every Man ] here admits an  
 Exclusion*, which a little before he Confeſſed it did  
 not; adding, *That the Text it ſelf inferreth a Re-  
 ſtriction, when it tells, Darkneſs did not compre-  
 hend the Light.* But this imports no more, than  
*ſome's rejecting*, which I deny not; but not, that the  
*Light ſhined not*: For it is expreſſly ſaid, *It ſhined  
 in the Darkneſs*; ſo it was there, which is the  
 thing

thing in Debate : And the Text saith positively, *This true Light lighteth every Man*; and therefore it is but to cover his own Shame and Weakness, that instead of something more solid, he closes this Paragraph with a Ridiculous Bob, saying; *Quakers are good at Dreaming*: But this filly Covering will not serve him with such as are not blind. To what I have said to shew, that *δι' αὐτοῦ* is to be referred to the *Light*, and not to *John*; he returneth his contrary Assertion instead of Reason: My shewing it, by its being said, *That all might believe through him*, which all could not do through *John*, as not bearing him: in stead of answering he tells me, *I may learn thence, how to take the Particle [All]*; which in Effect is nothing, but by his own bare Authority to Command me to take [All] not Universally: But I find no Virtue in his Order to perswade; and therefore will wait for Probation, e're I Obey. That *John*, as an Instrument, might be useful to bring People to believe in the *Light*, I deny not; and therefore he might have spared his pains in this Page to prove that: But it will not thence follow, that *δι' αὐτοῦ* is referred to *John*, until he first remove the Ground given against it by me, in shewing, [All] is not understood here Universally; which is incumbent for him to do, since he denies it.

1679.

*δι' αὐτοῦ* sc. *αὐτοῦ*. That all Men thro' it (the Light, not John) might believe.

¶ 6. Page 256. N. 31. In Answer to my arguing, *That this Light is saving and sufficient, because it is the Light of Christ, whereby all ought to believe*, he saith; *They know no Light sufficient, which is not Efficacious, that is, which certainly doth not save*: But besides that this Answer is but a meer begging of the Question, it is contrary to many Scriptures, which I have at length shewn before, in proving, Many that have had a Day, have resisted the Mercy and Grace thereof. What he saith further here against those, who affirm, *That*

J. B's Quibbles against saving Light.

the

1679. *the Improving of Nature aright, shall obtain Grace,* Toucheth me not; who affirm no such thing. He beginneth his *n.* 32, *p.* 257. with a Perverſion, as if I denied, that we received what is Natural and Common, from Chriſt, becauſe I ſay, *The Evangelift John Ch. 1. is treating, of what we receive from Chriſt as Mediator; therefore I deny, we receive from Chriſt, what is common and Natural.* But in Answer to my urging “The Light’s being “Supernatural, (to paſs by his pedantick Quibble, which he adventureth not to inſiſt upon) “becauſe the Darkneſs, that is, *Man* in his *Natural Eſtate comprehendeth it not; but Man in “that Eſtate can Comprehend what is Natural to “him; he tells me, they thence Infer, That Man in that Eſtate is void of all Spiritual Light: Is not this a Learned Refutation of my Reaſon, Reader? But ſuſpecting, this would not ſerve, he adds another Quibble upon the Word Comprehend; That though Man in his natural State can Comprehend that which is Natural, yet he cannot comprehend the God of Nature. I ſay not, that in his Natural State he can, nor yet in his Spiritual; Comprehend, being taken in the moſt Comprehensive Senſe: But otherwiſe being underſtood of Receiving or Apprehending (for ſo κατέλαβεν may be underſtood) he may Receive it by Virtue of the Power, which from the Light he receives ſo to do. That the Quakers exhort People to believe in a meer Creature, Is a meer Calumny; with which like Stuff this Page is filled: And therefore my Argument of the Light being Saving and Supernatural, becauſe we are commanded to believe in It, remains Unremoved. Page 258. In Answer to what I urge from the Parable of the Sower, Matth. 13. and the Word of Faith, Rom. 10. and the engraſted Word, Jam. 1. 21. he only oppoſeth his meer Assertions and Railing, calling it Quaker-Dotages, and a fanciful Dream. And to the*

To Comprehend, to receive, or apprehend.  
κατέλαβεν.



the Argument drawn from the *Talents*, Mat. 25. he denieth them to signify *Saving Grace*; of which above. Page 259. When he comes to answer, what I urge from *Col. 1. 23.* of the Gospel's being *preached in every Creature*, which is not only a Declaration of good Things, but the Power of God; he gives his meer Assertions, That the *Gospel was the Doctrine delivered by Men*; but the Doctrine was not the Power of God, which the Gospel is, albeit it declared of it: No more than a Receipt of *Physick* is the Ingredients. Next he asserts, That *if the Gospel be in them, it needs no Preacher*; but this he proves not: A Man may have good Herbs in his Garden, and yet need another to tell him the right Use of them; yea, and discover them unto him. And what if I would say, as he desires, *That it was preached from the Beginning of the World in a Measure*, that it wrought in Men's Hearts in order to save them; albeit the Full, Plain and Manifest Discovery, and Precious Effects thereof was reserved to the Ministration of Christ and his Apostles? And therefore his Assertion in the next p. 260. is false, *That according to the Quakers Principle, the Gospel was alike manifest in all Ages.* Was not the Promised Seed a Preaching of the Gospel to Adam? How poorly he has shewn the Restriction of the Particle *All* (albeit the Words here be *Every Creature*, which is more pathetick) in his *eighth Chapter*, is before Evinced. And whereas he desires to know, Where the Gospel is taken properly for that *Inward Strength, that is common to all Men*? I have shewn him, the Gospel is called *the Power of God* expressly, *Rom. 1.* and that is an *inward Power and Strength*: And then again I have shewn him, that this Gospel is *preach'd to or in every Creature*, which are plain Words; what is *preached to every Creature, is common to all Men*: And therefore until he answer this, his calling me a *Babbler* and a *Pagan-Preacher*


1679.

J. B. asserts the Gospel to be the Doctrine or Declaration of the Power of God.

1679. *cher* (as he doth in this Place) with such like Stuff, will have little Weight with Men of Reason. The rest of this Page and the following, 261, and 262. is a Complex of Railing, *That the Quakers Gospel is meer Heathenism, worse than Pelagianism, Socinianism, Arminianism and Jesuitism, because they say, that what is manifest from God in Man, is by the Gospel; and that which Revealeth Justice and Equity, is the Gospel:* Which this Man supposeth only to be the Light of Nature, and thereupon concludeth, *The Quakers Gospel is but Nature's dim and corrupt Light.* All which is but to beg the Question; as he doth, where he supposes, *That Man naturally can perceive the Eternal Power of the Godhead in the outward Creation, without any Supernatural Light:* Which he should prove, and not mock at my being otherwise minded; for this favours more of *Pelagian.* than any thing asserted by me, He asks me, By what Authority I make τὸ γνωσθῆναι Θεῷ, that is, *what is to be known of God* (for it seems, he was affraid to speak plain Scots of it, lest every one should have seen his Impertinency) and the Knowledge of God one and the same? *For to see this,* he saith, *he wants the Quakers Spectacles.* But indeed, he must be as dark-lighted inwardly, as these are outwardly, that need Spectacles, if he deny, *That the Knowledge of God is somewhat, of what is to be known of him;* and then *what is to be known of God indefinitely,* must Comprehend the Knowledge of God. He addeth; *That if by Inward Revelation the Heathens know the Will of God, then the Apostle was quite out here:* But this follows no more, than that a Master teacheth not his Scholar Navigation, because he makes use of the Compass and outward Observations to demonstrate it to him. Page 262. n. 38. as also n. 40. In Answer to what I urge from *Rom. 10.* of the *Word being near in the Heart and in the Mouth,* he returneth Railing and

J. B's  
proofs An-  
swers.


and meer Assertions : For his saying, *That this Word is not in every Man*, is but to affirm strongly, not to prove. As for his asserting, That the Apostle speaks of outward Preaching, I deny not; and that by an outward Testimony the Mystery, that had been hid, and even sparingly Revealed in the visible Church, was openly declared by Christ and his Apostles, I acquiesce to : But from all that it will no ways follow, that the Apostle speaks only of outward Preachers, and that it was not *in the Hearts of all Men*, though they had not a distinct Knowledge of it. He confesses, *The Mystery of Adam's Fall was not known to the Gentiles, but by the Scripture*; yet that hindred not, but they were hurt, yea, and according to him, *all of them defiled by it*. His saying, *That I Confirm here my desperate Design, and overturn the Foundation of the Christian Religion*, with his Exclamations, *O desperate Souls ! O wretched Error !* With much more of this kind of Stuff, uttered by him for want of better Arguments, may fright Fools, but will not move Men of Reason. At last, to conclude this Chapter he alledgeth, The Testimonies of the Fathers brought by me, *do not expressly prove my Assertions*; yet he tacitly and indirectly acknowledges, *Such Testimonies may be found among the most Antient of them*, while (albeit to their Disadvantage) he saith, *It is observable, that some of them had so put on Christ, as not sully to have put off Plato*.

1679.   
-and foolish  
Exclamati-  
ons, &c.

¶ 7. Page 267. Cometh his Eleventh Chapter, Intituled, *Of the Necessity of this Light to Salvation*: Where, according to his Custom, he beginneth with proofless Affirmations and Railing, saying; *The Universal Gospel pointed at by me, is no Gospel, not the Gospel Revealed in the Word; making the whole Gospel and Grace of God null and void, as that, by which the outward Administration thereof by the Apostles is unnecessary*: To which is Answered

1679. swered before. And then after an Enumeration of many Scriptures, wherein the Apostle Paul glorieth in his being an Instrument of the Preaching of it, with which he hath not shewn our Doctrine Inconsistent, he concludeth; *O what wretched Desperado's must these Quakers be, who thus undervalue and trample upon the Riches of the Wisdom and Grace of God, and instead of the true Gospel give us pure Paganism!* This is a fit Introduction for such a Chapter, wherein there is much of the same sort of Stuff (which I shall willingly pass) and which, that he may end as he begins, has the like Conclusion, p. 281. Then when he enters upon the Matter, n. 5. and p. 269. and comes to Examine what I say, to shew, *Wherein we differ from some other Assertors of Universal Redemption*, and for that End to shew, Why one is saved, and not another, seeing all have sufficient Grace; among others he mentions these my Words: "Moreover we believe, that in that special Time of every Man's Visitation, as Man of himself is wholly impotent for working with Grace, so neither can he make the least Progress out of his Natural State, till Grace lay hold on him: So that it is possible for him to suffer, and not resist, as it is also possible for many to Resist." By these Words of mine cited by him, the Reader may easily observe, how falsely he Charged me in the fore-going Chapter with asserting, *That Men could be saved by meer Nature, without the Operation of the Grace of God*; and yet he is not ashamed to re-iterate the same Calumny here, p. 279. But to proceed, he saith; *This my Answer is not satisfactory*: The Reason of which (besides some tedious Discourse of the Opinions of the *Arminians, Jesuits and Molinists*, concerning the Difference betwixt sufficient and effectual Grace (which is not my Work to answer, neither needs any, as he gives it here and there,

Grace in  
Man, if not  
Resisted,  
works his  
Conversion.

there, p. 270, 271, 272-274. 280) amounts to 1679. 

this, "That since the Working of the Grace  
 "comes from this Non-resistance, which (he  
 "saith) is a positive Act of Man's Will; then  
 "Salvation depends upon Free-will: And this he  
 labours to Aggravate by divers odious and some-  
 times ridiculous Expressions, such as, *Grace must  
 stand Cap in Hand to Lord Free-Will*, and more of  
 that kind; alledging, *That the two Examples of  
 Sick Men, and Men living in a deep Cave, brought  
 at length by me in my Apology (Lat. Ed. p. 91.  
 n. 17.) do not free me of this Absurdity.* To  
 which I Reply (1) That the Question is here on-  
 ly concerning such, as have only a sufficiency of  
 Grace, and not of those who have a Prevalency  
 of Grace; which I confess to some. (2.) That I  
 say not, that any Man can convert himself by  
 any Light, Grace or Seed in him, until quickned,  
 visited and stirred up by a New Visitation of Life  
 from God. (3.) That on both hands it is confessed,  
 that there must be a concurring of the Will of Man  
 in the Act of Conversion: For no Man is saved  
 against his Will. (4.) That I say, as well as he,  
 That this Concurrence of Man's Will, and Pli-  
 bleness to the Grace of God proceedeth not from  
 Man's Will naturally, but is the Product and Ef-  
 fect of the Grace: Then what has Man to glory  
 in? O (saith he) *such as are saved, may say, I was  
 not so ill disposed; my Will was not so averse as ano-  
 ther, that had the like sufficient Grace*: And what  
 then? His Aversion and Resistance is the Cause of  
 his Condemnation, that is not denied; but it fol-  
 lows not from thence, That the Non-resistance is  
 the Cause of the other's Salvation: I deny that  
 Consequence; for his Non-resistance did not procure  
 him that Visitation from God. Where then is  
 his Absurdity? It may resolve in one of these  
 two, *That it was possible for those that were dam-  
 ned,*

The possibi-  
 lity of Sal-  
 vation for all  
 demonstrat-  
 ed.

1679. *ned, to have been saved; or, for some of those that are saved, to have been damned.* What will the supposing, that those that are *damned might have been saved*, amount to, but that there Damnation is of themselves, which all acknowledge? And if he think, it is absurd to say, *Any that are saved, might have been damned*; Why is Salvation preached to any? Or to what End is Pains bestowed upon any in order to Salvation? Or how doth that signify any thing really to their *Salvation*, if *Damnation* was altogether *impossible* to them? When he has sufficiently answered this, he will solve his own Difficulties. But because the Man will always be nibbling, where he cannot give a solid Answer, therefore he falls a quarrelling at some Comparisons brought by me, *p. 273-275-277.* shewing, they do *not hit* in that, for which I *did bring* them; whereas I took notice, that the Comparison did *not hit every Way* (since all Comparisons claudicant.) The first is, because I say, That *Grace softens the Heart, as the Fire softens Wax*; therefore he concludes; *That according to me, Grace doth not Change the Heart, because Fire Changeth not the Nature of the Iron*; And what then? It was only in respect to the softning, that I brought the Comparison: Albeit had he been a good *Chymist*, he might have known, that by the Fire the Nature of Metals may be changed also. The Example of the *Sun's hardning Clay, and softning Wax* was brought by me to shew, That the *Sun loseth not it's Effect*, though the Operation in the Subject be different, and for no more; albeit the Sun also work a Disposition towards the producing its Effect in some Creatures, which by their Resisting or not Not-resisting may be *hindred*.

By Fire the Nature of Metals may be changed also.

¶ 8. When he cometh *p. 277.* to Examine the Proofs I bring to prove the Necessity of this Grace to Salvation, he mistakes the End, for which I bring them; and thence either alledgeth upon me

me false Insinuations, or judgeth them insufficient for not proving of that for which they were never intended. For the End for which I bring these Proofs here, is to shew, that whatever Use, Profitableness or Necessity of Believing to those, to whom they are Revealed, may be in Outward Knowledge; yet Salvation chiefly depends upon the Inward Work of Grace, bringing about Regeneration in the Soul: And this in Order to shew, That where this is wrought (albeit the Outward be wanting) Salvation will follow. Now when he sheweth, this is not proved by the Arguments I here bring, he may be answered; and till then, it is in vain for him to say, *I would infer a Destroying of the Ordinances of Christ*; which is false: or, *That this doth not prove, that this Common and Sufficient Grace is able to effectuate the New Birth*; that not being the Matter here to be proved. Pag. 178. N. 13. he denieth the *New Creation*, spoken of 2 Cor. 5. 16, 17. proceedeth from this *Light and Grace*: But his Mistake herein will be shewn hereafter from Tit. 2. 11. when I come to speak of that Place. He saith, *That the Manifestation of the Spirit given to every One*, spoken of 1 Cor. 12. 7. *is only understood of those within the Church*; but for this giveth no Proof: If there be an Enumeration made of all the several Virtues wrought by it in the *Visible Church*, it doth not thence follow, that none have it without it: The Text saith [*It is given to every Man*] *Indefinitely and Absolutely, not to every one only within the Church*; that remains for him to prove. He would fasten a Contradiction upon me p. 279. N. 14. because I say, [*The Seed is small in its first Manifestation; and though it be hid in the Earthy Part of Man's Heart*] *because a thing cannot be both hid and manifest*: And upon this he triumphs, as if he had discovered a great Absurdity. But doth he not know, That that may be said to be *hid*

1679. with Respect to a great, and clear and full Manifestation, which yet may be in some Respect *manifest* at some times? I do not say, That absolutely it is *bid* and *manifest* at one and the same time. In Answer to *Luke* 17. 20, 21. brought by me; where Christ saith, *The Kingdom of God is in the Pharisees*, he tells, *Judicious Calvin thinks, these Words were spoken to the Disciples*: But he, it seems, is not of his Mind, (and therefore I know not to what Purpose he brought him, since he follows not his Sence) For he will have it to signify [among,] and the Meaning to be, *That the Kingdom of God was near and among them*. But his Proof for this is not valid; for *ἐν* is sometimes interpreted *among*: But the Question is, if it should be so interpreted here? And till he prove that, he saith nothing. But his Mistake here is greater than he is aware of; for the *Greek* Word is *ἐντός*, not *ἐν*, which signifies *intus*, [within;] and I desire him to shew me in the New Testament, where it signifies *among*? All the Scriptures brought by him are impertinent, none of which is *ἐντός*, as in this Place, but *ἐν*. He confesseth, *p. 280. The Calvinists make Grace an Irresistible Power*; and saith, *That they have Reason so to do, because the Scripture speaketh of Grace, as a Drawing and Teaching*; But that may draw, which draweth not Irresistably. And because I say, [“The *Papists, Socinians* and *Arminians* deny this little Seed and Manifestation of *Light*, to be that *Supernatural* and *Saving Grace* of *God* given to all to *Salvation*”] he bringeth two Passages of the *Arminians*, wherein they confess, *The Spirit of God works immediately upon the Will, giving it Strength to believe*; desiring me then to tell him, Wherein I differ from *Arminians*? But will my Agreeing with *Arminians* in this prove, I differ not from them? Doth not himself agree with the *Arminians* in saying (as he affirms they do) *That*

*the*

The Kingdom of God is within, (ἐντός, in-tra) not among you, as J. B. says.

The Calvinists make Grace an Irresistible Power.



*the Power of Believing is conferred by Irresistable Grace?* And if he agree with them as well as I, may not I ask him the Question as pertinently, as he doth me, Wherein differs he from them? Has not he himself affirmed, *That as to our Doctrine of the Saving, Substantial Seed being in all*, p. 226. *neither Arminians nor Socinians ever speak of it?* What then needs he ask me, *Wherein we differ from them?* But it seems, he that fancieth Men can *dream waking* (as he sometimes speaks of the *Quakers*) has been in that Posture when he wrote this; which helped him to conclude this Chapter with Railing.

¶ 9. Now I come to his *Twelfth Chapter*, intitled by him, *Of the Salvation of the Heathens without hearing the Gospel*; he should have added, *Outwardly*, that is the Thing in Debate: But as in the Title, so in the Chapter he begs the Question. And that he may begin with Railing, as he ends it with a Flood of it, p. 292. he saith; *To say, Men may be saved without the Outward Preaching, must be true with this Quaker, though the Apostle saith the contrary:* For this citing *Rom. 10. 14. Eph. 2. 12. 1 Cor. 1. 20, 21, 22.* All which say nothing contrary to my Assertion, unless by the *Hearing* there, he prove is meant *only Outward Hearing*. And what! though the Apostle say to the *Gentiles*, *That they are Aliens to the Common-wealth of Israel*, and *That by Wisdom they knew not God*, and *That the Preaching of the Gospel was Foolishness to them?* All this may be said of some living in, and esteemed Members of the *Visible Church*, who have the Advantage of the *Outward Preaching*: And therefore it cannot prove, that the Want of this takes away the *Possibility* of Salvation. To that of *Peter* I agree, *Act. 4. 12.* *That there is not Salvation in any other, &c.* but it follows not therefore, that none

J. Bs' Proofs  
against the  
Heathens  
Salvation,  
disproved.

1679. can partake of his Salvation without the Outward Knowledge; himself overturns this Conclusion, by granting, *Infants and Deaf Persons may.* Pag. 287. to my Argument. That since the Gospel is preached to *Every Creature*, they may be saved by it; he saith, *A [may be] will not evince a [shall be]:* But I said only, *may be saved*, not *shall be saved*; and if it evince that, it doth my Business. That some have been *saved without it*, himself acknowledges in the Example of *Job.* Pag. 288. To overturn my Using of the *Gospel's being preached to every Creature*, he refers to his former Answer to this Place; and so do I to my Reply. *Beza's Sence*, to whom he refers me, moves no more than his doth; but when it is agreeable to Truth. Next he comes to answer my Argument drawn from *Tit. 2. 11. For the Grace of God that bringeth Salvation, hath appeared to all Men:* And for Answer he will have [*All*] here not to be understood Universally, but with a Restriction; alledging, *It is my Part to prove it:* But that needs no more Proof than to prove, That *John Brown* signifies *John Broten*; and for all his pretended Skill in the *Rule of Dispute*, he is under a Mistake. To take it Universally, is to take it as the common and proper Signification of it; so by the Rule of all Commentators we are to hold the Words of Scripture so, until by solid Reasons we be moved to the contrary: And therefore it is his Part that denies it, to give the Reason. That [*All*] sometimes is taken with a Restriction, I deny not; and therefore it's so taken here, doth not follow. That the Gospel is said to be preached by Men *outwardly*, I deny not; but that therefore it is *only so*, and never preached but when outwardly by the *Ministry of Men*, is no Conclusion: Himself acknowledges in the Example of *Job*, who he saith was *Taught by God without*

J. B. restricts  
the Word  
(all) only to  
the Elect.

without Scripture. His other Explications upon this Place are his meer Assertions, not to the Business: He calleth it upon the Credit of his own Affirmation, *False and Childish Pedantry* to say, *They take [All] for the lesser Part, because they take it indefinitely; while yet they understand that Indefinite Number to be the lesser Part: But do they not take the whole World, 1 Joh. 2. 2. for the far lesser Part of the World? Which is yet more absurd. To my Argument taken from Rom. 5. 18. where it is said, As something came upon all to Condemnation, so something is come upon all to Justification: Which shews, the last [All] to be of as large Extent as the first, which they confess is Universally taken. He saith, This will prove more, viz. That all Men are and shall be saved; because Judgment came actually upon All to Condemnation by Adam's Fall: But this is only his own Assertion. The Word Judgment is not in the Text; and Beza's putting in Reatus or Guilt, proveth not, It ought to be so: Whatever he do, we account not Beza Infallible; and therefore reject his Sence, until he prove it agreeable to Scripture: Nor yet his Enlargements afterwards upon the Place, because alledged without Probation. Pag. 285. N. 5. He accounteth my citing *Isai. 49. 6. where Christ is said to be given for a Light to the Gentiles, impertinent, because albeit the Gentiles are not excluded from the Dispensation of the Gospel, it will not follow, that such as hear not of Christ, can be saved, as well as such as are brought within the Church. But this Answer is founded upon the Supposition, that I affirm, That any are saved, which are not within the Church Catholick or Universal; which is false: And how Men may be of the Church who want Outward Preaching, will after appear. I think no sober Man will say, (supposing Salvation possible to the Gentiles without Outward Preaching)**

1679. ~~~~~  
The Apostles Words, Rom. 5. 18. Adulterated by the Translators.

1679. that it is blind Charity to judge, some of them have been *saved*; for upon that Supposition it were against all Charity to say, *None of them were ever saved.* His Example of the *Captives* (to whom one that Redeemed them did not communicate the Conditions, remaining *real Captives*) to answer my Argument from the Rule of Contraries, That *as Men are hurt by Adam's Fall who know not of it; so they may be benefitted by Christ's Death who know not of it,* hitteth not the Matter. It is strange for Men to be *Captives*, and not to know how? nor by whom? as to be Redeemed, and not know how? nor by whom? If he suppose the first, he may do the last. And this Example himself overturns, in what he grants of *Deaf Persons* and *Children*, as will after appear. To my asking [*Why Men cannot be saved, who never heard of the Death and Resurrection of Christ, as well as Men are damned, who never heard of Adam's Sin?*] he tells me very fairly, *Because God hath appointed this Way of Salvation by Faith in Christ, which cannot be without the Knowledge of Christ:* By which he meaning the *Outward* (as he needs must) his Answer is none at all, but a ridiculous Begging of the Question: As he doth also when he mentions that of *Isai. 53. 11.* *By his Knowledge shall my Righteous Servant justify many:* For though that should be understood of *Outward Knowledge* (which yet remains for him to prove) it will not follow, because Christ shall justify many by that Knowledge, that therefore he shall justify none without it.

¶ 10. When he comes *Pag. 186. N. 7.* to answer what I urge from the Example of *Deaf Persons* and *Infants*, the Reader may observe, how much he is pained; so that he is forced, after so long Contending and wearisom Wrestling, at last to give away his Cause, by confessing, *They except both these from the Necessity of Outwardly*  
Hear-

*Hearing the Gospel*: If so, then *Salvation is not impossible without the Hearing of the Gospel*, and the *Outward Preaching of the Gospel is not of absolute Necessity to Salvation*. But why are they and they only excepted? In which resolves my Question (which doth so vex him, that instead of Answering he tells me, *I am a deluded Quaker*) of which this is one, *Is not one in China or India as excusable for not knowing that which they never heard, as a Deaf Man that cannot hear, since God that has permitted the one to be naturally deaf, has also permitted the other to be necessarily absent?* To this I cannot find his Answer, save only this; *That these Deaf Persons and Infants are Members of the Visible Church, but not the other*: Of which this must be the Consequence, *That none can be saved, but such as are Members of the Visible Church*; for his saying, *That none are Members of the Invisible Church, but such as are of the Visible*, clearly imports it. But has not he, or at least the most Eminent of his Way said, *That the Church was many Ages Invisible, and in the Wilderness, and yet denied that all were damned during that Time?* Or will he say, *The Church of Rome was the Visible Church of Christ all that Time, of which they were Members?* What then becomes of the Testimonies of those who termed her *Antichrist, the Mother of Abominations, the Synagogue of Satan?* Which albeit true, yet begins to be Eaten up again by the Clergy, yea, even the *Presbyterians*; who begin by Degrees to creep back again to acknowledge their Old Father the *Pope*, to Establish their *Succession and Ordination*, especially when pinched by the *Quakers*; as is at more Length shewn in *G. Keith's Book called Quakerism no Popery?* But further: It seems, the *Outward Hearing is not necessary to make a Man a Member of the Visible Church?* And then what becomes of all his tedious Reasonings from *Rom.*

1679.  
J. B. ex-  
cepts Deaf  
Persons and  
Infants from  
having the  
Gospel, and  
why?

Outward  
Hearing  
makes no  
Church  
Member.

1679. 10. *How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* Which he urged before so vehemently, but now has overturned? He thinks, the Instance of *Cornelius* not to the Purpose, *Because he might have had the Knowledge of the Messiah from the Jews*: But his bare Supposition is no Answer. Besides, that he was no *Jewish Profelyte* is manifest, else *Peter* should not have been quarrelled for *Conversing* with him; and unless he had been such, or had received the Gospel, according to him, he must be esteemed to have been within the Covenant: And yet before any of these he is said to have been *Heard of God* and *Accepted*. Pag. 289. He confesseth, *Job lived before Moses, and was taught of God without Scripture*: And then is it not thence manifest, that *some* have been *saved*, to whom the Gospel was not Preached by the *Ministry of Men*? This also overturneth his Arguments from *Rom. 10*. Because he knows not how to answer my Argument drawn from *Rom. 2*. Therefore to amuse his Reader, he raises a Storm of Railing, calling me no less (with an Exclamation) than a *Miserable Miscreant, who make the Apostle contradict himself*. My Argument lies in the Apostle's positive Words, who saith, *The Gentiles did the things contained in the Law*; and again in the same Chapter, ver. 13. *The Doers of the Law are Justified*: Whence in the very Words of the Apostle, without any Commentary I argue, *That if the Doers of the Law be Justified, then the Gentiles, who did the Things contained in the Law, are Justified*. Do I therefore make the Apostle contradict himself? Yea, saith he, *because the same Apostle saith, That by the Deeds of the Law no Flesh shall be Justified*; but will he say, that these two Sentences of this Apostle, *The Doers of the Law shall be justified*, and, *By the Deeds of the Law no Flesh shall be justified*, are Contradictory? I say, they are not. If both

The Apostle does not contradict himself, in saying, *The Doers of the Law are justified*.

both these Sayings are True, his Challenge is in vain, if he will speak out that which he must; else manifest his Abuse of me, and say, they *Contradict one another*: Then let the Reader judge, who is the *Miscreant*? And observe, how he falls himself into the Pit, he had prepared for another. But to shew, how this *distinct, outward Knowledge* was not *absolutely needful* to Salvation, I instanced, how that divers of the Patriarchs, yea *Mary*, and the Apostles themselves had not so clear a Knowledge of it; but appeared ignorant upon several Occasions: To this *p. 289.* he would make the Reader believe, that I Conclude, *The Patriarchs had no saving Knowledge of the Messiah, because the wicked Jews Crucified him*: which is false. I shew indeed, according to Scripture, That the *Jews* that Crucified him, wanted this *distinct Knowledge*, notwithstanding they had the Scripture. His further Answer to this confutes himself, saying: *The Apostles did understand so much, as was then revealed*; and if this was sufficient for them (as he must say, if he speak Sence) the like may be said of the *Heathens*: For if the Apostles were not Condemnable for not believing nor understanding more, than what was Revealed to them; neither could the *Gentiles*. But to make his unwary Reader believe, as if *all this said by me, brought no Relief to my desperate Cause*, as he terms it, he concludes this 11 Paragraph, *p. 290.* with one of his Sententious Sayings, *Quakers can dream waking, I see*. He goes on in Answer to my Proofs brought from the Antient Philosophers to confirm this; to which he resumes little but Railing: Wherein I will not trouble the Reader to follow him; since without them the thing in Hand is sufficiently proved by Scripture: Yet if he will affirm the Citations to be either **False** or **Fictitious**, they may be proved

1679.



by

1679. by Production of the Books themselves. He thinks *The Impertinency of my citing Augustin's Words is discovered by the bare Reading*; and little less he saith to those of *Buchanan*: Which I refer to the Reader's Judgment, as he will find them in my Apology, towards the latter End of the Explanation of the *Fifth* and *Sixth Propositions*; and I will leave him concluding this Chapter with Rail- ing and empty Threats, which I neither Fear nor Value, as being without Ground, and the Fruits of no better Spirit than that of *Rabshekeb*.

## S E C T. VIII.

*Wherein his Thirteenth Chapter of Justification is Considered.*

¶ I. I Come now to his Thirteenth Chapter of *Justification*, where, after he has begun by telling, *This Doctrine hath been principally questioned by Hereticks*, which I deny not; and given us (according to his Custom) some large Citations out of their *Confession of Faith* and *Catechism*, with the supposed Sence of other *Quakers* from some of his formerly mentioned partial Authors; at last he comes *Pag. 296. N. 4.* to examine what I say in this Matter; where, according to his Custom, he begins with a Calumny upon his own false Supposition, *As if the Justification I plead for, were not the true Justification of the Saints, because proceeding from the Light, which* (saith he) *is but the dim Light of Nature.* This he takes for granted to be true, and thence falsely makes his Interence, *pag. 297, 298, 307, 308, 324.* To this he adds another Perversion; as if, because I say, [*From the Light received proceeds an Holy Birth*]

J. B. proceeds upon his own false Suppositions and Perversions.



Birth] therefore there were no Infusion of any gracious Principle or Virtue, &c. which is false. Men use to say, that where Seed is received in the Earth, it grows up to Fruit; yet not without the Influence of the Sun and descending of Rain: so is it with this Spiritual Seed, but with this Difference, That where-ever this Seed is, God is never wanting to give his Heavenly Influences towards its Growth and Advancement. In this Chapter also he omits not his Railing, calling us *poor deluded Wretches*, &c. with the Repetition of which I will not trouble the Reader; if he be pleased he may observe it, pag. 227, 299, 316, 318, 319. and in several other Places, but especially where he endeth the Chapter, p. 324, 325, I needed not at all trouble the Reader with his often reiterated Accusation of my Joining with the *Papists*, since he saith, *I am worse and less Orthodox than they in this Matter*, p. 301, 309. were it not to shew him how his Malice has blinded him: For he confesseth p. 300. N. 8. *That I condemn their Meritum ex condigno, and placing Justification in such Works as are rather Evil than Good*; and yet p. 305. he asks, *wherein I differ from the worst Papists? Papists*: So then such as assert *Meritum ex Condigno*, and those other things denied by me, are not in his Sence the *worst Papists*: Let him reconcile this with the general Sence of *Protestants*. Yea, with great Bitterness he quarrelleth with me for wronging the *Papists*, p. 301. calling it *a base Falshood and Deceit in me to say, Papists do not place Justification in any real Inward Renovation of the Soul*; Citing the Words of the Council of *Trent* and *Bellarmin* to the contrary. But he must know, if he will, I will not be cheated by the fair Words of *Papists*, contrary to what mine Ears have heard, and Eyes seen to be the general Practice of their People and Preachers, and that in a Kingdom where their Superstition

1679.



J.B.'s Pa-  
tronizing the  
Papists.

1679. *W*stition less abounds, than any Place of their Territories. I know, they place more Virtue towards the *Inward Renovation in the Soul* in such things as are justly condemnable, than in Obedience to Christ's Precepts: And were it not, that he is even glad to Patronize the *Papists*, that he might get some Occasion to rail against me, he could not but acknowledge this; since he cannot be ignorant (whatever Distinctions and fair Words they have invented now to smooth their Doctrine) that all the first Reformers do with one Voice affirm, That before the Reformation there was a profound Silence of any thing, save their Superstitious Works, Pilgrimages and Indulgences in the Point of Justification, not only as to making just, but even as to Remission of Sins, which they asserted to be attained by such Means. Yet this Man's Charity can extend to palliate their Hypocrisy, that he may accuse me; while yet in the same Page, as to me, he lays aside all his Charity, alledging most abusively, "That it is but good Words I give them about the Satisfaction of Christ, and that I deceive them with *Socinian* Glosses and Metaphorical Sences:" Which is a gross Calumny. Like to which is his Calumny, p. 317. where he saith, *The Quakers talk of Christ's Sufferings and Death, &c. as all done within Man.*

*Papists Pilgrimages and Indulgencies.*

¶ 2. That the Reader may not be interrupted in the thorough Examination of this Point by his Calumnies, Perversions and malicious Insinuations, which he bestows throughout most of his Work to squeeze out my Words, that he may render me either odious or ridiculous; I will remove them in the first Place, e're I come to the main Matter. Of this kind is what he saith p. 297. where he plays upon me, saying, *That Justification is not by our Work or Works, considered by themselves:* As if this were a mighty Absurdity

*Good Works in what Respect they help to Justification.*

dity to say, *Works wrought in a Man could in any Sense not to be called his*; which he reckons *Phanaticism in Folio*. But if this be so, he must accuse Christ and the Apostle Paul of this *Phanaticism*, and it shall not much trouble me to be accounted guilty with them, albeit I lie under *J. B's* Censure for it. For Christ saith to his Apostles, *Matt. 10. 20. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you*: and *Mark 13. 11. — for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost*: yet they uttered the Words. He must either here confess his Shame (albeit he term me a *shameless Man*) for saying, That *Christ's Words confirm it*; or else condemn Christ: Was not this *Speaking* a Work of the Apostles? And doth not Christ say, *It is not they*? And dare he call this a Contradiction? So then he may see, in what Respect good Works, considered otherwise than as merly the Works of Men, help in Justification: See also *1 Cor. 15. 10. — But I laboured more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the Grace of God which was with me*. So here the Apostle's Labour is ascribed to the *Grace*; so as he saith it was not he: And yet this Man asketh *p. 248. "If to be justified by Christ within, be not to be justified by our Works?"* Adding (to render me odious) "especially seeing, this is *Christ formed within, and not Christ who laid down his Life a Ransom for Sinners, which Christ in our Account (he saith) cannot cleanse nor do any good*:" Which is a gross Calumny. But the Evil he intendeth here to us returneth upon his own Head. For if to assert *Christ formed within*, be to assert another Christ than died and suffered, then the Apostle was guilty of this Crime, *Gal. 4. 19. — I travail in Birth again, until Christ be formed in you*: yea, he calls *Christ within, the Hope of Glory*, *Col. 1. 28*. Will he thence dare to say, the Apostle held another Christ

Christ formed within is he that died and suffered.

1679. Christ than he that died? And let him prove, if he can, that in our speaking of *Christ formed within*, we say more than the Apostle. Another of his Calumnies is, p. 302. where, because I say, *That all have sinned that come to Man's Age*, therefore I deny, that the wicked Actions of such as are not come to be Men and Women are Sin; which is utterly false: As I never said so, so I never intended, as he maliciously affirms, to insinuate any such thing. Pag. 303, 304. he would screw my Words speaking of a *twofold Redemption*, (whereof the first is, the *Capacity of being Redeemed purchased by Christ without*, and the *Receiving of and Enjoying that wrought by Christ in us*) to make an Absurdity, because I say, *That as to us they cannot be separated: Then all must be Redeemed the one way, who are Redeemed the other; and that then every Man must be Redeemed from the Power of Corruption, and saved.* But here according to his Custom he cites not my Words justly, which are [*That they are both perfect in their own Nature, albeit in their Application to us-ward they cannot be separated*] that is, he that comes effectually to enjoy the Benefit of the One, must enjoy the other; he that receives the Second, partakes of the first also; he that really receives the First, receives the Second also: But that hinders not, but many may be offered the Benefit of the First, and by rejecting and resisting it, lose the Benefit both of First and Second; and he that rejecteth it at any time, albeit he receive it for a Season, as by his Falling he loses what of the Second is wrought in him, to wit, of *Purification*, so he doth also lose the First, which was *Remission of Sin*. His last Cavil at this is very impertinent, which is by way of Question; *That if this Second Redemption be necessary to Salvation (as indeed it is) what shall become of the Child of God that hath no*  
*Light?*

A Two-  
fold Redem-  
ption pur-  
chased and  
wrought by  
Christ.

“Light? What shall become of them that have 1679.  
 “true Grace uniting them to Christ, &c. and yet  
 “through Darknes can see and acknowledge no  
 “such thing?” For to pass by the Absurdities 7. B's Ab-  
 here supposed, that Saints can be said to have no surdities,  
 Light, or have Grace and be United to Christ, that Saints  
 yet neither be able to see it nor acknowledge it, may be Uni-  
 and that not during their Life-time here; for un- ted to Christ  
 less this be also supposed, he cannot conclude what and not see  
 he will: For that a Saint may be clouded at a it.  
 Time, is not denied; yet this maketh nothing  
 for his Purpose. Will it follow, because they see  
 it not, that it therefore is not needful to their  
 Salvation? His own Words imply a Contradicti-  
 on to this. And thus the Man confutes that, by  
 which he would urge another, in the very Words  
 by which he expresses it; For *is not Grace to u-*  
*nite the Heart to Christ necessary to Salvation?* He  
 will surely say, *Yes*: If then the Acknowledg-  
 ment of that, and seeing of it, which is needful  
 to Salvation, be not needful, then the not-seeing  
 or not acknowledging of a thing makes it not a  
 thing unnecessary to Salvation; which is the Ab-  
 surdity he would insinuate.

¶ 3. Thus having removed out of the Way his  
 most obvious Perversions and Abuses, I come to  
 treat of the main Matter, which all depends up-  
 on this one Question; *What is that whereby a Man*  
*is justified, so as to appear truly Just in the Sight*  
*of God?* This he supposes to be done by the *Righ-*  
*teousness and Death of Christ without, even before*  
*any work of Righteousness be wrought in Man; e-*  
*ven as a Cautioner* (to whom he compares Christ  
 in this Case) *frees him whose Debt he pays.* I on  
 the contrary affirm, “That albeit Reconciliation  
 “and Remission of Sins be by the Death of Christ  
 “without, and the Door opened, so that all may  
 “be at Peace by the Offer of Grace made in  
 “Christ, if they reject it not, yet hereby no Man  
 “can By the  
Death of  
Christ no  
Man can be  
said to be ju-  
stified, until  
Christ receiv-  
ed in the  
Heart, there  
renew and  
make him  
Just.

1679. “ can be said to be Justified, or appear Just properly, until Christ be received in his Heart, there to renew and purify him, and make him just : So that however Justification may be distinguished from Sanctification, yet not divided ; nor yet so distinguished, that a Man can be truly said to be Justified, who is Unholy and Unsanctified. ” And therefore upon the Examining of what he urges against this, and for his Position, as also what he answers to my Probations for it, depends the whole Matter: But before I enter particularly upon this, and that there may no Interruption meet me, when entred in it, I will first take Notice and remove his Mistakes and misapplied Proofs thereupon, both in what he opposes me and affirms for himself ; as also here take Notice of his meer Assertions. And first then, p. 299. he supposes, *There can be no Reconciliation by the Blood of Christ’s Cross, &c. unless for such in whose Room Christ died, as a Cautioner and Surety, and so made Satisfaction that they should be Redeemed and Delivered.* But albeit upon this Notion and Affirmation all depends, yet I miss the Proof of it ; if his After-Proofs say any think to it, I shall examin them : That which he mentions here written *Rom. 8. 3, 4.* is so far from doing it, that it proves the contrary. For albeit the Death of Christ was, that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us ; yet it follows not, that the Righteousness of the Law must be *fulfilled in all for whom he died* ; yea, the following Words, — *who walk not after the Flesh, but after the Spirit,* shew this to be the Condition requisite on our Part, that we may partake of the Benefit of his Death. If to prove that Man should be reconciled, redeemed and delivered by the Death of Christ, he bring the Instances of the Righteousness of the Law to be *fulfilled in us* ; then Men cannot be said to be reconciled

The Benefit of Christ’s Death is to them that Walk after the Spirit.

ciled

cil'd, redeem'd and deliver'd by the *Death of Christ*; 1679. he brings the Instances of the *Righteousness of the Law to be fulfilled in us*; then Men cannot be said to be reconciled, redeemed and delivered, until this *Righteousness of the Law* be fulfilled in them. What he addeth to this, *That we cannot be said to be accounted Righteous, and absolved from Accusation upon the Account of our works of Righteousness*, I say no such thing; freely Confessing, that not only Pardoning of Sin, but Removing of the Filth as well as of the Guilt, is the Act of God's Mercy and Grace, as saith the Apostle, *Tit. 3. 5, 6.* And yet we are Saved, and consequently Justified according to his Mercy by the Washing of Regeneration: since this is the Fruit of the Grace and Spirit of God freely given us. And therefore it is not enough for him p. 203. to affirm, *That I pervert the Apostle's Words*, 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20.— *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself*, upon this bare Supposition, *That this [World] is only understood of the Elect*: For if this Reconciliation had been absolute, and not in Part only, that is, a Readiness on God's Part to be reconciled with them, if they repent, which I affirm; to what Purpose should the Apostle, as an Ambassador, intreat them to be reconciled? There needed no Intreaty to that which was already done: Neither are his meer Assertions to this, pag. 303. any Answer. It is strange, that to prove, *That all, for whom Christ died, are certainly made alive one Time or other*, he brings these Words, *And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, &c.* For he doth not say here, *That All he died for are made alive*, but that they that are made alive should so live: Neither doth the Saying, *Christ has born the Sins of all in his own Body on the Tree*, import any being actually freed of the Guilt of Sin, un-

The Removing both Filth and Guilt of Sin is the Act of God's Grace and Mercy.

1679. til they receive the Condition, as above; *Be ye therefore reconciled unto God.* But he overturns what he earnestly pleaded for before, p. 310. N. 23. where he saith, *They own not, that Reconciliation was so perfected by Christ on Earth, that there is nothing to be done by Man in Order to his Actual Justification:* If so, then no man is actually Justified, until *something* be done by him; and this Doing imports a Work: So here a Work of Man is necessary for Justification; and this is rather more than I say. And if Something be to be done on Man's Part, e're Actual Justification be obtained; then that which is done by Christ before must be only a *Potential Justification*: and what is this more than a Capacity of being justified? Which yet he batters against in me; and yet he must confess this, to distinguish himself from the *Antinomians*, whose Opinions, albeit he divers times disclaims, yet he shews not how he can liberate himself from it: And therefore in Contradiction to what is here observed, both his Assertions and Proofs resolve in the *Antinomian Doctrine*, and conclude for it as much as for him; which I might therefore pass all, as impertinent. But for Instance, his great Example of a *Cautioner* or *Surety*, used often, as *Pag.* 299, 310, 311. for when a Cautioner pays a Man's Debt for him, so soon as he lays down the Money, which is a sufficient Intimation to him to whom the Debt is due, the Person for whom it is paid is really acquitted; albeit he have done no Act, yea, know not of it: And this, as I observed before, himself acknowledgeth in the Application, saying p. 304. *That some who are united to Christ by Grace* (and surely such are Justified) *can neither see it nor acknowledge it.* So then, if this Example of his *Surety* hold true, Men are *Justified* before they *Believe*, as say the *Antinomians*; and therefore all the Scriptures brought by him, p. 308. to prove,


7. B.  
proves to be  
one with the  
*Antinomian*  
*Doctrines.*

The *Antinomians* im-  
putative Ju-  
stification  
Refuted.

That



That Christ made a proper, real and full Satisfaction in the Behalf of Men, will conclude for the Antinomians, as much as for him: whereas p. 314. he looks upon it as a Calumny to say, *They speak not of a real Justification*; for he concludes p. 312. That *Imputative Justification is real*. He argues for the Antinomians also, since he accounts this Imputation to be only of Righteousness wrought without Men by Christ in his own Person; for if by this Imputation Men be really Justified, then they are as much, or at least as really Justified before they believe, as after; since Faith is an Act of Man's Will, and no such thing according to him can have Place in Justification: And yet (to go round) he saith, p. 308. That they say not, *That God Justifieth any remaining in their Sins*. But do they not say so? Since taking his Opinion the safest Way and furthest from Antinomians, he concludeth a Man justified in the Act of Conversion? And such he supposes to have been great Sinners; yea, and that they may not be purged from them many Years after: yea, and how can they, if they must *Sin daily* (as they say) in *Thought, Word and Deed*? (of which more hereafter:) Are not such then *Remaining in their Sins*, according to them Justified? Pag. 306. N. 26. he would infer a Contradiction upon me from saying, *Good Works are necessary as Causa sine qua non*: For this (he saith) contradicts my saying, *We are justified by the Inward Birth, and not by our Works*, seeing *Works*, being but the Consequence of that *Birth*, are but the Effect; even as *Causa sine qua non*— must be before the Effect: on which he also insists, p. 319. n. 38. But this Contradiction is founded upon the Supposition, that this Birth is brought forth without Good Works, which I deny; seeing *Regeneration* is a Work of the Spirit in us, by which we are *justified*, that is, *really made just*; and the Works which proceed there-

1679.   
*Good Works*  
 are the Con-  
 sequence or  
 Effect of  
*Regenera-*  
*tion*

1679. from are but a Consequence of it. And now as to his Proofs, and also his Examining of mine, they are inserted *pag. 204. n. 13.* where he saith; That *the Redemption of Christ is a far other thing, and hath far other Effects, than to make Men capable of Salvation, even Remission of Sins.* But I never denied, but that it brought Remission of Sins to such as embrace and receive it; neither do the Scriptures cited by him prove more, *2 Cor. 5. 19. Dan. 9. 24-26. Col. 1. 19, 20. Ephes. 1. 11-15. Job. 17. 2. Heb. 9. 12, 13. 2 Cor. 1. v. 20.* none of which speak of the Reconciliation made by Christ to be in it self more, than procuring a Capacity of Salvation otherways than as received and laid hold on by Believers: and when it is spoken of with Respect to such, I never denied, but it was more; for the Capacity is brought unto Action. He addeth, *The very Texts cited by my self make against me, Ephes. 2. 15. He died to make in himself of twain one new Man; so making Peace: ver. 13. but now in Christ Jesus, ye who sometimes were far off, are made nigh by the Blood of Christ; Asking, Was this only a Capacity of coming near? But the Apostle here speaks of those who had received, and not resisted the Benefit of that Capacity. And whereas he saith 1 Job. 4. 10. The Son of God's being said to be a Propitiation for our Sins, is more than a meer Possibility of Friendship. But doth not the same Apostle say, He is a Propitiation for the whole World? Yet he did not actually Reconcile the whole World, save in a Capacity. Ezek. 16. 6. he giveth a Question instead of Answer, 1 Pet. 2. 24. Who his own self bare our Sins in his own Body on the Tree, that we being dead to Sins, should live unto Righteousness, by whose Stripes ye were healed: Noting 1 Pet. 3. 18. Christ hath once suffered, that he might bring us to God; but it saith not, that Christ by his Sufferings did bring us to God, which would have more made*

Reconciliation made by Christ laid hold on by Believers.

for his Purpose: And though it had been so, yet neither that, nor what is above-cited, prove any thing, being spoken to those who had received the Second Redemption, as well as the first. Then he notes these following, *Col. 1. 14. Gal. 1. 4. 3: 13, 14. 4: 5. Rev. 5. 9, 10. and 14. 3, 4. Tit. 2. 13.* all which I have looked, but find not that they prove what he intends; some were spoken not only to those, who had already received the Benefit of Christ's Death here; but of such as were already glorified in Heaven, if he think, they will prove his Matter, he must shew *How?* the next time he writes.

¶ 4. *Pag. 309. N. 21.* He brings my Argument shewing, That *where there is a perfect Reconciliation, there is no Separation*: Why doth God then so often complain of his People for their Sins? From this it would follow, that Sin made no Separation, or that their *good Works* and *worst Sins* are the same in God's Account. His Answer to this is, *That a Man may be in a Justified State, and declared Just, because constituted so; albeit unrighteous as to his Person, because of his unrighteous Actions, in which Sense he is not justified nor approved of God*: That is (in plain Scots) to say, *God constituteth and declareth Men Just, albeit they be wicked Men, and really Unjust*; the first being understood of their Condition, the second of their Person. But the Misery is, there wants something to knit this incoherent Matter together, and inform us, *How a Man as to his Condition is Just, while in his Person Unjust?* And indeed, he brings no Proof for all this. And albeit I wonder not at this Omission, since he could do no better; yet I desire, he may let me know the next time, why I should receive his Answer without Proof? That every Sin which may be committed by a Saint, doth not Unfaint him, or destroy his Condition, I acknowledge; but they suppose *no Sin* to do it: For when they

1679.

*J. B's Faith, That God declares Men just, whilst in their Wick- edness.*

1679 affirm, Murther, and Adultery, and Treachery not to have done it, (as they do) If these Sins are not destructive and killing, as to Man's Condition, I know none; and desire to be informed, how by Scripture it can be made appear, that these do not? So my Argument still remains in Force, and his Charge of *Antinomianism* against me falleth to the Ground. Pag. 311. he brings my Argument, shewing the Absurdity of their Objection from 2. Cor. 5. 21. thus; *If we be just, as Christ was a Sinner by Imputation, then as there was not the least Sin in Christ, so there is no Necessity for the least Righteousness in us*: To which he answers, *Neither is there to our being justified upon that Account.* The Reader may judge of this Doctrine, which the Man either forgetting or being ashamed of, plainly contradicts in the same Page, saying, *That Sanctification is inseparably joined with Justification*: for then sure Righteousness must be necessary to be justified upon whatever Account. And yet to go round again, within five Lines he cites *Job. 6. 29. and 9. 35, 36. and 10. 38. and 12. 36. and 14. 1. and 16. 9.* to prove, *That Christ would have People resting upon a Righteousness meerly Imputative for Justification*; for that is the thing denied by me: For if Sanctification be inseparable from Justification, it is impossible to rest upon that which is meerly *Imputative*. That these Scriptures prove no such thing, the Reader may see: All of them press *Believing* in Christ; but that to believe in Christ is to rest upon a Righteousness meerly Imputative, remains yet for him to prove. But to proceed with an unparallel'd Confidence to answer to my saying, ["That to my Observation that Sentence [*The imputed Righteousness of Christ*] which they so much urge as the Foundation of their Faith, is not to be found in all the Scripture"] he noteth divers Places of Scripture, in not one of which there is any

7. B's  
gross Opini-  
on of Impu-  
tative Righ-  
teousness.

Sanctifica-  
tion is inse-  
parable from  
Justification.

any such Thing. And indeed this Controversy 1679.  
 being of Matter of Fact, can be easily decided by any that can Read, who can easily see whether that Expression be there or not: For the Question is of the Expression *in Terminis*, not of what he apprehendeth, may by Consequence import the like. What he saith in Answer to my proving, Justifying to be understood of being *really made just*, from 1 Cor. 6. 11. he overturneth himself in a few Lines, confessing, That the *Corinthians* were *really changed*; and if so, we need not doubt, where it is said, *They were justified*, but they were *really made just*, that is, Changed from Unrighteousness, as he confesseth they were.

¶ 5. Pag. 312. N. 26. He cometh to take Notice of what I urge from the Word *Justification*, and from the *Etymology* of it; and having introduced himself with a Scoff, he saith, *I do place this upon the Authority of the Vulgar Latin Edition*; but therein he is mistaken: The *Greek Word δικαιώω, δικαιοῶ*, will make as much for my Purpose as the *Latin. Justifico*. He passeth from the *Etymology*, p. 313. and saith; *The Words usually import a Juridical Absolution by the Sentence of a Judge*: But what then? Is not that, because Judges usually at least *Absolve* Men upon the Account of their Innocency? And so his Comparison of a *Surety* will not here hit: For when Men are accused of Murther, or Adultery, or Theft, and that the Case is proved and confest; what Judges use to declare the Person acquitted upon Surety given by another Innocent Person? And therefore *Justifico, I justify*, signifies the *declaring of one just* who is so: And tho' *Justifico*, as being sometimes taken in a *Law Sence*, doth not in the *Indicative* answer to *sanctifico*, because it is there *Active*, and has Relation to another Person; yet in the *Passive*, when relating to the Person Sanctified, it is understood one Way: for *Justificatus* and *Sanctificatus* signify the same.

To justify signifies the declaring of one just, who is so.

1679. But he overturneth all his Quibbling here p. 313.

N. 27. by asking, *Whether they say, That a Man is said to be justified, who is not really just?* Which imports, they say not so; and then we are agreed. Only I would ask him, How a Man is really just, while committing actual Wickedness and Unrighteousness, as to his Person? And yet he said before, Such were Justified; and yet in the next, p. 314. he saith, *I maliciously calumniate them, to say, they make use of the Figurative Sence of the Word: Let the Reader judge of these Consistencies!* And whereas I cite some Scriptures, that *Justifying* is spoken of some, who arrogate Righteousness to themselves, though it do not belong to them; and at these he carpeth, saying, *The very first (Exod. 23. 7.) is spoken of God himself (he should have said, It is God speaking of the Wicked that he will not justify them) some of them speak of a Not Justifying, Joh. 9. 20. and 27. 5. And what then? The Places were marked to shew the Import of the Word Justify, and to shew, that many of them speak nothing of Justifying at all; whence he concludes in these Words: So unhappy is the Man in his Citations. He notes first, Isai. 5. 23. but it seems, he has been in haste; and therefore to rectify his Mistake, let him read the Words, which are; Which justify the Wicked for Reward. And what! though where many Scriptures are noted together, by the Mistake of the Transcriber or Printer, the Figures may be misplaced, and so miss? Truly, they must be very happy, that can secure themselves from this Hazzard: he has not been so happy, who denied the Words to be in a Place, where the Knowing of it depended not upon the Diligence of others, but of his own looking to it; as I have just now shewn. Page 315. to prove, That *Justified* is not taken in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, for Making Just, as I affirmed*

in the Passages cited by me, he saith, *To take it so, would make the Apostle contradict himself*: But this he affirms upon the meer Supposition, that the Apostle with him *Excludes all Works* from Justification; which is but to beg the Question, as will after appear. What he adds here and in the following Page, in Answer to the Citations I bring out of divers *Protestant Authors*, I need not trouble the Reader with a Reply to it; because he turns by the most material of them, as not having the Authors by him to examin them. Others he positively rejects, as not agreeing with them, as *Forbes* and *Baxter*: And at last insinuates, that the *Trial* is not to be by *Human Testimonies*; for such he accounts all the Writings of his Brethren, whereunto I do very well agree: Only I brought some of his own Folks, not as if I needed them to confirm me in my Opinion; but as having Weight with those, among whom they are esteemed Doctors. In this Page Answering, what I urge from *Rom. 8. 30.* shewing, How in that Golden Chain *Sanctification* must be excluded, or *Justification* must be taken in its proper Sence; he saith, That *Sanctification is comprehended under Vocation*. If this be true which he asserts, then he gives again away his Cause; for then no Man is sooner called, than he is *sanctified*: and since he will not say, (seeing he disclaims to be an *Antinomian*) that any Man is *justified* before he be called; it follows then necessarily, That *no Man is Justified before he be Sanctified*; and then to what Purpose has he been fighting and wrestling all this while? *Pag. 216. N. 33.* he accuses me of *Unparallel'd Falshood, Impudency and Boldness* for saying, That I have sufficiently proved, that by [*Justification*] ought to be understood [*to be made really Just*]; whereas I undertook only to prove, that the Word might be so understood without Absurdity: Adding, *I wonderfully conclude a*

No Man is justified, before he be sanctified.

[must

1679. [must be] *from a* [may be] &c. But the best is, his greatest Charges are built either upon forged Calumnies, or his own pitiful Mistakes. I never concluded, by *Justification* ought to be understood *to be made really just*, only upon that which I said from the *Etymology* of the Word; nor by [*Justification*] there did I understand meerly the Word; but I conclude from all my Scripture-Arguments of the thing, as my following Words manifest, where I say, *We know it from sensible Experience*: But he may be sure, it is not the *Etymology* of the Word we know so. And if thence he urge, *That this falleth not under the inward Sensation of the Soul*; he but fights with his own Mistake: For that the *Real Justification* of the Saints falleth under the *Inward Sensation* of the Soul, I think no Man of Sence will deny; for Christ is formed in the Mind, where he is said to be *Revealed Inwardly*, and that gives a Sense of *Justification*: Albeit he seem to wonder at it, asking, *What Scripture speaketh so?* He may read *Gal. 1. 16*. Whether was not the Apostle here Justified, and under the Sense of it? He is angry (*p. 317.*) that I call the *Life of Christ* an *Inward and Spiritual Thing*; but will he say, it is an *Outward and Carnal Thing*? But what thinks he of *2 Cor. 4. 10, 11*? He confesseth, *This Life of Christ supported and carried the persecuted Apostles through many Miseries and Deaths*; Will he say then, it was not an *Inward and Spiritual Thing*, that carried them through these Tryals? But he addeth, *But who except a Quaker could say, That the Apostle says, We are Justified by this Life?* I answer, *All*; except such absurd Men, as will deny, that where we are said to be Saved by a Thing, we are said to be Justified by it. *Rom. 5. 10. Tit. 3. 5.* we are said to be *saved by Regeneration*. And whereas he saith, *The Apostle saith not, That this is the formal, Objective Cause of Justification*: These are

Words

The Life  
of Christ is  
an Inward  
and Spiritual  
Thing.



Words the Apostle useth not at all; and therefore no wonder there be no Word of it here. He looks upon it, as being absurd for me to think, that *Reprobation is Non justification*; but I would know of him, if there be any Reprobates who are Justified? That the Marks and Evidences are not always taken from the Immediate, Nearest and Formal Cause, I confess; but that therefore the *not having Christ revealed in the Soul*, is only a Sign, and no Cause of Reprobation, remains for him to prove. Wickedness is a Sign of Reprobation, will he therefore affirm, it is not the Immediate nor Formal Cause of it? After the same Manner he denieth, p. 319. That *we must lean to that which the Apostle calleth* (Col. 1. 27, 28.) *Christ within the Hope of Glory*; his Reason is, because the Apostle saith, *Phil. 1. 28. And in nothing terrified by your Adversaries, which is ——— to you an evident Token of Salvation*, asking, *Must we also lean to that in Justification?* But will he say, there is no Difference betwixt that which is only a Token, and Christ within? If there be, his Reason concludes nothing.

¶ 6. *Lastly*, He comes to answer, what I say of the Necessity of *Good Works* to Justification: And what I urge from *Isai. 2.* he confesseth, that *good Works are an Instrumental Cause*; which Concession doth prove all I affirm: If they be an Instrumental Cause, they must be a Cause *sine qua non*, and necessary; since the Instrumental Cause of a Thing must be necessary towards its Being: What! though *Abraham* was Justified before he offered up his Son, it will not follow, that he was Justified without Works. His Absurdity, as if it would thence follow, *That no Man is Justified when he sleeps, or is not actually doing some Work*; looks liker the Objection of a Man Sleeping, who knows not what he saith, than of one awake: for by the same way it might be said, that Faith is


1679.  
The Cause of Reprobation.

The Necessity of good Works to Justification.

1679. is not necessary, since Men do no more actually believe, than do good Works, when they are Sleeping. My Argument deduced from *Heb.* 12. 14. *Matth.* 7. 21. *John* 13. 17. *1 Cor.* 7. 19. *Revel.* 22. 14. he says, proves the *Necessity of Works unto final Salvation, but not to Justification*; and if it do so, it doth the Business, unless he will say, That full and perfect Justification is not sufficient to Salvation. My Answer to their first Objection he observes, but replies not: To the Second, answering what they urge from *Rom.* 3. 20.— *By the Deeds of the Law there shall no Flesh be justified*; which I shew, is to be understood of Works done and not by the Grace of God: He answers, *That such are no good Works at all.* But may not a Man do *some* of the Works, which even the Moral Law commands, such as not to commit Murther, Theft or Adultery, without the Grace of God? Hath not he confessed as much of some *Heathens*, whom he judgeth not to have had the Grace of God? And will he say, these Works are not materially good, albeit not formally, with a Respect to any Advantage as to Salvation, they receive by them? And though it should be confessed, That *all* is not always requisite to be Antecedent to Justification, which falls out to be Antecedent to Salvation; yet the Question is, Whether there be any thing absolutely requisite to be Antecedent to Salvation, which is not also absolutely requisite to be Antecedent to Justification? If not, then if Works be absolutely necessary, or so far as they are absolutely necessary to Salvation, they must also be so to Justification. If he say other ways, then (as I observed before) full and perfect Justification according to him must not be esteemed sufficient to Salvation. Page 322. N. 42. He comes to prove the *best Works*, even those wrought by the Spirit in the Saints, to be *Impure*; which before also he had

Works of  
the moral  
Law justify  
not.

7. B. pleads  
the Works  
of the Spirit  
to be impure

had affirmed, pag. 307. there he would infer, we 1679.  
 say the same of Good Works, because I affirm, *That Works done by Man's own Strength are polluted.*   
 But it will not thence follow, we believe Works done by the Grace of God to be *such*. But for this Impurity of good Works he marks *Psal. 143. 2. 130. 3. Job 9. 16.* none of which speak one Word of good Works thus understood. Then he mentions *Isaiah 64. 6. All our Righteousness is as filthy Rags*; but silently passeth over, how I shew their own Authors, as *Calvin and Musculus, &c.* affirm this not to be understood of Evangelical Righteousness: and himself overturns what he urges from this, affirming, *That we ought not to call the Spirit of God in his People, Filthy Rags*: But if they were so, they might be so called; and yet he overturns it further, by confessing, *Some Works wrought by the Apostles were undefiled*; then all the Works wrought by the Spirit in the Saints cannot be said to be impure; which is their Assertion. And the Instance of *clean Water* passing through an *unclean Pipe* doth not hold; which is their great Probation. He will not contend with what I say about the Word *Merit*, neither hath he much against my Conclusion in this Matter; yet that he may end this Chapter like himself, he concludeth it with a gross Lye and Railing, saying, *I affirm, A Man may be Regenerated without the least Help of the Grace of God*: which as I wholly abhor, so there cannot be a greater Falshood alledged upon me.

Works of the Spirit to be pure and undefiled, confessed by J. B.

J. B's gross Lye.

1679.

## S E C T. IX.

*Wherein his Fourteenth Chapter of Perfection is Considered.*

¶ I. **I** Come now to his Fourteenth Chapter of *Perfection*, where, after he has repeated my Eighth Proposition, he reckons it Confidence in me, to accuse their Answer in their larger *Catechism*, of speaking against the *Power of Divine Grace*, which saith, *That Man is not able by any Grace of God received in this Life to keep the Commands of God*: But instead of Justifying this Assertion, he saith, *They are not ashamed of it*. Then he recurrerh a little to his Author *Hicks*, according to his Custom, and falls a Railing; where among other great Charges he accuseth the *Quakers* of *Reproaching, Reviling, Calumnies, Scolding*, and the like: Also pag. 329. speaking of *bridling the Tongue*; but he of all Men should have been silent in this, who is such a Railer in the Superlative Degree, that some of his own Faith, who have had enough Thoughts of the *Quakers*, have said, that he not only *Equals them*, but *Exceeds them* in Railing: Of his Railing in this Chapter the Reader may further observe, p. 332, 345-349. Here, as in his former Chapter, to enervate the *Perfection* asserted by me, he brings forth his Old and often-repeated Calumny, as if I asserted this Perfection to *proceed meerly from the Light of Nature*, affirming, The *Light* pleaded for by me, p. 227. to be *such, as never came from the Grace of God*; to be *Flesh, Blindness, Enmity to God, Natural, Sensual, &c.* affirming, that I say, “Man is Regenerated, Sanctified, Justified, though not one Ray of Divine Illumination hath shined into his Soul, nor one Act of Grace has reached

J. B. a Railer exceeding others, confessed by his own Party.


His false Charges.

"reached either his Intellect, Will or Affection 1679.  
 "to cause this Change: The like p. 331. All which is most abominable false, and never either believed or asserted by me; and therefore all he concludes upon this Malitious Assertion, falls to the Ground and needs no further Answer. Next, he bestows much Pains, p. 328, 329. to shew from the *Hebrew* and *Greek* Word, that Perfection is sometimes understood of *Sincerity* and *Integrity*: and Perfection in these Respects he thus defines: "In Regeneration the whole Man is changed, so that he is now born a New Creature, Sanctified wholly in Mind, Heart, Spirit, Affections, Conscience, Memory and Body, though but in a small Measure or Degree." And again, "Yeilding impartial Obedience, through the Grace of God, unto all God's Precepts, waving none." But if he will stand by what he here asserts, I will desire no more; albeit he falsely say in the following Page, *That all this will not satisfy Us*: For I would desire the next time, he would reconcile this with *Breaking the Commands daily in Thought, Word and Deed*. To prove this he insists (in Contradiction to what he said before) p. 330. N. 7. and his Proofs are, (1.) *Because in Christ's House there are divers Sizes and Degrees of Persons*, as *Babes*, or *little Children*, *Young Men*, *Old Men*: And this is not denied; but the Thing he should have proved is, That none of those Degrees can be without daily Breaking God's Commands. His Second Proof is yet more rare: *Christians are exhorted to grow in Grace, to put off the Old Man which is corrupt, to put on the New Man, to mortify their Members*; Very good: But is *To break the Commands daily in Thought, Word and Deed*, the way to grow in Grace, to put off the Old Man, and on the New? If this be not to pervert Christianity, what can be said to be so? If Men can dream waking (as he sometimes supposes) he has

Perfection defined.

Breaking the Commands daily, &c. is not Perfection, nor a growing in Grace.

sure

1679.  fure been in this Posture, when he brought this Proof. But he adds, *That this Perfection rendereth Gospel Commands useles*: But are the Laws useles if Men obey them? *This*, saith he, *takes away the Exercise of Repentance, the Exercise of Prayer, and maketh the Petitions of the Lord's Prayer useles* [*Forgive us our Sins*:] On this he also insisteth pag. 345, 346-349. That because all have sinned, they have need to Repent, and pray for *Forgiveness*, and the Continuance of it I have shewn in my Apology: But if this his Argument hold true, to prove, *That Men must sin all their Life-time, and break the Commands every Day, in Thought, Word and Deed*, then the greatest Sinners and most wicked, profligate Villains do les make *useles* Gospel-Commands, than others, because they afford more Matter to exercise Repentance and Prayer for *Forgiveness of Sins*. But he proceedeth, “That this tendeth to foment Pride and Security, and taketh away diligent Watchfulness and Holy Fear, Humility, and the Usefulness of the Ordinances of Christ:” But where Freedom from Sin is, where can Pride and Security have Place, or Diligence and Humility be wanting? But with him *to sin* is the way *not to be proud and secure, but to be watchful and humble*. Let the Judicious Reader judge, whether they, that *break the Commands daily in Thought, Word and Deed*, and affirm, *They must do so all their Life-time*, be more diligent and humble, and *less* proud and secure, than such as keep and obey them? For such Ordinances, as must be made *useful* by daily Breaking God's Commands in Thought, Word and Deed, I resolve never to cry up, but always cry down by the Grace of God, however *J. B.* may rail at me for it. Some Scriptures here added by him will come hereafter to be Examined.

*J. B.* be-  
lieves Per-  
fection fo-  
ments Pride,  
and taketh  
away the  
Usefulness of  
Ordinances.

¶ 2. Pag. 332. N. 9. When he comes to take Notice of my stating this Matter, as not being such a Perfection, as cannot admit of a *daily Increase*, but only a being kept from Sin, and receiving Strength to fulfil the Will of God; (for these are my Words) he would upon this, both in this Place and elsewhere (pag. 333, 341, &c.) urge this Absurdity, "That since the least Sin is a Transgression of the Law, it follows, that no Regenerated Man can Sin, and that no Man that sinneth, is Regenerated:" But we will not wonder at his Inference here, considering his many other Perversions. But to shew, he has no Ground to urge this Absurdity, let it be considered, that we are to consider Regeneration as begun and carrying on, and as perfected and accomplished; — *be which hath begun a good Work in you*, saith the Apostle Paul, *Phil. 1. 6.* And again, *Ye did run well*, Gal. 5. 7. with many other Places, which might be mentioned: Whereby it is clear, That Regeneration is not wrought in an Instant (and if he think so, he must prove it, e're he conclude any thing from it) and those were already Converted, and Regeneration begun in them. Now albeit such may sin, and that every Sin doth hinder and impede the Work of Regeneration, yet it doth not destroy it, nor wholly annihilate it. Physick given to a Man, in whom there is an inward and inveterate Disease, doth not cure instantly; and albeit by some heedless Actions he may hinder the Cure from being perfected so soon, yet every one of these Actions do not render it altogether unsuccessful. Also as to the Comparison of a *Child*, which he accepts of, albeit he have all the integral Parts of a Man, yet he has not that Vigour and Strength of Body, nor yet that Understanding nor Exercise of Mind that a Man hath; and thence can neither defend himself,

1679.

Regeneration begun, carrying on and perfected.

Physick doth not Cure in an Instant.

A Child has not the Strength of a Man: So those that are born of God.

1679. self, nor do either in Body or Mind that a Man can do. Now what I speak of such as are born of God, saying, That I dare not affirm, but there may be *some that cannot Sin*; I understand this of absolute, compleat and full Regeneration: Not that I deny, but such as are Entred, and in Part Regenerated, may be also said to be *born of God*, though not in that absolute Sence; and therefore still under the Possibility of Sinning, and Capacity thereunto. And thus his great Absurdity, upon which he insists so much, is removed. Next he proceeds, p. 334. to shew my Agreement with the *Pelagians*; but the very Citation he brings to prove it out of *Vossius History*, bewrays his Weakness and shews the contrary: where it is manifest, that the thing Condemned in *Pelagius* was his Affirming, *Men might keep the Commands by the Power of Nature*; which I never said, but always denied. And whereas he cites the Fathers Saying, *That none by the Strength of Grace did live all their Days without Sin*; That *the Perfection ascribed to some in Scripture, was not from Nature, but from Grace, &c.* This clearly shews, they believed, Men might be free from Sin by Grace sometime, though none had been so far all their Life-time: Which shews they were far from believing, *Men must break the Commands daily in Thought, Word and Deed*, which is his Affirmation. What he adds of the Fathers Arguments against the *Pelagians*, and of the Opinions of the *Socinians* and others in this Matter, I judge it not my Work to meddle with it; I heed not in this what these *Sects* say, but believe the Truth (without Respect to them) as it is clearly proposed in Scripture. I could easily recriminate, by shewing things wherein he agrees with *Papists, Socinians, Arminians, Antinomians, Pelagians, Anabaptists* and others against us, if I judged it pertinent to be filling up Paper with such Stuff to make a Noise, as he doth

The Fathers  
believed a  
Freedom  
from Sin.




Hundreds of Times to nauseating; but I love to abstain from such Superfluities, and come to the Purpose; and will now consider what he saith in Answer to my Arguments. 1679.

¶ 3. He begins p. 337. n. 18. and to my saying, Their Doctrine is against the Wisdom of God, who is of purer Eyes than he can behold Iniquity, he asketh, *Is it against these Attributes of God, that Sin should be in the World?* But my following Words shew, I spake of the Godly; neither will it follow what he adds after, *That then they must be as free of Sin here, as in Heaven, and that at first*: for I urge it to be contrary to God's Wisdom, to make this Freedom impossible unto them only; Means for their being free being given them, and not his permitting Sin. And whereas he proceeds in Answer to my Saying, [That if Man be always joined to Sin, he should be always disjoined from God, according to *Isaiah 59. 2.* whereas on the contrary they, to wit, the Saints, are said to be Partakers of the Divine Nature, *2 Pet. 1. 4.* and one Spirit with him, *1 Cor. 6. 17.*] he answers, *All this would plead for a Sinlessness from the very first Instant of Regeneration*: In the absolute Sense above-mentioned it doth, as also for the Necessity of pressing after, and for the Possibility of obtaining it after Regeneration begun; since so far as Man is joined to Sin, his perfect Regeneration is retarded. Yet, as himself towards the End of this Paragraph saith, *It may be begun, where some Members may yet be to be mortified*: and albeit some Corruption be not wholly purged out, yet God can have Fellowship with his own Work of Grace in the Soul, and with the Soul, so far as it is sanctified and renewed, but no further. Page 339. N. 19. he saith, *I wickedly dispute for God, &c. to say,* [“It is against his Wisdom not to have found Means whereby he might be served, Regeneration begun, and Perfection on pressed after.

1679. “ but by such Actions, by which the Devil is no less, *yea, is more served.*] But his Charge is upon the naked Supposition, that *their Doctrine is the Truth*, which is pitifully to beg the Question. Yea, he indirectly (notwithstanding much winding about to avoid it) confesseth my Charge, saying, *There is no formal Service perform'd to the Devil*; so he grants some *Material Service* to be performed to him: Is not the Devil served, and that Service justly displeasing to God, unless it be a *formal Service*? For to serve the Devil formally, is to acknowledge him as their Master, and give him Service, as due to him; which many do not, who yet may be said truly enough to serve him. He addeth, *That God hath seen meet, his Children be in a Spiritual Warfare*: What then? Can no Man be in a Warfare, unless he be overcome? Men may be engaged in War, and may be liable to be assaulted, yea, may be often times narrowed, straitned, beset by the Enemy, and sometimes wounded, and yet never overcome: But what he pleads for, is not only a Warfare, but a being worsted and overcome, and that every Day; for so truly are such overcome by the Devil, who *daily break the Commandments of God in Thought, Word and Deed*, as he affirms of all God's Children. He goes on n. 20. to say, *I run myself blind, in saying, it is against God's Justice, to require Men to abstain from all Sin, and not enable them to do it; because it would prove, all the Wicked are perfect, for God requires of them Obedience.* But it seems, himself has been *blind* when he made this Answer: I never urged, that because God gave Men Power, therefore they are perfect, as he foolishly throughout this Paragraph imagineth; and then battereth against this Man of Straw of his own making. And that this proves, that wicked Men might, if they had not resisted God's Grace, have forsaken their

The Spiritual Warfare J. B. pleads for is not to overcome, but to break daily the Commandments of God in Thought, Word and Deed.

their Wickedness, and been perfect, I deny not ; 1679. 

neither doth he prove the contrary. He confesseth Man's *Imperfection* to be of themselves, but he thinks, it cannot be accounted *Unrighteousness* in God to require, and yet not to give that Measure of Grace, whereby Men should become perfect ; because that Power, which was once given, was sinfully cast away. But all this dependeth upon the Supposition, that Man lost his Power in *Adam* ; which was before discusst, and is now in him but a begging of the Question. And when I shew, " That their Doctrin<sup>e</sup> maketh God more unjust than the vilest of Men, who will not give " to their Children, asking Bread, a Stone, &c. he reproacheth me as a Blasphemous Tongue. But let us see, how he frees their Doctrin<sup>e</sup> of this foul Consequence: *The Lord forbid (saith he) they hope for a Deliverance, but it is in Heaven.* This Answer confirmeth the Charge, and doth not lessen it: And so for all his Brag, the Stone yet remains (according to them) instead of Bread, and is like to choak him, unless he find some better Way to digest it than thus ; for God requires to *forsake Sin here*, and yet (according to them) denies the Power *here* : for concerning being *free from Sin in Heaven*, there is no Question. He addeth, pag. 341. *That my saying, [Their Doctrin<sup>e</sup> is injurious to the Sacrifice of Christ's Death, which was To take away Sin,] destroys all I said of Universal Redemption* : but he forgets to shew, *How* ? Perhaps we may expect it next, since his 8th Chapter is already Answered. His saying, *They affirm, that the Stain of Sin is taken away, and Victory obtained*, doth not Answer, because they refer that to another Life ; and the Question is concerning this. And to my saying, That if the Children of God sin in Thought, Word and Deed daily, then there is no Difference betwixt the Holy and Prophane ; he answereth, *The Difference is great, because what*

*J. B's*  
Doctrin<sup>e</sup>  
makes God  
to give a  
Stone instead  
of Bread,  
&c.


1679. *the Wicked do, is done with full Purpose of Heart, &c. but the Other mourneth over and repenteth of his Sin.* This Difference is in Respect of *Repentance*, not of *Sinning*: in their *Sinning* they are both alike. That there is a Difference betwixt him that continueth in *Sin*, and him that repenteth, I deny not; but since he supposes the Godly to *continue in Sin all their Life time*, yea, *in daily Sinning*, the Similitude still remaineth: and such will do well to take heed, who *break God's Commands daily in Thought, Word and Deed*, lest notwithstanding they may be in *J. B's Account The Godly*, yet in *Jesus Christ's* they prove such, to whom it shall be said, *Depart, ye Workers of Iniquity, I know you not.*

J. B's  
Godly continue in Sin all their Life-time, and sin daily.

¶ 4. Pag. 343. N. 23. Instead of Answering my Argument shewing, Their Doctrine maketh the Work of the Ministry, Preaching and Praying, *useless*, he saith, *Hence we see the Necessity of a standing Ministry, which I am against.* This is false as shall appear. He adds, *The Ministry is to bring them on toward Perfection*; but the Question is, Whether that Perfection is not attainable here? For a Perfection that admitteth not of a Growth, I plead not. If he would have had this Answer understood to be to the Purpose, he should have said, *That such as sin not, cannot be said to admit of a Growth*; which he doth not so much as attempt, nor offer to prove. What I affirm to the contrary in the Example of Christ, who, notwithstanding he was always free of Sin, is said to *Increase in Favour both with God and Man*, Luk. 2. 52. To this mentioned in my Apology (notwithstanding his Prolixity) he is as mute as a Fish. How their Doctrine makes Prayers *useless*, I have shewn before: Instead of Answering Col. 4. 12. where *Epaphras* is said to *Labour fervently in Prayers, that the Colossians might stand perfect and compleat in all the Will of God*; and to 1 *Thess.* 3. 12,

Perfection prayed for, and Unblameableness, &c.

13. where

13. where *Paul* prays, That *the Lord* would make *1679.*  
*them increase and abound in Love, &c. to the End*   
*he might establish their Hearts unblameable in Ho-*  
*liness; I say, instead of Answering he makes*  
 Commentaries upon these Places (which in them-  
 selves are as plain as can be) that this is, *They*  
*should walk in Sincerity, and always be growing.*  
 And what if all this be granted? It will not fol-  
 low, that it is impossible Men should be free of  
 Sin here even by the Grace of God. And sure,  
 where Men are perfect and compleat in all the Will  
 of God, and unblameable in Holiness, they are  
 not Sinning daily in Thought, Word and Deed.  
 Thus the Reader may judge of this Man's Confi-  
 dence, who saith, *These Scriptures make against*  
*this Imagined Perfection,* meaning that which is  
 asserted by me. Pag. 343. he saith, *My affirming,*  
*Men are called Justified or Reprobated in Respect of*  
*their being leavened with Sin or Righteousness (fer-*  
*menting* is a Piece of his own Pedantry, and none  
 of the *Quakers* Dialect) *would prove full Perfection*  
*to be Essential to the State of Christianity.* There-  
 fore I must answer it, as well as they, who deny  
 that to be common to all the Regenerate. But it  
 seems, he has not well understood his own New-  
 Coined *English* Word [*fermenting* :] for one thing  
 is not said to be leavened with another, but where  
 it hath much prevailed: Every Touch or Taste  
 of a Thing doth not leaven him with it, that so  
 toucheth or tasteth it, as all Men that under-  
 stand common Language know: And so every  
 Sin is not enough to denominate a Man leavened  
 with Sin. And so with his own Answer that fol-  
 lows, he looseth the Knot he imagined I was tied  
 by. What he adds afterward of *Fulfilling the*  
*Law,* urges nothing, but upon a Supposition of  
 its being fulfilled by the meer Strength of Man;  
 which I never affirmed. That *no Man is called*

1679. *Just because of Inward Righteousness*, is but his bare Supposition: As for the Word *Inherent*, so often repeated by him, it is none of mine. And to my urging, That the *Subject* is denominated from the *Accident*, he saith, *Yet that a Wall is called white, though the Whiteness be not perfect*: But it is not called *white*, if it be more *black* than *white*; which was the Pinch I urged, but silyly overslip'd by him: And such must be those that *break the Commands daily*; for how *such* can be said to be more Just than Sinful, is more than I can reconcile either with Scripture or Reason: sure, the Answer which he gives doth it not. To this Question, *Where are then the Children of God and of Light?* His Reply is with a notable Piece of inconsistent *Presbyterian Canting*; "Even where these are, who are giving to Christ much Work (to speak so) to wash and make them clean from their daily Pollutions and Defilements, and have renounced the Works of Darknes, &c." I desire to know of him the next Time, how these can be said to have *Renounced the Works of Darknes*, who have need to be washed from their daily Defilements? To my Argument shewing, That *Christ's Command to be perfect, proves it possible*; he saith, pag. 344. That *this only proves, we should endeavour after it*: But for this he addeth no Proof; we must rest contented with his meer Affirmation: As we must also do throughout the next, N. 26. where he confidently preacheth his own Sence of Scripture, instead of Answer or Reason; and then concludes with a Railing Saying, *I am led by an Anti-Evangelical and Diabolical Spirit*. He saith, That *Matt. 7. 21. and some other Places cited by me, prove nothing, without supposing, that no Man shall be saved who ever sinned*; but without giving any Reason. That the Unconverted may be by the Grace of God Converted,

A Wall that is more black than white, can not be called white; so F. B's Breakers of the Commands daily, and yet such as have renounced the Works of Darknes.

verted, and consequently made *Perfect*, I deny 1679.  
 not. He saith, *Rom. 6. speaks only of the Domi-*  
*nion of Sin*: And what then? Doth not every Sin  
 bring him that commits it under the Power of  
 that Sin in so far? To the Instances of *Enoch*,  
*Noah* and others, whom the Scriptures call *perfect*,  
 he goes about to prove, they sometimes Sinned:  
 And what then? The Question is not, Whether  
 they always were without Sin? but Whether they  
 never were without it, and sinned daily? which  
 is his Affirmation: Which if they had done, they  
 could at no Time have been called perfect. As  
 for his other Glosses, it will be time to receive  
 them when he proves them; it is not enough to  
 make them Authentick with me, though *Augustin*  
 had approved: If he will subscribe to all *Augu-*  
*stin's* Glosses of Scripture, I may give him a fur-  
 ther Answer.

¶ 5. Pag. 346. N. 28. He comes to take Notice  
 of my Answers to their Arguments: And first to  
 my Answer to their Arguing from 1 *Job. 1. v. 8.*  
*If we say we have no Sin, we deceive our selves,*  
*&c.* That this will not prove, the Apostle includ-  
 eth more than *James c. 3. v. 9, 10.* He answereth,  
*The Apostle is included, though not for the present*  
*Time.* If it be not for the present Time, then it  
 will not plead for Sinning daily in Thought, Word  
 and Deed, which is the Case in hand. Next,  
 supposing the Apostle were not included, he saith,  
*It is enough that Believers are included*: But this  
 he affirms without Proof; troubling himself and  
 the Reader to prove, that those *John* wrote to,  
 were *Believers*, which no Body will deny: yet  
 though they were included, it will not prove such  
 a continual and daily Sinning, as they plead for.  
 In Answer to my shewing, the Words are,—*Have*  
*not Sin,* and not —*Ye Sin not*; he only proves,  
*That they did, or may sin*: which I deny not. And  
 then when I say, *It may be affirmed of the Seed*  
*of*

*Enoch,*  
*Noah, &c.*  
 call'd *perfect*  
 in Scriptures

*J. B's*  
 pretended  
 Proofs for  
 Sinning dai-  
 ly.

1679. of Sin, he concludes *This to be sinful, so as to affect the Man*; but minds not to prove it: And with this Manner of Begging the Question he concludes this Paragraph. Pag. 347. To my shewing, that in 1 Kings 8. 46. and Eccles. 7. 20. there is nothing said of *Sinning daily*, he answers, "It is express in Ecclesiastes [That there is not a just Man upon Earth, that doth good and sinneth not] clearly Importing, that even in their doing good they sin." But that this is clearly imported he affirmeth, but proveth not; though there be no Man that *Sinneth not*, it will not follow, they *Sin daily*. And for his Alledging, "That my Answer, [That it will not thence follow, that though there was none that did not sin at that Time, there are none such now, or that it is impossible there should be such] will infer, there was none then Regenerate, no not *Solomon* himself:" What if I should say so, understanding Regeneration in the absolute Sence? To what I shew from the *Hebrew Word*, that it may be interpreted, not that *sinneth not*, but that *may not sin*; he tells me in Sum, That *it is but Vanity, and this*, he saith, *is obvious to every Reader*; To whom we will then leave it. To my Affirming, That the Apostle is not (*Rom. 7. 14.*) speaking of himself, but personating others in that State, after he has told me, that *Socinians* and *Arminians* say so, he tells me, *The Circumstances of the Text evince the contrary*: and then gives a kind of a Preachment upon the Place, which I shall accept as a Declaration of his Sence, but must wait the next Time to have him prove it. He saith, *The Apostle doth not contradict this, Chap. 6. 2.* That the Apostle doth not contradict himself, is without doubt to me; but he must endeavour to reconcile the Meaning he gives to the Apostle's Words, when he has Leisure. He saith, *Paul in a Respect was a carnal Man*; but unless he

The Apostle's saying, *I am carnal,* &c. made a Plea for Sin by J. B. with his Meaning put without Proof.



he prove him to have been so in Respect of Sinning at that Time, he saith nothing. To my urging *Rom. 8. 35.* where the Apostle saith, *Nothing shall separate him;* because where Sin is continued, there is a Separation. He denieth, That *where Sin is striven and wrestled against, it maketh a Separation;* but the Matter is, How he proveth, that those who strive and wrestle against Sin, do daily commit Sin? And until he do this, he but begs the Question. To prove the Impossibility of being free from Sinning daily, from the Examples of *Noah's* and *David's* Sins, he useth this Argument :

*If these Men, whom the Spirit of God stileth Perfect, and Men according to God's Heart have had their Failings, and these Failings are registred for our Use; then we have no Scripture-Warrant for such a Perfection here, as is not attended with Sin: [he should have said, as doth not admit a Sinning daily in Thought, Word and Deed, if he would have concluded according to the State of the Question.]*

*J. B's Argument for Sinning daily in thought Word and Deed —*

*But the former is true: Therefore, &c.*

But I deny the *Consequence* of this Proposition, or the *Connexion* of the *Major* : Besides the Argument is defective divers Ways, if he had stated and then proved it, That if such, whom the Scripture call *Perfect*, did break the Commands daily in Thought, Word and Deed; then he had argued to the Purpose. And for their *Failings being recorded for our Use*, it cannot infer the Necessity of our *Sinning daily*, unless he will be so absurd as to say, that they are therefore *Recorded, that we may Imitate their Failings*, and not avoid them. In fine, let him cause his Argument conclude in the Term of the Question, to wit, That *every Man, notwithstanding any Grace received, must sin daily* — *Refuted.*

1679. *daily in Thought, Word and Deed*, and prove his Propositions, and he shall not want either an Acknowledgment, or an Answer. And lastly, to conclude this Chapter, he saith; "I should rather have cited the Old *Begardi*, than the Fathers, and the Old *Alumbrados*, who had the same Opinion, and Practices suitable." But if their Opinion was, That Men may be free from Sin, and their Practices *suitable*, sure then they were *perfect*; and if so, deserve more to be followed than *J. B.* or his Brethren, whose Principle and Practice (as himself confesseth) is for Sin, and daily continuing in it, against any Perfection, except such as can admit of Sin: For To be Breaking the Commands daily in Thought, Word and Deed, is Essential to his Christianity.

The Old *Begardi* and *Alumbrados* mentioned by *J. B.* to have the same Opinion of Perfection.

## S E C T. X.

*Wherein his Fifteenth Chapter Of Perseverance is Considered.*

¶ I. **I**N this Chapter of *Perseverance* it would seem, the Man fancieth he hath got into the Pulpit; for he affirms, as if all that read him, were *bound to believe* without further Inquiry. For after he has introduced himself with his old Accusation of *Pelagianism*, he concludeth, This *Doctrine of the Possibility of Falling from Grace to depend upon Free-will*; and utthereth in a long Inveective against this, as maintained by me upou the Supposition of his old, reiterated Calumny, "That I asserted, All the Regeneration of the Saints to proceed only from the Light of Nature, without the effectual Operation of the Spirit of Grace:" which how false it is, hath above  
been

been shewn. He giveth us a large Citation out of their Confession of Faith, with an Account thence deduced (or Explanation thereupon) In what Respect they hold *Perseverance*; wherein if he will hold to the first asserted by him, to wit, That *they assert not the Perseverance of any that are not truly Regenerated*, we are Agreed: for in that Sence I never did deny it. And then he gives Eight Considerations for their Doctrine; all which conclude nothing, but upon the Supposition of the Truth of their former Principles, especially of *Election* and *Absolute Reprobation*: So that it is but a Begging of the Question, as his very Eighth Consideration shews, pag. 356. N. 14. to wit, That *the Affirming this Doctrine* (to wit, That there may be a *falling away* from the Beginnings of true and saving Grace) *will give a Blow unto many Articles of their Faith*. But can this have any Weight to convince such, as do not believe these Articles of their Faith? It seems then, it is not for me, or any *Quaker*, that this is written; so we are the less concerned to trouble our selves with it.


¶ 2. At last he comes Pag. 357. N. 15. to Examine my Arguments: And first to what I urge from *Jude* ver. 4. where it is spoken of some, that *turned the Grace of God into Wantonness*, he saith, *This is not understood of the true Grace of God; but External Grace, such as is that Tit. 2. 12. which teacheth to deny Ungodliness*: But for this he gives no Proof. Next, it seems to him, *The Grace of God that teacheth to deny Ungodliness, mentioned Tit. 2. v. 12. is not the true Grace of God*: Where learned he this? Or how proveth he it? He saith, *To understand the Faith, which some are said to have made Shipwreck of, 1 Tim. 1. 19. to be true and saving Faith, is contrary to 2 Tim. 2. 17. and other Places where the Doctrine of Faith is spoken of*;

J. B. asserts That the Grace of God, that teaches to deny Ungodliness, is not the True Grace; and the Falling from Faith, a falling onely from the Doctrine of Faith.

1679.



1679. *of*; thence he concludes, *It was only the Doctrine of Faith they fell from*: But this is a Conclusion fit only for Credulous Persons, and proveth nothing; unless he will argue, because in some Places the Doctrine of Faith is spoken of, therefore wherever Faith is spoken of, it must be understood of the Doctrine of Faith, and not of true and saving Faith: which were most absurd. He saith to *Heb. 6. 4, 5. The Words are not Absolute, but Conditional, if they fall away*: but such a Condition importeth the thing *supposed* to be possible, being given for a Caution. He adds, "*There is nothing there, that is necessarily to be understood of true and saving Grace;*" but let him inform according to Scripture, How any Man can come to taste of the Heavenly Gift, and of the Powers of the Life to come, and be made Partaker of the Holy Ghost, without true and saving Grace? For what he adds to this, being built upon the Supposition of Election, I refer it to what is above said upon this Subject. He concludes *Vossius's* Testimony to be false, in saying, *That this was the common Opinion of the Antients*: But if so little Credit be to be given him, he did not well that made so much Use of him to prove, what was *Pelagius's* Doctrine, as he has done throughout this Treatise. For *John Owen's* Citations, I have neither Accommodation nor Time at present to Examine them; it is enough to me, that this is contrary to Scripture, though all these he mentions had said so. To prove, *That Men may have a good Conscience, and yet want true Faith*, he bringeth *Paul's* Words, *Acts 23. v. 1.* where speaking of himself while a *Pharisee*, he saith, *He lived in all good Conscience before God, &c.* but that will not meet this Case. Those *1 Tim. 1. 19.* who are said to *Make Shipwreck of a good Conscience*, are such, who believed the true Doctrine of Faith in Christ;

Christ; as himself before acknowledgeth: Now, 1679.  A Man may live in good Conscience to other Principles, while ignorant of the true Faith in Christ.  
 albeit a Man may be said to *live in good Conscience* to other Principles, while ignorant of this; yet he should prove, How a Man can be said to *have a good Conscience* with respect to the true Faith of Christ, held by him, and yet without saving or true Grace? With Railing he tells me, *pag. 358. N. 18. that Phil. 1. 6. and 1 Pet. 1. 5. speak of God's Beginning and Perfecting the Condition*: And what then? Yet God doth not this against our Wills; it is with Respect to our Performing the Conditions on our Part: which yet we cannot do without him. Then he goes about to prove, That *Paul could not fall*, in Answer to my saying from *1 Cor. 9. 27.* That *Paul supposeth a Possibility that he might become a Reprobate*: But if the Reader consider, how I bring that in my Apology, he will find, he had no Reason for this Cavil; for I alledged it only to reprove those that are too too secure, shewing, where Sin was, there was always a Ground of Jealousy: Since the Apostle did reckon it needful to keep under his Body, to subdue Sin, that he might not become a Reprobate: Which since the Apostle did, but upon this Supposition, *if he did not keep under his Body*, suppose possible, others had no Reason to presume.

1679.

## S E C T. XI.

*Wherein his Sixteenth Chapter Of the Church, his Seventeenth Of the Ministerial Call, his Eighteenth, Nineteenth and Twenty First, Of their Qualifications, Office and Maintenance; and his Twentieth Of Women's Preaching, is considered.*

¶ I. **H**IS Chapter of the *Church* is soon dispatched; for it contains scarce any thing, but Perversions and Railing. For after he has given a large Citation out of their *Confession of Faith*, and then added some Enlargements of his own, and some little, nibbling Cavils, to what I say of—*No Salvation being without the Church*, P. 361. he goes on with his old reiterated Calumny, That I suppose, *Men may be made Members of the Catholick Church by the Light of Nature*; which is utterly false. And upon this False Supposition is built his *N. 5. P. 362.* as also what he saith, p. 364. But *N. 4* he screws this to a greater Pitch of Fallshood, affirming, *That what I say of a Particular Church, gathered together in the Faith of the true Principles and Doctrines of Christ, by the Spirit of God and Testimony of some of his Ministers, is, that these are Persons only taught by the Light of Nature, and by such Ministers, as preach nothing of the Gospel.* Against a Man thus desperately resolved and determined to Lie and Calumniate, there can be no Gaurd; but sure all Sober Readers will abhor such Dealing. What I speak of a *Church* in this Respect, is only of such, as have the Advantage of the *outward Knowledge* of Christ, as my Words afterwards shew; where I say, *Such were the Churches*

*J. B's*  
gross Calumny, That our Faith and Principles are only taught by the Light of Nature.

ches gathered by the Apostles, of which the Scripture makes Mention. And therefore what he Objects, That cannot be done by Pagans, is wholly Impertinent; and doth but verify the Grofness of his Calumny; which he endeavours to inculcate as a Truth to his Reader, p. 363. as if, what I say further of the things requisite to be a Member of this Particular Church, were a *third Sort*, and not a *more particular Description* of the former: Which the Reader may easily observe by looking to the Place, to be a meer Fetch of his, to afford himself some Matter of Cavil. Which imagining he has got, he fills up the Paragraph with gross Lies and Railing, saying; *That the Quakers believe not the Holy Truths set down in the Scriptures, because they oppose and contradict them: That they believe not in, nor make Profession of Jesus Christ Revealed in the New Testament, because they oppose him and all his Institutions: That Faith, according to them, is not wrought by the Spirit of God; but that Nature can sweetly and naturally incline, yea, Compel thereunto: All which are gross Calumnies. And then he concludeth, saying; And thus we have run round, and are again where we began: Which is very true; for he began with Calumnies, and having run round the same Way, his Work Resolves in them. Pag. 364. He affirmeth, Men may be Members of the Visible Church (and consequently ought to be reputed such) who are ungodly and without Holiness: and offereth to make it good, if I will form a Dispute upon it; but I leave him, as to this, to dispute with his Learned Dr. Owen, whose Works he has applauded in this Treatise: and whom his Postscript-Brother R. M. has in his Preface to this J. B's Book highly Commended, as a gracious Man. As for his silly Argument, that from the Apostle's saying, Acts 2. 39.—The*

1679.

J. B's further Lies against us, of the Scriptures, of Christ, and our Faith.

1679. *Promise is unto you, and to your Children; and*  
 I Cor. 7. 14. it follows, *Men become Members of*  
*the Church by Birth; I leave him to debate it with*  
*his great Author Thomas Hicks, who will tell him*  
*(if he be Consonant to his own Principles) it is a*  
*Babylonish Invention. But J. B. hath here un-*  
*wares Contradicted himself: For if these Scrip-*  
*tures prove, Men become Members of the Church*  
*by Birth, then the Sprinkling them with Water*  
*sometime after they are born, or their Baby-Bap-*  
*tism, is not necessary to make them Members of*  
*the Church; and they are to be accounted such*  
*without it. He saith; I am mistaken, when I*  
*say, Antichrist built his Structure upon this Foun-*  
*dation, (to wit, That Men without Holiness may*  
*be Members of the true Church) because he applieth*  
*all the Priviledges of the Invisible Church unto his*  
*Visible Synagogue of Satan: Whereas this sheweth,*  
*that I am not Mistaken; but that my Affirmati-*  
*on is true: For if he, to wit, Antichrist did be-*  
*lieve Holiness to be necessary to make a Member of*  
*the true Church, he could not apply the Pri-*  
*viledges of the Invisible Church unto his Visible*  
*Members; most of which he well knows (as of-*  
*ten-times himself) are not only void of, but E-*  
*nemies to Holiness. It is false, That I agree with*  
*him in his not distinguishing betwixt the Visible and*  
*Invisible Church; and yet much more in un-Church-*  
*ing all, who are not of his Combination: In which*  
*albeit J. B. most Impudently insinuates, I ap-*  
*proach to him; yet himself cannot but know it*  
*to be a most manifest Falshood: Since I suppose,*  
*some of all Sects of Christians may be Members*  
*of the Catholick Church; and he knows, and*  
*has observed here, how Contrary the Pope is to*  
*this Doctrine. At last he concludes this Chap-*  
*ter with a Fit of Railing, of which the last Words*  
*must not pass without Observation; to wit, That*  
*instead of true Holiness I press upon them a Natu-*  
*ral,*

J. B. shuts  
 out their  
 Baby-Bap-  
 tism, from  
 making  
 them  
 Church-  
 Members.



ral, Dead and anti-Evangelical Morality. Now 1679.  
 this Morality, as pressed by me, he himself con-  
 fessed before to be such, as the Law of Nature <sup>7. B. con-</sup>  
 taught, (albeit in Truth I pressed none, but what <sup>demns a Mo-</sup>  
 is through the Light of Christ, or Grace of God <sup>rality which</sup>  
 that is by Christ) which he acknowledged *did lead* <sup>himself hath</sup>  
*Men not to Murder, not to Steal, not to commit* <sup>confessed to</sup>  
*Adultery*; which he confessed also was *Just, Ho-* <sup>be just, holy</sup>  
*ly and Good*. And so it seems, according to him <sup>and good.</sup>  
 that which is *Holy, Just and Good, not to Mur-*  
*der, not to Steal, not to commit Adultery*, is no  
 Part of *true Holiness*; yea, is *Anti Evangelick* and  
 Contrary to the Gospel. Now if I would insist  
 after his Method, having much more Reason than  
 he, I might at large shew, what a *Pagan-Gospel*  
 to purpose his must be, that is Contrary to Hone-  
 sty, Chastity and Innocency; albeit I deny not,  
 but the *True Gospel teacheth more*, than the Height  
 of *meer Morality*.

¶ 2. He beginneth his 17th Chapter, entitu-  
 led, *Of a Ministerial Call*, after the Repetition of  
 some Part of my 10th *Thesis*, with his old reiterat-  
 ed Calumny, and false Supposition, *That I affirm,*  
*Men to be called and qualified to the Ministry by the*  
*Light of Nature*: and to this Purpose to help him  
 fill up the Paper, he insisteth p. 369, 370, 371.  
 Which being false, all that is built upon it falls  
 to the Ground. In this Chapter also he is very li-  
 beral of his Railing: Take one Instance, p. 372.  
 where he saith; "That the *Quakers* are Pagan-  
 " Preachers, who know not the Gospel; but are  
 " sworn Enemies to it, and plain Subverters of  
 " it, and all the Ordinances thereof: " And  
 p. 378. he saith; "They are a Company of the  
 " most desperate, Antichristian Opposers of Christ  
 " and all his Appointments, that ever the Sun  
 " shined on." More of this kind may be seen  
 p. 374, 375, and 376.

1679. *Pag. 366. N. 3. He saith; When I speak of a True Call to the Ministry, I must suppose ten things; which he after enumerateth: And albeit I judge myself not obliged to follow him in such Excursions, yet for the Reader's Satisfaction let it be observed, That I deny not, but what I speak here, is with a Relation to a Visible Church, which is his first Supposition. Secondly, That I acknowledge, that in it there must be a standing Ministry, which is necessary; and this is his Second and Third. That I acknowledge this to be an Institution of Jesus Christ; which is his Fourth. That none ought to take this upon him, without being lawfully called thereunto; which is his Fifth. That also None may take upon them that work, but such as are Called to the Ministry, so as to exercise it constantly, as exercised by Ministers: Tet a Man may, when particularly called by the Spirit thereunto, do that which is the Work of a Minister: which his doing pro hic & nunc maketh him not a Minister properly; and this is his Sixth. That neither the Work nor Office is common to all the Members, so that they may not do it simply, as Members; which is his Seventh and Eighth. That a Call differeth from Gifts and Qualifications; which is his Ninth. And lastly, That there are some Rules in the Scripture (if he understand general Rules, as I suppose he doth) which distinguish a true Call from a false; which is his Tenth Supposition: Now wherein I here disagree from other Quakers, or my self, as he insinuateth, he may be pleased next time to inform. I might pass, what he saith in the next Paragraph, p. 368. concerning the several Sorts of Calls to the Ministry, as containing no Answer to me; were it not to shew, that he there but begs the Question, and contradicts himself. (1.) He begs the Question, while he supposes that the Approbation and Concurrence of Men in a Call hinders the Call from being Immediate; and that*

Properties of  
a true Call.

J. B. his di-  
vers Sorts of  
Calls recited.

there

there is no immediate Call now: Which he all affirms without Proof. (2.) Of Mediate Calls he saith, *Some are rare and singular, when a Church is erecting: and other ordinary, according to the Rules set down in the Word.* So it seems, the Rare and Singular Call, which is usually ascribed to that of the First Reformers, was not according to the Rules prescribed in the *Word*: But if such Rules be set down, by what Authority without the Word can he Affirm, they may be dispensed with, if he Contradict not his own Principles? (3.) He saith; *There must be an Inward Call, which is the Signification of God's Mind of his Calling and Appointing him to the Ministry:* This is good; and it is false that he saith p. 372. That *this will not satisfy us.* Yet he cannot stand to this, but contradicts it, p. 372. speaking of my Words thus; *What meaneth he by this [must be called by the Spirit?] Is this an inward Inspiration or Enthusiasm. saying to the Man, he must go preach? We reject all such Fancies, &c.* But is not an Inward Call signifying God's Mind to a Man, of his Calling him to the Ministry, an Inward Inspiration, telling him, *he must go preach?* Or can an inward Call be without an Inward Inspiration? The Reader may judge of these Inconsistencies. As to his Question, p. 369. *Whether to be instructed by the Inward Vertue and Power of God in the Heart, be so necessary to a Minister, that he cannot be without it?* I say, it is; and the Reader may observe, how he is pinched, while himself is loth to say otherwise, p. 370. yet at last he saith, *He dare not say it;* referring to his *Learned Mr. Durban* (as he calls him) and giving the Example of *Judas*, of which hereafter. However we see, according to him, *That not only one who wanteth Holiness, but even a Devil may and ought to be esteem'd, heard and obeyed as a Minister of Christ;*

1679.

The true and  
Inward Call.

J. B's Gos-  
pel-Ministers  
Call and  
Qualificati-  
on may a-  
gree to the  
Devil him-  
self; whom  
yet they will  
not turn a-  
way from,

1679. *and that all they judge needful in the Call and Qualification of a Gospel-Minister, may agree to the Devil himself: nor can they be sure, but their Ministers may be all Devils, for ought they know. It is false, that he addeth in this Page 370. That I agree with Socinians and Arminians, in Affirming, That whoever understands the Truth of the Gospel, and are able to instruct others, may and have Right to Teach: This I no-where Affirmed; and do wholly deny; whatever Knowledge or Ability a Man have to Instruct, by reason of his Gifts either Natural or Acquired, that he ought to take upon him to Teach, without being particularly Called thereunto: And therefore the Scriptures he brings against such, as say so, are not to the Purpose against me. To my First Argument he confesseth, That it proveth the Necessity I speak of, to make a Man a real, upright and sincere Minister before God; but that any, that are not real and upright, are to be esteemed Ministers at all, or heard as such, I deny; and remains for him to prove. Why are we so often forbidden to hear false Teachers? And that this is not only with Respect to Teaching false Doctrine, the Apostle shews, 2 Tim. 3. v. 5. where he exhorts to Turn away from such, as have the Form of Godliness only (which cannot consist with false Doctrine.) To my Second Argument mentioned p. 372. he Confesseth: What he saith further in that Paragraph is above answered. To my Argument shewing, That if the Inward Testimony of the Spirit be not thought needful, the Gospel-Ministry should be post-poned to the Legal, he most ridiculously answers; Then the Jews needed to doubt of the Priests and Levites: Whereas my Argument was, If they were certain, and we should be uncertain, it would make the Evangelical worse, than the Legal; and therefore to this he returneth nothing further but Railing.*

Pag. 373. n. 10. he asketh, How I will prove, *That all such, as want the Call of the Spirit, come not in by the Door, but are Thieves and Robbers?* Affirming, *Here a Man may come in the Way appointed by Christ, though they want this:* Whereas before p. 369. and in the End of this Page he affirms the Necessity of an Inward Call, saying; *They must have an inward Call.* I run not out, as he alledgeth, upon a Mistake, in saying, *The Succession of the Church is objected against this Doctrine;* albeit J. B. and his *We* may not do so: since I write to others, than he will perhaps include in his *We*. He bestoweth his n. 12. p. 374. in *Railing*, and referring to what is formerly said by him, p. 375. n. 13. To my Answer to that Objection, *That who pretend to an Immediate Call, should prove it by Miracles, shewing, It was the same objected by Papists against the Primitive Protestants;* he in a frothy Manner desires me to take it thus, and it will be too hot for my Fingers: *That they, who had Immediate Calls from God, were able to give Evidence of the same by Miracles, or some other evident Testimony of the Spirit; which to contradict had been Iniquity, and utterly Unreasonable:* I grant the whole; and therefore desire him to shew me, and prove it, *What way the First Reformers did thus evidence their Call, which is not done by those called Quakers?* But his Probation must be somewhat solider, than the Railing, with which he filleth up the rest of this Paragraph. P. 376. n. 14. (as it should be marked) he argueth against my saying; *That such as receive and believe the Call of true Ministers, verify it, and become the Signs of their Apostleship,* 2 Cor. 13. 3. albeit this was the very Answer given by Beza to Claudius Espenseus at the Conference of Poissy by Papists against Protestants: And let him urge this if he can, any way against us, which may not be as well urged by Protestants against Papists? And if he cannot,

1679.

J. B. pleads  
for Miracles,  
&c. to evi-  
dence a Call.

1679. he doth but work for his great Father the *Pope*, to whom (to their great Shame) the *Protestant* Clergy begin to recur to justify their Calling.

Having ended this Paragraph with Railing, he begins the next with a silly, groundless Perversion and Inference, *viz.* That because I say, that this, to wit, the Inward Life and Virtue which is in true Ministers, is that, which giveth to the Minister the true and substantial Call and Title; it follows, That *the Extraordinary Call was no true and substantial Title*: As if any Extraordinary Call wanted this Life and Virtue; and that albeit it prove an Evidence to *such* as receive them, yet some may have it, who are Rejected of Rebellious Men. To prove the Necessity of *Laying on of Hands*, he asketh, *Why then were Hands laid*


*upon Paul and Barnabas? Acts 13. 3.* citing other Places. *Answ.* Because there was then a Spiritual Virtue communicated by that Action, which they ascribe not to theirs; yea, the Places cited by him prove it, as *Mark 16. 18. Luke 13. 13.* where the Laying on of Hands is said to cure the Sick. I said not, that the Laying on of Hands always was the giving of the Holy Ghost; it is enough if it was a Communicating of some Spiritual Virtue; which by their own Confession theirs is not. After he has ended this Paragraph with Railing, he ends this Chapter with Observing the *Infallibility pleaded for in Ministers by some Quakers*; but if he judgeth them to Err in this, he should have applied himself to them, answering the Arguments by which they vindicate what they say in that Matter.

¶ 2. I come now to his Eighteenth Chapter of *Ministerial Qualifications*: Where, after he has begun and repeated some Words of mine, he will have the Grace of God to respect not the *esse* or *being*; but *bene esse* or *well-being* of a Minister; albeit elsewhere he would be mincing this, and eat-

The Inward Life is their true Call and Title.

The Apostles and their laying on of Hands, do differ from *J. B's*, &c.

The Grace of God doth qualify the Minister or Preacher.

eating it up, yet it appears to be his *Belief*. To 1679.  
 prove which, he asketh, *pag. 380. What I think of*   
*Balaam, who is called a Prophet, not a false Pro-*  
*phet?* But he hath not proved, That no more is  
 required in a Gospel Minister, than in a Prophet,  
 meerly to *foretel Things to come*. God's Speaking  
 to him, urgeth nothing; for God *spake* also to  
*Cain*, as himself confesseth, Chap. 3. yet it will  
 not follow, that *Cain* had all the Qualifications  
 requisite to a Gospel Minister. To my Answer of  
*Judas*, that they had not proved he wanted  
 Grace when Called; he refers to what is written  
 of the *Possibility of falling from Grace*: To which  
 also I refer it. And in this also resolveth what  
 he saith *pag. 380. n. 4*. In his very first Paragraph  
 he has his Old Calumny; That *all the Power, Vir-*  
*tue and Life of the Spirit, according to me, is not*  
*to be understood of what is imported by these Words*  
*in Scripture*: And this he insinuateth again *pag.*  
*379, 380, 384*. But as this is false, so what is  
 built upon it falls to the Ground. Because I de-  
 ny the *absolute Necessity* of Humane Learning to  
 the Ministry, therefore he insinuates, as if I  
 thought it utterly *Useless*, *pag. 379*. which is  
 false. And so what he saith, *p. 382, 383, 384*. to  
 prove the *Usefulness of Natural Sciences*, is to no  
 purpose against me, who deny not their *Usefulness*  
 among Men; nor yet say, when well improved,  
 they are *useless* to a Minister, or that such things  
 may not be improved by a Minister, when acted  
 by the Spirit so to do, as *Paul* did the Saying of  
 the *Heathen Poet*. The thing then I only deny  
 is, That *they are absolutely needful Qualifications*  
*to a Minister*. What he mentions to be said by  
*Calvin* of the Philosophy spoken of by *Paul*, Col.  
 2. 8. I can very well agree to, without Preju-  
 dice to any thing said by me; I do not say, as  
 he falsely affirms, *p. 383*. That *Learning and Grace*  
*are contradictory*. And whereas he saith, *He is far*  
*from*

The Sci-  
 ences may  
 be of Use,  
 but make no  
 Gospel-  
 Teacher.

1679. *from saying, that Learning is more necessary than Grace*; he doth but cheat his Reader, and contradict himself and his Learned *Mr. Durham*, who makes *Grace only needful to the well-being, but Learning to the Being of a Minister*: And their Admitting of Ministers shews this; for they will admit none, till they be sure he has Learning. But many whom they are not *sure* have Grace; yea, upon the Supposition they want Grace, yet they think, they ought to be held and reputed by the People as true and lawful Ministers. And whereas he insinuateth, *pag. 383.* that I bring in a Fable, which he saith, *I have ready at Hand*; if he dare charge me in this with the Asserting of a Falshood in Matter of Fact, I will give Evidence for Proof; the Persons being yet alive: But until he do that, my knowing the thing to be true, gives me Ground enough to assert it. To my Argument shewing, That without Grace a Man cannot be a Member of Christ's Body, which is the Church, far less a Minister; instead of Answer, after he has accused me, as not understanding the Difference betwixt the *Visible* and *Invisible Church*, he tells, *Christ is an Head to both*; which I deny not. That I apply *Eph. 4. 7. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 12.* solely to the *Invisible Church*, so as to exclude the *Visible*, is his Mistake, not my Ignorance. Then he goeth about to shew the Difference betwixt *Gift* and *Grace*; but that any had the Gifts there mentioned, who were altogether void of Grace, remains for him to prove. Besides what is mentioned, he is not sparing of his Calumnies in this Chapter; as where he saith, *pag. 382.* That *I deny, that about the Time of Reformation there was a Christian World*: which is false in Respect of *Profession*; in which Sence I only here understood it. And *pag. 385.* albeit he find me Calling the Heresy of *Arius* horrid; yet upon the Trust of his Author *Mr. Clapham* he affirmeth, *The Quakers*

Without  
Grace none  
can be a  
Member of  
Christ's Bo-  
dy, which is  
the Church.



kers to be *Erroneous in this*: But sure, I have bet- 1679.  
 ter Reason to be acquainted with the *Quakers Do-*  
*ctrines*, than any of his lying Authors. Another  
 of his Calumnies is, pag. 386. That *we lay aside*  
*all Means in coming to the Saving Knowledge of*  
*God's Name*. And albeit his Railing in this Chap-  
 ter be thick enough, that the Reader may easily  
 observe it; yet for his more particular Direction  
 let him observe 380, 381-385, 386. And whereas  
 pag. 386. N. II. he enumerateth several Particu-  
 lars, wherein he affirmeth, *We agree with Papists*;  
 he may find them Refuted and Answered in G. K's  
 Book, called *Quakerism no Popery*. And in the  
 last two Sections of that Book written by me, he  
 may find himself and his Brethren proved far  
 more guilty of that Crime than we; which be-  
 cause the Professor *John Menzies*, against whom  
 it is written, found not yet Time to answer, he,  
 as having more Leisure, may assume that Pro-  
 vince. If the Increase of our Number be, as he  
 saith, a *clear Verification of 2 Theff. 2. 9, 10, 11,*  
*12. that we are of the Deluded Ones there spoken*  
*of*; then it must be a clearer Verification of it,  
 as to them, that they are of that deluded Com-  
 pany, since they are more Numerous than we, and  
 also increased more suddainly. As for his Exhor-  
 tations and Wishes in the End, because I will be so  
 Charitable, as to *suppose* they come from some  
 Measure of Sincerity, I do not wholly reject them:  
 only I must tell him, that nothing has more con-  
 duced of an External Means, to confirm me in the  
 Belief of the Verity of the Principles I hold,  
 than his Treatise, because of the many gross Cal-  
 umnies, manifest Perversions and furious Railing  
 in it; since I know, the Truth needed no such  
 Method to defend it; and I cannot believe, one  
 in the Truth would use it; since Lying is contra-  
 ry to the Truth. Therefore if he will lay aside  
 all this Falshood and Passion, he may have a more  
 sure

If Number  
 and Increase  
 bespeak De-  
 lusion, J. B's  
 surpasseth  
 Ours; and  
 leaves him  
 in Confusion.

J. B's  
 gross Calum-  
 nies, Perver-  
 sions and  
 Railing:  
 Truth need-  
 ed no such  
 Way and  
 Method of  
 Defence.

1679. *sure Ground of Hope to see the Truth manifested to the Dispelling of Error.*

¶ 4. He beginneth his Nineteenth Chapter of the *Ministerial Office* with supposing, That *their Order is according to Scripture*; and that what we plead for is quite contrary: And so ushereth himself into a Rant of Railing, with which he concludeth this Paragraph, saying, “That the Evil Spirit that acteth us, is such an Enemy to all Gospel-Order, that it crieth up only *Paganish* and Devilish Confusion.” More of this kind the Reader may observe, *pag.* 388, 389, 391, 392-394. His Calumnies and Perversions are also very frequent in this Chapter; as *p.* 387. where he saith, *We cast away all Order, and instead thereof bring in the Confusion of Babel*: and *p.* 388. because we are not for the Shadow without the Substance, therefore he saith, *We make a Repugnancy betwixt them*; which is also false. And again in the same Page *N.* 4. because I say, [“It was never the Mind of Christ to establish the Shadow of Officers, without the Power and Efficacy of the Spirit”] therefore he concludes, That the Quakers think, that Men can establish the Spirit: Which silly Perversion will easily be manifest to every intelligent Reader. And after the like manner *p.* 389. *N.* 5. because I say, [“That upon setting up meer Shadows, where the Substance was wanting, the Work of Antichrist was erected in the dark Night of Apostacy”] he concludes that then (according to me) *Christ and his Apostles wrought the Work of Antichrist and Mystery of Iniquity*; accusing me thence of Blasphemy: But who can be so blind, as not to see this manifest Perversion? And again, *p.* 390. he saith; *I will, that every Man according as his own Spirit (falsly called the Spirit of God) moveth him, setting to this Work*, (meaning that of the Ministry:) Which is a false Calumny never said by me, who deny all false

false Motions of Man's own Spirit, however called. And p. 391, he saith, That *Malice prompteth me to charge them with owning the Distinction of Clergy and Laity, though I know they do not*: Where the Man supposeth, that what I write, is only written against the *Presbyterians*; while he cannot but know, that I write against others; since in his first Chapter he charges me with *Writing against all the Christian World*: So it is his Malice to say, I charge them with it; if any of those I write to, be guilty of it, it is enough: albeit I doubt, whether the *Presbyterians* can free themselves of it.

¶ 5. Having thus far discovered his Perversions, I come to the main Business. Pag. 388. he saith, "They plead not for Shadows, but own the Ordinances, as Christ hath appointed to remain and continue for the Perfecting of the Saints, &c. *Eph. 4. 11, 12, 13.*" And pag. 389. N. 6. he asketh, "Whether the Primitive Church was not Instituted by Christ, and gathered by God, in whose Assemblies he was Ruler and Governor? Asking, Were there no distinct Officers, particular individual Persons set apart for the Work of the Ministry in the Apostles Days?" And p. 391. N. 7. he argueth against my Saying, That these mentioned *1 Cor. 12. 28, 29. and Rom. 12, 6.* were not *distinct Officers*, but only *different Operations of the same Spirit*: And against this also he pleadeth, p. 393. N. 11. and p. 394. To all which I answer distinctly and particularly That they can plead nothing from *Eph. 4.* unless their Church had all the Officers there mentioned, which it has not; yea, and which themselves affirm, *are ceased*: Such as *Prophets, Apostles*, which are said to be *given for the Work of the Ministry and perfecting of the Saints*, nothing less than the other. And by what Authority do they then turn these by, and plead so tenaciously for the o-

J. B. his  
Plea for a  
Detective  
Number of  
Officers  
from Scrip-  
ture.

ther

1679. ther? Let him give a Reason for this next; and by the same we shall answer what he urges from this: But he must remember, it is not enough for him barely to say, *These are extraordinary and are ceased, and the other ordinary and remain*; but he must prove it by plain Scripture, or else be justly rejected, as but begging the Question. As he doth p. 394. where he supposeth, there were only Thirteen Apostles, or perhaps Fourteen, if *Barnabas* be accounted one; since he confesseth, the Word signifies one *Sent*; and therefore whoever is sent, is properly an *Apostle*. Thus also will his other Argument return upon his own Head, for since *such* (as he saith) *were settled and ordained in the Church by Christ and his Apostles*; how come they to walk so contrary to Christ's Order, as to want, yea, and to judge such unnecessary in their Church? And as for all the Scriptures cited by him, to shew the Distinction of such *Church Officers* from other Members, they are not to the Purpose against me; who deny not, but Members were to be distinguished: But yet that proves not, that any Member was barred from these Exercises, when called by the Spirit thereto; which is the thing in Question. As for his saying, That the *Apostle is speaking of the Church, 1 Cor. 12. as an Organical Body*; If he means, the Apostle is comparing the Church to a Body, to which it answers in many Respects, I deny not; but if he say, that it answers in all, I leave him to prove it: However then, if we make Application of it, as the Apostle illustrateth it; their Church will prove a very lame one: For in this Body (as *J. B.* himself observes) the Apostle names *Apostles* and *Prophets*; and if we may suppose, that these, as being the most Eminent, are the chiefest Members, as the Eyes and Ears of the Body; their Church that wanteth these, must be *blind* and *deaf*. And whereas he would make my saying [That the Apostle

J. B.'s defective Church, if wanting Eyes and Ears, must needs be Blind and Deaf.

postle meant here different Operations] Ridiculous; he but sheweth his own Folly: for if the Apostle point at different Offices, they will not only want Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists, but a great many more. For the Apostle nameth also *ver. 28. Miracles, Gifts of Healing, Helps, Governments, Diversities of Tongues, &c.* These then must all be distinct Offices also: how come they to want them in their Church? Or how can they plead for these they have, more than for such as are placed nothing less by way of distinct Officers than they? Yea, all the several Titles enumerated by him *pag. 390.* will prove the same way distinct Officers; and how came they to cashier all these, and reduce them to so few a Number? By what Authority and Scripture-Warrant do they this? But I would inquire at him, what an Office is? If it be not an Operation of the Spirit, more particularly working in some Persons under such a Designation? And this is proved by the Coincidence of these Offices in one Person, which he confesseth. That some are thence more particularly called to the Work of the Ministry, I acknowledge, and he observes it. That *God will move none to violate the Order established in his House,* I deny not; but that to move some at times to speak, is a Violation of that Order, I deny; since the Apostle saith to the contrary, *1 Cor. 14. 31. We may all prophesy.* In Answer to which he supposeth, this is *Restricted to Prophets*; but the Text saith *All*, not *All Prophets* (albeit it were no Absurdity to suppose, *All the Lord's People to be Prophets* in this Sence, as well as they are said to be *Kings and Priests*) and the Words following shew it, *That all may learn, and all may be comforted:* For it were Nonsense to understand this with a Restriction. And therefore his bare asserting, *That this contradicts the plain Scope of the Place,* is no Argument for Men of Reason, who resolve not to build

1679.

God violates not Order; ye may all prophesy, not only Prophets.

1679. build their Faith upon his meer *say-so*. Page 395. he thinketh, My acknowledging, "That some  
 "are more particularly called to the Work of the  
 "Ministry than others, is not enough; because  
 "they are not to exhort, but when moved by the  
 "Spirit, and others when moved, may as well as  
 "they: So there is no Difference." That Mini-  
 sters ought not to Preach or Exhort without the  
 Spirit's Motion or Assistance, will come after-  
 wards to be proved: And to suppose, God cannot  
 or will not move any but Ministers by his Spirit  
 to Exhort, were to limit him; which is presump-  
 tuous in us to do. But in this appeareth the Dif-  
 ference, that we confess, many may, and know  
 Thousands among us, whom we acknowledge to  
 be good Men, and sufficiently endued with the  
 Spirit towards the Work of Regeneration in them-  
 selves, and brotherly Love and Care to their Bre-  
 thren, who never find themselves moved to speak  
 a Word in Publick; and there are others, whom  
 God calleth to make Teaching and the Oversight  
 of the Church so their constant Business, that they  
 are less Engaged in worldly Affairs, than the Ge-  
 nerality of those called *Clergy-Men*, even among  
*J. B's* Brethren: And therefore are owned and ho-  
 noured, and so far as need requires, maintained  
 by the Church. But to say, that no Man ought  
 without he be thus particularly Called, at any  
 Time *speak* in a publick Assembly, (since we  
 say, that they ought not, but when moved by the  
 Spirit) is not only to accuse us, but imperiously  
*bind up God*, from moving with his Spirit, whom  
 and when he pleaseth. And this being applied,  
 will answer his Queries, *pag. 369.* where *n. 14.* he  
 affirms, That *to suppose*, Ministers may use an ho-  
 nest Trade, *is to account the Work of the Ministry*  
*a light Business*: But this is to account it no more a  
 light Business than the Apostle did, who recom-  
 mended *Working with their Hands* for a Livelihood

Some do  
 not speak,  
 although en-  
 dued with  
 Spirit, in  
 Publick.


Yet none  
 to bind up  
 God from  
 moving with  
 his Spirit,  
 when, and  
 in whom he  
 please.

to the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*, Acts 20. 1679. 34, 35. giving them his own Example in so doing. But they indeed must have small Experience of a true Ministry, who do not know, a Man may be better qualified to discharge it, by being *inwardly Exercised in the Spirit*, and instructed thereby, than by all the Labour and Study they can derive from their Books; and perhaps it may be true, which he after affirms, that *such, who bring their Preaching always out of Books, will find little time to follow another Trade*: But it seems, such Preachers are incapable to follow the Apostle's Exhortation above mentioned; and therefore we will justly conclude them to be no true Gospel-Ministers.

Book-Study will not do; Paul laboured with his Hands.

¶ 5. That he may be like himself, he begins his Twentieth Chapter of *Women-Preachers* with Rail- ing, saying, *The Quakers are against all the Ap- pointments and Ordinances of Christ*: then he go- eth on at a high Rate, inveighing against the Li- berty of Women's Speaking from *Paul's Words* 1 Cor. 14. 34. *as being against the Law, as being contrary to Modesty and Shamefacedness*; urging pag. 398. *the Apostle's Authority in writing that Ep- istle*, which we deny not: And then he urgeth against us 1 Tim. 2. 11. alledging, "That its be- ing said, *Adam* was first formed, and then *Eva*; " and *Eva* being first in the Transgression, infers, "That Women's Preaching is against the Law of " Nature; and that this Silence is imposed upon " Women, as a just Judgment for *Eva's* Transgres- " sion." For this last Inference we have nothing but his Affirmation: To the former I answered in my Apology, shewing, that these Words of the Apostle cannot be taken absolutely, and without Limitation; since the same Apostle giveth Rules, how Women should behave themselves in their Praying and Preaching in the Church. But he reckons, that this is for me to make the Apostle

How Wo- men ought to pray and preach, the Apost'e tells.

1679.  contradict himself, while this is his own Case, who takes the Apostle's Words without Limitation; else there is not the least Contradiction; yea, his desiring them to *Ask their Husbands at Home*, shews, that it cannot be taken Universally, seeing all Women have not Husbands. And for his saying, That *what the Apostle saith*, Chap. II. v. 5. *But every Woman, that prayeth or prophesieth with her Head uncovered, &c. is not to be meant of their Carriage, when they are Praying themselves; but when they are present at others doing of it:* This is his bare Affirmation without Proof, contrary to the exprefs Words of the Text, which saith, *Every Woman that prayeth, &c.* not when she heareth another pray. And by this Way it might be as easily affirmed, where the Apostle in the same Place speaks of *Men's Praying with their Heads covered*, that it is not when they *pray themselves*; but when they hear others. And that there must be a Limitation, he confesseth, saying, *That the Lord made Use of Prophetesses of Old, and that he is free to make Use of whom he will:* If so, then if the Lord do so now, who dare plead against it? Yea, the Practice of *W. B's Brethren* doth contradict this Scripture, if they will not admit a Limitation. For will he deny, but heretofore at *Presbyterian Meetings*, where sometimes 20 and 30. and more have been together, Women have both Spoken and Prayed, yea, been invited and urged to do so by Eminent Preachers there present? And is not that properly a Church, where Christians are met together to worship God and edify one another? If he say, this was only private; I answer, However private it was, it was still a Church: For it is not the Greatness of the Number, that makes the Church; since the fewer Number may more properly sometimes be Esteemed the Church, than the greater. And if he take the Apostle's Words absolutely without

And have  
not Women  
both Spoke  
and Prayed  
at your  
Meetings;  
yea, been  
Invited too?



Limitation, it will exclude Women from Speaking in any Assembly met for Religious Worship and Exercise; unless he will be so Superstitious, as to ascribe the *Churchship* to the *Old, Popish Mass-House Walls* (and if so, it will trouble him to prove, there were any *such* in *Corinth* used by Christians, when the Apostle wrote to them) so as to think that if Women *speak* not there, they do not *speak* in the Church. And yet how comes it, that by the Acts of the General Assembly Whores are not only permitted, but constrained to *speak* in the most publick Assemblies, and that in a Place allotted for them, no less Eminent than the Pulpit? Sure, if *such* Women may there *speak* of their Sins, and tell, how they have been tempted of the Devil; good Women moved by the Spirit of God, may tell, what God has done for them, in preserving them from such Evils? Neither will it serve to say, that it is not *Authoritative Speaking*; for the Apostle's Words are, *I permit not a Woman to speak*; not, *I permit her not to speak Authoritatively*: for the Words added, *Not to usurp Authority over the Man*, is a distinct Precept. Women may *usurp Authority* over their Men, who never offer to Preach in the Church; as also *some* may *speak* there, who may be very *subject to their Husbands*: Besides, they permit Women to *Sing publickly*, which is a *Speaking*, and actual Part of God's Worship. Now, there is not a Word in the Text of these Exceptions, more than the other; and let him prove them, if he can, from the Scripture, without making way for Women's *Preaching*. He confesseth, *pag. 400.* That *Women may be instrumental in Conversion privately, but not publickly*: And for his saying, *He will suspect the Conversion that way wrought rather to be a Delusion*, he but telleth his own Conjecture; that so he may conclude

1679.

What! is  
the Church  
Old Popish  
Mass House  
Walls?

1679. this Chapter, according to his Custom, with Rail-  
ing.

The Main-  
tenance al-  
low'd to Mi-  
nisters in  
Scripture.

The Ho-  
nour due to  
them is not  
a Money-  
Price.

They are  
not by Con-  
straint to  
force their  
Maintenance  
which nei-  
ther Magi-  
strate nor  
People can  
make Law-  
ful.

¶ 7. Pag. 401. He begins his Twenty first Chap-  
ter of *Ministers Maintenance* with a manifest Per-  
version, insinuating; As if I were Joining with  
*such, who are against Ministers Maintenance*: which  
is utterly false; as by what I say upon that Sub-  
ject doth evidently appear. But indeed the Man  
contendeth here very warmly, and with might  
and main, and tooth and nail, as they say; albeit  
the thing he pleads for, as to the Substantial Part  
of it, be not denied: But it will not satisfy him  
to grant, as I do, that the *Ministers should receive  
Temporal Things from them, to whom they minister  
Spiritual, or that their Necessities should be sup-  
plied*: No; he will have it to be an *Honorary*, as  
he calls it, and that a large one too. For so,  
pag. 405. he interprets 1 *Tim. 5. 17, 18.* as if *Double  
Honour* could not be given without large giv-  
ing of Money. It seems, *Poor Folks* with him  
cannot give double Honour, nor fulfil this Com-  
mand of the Apostle; it is only the *Rich Folks  
Honour*, who can give largely, that he regards:  
yea, he reckons this *Giving Liberally* to Mini-  
sters, a *Sowing to the Spirit*; for so he interpreteth  
*Gal. 6. 8.* By all which it is manifest, that to  
give *Liberally to Ministers* goeth with him for a  
great Article of Faith. But the Question only  
lieth betwixt us concerning a *Limited and Forced  
Maintenance*: for a *Sumptuous* he cannot for Shame  
but seem to *disclaim*; and a *Necessary*, yea, what  
in any true Sence can be so called, I confess: There-  
fore, as what he saith of our denying it is false;  
so what he urgeth to prove it as to us is superflu-  
ous. As for a *Constrained or Forced Maintenance*,  
I desire him next time to prove it from Scripture,  
since he has not yet done it; nor indeed can he  
by any thing there written; since what is there  
said,

said, is only by way of such Exhortation, as Liberality and Charity is enjoyned: which albeit he saith confidently, he was convicted of Fallhood, but he hath *said* it, and that is all. For there were then no Christian Magistrates to Limit or Constrain *such* as would not Give; the Conclusions and Determinations of the Magistrate and People, make it not Lawful in its Self, as all that hath been given either by *Heathen* or *Popish Magistrates*, or People out of Superstition, may be Lawful for *Ministers* to receive: And indeed, many of them begin to call that the *Churches Patrimony*, and reckon it Sacrilege for others than *Church-Men* (as they call them) to meddle with it. He knows not how to turn by *Paul's* Exhortation to the Elders of *Ephesus*, Acts 20. 33. and therefore at last, after some ado, he agrees to it: but to make it have the less Weight, he tells, *How Paul took from other Churches*; which is not denied: But it is manifest, *Paul* preferred the *Not-taking*, but *working with their Hands to supply their Necessities*, as that which was rather to be done; else to what Purpose desires he them to *Remember the Words of the Lord Jesus, That it is more blessed to give, than to receive?* But it seems, *J. B.* and his Brethren think it the *Most blessed Thing* to be getting large Augmentations. My speaking of their Complaining of the *Hardness of Christians indefinitely*, doth not hinder Exceptions; and therefore his Carping at it, p. 409. is frivolous. And albeit *Paul* did not plead for a *Carnal Ministry*, in Reasoning for Maintenance (as he saith, p. 410.) yet it very well follows, that *such* are but a *Carnal Ministry*, that will not Preach without they get Money; yea, himself confesseth in the former Page, That *True Ministers must speak, whether they get Aliment or not*; and commendeth some for so doing. But he hath given in this pag. 410. a notable Example of his Sottishness

1679.  
w

1679. nefs and Malice both together. For in answering what I say, [*That a Carnal Ministry wanteth the Life and Power, and therefore needs a fixed Maintenance; but a Spiritual Ministry can confide in God, who will provide for them.*] To this he tells, *That the Priests in the Days of Jezabel were richly provided for; and the Servants of God put to great Straits: Shall we therefore* (saith he) *say, that these Priests of Baal were the only Called of God, sent forth in his Power and Authority; and that the Servants of the Lord were but a Carnal Ministry? This were to argue carnally with Belly-Arguments, as our Quakers do.* The sober Reader may judge of the Sottishness and malicious Perverseness of this Answer: Sottish it is, because no ways to the Purpose; for I never made the *Being richly provided* a Token of a *Spiritual Ministry*, as the whole I say of this Matter evinceth; but on the contrary with Christ and the Apostle I think, they are *most blessed who receive least.* And will he say, that my Saying [*that Spiritual Ministers can depend upon God, who will provide for them, so as not to need a fixed Maintenance*] Infers any such thing, it is malicious; because he would insinuate to the Reader, that this gross Assertion were mine, affirming, we *Argue with Belly-Arguments*: which is a Base, but Bare Calumny: How much more his Arguments favour of that, the Reader may judge; and that his extream Keeness in this Matter shews, how near of Kin he is to those, *whose God is their Belly, who Preach for Hire, and Divine for Money, and look for their Gain from their Quarter.* What he saith of the *Quakers Riches*, is both false and frivolous; for they are none of the Richest People; and their Preachers, especially such as receive Maintenance, are usually the poorest among them: For such as have of their own, and are called to the Ministry, do not use to receive; but follow-

And are not the Priests now adays, Richly provided for, whilst the Servants of God have been put to great Straits and Sufferings, and by them in N. England to Hanging; shall we therefore say, these Persecuting Priests, &c. are the Called of God, sent forth in his Authority and Power, J. B.?

following the Apostle, Labour to *make the Gospel without Charge*. He turns by what I say in the Conclusion of my Explication of my *Tenth These*, where I shew by many Scriptures the Distinction betwixt a *True* and *False Ministry*, shewing, how we plead for the *True*, and deny the *False*: This he calls *false, groundless and impertinent*; but he passed it so hastily, because it was too hot for his Fingers: And having given it this passing Sentence, he concludes with his Old Calumny of our being *Pagan Preachers*, and designing *Paganish Antichristianism*.

## S E C T. XII.

*Wherein his Twenty Second Chapter, Of the Quakers Silent Worship: His Twenty Third Of Preaching: His Twenty Fourth, Of Praying: And Twenty Fifth, Of Singing Psalms, are Considered.*

**N**OW followeth his Twenty Second Chapter, intituled, *Of the Quakers Silent Worship*; wherein if I should return him no Answer, but that of *Michael to Lucifer, the Father of Lies*, I should do him no Injustice; it being a Heap, either of manifest Calumnies, gross Perversions, or abusive Railing. Wherein, as if he were Constituted Judge by GOD over the *Quakers*, he concludes them over and over again, to be *Acted and Deluded by the Devil, and to be such, as wholly lay themselves open to him to possess them, and work in them at his Pleasure*; with much more of this Stuff: For which I need not particularly note Pages, for the Reader will scarce look seriously unto any one of this Chapter, from p. 412, to 419.

J. B's Un-  
godly Rail-  
ing.

1679. but he will find it very thick. And for a sufficient Refutation of it I recommend to any sober and unprejudicate Reader, seriously to Compare and Read with this Chapter that to which it relates, to wit, the Explication of the *Eleventh These* in my Apology; which I judge may suffice to give a sufficient Disgust of this Chapter. But lest he should think, this were too slightly a passing over his Matter, and for the Readers more full Direction and Satisfaction, I will propose to him to be considered these things following.

¶ 1. And first, his Calumnies, as pag. 411. where he saith, *I would have them understand, Christ's Spiritual Resurrection was never till now: Whereas I speak only with Reference to the Time since the Apostacy, and not to the Primitive Times before.* And pag. 412. he saith, *We acknowledge no Motion or inward Breathing of the Spirit, but what is Extraordinary and meerly Enthusiastick; as also that we abstract from all Means: This is false.* But as for his supposing, *That Studied Sermons are a Mean appointed of God, and that not to do it, is a sure Way of Tempting God, and Inviting the Devil to deceive and delude:* Which he affirms he has shewn; I have not seen it, and will expect, that next Time he will make it more manifest. His 413th Page containeth a Mass of Calumnies, to wit, *That there is no Word in our Assemblies of the Scripture; That we apply them not for Instruction, Reproof and Edification of the People; That the Scripture is no Rule to us in our Walk, nor has any Place in our Worship; That there is to be found in all our Solemn Service neither Preaching, nor Prayer, nor Praise.* And pag. 414. he has his old, reiterated Calumny, *That the Power and Life the Quakers speak of, proceedeth not from the Grace of God, but is the meer Operation of Nature.* To this Purpose he hath over and over again, pag. 415, 416, 417, 418, 421, and 422.

7. B's Egregious Plea for studied Sermons.

7. B's many false Charges without Proof, against the Quakers.

He supposeth, p. 414. that it is affirmed by me, 1679. *That at all times the Quakers meet, all of them are truly gathered unto the Sense of the Power, and whatever any says, comes from it, and is not to be questioned*: Which is wholly false. I shew their Manner of Meeting, and their Duty when Met, according to their Principles and the Consequence thereof, when they truly perform it; but it doth not thence follow, that none of them ever miss in their Performance: No more than if he should relate their Manner of Worship, and the good Effects he may suppose it sometimes has; it would follow, that whoever set about it, and got up to the Pulpit, and read his Text, could not Preach false Doctrine, nor speak impertinently: And therefore what he builds upon this here, as also pag. 416. N. 7. pag. 417 and 429. falls to the Ground. But he seeketh to uphold this with another Calumny; As if all that frequent the *Quakers Meetings*, and are accounted of their Number, were supposed by us to be perfect, asking, *How can the Power of Darkness work, if they be made free from Sinning?* which is false: How we affirm this absolute Perfection, even of such as we account our Brethren, I have shewn in my Section of *Perfection*. A Sixth Calumny is p. 415. which he also hath pag. 424. where he supposeth it to be our Doctrine, that there is *No setting about Prayer or other Duties, without a previous Motion of the Spirit*; and upon this he insists as an Absurdity. But we speak not of a *previous Motion* in Order of Time, as absolutely necessary; it is enough, if it be in Order of Nature, which he knows may be without any Priority of Time: And so his Absurdity upon this pag. 424. vanisheth; which I also answer, speaking of *Prayer*, in my Apology. A Seventh Calumny is p. 426. where he concludeth, because I say [*Gospel Wor-*

Of Perfection, see above, p. 430.

F. B. is for praying without a previous Motion of the Spirit.

ship

1679. *ship* is not to be in Outward Observations gone about by Man, in his own Will and proper Strength] that I affirm, *Gospel Worship putteth away all External Actions*; which how false it is and inconsequential, any ordinary Reader may easily judge. And yet upon this false Inference he thinketh to bind upon me a Contradiction, in owning afterwards *External Acts of Worship*; for to say, *Worship may be performed without these Acts*, and that *Worship cannot be performed in these Acts*, is very different: The last I deny, but own the first. An Eighth Calumny is, pag. 418. where because I say [That it sometimes falleth out, that one come into a Meeting upon a sinistrus Account, may by the Power raised in the Meeting be Reached, if the Day of his Visitation be not expired] he concludes, *If any such come in, and be not thus changed, his Day is gone; and it is impossible to him to be saved*: Which is a gross Abuse. For albeit the Not-expiring of his Day must be presupposed to a Capacity of Salvation; yet his not presently, yea, after divers Times not being Converted, doth not suppose his Day to be over: Since it was never our Principle to say, God affords no Men Opportunity but one. Besides these, there are many other Perversions scattered up and down, such as, Are J. B's pag. 421. his saying, "That the Waiting we Prayers without a previous Motion of the Spirit any better than his Dumb Mumry, he speaks of?" "plead for is such, as putteth away Prayer; that we plead for it to shut out the Ordinances of Jesus Christ, and to give God no more for all his Solemn Worship, but a dumb Mumry:" Which Word pleaseth him so well, that he hath it several times over.

¶ 2. His great and mighty Charge in this Chapter is indeed great enough, if he could make it out; and that is, *That the Quakers are guilty of Devilry, and are certainly acted by the Devil in their Assemblies*. But this he only strongly affirms, without Proof, unless one; which, whether



whether it be valid or not, comes now to be examined. And that is p. 418. from my saying, *That there will be sometimes an inward Struggling, yea so, as the Body will be strangely moved*: To this he adds a Story of one *Gilpin*, long ago answered; and describeth these Motions of the *Quakers* to be, *Foam, Swell and Froth at the Mouth*: Which is false; and returneth upon him as a Calumny, however he compares these Motions of the Body, as Asserted by me, to the *Work of the Devil, and the old Pythonicks*. But it seems, Malice hath wonderfully blinded the Man here, else he would not have given his own Cause, which he esteems *The great Cause of God*, so deep a Wound. For in the Book called *The fulfilling of the Scriptures*, a Treatise much applauded by them, whose Author is said to be *Robert Fleeming*, one of their *Non-conforming Brethren*, he relates as a *Convincing Proof of the Power of God, how some were choked, and taken by the Heart, that they were made to fall over, and so carried out of the Church*: And as a *convincing appearance of God and down-pouring of the Spirit, that there was a strange and unusual Motion on the Hearers*; which by the *Prophane* was called [*The Stewarton Sickness*] from the Name of the Parish. Now, What difference is betwixt *this*, and my speaking of Mens being strangely moved by the Power of God? Will not this prove as much, that all this was *Devilry*, and the *Passions of the old Pythonicks*? Since these Motions are made the great Argument, why the *Quakers* are said to be acted by the Devil, let him the next time assign clear Reasons according to Scripture, *Why* these Motions upon the *Presbyterian* Bodies are a Convincing Sign of the Working of the Power of God among them; but that the Motions on the *Quakers* Bodies are enough to Confirm, *they are acted by the Devil*? And if he do this effectually, he may be in Hopes of gain-  
ing

1679.

*F. B.* call the Movings of the Power of God upon the *Quakers*, *Devilry*; and that they are certainly acted by the Devil in their Assemblies.

*Unusual* Motions asserted by *F. B.*'s Party of their own Hearers as of the Power of God; which *F. B.* calls *Devilry* in others.

1679. ing a Profelyte. Next to this I come to consider, what he urges as a great Absurdity, to wit, *That the Quakers turning their Minds inward* (which he will needs term *Introverting*, and not interpret the Word, that he may make Ignorant Folks believe, it is a Piece of the *Quakers Devilry*) *and laying aside all their own Thoughts and Imaginations, were a laying aside both Christianity and Humanity, a becoming no Men, but Brutes, and worse, and most capable to be deluded by the Devil.* Upon this he insists p. 414, 422. and elsewhere; as if for Men to abstain from their own Thoughts and Imaginations, were the Way to Un-man them: Yet if he will understand it of the *Old Man*, the Man of Sin, that is Corrupted; we will say with the Apostle, *That ought to die, and be crucified*: And are so far from thinking, *this is against Christianity*, that we believe according to Scripture, it is the Way to become a *Christian*, and to overcome the Devil; not to lay our selves open to him. And therefore his Railing against Man's Silence from his own Thoughts, *That God may speak and work in him*, doth evidence his great Ignorance in the Work of a true Christian; for this is so far from descending from Humanity to Brutism, that it is rather an Ascending from Humanity to Divinity: So that, albeit in one Sense we are said to die, or be emptied as to our selves; yet we do more truly Live and Exist. And if he think this a Contradiction; let him consider that of the Apostle, *Gal. 2. 20. I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me*: And this if rightly considered, will answer his Questions p. 422. by answering of which he would have me *Clear my Way of Devilry*. As for any Arguments in this Chapter, that have the least shew of Solidity or Weight, I have looked narrowly, but can find none; only

For Men to abstain from their own Thoughts, is in J. B's Sense a becoming worse than Brutes, &c.

To die to self is Life and Love in Christ the Crucified.

only instead thereof he has some little nibbling Quibbles and Questions: Which albeit they be so Inconsiderable, as scarce deserve the Pains to Answer; yet lest he may think something of them, if omitted, I will now take notice of them, and Answer them. As *first* p. 412. he asketh, *Whether the appointing of set Times and Places be not a limiting of the Spirit?* *Ans.* If it were to Exclude other Times and Places, when God moves thereunto, it might be so judged; but other ways it is not: For *meeting together* is not an immediate Act of Worship; but a Matter of Outward Convenience: And therefore needs not always a particular Motion. As for his *desiring me* in this Page to Answer, *what he has said of the Sabbath* (the denying of which in their *sense* he accounts a great Error) I must wait then, till he come to his Matter, which he has not done in his *first Tome*, (which I have only seen as yet) albeit it be a *Book* about an *Hundred Sheets* of Paper: And when he has written all that he can say upon that Subject, I doubt, whether it may not be sufficiently Refuted by a few Lines, which *Calvin* has written thereon; *Inst. lib. 2. cap. 8. § 34.* from whom, as well as the Generality of *Protestants*, I know not that I differ in this Matter. P. 413. he proposeth as an Exception against the Manner of Worship expressed by me, *That it wanteth that Preparation requisite*; which he accounts to be *some Impression of that divine Majesty, with whom they have to do*: But I see no Reason, why he should accuse us for Want of this; since none can be more fit than such, as make Silence and an Inward Turning of the Mind necessary to their Entering to Worship: But if he understand this by outward Prayer, meaning, This should be done first, since it is an Actual Part of Worship, by which we draw near to that Majesty; there would be a Preparation to That by the same Rule, and another to *that*, and so

1679.

Set Times and Places for to Worship do not stint the Holy One.

F. B's Preparation to Worship proceeds in Infinitum.

1679. so a *Progressus in Infinitum*. But a Godly Frame of Spirit, and a Studying to be found always in the Sense of God's Holy Fear in all things, is a good general Preparation to all Acts of Worship. And for his crying out against *Silence*, as that which cannot Edify, and thinking it so strange, that *Life or Vertue should be transmited from one to another, when they do not bear one another speak*, as p. 415, 420, 426. What will he say, to what is Reported by the foresaid Author of the *Fulfilling of the Scriptures*, pag. 432. how *Robert Bruce his Praying caused unusual Motions upon those who were not in the Chamber with him, nor knew the Cause, how that came upon them?* And yet this is given as an Instance of *his knocking down the Spirit of God upon them*, as they themselves phrase it? P. 420. he wondereth and asketh, *How one, in whom the Life doth flow, so that he might speak, yet may forbear, since that is a sufficient Call?* And how dare they follow their own Choice? But this is a silly Quibble: The Flowing of Life may sometimes give Ability to speak Justifiably, and yet it may be no Sin to forbear; since albeit it gives a Sufficiency of Authority, yet not a peremptory Command: And this is no Contradiction. The Apostle *John* could have written more, and that no doubt from the Spirit; and yet did it not: 2 *Joh.* 12. 3 *Joh.* 13. And I suppose *J. B.* will not dare to say, *he sinned in this Ferbearance*. He goeth about p. 420. n. 12. to Examine the Scripture-Proofs I bring for *Waiting*; and then he shews, in what Respect *Waiting* is there understood; which nothing hurteth my using them. What if *Waiting* be understood, as he saith, in Opposition to *Fretting*? May not that be in *Silence*? But as to this, since his Brother *R. M.* in the *Postscript*, has promised us his Answer to *G. K's* Book, called *The Way cast up*, we will Wait to see, what he Answers

The true Preparation.

Unusual Motions by Praying Instanced of J. B's Party.

The Waiting in Silence in our Meetings vindicated.

ſwers to his 15th *Seſt.* and to the Scriptures brought by him there to this Purpoſe: And that he may more fully conſider that Matter, I recommend to him the ſerious Peruſal of G. K.'s Book, called, *The Glory and Advantage of Silent Meetings.* He alledgeth falſly p. 423. that I ſay, *Men cannot Wait upon God in Prayer*; I ſay only, That Waiting in it ſelf rather denoteth a Paſſive Dependence, and that true Prayer preſuppoſeth Waiting: And that therefore their Objection is frivolous, that aſcribe Waiting of it ſelf or ſimply conſidered, to ſuch Acts: But I never denied, that a Man in Prayer might be ſaid alſo to Wait. Another of his ſilly Quibbles is pag. 424. n. 17. where, becauſe I ſay, That *the Devil can only work in and by the Natural Man* (for ſo he may be pleaſed to Tranſlate my Words, or at leaſt he muſt ſuffer me ſo to do: ) he ſaith; *He thought, he could alſo work in a Spiritual Man, as in Peter, &c. But not in and by the Spiritual Man*: It was in and by the Natural Part both in *Peter* and *Paul*, that he wrought; if he thinks not ſo, let him ſay the Contrary. P. 425. in Answer to what I ſay of the Excellency of this Worſhip, as that which cannot be Interrupted, to prove; That *Chriſt's Kingdom needed outward Power to protect it*, he telleth of the Promise, That *Kings ſhould be nurſing Fathers.* What then? That may be an Advantage; yet it will not follow, there is an Abſolute Need for it; elſe Chriſt's Kingdom could not be *without* it. But indeed, ſuch a ſure, outward Kingdom the Priests always Covet, where they may be Upheld by the Magiſtrate, and ſupplied with daily Augmentations; and have all others that differ from them, Severely Perſecuted: For where this is wanting, they cry out, *Alas!* like *Babylons Merchants*; and think, *it goes not well with their Zion.* The Reſt of this Page he concludes with Railing; but for Answer to it he may know,

1679.

The Devil works in and by the Natural Part in Man.

Chriſt's Kingdom needeth not an outward Power to protect it.

1679. know, that the *Quakers* Meetings in *Scotland*, albeit few in Number, have met with more Injuries from Wicked Men, than the *Presbyterians*; and that they never defended themselves with Force of Arms against any, far less against the Magistrate, as his Brethren have done: Or with shedding of Blood. As for his other Quibble, pag. 427. That ceasing to do Evil, is not without all Action of the Mind: Not to contend with him about it, I shall not plead for a further Cessation, than such a simple Forbearance importeth; and let him call it an Action, if he will. His chief Reply to what I say in Answer to what they object of Silence (besides some Scoffs) is; That what I alledge, is not spoken of an *Introverting Silence* (for he will needs use this *Latin* Word, and not translate it) But can there be any true Silence in order or with respect to the Worship of God, where the Eye of the Mind is not Inward, since the Spirit of God, by which Christians are led and instructed, is said to be Within them? But pag. 424. n. 16. he saith, That *Watching* is not a turning inward, but a looking outward also. Indeed they, who look outward, go the Way to be tempted; for outward Objects is not that, which delivers Men from Temptations; but often draws them to them: But it would seem according to him, that Men, if their Eyes be shut, or in a dark Room, cannot Watch in a Spiritual Sense; And then what became of many Saints, that have been put into Dungeons? As to what he adds out of *Dr. Stillingsfleet's* Book *Of the Idolatry of the Church of Rome*, and *Tauler's* Sermons, which takes up about 7 whole Pages (by which the Reader may see, how his Book grows so bulky) he misseth his Aim: For he will never prove, that the first and most Eminent Preachers among the *Quakers*, who both practised and commended

Silence and  
Inward  
Watching  
Controvert-  
ed by F. B.

this

this Way of Worship (as well as Thousands of 1679. them yet) did ever know, that there was such a thing spoken of among *Papists*, or that there ever lived such a Man, as *Taulerius*. So that he but wastes his Paper in seeking to prove, *They have borrowed their Doctrine thence*: And albeit I will not Justify many of the Expressions used in the Pages cited by him; yet I will not scruple to affirm, That *some of them savour more of Christianity*, than his Lies, Calumnies and Railings.

¶ 3. He begins his 23d Chapter of *Preaching* (that he may be like himself) with a Calumny, saying; *I have something against Preaching, Praying and Singing*; which is false: I am against none of those Duties, as truly performed according to the right Gospel-Method; as by the Sequel will appear. And that he may go on at the same rate, he seems to be glad, *that I acknowledge the Necessity of Worships being consonant to Scripture*; but then, that he may not want something to Cavil, he intreats me to reconcile this with what I say of the *Scriptures*: But he should first have shewn me, wherein the Difference is? For I profess, I see none. He desires also to know from Scripture the Necessity, when Men are Met together, of Turning their Minds Inward; which he still will express (to make it the more frightful) by the *Latin Word Introversio*: And this he thinks so hard, that he often insists upon it, as p. 446, 447, 448. But is it not needful to *Assemble in the Name of Jesus*? And can that truly be without *turning the Mind Inward*? Unless with superstitious *Papists* he thinks it is enough for meeting in the Name of *Jesus*, to say, when they begin, *In Nomine Domini*; however their Minds be abroad. Can there be any true Sense of God's Majesty, as him to whom we draw near (which himself confess before to be needful) without a se-

Preaching  
praying and  
singing own-  
ed by us.

A Turning of  
the Mind in-  
ward, is an  
Abstracting  
from all  
Worldly  
Thoughts to  
mind God in  
the Soul.

1679. rious Turning of the Mind Inward, that is, an Abstracting from all Worldly and Vain Thoughts, to mind G O D and the Operations of his Spirit in the Soul? Let him read *Psal.* 46. 14, and 62. *I. Eccles.* 5. 2. 3. *Zach.* 2. 3. It were hard for him to forget his old, often-reiterated Calumny, and therefore he hath it here oftner than once, as *p.* 441, 442-447. alledging most falsly, "That all that, by which the *Quakers* preach, or require as needful to preach, is but the *Dima*, "and darkned, and malignant Light of Nature." Neither will he forget here his constant Trade of Railing; take one Instance, *p.* 447. where he says; *That before I want Revelations, I will go to the Devil to get them, as Saul did to the Witch of Endor.* More of such Railing Stuff the Reader may find, and that very plentifully *p.* 440-442-448. He wants not here also his malicious Insinuations, as *p.* 439. "That the *Quakers* use Le-gerdemaine, to make People believe, they "speak all without a Previous Thought in their "Preaching; and yet have all, to a Word, well "studied:" If he accuse the *Quakers* of this, let him prove it, if he can; for we deny it, as a gross Calumny. Another is *p.* 441. *That we would have all Study, all Meditation, all Prayer and Wrestling with God in Prayer laid aside;* which is also false. But to proceed: he foundeth what he saith in this Matter upon two great Mistakes; which being removed, the Superstructure will fall of it self. The First is *p.* 438. where, to prove the Usefulness of Study and Premeditation to Preaching, he tells, "How *Paul* made use, of what he "had read out of a *Heathen-Poet*; his recommending Reading to *Timothy*; his desiring *Titus* to hold fast the faithful Word, as he had "been taught, &c. and *Apollos* being instructed "by *Aquila* and *Priscilla*:" All which are nothing to his Purpose. For we never said, It was


7. B's abusive Railing.

7 B. pleads Study and premeditation to preach, from Paul's citing Heathen-Poets, &c.

Unlaw-




Unlawful for Men to read Books, especially the *Scripture*; or that by such Reading Men may not acquire Knowledge, which may prove Useful in Preaching or Defending the Truth; but the Question is, *Whether Men may make use of these things in publick Worship, otherwise than as led, and acted, and Influenced by the Spirit so to do? And Whether any of these Places will allow Men to Preach in the Strength of their Natural or Acquired Parts, without being acted therein by the Spirit?* Let him prove this, if he can, for this is the Matter in Question; and remember *Robert Bruce* his Censure of *Robert Blair* his Sermon Recorded in *The Fulfilling of the Scriptures*. His Second Mistake is p. 443; where he supposeth, That to be led by the Spirit, excludeth, or is inconsistent with Reading Scripture, and with all the particular Instructions given by *Paul* to *Timothy* and *Titus*; who might have said (as this Man argues) *I cannot be stinted unto these Doctrines, which you desire me to put the Brethren in Remembrance of; for I must speak as the Spirit speaketh in me, and the like.* But will he say, that *Timothy* was not to speak, as the Spirit spake in him? To suppose this, as Inconsistent with such Instructions, is to beg the Question: And that these are Consistent, I have shewn above in my Third Section of *Immediate Revelation*: Or let him tell plainly, if *Timothy* could do those Things acceptably without the Spirit, since all Worship is commanded by Christ to be done now in the Spirit. And yet he seemeth to agree to the Necessity of the Spirit; else why quarreleth he me p. 448. for insinuating, as he saith, That *their Ministers preach not in the Demonstration of the Spirit?* Giving an Enumeration p. 439. of several ways, which he saith, *I know not, but their Ministers are led to preach by;* among which this is one: *What know I* (saith he) *but there may be some, that never digest their*

1679.  
  
 To be led by the Spirit doth not exclude the Reading of the Scriptures.

1679. *Preachings so, as not to lie open to the Influences of the Spirit; and to welcome his seasonable and useful Suggestions, and to speak many things, which they had not once premeditated? But I would ask him, Whether it be Lawful for any so to digest their Matter, as not to lie thus open to the Spirit's Influences? He would seem to say, It were; since it is but some, and a [may be some] too with him, that do so. And whereas he tells of some, that are constrained to change their Text; and what they had purposed to speak upon it? This shews, the Case is but rare; and therefore I am not to be blamed, for what I say in general of Preachers among Papists and Protestants, whose general Way is, To prepare aforehand, what they preach, and then speak it to the People at a set Hour, without waiting for the Leading of the Spirit, or whether they have it's Influence, or not. And for all the Weight, that this Man would seem to lay sometimes upon the Spirit's Influence and Concurrence; yet he gives shrewd Presumptions, that he doth it but pro Forma: Else how comes he to urge as an Absurdity, p. 445. That all that Ministers preach by the Spirit, must be true? And why not? If it be from the Spirit, it cannot be other ways: Yet Men, whose Principle it is to speak from the Spirit, may through Weakness and Mistake preach false Doctrine; yet the Spirit is not to be blamed for it, but those who keep not purely to it. I suppose he will not deny, but all that, which Men preach according to the Scripture, is Infallibly True; it will not thence follow, that all that, which Men (whose Principle it is to preach according to Scripture) preach, is True; because that through Weakness they may mistake the true Meaning of the Scripture. Also what he adds; "If the Matter be thus, it is all one, whether the Preacher be young or old—for it is not he that speaketh, but the Spirit in him;" for this*

Both Protestants and Papists prepare aforehand, what to preach.

It is not ye that speak, but it is your Father's Spirit which speaketh in you.

1679. 

this favoureth not of a Christian Spirit, to seek to draw an Absurdity, or make a Mock of that, which is no other than Christ's Express Words, *Mat. 10. 20. Mark 13. 3.* And indeed, what he saith in this Page *n. 9.* in Answer to these Scriptures, seemeth rather a Mock at Christ and his Apostles, than any Answer; asking me, *If I know not, that Christ gave them their Preaching with them, telling them what they should say; And as ye go, preach saying, The Kingdom of God is at Hand?* And a little after he saith; *They had their Sermon taught them before-hand: But dare he say, That Christ's Words before-mentioned were therefore false?* This he must say, or else prove nothing. Or will he say, that the Apostles in all that Progress said nothing, but these Seven Words, *The Kingdom of God is at Hand?* For according to him, this was *all they said*, which they had learned afore-hand, and not, as the *Holy Ghost taught them in that Hour, what to say*, albeit it be Christ's Express Words, *Luke 12. 12.* P. 447. to my Argument, that according to their Doctrine the *Devil himself ought to be heard*, seeing he knoweth the Notion of Truth, and excelleth many of them in Learning and Eloquence; he answers; *Why doth the Man thus speak Untruth? Do we say, that every one, though he were the Devil, if he speak Truth, should be heard?* Do they not say, *That Men ought to be heard and accounted as Ministers, albeit void of the true Grace of God, if having the Formality of the outward Call?* And to prove this, do not they bring the Example of *Judas*, whom Christ called a *Devil?* And they suppose him to have been *such*, even when sent by Christ, and deserved to be heard, as his Apostle. Let him consider then, how he can shun, what I have affirmed? And albeit the *Devil may speak without Study*; yet he cannot be said to speak by the

1679. Spirit of God : which is the thing we affirm *need-  
ful* to Gospel-Preaching. And for his last Argu-  
ment p. 448. *That since extraordinary Gifts ceased,  
there hath been no ordinary way of Preaching, but  
by ordinary Gifts studied and acquired; It is but a  
bare begging of the Question, and the same up-  
on the Matter with his new-enforced Objection;  
which I answered towards the Beginning of my  
Third Section of Immediate Revelation.*

*J. B. argues  
for acquir-  
ing the Gift  
of preaching  
by outward  
Study of the  
Letter.*

¶ 4. I come now to his Twenty fourth Chap-  
ter of *Prayer* : And as to his first Paragraph,  
there needs no Debate; for (except some Railing  
intermixed) I own, what is asserted in it, as to  
the Necessity of Prayer, and its being through  
Christ, as Mediator. In the next he alledgeth,  
I speak untruly in saying, *That the Acts of their  
Religion are produced by the Strength of the Natu-  
ral Will; for they can pray, when they please :*  
But how truly this is affirmed concerning them,  
will after appear. Albeit in Opposition to it,  
after citing a Passage out of the larger *Catechism*,  
he saith; *They own the Influences of the Spirit,  
as absolutely Necessary to this Duty:* Which if he  
would hold to, there needed no further Debate;  
I should agree to it. For he doth untruly state  
the Question, when he saith a little after; *That  
the Motions and Inspirations I plead for, are extra-  
ordinary; which is false, and never said by me:*  
And therefore his building on it is in vain as well  
here, as p. 452-457-459, 461. where he insinuates,  
*That I judge not the gracious and ordinary Influ-  
ences of the Spirit a sufficient Warrant to pray;*  
which is false. What he saith p. 451. of the *Ne-  
cessity of Prayer at some times,* and of the Scrip-  
tures mentioning, *Prayers being made three times a  
Day,* I deny not; nor is it to the Purpose: The  
Question is, *Whether any can pray acceptably with-  
out the Spirit?* We see, he hath granted, *they  
can-*

*J. B. owns  
the Spirit  
necessary to  
Prayer.*

cannot; then the thing to be proved, is, *Whether the general Command authorized any to set about it, albeit in a Manner, which is granted, will not avail, and is unacceptable?* So the Matter resolves in Examining, what he can say from Scripture or other ways, to prove this. And that there may be no Mistake, let it be considered, that I deny not the *General Obligation to pray upon all*; so that they, who do not pray, Sin; albeit they be not sensible of the Spirit's Help enabling them to do it: But that the Way to avoid this Sin, is not to commit another, to *pray without the Spirit*; but to *Wait for the Spirit*, that they may pray acceptably: Seeing without it, though they should use Words of Prayer, it would be no fulfilling of the Command. And first then to what he argueth p. 452. from the Reiterated Commands of God to pray, I answer; That God's Commands lay upon Man an Obligation to pray, I deny not; but *God commands no Man to pray unacceptably*; God commands the Right Performance of Prayer; and this he has confessed cannot be *without the Spirit*; therefore *God commands no Prayer without the Spirit*, neither is the Command answered or fulfilled by such as pray without it. To this he Objecteth, p. 453 and 458. *That the same moral Duties might be shifted, until the Spirit lead to them; and also Natural Acts of Sleeping, Eating, &c. which are Abomination in the Wicked*: And yet to go round, he accuseth me p. 454. (albeit falsely) of saying; *Men may pray without the Grace of God*: Which by this Objection is his own Faith; since he will not deny, but Men may Sleep and Eat without the Grace of God. But to this Objection I answered in my *Apology*, shewing the Difference betwixt these Acts and Acts of Worship; which he grants p. 461. And albeit I confess (which he urgeth here) that these profit not the Man at all, as with respect to

1679

Who do not pray, do sin.

God commands no prayer without the Spirit.

1679. God's Favour, when done without the Spirit ; yet they really fulfil the Matter of the thing commanded in Relation to our Neighbours and to our selves, in Eating, Drinking, Sleeping, else it would be Self-Murder. But in Prayer the Matter is not fulfilled without the Spirit, which relateth only to God, to whom every Prayer without the Spirit is an Evil Savour, and not in any true and proper Sense a Prayer : For Prayer, as to the material Part, cannot be performed without the Spirit. He confesseth according to their *Catechism*, That *the Spirit is needful to know, what to pray for* ; which is the material Part : But the Necessity of the Spirit as to these other things, is only as to the formal Part, or right Manner. And this pleading for Praying from these Natural Acts shews, how he contradicts himself, in saying ; *It is untrue, that they are for Prayer without the Spirit* ; for if they be not, this Argument were Impertinent, which is ; *As these ought to be done without the Spirit, so ought the other*. And yet he more manifestly Contradicts this, p. 456. saying ; *That God requireth not Men to feel the Influences of the Spirit, as a Preparation to Prayer ; yea, that Men ought to pray, even when, and because they feel they want them* : For if it be true, that he said before, *That these Influences are necessary to the right Performance of Prayer* ; either Men ought to perform Prayer wrong, or this must be a manifest Contradiction : But since this Manner of Prayer is owned really in their Praying at Set Times, whether they have the Spirit's Influence or not, it shews, I spake no Untruth of them ; and that his saying so was untrue, said by him. And hence also the Man's Impudence may be seen p. 460. in saying, *I am a Liar in affirming, they profess, they may pray without the Spirit, and have their set Times* : But the thing I say, is, That they limit themselves so,

The formal part of Nature's Acts directed by the Spirit.

so, as to lay a Necessity upon themselves to pray at set Times, as before and after Sermon, and before and after Meat; and this he cannot deny: Or if he should, their Universal Practice would declare him a Liar. And if they pray at set Times, and that professedly, without Waiting for the Spirit's Influence, yea, when they are sensible they want it; Do not they profess to pray without the Spirit? What he saith here and elsewhere, that this was the Opinion of *Swenkfeldius* and the *Familists*, is not to the Purpose: For what we believe in this, we do it as being the Truth, and not with respect to such, of whose Belief we take no notice, so as to make it any Ground for our Faith. And to shew, how impertinent this *Classing us with others* is, to render us odious upon every Occasion, I may tell him here once for all; That even as to this very thing of *Prayer* he agrees against us with *Papists, Socinians, Pelagians, Episcopalians, Independents, Anabaptists, Lutherans, Arminians, Antinomians*, yea, and with *Pagans, Turks and Jews*; all which affirm with him, That Men may and ought to pray at certain Times and upon certain Occasions, albeit not having any present Motions or Influence of the Spirit of God so to do.

¶ 5. What he saith here in several Places of *Introversion*, I refer to what is said before, to avoid Repetition. It might have been thought, that in this Chapter of *Prayer* (and where he urges it so much from the General Command, that he would have minded) it would have been more suitable to pray for such, as he may account his Enemies, and even *Hereticks*, than Rail at them. But the Treating upon this Subject has had no such Inference with him: And therefore he is sure to keep here his old Style of Railing; which the Reader may observe pag. 452-456-459, 460, 461. He hath divers little Cavils and Quibbles in this Chap-

1679.  
 Professors  
 limit them-  
 selves to  
 pray at set  
 Times, with-  
 out Waiting  
 for the Spi-  
 rit.

J. B. plead-  
 ing for pray-  
 er forgets to  
 pray for, but  
 not to Rail  
 against such  
 he accounts  
 his Enemies.

1679. Chapter, which I willingly omit, as not concerning the Weight of the Question; only to give the Reader a Taste of them, I shall note one or two. P. 455. upon these Words, *sub Degustationem*, he fancieth; *The Quakers hold a State of Prayer distinct both from publick and private*: But if he had not been very Critical, and ready to Catch (albeit he omits more weighty things) he had not troubled himself with this; which is an Error either of the Transcriber or Printer: For it is in my Copy, *ad cibum*, meaning the Prayers before and after Meat; and that the other Word doth also signify. The next is his asking, What I mean by *Ejaculations emitted to Man's Self?* and *this* (saith he) *looks like a Piece of Quaker Idolatry*. This shews the Man's Eagerness to stretch every thing to make an Accusation; for by this I intended nothing, but to express such Prayers, as Men make unheard of others. And if this be a Piece of *Quakers Idolatry*, it is such, as he must account the Apostle *Paul* guilty of, as well as I; whose Words are *1 Cor. 14. v. 28. εαυτῷ δὲ λαλεῖτω, sibi ipsi loquator, Let him speak to himself*, as both *Arias Montanus* and *Beza* translate it, as well as the *English*: And that this is understood of Prayer, see from *v. 24*. So the furious Man may see, whither his Malice hath driven him! He forgetteth not also in this Chapter his old Calumny, and therefore hath it here oftner than once; that *As all the rest, so the Prayers of the Quakers, as well as Preparations thereunto come only from that Light of Nature*, as p. 455, 456, 457. and hence he accuseth me of *Pelagianism*, p. 459. for saying;

“ That to Command a Man to pray without the Spirit, is to command him to see without Eyes, and work without Hands; because *Pelagius* said, that whatever God commanded us to do, he gave us sufficient Strength to do it. But if *Pelagius* said so, he understood it of an Ability without the Spirit

*Ejaculations*  
quibbled at  
by J. B. al-  
lowed in  
Scripture.

A Man cannot  
more pray  
without the  
Spirit, than  
he can see  
without  
Eyes.



rit of God; for which the *Antients* condemned him: Whereas my very Assertion here is in as opposite Terms to that, as any thing can be; since I argue, that a Man can no more *pray without the Spirit, than he can see without Eyes.* And indeed, all this Man's Reasoning in this Chapter favours strongly of *Pelagianism*, where he pleads throughout for *Mens setting about Spiritual Duties without the Spirit*; yea p. 463. he saith, *That the Divine Indulgence towards such, as have begun to pray without the Spirit, and afterwards have found it assisting them in their Prayer, is a strong Inducement and Encouragement to them*: For this agrees exactly to the *Semipelagian Principle, Facienti quod in se est, Deus non denegat Gratiam*, i. e. *God will not deny Grace to such, as do what they can.* And indeed, this allowing Men to perform *Spiritual Duties without the Allowance of the Spirit*, as this Man doth, pleading for it, and reckoning the Contrary Absurd, p. 453. is Compleat *Pelagianism*; and doth clearly import, *That Man by the Working of Nature can acquire the Spirit*, and can do something in order to obtaining the Spirit of himself, before he have it: And thence this Man pleads so much p. 451. for the general Use of Prayer from the Light and Law of Nature: Let him Reconcile this, if he can, with his other Doctrines, and Clear himself of *Pelagianism*. And it is so much the more considerable, that he has fall'n into this Pit, of which he so often falsely accuseth me, as also p. 461. He asketh again, pag. 460. *Why we come to their Places of Worship, if our Consciences be hurt in joining with them?* And thence he concludes, *It is to do open Contempt.* This is but his malicious Conjecture: We come not there, but in Obedience to the Lord, when moved by his Spirit so to do, to bear a faithful Testimony against all Superstition and Will-Worship.

1679.



J. B. with Pelagians plead for a Prayer from Nature's Law and Light.

J. B.'s false Accusation why we come to their Places of Worship?

1679. ship. For it is not pleasant to us to come there, where for the most Part we are saluted with Knocks and Stones, and other such *Brutish* and *Paganish* Dealings by their Church-Members; which is the Fruit of their Holy Things, and whereunto the People are often encouraged by their Preachers, who sometimes shew an Example of this themselves: And of whose barbarous Actions even by the *Presbyterian* Preachers there is a Book Extant, entituled, of *Fighting Priests*; giving account, *how many of them fell upon these Innocent Servants of the Lord with their own Hands*: And I my self have seen of the present Preachers of *Scotland* do it. As for his flouting at the *Quakers*, for laying Claim to a Spirit of *Discerning*, so as to *distinguish, who pray from the Spirit, and who not*; he doth but therein declare himself to be none of Christ's Sheep, who are said to know his Voice from that of a Stranger. And as for his saying, That the *Quakers* judge of this by the *Mimical Posture of the Body*, it is false; and would agree far rather to his Brethren, whose *Affected Postures of Body*, as well as their *Non-sensical and Absurd Expressions in Prayer* have disgusted many of their Way: Of which I could give some *Eminent Instances*, but that I spare them at present. The Example I gave of their *Excluding some from their Sacrament of the Supper* (so called) doth not *halt*, as he affirmeth, *p. 462.* as to the main: For if the *Command to take it*, is with *Presupposition of Examination*; so the *Command of Praying* is with the *Presupposition of its being in the Spirit*, in which all *Worship* is now to be, *Praying always — in the Spirit*, *Ephes. 6. 18.* To my shewing, in Answer to their *Objection of Peter his Commanding Simon Magus to pray*, that he says, *Repent and pray*; after a *meer Assertion without Proof* he says;

He

Fighting  
Priests fall-  
ing upon  
the Innocent  
with their  
own Hands.

*He sees, that with our Quaker a graceless Person 1679. can repent, but not pray. To which I answer; If he speak of Possibility, I believe a Graceless Person may both repent and pray; but as he cannot repent without Grace, so not pray without the Spirit: But Grace worketh in all, if not resisted; as the Spirit doth in all to Prayer, when they have received the Grace in Measure: but that some Measure of Repentance must go before Prayer, himself I judge will hardly deny; since the very offering to Pray importeth in the Person applying himself thereunto a Sense of his Iniquity, and a Desire to be delivered from it; for which End he approacheth to God to demand Pardon and Help to amend.*

A Measure of Repentance goes before Prayer in a Sense of Iniquity and Desire of Deliverance.

¶ 6. Now I come to his Twenty Fifth Chapter of *Singing Psalms*; where I shall not need to be large. I deny not (as he observes) *Singing*: But to justify their Custom of *Singing David's Conditions*, by which many are made (as I observed in my *Apology*) to *speak Lies in the Presence of God*, he objecteth the Practice of the *Jews*; but their Practice in Matters of Worship, without a Gospel-Precept, is not a Rule to us. Neither doth the Instance given by him of *Psal. 66. 6.* answer the Matter: for the *Jews* might very well praise the Lord for the Deliverance of their Fore-fathers out of *Egypt*; but that will not allow Drunkards and Impenitent Persons to say, *They water their Couch with Tears*; as by *Singing Psalms* many do, which is false. As for his saying, *They do but praise God for what he hath done for others*; why do they not express it so then? And whereas he asketh, *Whether the Spirit inspireth the Meeter in the Song, and the Tone of the Singing?* He sheweth his Folly and Lightness, while he ridiculously supposeth, that Meeter is necessary, or any other Tone, than Nature hath given to every one; of which God by his Spirit maketh Use as an Instrument,

*J. B.* endeavours to justify their Custom of *Singing David's Conditions*, and their speaking Lies.

1679. ment, as he doth of other Parts and Faculties of the Body to the Performing of Spiritual Duties. And the like Folly he sheweth, when he tells, *What they do not in Scotland*; since he knows it was not particularly or only against the things practised in *Scotland*, that I write in that *Apology*.

## S E C T. XIII.

*Wherein his Twenty Sixth Chapter Of Baptism is Considered.*

¶ I. OUR Author to shew, how angry and forward he resolves to be in this Chapter, makes his first Paragraph a compleat Stick of Railing. He begins with telling, That *the Paganish Antichristian Spirit, which reigneth and rageth in the Quakers, manifest a perfect and compleat Hatred at all the Institutions of our Lord Jesus Christ*; and he endeth with this Exclamation, *O! what desperate Renegado's must these Men be?* More of this kind may be seen pag. 472, 473, 474, 480, 481. As for what he adds from several Scriptures of *Baptism*, pag. 466, 467. what of it relates to the Weight of the Question, will be examined afterwards. He gives us here a Citation out of their larger Catechism, and then comes at last, pag. 468. n. 4. to Examine, what I say in the Matter; where upon my urging the many Contests among Christians concerning these things called *Sacraments*, as one Reason against them, he concludes, *I might as well plead against all Christianity, because of the many Debates about it*: And with this Conceit he pleaseth himself a little; which only evidenceth his malicious Genius: for I should never have used that as an only Argument; and did not use at all, but as having many other

J. B. a  
compleat  
sailer.

Contests  
about their  
Sacraments  
among Chri-  
stians (so  
called.)

other considerable Ones against their Use of these things: and therefore I add, That *these things contended for, are meer Shadows and outward things.* Then to cover their making Use of the Word *Sacrament*, which is not to be found in Scripture, he objecteth my making Use of the Word *Fermentation*, and of the *Vehicle of God*: But I use not to make Use of these Words, when I speak *Scots* or *English*; but these Words, when interpreted, are made Use of in Scripture: for the Latin *fermentum*, which signifies *Leaven*, is oft used, even as compared to *Spiritual Things*; as *Mat. 13. 31. Luke 13. 21. 1 Cor. 5. 6, 7, 8.* yea, the Word *Leaven* and *Leavened* is to be found in Scripture above *Thirty Times*: But the Word *Sacrament* never so much as once. And it is not (as he saith) a *poor thing* to Challenge them for expressing the Chief Mysteries of their Religion in Words, that cannot be found in all the Scripture; while they affirm it to be the *only, adequate Rule of their Faith and Manners.* That we deny the thing truly imported by the *Trinity*, is false. As for the Word *Vehiculum Dei*, as having a Respect to *Christ's Body or Flesh and Blood from Heaven*, that it is a Scripture-Word, see *Cant. 3. 9. King Solomon made unto himself a Chariot of the Wood of Lebanon;* and *v. 10. Vehiculum ejus purpureum:* the Hebrew Words for *Chariot* and *Vehiculum* are אפריון *Appirion* and מרכב *Merkabb* or *Merkaba*, both which signify a *Chariot* and *Vehicle*; and that by *Solomon* is mystically understood *Christ*, of whom *Solomon* was a *Figure* or *Type*, none who are spiritually-minded can deny; and consequently that this *Chariot* or *Vehicle* must be mystically and spiritually understood. Nor can it be meant of *Believers*, or the *Church*, because it is said, *The midst of it being paved with Love for the Daughters of Jerusalem,* i. e. for *Believers*: So that they are received by *Christ* into his *Chariot* or *Vehicle*; and there-

1679-

*Fermentum*  
or *Leaven* is  
oft used in  
Scripture.

The like  
of *Vehiculum Dei*, a  
*Chariot* or  
*Vehicle*, signi-  
fied by the  
Hebrew  
Words  
אפריון  
אפריון  
and  
מרכב:

*Solomon* a  
*Figure* of  
*Christ*.

1679. therefore not it, but distinct, as the Contained is distinct from the Containing. But for the further understanding of these *Hebrew Words* see *Buxtorff* his *Hebrew Lexicon*, and the Book called *Apparatus* in lib. *Sobar*. part. 1. p. 144, and 553. And however he might Cavil upon this mystical Meaning; yet the Word is Scriptural, which their Barbarism *Sacrament* is not. And to his saying (in Answer to my shewing, That by laying aside this *Unscriptural Term, the Contest of the Number of the Sacraments will vanish*) that it will remain, if instead of *Sacrament* they use *Signs or Seals of the Covenant*: This is but his bare Assertion, until he prove by clear Scripture, that there are only *Two Signs or Seals of the Covenant*: which he will find hard; and yet harder, that these two are they. Pag. 469. n. 5. he denieth the Scripture faith, *There is one only Baptism*; instancing the Baptism of *Affliction*: But I speak here of the Baptism of Christ in a true and proper Sence; and *Eph. 4. 5.* will prove as much, *That there is one only Baptism*, as there is *one only God*; which is in the next Verse. But before I proceed any further, I must desire the Reader to observe, how this Man, speaking of the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, understands it only to relate to the *Extraordinary Gift of speaking with Tongues*, which the Apostles had; and not as any thing common to all true and really Regenerated Christians: So that he concludes, the *Baptism* with the Spirit and with Fire now to be ceased. And upon this his Supposition he buildeth pag. 471-473, 474-478. without so much as offering to prove it. And to this he addeth a gross Lie upon me, pag. 472. *That I will have none to be Baptized in the Spirit, but such as are endued with these Extraordinary Gifts*; which I never said nor believed: And therefore this his false Supposition I deny; and consequently till next time, that he take Leisure to prove it,

The *One Baptism*.

What *J. B.* understands by *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*, which in his Account is ceased.

it, all that he builds thereupon, is meerly precarious, and needs no further Answer. *John the Baptist* speaking of the *Baptism* of Christ in general, as contradistinct from his, saith, *He that cometh after me, shall Baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with Fire*: which could not have been the Mark of Distinction, if this had only been restricted to what the Apostles received the Day of *Pentecost*; and not of the *Baptism* wherewith Christ Baptizeth all his Children. But to rectify the Mistake he supposeth I am in, concerning the *One Baptism*, he tells me, *The One Baptism comprehendeth both the outward Element, and the thing Represented and Sealed thereby*: But the Reasons he gives for this are so weak, that thereby I am confirmed, I am not in the Mistake. *I might say* (saith he) *there were two Circumcisions, because Circumcision is called Circumcision of the Heart*: And what then? In that Sence there were *Two*, so long as the *Outward* continued, to wit, the *Outward* and the *Inward*; that of the *Flesh*, and that of the *Heart*: And if he can answer this no better, than by Smiling at it, we must pity the Levity of his Spirit; but not be moved by the Weight of such airy Arguments. What he addeth of the *Object of Faith* being called *Faith*, as also the Profession, albeit the Apostle say, *there is One Faith*, is not to the Purpose; since these are included in the one true Faith the Apostle speaketh of: But for him to say, *That the Baptism of Water is included in the One Baptism, spoken of there by the Apostle*, is only to beg the Question; And yet all he doth, is strongly to Affirm this without Proof. So that all that he saith in Answer to me, being built upon this and such like Mistakes, needed in Strictness no more Reply, as his Answer to my Argument pag. 471. sheweth; where he supposeth *Two Baptisms*, one administred by Men,

1679.

F. B's  
One Baptism  
not the true  
One.

1679. another administred by Christ himself by his Spirit, and not by Men : But he should have proved this, e're he had used it as a Distinction ; and till he do so, my Argument, to wit, That *since such as were Baptized with Water, were not therefore Baptized with the Baptism of Christ, therefore Water-Baptism cannot be the Baptism of Christ* ; will stand for all his Blowing. I desire the Reader take Notice here of his Insinuation, as if I had borrowed this Argument from *Socinus* ; which he hath over and over again afterwards, as to others, speaking expressly *pag. 433.* of my stealing Arguments from *Socinus* : But to shew him, how unhappy he is in being so apt to speak Untruth, he may understand, that I never read *three Lines* of *Socinus's* Writings hitherto ; nor knew, what Arguments he used, till now he informs me, in Case his Information be true. Instead of Answer to what I urge from *1 Pet. 3. 21.* in my Apology, he giveth a Preaching made up of meer Assertions built on the former Mistakes, and Railing ; his Answer is built upon the Supposing, *That Water Baptism goes to the Making up of Christ's Baptism, which is now to continue* ; which yet remains for him to prove : And on the other hand Supposing, That I affirm, that by the *Answer of a good Conscience* there mentioned, is to be understood the *Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit* : which is false. And upon the same two Mistakes he grounds his Answer *pag. 473. N. 8.* to what I urge from *Gal. 3. 27.* and *Col. 2. 12.* as a Supplement, That the *Putting on of Christ* there mentioned by the Apostle, may be understood of *Putting on Christ by Profession, though not in Truth and Reality* ; which he also hath *pag. 438.* for which Exposition I shall expect his Proof next time, if he have any.

¶ 2. *Pag. 474.* He proceedeth upon the same unproved Supposition, *That Water Baptism was In-*



*Instituted by Christ*; and here he denies, that *John's Baptism* was a Figure. But since *John's Baptism* was a washing with Water, and that the Apostle ascribeth the *Putting on Christ* to the *Baptism* of Christ, as Washing with Water typifieth or signifies the Washing of Regeneration; so doth *John's Baptism* that of Christ. He concludeth this Paragraph with a silly Quibble, where, in Answer to my urging *John's* Words, saying, *I must decrease, and he must increase*, he adds, *As if John and Baptism with Water were all one; and Christ one and the same with the Baptism of the Holy Ghost*. Poor Man! he has been sore pinched when he betook himself to this silly Shift. Will he say, this is to be understood of *John's* and *Christ's* Persons, and not of their Ministry? Then we must suppose, *John* grew less and decrepit as to his Person ever after this; and *Christ* grew bigger and taller: Let him remember to prove this when he writes next. He goes on pag. 475. upon his old Mistake, supposing, *That Water Baptism was Instituted by Christ, and that he gave Command to his Disciples so to Baptize; and that Mat. 28. 19. is to be understood of Water Baptism*; all which is meerly to beg the Question. He saith, *That to say, John's Baptism is not Pure and Spiritual, or that it is a Legal Rite, is to condemn John, Christ and his Apostles; because God gave John an express Command for it*: And what then? God commanded the Legal Rites also; that did not hinder them from being *such*, to say, he needed not *such* a Command: If it had of the Nature of the Legal Rites, is but a presumptuous Quarrelling with God, seeing on all Hands it is granted, he Commanded it; and a meer Affirming, it is not *such*, instead of proving it. As for the Apostle his making Honourable Mention of *Baptism* in his Epistles, and of its Ends, which he points in several Scriptures; all which is granted: But it

1679.

*J. B's* Supposition, that *Water-Baptism* was Instituted by *Christ*, Invalidated.

*J. B's* poor Shift, that by *John's* Decrease is not meant his *Baptism*, &c.

The Legal Rites had a Command, as well as *John's* *Baptism*.

1679. doth not thence follow, that all this is to be understood of *Water Baptism*; and while that still remaineth the Thing in Debate, he can prove nothing from these Scriptures. But it is no wonder he thus forgets himself as to me; since in the following Words he quarrelleth with the Apostle *Paul*, saying in Answer to his Words, *1 Cor. 1. v. 17.* That *he was not sent to Baptize.* If *Paul* had not been sent to Baptize, why would he have done it? I think it needless to me to answer the Absurdity he would here fix upon the Apostle; since it sufficeth me, and I hope, will other good Christians, that the Apostle saith positively, That *he was not sent to Baptize*: And for his Baptizing of *some*, we will suppose he had a Reason, though not from his Commission, which he expressly denies; whatever *John Brown* may bawl to the contrary. As for his saying, *That it seemeth then, the other Apostles had another Commission than Paul had*; It is built upon the Supposition, that they had a Commission to Baptize with Water: which remains for him yet to prove. And not to contend with him (for Brevity's sake) about that of *Hosea 6. 6.* whether [*not*] there be only to be understood of *less principally*; yet though it were, it would not follow, it should be so understood here also: I shew him by an Example, *1 Cor. 2. 5.* what wild Work such an Interpretation would make, if ordinarily applied; but he, it seems, judged it most convenient not to take Notice of it in this his *Examen*, albeit in Reason he should have done it, if he would give a compleat Answer: For he must either prove [*not*] always to be understood of *less principally*; or otherwise he must bring particular Reasons, why it should be so here, and not, that it sometimes is *so* understood: For such a Particular will not infer the Consequence.

¶ 3. The Reason he giveth of Christ's Submitting to Water *Baptism*, to prove it now to continue, is his Saying; *For thus it becometh us to fulfil all Righteousness*: But may not that be applied also to Circumcision? And yet its Continuance will not thence follow. *John's* receiving a Divine Command to Baptize, sheweth, there was a Divine Institution for it under the Law; because the Law was not as yet abrogated, nor the Legal Ministrations accomplished, till Christ was offered up: As for Christ his Consecrating it in his own Person; the like may be also said of Circumcision. I come now to see what he saith *n. 14.* to prove *Matt. 28. 19.* to be understood of *Water Baptism*. And first, after a little Railing he saith, *This was but an Enlargement of their former Commission, as to the Object; And before this we heard of their Baptizing with Water, with Christ's Warrant and Authority, &c.* *Answ.* We have heard him say so indeed; but must wait, until he prove, ere we be so forward as to believe it. And next, what if it were all granted? We heard before of the Disciples Preparing and Eating the *Passover* with Christ's Warrant and Authority; will it thence follow, that that Practice is still to continue in the Church? (2.) Because *it is joined here with Discipling; and Baptizing was the Way of Making Disciples among the Jews*. So was Circumcision, and that no less constantly and necessarily; will it therefore follow, that Circumcision is to continue? (3.) He saith, *Their constant After-practice declareth this to be the meaning of the Command*: But the Apostle *Paul's* Practice and Testimony declareth this to be false. (4.) He saith, *This is the proper Import of the Word*: But I deny it is so in Scripture; since we see no Necessity in most of the Places of Scripture to understand the Word of *Water-Baptism*: And

1679.  
Christ submitting to Water-Baptism proves not its Continuance.

J. B's further Reasons for its Continuance examined.

1679. when he shews the *Necessity*, he may be answered ; and the Scriptures so frequently using it, where *Water* upon all Hands is confessed not to be understood, prove this to be true. And as for his saying, *That it cannot be understood here of Baptism with the Spirit*, it falleth to the Ground ; because only built upon the Supposition, that that is only understood of *Extraordinary Gifts*. He urgeth Christ's Saying, *Luke 12. 50. I have a Baptism to be baptized with ; and how am I straitned till it be accomplished ?* As if this were to be called *Christ's own Baptism* ; and so I shall grant it with Respect to his *Personal Sufferings* : But when I speak of *Christ's own Baptism*, I speak of that which is his as being Instituted by him for others ; and that Contradistinct from *John's*. Pag. 479. he saith, The Words of *Baptizing into the Name*, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, is only to be understood of a *Dedicating to God*, and not a *being Baptized into the Power and Virtue* : But this is his own Assertion. Neither doth *Paul's* saying, *1 Cor. 1. 13. Were ye Baptized in the Name of Paul ?* make it clear at all : For making it unto *Paul*, will render the Apostle's Argument more forcible, to shew the *Corinthians* their Folly, in saying, they were of *Paul*, or other Men, *into whose Power or Virtue* it was absurd to say, they were *Baptized* ; as must be said of all true Christians, being *Baptized into the Name of Christ*. That I condemn their *Manner of Baptizing*, is true ; but that I do it because of their Doing it *In the Name of the Father*, is his false and foolish Conjecture : And therefore his troubling himself to prove that, is to no Purpose. For his Saying, *That if Matt. 28. 19. be not understood of Water-Baptism, it would make a Tautology* ; I answered that (*n. 8.*) in my *Apology of Baptism* ; and here he only repeats the Objection, without taking Notice of my Answer : Which shew-

7. B's false  
Gloss upon  
the Words  
εἰς τὸ ὄνο-  
μα.

sheweth how Defective his *Examen* is. He goes on 1679.  
*pag. 480.* upon the Supposition, *That the Apostle's* The Apo-  
*Baptizing with Water was not by meer Permission;* stles Baptiz-  
 and yet the Apostle's Commanding the *Gentiles* ing with Wa-  
*to Abstain for a Time from things strangled, and* ter proves  
*from Blood, which was a Jewish Rite, shews, their* it not Evan-  
*Using Baptism with Water doth not prove it Evan-  
*gelical.* He confesseth here, *They did not fully at*  
*first comply with their Commission;* and he must  
 also say, they did not understand it, though he  
 would here wave it: And because he knows not  
 well what to say, he falls to Rail, saying, He  
*seeth, what Quakers cannot do with Reason, they*  
*must do with confident and bold Lies:* But the Rea-  
 son he gives of all this Accusation (so strange  
 Confidence) is my saying, That the Chief of  
*Christ's Disciples had been John's,* adding, *Will he*  
*tell us who these Chief were?* Yes, I will, seeing  
 he is so ignorant: *Joh. 1. 35, 37.* where he may  
 see, *Two of John's Disciples followed Christ,* one  
 of which is expressly mentioned to be *Andrew the*  
 Apostle; and it is there clearly enough imported,  
 that *Peter was another:* And such may without  
 Absurdity be accounted among the Chief of  
 Christ's Disciples. *Pag. 481.* he most falsely saith,  
*That I condemn Peter and all the Apostles for rest-*  
*ing satisfied with what he had done:* His saying  
 here, *That they do not urge their Baptism from*  
*Peter's Baptizing Cornelius,* shews, he sees a Ne-  
 cessity of not laying great Strefs upon that: But  
 for his adding, *That Jesus Christ hath command-*  
*ed,* he doth but say, and not prove it. He saith,  
*That Gal. 2. 12. will not prove, that Peter con-*  
*strained the Gentiles to be circumcised:* But *ver.*  
*14. to which my Words alluded, saith expressly,*  
*—Why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do*  
*the Jews?* And sure, that was to be circumcised. For  
 his Malitious, False Affelevation, *That we with the*  
*Jews design to destroy Christianity;* it needs no*

Some of  
 Christ's Dis-  
 ciples had  
 been John's.

1679. Reply. That there were *Baptisms* among the *Jews*, is clear from *Heb. 6. 2.* albeit *Paulus Riccius* were not alledged to prove it, nor any Debate used about the Antiquity of the *Jews Writings*; but that some of them wrote before the Year 200, *Josepbus's* History is an Example. He confesseth The *Etymology* of the Word inferreth *Dipping*; and albeit we deny not that, yet this sheweth, with how little Reason he urgeth that *Etymology* upon us: If the Reader will but seriously read, what I have written in my *Apology of Baptism*, he will easily find, how slender his Answer is, albeit I had not written this Reply.

## S E C T. XIV.

*Wherein his Twenty Seventh Chapter, Intituled, Of the Lord's Supper, is Considered.*

¶ I. T H E Reader before this time hath had so much Opportunity to discern the *Temper* of this Man's Spirit, that he need not wonder to find him begin this Chapter of the *Lord's Supper*, with an Heap of Railing; accounting us such, as *Overturn Christianity, and introduce Paganism, yea, as are posting towards it.* And then having given a large Account, *p. 483, 484.* of their *Confession of Faith* and *larger Catechism*, pag. 485. he comes to tell the *Good Experiences many have had by their Use of this Supper*; which to make strong in his Conceit, he useth a continued Style of Railing against us, as *Men only led by our own Imaginations, and given up to the Working of the Prince of Darkness:* And thus he goes on. But such Experience, albeit granted, will not prove the Necessity of its Continuance: For the Assembly of Divines (so called) in their *Preface* to

7. B's good Experiences of this Supper prove not its Continuance.

to the *Directory*, do speak of the Good, which 1679.  
 was Experienced by the *Liturgy* of the Church of *England*, and of the Religious Intentions of the  
 Compilers of it; while yet they are rejecting and  
 abolishing it, as that which proved an Offence  
 to the Godly, and occasioned much Mischief:  
 Therefore that is no Argument. P. 486. n. 5.  
 He comes to Examin, what I say in the Matter:  
 And then after a Reference to his *Tenth Chapter*,  
 he has his Old Calumny, *That the Celestial Seed,*  
*and Spiritual Substance is nothing, but the dim*  
*Light of Nature*; he falleth into a new Fit of Rail-  
 ing, which holds him to the End of this Paragraph;  
 terming us such as are *Judicially blinded and de-*  
*luded, acted and driven by the Devil into a Profane*  
*and Paganish Contradiction to the Ways of Grace.*  
 And with the like Shame, and upon the same old  
 Supposition of *our exalting the Light of Nature*  
 (which is most False) he filleth his n. 6. and also  
 his 7. p. 488. For what he saith there of the Absur-  
 dity of *God's Revealing himself to Heathens*, or  
 such as were *Idolators*, I have spoken before,  
 writing upon that Subject. And here he con-  
 cludes, *That my Asserting of a Spiritual Body*  
*and Flesh of Christ, at one Blow is a denying the*  
*Christ of God, and overturning Christianity:* But  
 instead of proving it, he proposeth some Questi-  
 ons; *Had Christ two Bodies?* Yes: And let him  
 deny it, if he dare, without contradicting the  
 Scripture. *Job. 6. 58.* Christ speaks of his Flesh,  
 which *came down from Heaven*: But this was not  
 the Flesh he took from the *Virgin Mary*; for that  
*came not down from Heaven*: But he had a Spiritu-  
 al Body, in which his Soul Existed long before he  
 took Flesh of the *Virgin*; and we will see, how  
*John Brown* proves this to be an Error, in the Re-  
 futation that is promised in his Name of *G. K's*  
*Book.* And for the rest of his Conjectures, such  
 as, *We have two such Bodies too,* is but a Fiction of  
 his

J. B's Rail-  
 ing against  
 the Light.

Christ's Flesh  
 which came  
 down from  
 Heaven, was  
 not the Flesh  
 he took  
 from the  
 Virgin Mary.

1679. his own Brain: We call no Body of Christ *Carnal*, but believe, That that Body, which Christ took of the Virgin, which was of the Seed of *Abraham* and *David*, in which Christ walked upon the Earth, and was Crucified, did Arise the Third Day, was Glorified, and remaineth in Heaven; wherein the Centre of his most Glorious Soul remaineth for Ever: And let him shew, if he can, how this is a Denying of the Christ of God, or Overturning of Christianity; He proceedeth p. 489. at a most violent Strain of Railing, upon the Supposition of his old Calumny; and here, that it may be Compleat, he makes a Preaching to the Devil: For which Blasphemous Abuse I wish heartily, the L O R D forgive him! That these Devils, to whom he preacheth, be not permitted to give him his Reward for his Sermon. But seeing, he blusheth not to do this in Print, I shall not think the many gross Abuses, I have heard to have been uttered by *Presbyterian*-Preachers, so Incredible, as I have been apt to do; especially that, which I have been informed of of late of one, who at a Conventicle in the *South* near *Legerwood*, not far from *Lauter*, made a Digression, in his Prayer, to the Devil, saying; *O Devil! thou hast troubled us much with the Bishops and Curates; We beseech thee, Devil, take them to thee, and make us quit of them!* This Prayer sutes with *John Brown's* Preaching: And indeed, the *Presbyterians* will need a *New Directory*; for the *Old one*, by which they are instructed to preach to Men, and pray to God, will not serve for this New Ministry, by which they begin to Preach and Pray to Devils. And of the like Strain is his saying, after much Railing, p. 490. *That if the Quaker write Comments on Paul's Epistles, it must be of Paulus Paganizans:* This Sort of Stuff is enough to give all sober Christians a Disgust of this Man's Writings. In this

J. B. makes  
a Preaching  
to the Devil.

A *Presbyterian* Preacher praying to the Devil to take the *Bishops* and *Curates*, to him, that they might be quit of them.



Page, after some Quibbles about Relation, he comes p. 491. n. 11. to Affirm, That *there may be a Relation, which is neither from the Nature of the thing, nor from some Divine Precept; such as a Promise and divine Institution.* But is not a divine Institution a divine Precept? And whereas he boasts here, *That my whole Discourse falleth, as being built upon a Mistake;* the Reader may see, the Mistake is his own, and not mine; and then judge of his Discourse, that's built thereon: As also how Airy, Vain and Ostentive he is in saying, *What will he now do? His Light has confounded him, so as he knows not what he says:* Is this Language becoming a Gospel-Minister? That what *Luke* saith, doth not import a perpetual but temporary Command, will after appear: Of what *Paul* saith, *1 Cor. 10.* will be spoken hereafter. To my shewing, that *1 Cor. 11. 26.* *Paul* expresseth the End of this Ceremony to be a Declaring of the Lord's Death; which hath no necessary Relation with partaking of Christ's Body and Blood: He answereth, *That a Declaration of Christ's Death is a comprehensive End, &c.* And what then? That proves not the Necessary Relation; nor yet what he adds in this Paragraph: Therefore I intreat him, next time to Speak to the Purpose. P. 492. n. 12. He Raileth at me, as *perverting the Apostle's Words;* but giveth no Reason, unless his own meer Affirmation and Queries be esteemed sufficient. He asketh, "What signified Christ's Blessing of the Bread, breaking, giving it to his Disciples, desiring them to eat?" *Ans.* Christ blessed the Bread, brake it, and gave it to his Disciples to eat, and they to others; where themselves confess no such Mystery or Sacrament, as they would have here, is deducible: see *Mat. 14. v. 19.* *Mark 6. 41.* He insinuates, I *speak falsely in saying, there is no mention*

1679.

The Declaring of the Lord's Death has no necessary relation with partaking of Christ's Body and Blood.

J. B.'s proofless Proofs for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (so called.)

1679. *mention of this Ceremony* 1 Cor. 10, 16. but is not so charitable as to point to me, *where?* If there be any such thing. As for his meer Affirmations and Distinctions here about the Bread, I will wait the next time to have them proved by Scripture; then will judge them worth the Considering. I have shewn in my *Apology*, that the *Corinthians* being in the Use of this Ceremony, and the Apostle's rectifying the Abuse they were in, in the Use of it, nor yet its having been done upon a Religious Account, or in a general Respect to the Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ; will not prove the Necessity of its being *now to be performed*: And therefore what he saith p. 493. n. 14. *evanisheth*. And as for his adding here, *That then it was an Act of Will-worship and Superstition*, and that I conclude, *the Apostle encouraged such a thing*: Whence he taketh Occasion to Rail at me, as *blasphemously imputing Unfaithfulness to the Apostle, and to the Spirit of God that acted him*; I Answer: What is done by Permission for a time, is not Will-Worship and Superstition; and he confesseth, he argues not from the *Corinthians* Practice: And for his Railing, the Ground of it being false, it needs no Answer. As for his denying, the *Jews* had such a *Custom at the time of their Passover*; his meer Negation is not sufficient to Elide the Testimony of far more Credible Authors, than he himself in this Matter: And as for the Words of *Luke, Do this in Remembrance of me*, It doth not infer perpetual Obligation upon the Church in all Ages. He Raileth at this, but without a Reason, p. 495. instancing the Apostle's 1 Cor. 11. 24, 25. But I told him before, that the Apostle gives here an Account of Matter of Fact; which infers not a Command: And in this Page the Man is miserably pinched to shew, how the *Washing of one anothers Feet*, albeit commanded with as great Solemnity

Do this in Remembrance, is no perpetual Obligation.

lemnity, doth not oblige as much now: But his Conjectures prove nothing. What! albeit it was a Custom in the hot Countreys, and that it was a Sign of Christ's Humility; How doth all that Abrogate the Express Command to do it? Let him shew an Exemption from this from plain Scripture: For his meer Assertions have but small Weight; and by which I am not like, nor yet any Man of Reason, that is not resolved to set up *John Brown* as a *Pope*, to believe all he saith from his bare Words, to conclude the Differences. He thinks *p. 496.* "That their not keeping exactly to the Method used by Christ in this thing, signifieth nothing;" but he should prove by Scripture, how they are safe in practising one Part, and not the other? And by what Rule he accounts the one Part Circumstances, and not the other? For as to the Matter of the thing he will confess, there is nothing in it, but by reason of Christ's Command and Practice; so that affects all Parts alike: And indeed, he gives a very summar Answer, to what I urge as to this, as the Reader by comparing his *n. 17.* with *n. 6.* of my *Apology* upon this Subject, may observe. It passeth my mean Capacity to see any solid Reason given by him *p. 497. n. 18.* Why *Acts. 2. 42.* should be understood of other than their Common Eating? Unless this may be esteemed one, "That to say so, is a meer groundless Fancy; like many of the *Quakers* bold Notions." To prove *Acts 20. 7.* to be understood of Sacramental Eating, he saith; *It required Paul's Preaching*; but for this we must wait his Proof. That *Paul* preached not upon other Occasions, because not mentioned, is but his meer Conjecture; and his Inference from this being the Christian Sabbath, is but a silly Begging of the Question.

¶ 2. *Pag. 498. n. 20.* He stateth my Words, how the Apostle *1 Cor. 11.* saith *When ye come together,*

1679.  
The Washing  
of Feet com-  
manded with  
as great So-  
lemnity, yet  
Ceased.

Professors  
not keeping  
to the Me-  
thod Christ  
used in the  
Supper.

*F. B.* for-  
gets to An-  
swer.

*ther,*

1679. *ther, this is not to eat the Lord's Supper*; and not, that it was not *to eat aright*: And I expected his Answer to this to follow, but in vain; for I found not any: Perhaps he has forgotten it; and therefore I desire, he may remember it next. Also here instead of giving a Reason, to prove the Apottle gives here a Command, and not simply a Relation of the Matter of Fact; he returneth Railing: I intreat him next to lay aside his Railing, and give a Reason. That the *Corinthians* were Babes in Christ, and some of them even further advanced, I acknowledge; yet that will not prove, that some things might be Indulged to them, which is not needful to us now: The Christians, that had been *Jews*, were also Babes in Christ, and even more; such as the Apottle *James*, who desired *Paul* to purify himself in the Temple: And yet we are not thence obliged to Imitate such Practices. Whether the *Syriack* Version mentioned by me, make not to my Purpose, I leave to the Reader's Judgment; my Using it will not infer my Acknowledging that Version in all things to be Authentick, more than his own Using it: And albeit I think, it might have been sufficient to have given the Words upon the Credit of the Interpretation in the *Poly-glossa*; yet to shew him, how apt he is to fall into false Conjectures, he may know, I did it not: And if he could hence, as well as from several other Occasions heretofore observed, learn not to lay so much Strefs upon, and so forwardly Vent his own Conjectures, he would do himself a Courtesy. P. 409. n 21. He can easily turn-by the Apottle's express Command, *Acts* 15. 29. as being a Part of the Ceremonial Law: But I hope he will acknowledge, that the Obligation upon the Christians (especially such as had not been *Jews*) to observe it, was not its being a Part of the Ceremonial Law; but its being now  
a Com-

*Paul* Purifying himself in the Temple, Christians are not thence obliged to Imitate such Practices.

a Command of the Apostles, or rather of the Spirit of God, to whom it seemed good so to command: And he should shew next time, how this is more Abrogated in the *Epistles* of Paul, than the *other*? And particularly, how that *Rom. 14. 17.* doth touch the one more, than the other? And this Command *Act. 15. 19.* being after the pouring down of the Spirit, and *Universal Preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles*, hath as much of a Gospel-Institution, as any thing Commanded before by Christ can have; if not, let him give us a Reason from Scripture: Till then, his meer Assertions *p. 500.* will not do the Business. To my shewing, *That this is not to distinguish the Gospel from the Law*, he thinks it enough to say; *This is a Socinian Argument formerly spoken to:* And he is very careful not to weary the Reader with Repetitions; I wish, he had minded this all along. He also referreth the Proof of their Authority to Administrate this Sacrament to his 17th Chapter: But they must be very Clear-sighted, that can observe any such thing there. And to conclude with some shew of Victory, he in a most ostentive way saith; "That I have fought, "until I can stand no longer; and finding my self weak, and unable to fight any more, I come to something like a Parly," by saying ["Such as out of Conscience will perform this Ceremony, as the First Christians did, might be Indulged in it"] but he concludeth; "These things I affirm being proved, none can be supposed to do it out of Conscience: But some may not have such a clear Sight of it; and thence may stick in these things. He dispatcheth, what more I say as to this, as being *A Bundle of groundless Whimsies without Truth, Sense or Consistency:* But indeed I must say, I wonder to see the Man so weak upon this Theam, as well as the former of *Baptism*; considering, they are the


1679.



J. B's Proof of their Authority to Administrate this Sacrament Invisible.

The weak Proofs J. B. brings to vindicate the great Sacraments of their Religion.

great on.

1679.  great Sacraments of their Religion: But it seems, his Rage in these has Robbed him of his Reason. I will Intreat the Reader seriously to peruse, what I have written upon both these in my *Apology*; that comparing it with his, he may easily perceive (albeit this Reply had not been Written) how Weak all is, the Man brings for the Proof of these things.


S E C T. XV.

*Wherein his Twenty Eighth Chapter Of Liberty of Conscience is Considered.*

¶ I. **A**S he ended his last Chapter with Railing, so he begins this, comparing the *Quakers* to Thieves and Robbers, adding; That *their being conscious to themselves of the Evil of their Ways* (which after he has a little amplified in as black a manner as he can, he Concludes, *that*) “ They thought it best for their own Safety to add this to the rest of their Errors, that *Magistrates* have no lawful Power over them: ” In which (besides his Railing) are two gross Lies. *First*, “ That the *Quakers* are conscious of their own evil Ways; and that moves them to assert Liberty of Conscience: ” Which being a gross Falshood, hath no Bottom, but his own malicious Conjecture; where he presumptuously presumes to Judge of other Mens Hearts. The *Second* is: That the *Quakers* say, *The Magistrate hath no lawful Power over them*: A most gross Lie; The Contrary whereof is expressly asserted in the *These* in these Words; “ Provided always, that no Man under the Pretence of *Conscience* prejudice his Neighbour in his Life or Estate, or do any thing destructive of, or inconsistent with  
“ Humane

*J. B's Malicious Assertion against our Acknowledging the Magistrates to have a Lawful Power over us.*

*The Lawfulness and Justice of Magistracy asserted by us.*

“ Humane Society; in which Case the *Law* is for 1679.  
 “ the Transgressor: And *Justice* is to be admini-  
 “ ftered upon all, without respect of Persons.”   
 Who will but open their *eyes*, may here see the Man  
 so desperately resolved to Calumniate, that he  
 neither seems to Regard his Conscience towards  
 God, nor his Reputation among Men; that he  
 may fulfil his Envy in this Particular: But such  
 gross Abuses will not hurt, but help the *Quakers*.  
 Yea, in the very next Page he taketh notice,  
 That I grant to the *Magistrate only Liberty to judge*  
*in Matters touching the Life and Goods of others,*  
*&c.* So here is *some lawful Power*. As for the ma-  
 litious Insinuation that follows, it needs no other  
 Refutation with Men of Sobriety, but to repeat  
 it, to wit, *But probably not of Quakers, for they*  
*are perfect, and so cannot do wrong*: Is not this  
 solidly, and learnedly, and Christianly argued,  
*Reader?* Thinkest thou, that to say, *That this*  
*Restriction is destroyed; because Men may pretend*  
*Conscience in wronging their Neighbours, as some*  
*have done in committing Villanies,* saith nothing,  
 since the Proposition expressly allows the Magi-  
 strate to punish Acts, that are materially injuri-  
 ous to Civil Society, albeit Conscience be pre-  
 tended? After (according to his usual Manner)  
 he has given us a large Citation out of the *Con-*  
*fession of Faith,* and some Quibbles about the  
 Word *Conscience* (which, as not directly concern-  
 ed in this Debate, for Brevity's sake I omit.) *Se-*  
*condly,* he comes *p. 504. n. 5.* to say; “ That I  
 “ most perversly State the Question, in saying,  
 “ The Magistrate has not Power to Compel Men  
 “ against their Consciences in Matters of Religi-  
 “ on (*and why?*) Because I distinguish not be-  
 “ twixt Elicit and Imperate Acts of Conscience;”  
 That is (as himself explains) *Inward and Outward*:  
 For as to the first, he confesseth, The Magistrate

1679. is not to Compel Men, so as to hinder them to think, judge, understand and conclude in their Mind as they will; but only in speaking, writing and open professing, which are visible and audible: Yea he thinks, the Magistrates Power doth not only extend on this side to Prohibition; but that he may also force them to hear, and to the Use of Publick Means, that is in plain Terms, to an Outward Conformity: And yet he saith, *This is no Force upon Conscience.* Well! then *Papish* Magistrates according to him used no Force upon the Consciences of *Protestants*, in forcing them to hear *Mass*; nor yet the *Pagans* upon the Christians, in forcing them to go to Idol Worships: And to come near Home, the present Magistrates in *Scotland* use no Force upon the Consciences of his Brethren, the *Presbyterians* in the *West-country*, in Constraining them to go to hear the Bishops Curates (as they term them) where they cannot pretend, there is any thing of Idolatry. As for his Distinction of the Magistrates having Power of *Outward* but not *Inward Acts*, it were enough for me to Reject it, as not being proved by him to be founded on Scripture; as indeed it is most deceitful. For if the Magistrate Restrain me from doing that Outward Action either of Confessing to Truth, or Denying Error; Abstaining from Idolatry or False Worship, and Practising the True, which my Inward Perswasion convinceth me of; he Incroacheth upon, and takes upon him to Rule over my Inward Perswasion, as well as the Outward, which follows naturally from the Inward: And without doing whereof, my Inward could add nothing to me save Condemnation, seeing Christ requires an Outward Confession. And if the Magistrates Power as to outward Acts even in Matters of Religion, be limited, then he of Right may Decide and

*J. B. Asserts, that for Magistrates to force an outward Conformity is not a Compelling Men contrary to their Consciences.*

Christ requires an Outward Confession.



and Judge of all outward Matters relating to Religion; which *John Brown* may remember his Brethren have strongly denied, reserving that only for the *Kirk*. For to say (as he addeth,) *That the Magistrate hath Power to punish Hereticks, but not the Orthodox*, is (as I observed) miserably to beg the Question; since never any Magistrate was so mad, as to persecute Truth, as Truth; but still under the Notion of Error. The Sum of what he saith further upon this Matter, p. 505-507, 508, 509. in Answer to me, resolves in these Two *Objections*.

¶ 3. First, *That my Arguments do no less take away the Magistrates Power in Civils.*

Secondly, *That by the same Arguments may be denied and taken away all Church-Censures, which I grant; and in so doing contradict myself, or must answer my own Arguments.*

For Proof of the First he tells; *That many Magistrates have been or may be incapable to judge in Civil Matters, as well as Religion; as also have done Injustice in their Judgment.*

*Answ.* True: but all this will no ways infer his Conclusion; because they still had that, which was needful to the *Being* of Magistracy, that is, being duly Constitute (for of Usurpers we do not here speak) however they may want these Qualities, which might more accomplish them in their Employment; or that they may Err in the Administration of it. But Christianity, and consequently to judge in Matters of Religion, doth not so much as pertain to the *Esse* or Being of a Magistrate: For if it did, no Man could ever have been, or yet could be a *true Magistrate*, or ought to be so owned, unless a Christian; which I suppose *John Brown* will not adventure to affirm; or if he do, he will manifestly contradict the Doctrine, as well as Practice of Christ and his Apostles, who preached Subjection, and were them-

The being of the Civil Magistrate is to judge of Civil, not of Religious Matters.

1679. selves Subject to such Magistrates, as were Enemies to Christianity. If then a Magistrate may be truly a Magistrate, and ought by Christians to be acknowledged and submitted to as such, who is not a Christian; to deny to Magistrates that Power of Judgment, which they can only have as being Christians, will not necessarily take away any of their Power, as Magistrates: For Christian Subjects, especially being private Persons, may and ought to submit and obey their lawful Magistrates, albeit committing Errors in the Government, and commanding things hurtful to the State; and if they do other ways, may be justly punished, where the Nature of the Government giveth them not Allowance so to do.

Magistrates  
Committing  
Error in Go-  
vernment.

Magistrates  
Commands  
ought not to  
be contrary  
to the Law  
of God, nor  
forcing Con-  
science.

But if the Magistrate shall command any thing contrary to the Law of God, or Impose in Matters of Conscience contrary to Truth, *J. B.* will with me confess (unless he condemn himself) that every private Christian may, without being justly accused of Contempt, refuse to Obey: As many of *John Brown's* Friends do in not going to the *Parish-Kirks*, (where the same Faith and Doctrine they hold, is preached) contrary to Acts of *Parliament*: For he hath not proved, That a Magistrate by being a Christian acquires more Power, than he had before, or is more a Magistrate; though he may be a Better. For albeit, as he observes, Fathers be desired to Instruct their Children, which *Pagan-Fathers* cannot do; yet they are not more Fathers than before, nor have more Power over their Children to force them, than before: So a Magistrate being a Christian, may Instruct, countenance and Advance Christianity by the Advantage of his Place; but acquires no more Power thereby, to force his People upon that account: *J. B.* if he judge so, will do well to prove it by Scripture.

¶ 4. The Reason of his Second Objection is; *1679.*  
*Because a Church may Err in their Judgment, being defective* (as he supposed the Magistrate in the former Objection) *and so may condemn Truth for Error*: But how weak this is, is very apparent. For if he can shew us a Church having the True Being of a Church, which ought to be acknowledged and submitted to by Christians as such, which yet is wholly a stranger to, yea, an Enemy and Persecutor of Christianity (as I did him in the Case of Magistracy) he will say something; but other ways nothing at all. *Next*: The Censure of a Church (however he seems to judge otherwise) cannot be called forcing of Conscience in the Sense I grant it, which is only for to deny the Persons Censured their Spiritual Fellowship; since he himself by his Differing from them breaks it off (as in my Book, Intituled, *The Anarchy of the Ranters, &c.* written concerning *Church-Government*, I have at large shewn.) And if the Difference be such, as the Church judgeth in Conscience, they cannot have Spiritual Communion with one so principled; it were in him a Forcing of their Conscience to urge it upon them: For since he takes the Liberty out of Conscience (as he judgeth) to differ from all his Brethren, it were a most unreasonableness in such a one to deny them the Liberty (being perswaded in their Conscience they ought) to Withdraw from him; seeing, the Band of their Unity, which at least in Part was an Agreement in Doctrine, is so far by him Broken: But as he doth not fall upon them to Beat, Imprison or Kill them; neither ought they to do so to him.

As for his Answer, *That they are not for propagating Christianity by Force, or that the Ministers should use Fire and Sword*, pag. 508. It is the same Deceitful Return, that the Pope and the Jesuites (his *Janizaries*) give upon the like Occasion (with

Church Censure is not a Forcing the Conscience.

1679. whom the *Presbyters* in most things of this Nature do most unanimously Agree) who it is said, after they have judged any one Guilty of Heresy, deliver him over to the Magistrate; because (alas! merciful and tender-hearted Men! as is usually spoken by Contraries) *They will not meddle with Blood*: But how would they Thunder the Magistrate, if he did not proceed to Execution! The same way do the *Presbyters*: For we know, what naturally follows upon the Church-Censure, or Disobedience to their Orders; as by many Examples during the Reign of *Presbytery* in *Scotland* might be proved; and which I may Instance, if further provoked thereto: By which it shall appear, that they are no less **B L O O D Y** and **C R U E L**, than the *Popish Inquisitors*; and that both the **P O P E** and the **P R E S B Y T E R S**, Assuming the Power of Judgment to themselves, leave nothing to the *Magistrate*, but the dishonourable Office of being their Executioner, or in plain *Scots*, Hangman: While both most deceitfully wipe their Mouths, as if they were Innocent of the Blood-shed procured by them.

*Presbyters*  
with their  
Church Cen-  
sure no less  
Bloody and  
Cruel, than  
the *Popish*  
Inquisitors

¶ 5. Instead of giving any direct Reply to my Answer to their Objection drawn from *Deut. 13.* where false Prophets and Idolaters are ordained to be Killed; he seeks maliciously to infer, *That I deny all Authority of the Old Testament*: Which is a horrid Calumny. But since there are many things Commanded there, which himself will acknowledge are not binding upon us now; What shall be the Rule, whereby we shall judge, what we are now Tied to, and what not, unless as the same is Ratified, or again Commanded by Christ in the *New*? And for clearing of this, let him tell me, if he can, *What is incumbent upon us now from the Old Testament, which hath no Precept or Authority in the New?* But further, after he

Many things  
Commanded  
in the *old T.*  
are not bind-  
ing upon us  
now.

he has manifestly wrested the Place, to Evite 1679. what I urge from *Deut.* 5. 9. (as the Reader by comparing it may judge) at last he confesseth to it; only alledgeth, *It was a Circumstance*: But seeing, this Circumstance was Commanded, as well as the rest; he should shew, where the one is Repealed, and not the other? And how it comes to pass, that it should be Duty to obey the one Part of the Command, and yet Murder to obey the other? Or (if he will, the Circumstances commanded Conjunctly with it, as I hope he will confess it should be) for any now to kill their Brother or Sister as an Heretick or Blasphemer, without bringing them to a Judge? He has a quick way of answering, what I say p. 323, 324. in alledging, *That it is not to the purpose*; as also what I say p. 328, 329. in answering it by *two or three Lines of Railing*, p. 513. but methinks, since he gives his Reader as a Reason of his Prolixity, *That he left nothing said by the Quakers unanswer'd*; it is strange, he jumps so quietly over that Place, (p. 324.) where I shew, "That the *Presbyterians* as well as the *Jesuites* notwithstanding their pretended Subject-  
 " on to Magistrates, and Pleadings for the Ex-  
 " tension of their Power, and accusing us for de-  
 " nying it, do not spare to Tyrannize over the Ma-  
 " gistrates Conscience, when they can; as by the  
 " Example of the *Presbyterians* Behaviour towards  
 " this present King of *Britain* I did prove:" It is enough for him to this to say, *This Page is not to the Purpose*. But the Judicious Reader will rather judge, that he is here so Silent (being elsewhere upon less Occasion so Clamorous) because he knew not well, what to Answer to the Purpose. With the like hasty and pitiful Stuff he would turn by the many Citations of the Antients brought by me against *Persecution*, because of his deceitful *Popish* Concession, above observed: But he should have shewn, how these things of the

*Presbyterians* and *Jesuites* pretending subjection, Tyrannize over Magistrates Consciences.

1679. Antients are Consistent with the Civil Magistrates Using any Force in Matters of Religion, as being a thing Inconsistent with Christianity; which the Reader by reading over these Places may easily observe, and thence find, why he made such Haste, and gave all these Citations no other Answer.

¶ 6. But as he is Hasty in passing over, what he finds he cannot Answer; so to fill up the Pages, he spares not to insist upon Trifles, or things of no Moment, or which only serve to shew his own Folly and Impertinency: as in p. 503. is manifest, where he saith, *He doubts, whether it be 25 Years, since I adjoined my self to the Quakers.* But whether it be so or not, it not Adds, nor Takes from the Controversy: Only to solve him of this Doubt, he may assure himself, It is not; since I have not yet seen the 30th Year of my Age. But because I say, "It is about 25 Years, " since they were a distinct and Separated People: thence he says: *He sees, it is not an Old Sect; and so has less Affinity with true Christianity; because he is sure, Christianity is older.* But what Protestant in his Wits (if Malice did not blind) would use such an Argument, knowing, how easily the same may be, and has been objected by Papists, that use to ask us, *Where our Religion was before Luther and Calvin?* That Christianity is older than 25 Years, I am sure, as well as he; but it will not thence follow, but that it may be a short time, since God raised up a separated, gathered, visible People, to shake-off the Corruptions of Babylon, and Restore the pure and old Christianity, as it was before the Apostacy entred. And if he will not admit of this to the Acknowledgment of his own Impertinency, he must needs own the like Argument in the Mouth of Papists to have been Valid against our great Grand-Fathers; and Consequently give away the Protestant Cause.

7. B's doubts, whether it be 15 Years, since the Author did Unite with the Quakers answered.

A People raised of God to shake off the Corruptions of Babylon, and restore the pure and old Christianity.

¶ 7. But

¶ 7. But the Man seems not to have heeded, 1679. what he wrote in this Page, by another yet more palpable Mistake: For while in the Calculation of the Appearing of the *Quakers* he goes about to find me Contradicting another *Quaker*, he sheweth his own Senselessness. My Account, saith he, of 25 Years, being numbred from 1676, will fall into Anno 1651; but another *Quaker* in Anno 1659, saith, it is now about 7 Years, since the Lord raised us up in the North of England, &c. Now number 7 back from 1659, my *Arithmetick* tells me, it will be 1652; and if I account it 1651, and the other reckon it about 1652, it comes to one Reckoning. But *John Brown* will have mine to be 15 Years later, as if 25 Years back from 1676 were 15 Years after 7 Years back from 1659, that is, that 1652, is 15 Years before 1651: So far has the poor Man missed of his Numeration. He sometimes reproachingly and scoffingly says, *He sees, the Quakers can dream waking*: But it is a Question, whether he was Dreaming or not, when he proclaimed his Sottishness thus to the World; which cannot be reputed an Error of the Press, since he is at Pains to reconcile this Imaginary Difference, saying, *But perhaps I mean of those in the North of Scotland, the other of the North of England; and therefore he will not contend about it*: He will find, he has Reason, when he sees his Mistake. Yet he must have on Observation that according to the old Proverb, *All Evil cometh Out of the North*: But no wonder, the Man has been here benumbed, since he will, ere he want something to Reproach the *Quakers*, make Use of Old Proverbs; albeit to contradict Scripture-Prophecies, *Jer. 50. 3.* where the Prophet speaking of the Judgment of *Babylon*, saith, *For out of the North there cometh up a Nation against her, which shall*

J. B's  
Senseless Cal-  
culation of  
the *Quakers*  
first Appearance in Eng-  
land.

A Nation  
coming from  
the North  
against Ba-  
bylon.

1679. *shall make her Land desolate: And ver. 9. I will raise and cause to come up against Babylon an Assembly of great Nations out of the North Country: But an Old Proverb with him it seems is of more Weight, which can hit the Quakers, than the Scriptures, for all the Reverend Esteem he pretends to them: Yet that an Evil hath or may come out of the North, I shall not deny; for of that the PERSECUTING Spirit of PRESBTTERTY is one Example: which as to its Rise in Scotland was more Northerly, than the Appearance of the People called Quakers.*

## S E C T. XVI.

*Wherein his Twenty Ninth Chapter, Of Wars, and Thirtieth, Of Oaths, is Considered.*

**J. B's Malicious Insi-  
nuations be-  
cause of our  
Testimony  
against Wars  
and Fighting.** ¶ I. **A**FTER having Classed us (according to his Custom) with such as he accounts *Odious Hereticks*, for our Opinion of *Wars*, he proceedeth with his Old Trade of Malicious Insi-  
nuations and Railings, questioning, *Whether our Intent may not be, that we may obtain Freedom and Liberty to Rage over all?* And whereas he saith, *He leaves our selves to judge of this;* Truly, we can sincerely judge in the Sight of God, that this is a gross Calumny; of giving any Colour for which, we are altogether Innocent. And like to this is that Malicious Insi-  
nuation, pag. 515, 521. wherein he chargeth us with a *Bloody Design, in seeking to reduce them to Paganism, and by disarming Christians, give up Christendom as a Prey to Turks and Pagans.* To which I shall only Answer; That as it is obviously enough Malicious, so he shall never prove it true: And therefore I wish



with the Lord rebuke him, and forgive him for these his Evil Thoughts! What he says here, as well as *pag.* 517, 518, 522, of the Necessity of *Defensive War*, to defend from those that unjustly Assault, and Thieves, and Robbers, and Cut-throats, &c. he speaks more like an Atheist than a Christian, and like one who believeth nothing of a Divine Providence of Restraining Evil Men at his Pleasure, and not suffering them to go further than he seeth meet. Doth he think, that all the Endeavours of the wicked Men of the World can do any thing, but as GOD permits them? And that all the Opposition to such by Force of Arms can prevail, but by God's Blessing? If so, he must not think, that such Carnal and Atheistical Reasons can brangle the Faith of those, who out of pure Obedience to God, desire to be Conform to the Image of his Son, according to the Measure of the Grace given them, so as to make them think, they are less secure under the Protection of the ALMIGHTY, than by their Guns and Swords. But this is consistent with his Faith, the most Eminent of whose Brethren have learned to Preach with Sword and Pistols; and instead of the Guard of a Christian Boldness and a good Conscience (which the Primitive Christians and Apostles used) will be guarded with Men in Arms, and that in Opposition to the Authority of those, they confess to be their lawful Magistrates. And if he say, That *we must not lay aside lawful Means*; I ask him, Whether he thinks not to defend a Man's Self from a Principle of Conscience, be simply Unlawful? Let him remember, the most Remarkable Deliverances that God's People met withal, were, when there appeared least of Outward Help, and where the Arm of Flesh had least hand in it; as the Children of *Israel's* Deliverance out of *Egypt*, as also *Judges* ch. 5. from *ver.* 16, to the End, 2 *Kings* 6, 17, &c.

1679.  
 J. B's Atheistical Doctrine of the Necessity of a Defensive War.  
 His Brethren preach with Sword and Pistols.

The most remarkable Deliverances of God's People have been without the Arm of Flesh.

1679. 6. 17, &c. and Chapters 7, 13, and 19; 35, and in other Places. To prove, *That Christ in the 5th of Matthew commands no more than in the Law*, he referreth to the Writings of their Divines: but he might have done this to all he has written, if he judge it sufficient; and so have saved himself a great deal of Labour: since he saith elsewhere, *All I have written, is confuted long ago.* How Men can Love their Enemies, and yet Kill and Destroy them, is more than I can reach: But if it were so, such as rather Suffer than do it, do surely more love them; and to do so, is no Injury to our Selves, nor Neighbours, when done out of Conscience to God in Answering our Duty, to whom we must not regard our own or Neighbours Profit. And if what I grant of the *Lawfulness of Fighting* to the present Magistrates and State of Christians, be considered, it will render all his Arguments superfluous; since he confesseth, *A Time will come, in which the Prophecy of Isaiah 2. 4. Mic. 4. 3. will be fulfilled*; and thinks fit, there should be a Praying for the Fulfilling of it. And what, if some believe, that (as to some) there is a Beginning already of the Fulfilling thereof? We do nothing doubt, but that of *Rev. 16. 5, 7.* which he mentions *pag. 522.* will in due Time be fulfilled; but we see no Necessity of Believing, that that will be performed by Outward Fighting, or that the Saints shall need to draw Carnal Swords, or shoot Cannons towards the Performing of it. When he saith, that the Argument of Fighting is not taken from the *corrupt Nature of Man*, *pag. 519.* he must have forgotten himself; since had not Man fallen, and so his Nature been Corrupted, he may infer, if he can, where there should have been an Occasion for fighting with Carnal Weapons? And since he confesseth, *That in nothing more than in War, is seen the Fruits of Man's Rebellion against God*; He may  
thence

How can  
Men Love  
their Enemies,  
and yet  
kill and de-  
stroy them?

Fighting  
is from the  
corrupt Na-  
ture of Man.

thence see, how little need Christians have to plead for it. As for the Citation out of the Confession of *Faith*, wherewith to fill up, he closeth his Chapter, I know not to what Purpose he did it; since no Man doubts their Faith in this Matter. 1679.

¶ 2. He begins his Thirtieth Chapter of *Oaths*, with saying, *We deny their Lawfulness, that we may destroy all Policy and Government*; But it must only be the Devil's Government: For where the Government of Christ prevails, and Men *Speak Truth*, there all must confess, there is no need of *Oaths*; and also, where the like Punishment of Perjury is inflicted for *Speaking falsely*, the End of *Oaths* is obtained, and that without Breaking Christ's Command. Thus according to his own Confession, since the Verity may be had as well without an *Oath*, none should be urged to take an *Oath*. where Men speak Truth, there is no need of Oaths. But let us see, what after a Citation out of their Confession of Faith he saith, to Answer *Mat. 5. 34.* and *James 5. 12.* which saith so expressly, *Swear not at all*: To this he saith, *That Christ is only Interpreting the Law, and not Adding any thing to it; and that it only relates to ordinary Discourse*: But for Proof of this he has nothing, but an Heap of Words asserting the Thing: To all which, till he bring some Scripture-Proof, there needs no Answer. But to oppose Christ's and *James's* Words, *Swear not at all* — It is not said, *Except ye be called before a Judge*; let him prove this Exception by Scripture next time: And therefore till he do so, his Affirming over and over again, *That Christ forbid no more than was forbidden in the Law*, pag. 525. is to no Purpose. The Law forbid *Idle Swearing* and *Oaths in Communication*; but Christ's Resumption shews throughout that Chapter some more to be urged, to any that understand plain Words, and will not shut their Eyes. That its being

1679. being said, *Deut. 6. 13. Thou shalt Swear by his Name*, is urged as an Explication or Comprehensive Part of Moral Worship, I deny; and remains for him to prove: Or that it was more than a Command to the *Jews* to Swear by the true God, that they might not Swear by Idols; and till he prove this, Arguments founded upon it need no further Answer. As for what he addeth N. 8. to prove *Swearing not to be of the Devil, because commanded of God*; and afterwards Concluding, *That my urging against it, as being of the Devil, is pregnant of Blasphemy, because it would infer, some of the Ceremonial Laws of God to have their Rise not from the Will of God, but from the Work of the Devil*; He sheweth here more Malice than Strength of Reason. Was not the Command, *Deut. 24. v. 1. Let him write for her a Bill of Divorcement*, a Part of the Ceremonial Law? And yet Christ saith, *Matth. 19. 7. that Moses did this, because of the Hardness of their Hearts*; and is not Hardness of Heart, which gave a Rise to this Command, of the Work of the Devil? Let him then make the Application, and then answer the empty Bluffer he has made of *Blasphemy*. And doth not, what Christ saith of this Matter of *Divorce*, *Matth. 5. v. 31, 32. shew, Christ commanded more there, than was commanded under the Law*? He confesseth pag. 529. *That God cannot be said properly to Swear*: Albeit some things being ascribed to God, makes them not Unlawful to us; yet any thing being ascribed to God, makes it not Lawful to us, when Christ commands the contrary. That Christ's saying, *Verily, Verily*, is more than *Yea* and *Nay*, I deny; and it remains for him to prove it: That the *Apostles Asseverations* are *Oaths*. he affirms in like Manner, but proves it not. His thinking, *We*, in being willing to do as much as the Apostle did, *do strain at a Gnat, and swallow a Camel*, is but an

The Bill of Divorcement permitted in the Old Test. because of the Hardness of their Hearts.

Christ's and the Apostles Asseverations were not Oaths.

Evidence of his Railing Genius ; as it doth of his Malice in catching what follows : *That the Question is not, What Paul or Peter did? but what their and our Lord?* For that is not said by me: he hath but said it, as believing they did Swear, or that their *Words* were *Oaths*. But the giving (not granting) it had been so, to shew, it would not prove this thing now Lawful, and that *Peter* and *Paul* both had their Failings, so as all, though not in that, himself will not deny: which is enough to shew, their Practice in all things is not to be our Rule. His 531 Page needeth no Answer, being but his own Affirmations and Conjectures instead of Answers; these may be considered when he proves them. That *Paul* Swore any way, we deny; and neither *Abraham's* nor *Jacob's* Practice, nor yet that of Angels will warrant us to Imitate them, when Christ has commanded the contrary: And albeit he acknowledge the Testimony of *Pythagoras*, *Socrates* and *Plato* doth shame many Christians for their Swearing; yet he cannot omit here his ordinary Reflection at our Religion, as *Paganish*. He confesseth That many of the Fathers were against Swearing, and indeed, none any ways versed in Antiquity can deny, this to have been the *General Faith* of the Primitive Church.

1679.

¶ *Abraham's* and *Jacob's* Practice will not warrant our Imitation of it.

## S E C T. XVII.

*Wherein his Thirty First Chapter Of Civil Honour, and Thirty Second, called, A View of the Conclusion, are Considered.*

¶ 1. **A**S he enters upon this Chapter of *Civil Honour*, he accuseth me, as being *Effronted* and *Shameless*, for saying, [“ All our Ad-  
“ ver-

1679. “versaries plead for the *Lawfulness of Superfluity*  
 “*of Apparel and Plays :*] And to make this ap-  
 pear the more probable, he would seem to be much  
 against these things; and wisheth, *there were less*  
*of them.* But all will not do, nor hide him

No Laces  
 and Rib-  
 bonds denied  
 by J. B. to  
 his Bountiful  
 Ladies.

Presbyteri-  
 an Ministers  
 go with their  
 Sword and  
 Pistols, lac'd  
 Bands and  
 Cravats.

ness of *Laces* and *Ribbons*? The Man will not  
 offend the good Ladies, to whose Bountifulness  
 they are so much obliged, so as simply to deny  
 their Superfluities. And how can he? Since it  
 is become a Practice of some Eminent *Presbyterian*  
*Ministers*, which they have learned from their  
 Friends, the *Popish Priests* and *Jesuitish Emissaries*,  
 not only to go up and down with their *Sword*  
 and *Pistols*, to evidence, they are Men of Blood,  
 and Brethren in Politicks; but also in their *Laced*  
*Bands* and *Cravats*, *Perriwigs* and *Gilded Belts*, to  
 make them look like *Monsieurs*. But if he think,  
 that I wrong any of our *Adversaries* in this, let  
 him tell me, which of them dogmatically hold  
 it as a General Principle, *That Superfluity of*  
*Cloaths, and the Use of Plays in general is Unlaw-*  
*ful* (whatever some Particulars may do, whereof  
 I made an Exception?) As for any their laying  
 aside these Vanities out of Pride, I do not justify  
 it; for him to insinuate that, as to us, is but his  
 bare, malicious Assertion. After that (pag. 534.)  
 he has told his Reader, he comes to *Treat of that*  
*which is peculiar to the Quakers*, he gives him a  
 large List of *strange Hereticks*; as among others,  
*Heracleonites, Carpocratians, Gnosimachians*, (e-  
 nough to fright Ignorant Folk) telling, *That what*  
*the Devil could not effectuate by all these, he think-*  
*eth now to accomplish by the miserable Quakers.* It  
 seems, the Man must be one of the Devil's Coun-  
 sellors, that he is so well acquainted with his Pur-  
 poses: But I shall not covet this his Preferment,  
 nor seek to Imitate the Language he has learned  
 of that Court; which he bestows in the follow-  
 ing

ing Page to rage at us, as *Rude* and *Uncivil*, and such, as deny to give the least Signification of Civil Honour to Equals or Superiours: which is false. And then by a strange Figure he will seem no less known in *God's Counsel*, than he before would appear in the *Devil's*; and therefore Magisterially concludes, "That God has given us up to the Unmanning of our Selves, who have renounced all Christianity, and every thing that looketh like Serious Religion." It seems, *Bowing* and *Taking off the Hat*, and *Complemental Titles*, is the Man's Christianity and Serious Religion, which the *Quakers* have renounced; I will next Examin how he proves it.

¶ 2. Pag. 536. He tells, That *Honour is to be rendered to whom Honour is due*; but this we never denied. The Question is, Whether *Honour* may not be rendred without *Bowing*, or *Taking off the Hat*? The Scriptures he brings here to prove this, are so far from doing it, that most of them are egregiously Impertinent; as will appear. For as to *Abraham's* and *Lot's Bowing* there mentioned, I shew in my *Apology*, how their Practice in that was not to be a Rule to us. But he brings *Act. 14. 15.* where *Paul* and *Barnabas* are said in our *English Translation* to say, *Sirs*; and *Act. 27. v. 10.* where *Paul* saith, *Sirs*, to the *Mariners*, to prove, They gave a *Title of Honour*; as if *Sirs* did infer the Plural Number of what usually *Sir* to one imports with us: But if he had looked the *Greek*, he would have found in both Places *ἀνδρες*, which signifies *Men*. I would willingly know, if the Man will be so void of Ingenuity, as not to acknowledge his Folly here? For as for the *Jaylor's Practice*, he will have much ado to prove it a Rule to Christians. Neither is he less impertinent, when he brings the Instance of *Mary* saluting *Elizabeth*; *Paul* the Church of *Corinth*;

Abraham's  
Bowing and  
Lot's is no  
Rule.

Paul's say-  
ing Sirs, in  
Greek it is  
ἀνδρες,  
i. e. Men.

1679. Christ desiring his Disciples to *Salute the House*; and Paul in his Epistles desiring such as he wrote to, to *Salute others in his Name*: For who will not condemn him of Folly, in Imagining, That the Apostle by these Christian Salutations desired them to *Take off their Hats*, and bow to one another *in his Name*? Or that this was the Way Christ willed his Disciples to *Salute the Houses they came to*? He must remember to prove this next Time, and know, We deny neither *Salutations* nor *Civility*: But have not yet heard him prove, That they consist in such Practices. He confesseth, pag. 537. *That several of the Titles used, may be granted not to be lawful to Christians*: But thinketh, That makes nothing for our *Blunt and Rude* (as he terms it) *Thou and Thee*, with which we speak to *Magistrates* and *great Persons*, *no otherwise, than we would do to our Foot boys*. But since he confesseth, they use this *Thou and Thee*, which he thinks so *Blunt and Rude*, when speaking to God; I desire, he may acquaint me next time, Why they speak to God no otherways than they would do to their *Foot-boys*, to whom, I hope, he will say, they own greater Respect, than to any *Magistrates* or *great Personages* whatsoever? And this shews, it was no *Rudeness* in me to address my self thus in my Epistle to the King. Besides that what he quarrels being written in *Latine*, shews his Folly; since it is usual for themselves writing in that Language, to use the *Singular Number* even to *Kings*. And forasmuch as he thinks this so absurd, that in a silly Scoff he saith, *Under Favour of my Thou-ship*: And pag. 540. he accounts this in us *Singularity, Contempt, Pride*; yea, and to proceed from a *more sinking Root*: I will desire of him to know, how it comes, that the Bishop of *Canterbury* in the *Coronation* of this present *King* in most of his

Alledged Salutations from Scripture, they were not a Taking off the Hat, and and Bowing to each other.

To Thee and Thou a single Person says J. B. is blunt and rude.

In Latin the Singular used to Kings

King's Coronation Act instanced.

Ad-



Addresses to him during that Solemnity, terms 1679. him *Thee* and *Thou*, as *Philips* in his History relates, printed at London Anno 1670, pag. 764, 765? But if he think this of little Weight, as being the Practice of a proud Prelate in his Esteem; what will he say of his Reverend Brethren, the *Assembly of Divines at Westminster*, who teach us in their *Directory* to use this *Thee* and *Thou*, as in the Form prescribed for Marriage, in these Words, *I, N. do take thee to be my Wife*, &c. ? He must say, that either they had a Reason for this, or they had none: If none, he must conclude them to have been an *Irrational Pack*; which I think he will hardly do: If they had, when he gives it, let him free them of *Pride*, *Contempt* and *Singularity*, or *Something more stinking* (to use his own Phrase) and find us guilty of it. For his Proverb of being *as Proud as a Quaker*, we think, he has hardly Authority to make this pass for one; though by Coining this, it seems he affects to be a *Proverb-monger*: But if vulgar Proverbs were of any great Weight, I could tell him of more *Antient* and *Authentick* long ago ascribed to his Brethren. P. 537. he saith, *The Terms of Grace and Eminency are not given, because of personal Endowments corresponding thereunto; but because of Place and Power*: But he should prove, that to do so, where these Virtues are absent, is either proper or lawful; since in addressing our Selves to any, in saying, *Your Grace* or *Your Eminency*, we suppose them to have these Endowments; which if they have not, we speak a Lye, and that is not lawful to Christians. To prove the Lawfulness of the Compellation of *Majesty* to *Kings*, he telleth, That *the Lord bestowed upon Solomon Royal Majesty*, and *Nebuchadnezzar*, saying, *Dan. 4. 26.* That *Excellent Majesty* was added unto him; in both which Places it imports no more than an *Outward Glory*: But where finds he

Are the Divines at Westminster an Irrational Pack for teaching Thee and Thou, J. B. 2

The Titles of Your Grace and Your Eminency.

Christians not to speak Lies.

1679. that any Addressing themselves to Kings, use the  
 W Compellation of *Excellent Majesty*, as is usual now  
 a days? He will read his *Concordance* often over,  
 The like of *Excellent Majesty*. e're he can find this. As for his Jeering me about  
 my *Concordance*, and saying, *I cite Scriptures at Random*, for that *Psal. 29. 4. Majesty* is ascribed to the *Thunder*; he but declares his own Folly: *Majesty* is there ascribed to GOD; for what is ascribed to *God's Voice* is ascribed to him: He may say also then, That *Powerful* in the same Verse is not ascribed to God, but to the *Thunder*; if he resolve to be Ridiculous. What he saith, *pag. 540. N. 11. That we Salute no Man*, is false; But the Question is, *Whether there cannot be Salutations without the Uncovering of the Head, or Bowing of the Body?* This he should have proved. He saith, *Abraham's Bowing was against no Law of the Creation; but so was Abraham's Practice in the Matter of Hagar* (which I brought to shew that *Abraham's Practice* was not to be our Rule) But since *Abraham's Practice* in the *Matter of Hagar*, and the like Practice of *Jacob* and the *Jews* was permitted to them, and yet thence we are not allowed to do the like; that shews, that Argument deduced from *Abraham's Simple Practice*, is of no Weight. He thinks it silly to say, That Bowing of the Body and Knee, and Uncovering of the Head are only External Signs of our Adoration of God; because it may as well be inferred, that a Man must never bow his Body to tie his Shoos, or uncover his Head to have his Hair cut. But this his Answer is silly: Since Men do not these things as a Signification of Honour, which is the End of their Bowing to one another, and the thing here in Question; and therefore his Repetition of the same in the following Page needs no Answer. He would make *Mordecai's Case* singular, because *Haman* was an *Agagite*, one come of *Agag*: But since he is so good at *Genealogies*, let him prove this

Abraham's  
 and Jacob's  
 Practices  
 were by Per-  
 mission to  
 them, not  
 for our Imitation.

J. B's Un-  
 certainty in  
 stating Ge-  
 nealogies.

this next Time, for if the *Similitude* of the Name were enough, might we not say with as much Reason, That *John Brown* is a *Brownist*? and yet perhaps he would think this a Reproach. 1679.

¶ 3. But the poor Man thinks (it's like) he has *hit the Nail on the Head* to purpose, when he saith *pag. 542.* upon this Subject; *One thing I would ask, what he thinketh of that Honour and Worship that was given to James Naylor, as he rode into Bristol, Oct. 24. 1656?* I answer, I think it was both Wicked and Abominable, and sodo the People called *Quakers*; who thereupon disowned him, and all those that had an Hand in it: As by the several Letters found written to him, and other Papers, if need were, I could at large prove. But it sufficeth to inform the Reader of this, that he was denied by that People, and not any ways afterwards owned by them, until several Years after, that he testified his full Repentance for that thing in a publick Assembly upon his Knees, with many Tears; signifying the same also under his Hand, which also was printed. And thus is swept away his malicious Insinuation, *pag. 530.* as to this; and also what his Brother *R. M. C.* saith so often in his *Postscript* in Terming us *Naylorists*, as if *J. N.* had been the *First* among the *Quakers*; hence *John Brown* in the List he gives of the *Quakers* Errors of *Civil Honour*, calleth him their *First Father*: But to teach him not to be so forward to lie next time, he may know, That Years before *J. N.* joined with the *Quakers*, there were Hundreds went under that Name; and who both preached and practised their Way. This may shew the sober Reader, how apt these Men are to print Malicious Lies; and *R. M. C.* so frequently seeking to denominate us from that Name because of this, sheweth, how frivolous and false it is. I must mind, That it were but a just Retribution, and no Injury done to them (as this of

*J. Naylor's*  
Case object-  
ed and an-  
swered.

*J. Naylor's*  
feigned Re-  
pentance.

1679. theirs to us is a manifest one) if I should mind them of no less abominable Actions, than ever was or could be proved against *J. N.* not many Years ago done by some Eminent among them; who died without any Sense of true Repentance (whereof *J. N.* gave singular Evidence.) What would he think then, if I should thence term them ——— *ists*? But I spare them at present, in hopes they will see their Folly, and amend. After this Thing of *J. N.* he Ends this Chapter with Railing: But I observe, he makes an intire Omission of what I say *N. 16.* upon the last *These* in my *Apology*, which I therefore refer, to the Reader's Serious Consideration.

¶ 4. I come now to his last Section, intituled, *A View of my Conclusion*: Where coming to Examine the few Lines wherewith I conclude my *Apology*, he bestows upon me a Flood of most Unreasonable Railing. I did in that Conclusion recommend to the Reader the *System* I had presented to him of the *True Christian Religion*; which this Man here with many bitter Words affirms to be other ways: But we must leave the Judgment of this to the Reader, when he has seriously read both what he saith on the one hand, and I on the other. And whereas I in my *Conclusion* did shew the Reader, how falsely we are charged with *Denying the Outward Appearance of Christ*; the *real Existence of Heaven and Hell, as a Place without us*; *the Last and General Judgment*; *the Resurrection of the Body*; by telling him seriously and in the Presence of God, that these Accusations are false, and that we really believe these Things; he with a most effronted Impudence reckons it *Boldness* in me to say so, *pag. 554.* and that because of the Testimony of *Faldo* and some others of our manifest Opposers: As if they should know, what I and my Brethren believe, better than I my Self do; or should be more credited in

*J. N.*'s false Charge against us from the Books of our manifest Opposers.

in giving Account of our Faith than our Selves. 1679. Who can secure themselves from being stigmatized, as the *Vilest* and *Grossest* of *Hereticks* from the Malice of Liars, if this Method be to be followed? But to proceed, to shew his Injustice and Unfairness in this Matter in the highest Degree, contrary to the Rules of fair Disputing, and all honest Dealing in Matters of Controversy, it doth manifestly appear, in that notwithstanding in his Title he declares, He intends an *Examination of the Quakers Religion, as the same is presented to the World by me*; when he has laboured all he can by turning, perverting, commenting and divining to squeeze out of my Words, all that may seem absurd and erroneous, or at least, which he will have to be so, and that he cannot find enough there to render the *Quakers* such *horrid Monsters* and *Vile Blasphemers*, as he ever and anon proclaims them to be; then away he runs from *R. B's Apology*, (which is the Theam of his Examination) and comes off with a — *But is not the Man of this Opinion? Or, May we not conjecture, that he is of such and such an Opinion* (which to be sure is more *absurd*) *as such and such a Man as Mr. Stalham, Mr. Norton, or Mr. Hicks and Faldo relate of such and such Quakers, that say so and so? —* Is this Justice? Is this Christian Dealing? Is this Honesty as among Men, in Writing against a People not to seek their Opinions and Faith from their own Mouths and Pens, but from those of their manifest Enemies and Opposers? Doth not this bespeak the Height of Malice with a Witness, and shew a determinate Resolution to Calumniate at any Rate? Is this to walk according to the *Royal Law, To do as he would be done by*? Dare *J. B.* say, he would be content to be done so by? Would he Judge it Equal Dealing, if one writing against *Presbytery*, should re-

*J. B's* Authors for his Refuge of Lies cast out against us.

1679. present them not as they declare themselves to be; but out of the Writing of their manifest Opposers, as to give Credit to *Spotwood's* History, in Judging of the Rise and Growth of *Presbytery*? Would he judge it fair *Reasoning*, if one writing against the *Calvinistical* Points of *Reprobation*, should instead of making Use of their own Authors, or when he could not make the Matter bad enough there, tell, the Case is *so and so*, as *Arminius* or *Episcopus* relates it? Or one writing against *Protestants* should, in the Representing of their Principles make Use of *Bellarmin* and other *Papish* Writers? If this then would justly be accounted Ridiculous and Absurd, let the Judicious Reader judge, what Character may *John Brown* so doing deserve? But above all is singularly to be noticed *J. Brown* his Venerable Esteem of his beloved Author *Mr. Hicks* (as he terms him) of whom he has so high an Esteem, that he hath given him more Place in his Book than any other; there being no Author to my Observation so frequently cited by him: Who, because this *Thomas Hicks* has been the most abusive and grossest Liar and Calumniator that has appeared against us, therefore he receives him with the most kindly Entertainment. For as Malice against Christ of Old cemented *Pilate* and *Herod* to put up their private Quarrels; so at this Day it hath done these Men against his Truth and Followers: Else what should it mean, that a *fierce Presbyter* should so heartily embrace a *keen Anabaptist-Preacher*, since the same Man often upbraids the *Quakers* with their Affinity to the *Anabaptists*? Certainly, the *Presbyters Cause* must be at a low Ebb, and he in mighty Fear of the *Quakers* Prevailing, when he can so cordially shake Hands with his beloved *Anabaptist* Brother *Hicks*, to help at a dead Lift against the *Quakers*, and take him for his Auxiliary

Hicks most Abusive to the Quakers, most esteemed by J. B.

A Presbyter and Anabaptist thus contract Affinity.

fiary with his Lies and Forgeries, to make a Noise, when other Matters and Arguments fail. But it had been more wisely done in *J. Brown*, e're he had given the *Anabaptist Hicks* his Writings so much Place in his Book, to have considered the Answer to the first Dialogue and Continuation thereof, written by *W. P.* intituled, *Reason against Railing, and Truth against Fiction*; and the Answer to his Third Dialogue by the same Author, intituled, *The Counterfeit Christian detected, and the Real Quaker justified*: For I question if *J. B.* will judge it safe, to take implicitly upon Trust in Matters of Controversy of Religion (without Examining) the Word of an *Anabaptist*, unless it be against the *Quakers*; where any Witness (it's like) with him may be admitted: For if he do but speak Evil enough, it will be acceptable, whether true or not. And *J. B.* should also have done well to have informed himself, how this *Thomas Hicks*, being publickly called to an Account before several Thousand Witnesses for his gross Abuses, in framing Answers in the *Quakers* Name, which was never said by any *Quaker*, and in other ways perverting, and misapplying Sentences of their Writings to Questions of their own Framing, so that he might make them as impertinent and ridiculous, as he was willing others should esteem them to be; did pitifully Succumb: So that his best Defence to come off, was to plead the Infirmity of his Lungs, which made him desert the Second Meeting held for that Purpose, and Substitute in his Place a *Free will Anabaptist* (with whom I suppose *J. B.* will yet have less Fellowship) who made a Noise and Brawling to keep off the chief Matter. And yet the Grossness of *Thomas Hicks's* Dealing was so discovered, that some of his own Way, and others who are not *Quakers*, did publickly, yea, and in Print declare their Abhorrency of his Forgeries:

1679. 

The Grossness of *T. Hicks's* Dealing discovered and abhorred in Print by others.

1679. *series*: As appears by a Book written at that Time, intituled, *The Twelve Pagan Principles considered, upon which Thomas Hicks undertakes to Unchristian the Quakers*; and another, intituled, *Quakerism no Paganism*; and another, *The Christian a Quaker, the Quaker a Christian*; all written upon that Occasion by Men that were no *Quakers*. Yea, *Th. Hicks's* Abuses and Lies were so far from doing us hurt, that they were Instrumental to bring among us a young *Independent* Preacher of good Repute, and well received and heard among them; who has told my self, That the *Reading of Hicks's Dialogues*, and seeing his *gross Lies and Abuses* gave the first Rise to his Searching after, and Embracing the Truth. And when *Th. Hicks* and his Complices were further pursued by the *Answer* to their pretended *Narration* of these Debates, intituled, *Forgery no Christianity*, written by *Thomas Elwood*; and another Paper, intituled, *A Fresh Pursuit*, by the same Hand, wherein he arraigneth the said *Hicks* and his Complices of *Falshood, Lying, Forgery*, and requires them to make them good, or else abide under the just *Condemnation* of so manifest *Guilt*; which they were glad to do, and have not so much as peeped out now these three Years since the last of these *Transactions*, until now this *Vomit*, of which all sober Men are ashamed, and from which the Authors have shamefully shrunk, is licked up by *John Brown*, and is become the chief Authority of his *Tract*. Will it favour well in the Mouths of Sober Professors, that the chief Gun that *J. B.* useth against the *Quakers*, are the *Lies, Forgeries and Abuses of a shameless Anabaptist*? Certainly, when *J. Brown* considers these things, he will, if malice hath not altogether blinded him, find, that he has too suddainly laid Hands upon his Brother *Hicks*, e're he well minded the *Consequence* of it; and that so great an

An Independent Preacher embracing Truth.

J. B. has used the Lies, Forgeries and Abuses of a shameless Anabaptist against the Quakers



Infusion of *Hicks* his *Anabaptistical Durt*, which takes the best Share of not a few Pages of his Book, will make the rest to stink, albeit it were more cleanly Stuff than it is. And for *Faldo's* Books, out of which he copieth not a little in this Chapter, he may find them both answered by *W. P.* the one called, *Quakerism a new Nick name to old Christianity*; and the other, *The Invalidity of John Faldo's Vindication*: in which, pag. 420, 431, 432, 433. he may find a List of *John Faldo's Miscarriages* in citing Assertions said by *Quakers*, without telling the Books, and of Books without Parts; Chapters and Page of these Books falsely cited, of Passages clip't and maimed, and others perverted by Additions: and which makes up above 70. to which *John Faldo* hath never had Face yet to Answer. So that this Man may see, what kind of Authority he has made Use of; and how his Proofs are bottomed. And Lastly, of our full Belief of *Future States*, and of the *Resurrection*, he may find a large Account in a Book called, *The Christian Quaker and his Divine Testimony Vindicated*, by *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead*, Printed in the Year, 1674. from Page 146 of the Second Part to the End.

Of future States and of the Resurrection.

S E C T. XVIII.

Wherein Robert Macquare his Postscript is Considered.

¶ I. AS to *R. M. C.* his *Postscript*, which I come now to in the last Place, I shall not need to be large; it being a Compound and Heap of most Abusive and Unreasonable Railing against me and my Friends on the one Hand, and a most

*Rob. Macquare's* most abusive Railing against us and our Doctrine.

1679. a most fawning, manifest-Piece of nauseating and shameless Flattery to his Brother *J. Brown*, on the other. In the very Entry he brands our Doctrine as the *Devil's*, and our Selves as *his Ministers* and *Amanuenses*: and a little after he exclaimeth thus; *O what horrid, what Hell hatched, bold Blasphemies this black Brood belbeth forth!* And for me in particular, *pag. 559, 560.* in a few Lines he calls me both a *Turk*, and a *Devil*; and what more his Railing Spirit affords him: To all which I shall only say, the worst I wish him, is heartily to desire the Lord to forgive him, as by the Strength of his Grace I freely do. As to his Brother *J. Brown*, he accounts him *singularly Acute, solidly Learned* and *truly Gracious*; so that he conceits, if the Devil, who he *supposeth drew me on to write, had his Dictates again, he would bury or burn them.* Thence he highly Exalts the great Depth of this his little *Presbyterian David*, (as he calls him) *in the shining Light and Sharpness of his Examen*: Sober Men will blush to read such shameless Flattery. And truly, this *Presbyterian Prince* looks liker *Cursing Shimei*, than little *David*; and he himself looks liker the *daring Philistine*, who thus commends him, proclaiming a Defiance in his Name, as if no Solid Answer could be given: But such Crying of Triumph beforehand will have small Weight with Men of Reason. His Jeering Quibble at my Words in my Book of *Universal LOVE*, where I speak overly of the *Felicity* of my *Understanding*, shews, he wanted Matter, but not Malice: Many modest Men will be found to have said as much of themselves. Neither did I that, as a Thing, by which I would have any to measure now either me or my Writings: The greatest *Natural Understanding* (wherein I confess my Self freely to be inferiour to many) availeth but little (yea, often hurteth) to the chief Thing needful,

to

R. M's  
Shameless  
Flatteries of  
J. B.

The Author  
glories not in  
Natural En-  
dowments.

to wit, *Regeneration*; which is by Grace, and not by Nature, and therein I desire to Glory. His petty Remark upon *Barclaii Argenis* is both Childish and Malitious; he must know, That the *Quakers* and my Self do both Abhor and Condemn such Books: And truly, my Love to my Name is not so great, that I would have that exempted; and therefore I could freely give my Vote, that all *Romances* were burnt. And he will find it hard to prove, That *such are used by any of us*; whileas I know some, who passed and yet go for *Pious and Elect Ladies* among them, that bestowed no small Share of their Time in Reading them. And *Preachers* may be found Eminent enough, whose Closets are well stored with most approved *Romances*; and some being challenged, even of Note among the *Presbyterians*, by some Serious Professors for their Reading of them, did Justify it, as that whereby they were helped in their Pulpits to give their Sermons a better Lustre. So he may see, these Books are of more Use to his Brethren than us; who can content our Selves with such *homely Language* as the *Holy Scripture* Teacheth. For what he saith of *James Naylor*, I need return no *Answer*; having sufficiently done it in the former Section. And whereas he gives the Example of the *Antinomians*, to shew, The *Quakers* are not *Singular*, in not being called after a particular Person; he doth but miss of his Aim: For the *Quakers* are known by that Name as such, being an Imbodied People, consisting of several Hundred Gathered Churches or Congregations: but the *Antinomians* are only here, either some having these particular Notions, and no such Imbodied People; else let him tell us, where we may find these *Antinomian Churches*? I need say no more to this *Postscript*, which hath nothing in it; but meer Railing Assertions, as to me; and that the rather, as I suppose *R. M. C.*

1679.



*Presbyterians read Romances to give their Sermons in the Pulpit a better Lustre.*

will

1679. will, long e're this appear in Print, receive a solid and grave Letter from an old Friend and Acquaintance of his, which may make him sensible of his Iniquity in this Matter; if there be yet any Christian Ingenuity abiding with him, and that by Prejudice he is not totally blinded.

See the Letter following

¶ 2. As for his Railing Assertions of *George Keith's* Book, we will see, how it is Refuted in the promised Answer to it; and then it will be time to answer them, as to that; as well as to the Blasphemous Assertions, which they pretend they have gotten out of it: But all Christians may judge, how they are like to prove it Blasphemous, when, as an Instance of the Blasphemous Assertions, they give *G. K's* saying, *That the Man Christ Jesus is the Mediator*. And to help them to do their Work fully, I desire them, when they go about to prove this Assertion to be *Blasphemy*, they may not forget the Apostle's Words, *1 Tim. 2. 5. For there is One GOD, and One Mediator between GOD and Men, the MAN Christ Jesus*; and shew, how *G. K's* Words are more Blasphemous, than these of the Apostle: Which, to make it more plain to the Reader, I will add thus;

Their Charging us with Blasphemy from the Apostle's Words.

*G. K's* Position, which *J. B.* and *R. M. C.* two Eminent *Presbyterian* Preachers, in the Index at the End of *J. B's* Book, affirm to be one of the *Abominable Heads of Quakerism*, is;

*That the MAN CHRIST JESUS is the MEDIATOR.*

The Apostle his Assertion (*1 Tim. 2. 5.*) is,

*That there is One MEDIATOR between GOD and Men, the MAN CHRIST JESUS.*

We desire the Sense and Censure of the *Presbyterian* 1679. Ministry upon this; or otherwise we hope, they cannot in Reason be offended, if justly reputed Accusers of the Spirit of God, that Taught the Apostles to speak, and thence Condemned, as *signal Calumniators* and *Hereticks*.

An Expostulatory Epistle,  
Directed to  
**ROBERT MACQUARE.**

The Letter  
of Lillias  
Skein to R.  
M. C.

Friend ROBERT MACQUARE,

**M**Y Tender Love and Sympathy was great towards many of the *Non-Conformists*, who were Suffering for Conscience sake, and not for Interest espousing that Opinion; of whom thy self being one, thou wast often very near me, notwithstanding I knew, generally the *Non-conformists* were more Imbittered and Prejudiced against us, called *Quakers*, than any other Men, Yet this I often constructed to flow from Misinformation concerning us, being so little acquainted with and conversant among us; whereunto your being so Shy, was but like the Disciples in a Storm seeing him *Appear in a Manner, they had not seen him before*, thought, he was coming nearer them for their Deliverance; yet they *Cried out through Fear*, as if it had been the Appearance of some Evil Spirit. Other times I have looked upon the great Prejudice many had against us, answerable to Christ's saying; *No Man having drunk Old Wine, straightway desireth to drink New, they say, the Old is better*: Which hitherto hath, and yet doth cause me bear with you,

Misinformation to prejudice and Bitterness gives often great Occasions.

1679. you, and love that which is good amongst you, wherever it appeareth. And so because of this Love towards thee I am the more concerned at this Time, with what thou hast lately published. For though my Acquaintance and Intimacy with thee was not so much as others, yet it being in a very serious Season with both of us, as I very well Remember (when thou wast shut up close Prisoner, and wast daily in Expectation of the Sentence of Death) thy Deliverance, from which I retain the fresh Sense of ; and it was and is with many such like Seasons, wherein the Lord prepared my Heart, and bended his Ear: A sweet Encouragement to trust him, and a singular Engagement on me to Wait for his Immediate Leadings and the Manifestations of his Will at all Times. But Oh! since I heard of and read thy *Postscript* to *John Brown's* Book, and *S. R.* his *Letters* (as is supposed) I am astonished, and much ashamed on thy Behalf! O! Is the best Fruits of so many Years Affliction thou hast to publish to the World, That one called and suffering as a *Non-conformist* (to this Sinful Time) should have learned no more Conformity to meek, lowly Jesus (of whom it is said, *He learned Obedience by the things which he suffered*) Surely, none who read thy Language, will say, this Man hath been with Jesus; but rather say, whose-soever's Company thou hast been in, thou hast learned to be a Cunning Artift at the Scolding Trade, and art therein vainly puffed up, that thou even fleest aloft (though with Waxen Wings) above the lowly, harmless, meek Spirit of Christ. And verily, had I all thy *Rhetorick* (whether natural, or acquired) which thou so much mis-improvest to the gratifying of that, which needs more to be Crucified in thy self and many, who are ready Implicitly to follow thee ; it is not in my desire

R M's Ex-  
altedness and  
Railing Spi-  
rit Rebuked.

to follow thy Example: Nor shall I wish, that ever thou have an Answer from any of the Lord's People in thy own Terms, which are such, as all sober, unprejudiced People, who read them, will see thy Spirit most strongly Imbittered, when thy Pen is so dipt in Gall. I say, it is not in my desire to bring forth one Railing Accusation against thee, neither to Answer many things thou hast vented against the Lord's present Work and Witnesses, whom thou despisest and abhorrest more than Dung under thy Feet, and crowest over: yet if the Living God (a Part of whose Host they are) see it meet, he can raise up the least of them, and make thee feel Worm *Jacob* a Threshing Instrument with Teeth to deal with thee, and thresh that Lofty, Malitious Spirit of Prejudice, that Breathes through thee. The Consideration whereof upon thy Soul's Account is the Occasion of this Letter: wherein I desire to lay some things before thee, which are with Weight upon me; my Compassions being kindled towards thee, that when the Lord cometh to visit the Earth, thou should'st be found among them, who are *Beating their Fellow servants*; the Hazard of which State thou knowest, and many will feel, when the Lord riseth up to Prey: For *his Eyes are upon the Righteous, and his Ears are open to their Cries*. Though now he be Trying the Children of Men, and permitting some to Suffer, and others to do hard Things; yet a Hope lives in me, the Time approacheth, wherein the Lord will more manifestly Appear to the Joy and Refreshment of the single in Heart, who Suffer with him, and patiently Wait for him, and for the Shame and utter Overthrow of his malitious Opposers.

And so one of the Particulars I would lay before thee, is a Desire, thou would'st yet in the


1679. *Lord's Light Search thy own Heart* move, till thou findeft out, what fecret Affinity hath remained with thee to any of the Lord's Enemies in thy own Heart: For if all were brought under the Government of the Son of God inwardly, I am fully perfwaded, thy outward Opposition to the Lord's Work could not long ftand. The outward is a true Figure of the inward; and I know by true Experience, all that Difpight, and disdainful, undervaluing Epithets thou squeezeft up thy Engine to Coin (which one may feel Answers not fully thy own Satisfaction) for befpatting and loading that People and their Principles, is but (alas!) a Mirrour-glaſs ſet up to Represent the low, mean, unworthy Eſteem thou beareſt to the Light of Chriſt in its inward Appearance in thee, as a Reprover: For whoſoever turneth Univerſally at the Reproofs of God's Light in the Conſcience, ſhall witneſs the Pouring forth of his Spirit in larger Manifeltations; according to *Prov.* 1. 23. But that Spirit ſpeaketh in thee, of which *Iſaiab* propheſied, *Iſa.* 53. 2, 3, &c. concerning the outward Appearance of the ſame Chriſt, our Head, and the Captain of our Salvation (whoſe Sufferings, Death, Reſurrection and Glory we dearly own, and wait from Day to Day more to feel the precious Vertue thereof ) altho' he then was and now is Rejected and Deſpised of Men, who hide, as it were, their Faces from him, becauſe his outward Appearance was as a Root out of a dry Ground, in whom there was no Form nor Comelineſs, nor Beauty, that he ſhould be deſired by that Mind, which was looking after great things, and expecting much outward Glory and Advantage. And ſo Chriſt's Appearance was miſtaken by the learned Rab-  
bies in that Day; notwithstanding they had *Moses* and the Prophets Teſtimonies, and were not

Search thy  
own Heart  
in the Light  
of the Lord.

The mean  
Appearance  
of Chriſt de-  
ſpised by the  
Learned  
Rabbies.

want-



wanting in Reading the Letter, as others now: 1679. 

For as it was then, it is now, he was and is mistaken by all, who seek any thing to glory in, save the Cross of Christ. For the Wisdom of the Flesh hath and doth lift fall'n Man above the innocent Seed in themselves, only through which they can see the invisible Glory of the Kingdom of God; and find an abundant Entrance unto the Righteousness, Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost, whereof it consists. Wherefore take heed of being lifted up above the Seed, Light, Life and Spirit of Christ in thee, and so thou wilt see Matter to *work out thy Salvation in Fear and Trembling*, and wilt not set down upon former Attainments or Experiences, when the Life is gone.

Another thing I would put thee in Remembrance of in these present Times is, The great Danger of *Sinning at the Waters of Strife*; whereof *Moses* his Example may be a standing Monument to all Generations: Of whom it was said, *He was the meekest Man upon the Earth*, yet at the *Waters of Strife* he spake *unadvisedly with his Lips*; because of which he was debarred from entering into the promised Rest. And are there not some living at this Day, who with Sorrow of Heart have observed the Heat and Bitterness of Spirit, that hath arisen, because Differences and Controversy concerning Religion have eaten out the Life of that Love and Tenderness, that was with many? And having hurt the Green Thing in themselves and one another, hath brought on Death, Darknes, Dryness and Sensible Withering; and cannot chuse but so to do, seeing Bitterness of Spirit and Prejudice, and such like Frames in Man or Woman separates from God, while there any one abides. For *God is Love*, and he that dwells in God, dwells in Love; and Christ hath said, *Unless ye abide in me, ye cannot bring forth much Fruit*: So not abiding

The great Danger of Sin at the Waters of Strife.

Dwell in Love.

M m 2 in

1679. in that pure Love to God, and his Image in his Children, hath caused many to fall short, and hath letted their Progress, and made many lose sight of their Way, and the Guide of their Youth; and so they have not followed the Lord fully, nor followed him in the Regeneration, Renewing according to the Increase of Light and the Measures of Manifestation, whereby they should know, even in this Life, a being *Changed from Glory to Glory*, as by the Spirit of the Lord. Thou mentionest in thy *Postscript*, to *J. B.* pag. 557. *Many, who may Remember with shame and Confusion of Face their Laughing at, and making light of the Appearance of that Prodigy, and that it may cause some go groaning to their Grave, being an Evidence, that ye knew not the Signs of the Time, and what they called you to do.* To which I answer: Lightness and Laughing among People, that lay claim to Religion, is none of the least Causes of Mourning; but I also believe, if the Appearance of *Quakerism* (so called) had in the Beginning been looked on, as the Fore-runner of the Down-fall of a meer Man-made Ministry in these Nations, it's like, it would have moved those, who laughed most, to have mourned most even then; and *Babylon's* Merchants would have cried, *Alas! Alas!* But since now thou acknowledgest, in the Space of a Score of Years at most *Thou see'st Cause to mourn for that, which ye then laughed at*; I am very willing to admit of your own Acknowledgment for a Ground of Hope, that the Single-hearted among the *Non-conformists* may out-live all the Clamour they are now making against us; and in less than *as many Years* more, may work through the Fogs and Mists, that now darken their Understandings concerning the Signs of this Time, and *look back with Shame and Confusion* on their great Darkness, that would have mourned for that, which was Matter of Joy. And  
 this

The Fore-  
 runner of  
 the Down-  
 fall of a  
 Man-made  
 Ministry.

this is no far-fetched Consequence; for ye had then, and now the same Acquaintance with the Letter of the Scriptures, and as much Humane Learning, and Sharpness and Natural Abilities for an Acute Examen: And so it follows by the Rule of Contraries, and may it not be without Presumption concluded, *Ye needed then, and do now, the Help of the Spirit's immediate Teachings in your own Hearts*, without which ye will not yet understand the Signs of this Time aright? Which if ye did, ye would see the Lord *Staining the Pride of all Flesh, and bringing into Contempt all the Honourable in the Earth, that the Lord alone may be exalted*, and see him coming out of his Holy Habitation to silence all Flesh. Hath not the Lord removed most of all those, who were Eminently instrumental to serve him in the Work of the Ministry? And is he not daily making their Skirts bare, who remain, and daily making them to Cease out of the Midst of the National Church, who rejoyced in her Pride? Is not his Voice sounding aloud unto such of you, as yet remain? *Ye shall no more be haughty, because of my Holy Mountain: If to day ye will bear his Voice, harden not your Hearts*; for I am sure, the Teacher, that will tell you infallibly, what ye are called to do, is near, and is not *removed into a Corner*. But it is the Enemy's Work to vail and cover present Duties and Opportunities, and represent what is past or lost, as very desirable, and even to prompt a People or Person to lament and bewail their by-past Failings and Short-comings, who do little heed or regard the Worth of the remaining Season, and so to Redeem the Time. Wherefore my Advice in tender Love to thy Soul is, That thou Wait on the Lord to understand aright the Import of such Signs, as are now appearing, when the Lord is proceeding to work marvellous Works and Wonders in the Earth, and is making the *Wisdom of*

1679.

The Lord is  
Staining the  
Pride of all  
Flesh.


1679. *the Wise to perish, and the Understanding of the Prudent to be hid*; and pouring out his Spirit upon Sons and Daughters, Servants and Hand-maids, provoking to Jealousy, and angering the Mighty, Learned, Wise Men in this Generation by the foolish Appearance of a Company of Illiterate Tradesmen, who were never Bred up at Schools and Universities, Weavers and Shoo-makers, and Fishers. Yea, Is not one of the dreadful Signs of this Time fulfilling in thee and thy Brethren, *Rev. 16: 8, 9.—The Fourth Angel poured out his Vial upon the Sun, and Power was given unto him to scorch Men with Fire: And Men were scorched with great Heat, and blasphemed the Name of God, which hath Power over these Plagues; and they Repented not to give him Glory?* And whether this Plague be not poured out upon your Anti-Christian Sun, and ye be the Persons, that are thus scorched, your Dialect doth sufficiently declare unto all those, whose Eyes the Lord hath opened. I also desire thee to consider, how Inconsonant with true Christianity a Spirit of Persecution is, and how much more unsuitable, and unequal for a People or Person under the same Condemnation? Surely, that poor Man, who had been but a little time in Christ's Company, was so far influenced by his meek and moderate Spirit, as not only to forbear Railing himself against suffering Christ, but to rebuke his Fellow-companion for so doing: Which Instance will stand in Judgment against thee for the contrary Practice. Neither will thy denying us to be Members of Christ, and *not suffering for well-doing*, and thy accounting us *Demoniacks*, avail thee, nor cover thee from that Woe (if thou obtain not Mercy to Repent) denounced against such, *as call Good Evil, and Evil Good, and Light Darkness, and Darkness Light*, in that Day, when the Lord Jesus shall declare before Men and Angels, we are his *Friends and Followers*.

The Lord is angering the Wife and Learned, by pouring out his Spirit upon Illiterate Tradesmen, not bred up at Schools and Universities.

The Scorching Plague on Anti-Christ his Dialect doth shew.

Gross Railing rebuked.

O Robert!

1679. 

O Robert ! thy hard Speeches have manifested thy own sad Acknowledgment to be very true : The *Holy Fire* is gone out with thee indeed ; in Place of which that which never was, nor is of God's Kindling is brought forth : And this is not now to be found by secret Search in Corners by secret Surmises ; but is by many of you laid open, and in thy late *Postscript*, as on a Theatre set up, as those who run may read, the *Holy Fire*, if ever there was any, is quite extinct. Concerning which Compound of *unjust, groundless Accusations* and *Malitious Inventions*, I hope, I may say, there are many Sober, Serious People, who Fear and Serve the *Living God, inward Jews*, whose Hearts the Lord hath Circumcised to love him ; who desire continually in the Integrity of their Hearts to serve him ; against whom I know, no *Divination* nor *Inchantment* of *Devils* or *Men* shall prosper. Of which Blessed Company I do avouch my Self One, through the Free Grace of God ; and I hope, I, and many with me, have put all *thine* and thy *Brethrens Writings* in the Lord's own Hand to Answer, for the Vindication of his Glory and the manifestation of his Truth : And I desire to make no *worse Use* of thy *Postscript*, than *Hesekiah* made of the Writings of *Rabshakeb* in that Day. Unto the Righteous Lord, who *searcheth the Heart and trieth the Reins*, do I Appeal, for whose immediate Help, and seasonable, powerful Appearance I desire both to Hope, and patiently to Wait, until he have performed his whole Work in *Zion* and *Jerusalem* both amongst *You* and *Us* : Then shall be brought to pass the *sure Promise*, *The Lord will punish the Fruit of the stout Heart of his Adversary, and the Glory of his High Looks*. In that Day he will inwardly and outwardly both plead our Cause and execute Judgment for us : He will *bring forth our Righteousness as the Light, and make his Judgments*

The Lord  
will plead  
our Cause.

1679. *ments for us manifest, as the Noon-day; although we lie among the black Pots of our Reproaches.*

Now, the Lord will bring us forth unto the *Light*, and we shall behold his *Righteousness* fulfilled in you, or manifested upon you: My Witness is in Heaven, I am one, who desires not the *Evil Day*, but am willing to embrace all the sweet Opportunities of the Drawings of my Father's Love, and the Arisings of his Life to stand in the *Gap* for the Single-hearted among you: And I must declare for the Exoneration of my own *Conscience*, I am an Experimental Witness, how grievously thou violatest the Truth, in misrepresenting the things, which thou callest, *The bitter Root springing up in these Sprouts of Hell.* 1. *Mens not receiving the Love of the Truth.* 2. *Their pleasing themselves with Names and Notions, while Christ was not received to dwell in the Heart.* 3. *Their not departing from Iniquity, who seemed to call on his Name.* I am a Witness when the Lord called me out from among the *Presbyterians*, I was one, who according to my Education and Information, and Inclination from my Childhood, was a true Lover of that called the *Glorious Gospel*, and a constant Attender upon the Declarations thereof; and the *Messengers Feet* that published it, were beautiful to me, so long as those *Ordinances of Man* were unto me as the *Ordinances of Christ*; which was more than Thirty Years: I loved them more than all things in this World; I passed through them *hungry* and *hardly bestead* for many Years, feeling after Life and Immortality, but could not find that: Somewhat was raised in me, that *Words* and *Reports* could not feed; *Names* and *Notions* I minded little; but *Christ to dwell in me*, was that and is that more and more I press after.

L. S. *her*  
first Con-  
vincement.

And now I must for the *Truth's sake* say somewhat, which I humbly mention with a fresh Remembrance

membrance of the Love, Power and tender Mercy of God, who enabled me (I know, the Lord will not impute it to be Boasting) in that Season, wherein the Lord revealed the true Way to Life and Immortality to me, by his Inward Appearance in my Soul: It was a Time wherein he had Mercifully turned me from all, that ever his Light inwardly and Law outwardly had condemned me for; my Heart also did bear Witness for me, that whatsoever I had known would please him, I was chusing to do that: Not that thereby I was seeking *Justification in my own Righteousness*, but a sure *Evidence* of my Interest in him, who was made unto us *Righteousness, Justification, &c.* This blessed Glympse of my begun Freedom was given me in a seasonable Time, that I might thereby be enabled to speak with mine Enemy in the Gate, and be encouraged to believe in the Light, and wait upon the Lord, to feel his Virtue perfectly to cleanse me from all Filthiness of Flesh and Spirit. Neither was I an Undervaluer of the Scriptures; they were my Rule then, and I hope for ever my Life shall answer them: I think they honour the Scriptures most, who live most according to them; and not they, who call them the *Only Rule*, yet do not make them their Pattern. The Scriptures of Truth were precious to me, and by them was I taught not to walk nor worship in the Way of the People; the Spirit shewing me his Mind in them: And then I saw in his Light, that it is not the Scriptures many Adore so much, as their own corrupt Glosses upon them. Neither can my Experience go along, with what thou affirmest of the Hazzard of Converse with that People: It is very well known to all, that lived in the Place, where I sojourned, I was none who conversed with them; I was never at one of their Meetings; I never read one of

1679.



To whom  
and how the  
Scriptures  
are a Rule.

their

1679. their Books, unless accidentally I had found them where I came; and look'd to them, and laid them by again.

The Occa-  
sion of L. S.  
her joining  
with the  
Quakers.

So now it remains with me to tell thee, what was the Occasion I joined with them? Since it was none of those thou mentionest; which I will very singly, and can very comfortably do. It was that thing ye *School-men* call *Immediate Objective Revelation*, (which my Desire is, ye were more particularly and feelingly Acquainted with) whereby the Lord raising in my Soul his *Feeling Life*, I could not sit down satisfied with hearing, of what the Son of God had done outwardly, (tho' I believe that thereby he purchased all that *Grace* and *Mercy*, which is inwardly wrought in the Hearts of his Children) until I should be a Partaker of the Virtue and Efficacy thereof, whereby I might possess *the Substance of things hoped for*. I saw, an *Historical Faith* would neither Cleanse me, nor Save me; If that could Save any, the Devils were not without a Door of Hope. I felt, I needed the *Revelation of the Son of God* in me; All that ever I read or heard without this, could not give me the Saving Knowledge of God. *None knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son revealeth him*; through the Virtue whereof mine Eyes were more and more by Degrees opened. For the tender-hearted *Samaritan* had Pity upon my wounded Soul, when both *Priest* and *Levite* passed by, and the *Watchmen rent my Vail*; and when there was no Eye to pity, nor Hand to help me, he drew near, and poured in Wine and Oyl, as he saw needful, and fulfilled the Promise in Measure, wherein he had long caused me to hope, *He that follows me, shall not walk in Darkness, but shall have the Light of Life*: And that sweet Saying, whereby I am confirmed and comforted; *If evil Parents know, how to give their Children good things, how much more will*

The Scrip-  
tures made  
comfortable  
by the Spirit  
of Truth.

will




will the Lord give his Holy Spirit to those who ask him? When your Children ask Bread, will ye give them a Stone? Or when they ask a Fish, will ye give them a Serpent? These precious Scriptures, and many such like, being opened up and applied by the Spirit of Truth powerfully and seasonably (in saying, *Be not faithless, but believing*) Times above Number before and since hath made me set to my Seal to these Words of Christ, *The Words that I speak are Spirit and Life*; and as I walk with him, and abide in him, *watching at the Posts of Wisdom's Gates*, travelling in Spirit more and more to bring forth Fruit unto him, and walk worthy of him, unto all well-pleasing, daily to die unto Self, that Christ may live in me, I becoming a *passive Creature*, and he an *active Christ*, in the Increase of his Government I feel the Increase of my Peace.

And so, *My Friend*, thou hast here by some Touches at Things Occasion to see, how far thou art mistaken concerning us, and how far contrary to the Truth, as it is in Jesus, thou represent'st many things to the World, *speaking Evil of Things which thou knowest not*; and if thou dost, the greater is thy Sin. Two Particulars indeed I cannot strain Charity so far as to believe, thou thinkest. Do we *deny Jesus Christ*, and *Justification through his Righteousness*, because we make the Sufficiency thereof of a more universal Extent, than ye? Or because we love *whole Christ* so much, and his seamless Coat, that we will not have it divided? Nay, we dare not divide *Justification* and *Sanctification*, neither confound them; we have felt the *Blood* and *Spirit* distinct things, yet inseparable. Neither can'st thou think we *make void the Scriptures*; because we honour the Spirit that was before the Scriptures were written, and bear Testimony against all, who deny the *Spirit's Immediate Teachings* to be the universal Pri-

1679.

Christ owned and the Scriptures.

1679.  Priviledge of his People: Whereby ye take away the Key of Knowledge, and neither enter the Kingdom, nor suffer others who would; but *Monopolize Knowledge* to your selves, and intrude your Meanings upon the Consciences of Men, as the Rule: Which Meanings indeed I do not own, either as the Only, or any Rule, but as the Spirit of Christ in my Conscience answers it. The Testimony of the Spirit of Truth in Thousands with me will stand and rise up against thee in the Presence of the Lord, when all thy unjust Reproaches and malicious Accusations shall melt away before the Presence of the Glory of the heart-searching God; before whose Tribunal I desire daily to stand, that he may more narrowly search me by his Light, and both discover and destroy what he finds contrary to his Pure Nature and Holy Will, whether mediately or immediately Revealed: And before whose Tribunal thou and I will e're long more solemnly appear, to give an Account of Things we have done in the Body. Which that thou may'st do with Joy, and not with Grief, hereafter, when thou commend'st thy Advice to the Readers of thy Epistles, have so much Mercy upon thy own, and the Souls of those thou writest to, as to desire them to ponder their Path, and be established: And be sure, they be come to the Holy Faith, and not to an Implicit, believing the *Tradition of Men*; for by so doing indeed, thou, and as many as thou canst influence, may come to fare well, according to *Pro. 4.26. Ponder thy Path, and be established, and turn not to the right Hand, nor the Left.* I am one,

*Who, in my Measure, Travel for the Redemption of the Seed of God in all Souls, and in thine,*

Newtyle, the 8th of  
the 4th Mon. 1678.

Lillias Skein.

*A Catalogue of some of the many downright Lies and Calumnies, which he asserts in the Index before his Book, to be the Assertions of the Quakers.*

All these Things he asserts falsely of Us.

1. **T**HAT we arrogantly stile our selves the Servants of God.
2. That we glory of the Title Quakers.
3. That we account our selves the only Teachers of Truth, Equalizing our selves to the Apostles.
4. That we say, we are perfect without Sin.
5. That we only taste, see and smell the inward Light.
6. That we assert our Experiences, in Matters that cannot be experienced.
7. That we assert our selves to be Equal with God.
8. That we say, *All is done without the Spirit, that is not done in our Way.*
9. That we remain Covered, when they pray or praise, really to Mock.
10. That we ascribe as much to our own Writings, as to the Scriptures.
11. That we speak basely of Learned Men.
12. That we Condemn the Study of Original Languages.
13. That we speak most basely of the Scriptures.
14. That we say, *They are no Rule to us.*
15. That we call them Imperfect.
16. That we dissuade from Reading and Studying them.
17. That we say, *God only worketh a Possibility of Salvation.*
18. That we say, *God ordaineth nothing from Eternity.*
19. That we deny Christ's Second Coming.
20. That

1679. 20. That we are *not Clear concerning Jesus of Nazereth his being the Son of God.*
21. That we *acknowledge no Christ, but a Christ within us.*
22. That we *make Him nothing, but a meer Holy Man.*
23. That a *Christ without us, is but a Carnal Christ with us.*
24. That we are *unclear touching the Sin of Adam, and the Fall.*
25. That we *make Original Sin to be a Substance.*
26. That we deny, that *Heathens have any thing of the Law written in their Hearts.*
27. That we say, *A Pagan can perform all inward Worship easily.*
28. That we *confound Revelations with the gracious Operations of the Spirit.*
29. That we *succeed to the Old Enthusiasts.*
30. That we *turn the History of Christ's Death into Allegories.*
31. That we *wildly describe it.*
32. That we say, *There is no more Advantage to be had by the History of Christ's Death, than by the History of other Saints.*
33. That we *miserably mistake the Judgment of the Orthodox about Reprobation.*
34. That *in Exaggerating the Matter of Reprobation, we miserably belch out against God.*
35. That we *deny Faith and Repentance to be the Gifts of God.*
36. That we *vilify the Virtue and Efficacy of Christ's Satisfaction.*
37. That we *deny all Imputation of Righteousness.*
38. That we say, *The Patriarchs had no Faith of the Messiah to come.*
39. That with us *All Members of the Church are Officers.*
40. That we say, *All Worship must be done by inward Inspirations, as to Time, Place and Duration.*
41. That

41. That we make no Use of the Scriptures in our Worship. 1679.

42. That in our Worship we Unchristian and Un-man our selves.

43. That we deny Magistrates to be lawful, that are not of our Way.

44. That we are against giving of all Honour and Respect to Superiors or Equals.

45. That we assert no Heaven nor Hell, but what is within Us.

I could have noted several others, which are direct enough Lies, set down in the *Index*, besides not a few he has in the Book, which are not in his *Index*; and which the Reader will in this *Vindication* observe. There are also several in the *Index*, which are false, and not owned by us in the Terms he writeth them; Of which I shall give the Reader a few Examples, that he may judge thereby of his Fallacy in most of the rest. As where he saith;

1. That we say, *The Knowledge of the Fall is not necessary.*

*Now this is false, for we hold it necessary for all to be sensible of their Loss and Want; only we say, A distinct Knowledge of the History of Adam's Fall is not of absolute Necessity to such, as God never afforded the Means of knowing it.*

2. That we deny, *bodily Death* to be a Punishment for Sin.

*This is also false; only we say, that it is not a Punishment for Sin unto all, but rather a Pleasure and Satisfaction, according to the Apostle's Words, To me to die is gain.*

3. That with us the *Preaching of the Gospel* is not necessary.

*This is a meer Fallacy: for we say, the Preaching of the Gospel is absolutely necessary; only we do not think, the External Knowledge of Christ to be only the Preaching of the Gospel: And that the Preach-*  
ing

1679. *ing of the Gospel has been or may be, where this is wanting.*

If I should go through the rest of the *Index* thus, I should find very few Particulars, in which there is not some such Perversion or Fallacy; so that very few are set down, as they are truly owned by us: Some indeed are, such as;

1. *That we deny Men to be Christians by Birth: for we believe that Men by Nature are born Children of Wrath; and yet this may have Exceptions, as in the Case of Jeremiah and John the Baptist, who are said to be sanctified from their Mothers Womb.*

2. *That we would have Ministers learning Trades whereby to live. We truly think, it were no Disparagement for Ministers to work with their Hands, as the honest Apostle Paul did, who commended the same to the Elders of Ephesus, Act. 20. 34. And yet we think, a Man may be a good Minister, though he have not a Trade, and work none; but yet never the worse if he have one.*

3. *That in Worship we think Men should be silent in the first Place: Yes; for Silence goes before all solemn Actions of Speaking.*

4. *That we think to command Men to pray without the Spirit, is to command Men to see without Eyes: Yes; because we know not what to pray for, as we ought, without it, Rom. 8. 26. and no Man should be commanded to pray as he ought not.*

But as to these which are indeed owned by us, thou wilt find them at large Vindicated by Scripture and Reason, either in my *Apology*, or in this *Treatise*. I could have made a further Remark in this his *Index*, to shew thee, how many of them he sets down as our Assertions, are not, nor ever were Asserted by any of us, nor by him Affirmed to be so, where he has them in his Book, but only his own meer Conjectures and Consequences; but I am loth to detain thee any longer in this: by looking the Pages, to which he referreth, thou mayest easily observe it.

THE  
 POSSIBILITY and NECESSITY  
 OF THE  
*Inward and Immediate Revelation*  
 OF THE  
 SPIRIT of GOD.

Towards the Foundation and Ground  
 of *True Faith*, proved, in a *Letter*  
 writ in *Latin* to a Person of Quali-  
 ty in *Holland*; and now also put  
 into *Engliff*: By R. B.

Advertisement to the Reader.

**T**HIS serves to inform thee, That it is above  
 Seven Years, since this *Epistle* was Printed in  
 Latin: The Person to whom it was writ, the Heer  
 Paets, is a Man of no mean Account both in the  
 Learned and Politick World; The Conference I had  
 with him, was lately after his Return from Spain,  
 where he had been Ambassador from the United  
 Netherlands. I discoursed with him on the same Sub-  
 ject last Year at London, where he was one of the  
 Commissioners for the Dutch East-Indian Compa-  
 ny; but could not find him propose any thing new,  
 nor what I could conceive, had any Weight towards  
 a Reply. What his Reasons were, not to prosecute  
 this Matter further, I shall not determine: But  
 thus far he readily yielded, That he had been mi-  
 staken in his Notion of the *Quakers*; for he

\* N n

found

1679. found they could make a reasonable Plea for the Foundation of their Religion. *Upon my Reading it over again, I found an Inclination in my self, and was perswaded by some Friends, to publish it in a Language more obvious to all my Countrymen. It is a Question now frequently tossed, What is the Ground and Foundation of Faith? And when the Matter is sifted to the Bottom, it resolves in Tradition or Revelation: For those who lay claim to the Scripture, and would make it the Foundation of their Faith, do resolve it but in a Tradition, when the Motives of Credibility are inquired into; since the Subjective Revelation, which they yield, comes but in the last Place, and is by themselves termed Medium Incognitum Assentiendi. And such a Revelation those of Rome will not refuse, to influence them to assent to the Determination of the Church: So those Protestants, who say, The Subjective Operation of the Spirit influences them (though they know not how) to believe the Scripture, presented and conveyed to them by Tradition, as the Dictates of GOD's Spirit, and so understand them, as their Preachers interpret them; differ not much, or at least have not Reason to differ from the Church of Rome, who say, The Spirit Influences them to believe the Scriptures, as proposed by the Church, and according as her Doctors and Councils interpret them: And neither has any better Foundation, than Tradition. And to speak the Truth plainly, the Faith of both resolves in the Veneration they have for their Doctors: but whereas the one affirms, they do it by an Intire Submission; they think it decent to say, they judge them Infallible. And certainly, it is most reasonable, that such as affirm the first, believe the last. The other, because they pretend, they believe the Church but conditionally, have denied to her Infallibility; though generally they be as credulous as the other. And I find, the Doctors*

The Ground of Faith and its Foundation, Revelation.

The Church of Rome's Belief concerning the Scriptures.



of their Church as angry to be contradicted, as the other; that is an Ingredient goes to the Composition of all Clergymen, since it became a Trade, and went to make a part of the outward Policy of the World; from whence has flowed that Monster PERSECUTION. In short, the Matter is easily driven into this narrow Compass. We believe either because of an outward or inward Testimony, that is, because it is outwardly delivered to us, or inwardly revealed to us. For my Part, I think, the Papists do wisely in pleading for Infallibility; for certainly, the true Church never was nor can be without it: And the Protestants do honestly in not claiming it; because they are sensible they want it. I should therefore desire the one to prove, That they are Infallible; and advise the other to believe, They may, and seek after it: But I am sure, neither the one is, nor the other cannot without Immediate, Divine Revelation. Therefore as to deny Revelation, is a bad way to prove Infallibility; so to deny Infallibility, is a bad way to make a Reformation: Since they, who do Reform, had need to be certain they are doing so. The Asserting of Infallibility in the Church of Christ, is not the Error of the Church of Rome; but the Pretending to it, when they have it not, and Placing it where they should not: But since those who oppose Immediate Revelation, do it on the Account, that they reckon it either Impossible or Unnecessary; I hope there will be as much found in this Epistle, as will evince the contrary. I have now exceeded the Limits of an Advertisement; but being known not to be a Man of Form, I hope, my Reader will excuse me: to whom I wish true Certainty of Faith, and so bid him heartily Farewel!

Robert Barclay.

The 9th of Octob.

1686.

N n 2

My

1679.



My Friend,

**A**LBEIT I judge, I did fully Answer to all thy Arguments in that Conference we had, concerning the *Necessity* and *Possibility* of *Inward Immediate Revelation*, and of the *Certainty of true Faith from thence proceeding*: nevertheless, because after we had made an End, and were parting, thou would'st needs remit to my further Consideration the Strength of thy Argument, as that in which thou supposed'st the very Hinge of the Question: to lie. That I might satisfy thy Desire, and that the Truth might more appear, I did further consider of it; but the more I weighed it, I found it the weaker. And therefore that thou thy self may'st make the truer Judgment of it, I thought meet to send thee my further Considerations thereon; (which I had done e're now, had not I both at *London* and elsewhere been diverted by other necessary Occasions) wherein, I doubt not, but thou wilt perceive a full and distinct Answer to thy Argument. But if thou can'st not as yet yield to the Truth, or thinkest mine Answer in any Part to be defective, so that there yet remains with thee any Matter of Doubt or Scruple; I do earnestly desire thee, that as I for thy sake, and out of Love to the Truth, have not been wanting to examine thy Argument, and to transmit to thee my Considerations thereon; so thou may'st give thy self the Trouble to write and send me what thou hast further to say: Which my Friend *N. N.* who delivers thee this, will at what Time thou shalt appoint, receive from thee, and transmit to me thy Letter; that at last the Truth may appear where it is.

And that the whole Matter may the more clearly be understood, it will be fit in the first Place, To propose thy Argument, whereby thou oppos-  
est

test the *Immediate Revelation* of GOD in the 1679. *Saints*; thence concluding, thou hast fully overturned the Foundation of the People called *Quakers*. Which Argument of thine is;

*That since (as thou judgest) the Being and Substance of the Christian Religion consisteth in the Knowledge of, and Faith concerning the Birth, Life, Death, Resurrection and Ascension of Christ Jesus, thou considerest the Substance of the Christian Religion as a Contingent Truth; which Contingent Truth is Matter of Fact. Whence thou reasonest, That—*

H. P's Objection against Immediate Revelation stated by way of Argument.

*Matter of Fact cannot be known, but by the Revelation of another, or by the Perception of the outward Senses; because there are naturally in our Souls no Idea's of Contingent Truths, such as are concerning Necessary Truths: To wit, That GOD is; and that the Whole is greater than the Part.— And since it may without Absurdity be said, That*

*GOD cannot make a Contingent Truth to become a Necessary Truth; neither can GOD reveal Contingent Truths or Matters of Fact, but as Contingent Truths are revealed: But Matters of Fact are not revealed, but by the outward Senses: — From whence thou concludest, That*

*Men are not even oblig'd to believe GOD producing any Revelation in the Soul concerning Matter of Fact, whether of a thing done, or to be done, unless there be added some Miracles obvious to the outward Senses, by which the Soul may be ascertained, that that Revelation cometh from GOD.*

And this thou endeavourest also to prove from the Scripture, *Rom. 10.* where the Apostle saith, *Faith cometh by Hearing*: And because the Apostle speaketh afterwards of those, who were sent, in

The Proofs of the Arguments.

1679. the Plural Number ; thence thou concludeſt, *That to be ſpoken of outward Preaching by the Miniſtry of Men* : And ſince the Apoſtle uſes a Queſtion, ſaying ; *How ſhall they believe, unleſs they hear*, Thou gatheſt from the Induction and Connexion of the Text, that the Apoſtle treats only of outward Hearing ; thence concluding, *That without outward Hearing, Faith cannot be produced* : And therefore, that there can be no *Immediate Revelation by the ſimple Operation of the Spirit in the Mind*, unleſs there be ſomewhat propoſed to the *outward Senſes*.

Before I proceed to a direct Answer to this Argument, ſome things are neceſſary to be premiſed :

The Chriſtian Religion conſiſts not in the Hiſtorical Knowledge of Chriſt.

*Fiſt* then ; That is falſly ſuppoſed, *That the Eſſence of the Chriſtian Religion conſiſts in the Hiſtorical Faith and Knowledge of the Birth, Death, Life, Reſurrexion and Aſcenſion of Chriſt*. That Faith and Hiſtorical Knowledge is indeed a Part of the Chriſtian Religion ; but not ſuch an Eſſential Part, as that without which the Chriſtian Religion cannot conſiſt ; but an Integral Part, which goes to the Compleating of the Chriſtian Religion : As the Hands or Feet of a Man are Integral Parts of a Man, without which nevertheless a Man may exiſt, but not an Intire and compleat Man.

The Hiſtorical Knowledge of Chriſt is not commonly man feſted to us, but by the Holy Scripture.

*Secondly* : If by *Immediate Revelation* be underſtood ſuch a *Revelation of G O D*, as begets in our Souls an Hiſtorical Faith and Knowledge of the Birth of Chriſt in the Fleſh, without the Means of the Holy Scripture, we do not contend for ſuch a Revelation, as commonly given, or to be expected by us or any other Chriſtians. For albeit many other Evangelical Truths be manifeſted to us by the Immediate Manifeſtion of God, not uſing the Scripture as the Means ; yet the Hiſtorical Knowledge of Chriſt is not commonly manifeſted to us, nor to any others, but by the Holy Scripture, as the Means, and that by way

of a Material Object: Even as when we see the Person of *Peter* or *Paul* to our visive Faculty Immediately, yet not without the *Medium* of that Person concurring as a Material Object to produce that Sight; while the Light of the Sun concurs, as the formal Object of that Vision or Sight. So that when we Livingly and Spiritually know the History of the Birth of Christ in the Flesh; the Inward Revelation or Illumination of G O D, which is like the Sun's Light, proceeding from the Divine Sun, doth shine into the Eye of the Mind, and by it's Influence moves the Mind to Assent: unto the *Historical Truth* of C H R I S T's Birth, Life, &c. in the Reading or Hearing the Scripture, or Meditating therein.

*Thirdly*: \* Nevertheless we do firmly Assert, That G O D can most easily, clearly and certainly manifest to our Minds the *Historical Truths* of C H R I S T's Birth, &c. when it so pleaseth Him, even without the Scripture, or any other Outward Mean. And because this Argument seems to be formed against the *Possibility* of such a Revelation, therefore I shall proceed to Discuss it: But first thou may'st mind, that the Prophets, who foretold *Christ's Coming in the Flesh*, and *being to be born of a Virgin*, and afterwards to suffer Death, did know these Truths of Fact by the *Inward Inspiration* of G O D without *Outward Means*: For which see 1 Pet. I. 10, 11. Now that which *hath been, may be*.

\* God can manifest the Historical Truth of Christ to our Minds without the Scripture.

*Fourthly*: This Argument doth at most Conclude, that we cannot know Naturally any Truth of Fact, but by the Relation of another without us, or by the Perception of the Outward Senses; because there are naturally in our Minds no *Idea's* concerning *Contingent Truths* (and every Truth of Fact is a Contingent Truth) as there are of *necessary Truths*. This then proveth, that we cannot naturally know any Contingent Truth, but by

A contingent Truth may be known by a Supernatural Knowledge.

1679. the Relation of another, or Perception of the outward Senses: But that hindereth not, but we may know a Contingent Truth by a Supernatural Knowledge, G O D supplying the Place of an outward Relator; who is so True, that he may and ought to be believed, sith G O D is the Fountain of Truth.

*Fifthly*: When G O D doth make known unto Men any Matter of Fact by divine, immediate Revelation or Inspiration, G O D speaking as to the Ear of the Heart of the Inward Man, or as by his Finger writing it therein, *two* things are to be considered in such an *Immediate Revelation*.

1. τὸ *Materiale*, The Matter of Fact or thing Revealed, which is *Contingent*.

2. τὸ *Formale*, The Form or Mode, how the Revelation is made: which Form is an Inward, Divine and Supernatural Revelation, which is the *Voice* or *Speech* of G O D, inwardly Speaking to the Ear of the Inward Man, or Mind of Man, or a divine Writing supernaturally imprinted therein. Now as to the *Material Part*, or the thing and *Matter revealed*, this is indeed a *contingent Truth*, and of it self is not manifest to the *Mind*; but because of the *Form*, that is, because of the *divine Mode*, and *supernatural, inward Operation*, the *Matter* is known to be *true*. For that divine and supernatural, Inward Operation, which the Mind doth feel and perceive in it self, is the *Voice* of God speaking unto Man, which by its Nature and *specifick* Property is as clearly distinguished and understood to be the Voice of G O D, as the Voice of *Peter* or *James* is known to be the Voice of such Men. For every Being as a Being is knowable, and that by its own *specifick* Nature or Property proceeding from its Nature; and hath its proper *Idea*, by which it's distinguishable from every other thing, if so be its *Idea* be stirred up in us, and clearly proposed to us.

The form of Revelation is the Voice of God inwardly speaking to the Mind of Man.

*Sixthly*: Now as some Beings are Natural, some 1679.  
 Supernatural; so some *Idea's* are Natural, some  
 Supernatural: And as when any Natural Idea is  
 excited in us, we clearly know it; so also when a  
 Supernatural Idea is raised, we clearly *know that*,  
 whereof it is the *Idea*. But the Voice of *G O D*  
 speaking to the Mind of Man, is a Supernatural  
 Being, and stirreth up in us a Supernatural  
 Idea, by which we clearly know that Inward Voice  
 to be the Voice of *God*, and not the Voice or Oper-  
 ation of another, or of any Evil Spirit, or An-  
 gel, because none of these have a Supernatural  
 Idea, as the *Voice* of *G O D*, and his divine Oper-  
 ation hath: For it is full of Vigour, Virtue and  
 Divine Glory, as saith the *Psalmist*, who had of-  
 ten Experience of it; and we also in our Mea-  
 sures are Witnesses thereof, for the Voice of *God*  
 is known to be his by its Divine Vertue.

*Seventhly*: The Senses are either *Outward* or  
*Inward*; and the Inward Senses are either Natu-  
 ral or Supernatural: We have an Example of the  
 Inward, Natural Sense in being Angered or Paci-  
 fied, in Love and Hatred; or when we perceive  
 and discern any Natural Truth, (such as the Na-  
 tural Maxims, to wit, *That the whole is greater*  
*than the Part*) or when we deduce any Conclusion  
 by the Strength of Natural Reason, that Percep-  
 tion also in a larger Sense may be called an In-  
 ward Sense. But an Example of an inward, Su-  
 pernatural Sense is, when the Heart or Soul of a  
 pious Man feels in it self Divine Motions, Influ-  
 ences and Operations, which sometimes are as  
 the Voice or Speech of *God*, sometimes as a most  
 pleasant and glorious Illustration or visible Ob-  
 ject to the inward Eye, sometimes as a most  
 sweet Savour or Taste, sometimes as an Heavenly  
 and divine Warmness, or (so to speak) Melting  
 of the Soul in the Love of *God*. Moreover this  
 divine and Supernatural Operation in the Mind  
 of

The speak-  
 ing of God  
 in Man is a  
 Supernatural  
 Being known  
 by its Ver-  
 tue.

What the  
 inward, Su-  
 pernatural  
 Sense in Man  
 is?

1679. of Man, is a true and most-glorious Miracle; which when it is perceived by the Inward and Supernatural Sense divinely raised up in the Mind of Man, doth so evidently and clearly persuade the Understanding to Assent to the thing Revealed, that there is no need of an outward Miracle: For this Assent is not because of the thing it self, but because of the *Revelation* proposing it, which is the *Voice of God*. For when the *Voice of God* is heard in the *Soul*, the *Soul* doth as certainly conclude the *Truth* of that *Voice*, as the *Truth* of *God's Being*, from whom it proceeds.

Contingent and Necessary Truths distinguished.

These things being thus primised, I now proceed to a direct *Answer*. For what is said, *That God cannot make a Contingent Truth to become a necessary Truth*, I agree; but when any Contingent Truth is manifest to us by the Immediate Revelation of God, there is in it two things to be considered, to wit, the *Thing Revealed*, which is *Contingent*; and the *Revelation* it self: Which upon the Supposition, that it is a *Divine Revelation*, is no *contingent Truth*, but a most *Necessary Truth*. And this all Mankind will say, that this Proposition, *Every divine Revelation is necessarily true*, is as clear and Evident, as that Proposition, *That every Whole is greater, than its Part*.

How a Divine Revelation is known to be a divine Revelation.

But thou wilt say; *How knowest thou, that a divine Revelation is a divine Revelation?* I answer, How knowest thou, that a *Whole* is a *Whole*, and a *Part* is a *Part*? Thou wilt say; by the *natural Idea* excited in me of a *Whole*, and of a *Part*. I answer again; Even so a *Divine Revelation* is known to be such by a *Supernatural Idea* of *Divine Revelation* stirred up in us, and that by a *Divine Motion* or *Supernatural Operation*. But it is no wonder, that Men, who have no Experience of *Supernatural Idea's*, or at least do not heed them, do deny them; which is, as if a Man natu-



naturally blind denyed Light or Colours; or a Deaf Man Sounds, because they experience them not. Therefore we cannot dissemble, that we feel a fervent Zeal even divinely kindled in us against such an Absurd Opinion, as Affirms, *That God cannot Ascertain us of his Will in any Contingent Truth, but by proposing it to the outward Senses.* This Opinion does in a Manner turn Men into Brutes, as if Man were not to believe his God, unless he propose, what is to be believed, to the outward Senses, which the Beasts have common with us: yea, it derogates from God's Power, and imputes Weakness to him, as if he could not do that, which not only both Good and Evil Angels can do, but which the meanest Creatures can do, and the most unsensible. As for Instance: The Heat of the Fire, the Coldness of the Air and Water worketh upon us; yea, if a Pin prick us, we feel it, and that by the outward Sense; because the Objects are outward and Carnal: But since GOD is a most-Pure and Glorious Spirit, when he operateth in the Innermost Parts of our Minds by his Will; shall not he and his Will be clearly felt according to his Nature, that is, by a Spiritual and Supernatural Sense? For as the Nature of God is, so is the Nature of his Will, to wit, *purely Spiritual*; and therefore requireth a spiritual Sense to discern it: which spiritual Sense, when it is raised up in us by a divine Operation, doth as clearly and certainly know the Voice or Revelation of the Will of God, concerning any thing which God is pleased to Reveal however Contingent, as the outward Sense knows, and perceives the outward Object. And it is no less Absurd, to require of God, who is a most-pure Spirit, to manifest his Will to Men by the outward Senses, else not to be Credited; as to require us to see Sounds, and hear Light and Colours.

1679.



Natural and  
Spiritual  
Senses distin-  
guished by  
their Ob-  
jects.

For

1679. For as the Objects of the outward Senses are not to be confounded, but every Object is to have its proper Sense; so must we judge of Inward and Spiritual Objects, which have their proper Sense, whereby they are to be perceived. And tell me, How God doth manifest his Will concerning Matters of Fact, when he sends his Angels to Men, since *Angels* (as is commonly received) have not outward Senses, or at least not so gross ones, as ours are? Yea, when Men die, and appear before the Tribunal of God, whether unto Eternal Life or Death, how can they know this having laid down their Bodies, and therewith their outward Senses? And nevertheless this Truth of God is a Truth of *Fact*, as is the Historical Truth of Christ's Birth in the Flesh. And which is yet more near: How do good and Holy Men even in this Life most certainly know, that they are in Favour and Grace with God? No outward Revelation doth make this known unto them; but *The Spirit* (as saith the Apostle) *beareth witness with our Spirits, that we are the Children of God*. For the meer Testimony of a Humane Conscience, without the Inward Testimony of the Holy Spirit, cannot beget in us a firm and immoveable Testimony of our Sonship, because the Heart of Man is deceitful; and if the Testimony thereof were true, at most it is but a humane Testimony, which begetteth in us only a Humane Faith: But that Faith, by which Holy Men believe they are the Sons of God, is a divine Faith, which leans upon a divine Testimony of the Holy Spirit, witnessing in them, that they are the Sons of God. Moreover, when a good Man feels in himself that undeclarable Joy of the Holy Spirit, concerning which the holy Scripture speaks, and which is the Common Priviledge of the Saints, how or whence feels he this Joy? Truly, this Argument

How good Men know, they are with God in Favour?

ment concludes no less against this Heavenly, Spiritual Joy, which is begotten in the Souls of the Saints by the holy Spirit, than it does against the *Immediate Revelation* of God: For there is no natural Idea of this Spiritual Joy, else meer natural Men, yea such, as are profane and ungodly, would feel it as much as the Godly: But because it is a Supernatural Thing, Therefore it can have no true Idea, but what is Supernatural. Moreover whence is it, that profane Men feel sometimes in themselves the Wrath of God as Fire, when all things, as to the outward, go as prosperously with them as with the Godly, and oftentimes more prosperously? For there is no natural Idea in Men of this Inward Wrath of God. There is also an inward Grief oftentimes raised up in Wicked Men from the Sense of this Wrath of God, which very much vexeth and tormenteth their Minds; and nevertheless this Grief hath no natural Idea in us: For oftentimes Wicked Men feel not this Sorrow; for God sometimes is, as it were Silent, while the Wicked Sin, as in *Psal. 50.*

All which Things do most clearly demonstrate, That there are in Men *Supernatural Idea's* of *Supernatural Beings*; which Idea's are nevertheless not perceived by us, unless they be stirred up by some *Supernatural Operation* of *G O D*, which raiseth up in us Supernatural and Spiritual Senses, which by their Nature are as distinguishable from the natural Senses, whether inward or outward, as the natural Senses are distinguished one from another by their specifick Difference. Of which Spiritual Senses the Scripture speaks frequently, as *Heb. 5.* and *14.* where is spoken of the Spiritual Senses in general, by which the Spiritual Man hath the Discerning of Good and Evil: Which Good is of a Spiritual Nature, and conduceth to feed in us a Spiritual and Divine Life; and the Evil is of that Kind, by which the

1679.  
How profane Men do feel the Wrath of God as Fire.

Spiritual Senses discerning good and Evil.

1679. Spiritual Life is in us hurt ; to wit, *Sins*, whether Carnal or Spiritual: All which cannot be discerned, but by such, who have Spiritual Senses stirred up in them, as saith the Apostle. In other Places the Scripture also speaketh of these Spiritual Senses in Particular ; as of the Spiritual Seeing, *Psal.* 34. 9. Of the Spiritual Hearing, *Psal.* 85. and 9. Of Spiritual Tasting, *Psal.* 34. 8. Of Spiritual Smelling, *Cant.* 1. 3. Of Spiritual Touching, *Acts* 17. 8. and in many other Places of Scripture we read of those Spiritual Senses in particular. Yea, it is the Promise of the *Gospel*, that *The Glory of God shall be seen of Holy Men*, such as are clean of Heart, even in this Life: *Isai.* 33. 17. *Mat.* 5. 8. Which were fulfilled in the Primitive Christians, see *John* 1. 14. 1 *John* 1. 1, 2, 3, 4. 2 *Cor* 3. 18. and Chap. 4. 6. But what is this *Vision of GOD* and *Divine Glory*, which the *Souls* of the *Saints* Enjoy in this *Life*, which is only as the *Earnest* or *first Fruits* of that *more abundant, glorious Vision* in the *Life to come*, concerning which the *Scripture* so much declareth, which is the *highest Happiness* of the **I M M O R T A L S O U L.**

For this Argument seemeth to do no less Injury to the Saints, than to rob them of this most glorious Treasure both in this Life, and that to come. For there is in us no Natural Idea of this Divine Glory, as there is not of GOD himself, which is any ways proportionable unto so great Happiness, which the Scripture so much declareth of, by which the Godly are Rewarded partly in this Life, and plenarily in that which is to come. We confess indeed, there is in all Men, as well the Godly as Ungodly, some Sort of Idea of GOD, as of a most perfect Being ; and that therefore this Proposition, *There existeth a most perfect Being*, doth as clearly appear to Human Understanding, as that *The Whole is greater than*

the

The Existence of a most perfect Being Asser-  
ted.

*the Part*: And therefore this Proposition, *That a most perfect Being existeth*, ought to be numbred among the Principles, that of themselves are manifest. But this Idea of GOD is as manifest to Ungodly, as to Godly Men; yea, is as clearly perceived by the Devil, as by the most holy Angels: For all the Devils know, that GOD *Is*; but yet how blind is the Devil, and all wicked Men as to the *Vision* of GOD, which is the chief Reward of the Saints.

There is then either no such *Vision* of GOD, neither in this Life, nor in that to come; or there is a *Supernatural Idea* of GOD *in us*, by which we are made capable of this Vision: Which Supernatural Idea of GOD differeth much from that Natural Idea of GOD, which *Cartesius* and his Followers so much talk of, (albeit others long before *Cartesius* did observe this Natural Idea of GOD, and spoke of it) But the Happiness of the Saints consists not in Contemplating this Natural Idea of *God*, else the Wicked would be as happy as the Godly; yea, the very Devil as the most holy Angel: Since as is said, both the Devil and most wicked Men do as clearly perceive this Natural Idea of GOD, as the most holy Men or Angels.

If the Scripture then be true, there is in Men a *Supernatural Idea* of God, which altogether differs from this Natural Idea: I say, *in all Men*; because all Men are capable of Salvation, and consequently of enjoying this *Divine Vision*. Now this Capacity consisteth herein, that they have such a Supernatural Idea in themselves: For if there were no such Idea in them, it were impossible they should so know GOD. *For whatsoever is clearly and distinctly known, is known by its proper Idea*; neither can it otherways be clearly and distinctly known: For the Idea's of all things are Divinely planted in our Souls; for they

1679.

The Supernatural Idea of God differs from the Natural.

There is in all Men a Supernatural Idea of God.

1679. they are not begotten in us by outward Objects, or outward Causes, (as the better Philosophy teacheth) but only are by these outward things excited or stirred up. And this is true not only in Supernatural Idea's of GOD, and things Divine, and in Natural Idea's of the Natural Principles of Human Understanding, and Conclusions thence deduced by the Strength of Human Reason; but even in the Idea's of outward Objects, which are perceived by the outward Senses;

*Boetius* a Christian Philosopher. As that Noble Christian Philosopher *Boetius* hath well observed; to which also the *Cartesian Philosophy* agreeth. For when I see any outward Object, whether it be a Man, or Horse, or Bird, the outward Object does not treat in my Eye, nor yet in my Mind the Idea of those things; for the outward Object does nothing, but imprint in our sensible Organs a Corporal Motion. Now there is nothing in a Corporal Motion, that can form in us the Idea's of those things; for all Idea's are of a Spiritual Nature? Now, nothing that is Corporal, can produce that which is Spiritual, because *The less Excellent cannot produce the more Excellent*, else the Effect would exceed its Cause; which is against all sound Reason, that it should bring forth what were of a higher and more excellent Kind. Therefore all Idea's, whether of Natural or Spiritual things, are *Divinely Implanted* in our Minds: Which nevertheless do not always appear, but sometimes appear, and sometimes are as it were hid in us; and sometimes are stirred up in us by Causes outward or inward, and again do as it were sleep and shun our Observation, and seem not to be otherways distinguished by our Minds, but as Thoughts and Perceptions of the Mind from the Mind it self; that is, as the Mode from the Subject, or as a bodily Motion from the Body, whereof it is the Motion: *For as is the Relation of a Bodily Motion*

The Motions of the Body and Mind distinguished.

to a Body, so is the Relation of a Thought or Perception of the Mind to the Mind. In this nevertheless they differ, that the *Mind* can move it self, and operate in itself; which a *Body* cannot do: but as a *Body* can be moved by another, so also can the *Mind* after its Manner be moved by another, and that both by outward and inward Causes; but chiefly by God himself, in whose Hand all Souls and Creatures are. But of these things there is enough said at present; and I hope, I have not thus far impertinently *Philosophized*.

To return again to the Matter in Question: It is already proved, *That there is in a Man a Supernatural Idea of GOD*; from whence it easily may be concluded, *There are other Supernatural Idea's in Man also*, to wit, Concerning *Divine and Supernatural Things*: Yea, as the Saints Experience doth prove it, neither doth sound Reason any ways contradict it.

As there are then Natural Idea's concerning the things of the Natural World, as for instance; Idea's of Light and Colours, Idea's of Voice and Sounds, Idea's of Savouring and Smelling, Idea's of Tasting and Feeling, as of Heat and Cold, of Grief and Joy; it follows also, that there are Idea's of Supernatural Things, concerning the Divine and Supernatural Things of the Divine and Supernatural World; as Idea's of those Things above mentioned in the Spiritual World. And as the Natural Idea's are stirred up in us by *Outward and Natural Bodies*: so *those Divine and Supernatural Idea's* are stirred up in us by a certain Principle, which is a *Body in Naturals in Relation to the Spiritual World*; and therefore may be called a *Divine Body*: Not as if it were a *Part of GOD*, who is a most pure Spirit; but the Organ or Instrument of *GOD*, by which he worketh in us, and stirreth up in us these Idea's of Divine Things. *This is that Flesh and Blood of*

Superna-  
tural Idea's  
deducible  
from the  
Natural.

The Flesh  
and Blood  
of Christ, by  
which the  
Saints are  
nourished.

1676. *Christ*, by which the Saints are nourished; which is a Myſtery to all Unregenerated and meer Natural Men, never to be reached by them, while they remain in that State.

The Beauty of God makes the Glory of this World deſpicable.

Now if there be ſuch Supernatural Idea's, there are alſo Senſes, or perceptive Faculties by which thoſe Idea's are perceived; for thoſe are two Relatives that ſuppoſe and infer one another: But in Wicked Men thoſe Senſes or Faculties do as it were ſleep (as the Viſive Faculty of a Blind Man;) But in the Godly they are ſtirred up. Now by theſe Divine and Spiritual Senſes, which are diſtinct and diſtinguiſhable from all the Natural Faculties of the Soul, whether of Imagination, or Natural Reason, Spiritual-minded Men do behold the Glory and Beauty of GOD, in reſpect whereof and for which all the Glory of this World is deſpicable to them; yea, even as Droſs and Dung. And they alſo *Hear GOD Inwardly ſpeaking in their Souls* Words truly Divine and Heavenly, full of Virtue and Divine Life; and they favour and taſte of divine Things, and do as it were handle them with the Hands of their Souls. And thoſe Heavenly Enjoyments do as really differ in their Nature from all falſe Similitudes and fictitious Appearances of them, which either the Mind of Man by its own Strength can imitate, or any evil Spirit to deceive Man can counterfeit; as a true Man differs from the dead Image of a Man; or true Bread, Honey, Wine or Milk doth from the meer Picture of thoſe things. And albeit either the Imagination of Man, or Subtilty of the Devil may counterfeit falſe Likeneſſes of theſe Enjoyments, by which Men may be deceived; and no doubt many are deceived; that doth not hinder, but that thoſe Divine Enjoyments are clearly perceived in ſuch, in whom the Divine and Spiritual Senſes are truly opened, and the true Supernatural Idea's of thoſe things truly raiſed up.



up. And if there be at any Time a Mistake, the Divine Illumination is not the Cause of that Mistake, but some Evil Disposition of the Mind; as happeneth in those things relating to *Natural Reason*: For there are many false Appearances of Reason, which differ as much from true Reason, as those false and pretended Revelations, and Diabolical Inspirations from such as are truly *Divine*. Now, how many Men, who would be esteemed Philosophers, are miserably deceived by those false Likenesses of Reason, judging their false Reasons to be the true Similitudes of things, and solid Ratiocinations; which nevertheless moveth no Man of sound Reason to reject sound and solid Reason, as doubtful and uncertain? For even sound, natural Reason is an Excellent Gift of *GOD*, and very useful to Mankind, when used in its proper Place: But let none think, to comprehend by their *Natural Reason* things that are of a *Divine* and *Supernatural* Kind. And as we use to do, when any one is deceived by false Appearances of Reason, we endeavour to reduce them to Contemplate the first natural Idea's of natural Things, and to meditate therein, which is as a Test or Touch-stone, by which all the Appearances and Likenesses of Reason are to be Examined; if they contradict them, to be rejected. So also when any one is deceived by his own Imagination, or the Cunning of Satan, thinking, any *Evil Inspiration* of the Devil to be a *True Divine Revelation*; He that is so deceived, is to be reduced to the Natural Idea's of things (if so be that pretended Revelation doth contradict them, for no true Divine Revelation can contradict the true natural Idea) or to the Supernatural Idea's of *Divine Things*, which are most simple, clear and obvious to the Minds of Men, if they will turn their Minds to the *Divine Seed* in them; or at least those Idea's are readily and easily stirred up.

1676.

The Cause  
of Mistakes  
by false  
Likenesses of  
Reason.

*Natural*  
*Reason* com-  
prehends not  
things *Si-*  
*pernatural*.

1676. For as in Natural Idea's, so in Supernatural some are more easily raised than others: For there is a certain Order both of Natural and Supernatural Idea's, whereby they are gradually excited: Nor is there any Mortal Man, in whose Mind at some time or other there is not stirred up some Idea, that is truly *Supernatural* and *Divine*; and who hath not felt in himself both the Wrath and Judgment of God for his Sins? And also some tender and gentle Taste of *God's* Love and Goodness, by which wicked Men are invited to Repentance? Now that which is thought to be a *Divine Revelation*, and is felt to contradict any *Divine* and *Supernatural Idea*, which is clearly perceived in the Soul, it is a manifest Token, that it is not a *Divine Revelation*, but either a false Imagination, or the wicked Suggestion of some Evil Spirit.

God hath declared his Will even in *Contingent Truths* in the *Scripture*

But to proceed: If we will hear the *Scripture* (as all Christians ought) it testifies to us, That *GOD* hath declared his Mind and will even concerning *Contingent Truths to come* in the Prophets; as that of the first to the *Hebrews* doth evidently declare: *GOD, who at sundry Times, and in divers Manners spoke to our Fathers in the Prophets.* Yea, let us hear the Prophets themselves, *Hosea* Chap. 1. saith plainly, *That the Word of the LORD was made in him* (as it is in the *Heb.*) *Habakkuk* also says, *As he was standing on his Watch, to see what Jehovah would speak in him.* And it is so manifest, that the most *Heavenly Revelations* are by *Inward Illustrations* and *Inspirations* in the very Minds of the Prophets; that it is strange, how any, that believes the *Scripture*, should doubt of it. And if it happened at any time, such Revelations were made in the natural Imaginations of the Prophets, or any of their inward natural Senses; then it may be confessed, they could not be infallibly certain, they came

*Revelations* were in the Minds of the Prophets by *Inward Inspirations.*

came from GOD; unless they also felt God in the *Divine* and *Supernatural Senses*, by which they did most nearly Approach to him, from these Superior and most inward Senses working upon the lower and less noble Faculties of the Mind. But which ever way the Prophets were certain, that they were *Inspired of GOD*, even when they foretold Contingent Truths to come; it is without Doubt, they were most certainly perswaded, that they were Divinely Inspired, and that frequently without any outward Miracle. For *John the Baptist* did no Miracle; and many Prophefied, where there appeared no Miracle: As in the Scripture may be often observed. And we also by the *Inspiration of the same Divine Spirit*, by which the Prophets prophefied, do believe their Words and Writings to be *Divine* concerning Contingent Truths, as well past, as to come; else that Faith, by which we believe the Scripture, would not be *Divine*, but *meerly Humane*. And thence we need no outward Miracles to move us to believe the Scriptures; and therefore much less were they necessary to the Prophets who writ them. For we see in many Places of the Prophets, where they declare Prophecies as revealed to them of *GOD*, there is not a Word mentioned of any outward Miracle, as that by which alone they were certain of it. Moreover the Falseness of this Argument doth appear, in that the Scripture doth declare many Contingent Truths to have been revealed to the Prophets in Dreams: Now as natural and wicked Men do not see, what they dream, by a real Perception of the Outward Senses, but by Inward Idea's, which are presented to the Mind, and perceived by it; so it is also in *Divine Revelations* of this Nature. Of which we have a clear Example in *Joseph*, the

1676.



Which were most certain without any Outward Miraculous Demonstrations.

Divine Revelations by Dreams.

1676. Husband of the Blessed Virgin, who when he observed his Wife with Child, was told in a Dream, That She had Conceived by the Holy Ghost: Now I would know, to which of *Joseph's Outward Senses* was this Revealed? Or what Miracle had he to induce him to believe? Which could neither be proved, (so as to make an infallible Application to *Mary*) by the Testimony of the Scripture; and which being against the Order of Nature, did choak his Reason. The Scripture mentions no Miracle in this Matter; and yet no doubt *Joseph* had highly sinned, had he not believed this Revelation, and notwithstanding rejected his Wife as an Adulteress. But if thou say'st, That according to thy *Hypothesis* there must have been a Miracle; That is only to beg the Question: And how false this *Hypothesis* is, the Apostle shews clearly *Corinth. 2. 14. The Natural or Animal Man knoweth not, receiveth not the Things of GOD.* Now *Divine Revelations* are of this Nature; and if either chiefly or only those things were to be judged by the Outward Senses, it would contradict the Apostle. For *Natural Men*, yea, the *most Wicked* have the Use of the Outward Senses as true and exact, as the *most Godly*. And whereas the Apostle adds, *For they are Spiritually discerned*; it puts the Matter out of all Question: For thence it abundantly appears, that this Discerning is not by the Outward Senses, according to the following Verse; for the Apostle saith, *The Spiritual Man judgeth all things*; This then must be done by some Senses or Properties peculiar to the Spiritual Man, and in which he excels the Natural Man, which is not in the outward Senses (as all do know.) Therefore the Perception of *Spiritual Things* cannot be by the outward Senses, either as the chief or only Means, as is falsely contended for.

The Outward Senses cannot discern the Things of God; for they are Spiritual.

Now

Now as to these Words of the Apostle, *Rom. 10.* 1676. *That Faith comes by Hearing*; *Zuinglius* observed well, That the Apostle intended not to affirm *Faith* to come by the Hearing of the *outward Word*: Neither do the following Words prove it, *How shall they believe, unless they hear? And how shall they hear without a Preacher? And how shall they Preach, unless they be sent?* For the Apostle uses these Words not as his Arguments, but as Objections which might be formed; as the same Apostle uses in other Places: To which Objections he answers in the same Chapter, as appears *ver. 18.* *But I say, have they not all heard? Yes, truly; their Voice went into all the Earth: That is, of the Father and Son, or the Father in the Word: which Word is not only near us, but* (according to the same Apostle in the same Chapter) *in our Mouths, and in our Hearts.* But further thou canst conclude nothing from this, but *that Faith is begotten by outward Hearing only, and no otherwise*: For this is the Strength of thy Argument, *That since Faith cannot be without Outward Hearing*; Therefore nothing can certainly be believed, but where somewhat is proposed to the Outward Hearing. For if thou acknowledge, Faith can be begotten any otherwise, than by Hearing, thou loosest the Strength of thy Argument: And if that Argument hold, *That Faith comes only by Outward Hearing*, thou destroyest the whole *Hypothesis*. For having before affirmed, *That outward Miracles are sufficient to render one certain of the Truth of any Revelation*; those Miracles, whether it be the Healing of the Sick, or the Raising of the Dead, would avail nothing, because those (as for the most Part all Miracles) are obvious to the *Sight*, not to the *Hearing*: And if it be not by *Outward Hearing* only, thou canst conclude nothing from this Place.

Whether  
Faith comes  
by the Out-  
ward Hear-  
ing?

1676. But I the more wonder thy Using of this Argument, considering the Discourse we had together, before we entred upon this Debate. For when we were speaking of the Opinions of a certain Person, who denied the Certainty of every thing, but what was discerned by the Outward Senses; thou Condemnedst as most Absurd; But *why?* I cannot conceive, since there is no great Difference betwixt those two Opinions: The one saith, *There can be no Certainty concerning any Truth, whether they be Necessary or Contingent, but by the Perception of the Senses;* The other affirms the same of Contingent Truths, though not of Necessary Truths. But among the Number of Contingent Truths thou esteemest what belongs to Christian Religion; for thou reckons the Necessary Truths only to belong to Natural Religion. This then is all the difference, that that other Person says; There is no Certainty of any Religion, neither Natural nor Christian, but by the Perception of the outward Senses: But thou say'st, Though thou esteemest the Certainty of Natural Religion to be without them, yet not of the Christian Religion. But again, since thou esteemest, that not Natural Religion, but the Christian Religion is necessary to Salvation; thou must necessarily conclude, That those Truths which are necessary to Salvation, are only known and believed by the Benefit of the outward Senses: In which Conclusion (which is the Sum of all) thou yieldst the Matter to that other Person.

Put Lastly; If all the Certainty of our *Faith, Hope and Salvation* did depend upon the *Infallibility of Outward Senses*, we should be most miserable: Since these Senses can be easily deceived, and by many outward Casualties, and natural Infirmities, whereunto the Godly are no less subject,

A certain Person placing the Certainty of every thing in the outward Senses.

Outward Senses can be deceived.

subject than the Wicked, are often vitiated; and there are (as the Scripture affirms) *false Miracles*, which, as to the outward, cannot be distinguished from the true: of which we cannot infallibly Judge by the outward Senses, which only discern what is outward. 1676.

There is a Necessity then to have Recourse to some other Means.

From all which it does appear, how fallacious and weak this Argument is: But Thanks be unto GOD, who would not that our Faith should be built upon so uncertain and doubtful a Foundation. And whoever hath known True Faith, or hath felt the *Divine Testimony of GOD's Spirit* in his Soul, will judge otherways; neither will be moved by such Reasonings. I pray GOD therefore to remove these Clouds, which darken thy Understanding; that thou may'st perceive the Glorious Gospel of CHRIST: This is that Saving Word of Grace, which I commend thee unto; and that GOD may give thee a Heart inclinable to believe and obey the Truth, is the Desire of

*Thy faithful Friend,*

R. BARCLAY.

The 24th of the Month,  
call'd *November*, 1676.

*This Letter a Year ago, at the Desire of my Friend R. B. I delivered into the Hands of the afore-named Ambassador, desiring his Answer in Writing, which he then promised; but not having as yet done, it was seen meet to be published.*

B. F.

Rotterdam the 28th of  
March, 1678.

R. B's

1686.

## R. B's Testimony Concerning his FATHER.

R. B's Account of the Death of his Father.

**D**avid Barclay, of Urie in the Kingdom of Scotland, Received the *Truth* in the Year 1666. being the *Fifty Sixth* Year of his Age about the *Seventh Month*, and Abode in it, and in *Constant Unity* with the *Faithful Friends* thereof; having Suffered the *Spoiling* of his *Goods* cheerfully, and many other *Indignities*, he was formerly unaccustomed to bear, and several *Tedious Imprisonments* after the *Sixty Sixth* Year of his Age.

In the *latter End* of the *Seventh Month*, 1686. being past the *Seventy Sixth* Year of his Age, he took a *Fever*, which continued with him for *Two Weeks*; during which time he signified a *Quiet, Contented Mind*, freely Resigned up to the *Will of God*: And gave several *Living Testimonies* to the *Truth*, and to the *Love of God* manifested to him in the *Revelation* thereof. And though there be hardly to be found *one* of a *Thousand*, like to him, for *Natural Vigour* of his *Age*, and that his *Fever* at times was very strong; yet he never was *Un sensible*, nor did any *wrong Expression* or *Actions* proceed from him, nor the least *Symptom* of *Discontent* or *Fretfulness*. He had been troubled with the *Gravel*; and after his *Sickness* had very much *Pain* in making *Water*: So about *Two Days* before his *Death*, as those about him were helping him up for that *End*, feeling his *Weakness* with the *Pain*, in an *Agony* he said, *I am gone now*; And then instantly checking himself, added, *But I shall go to the Lord, and be gathered to many of my Brethren, who are gone before me; and to my*



my Dear Son: This was his *Youngeſt Son*, who died at *Sea* about a *Year* before. 1686.

Upon the *Eleventh Day* of the *Eighth Month*, between *Two* and *Three* in the *Morning*, he growing *Weaker*, I drew nigh to him: He ſaid, *Is this my Son?* I ſaid, *Yea*; and ſpoke a few *Words*, ſignifying my *Travel*, *That he that loved him, might be near him to the End*: He answered, *The Lord is Nigh*; Repeating it once again, ſaying; *You are my Witneſſes in the Preſence of God, that the Lord is Nigh*: And after a little he ſaid; *The perfect Diſcovery of the Day-Spring from on high, how great a Bleſſing it hath been to me, and my Family!* My Wife deſiring to know, if he would have ſomething to Wet his Mouth? he ſaid, *It needed not*: She ſaid, it would Refresh him; He laid his *Hand upon his Breſt*, ſaying, *He had that Inwardly that Refreshed him*. And after a little while he added divers times theſe *Words*; *The TRUTH is over ALL*.

He took my *Eldeſt Son* to him, and *Bleſſed* him, ſaying; *He prayed God, he might never depart from the Truth*: And when my *Eldeſt Daughter* came near, he ſaid, *Is this Patience?* *Let Patience have its perfect Work in thee!* And after *Kiſſing* the other *Four*, he laid *Hands upon them*, and *bleſſed them*. He called for my *Father-in-Law*, and *two* of his *Daughters*, that were preſent, and ſpoke ſome weighty *Words* to them very kindly: And perceiving one of them, (who was not a *Friend of Truth*) *Weeping* much, he *Wiſhed*, *She might come to the Truth*; bidding her, *Not weep for him, but for her ſelf*.

A *Sober Man*, an *Apothecary*, that waited upon him, coming near, he took him by the *Hand*, ſaying; *Thou wilt bear me Witneſs, that in all this Exercise I have not been Curious to Tamper nor to Pamper the Fleſh*: he answered; *Sir, I can bear Witneſs, that you have always minded the better*  
and

1686. *and more substantial Part, and rejoyce to see the Blessed End, the Lord is bringing you to: He Relyed; Bear a Faithful and true Witness: Yet it is the Life of Righteousness (repeating these Words twice over) that we bear Testimony to, and not to an Empty Profession.* Then he called several Times, *Come, Lord Jesus, Come, Come!* And again; *My Hope is in the Lord:* And so slept now and then, about *Ten Hours.* Observing a *Country-Man* coming into the Room, he thought, it had been one of his *Tenents*, who was a *Carpenter*; I telling him, it was not he, but another; he said, *See thou, Charge him to make no Manner of Superfluity upon my Coffin.*

About *Three* in the *Afternoon* there came several *Friends* from *Aberdeen* to see him, I telling him, he took them by the *Hand*, and said divers Times, *They were come in a seasonable Time:* and after some Words were Spoken, and that *Patrick Livingstone* had *Prayed*, which ended in *Praises*; he held up his *Hands*, and said, *Amen, Amen for ever!*

And after they stood up, looking at him, he said; *How pretious is the Love of God among his Children, and their Love one to another! Thereby shall all Men know, that ye are Christ's Disciples, if you love one another. How pretious a thing it is, to see Brethren to Dwell together in Love! My Love is with you; I leave it among you.*

About *Eight* at *Night* several *Friends* standing about the *Bed*, he perceiving some of them to *Weep*, he said; *Dear Friends, all mind the Inward Man, heed not the Outward: There is one, that doth Regard, the Lord of Hosts is his Name.* After he heard the *Clock* strike *Three* in the *Morning*, he said, *Now the Time comes:* And a little after he was heard to say; *Praises, Praises, Praises to the Lord! Let now thy Servant depart in Peace:*

*Peace: Unto thy Hands, O Father, I Commit my Soul, Spirit and Body, Thy Will, O Lord, be done in Earth, as it is in Heaven!* These Sentences he spake by little Intervals one after another. And so a little after *Five in the Morning, the twelfth Day of the Eighth Month, 1686.* he fell asleep like a *Lamb*, in Remarkable Quietness and Calmness; there being standing about to Behold his *End* above *Twenty Persons*, who were *Witnesses*, to what is above said; though not all to every Part, yet some to every Part, and some to all of it.

This *Brief Account* is only intended for the Refreshing and Satisfaction of some particular Friends; else several other things might be added, which are not Inconsiderable.

He was *Buried* in a *Place* allotted by himself for that End; and Discharged, any should be Called to his *Burial*, but the *professed Friends of Truth*, and his own *Tenents*: Yet the Time being known, a great Number of the *Gentry* came undesired, and Conveyed his *Body* to the *Grave*.

Urie, the 20th of the  
8th Month, 1686.

---

*The End of the Third and Last Volume.*

The

The *Contents* of this Third Volume, directing to the Pages of the several *Tracts* herein contained, *viz.*

- I. **A** *Dispute between some Students of Divinity (so called) of Aberdeen, and the People called Quakers, held in Aberdeen: Opponents or Students, John Lesly, Al. Sheriff, P. Gellie; Defendants, R. Barclay and G. Keith, &c. Page 1. With the Author's Offer to Jo. Menzies, Professor of Divinity (so called) G. Mildrum, Minister at Aberdeen, and W. Mitchell, Catechist at foot of Dee, &c. And G. Keith his Postscript, (1675.)*  
p. 34, 40.
- II. *Quakerism Confirmed: A Vindication of the Chief Doctrines and Principles of the Quakers, from the Objections of the Students aforesaid, in their Book called, Quakerism Canvased. (1676.)*  
p. 47.
- III. *Universal Love considered, and Established up-its right Foundation, &c. (1676.)* p. 83.
- IV. *An Epistle of Love and Friendly Advice to the Ambassadors of the several Princes of Europe, met at Nimmeguen, to consult the Peace of Christendom, &c. (1677.)* p. 336.
- V. *R. B's Apology for the true Christian Divinity Vindicated from John Brown's pretended Confutation, &c. with L. S's Letter to R. M. C. (1679.)*  
p. 253, 543.
- VI. *The Possibility and Necessity of the Inward and Immediate Revelation of the Spirit of God, towards the Foundation and Ground of true Faith, proved; in a Letter writ in Latin to a Person of Quality in Holland: and now also put into English. (1676.)* p. 561.

Whereunto is added,  
The Author's Testimony concerning his Father,  
(1686.) p. 586.

# A TABLE of the chief Things contained in this Third Volume.

## A

**A** DAM, (see *Man, Sin, Redemption*) whether there be any Relicks of the Heavenly Image left in him, page 340, 341, 342.

*Anabaptists* of *Munster*, how their mischievous Actings nothing touch the *Quakers*. 142-146.

*Antichrist*) the Body of Antichrist is but one, having many Members, 40. who those Members be, 42.

*Appearances*, see *Faith*.

*Armenian, Greek and Ethiopian Churches* indulged by the *Pope* in some Ceremonies different from those commonly enjoined and received, is rather the Effect of Policy, than fatherly Compassion, 202, 203.

*Arminians*, see *Remonstrants*.

*Arminians, Lutherans and Calvinists* hold that there can be no Salvation without the explicit Knowledge of Christ, and Benefit of the Scriptures; which Doctrine destroys the Nature of Universal Love. 208, 209.

*Atheism*, see *Superstition*.

*Augustin's Testimony* in the Case of Circumcision, Observing of Meats, Drinks, Washings and Sacrifices, 30.

*Authority* of Princes justly owned. 243.

## B

*Baptism* is one; its Definition, 495, 496. The Baptism with Water,

which was *John's Baptism*, was a Figure of this Baptism, and is not to be continued, 141-143. How the Apostles baptized with Water, is explained. 138-140.

*Infant-Baptism* is a meer Humane Tradition, 134.

*John's Baptism* no Part of the Gospel Dispensation, but served only to prepare the way to Christ. 142. *Augustin's Testimony* of its being ceased. 30. *Cyprian's Testimony* of its being void, 136. None are to be found, that have the Power of administering it. 135. It being but a carnal Ordinance, 139. and no Part of the Gospel-Dispensation, 142. Carrying a Repeal in its Bosom, 144. (*Matt. 28. 19.* explained, 142. *Joh. 3. 30.* explained, 146) of Baptism, 196-503.

*Bereans* searching Scriptures, 322. *Blood*) to abstain from Blood and things strangled, 302.

*Body*) to bow the Body, see *Head*.

*Books Canonical and Apocryphal*, see *Canon, Scripture*.

*Bow*) to bow the Knee, see *Uncover the Head*.

## C

*Calvinists*, they feign a Revealed and Secret Will of God, which are contradictory, 213.

*Ceremonies*. see *Superstition*.

*Christ* is compared to a Grain of Mustard-Seed (*Clem. Alex.*) 18. Christ at this Day speaketh in his Servants, and will to the End of the World, 129. The Seed and

and Spiritual Body of Christ, both in him and us, belonging to Christ, is as really united unto the Word, as his outward Body was, 100. The Seed is not our Souls : The Seed and spiritual Nature of Christ is one and the same, both in him and in us, *ibid.* Christ's outward Satisfaction is owned against the *Socinians*. The Sufferings of Christ in Men are voluntary, and yet without Sin : Christ's outward Sufferings at *Jerusalem*, were necessary unto Men's Salvation, *ibid.* The Doctrine of the Incarnation, Sufferings, Death, Resurrection, &c. are necessary every where to be preached, 102. Christ's In-dwelling and Inbeing differ, 390. Christ's praying to save him from *this Hour*, explained, 366. what the Flesh and Blood of Christ is, 505, 577.

*Christian*) Every Christian ought to be concerned in the Work of the Lord, 237. A Judgment of several Sorts of Christians must be made from their respective Principles, and not from the Practice of particular Persons, 196. The Gathering of the primitive Christians was an uniting of Hearts, and not of Hands only, 220, 240. what the Cause is of all the Mischief in Christendom, 244, 246. The Essence or Being of Christianity placed in the true and real Conversion of the Heart, by Virtue of the Operation of the Light, Seed and Grace of God, 225, 227. That there is nothing but the Name, and nothing of the Nature of true Christianity among Christians, is manifest in the Clergy, 240.

*Church*) The Church of *Rome's* pretended Charity, 203-205. The Church of *Rome* no Church, 135.

The Basis and Foundation of that Church stands in confessing the Superiority and Precedency of *Peter* and his Successors, and in believing that Infallibility is annexed thereunto, 202. The Notion and Definition of a Church, which arises from the Universal Principle of Light and Grace, doth establish Universal Love, 229. The Cause of the true Churches gathering to a Body, was a Sense of their Want, 220. Men may be said to be within the Church, who want outward Preaching, 403, 409. In what Cases the Church of Christ may pronounce a positive Sentence and Judgment, without the Hazard of Imposition upon either of the Parties controverting, 516, 518.

*Circumcision* a Seal of the Old Covenant, 29, 30.

*Clergy*) The Clergy the greatest Promoters of Wars, 240. They are so impudent, as to thank God for the Destruction of their Fellow-Creatures, 242. Upon the Charge of a Prince or State, they will pray for those to whom before they wished Ruin and Destruction, *ibid.* They cloud the Truth, that the common People might maintain and admire them, 277. They acted the mad Pranks of *John of Leyden*, in the Civil Wars of *England*, 172. See *Protestants*.

*Communion*) The Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ is a Spiritual and Inward Thing, and that it is that heavenly Seed, whereby Life and Salvation was of Old, and is now communicated, 41, 42.

*Complements*, see *Titles*.

*Conscience* and *Reason* are distinguished from the saving Light of

of Christ in all Men, 56. *Clem. Alex.* his Testimony, 18. God alone can inform and enlighten the Conscience, 233.

*Controversy*) Solid Controversies may be entertained for clearing and maintaining the Truth, 275. *Courts*, see *Princes*.

**D**

*Day*) the first Dawning and Breaking forth of the heavenly Day of the Lord in this our Age described, 220, 221.

*Deaf Persons*, see *Light*.

*Devil*) the Rage of the Devil against the Lord's chosen, 249.

*Dreams*, see *Faith, Miracles*.

*Doctrine*) that Doctrine which is both contrary to Scripture and Experience, is not for the Spirit, but against it, 53. The Fruits prove the Doctrine, 93. *F. B.* brings his own Author in for Devilish Doctrines, 307.

*Duties* Natural and Spiritual differ 115.

**E**

*Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, Into the Name, *F. B.*'s false Gloss upon it, 502. see *Baptism*.

*Ejaculations* proved from Scripture, 491.

*Election* and *Reprobation* of Infants, 337, 339. *F. B.* makes the Word [*All*] express of two Numbers the least to be elected, 368.

*Eminency*) Your Eminency, see *Titles*.

*Enthusiasm*, its proper Signification 152.

*Epistle*, see *James, John, Peter*.

*Evidence*) The best and most principal is the Immediate Evidence of the Spirit, and the greatest outward Evidence that can be given, is the Scripture, 40-45. The

Spirit's Evidence is, That it teacheth to deny Ungodliness and worldly Lusts, &c. 12, 13. An Evidence that no Hypocrite can have, 149. See *Ministry, Spirit, Revelation*.

*Excommunication*, the Evil thereof, 208.

*Eye*) the Spiritual Eye sees and discerns the true Confessor from the false, 151, 462.

**F**

*Faith*) Accidental Objects of Faith, 54. Wherein the Nature and Essence of Faith consists, 56-58. *F. B.*'s halting Examples to prove true Faith, 324. *Sadeel's* Testimony concerning Succession of Faith, 136. The Material and Formal Object of Faith distinguished, 294, 298. Whether Faith comes by the outward Hearing, 583. See *Grace*.

*Fall of Man*, see *Man*.

*Father*, see *Knowledge, Revelation*.

*Feet*) the Washing of Feet, &c. 142. A Spiritual Washing of Feet pointed at by Christ, 143. Washing of Feet observed by Christians in the primitive times, *ibid.* Which though commanded with so great Solemnity, yet ceased, 509.

*Forbearance of God*, see *God*.

*Freedom from Sin*, see *Perfection*.

**G**

*Games*, see *Plays*.

*Gentiles*) by what Nature the Gentiles did the things contained in the Law, 331. See *Heathens*.

*Gifts*) the confining of the Gifts and Graces of God to certain external Forms and Ceremonies, is directly opposite to Universal Love, 231.

*G O D*) God's Voice is known by

- a Spiritual and Supernatural Sense, 571, 572. There is in all Men a Supernatural Idea of God, as of a most perfect Being, 575. His Glory and Beauty makes all the Glory of this World as Dross and Dung, 578. whose Riches and Bounty lead Men to Repentance, 380. who speaks inwardly to the Mind of Man, 568.
- Godliness* from a tender Age, the Happiness of few, and why, 185,
- Good*) the Good in all ought to be commended, 192. and the Evil not to be encouraged, 193.
- Gospel*) Evil under the Gospel not to be resisted, 167. Its most excellent Dispensation is to be like Christ, 165. The Gospel is preached to every Creature, or *in every Creature*, 395. which Gospel is hid in them that are lost, 107. A twofold Dispensation of it, 165. The Preaching of it perverted by our Adversaries, 364. The History of the Gospel is necessary, 385. yet the Declaration is not the Power, or Manifestation of God in Man, 395. which Assertion is neither *Heathenism* nor *Jesuitism*, &c. *ibid.* and Salvation is not impossible without the Hearing of the Gospel, or outward Preaching, 405.
- Grace*) All have Grace sufficient for Salvation, and, if not resisted, works Salvation, 15, 16. The *Calvinists* make Grace an irresistible Power fallily, 401, 402, 445, 446, 458. A graceless Man is rendred unfit to receive the New Wine of the Gospel in his unclean Vessel, 148.
- Greeks*) The Wisdom of the *Greeks* appeared in their worldly Affairs 333.
- H
- Hands*) Laying on of Hands, 155,
456. Paul wrought with his own Hands, 161.
- Head*) Of Uncovering the Head in Salutations, 530. Salutations commanded by Christ don't consist in taking off the Hat, and bowing of the Body, *ibid.* See *Honour, Salutations.*
- Hearing*) Inward and Outward Hearing distinguished, 56, 401, 402, 404. Whether the Outward Hearing is necessary to make a Man a Member of the visible Church, 406, 408. Faith comes not by outward Hearing, 583. See *Infants.*
- Heart*) Obdurateness and Hardness of Heart, when begotten, 377.
- Heathens*) They declared that *Inward Concupiscence is Sin*, 58. Concerning the *Heathens* Book of Nature, 104, 105. Salvation is possible to them in the most barbarous Places, 225, 401, 403. They having a Day of Visitation through the Gospel, 376. Those that deny the inward Principle of Grace and Light given to all Men, are forced to urge the same against an *Heathen*, 225. Because he doth not acknowledge any Scripture or Tradition, 226, 227. See *Gentiles, Pagans, Heathen-Persecution*, see *Persecution.*
- Heresies*) Who cannot certainly judge of Heresies, ought not to punish for Heresy, 163.
- Heretick*) An Heretick hath no just Ground from the *Quakers* Principle to abstain from Prayer 131. Hereticks Pretences to the Spirit, 64, 69, 72, 73.
- Hicks*) the Grossness of T. Hicks his Dealing with the People called *Quakers* discovered, and abhor'd in Print by others, 538.
- High-Priest*, see *Priest.*
- History of Christ*, see *Quakers, Redemption, Knowledge.*



*Holiness*) Your Holiness, see *Titles*.  
*Honour* (see *Titles*) concerning Civil Honour, 528-532.  
*Hypocrites*) the Hypocrites Works have no Savour of Life, 149.

I

*Jacob* and the *Jews* their Practice (of Bowing) as also of *Abraham's* was by Permission, and not to be our Rule, 532. *Abraham's* and *Jacob's* Practice will not warrant our Imitation of it, 527. Worm *Jacob* is a *threshing Instrument*, 545.

*Japonians*) the *Japans* knew by the Teaching of Nature, that it is unlawful to kill, steal, forswear, &c. as is evident by the Pricks of their Consciences: *Fra. Xavier's*, 227.

*Idea*) there are Supernatural Idea's of things Supernatural in the Souls of Men, 575, 577. Men can have no true Idea of things supernatural, but what is Supernatural, *ibid.* There is a *Natural Idea* of God in Men, common to the Wicked with the Godly, 575. The *Idea's* of all things are *divinely planted* in the Souls of Men, *ibid.* All *Idea's* are of a *Spiritual Nature*, *ibid.* The *Supernatural Idea's* in Men infer *Supernatural Senses*, or *perceptive Faculties*, 580. Those *Faculties* in wicked Men do, as it were, sleep, *ibid.*

*Festing*, see *Plays*.

*Jesuits*, see *Saint-Ignatian*.

*Jews*) Particular Commands given to the *Jews*, whether now obligatory on us, 164.

*Illiterate*, see *Mechanicks*.

*Image of God*, see *Adam*.

*Independency*) An *Independent Preacher* embracing Truth, and upon what Occasion, 538.

*Indians*) The Defect of the Scrip-

tures and outward Knowledge of Christ in the *Indians* is *Providential*, 210. See *Americans, Pagans*.

*Infants*) see *Sin*, *Infants* and *Deaf Persons* are excepted from the Necessity of outwardly Hearing the Gospel, 405, 406. *Infants* are under no Law, 341. Whether *Childrens Death* argues Guilt? 344. *Infants saved without Christ*, *F. B's* horrible Lie, 346. *Infants saved by Christ*, *ibid.* *Sodom's Children*, &c. *Infants perishing in the Flood*, 347, 348. *Circumcision* argues not *Infants* guilty, 349. *Regeneration of Infants*, *ibid.*

*Influences*) There are general and special *Influences*, 23. none can pray truly in Words, but by a particular *Influence*, 24. *Unfaithfulness* wants *Influences* to Duties, 123.

*Inspiration*) Some *Christians* and *Gentiles* have acknowledged the Evidence and certainty of *Divine Inspiration* in all Men, as the surest Ground of Knowledge, 60, 61. *Permissive Inspirations* disowned, and owned again by the *Quakers* Adversaries, 180. *Inspirations* are necessary to *Inward Duties*, 22, 23. *Christ's Illumination* is his *Inspiration*, 43. which is a greater Evidence than the Scripture, 44, 45. Even *Heathens* have a Knowledge of the Self-Evidence of *Divine Inspiration*, 60. *Inspirations* *Mandatory* and *Permissive*, 117. *Inspirations* of things either to be done, or simply to be believed, 121. *Inspirations* general and particular, *ibid.* the same which was given to the *Holy Men* of Old, 152.

*Instruction*, see *Teaching*.

*Interpreters*, 368, 109, 386, 401, 406.

*Judgment*) Unsettled Men judging, 193. Charitable and Uncharitable Judgment, 198. He that is spiritual judgeth all things, 388. See *Church*.

*Justification*) It is the making a Man just by an Inward Righteousness, 416, 417. The Doers of the Law justified, 407. *Antinomians* imputative Justification refuted, 418. *F. B's* gross Opinion of it, 422. No Man is justified before he is sanctified, 425. The real Justification falls under the inward Sensation of the Soul, 426.

## K

*Keith*) G. K. Vindicated from our Adversaries malicious Intimations against him, 89.

*Kingdom of God*) Christ's Kingdom needs no outward Protection, 479. The Kingdom of God is *within you*, 41.

*Knowledge*) Of the true Ground of Knowledge, 272-280. the Difference between Head Knowledge, and the Partaking of the Divine Nature, 332. Monopolizers of Knowledge, 566. (see *Clergy*) the Christian Religion consists not in the Historical Knowledge of Christ, 566. See *Indians*, &c.

## L

*Laces and Ribbands*, 528.

*Lamb*, see *Paschal Lamb*.

*Law*) The divine Law was implanted in Man's Nature, before all Laws made by Man, 228. *F. B's* Proof for what is meant by *Law* and *Testimony*, 319. his asserting the Law of Nature against his former Reason, 384. *Law of Moses*, see *Legal Rites*.

*Learned*) the Lord is angering the Wife and Learned, 549.

*Learning*) Human Learning is not the Qualification of a Minister, 231, 274. See *Literature*, *Schools of Learning*.

*Leaven*) *F. B's* Objection against the Word *Fermentum* (Leaven) or *Fermentation* (a Leavening) answered, 495.

*Legal Rites* had a Command, as well as *John's Baptism*, 499.

*Levi*, a Figure of Christ, 446.

*Libertines* see *Ranters*.

*Lies*) Christians not to speak a Lie, 531. *F. B's* Refuge of Lies, 536.

*Light within*) the Light of Jesus Christ in Men, will discover the Intents of the Heart, and flatter none, 246. *Light of Nature* objected, 211. The Light, Seed and Grace of God, no Part of Man's Nature, 213. the inward Principle of Light and Life described, 223, 224. Deaf People, &c. the Light may influence, which Writings, &c. cannot, 325, 405. Objections against the Universality of the Light, 395, 396. 'tis sufficient and saving, *ib.* 'tis not Nature's Light, 448, 449.

*Life*) the Principle of Divine Life is never idle, 128. the Life of Words witnessed, *ibid.*

*Lot*) *Abraham's* and *Lot's* Bowing, 529.

*Love*) Of a Love Feast, 189, 213, 233.

*Lukewarmness*, see *Church, Religion*.

*Lutherans*) their Principle of Persecution, 205. they hold no Salvation without the Knowledge of Christ and the Scriptures, 208.

## M

*Macquere*) R. M's most abusive Railing against the *Quakers*, and their Doctrine, 540--542. And his shameless Flatteries to *F. B.* *ibid.* *Magistracy* is an Ordinance of God, 243. Its Lawfulness and Power,

512, 513. He bears not the Sword in vain, 166. Not to punish for Religious Matters, but Evil in Civil Matters, *ibid.* The Priests make the Magistrate their Executioner, 170. Christ's Kingdom needs not outward Power to protect it, 479. Forcing a Conformity is not compelling the *Conscience*, as *F. B.* asserts, 513, 514. see *Heresies*.  
 Majesty) Excellent Majesty, 532.  
 Maintenance) A Ministers Necessities to be answered, 158. what kind of Maintenance is denied, 157, 159. what Maintenance allowed to Ministers in Scripture, 468.  
 Martyrs) *F. B.*'s condemning Primitive Martyrs falsely, as led by a Spirit of Error, 284.  
 Meats and Drinks) the Observing of Meats, Drinks and Washings, to be considered in a threefold Respect, 30.  
 Mediator, see *Christ*.  
*F. M.* his Answer to a *Jesuit*, 70.  
 Minister of the Gospel) the Properties of a true Call, 452, 454. the Ministration of the Gospel, is a *Ministration of Life and Grace*, 148. true *Ministers Call* is not of *Man*, 153. *Ministers* of the Gospel, and of the Law and Shadows differ, 146. the Lame and Blind no *Legal Ministers*, *ibid.* The Students *graceless Ministry*, *Judas* its Patron, *ibid.* Holiness required in a Preacher, *ibid.* the work of the *Ministry*, is not limited to outward Ordination and Literature 231. see *Priests*. Whether Natural Sciences are necessary to the Ministry, 457. the Forerunner of the Downfall of a Man-made Ministry, 548.

Miracles, the unbelieving Jews believed them not, 93. the Preaching of sound Doctrine with an Holy

Life, is a better Evidence of a true Prophet, than outward Miracles, *ibid.* we need no outward Miracles to believe the Scriptures, 581.

Motions to worship are previous in Order of Nature, 114. False Motions denied, 460. *F. B.* is for Praying without the Spirit's Motion, 473. He calls the *Movings* of the Power of God upon the *Quakers*, *Devilry*, 475. *F. B.* instanceth *unusual Motions* of his own Party, 475, 478.

N

Nature) the Book of Nature cannot discover all things necessary to Salvation, 105. see *Socinians*. The Lamb's Nature not to be found in most Christians, but the *Doggish* and *Wolvish* Nature doth prevail, 241.  
*Naylor James*, 533. his Repentance 104, 533.  
*Nero*, 167.  
 Number) to thee and thou a single Person, says *F. B.* is blunt and rude, 530, 531.

O

Outs, 522--527.  
 Obedience) No Man's Obedience to any Command will avail him any thing, unless upon inward Belief and Conviction, that the thing commanded is of God, 287.  
 Object of Faith, see *Faith*.  
 Office) what is meant by an Office in the Church? 462, 463.  
 Ordination) the best primitive Protestants had no *Lawful Ordination* at all, and therefore could not convey any to others after them, whether Protestants or others, 136, 137, 156, 157.

P

Papists) the Maxim among the Papists, *Extra Ecclesiam nulla Salus*,  
 P p 3

in some sense true; but as it is understood by them generally, it destroys *Love* and *Charity*, 202. *Papists* pretended *Charity*, see *Armenian*.

*Peace*) the worldly *Peace*-contrivers Rule is not *Equity*, but the *Power* of *Parties*. 242, 243.

*Perfection* existed, 86.

*Persecution*) Violent *Persecutions* upon the Account of Religious Principles, rather confirm than drive the *Persecuted* from the *Belief* of those Principles, 200, 201. the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* united in the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of *Persecution*, even practise the same against one another, 205, 206. *Pressing* after, and seeking to establish a *National Church*, tends to promote *Persecution*, 207. the Principle of *Persecution* preached up and practised by the *Church* of *Rome*, 203, 204. *Severity*, see 513, 514.

*Pharaoh*, 538.

*Philosopher*) an *Heathen* *Philosopher* converted, his *Testimony* concerning an *Old Man's Words*, 129. A *Philosopher* troubled for being commended by a profligate *Person*, 179.

*Power*) the *Power* of *God* being inwardly felt to give *Victory* over *Sin*, in some serious *Enquirers*, was the *Cause* of their *Uniting* and agreeing unanimously to the *Universal Preaching* up of this *Power*, which is the true *Church's* first and chiefest Principle, and most agreeable to the *Universal Love* of *God*, 220.

*Prayer*) *Mental Prayer* the *Cause* and *Spring* of *Vocal Prayer*, 127. is sometimes of more *Force* than *Vocal Prayer*, *ibid.* All that are faithful, who have no *Natural Defect*, may *Pray* *vocally* at times, 132.

*Preaching*, see *Worship*. No *Preaching* is profitable, but that which comes from the *Immediate Teachings* of *God's Spirit*, 483, 484.

*Presbyterians*) *Scots Presbyterians*, the severest of that *Sett*, they derive their *Pedigree* from *Geneva*, but surpass it in *Zeal*, 186. *Presbyterians* *Compliance*, 323. A *Presbyterian Preacher's Prayer* to the *Devil*, 506. A *twofold Will* in *God* vindicated by the *Presbyterians*, 356.

*Pride*, 549.

*Princes*) the *Courts* of *Princes*, the *Scenes* of the greatest *Wickedness*, 239.

*Prophets*) concerning *Prophets*, 59, 130, 171.

*Protestants*) According to the *Episcopalian* and *Presbyterian* Principles and Practices, no *Man* can be a *Member* of the *State*, but first he must be a *Member* of the *Church*, 207, 208. the *Protestants* to their shame, have recourse to their old abdicated *Father*, the *Pope*, for a *Title* to their *Call*, 456. concerning *Protestants*, 71, 260.

## Q

*Quakers*) i. e. *Tremblers*. A *Catalogue* of *Lies* and *Calumnies*, falsely alledged to be the *Quakers* *Affertions*, 557, 558, 559. the *Quakers* *Adversaries* fasten *Contradictions* upon *Christ* himself, 167, 168. *F. B's* *Doubts* concerning the time of the *Author's* *Joyning* with the *People* called *Quakers*, resolved, 520. the *Author's* *Education*, 72, 186. his *Burthen*, 237. *Reflections* cast upon him, 255, 540, 541. the *Quakers* *Ministry*, &c. 65, 67. Their *Sufferings*, 260. *F. B's* *Calumnies*, 326. *Ungodly Railings*.

ings against them, 385, 430, 459, 472, 493, 448, 474. and false Charges, 534, 536. the Lord their Honour and Reward, 222.

R

*Regeneration* is not wrought in an Infant, 433, 434.

*Religion*) Indifferency and Luke-warmness in Religious Matters highly displeasing to the Lord, 191.

*Remonstrants of Holland*) the Practice of the *Remonstrants* and *Contra-Remonstrants* of Holland, doth shew, how void they are of *Christian Love* and *Charity*, 207.

*Reprobation*) who espouse the precise Decree of *Reprobation* declare themselves Strangers to the *Universal Love of God*, 213, 215. The precise Decree of *Reprobation* is inconsistent with the *Universal Love of God*, *ibid.* The *Presbyterian Doctrine* of *Reprobation* makes *God* the Author of Sin, 354. the same Doctrine makes the *Gospel* a meer Mock, 356. It is injurious to *Christ's Propitiatory Sacrifice*, *ibid.* It puts Devils in a better Condition than Men, 359.

*Revelation*) Divine Revelations the Privilege of all true Christians, 63. the inward Efficacy of the Spirit is that *Objective Revelation* pleaded for, 108. No true Revelation can contradict the Scripture, 296. How and after what Manner these Revelations were the *Objects* of the Saints Faith of Old, 298, 299. Of the Necessity of *Immediate Revelation* to the Building up of true Faith, 92, 108. The Distinction of *Subjective* and *Objective Revelation* unnatural, 153. It is in the Power of God to reveal himself, when, how, and so long as he pleases, 310. what Revelations are con-

trary to the Scriptures, are to be rejected, 312. *Heer Paets* his Argument against *Immediate Revelation* discussed, 565.

*Rule*) of Faith and Manners, see *Scripture*. Whatever Difficulties happen in saying, *The Spirit is the Christians Rule*, whereby to be ordered in Life and Conversation; the same will occur in saying *The Scripture is the Rule*, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44.

S

*Sacraments*) the most Wicked may both minister and partake of these outward elementary things, called *Sacraments*, as the most holy and sincere, 232, 494, 511. *Salvation*, not only supposed, but concluded possible to all Men, 225. The *Lutherans*, *Calvinists* and *Arminians* hold, that there can be no *Salvation* without the *Explicit Knowledge of Christ* and *Benefit of the Scriptures*, 208. Those that hold this Opinion cannot justly pretend to *Universal Love*, 211. *Salvation* chiefly depends upon the inward Work of Grace, 399, 400.

*Salutations*, 529, 530.

*Schools and Universities*, 550.

*Sciences*, 457, 465.

*Scriptures*) *Noah* and *Job* were Preachers of Righteousness before the Scriptures were written, 232. the Knowledge of the Scriptures to be of great Advantage, is owned, 225. The Scriptures cannot beguile Men, but Men may beguile themselves by a wrong Use of them, 14. the Scriptures the best outward Rule in the World, *ibid.* the Scriptures are a clear and perfect Copy, as to all Essentials of Christian Religion, 57. That the Scriptures are a sufficient *Objective*

*Give* Revelation of all things necessary to Salvation, is denied, 107. the Scriptures are the Words of God, 303. A Secondary Rule, 315, 316. that Supposition is false, that supposes the Will of God is only known by the Scriptures, 325. The Canon of the Scripture not completed, 282, 309, 310. They are not the Means of knowing God in Spirit, 553, 556, 580. see *Gifts*.

*Scriptures explained*) *Gen.* 2. 17. p. 330. *Ija.* 3. 20. p. 318. *Prov.* 10. 11. p. 130. *John* 1. 9. p. 391, 392. *1 Cor.* 11. c. p. 466. *2 Tim.* 3. 16. p. 317. *2 Pet.* 1. 19, 20. p. 296. *Jam.* 1. 25. p. 321. *1 John* 4. 1. p. 151.

*Señ*) the Definition of a Sect, 218. Those cannot pretend to universal Love, who confine all spiritual and temporal Blessings to their own Sect, 207. One Mark of a Sect is, when People seek to advance and propagate their Way in the Strength of their own Spirits, &c. 222, 223. those whose unity arises from Notions and Opinions, do derive their Names and Designations from the first Authors, Inventors and Fomentors of those Opinions, 221, 222.

*Seed*) the Seed a distinct Principle from the Soul, 289.

*Sense*) Supernatural, 150, 559, 573, 582.

*Silence*) Silence and an inward Turning of the Mind, necessary to the Entering upon *Worship*, 476, 477.

*Sin*) Continuance in Sin eclipses and takes away the Sense of God's Favour, 547, 548.

*Society*, see *Religion, Principles*.

*Socinians*) they exalt self, or Nature, 224. their scanty Confession does not reach to *Universal Love*, 211.

*Son of God*) see *Christ, Knowledge, Revelation*.

*Spirit*) to be led by the Spirit of God, is a Privilege common to all Christians and Members of the Church, if Obedience thereunto be yielded, 231. 232. the Spirit's Operations, 54.

*Study*) the Priests Study and Premeditation to preach by the Hour Glasses, 482, 485.

*Supper*) Arguments concerning the Supper, answered, &c. 78, 83, 508, 510.

## T

*Testimony*, see *Spirit*. The four Students Testimony against their fellow Students, 181.

*Thou and Thou*, see *Number*.

*Translations*, see *Bible, Interpreters*.

## V

*Voices*) Outward Voices, see *Faith, Miracles*.

## W

*War*) the National Preachers and Professors the chief Promoters of War, 240, 241. who account it lawful to revenge every Injury, are no Favourers of Universal Love, nor true Followers of Patient Jesus, 233, 234. the Devil the primary Cause of all the Contention and Wars in *Christendom* (so called) 238. unless this be foreseen, and this evil Guest turned out, no effectual Remedy can be applied, *ibid.* Worldly and Carnal Wisdom the Cause of Wars, 244.

*Westminster Confession of Faith* saith expressly (*Chap.* 3.) That God ordained such as are not Elected for Dishonour and Wrath, to the Praise of his glorious Justice, 352. The same Confession saith, that nothing future, or what was to come, even as foreseen by God, was the Cause of God's Decree. *ibid.* The *Westminster Confession of Faith* hath long lain under the Censure of an *Examen*, not yet answered, 269. the Confession weakly confirmed, and the Scriptures perverted to make them serve for a Proof, 268-270. the Scriptures are made to serve this Confession of Faith, and not it to answer the Scriptures, 270.

*Women*) Arguments against Women's Preaching answered, 89, 90.

*Word*) the Eternal Word is the Son, it was in the Beginning with God, and was God, It is Jesus Christ, by whom God created all things, 303. the Life and Virtue of Words, is a distinct thing from the Words, 129, 130. the Word of God is ascribed to Christ, 303.

*Worship*) Concerning *Worship*, 299, 300.

## X

*Xavriut*, his Testimony concerning the Inward Innate Life in the Soul, 227, 228.

## Z

*Zeal*, having a right Bottom and Foundation, proceeding purely from the Love of God, is a great Virtue, and greatly to be commended and pressed after, 191. *False Zeal*, and the several Kinds thereof, 192, 193.

**S**acred History; or the Historical Part of the Holy Scriptures of the  
**OLD** Testament, digested into due Method, with respect to Or-  
der of Time and Place; with some Observations, tending to Illustrate  
the same; with a Table to the whole, by *Thomas Ellwood*. Price 10 s.

Sacred History; or the Historical Part of the Holy Scriptures of the  
**NEW** Testament, digested into due Method, with respect to Order of  
Time and Place; with some Observations, tending to Illustrate the  
same; with a Table to the whole, by *Thomas Ellwood*, Price 9 s.

*Dauidis*. the Life of David King of Israel: A Sacred Poem. In  
Five Books. by *Thomas Ellwood*. price 2 s. 6 d.

A Journal, or Historical Account of the Life, Travels, Sufferings,  
Christian Experiences, and Labour of Love in the Work of the Ministry,  
of that Ancient, Eminent and Faithful Servant of Jesus Christ, *George  
Fox*. the second Edition in two Volumes Price 10 s.

A Collection of many Select and Christian Epistles, Letters and Testi-  
monies, written on sundry Occasions, by that Ancient, Eminent, Faith-  
ful Friend and Minister of Jesus Christ, *George Fox*. Price 11 s.

Gospel Truth Demonstrated, in a Collection of Doctrinal Books, Con-  
taining Principles, Essential to Christianity and Salvation, held amongst  
the People called *Quakers*, given forth by that Faithful Minister of Jesus  
Christ, *George Fox*, Price 18 s.

*The Enormous Sin* of Covetousness detected; with its Branches: *Fraud  
Oppression, Lying, Ingratitude, &c.* And some Proposals how to escape  
these Dangerous and Destructive Evils. by *William Crouch* Price 2 s.

*Posthuma Christiana*; Or, a Collection of some Papers of *William  
Crouch*. Being a brief Historical Account, under his own Hand, of his  
Convincement of, and Early Sufferings for the Truth. with Remarks on  
sundry memorable Transactions, relating to the People call'd *Quakers* p. 1s. 6d.

*Scripture-Instruction*; digested into several *Sessions*, by way of Ques-  
tion and Answer. In order to Promote Piety and Virtue, and Discou-  
rage Vice and Immorality. With a Preface relating to Education. By  
*John Freame*. price 1 s.

*A Treatise concerning the Fear of God*; Scripturally recommended unto all  
People, from the Example of the Patriarchs, Prophets, Kings, and Judges,  
&c. With an Historical Account, briefly relating the many Advantages  
which they received, who lived therein. price 1 s.

Scripture Truth demonstrated, in 32 Sermons, or Declarations of *Step-  
hen Crisp*, late of *Colchester* in *Essex*, two of them not before Printed in  
his other three Vol. now all done in one Vol. on a larger Character P. 3 s

The Works of *William Dell*, Minister of the Gospel, and Master of  
*Gorvil* and *Caius* Colledge in *Cambridge*. All Reprinted in 1 Vol. pr. 5 s.

A Treatise concerning *Baptism*, and the *Supper*. Shewing, that the  
*One Baptism* of the Spirit, and *Spiritual Supper* of the Lord, are only and  
alone, Essential, and Necessary to *Salvation*. Wherein, the Strongest  
Arguments for the use of the Outward *Baptism* and *Supper* are Consider-  
ed, the People called *Quakers* Vindicated: and the greatest Objections  
against them, for their disuse of these *Outward Signs* are Answered,  
by *Joseph Pike*. price bound 1 s. 6 d.

Primitive Christianity Revived, in the Faith and Practice of the People called Quakers. Written in Testimony to the present Dispensation of God, through them to the World; that Prejudices may be removed, the Simple informed, the Well-inclined encouraged, and the Truth and its Innocent Friends rightly represented. by W. Penn. Price 1 s.

An Account of W. Penns Travels in Holland and Germany, for the Service of the Gospel of Christ; by way of Journal. Containing also divers Letters and Epistles, writ to several great and Eminent persons whilst there; the third Impression. Corrected by the Author's own Copy; with some Answers not Printed in the First. To which is now added Two Epistles, formerly Printed in Dutch, but never in English, till this third Edition. price 2 s.

W. Penns Key in English new Edition. price 4 d. French 4 d.

The History of the Life of Thomas Ellwood. Or, an Account of his Birth, Education, &c. with divers Observations on his Life and manners when a Youth: And how he came to be convinced of the Truth; with his many Sufferings and Services for the same. also several other Remarkable Passages and Occurrences. written by his own Hand. pr. 3 s. 6 d.

More Fruits of Solitude; being the second part of Reflections and Maxims relating to the Conduct of Humane Life. by the Author of the former. pr. 9 d.

The Harmony of Divine and Heavenly Doctrines, demonstrated in sundry Declarations, on Varie y of Subjects. Preached at the Quakers Meetings in London, by Mr. W. Penn. Mr. G. Whitehead. Mr. S. Waldenfield. Mr. B. Cole. taken in Short-hand, as it was delivered by them, and now Faithfully transcribed and published for the Information of those, who by reason of Ignorance, may have received a prejudice against them. by a Lover of that people. price 1 s. 6 d.

No Cross, No Crown. A Discourse shewing the Nature and Discipline of the Holy Cross of Christ; and that the Denial of Self, and daily bearing of Christ's Cross, is the alone way to the Rest and Kingdom of God. to which is added, the living and dying Testimonies of divers Persons of Fame and Learning, in Favour of the Vertue and temperance recommended in this Treatise. by W. Penn. the Sixth Edition. price 3 s.

The Harmony of the Old and New Testament, and the fulfilling of the Propets, concerning our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and his Kingdom and Glory in the latter Days; with a Brief Concordance of the Names and Attributes, &c. given unto Christ: and some Texts of Scripture collected, concerning Christ's Humiliation and Sufferings, also his Excellent Dignity and Glorification. Published for the benefit of Christians and Jews by John Tomkins. with an Appendix to the Jews, by W. Penn. the 3 d Edit. with Additions price 1 s.

The Works of the Long Mournful and Sorely Distressed Isaac Pennington, whom the Lord in his tender Mercy at length visited and relieved, by the Ministry of that Despised People, called Quakers; and in the Springings of that Light, Life and Holy power in him, which they had truly and faithfully testified of, and directed his Mind to, were these things written, and now published as a thankful testimony of the goodness of the Lord to him, and for the benefit of others. In two Parts. price 12 s.

The Work of that memorable and ancient Servant of Christ, Stephen Crisp;



BOOKS Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle.

Crisp; containing also a Journal of his Life, giving an Account of his Convincement, Travels, Labours and Sufferings in and for the Truth. price 5 s.  
Truth's Innocency and Simplicity shining, through the Conversion, Gospel-Ministry, Labours, Epistles of Love, Testimonies and Warnings, to Professors and Profane (with the Long and Patient Sufferings) of that Ancient and Faithful Minister and Servant of Jesus Christ, *Thomas Taylor*. price bound 5 s.

The Memory of the Righteous revived, being a Collection of the Books and written Epistles of *John Gamm* and *John Audland*; together with several Testimonies relating to those two faithful Labourers. p. 2s.

The design of Christianity testified, in the Books, Epistles, and Manuscripts, of that Ancient and faithful Servant of Christ Jesus, *John Crook*, who departed this Life the 26<sup>th</sup> Day of the 2<sup>d</sup> Month, 1699. in the Eighty-second Year of his age. price 3 s. 6 d.

A Collection of the writings and Epistles of our ancient deceased Friend *John Whitehead*, price 3s.

*Sion's Travellers* comforted, and the Disobedient Warned. In a Collection of Books and Epistles of that Faithful Minister of Jesus Christ *Charles Marshal*, price 3 s.

A Collection of the Christian writings Labours, Travels and Sufferings, of that faithful and approved Minister of Jesus Christ, *Roger Halock*, with an account of his Death and Burial. price bound 1s. 9 d.

An Apology for the true Christian Divinity, as the same is held Forth and Preached by the People, called in Scorn Quakers; Being a Full Examination and Vindication of their Principle and Doctrines, by many arguments, deduced from Scripture and right Reason, and the Testimonies of Famous Authors, both ancient and Modern, with a full Answer to the strongest Objections usually made against them. By *Robert Barclay*. the Fifth Edition in English. price bound 4 s.

*Robert Barclay's* Apology Translated into French, and Spanish, for the Information of Strangers. price 5 s.

*New England* Judged, in two Parts. First, Containing a Brief Relation of the Sufferings of the People called Quakers in *New England*, from the Time of their first Arrival there, in the Year 1656, to the Year 1660. Wherein their Merciless Whippings, Chainings, Finings, Imprisonings, Starvings, Burning in the Hand, Cutting off Ears, and putting to Death, with divers other Cruelties, inflicted upon the Bodies of Innocent Men and Women, only for Conscience-sake, are briefly described. Second Part, being a farther Relation of the cruel Sufferings of the People called Quakers in *New England*, continued from Anno 1660, to Anno 1665. Beginning with the Sufferings of *William Leddra*, whom they put to Death. Published by *George Bishop*, in Anno 1661 and 1667. and now some-what abbreviated. with an Appendix, containing the Writings of several of the Sufferers; with some Notes, shewing the Accomplishment of their Prophecies, and a Postscript of the Judgments of God, that have befallen divers of their Persecutors. Also, an Answer to Cotton Mather's abuses of the said people, in his late History of *New England*, printed Anno 1702. price 5 s.

Vindiciæ Veritatis: Or an Occasional Defence of the Principles and

BOOKS Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle:

Practices of the People called Quakers: In Answer to a Treatise of John Stillingfleet's, miscalled, Seasonable Advice concerning Quakerism, &c. By Daniel Phillips, M. D. price 1 s. 6 d.

A Dissertation concerning the Lord's Supper. The second part, by the Author of the First part. Price 3 d.

An Encouragement early to Seek the Lord: And be Faithful to him: In an Account of the LIFE and Services of that Ancient Servant of God, Thomas Thompson. Price 6 d.

The Christian-Quaker, and his divine Testimony, stated and vindicated, from Scripture, Reason and Authority. by W. Penn. Price 2 s.

Piety Promoted, in a Collection of the Dying Sayings of many of the People called Quakers. with a Brief account of some of their Labours in the Gospel, and sufferings for the same. In three Parts by John Tomkins. price bound 1 s. each Part.

Piety Promoted, in a Collection of Dying-Sayings of many of the People call'd Quakers. with some Memorials of their Virtuous Lives The Fourth and Fifth Part by J. F. price bound 1 s. each Part.

Persecution expos'd in some Memoirs of the Sufferings of John Whiting and many antient eminent Friends. price 3 s.

A Journal of the Life, Travels and Sufferings of William Edmundson. price bound 3 s.

A Catechism and Confession of Faith. by Robert Barclay. price 9d.

Fruits of Retirement; or Miscellaneous Poems, Moral and Divine: Being some Letters, Contemplations, &c. written on Variety of Subjects; By M. Mollineux, late of Liverpool, deceased. price 1 s. 6 d.

A Light shining out of Darkness: Or, Occasional Queries, submitted to the Judgment of such as would enquire into the true State of things in our Times. the whole Work revised by the Author, the Proof's Englished and augmented, with sundry Material Discourses concerning the Ministry, Separation, Inspiration, Scriptures, Humane Learning, Outbs, Tribes, &c. With a brief Apology for the Quakers, that they are not Inconsistent with Magistracy, by an indifferent but Learned Hand. the 3d. Edit. pr. 1s. 6d.

God's Protecting Providence, Man's surest Help and Defence, in Times of the greatest Difficulty, and most eminent Danger. Evidenced in the Remarkable Deliverance of Robert Barrow, with divers other Persons, from the devouring Waves of the Sea, among which they suffered Shipwrack: and also, from the cruel Devouring Faws of the Inhumane Canibals of Florida. Faithfully related by one of the Persons concerned therein, J. Dickenfon. 8d.

A Scripture Catechism for Children, by Ambrose Rigge. price B. 6 d.

Truth's Vindication; or, a gentle Stroke to wipe off the foul Aspersions, false Accusations and Misrepresentations, cast upon the People of God, called Quakers, both with respect to their Principle, and their way of proselyting people over to them. by E. Burburft. price 1 s.

A brief Testimony to the great Duty of Prayer; shewing the Nature and Benefit thereof; to which is added, many Eminent and Select Instances of God's Answer to Prayer: Collected out of the Record of Holy Scriptures, by J. Tomkins, one of the People called Quakers. With a Postscript by J. F. The Second Edition, with Additions. price 6 d.

**BOOKS Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle.**

The Poor Mechanick's Plea, against the Rich Clergy's Oppression; shewing *Tithes* are no Gospel-Ministers Maintenance: In a brief and Plain Method, how that *Tithes*, (as now paid) are both Inconsistent with the Dispensation of the Law, and Dispensation of the Gospel. also how they were brought into the Church many Hundred Years after Christ, and testified a gainst by several ancient Christians and Martyrs. with several sober Reasons against the payment of them, By J. Bockett. price 3 d.

Academia Cœlestitis: *The Heavenly University; or, the Highest School, where alone is that Highest teaching, the teaching of the Heart.* By Francis Rouse, some time Provost of Eaton Colledge. *A Treatise written above 60 Years since. the third Edition, Revised and Compared with the Latin, p. 15.*

*A Dissertation of the Small Pox, by Daniel Phillips, at his Commencing Doctor of Physick in the University of Leyden in Holland, in the Year 1696. translated by T. E. price 9 d.*

Mercy covering the Judgment Seat; and Life and Light Triumphant over Death and Darknes: In the Lord's Tender Visitation, and Wonderful Deliverance, of One that Sat in Darknes, and in the Region and Shadow of Death. Witnessed unto in certain Epistles and Papers of living Experience. by Richard Claridge. price 6 d.

Lux Evangelica Attestata. *Or a further Testimony to the sufficiency of the Light within. Being a Reply to George Keith's Censure, in his Book, intituled, An account of the Quakers Politicks, upon certain passages in my Book, intituled, Mercy covering the Judgment-seat, &c. For the clearing of Truth from G. K's Misrepresentations, and satisfying of sober Enquirers into the true state of the Controversie between us.* by R. Claridge. 1s.

Anguis Flagellatus; or a Switch for the Snake. *Being an answer to the third and last Edition of the Snake in the Grails, wherein the Author's Injustice and Falshood, both in Quotation and Story, are discovered and obviated; and the Truth Doctrinally delivered by us, stated and maintained, in opposition to his Misrepresentation and Perverision.* By Joseph Wyeth, to which is added, A Supplement, by G. W. price 4s.

*The Clergy-Man's Pretence of Divine Right to Tithes, Examined and Refuted. Being a full answer to W. W's Fourth Letter, in his Book, Intituled, The Clergy's Legal Right to Tithes asserted.* By J. Gratton. 6d.

*A Treatise concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Shewing that the true Discip's of Christ are sent to Baptise Men into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for the carrying on of which, Christ is with them, and will be, to the End of the World. also a few words concerning the Lord's Supper; shewing, that those that Sup with him, are in his Kingdom.* By John Gratton. price 9 d.

*A Brief Concordance of the Names and attributes. with sundry Texts, Relating unto our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Collected out of the Scriptures.* by John Tomkins. price 4 d.

*A brief Apology in behalf of the People called Quakers. written for the Information of our sober and well-inclined Neighbours in and about the town of Warminster in the county of Wilts.* By W. Chandler. A. Pyot. J. Hodges. and some others. price 6 d.

*The Saints Travel to Spiritual Canaan; wherein are discovered several false Rests, short of the true Spiritual coming of Christ in his People, with*

*BOOKS Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle.*

sentations often put upon them by *Envious Apostates*, and *Mercenary Adversaries*. price 3 d.

The Glorious Brightness of the Gospel-Day, Dispelling the Shadows of the Legal Dispensation: and whatsoever else of *Human Invention* hath been super-added thereunto. Set forth, in some Observations made on a late Pamphlet called a *Divine Treatise*, (written by way of *Essay*, and pretending to Demonstrate, according to the *Mosaical Philosophy*, that *Water-Baptism*, *Imposition of Hands*, and the *Commemoration* of the Death and Passion of our ever Blessed Lord and Saviour, under the Species of Bread and Wine, were all of them suitably and Homogeneally adapted to the present imperfect State of Nature, as Man consists of Body, Soul and Spirit.) By *Thomas Ellwood*. price 1 s.

The Works of *Samuel Fisher*, in Folio.

*Cerintus* and *Ebion*: Or the Heresie of Tithing under the Gospel Detected: in some Observations upon a Book entituled, *An Essay concerning the Divine Right of Tithes*: By the Author of the *Snake in the Grass*. Together with an Essay concerning the First Rise of Tithes: And an Essay against their Divine Right. price 8 d.

An Abridgment of *Eusebius Pamphilius's* Ecclesiastical History, in two Parts. Part I. A Compendious *Commemoration* of the Remarkablest *Chronologies* which are contained in that Famous History. Part II. A Summary or brief hint of the Twelve Persecutions sustained by the *Ancient Christians*: with a Compendious *Paraphrase* upon the same. wherunto is added a Catalogue of the *Synods* and *Counsels*, which were after the days of the Apostles; together with a hint of what was decreed in the same. by *William Caton*. price 1 s.

Musa Parænetica; or, a *Treatise* of Christian Epistles, on sundry Occasions, in Verse. By *VVilliam Masley*. price 6d.

*A Vindication of Women's Preaching*, as well from holy Scripture and ancient Writings, as from the *Paraphrase* and *Notes* of the judicious *John Locke*, on 1 Cor. xi. By *Josiah Martin*. price 1 s.

A New Discourse of Trade, wherein is Recommended, several weighty Points relating to the Companies of Merchants. The Act of Navigation, Naturalization of Strangers, And our Woolen Manufactures. The ballance of Trade, &c. by *Sr. Josiab Child*. price bound 2 s.

The way to Health, long Life and Happiness: Or, a Discourse of Temperance, and the particular Nature of all things requisite for the Life of Man, &c. by *Thomas Tryon*, Student in Physick. Price bound 4 s. 6 d.

The good House-wife made a Doctor, Or Healths choice and sure Friend. Being a Plain way of Natures own Prescribing, to Prevent and Cure most diseases incident to Men, Women and Children, by Diet and Kitchin-physick only, with some Remarks on the Practice of Physick and Chimistry, by *Thomas Tryon*. Student in Physick. The Second Edition. To which is added some Observations on the Tedious Methods of Unskilful Surgeons; with cheap and Easie Remedies, by the same Author, price bound 1 s. 6 d.

Where also may be had Bibles, Testaments, Concordances, Spelling Books, Primers, Horn-Books; with Writing-Paper, and Paper-Books, Ink-Powder, &c. And Marriage Certificates on Parchment, Stamp'd.



DOC

2  
a  
F  
Se  
M  
the

Box  
Ink

