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My Lord,

I have, upon more accounts than
one Prelum'd to shelter this
Book under Your Patronage.

THE
DEDICATION.

THE Great Family, whence You are Sprung; and whereof You are so Bright an Ornament, has always, since the first Dawn of the Reformation, Patroniz'd the Cause therein Defended. They have Manag'd it by their Wisdom, Protect'd it with Their Sword, Adorn'd it by Their Lives, and too often Sealed it with Their Blood. Yet even this was a Fate rather to be Envied than Lamented. For, to fall a Sacrifice at once for Their GOD and Their Country; To be transmitted to Posterity under the united Characters of MARTYR and PATRIOT; This, MY LORD, was, next to the Enjoyment of Heaven, the highest Glory Great and Virtuous Souls cou'd attain to.

I need not tell Your Lordship that the same Cause is still in Hazard. It is Lampoon'd in the Tavern, Declaim'd against from the Pulpit, Scribb'd at from the Press, and its Ruin Projected by the Dealers in the Politicks. Yet all the Nation is Persuaded, that it is no less the Inclination,
tion, than 'tis visibly the Interest of the Family of ARGYLE heartily to espouse it: And all the Owners of that Interest, that is, the Wiser and Better and far Greater Part of the Nation, have necessarily such an Opinion of the Personal sufficiency of the Principal Members of that House, as to found the greatest Expectations thereon.

YOUR Illustrious Brother, The DUKE, has rais'd Himself to an Unrival'd Glory, and Distinguisht'd Himself as the HERO of the Age.

YOU, My Lord, not contented to excel in those Exercises which are too often the only Accomplishment of Persons distinguish'd by Their Birth, not satisfied to have Adorn'd Your Mind with that which is call'd the Polite Part of Learning; and, by a True Taste of the Belles Lettres, and uncommon Advances in the Mathematicks and all the most valuable Parts of Philosophy, to make Your Conversation both Shining and Instructive. Not satisfied, I say,
with all this, You have besides, that you might be a Publick Good to your Country, stock'd Your Soul with so Exact and Extensive a Knowledge of the Laws, that you are Distinguish'd on the Bench by your Ability no less than by Your Quality: And the whole Nation finds it felt Happy in Her Majesty's Wise Choice of Your Lordship to bear so great a Part in those Courts, on the Sentences of which their Lives and Fortunes depend.

THO' then, My Lord, the Weaknesses of the Book are Mine only, and so can no Way affect Your Lordship; yet the Subject of it, and the Cause it appears for, necessarily intitle it to the Patronage of a Person of your Character: You, My Lord, know that the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland can never be overthrown, without breaking through whatever has been hitherto held Sacred among Men. And Your Lordship knows, there is no Cause why it shou'd be attempted.
THO' the High-Church Faction, with whom Modesty and Moderation are reckon'd Scandal, has taught her Proselyts to Charge the Presbyterians with a SPIRIT Diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel; Yet, You, My Lord, from Your own Personal Acquaintance with 'em, know how False and Calumnious that Charge is. As 'tis Evident, to the Observation of all the World, that They are the most serious Christians; So Your Lordship is abundantly convinced, that They are the most Faithfull Subjects Her Majesty has on this Side the Border.

THEY don't indeed allow of a WORSHIP Fring'd with Ceremonies of Human Invention and Imposition. But, I'm persuaded, a Person of Your Lordship's Reflection must needs be sensible, that a Minister of GOD never makes a more Unsightly Figure, than when Appearing in a Party-Colour'd Dress, and Practising Motions and Postures His Heavenly Master never enjoin'd Him. 'Tis True the Presbyterians
The Presbyterians don't restrict themselves to Forms in Praying to Almighty GOD: But, I suppose, Your Lordship does not think a Beggar ever the less Sincere, tho' he don't always ask his Alms in the same studied Cant.

'TIS Confess'd likewise, there are several ARTICLES OF FAITH taught by the Presbyterians, which are above the Comprehension of Our finite Minds: But Your Lordship, who, every Day, in the Search of Nature, find so many Appearances perfectly Unaccountable from the Laws of Mechanism, without having Recourse to the First Mover and great Author of Nature, can't be surpriz'd to find Articles in Religion not otherwise to be Resolv'd, but by Believing That GOD's Judgments are Unsearchable and His Ways past finding out. Nor will Your Lordship, I presume, be straitned to Believe, that the whole Christian Church, which has Taught those Articles equally with the Presbyterians, is as likely to be in the Right, as an Upstart
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Upstart Sect of yesterday, whose Confidence is their most Usefull Quality.

IN a Word, My Lord, the Presbyterians disown a PRELACY among the Ministers of the Gospel: And, on this Score, High-Church finds in Her Heart to Damn 'em by the Lump, and Mercifully to consign 'em to Everlasting Flames. But Your Lordship has a juster Notion of the Kind Author of our Being, than to Believe that He will Ruine His Creatures for not Submitting to a Government, which its Freshest and most Learn'd Patrons own, is not to be found in the ORACLES OF TRUTH.

I have therefore adventur'd to Inscribe this Piece to Your Lordship; not doubting but, how Weak soever the Performance may be, that yet an Essay to Defend so very Good a Cause, wherein not only Truth, but Peace, Charity and Good Neighbourhood are so much concern'd, will not be quite Ungratefull to You.

*2 THAT
THAT Your Lordship may be always Blessed with the Richest Favours of Heaven, is, and shall be the Daily Prayer of

MY LORD,

Your Lordship's

most Humble, and

most Obedient Servant

JOHN ANDERSON.
THE PREFACE.

BEING Sensible that Books always occasion an Ex pense of Money, and, which is much more valuable, of Time; I think myself obliged to account, why I have given the P ub lick the Trouble of this.

HOW soon the APOLOGY appeared; that Party, which is dist inguished by the Name of HIGH-CHURCH, Gloried both in the Author and in the Service he had done. They spread his Book with great Industry into the several Parts of the Nation, recommended it as a perfect Piece in its Kind, and at length boasted it made Proselyts.

I hate to Grudge even an Adversary his due Praise. I frankly own, Mr. Rhind has done as well as the Subject was capable of. I own, His Book is, of its Bulk, the most Comprehensive in its Subject, I have seen. Some Authors have attacked Us upon the Head of GOVERNMENT, some upon our DOCTRINE, some upon our WORSHIP, and some too (tho' these not always excessively Qualified, either Morally or Intellectually, for such an Undertaking) upon our SPIRIT and PRACTICE. But Mr. Rhind has widen the Compas, and taken all Four within his Circle, hinting at every Thing, of a General Nature, that has been wont to be objected to us; and all this in so very Pointed a Stile, that, had His Probation been equal, there had been an End of the Matter, and the World had heard its last of Presbytery for ever.
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IT might then possibly have argued, either too much Indolence, or an Ill Conscience, to have neglected such a Book, without either Answering or Confessing to it. Nor is it quite Improbable that Silence would have heightened the Vanity of a Party abundantly remarkable already for that Quality. I cannot deny but these Considerations somewhat Influenced me to write.

BUT then, That which Determin'd me, was the Consideration of the Design of Mr. Rhind's Book, and of the Effect it must necessarily have, so far as it Persuades. And who knows how far it may do so? Mankind grows Daily more Corrupt: and Mr. Rhind is very far from being singular in what He has advanced, most Part of Books we get from High-Church being of the same Strain, and Breathing the very same Spirit.

NOW what else is the Design of Mr. Rhind's Book, but to overturn the most Sacred and Important Truths? And what else can the Effect of it be, so far as it obtains Credit, but the Utmost Contempt of Seriousness and Piety; which, GOD knows, is at too low an Ebb already on both sides? What else is the Design of it, but to Exasperate the one Half of the Nation into Rage and Fury against the other? And, shou'd it gain Faith, how Dire must the Consequences be? Then must Love, Peace, and Charity be for ever Banish'd, a State of Universal Hostility instantly commence, Persecution, in all its most terrible Forms, take Place, till not only Presbytery be abolisht, but the whole Generation of Presbyterians be Extirpated from off the Face of the Earth, which, I suppose will hardly ever be, so long as there is a Bible on it.

THAT Unhappy Fellow De Foe, some Ten or Twelve Years ago, put all England in a Ferment by His SHORTEST WAY WITH THE DISSENTERS. But what else is His Shortest Way, but the Immediate Use of the Doctrine laid down in Mr. Rhind's Book, and indeed generally in all the Controversial Books, and oftimes in the Sermons, of High-Church? For

IF
If the Presbyterian Pastors are no Ministers; If their Sacraments are null; If all, who are of that Communion, are out of the Ordinary Road to Heaven, and can have no Rational Hope of Salvation; Does it not unavoidably follow that it is the Duty of Our Civil Governors to overturn their Settlement? Is it not plain that They are in a state of Deadly Sin so long as They leave it undone? Were it not an ACT of Great Mercy, and Christian Compassion to COMPELL us to come in, tho’ it were by the Rought Arguments of Heading, Hanging and such like, rather than suffer us to go into Hell Fire Our selves, and lead others thither, with the Limbs intire? If Presbyterians are not only without the Church, but Enemies to it, what can the STATE in Conscience do, but Declare them to be denuded of all those Immunities and Priviledges which the Law had secuir’d ’em in, and which hitherto They have enjoyed in Common with Their Neighbours, upon the Supposition of Their being Christians? If Presbyterian Parity is so Inconsistent in its own Nature with Monarchy, are not the Civil Powers obliged for Their own Security to crush a Society of so Dangerous a Constitution? If the Presbyterian Spirit is Diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel, what Eternal Animosities must there betwixt True Church and such a Party? Is it possible but that, upon such a Supposition, there must be Constant and Mortal Feuds in every the same City, the same Congregation, the same Family, and oftimes in the same Bed? For, what show’d an Episcopal Husband, who would not pass for Henpeck’d *, do with a Wife who is Incorrigibly Presbyterian? Shall He still cherish the Serpent in His Bosom till She sting him to Death? Shall he hug the Charming Tempter till She Teaze him into the Devouring Jaws of the Old Serpent by Her Bewitching Importunities? Must not then all Things run into Confusion upon such Principles? ’Tis True, Almighty Providence may restrain such Dismal Effects, or Good Nature may overcome bad Principles; but such, I’m sure, are the Native Consequences of ’em, and are Daily put in Practice in all the Popish Countries; too sure a Sign (besides the Proof of former Experience) that not Will, but Power only, is wanting to act the same Tragical Scenes

* See the Apology p. 205. &c.
Scenes in Britain. And what less should be expected from a Party, which justifies all that Carnage the French King has made of His Protestant Subjects? T

THIS then being the Natural Product of the Principles of Mr. Rhind's Book, I thought I owed this Service not only to the Truth but to My Country; And that I was obliged to bring my Bucket, tho' a shallow one, to Quench that Flame which, if not suppress'd in Time, must needs Consume it to Ashes, and bring us to the same miserable State which, Jolephus tells us, the Zealots brought Jerusalem into before its Destruction. This, I hope, will not only excuse but Justify my Writing.

BUT then the next Question will be, Why so largely? Was it so very hard a Matter to Answer Mr. Rhind, that no less than a Book about Four Times the Bigness of His could serve the Turn? His Singularities are but few, and might have been quickly discussed; nor had the Reader been at any Great Loss, tho' they had been quite neglected. What else He has advanced has been brought into the Field a Hundred Times before, and it might have been Sufficient for Answer to have recommended the Reader to former Writers on the same Subjects. Besides, He has very often through His Book, and upon the Spirit of the Presbyterians always, contented Himself with mere Assertion: And, in such Cases, 'tis still as Honourable to deny without a Reason, as it was to assert without a Proof.

ALL this I acknowledge is very True; and such a Conduct, 'tis plain, had brought my Book within a very Moderate Compass: But then too, such a Conduct had sunk its Usefulness proportionally with its Bulk: For I did Intend by it, and shall be sorry if the Reader find himself disappointed, somewhat more than a Simple Confutation of the Apology: I design'd it should be of Universal Use in this Controversy; and therefore have not barely Deny'd, which in very many Cases

† See afterward p. 69.
Cases had been enough for our Apologist, and would have very much shortened the Work; but I have Disproved too: Nor have I put off the Reader with Answering Mr. Rhind, but have said as much as I thought Sufficient to Satisfie the Argument it self by whoever it were manage'd.

PLAINLY I design'd, in the First Place, to say as much as was needfull to Vindicate the Presbyterians from those Imputations in Fact which fill so many Hundreds of the Episcopal Sermons, Books and Pamphlets, and are so much the Subject of their Conversations. If in doing this I have mention'd any Facts on their Side, the hearing whereof may be Grateing to them, they hope themselves to blame: For every one must own, it was a very proper Way in Me, for Disproving the Reasons of Mr. Rhind's Conduict, to make it appear, that the Side He had espoused lay every Way as open to Exceptions as that He had Deserted. Here then the Old Apology takes Place

Responsum, non Dicatum esse, quia iust., prius.

But then, which will sufficiently distinguish my Management, the Reader may Promise Himself to find My Assertions verified, in all Cases needful, by the most Authentick and Unexceptionable Documents, a Piece of Drudgery which Mr. Rhind has, and the Writers of His Party generally do, excuse themselves from. 2dly, I design'd to say as much as I thought needfull for Convincing any Man's Conscience that the Presbyterian Communion is not only Safe but the Best, both as to Government, Faith and Worship. And as the Reader will find all the Arguments for Prelacy particularly Discoursed; so, which I doubt not will be surprizing enough, He will find my Reasonings against 'em Fortified by the Judgment even of the most eminent Divines of the Church of England who habitually reject each others Arguments for Prelacy, and are so very unhappily situated, that they can't possibly Defend against Popery but upon Presbyterian Principles, nor Impugn Presbytery but upon Popish ones. I hope then the Reader will easily Pardon me that;
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I have run out into such a Length when my Subject and Design was so large.

As for that which is called STILE, I have taken just as much care about it as was needfull to make my Self understood. Any further Niceness I judged Superfluous upon a Subject of this Nature, which I suspect is not very capable of Dress, unless one intend a Harangue instead of a Dispute.

Ornate Res ipsa negat, contenta Doceri.

My greatest care, next to that of the Matter, was that I should not be Intricate or Perplexed, as Controversies are apt to be: And this I hope I have obtained: For I have never made any Blind References to Mr. Rhind's Book, but have always given His Sense, and almost always in His own Words, which is another considerable cause that my Book is so large.

To both which I may add a Third viz. That I have inserted some few Digressions, tho' not I hope from the Purpose, yet from the Thread of Mr. Rhind's Book. That upon the late Vindication of the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, which the Reader will find p. 32, is but short: And, tho' one would think that Scots Men ought to be very little concerned with the English Liturgy, yet that being the Dispute of the Day, I understand that the Author of the Country-Man's Letter to the Curate, against which that Vindication is directed, intends, if GOD spare Him, a Second Edition, in one Volume on a fine Paper and Type, both of the Dialogues concerning the English Liturgy, and of that Letter &c; wherein the Subject of the Liturgy is to be more largely Discoursed, and whatever has been advanced against the Dialogues by Mr. Barclay or others, and against the Letter by the Vindicator, either in Reason or History, is to be consider'd. The largest Digression I have made, which the Reader will find p. 317, is that on the Earl of Crometty's late Book. Besides that it was necessary in Point of Self Defence, I persuade my Self His Lordship will be pleased with it, because
The PREFACE. VII.

it may help to Exactness in a Piece of History, which His Lordship has so much contributed to the Inlightening of.

As to the Conduct of the whole Book, I am sensible how much I shall want the Reader's Indulgence. But this Piece of Justice I crave That He would not Censure any one Part of it, till He have read through the whole; because what He might perhaps expect to find in one Place, I may have possibly thought fit to reserve to Another, where I fancied it might stand to greater Purpose or with a better Grace. Further, I must advertize the Reader, that, having used the Word WHIG in some few Places, I meant it in the Original Scotch Sense, as signifying a Presbyterian, except when by the Context it appears, that it is to be understood in that more Comprehensive Notion Use has now affix'd to it.

I hope the Reader will be Mercifull as to the Errors in Printing. Such as are of any Moment are but few; and both these and the lesser Escapes in Spelling, Pointing, or Dividing of Syllables I expect will be Excused upon the Account of My Distance and necessary Absence from the Press.

AFTER all I have said p. 15. there are some would still persuade me that not Mr. Rhind, but another Person of a much higher Character is the true Author of the APOLOGY. But 'tis the same Thing to me whether it be so or otherwise: For I never thought that External Character cou'd either heighten or diminish the Intrinsick Value of a Book: Nor did I intend a Dispute against any Man's Person, but, tho' I ordinarily name Mr. Rhind only, yet I generally mean His Party: And therefore, tho' He complains that the Presbyterians have exhausted all their Common Places of Slander against Him, yet for my own Part, I have consider'd Him merely as the Writer of the APOLOGY, without so much as touching upon His Personal Qualities or Circumstances in any Private Concern. I knew the Publick cou'd have been very little Edified with Personal

†† 2 Objections;
Objections; and I did not think I wanted such Adminicles, the Argument it self, having given me sufficient Advantage.

PLAINLY, I persuade my self that every one who has read Mr. Rhind's Book will, upon the Reading of mine, allow that I have kept more Temper than perhaps was due to such a Piece. For, when a Set of People, about whom there is nothing Extraordinarily Christian appearing, will needs put such a Jest upon Mankind, as to Monopolize the Name of CHURCH to themselves, and Belch out their Fire and Venom, without Fear or Wit, against the whole Reformed Interest, and yet at the same Time will have us to believe'em Protestants; In such a Case I must needs own, that

Difficile est Satyram non Scribere;—

However, I have restrained my self as much as the Matter could admit of, or either Justice or Charity required.

I reckon upon it that my Book will be answered; and tis hardly possible to foresee what kind of Arguments may be used against me; But there is one which I depredate viz. that Powerfull one ... Damn me. I don't fear that any of their Laity will attack me with it, I have a better Opinion of their Piety and Manners; but I dare not promise so much on their Clergy's Head: For, what has been, may be. However, by Way of Prevention, I own it to be an unanswerable Kind of Argument; And therefore they may save themselves the Trouble of it; so much the rather that they cannot be very great Losers, tho' they omit it.

BUT I am sensible that by the Length of this Preface I add to the Transgression of the Book. After all I can say, I know it must, as all other Books have ever done, take its Fate according to the

[†] See Mr. Calder's Miscellany Numbers Num. IV.
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the Inclination or Capacity of its Different Readers. And therefore, as it is, I send it forth into the World with its Father's Blessing, heartily praying that the GOD of Truth and Peace may Prosper it to the Preserving among us Two such valuable Enjoyments.

March 17th, 1714.

ERRATA.


CORRIGENDA IN MARGINE.

Mr. Rhind's Apology disproved.

THE INTRODUCTION

The general Method of Mr. Rhind's Book is, I acknowledge, abundantly Distinct. Therein, after the History of the MANNER How, He gives an account of the REASONS for Which He separated from the Presbyterian Party; to wit, because, upon Enquiry He found Their GOVERNMENT to be Schismatical, Their Articles of FAITH fundamentally False and Pernicious, Their WORSHIP scandalously Corrupt and highly Imperfect, and their SPIRIT diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel. A heavy enough Charge truly; and if but one half of it hold True, every good Christian must needs at once Justify his Separation, and Congratulate his Escape.

But it is the Design of the following Sheets to Examine his Performance; and if in the Issue it shall be found, that there is neither Truth in his Assertions, Strength in his Arguments, Proof for his Allegiances, nor Modesty in his Characters; Then, I hope, it will follow, that, how much Reason sooner some other Party may have to be fond of their new Profelyt, yet the Presbyterians have no such Cause to be swallowed up of overmuch Sorrow for their Lofs, but that they may hope the Days of their Mourning may wear over, and they may be comforted.

A

CHAP.
CHAP. I.

Containing preliminary Remarks.

Though his Title, Preface and Narrative have no great Influence on the main Subject; yet, that I may proceed in order; for clearing the Ground, I shall beg leave to take them under Review in some few Remarks: the rather, because the doing so will, I hope, sufficiently distinguish the Spirit of the Author, perhaps too, help to enlighten his Book.

SECT. I.

Containing Remarks on the Title of Mr. Rhind's Book.

I. Mr. Rhind has given his Book the Title of an Apology. But, I apprehend, when the Book itself is lookt into, it will appear to be very ill Chosen. The Apostle Peter enjoins (a) Christians to be always ready to make an Apology (so it is from the Original,) to every one that asks a Reason of the Hope that is in them. But, though that Apostle had as much Edge on His Temper, and possibly was as forward in his Zeal as Mr. Rhind; though the Cause of Christianity was at least of as great Importance as that of Prelacy, and the Enemies the Church had then to do with little better natured than the Presbyterians; yet He would not allow them, in putting in an Apology even for Christianity it self, though against Jews and Pagans, to use Rudenes or Bitternes, far less Calumny and Slander; but expressly Charges Them to do it with MEEKNESS and FEAR. Mr. Rhind was not Ignorant of this Precept. He has fronted his Book with it; but, since ever Apologies were in fashion, I very much doubt if ever any was writ, with so unchristian a Spirit; so absolutely void of both these Requistes. I do not believe the

(a) 2 Epist. Chap. 3. 15.
the Reader would think himself much gratified by entertaining Him with a Collection of all the Passages in the Apology that might contribute to prove this Character I have given of it: Yet 'tis necessary I produce One, left any should suspect I charge Him falsely. And one, I'm persuaded, will be fully sufficient for that Purpose. I shall therefore, without adding, altering or diminishing, transcribe one Paragraph from Him, wherein He has drawn the Character of the Presbyterians, distinguishes too into its Periods for the Readers more distinct conception. It is thus

1. They (the Presbyterians) are naturally Rigid and Severe, and therefore conclude, that God is such a One as themselves. 2. They damn all who differ from them, and therefore think that God does the same. 3. And because They love themselves, They are pleased to persuade Themselves that They are his special Favorites. 4. In a Word, They are Respecters of Persons, and therefore think to Patronize Their Partiality with His Authority. 5. Hence They conclude that They owe them no Civilities whom God neglects, nor kind Offices whom he hates. 6. He neglects and hates all who are not capable of his Grace, which none are (say they) who are not of their Way. 7. This wicked persuasion sanctifies not only the ill Manners, but which is worse, the ill Nature of the Party, towards all who differ from them. It contradicts the Ends of Society and Government, and is only calculated to advance the private Interest of a Partial and Designing Set of Men! Thus He p. 208.

Now, if in all this Paragraph there is the least allay of Meekness, He would very much oblige us, if He would tell us what Bitterness and Malice is.

But though His Zeal swallowed up his MEEKNESS, yet, was there no place for FEAR (the other Requisite) I mean a Reverence and Regard to Truth? Might he not have thought it Necessary to offer at least at some Instances for supporting the said Character? Did he fancy it would be believed on his bare Word? He must be abundantly fanguin if he did. However, Presbyterians don't think themselves much in hazard from Writers that sacrifice their Veracity to the Pleasure of breathing their Spleen. They are accustomed to have the most black Characters drawn of them by the Rampant high Church Authors; But they don't feel themselves much
much hurt thereby, because they are as notoriously false as they are Black. 'Tis difficult to name that ill Thing which a Haylin, a Hicks, a Leyst, a Sacheverel, Calder or some other very Reverend Divine of the like Probitly has not write of Them or imputed to Them. Who were the Instruments that procured the Spanish Armado to invade England in 1588? The Whigs (b). Who burnt London in 1666? The Whigs (c). Who piloted in and ashitted the Dutch to burn the English Fleet at Chatham? The Whigs (d). Nay who crucifed Jesus Christ? Who but the Whigs, the very Children are taught to lisp out that (e). Calves Headfeasts are with these Authors true History, Why? Because one of themselves wrote it, and the ref: cite it (f), and who dares doubt it after that?

But suppose it was below an Author of Mr. Rhind's Soaring Genius, to adduce Proof for his Affertions, or to regard so small a Circumftance as Truth in his Characters; yet might he not have used so much common Prudence, as not to draw the Presbyterians in the Habit of High-Church Tories, and to Twit them with that whereof Himself and Fellows are notoriously Guilty beyond what was ever heard of among any Party of Christians except the Church of Rome? His forecited Character turns mainly upon uncharitableness. The Presbyterians, faith he, damn all that differ from them, and therefore think that God does the same. But is not this even the distinguishing Principle of a High-flyer? Has not Mr. Dodwell, whom Mr. Rhind so much admires, and upon whose Principles he professes to have formed his own p. 24, 25. expressly taught, that there is no communicating with the F A T H E R or the S O N but by Communion with the Bishop. 'Tis, faith he, one of (g) the most dreadful aggravations of the Condition of the Damn'd, that they are banifhed from the Presence of the Lord and from the Glory of his Power. The fame is their Condition also who are difunited from Christ, by being difunited from his visible Representative (the Bishop). Nay, has he not shut up even the small Cranny of the uncovenanted Mercies of God, which might have let in some faint Ray of Hope, against all the

the World but Episcopalians alone, by declaring in that same Place, 2 That it is extremely uncertain, and at least infinitely hazardous (and what can be beyond Infinite?) that ever they shall share in them. Do not Scores of their other Authors talk at the same Rate? But why do I speak of others? Is not this the very Design of Mr. Rhind's Book? Was not that the Reason why he separated from the Presbyterians, because They are not in the Ordinary Road to Heaven p. 31? Nay I hope to make it good to every Man's Conviction ere I have done, that he has damned the whole Christian Churches on Earth, the Church of England her self too among the Rest excepting some High-flyers, who can no more be said to be of the Church, than an overgrown Wart or some monstrous Tumour on the Body can be called a Part of it. Think now how well calculate Mr. Rhind's Book is to bear the Title of an Apology; how wisely and justly his Meek and Catholick Spirit charges the Presbyterians with Rigour and Uncharitableness. I would advise him, if ever his Book come to a Second Edition, to alter the Title a little, and instead of an APOLOGY to call it a LYBEL.

II. In his Title he promises to give an Account of the Reasons for which he separated from the Presbyterian Party, AND EMBRACED THE COMMUNION OF THE CHURCH. I cannot but wish he had been a little more particular, and told us OF WHAT CHURCH. 'Tis true, the Church is but one; yet there are several Communions. There is the Roman, the Lutheran, the Church of England Communion, with too many others, which differ from each other in very considerable Points; But though I have read his Book with all the Application I was Capable of; I sincerely declare I cannot find out that Church, whose Communion he can reasonably claim to.

The Presbyterian Party is that which he hath abandon'd. He hath, though indeed in very modest Terms, disclaimed the Communion of the Church of Rome p. 14. 15. The Greek, Armenian, Ethiopick Churches &c lay too far out of his Road. The lesser Fractions and Sects among Christians he gave not himself the Trouble to enquire about, from a just Fear lest if he had, He had ended His Days, ere He had formed His Confession of Faith p. 14. What Church then can it be whose Communion he has embraced? He
He has given us three hints to find her out by, but none of them sufficient to give Light in the Matter and determine the Enquiry.

I. He tells us p. 28 It is the Communion of the Catholick Church. But this CATHOLICK, is a Hackney which every Party presses into their Service, every Church claims, and the Church of Rome, which yet he disowns, appropriates to her Self. And so we are just as Wise as we were.

II. He tells us in the Beginning of his Preface, that it is the Communion of the SUFFERING CHURCH, by which he means the Prelates in Scotland. But, though he hath joined himself to them, yet that he is not of them, nor within their Communion, I shall, ere I go further, make abundantly Evident upon this single Postulatum, that that CHURCH is the same in her Principles now she is Suffering, that She was while Flourishing.

She was while Flourishing Erastian in her Government, Calvinist in her Doctrine, her Worship without a Liturgy, her Discipline exercised by Lay Elders. All which is directly Contrary to the Principles of Mr. Rhind's Book.

First, I say, His Suffering Church was Erastian in her Government. Besides the Tract of our History and many Acts of Parliament, Arch-Bishop Gladstones has given Emphatick Testimony that it was so in the Time of King James VI. In his Letter to that Prince of the Date August 31, 1612. He has these remarkable Words. 'For besides that no Estate may say, that they are your Majesties Creatures, as we may; so there is none whose standing is so slippery, when your Majesty shall frown, as We. For at your Majesties Nod we must either stand or fall. Thus also it was in the late Times after the Restoration of King Charles II, as appears by the Act of Parliament Redintegrating the Estate of Bishops: For there-in ' the Disposal of the External Government and Policy of the Church was declared to be in his Majesty and his Successors as an inherent Right of the Crown, and that they might settle, enact and limit such Constitutions, Acts and Orders concerning the Administration of the External Government of the Church, and the Persons employed in the same, and concerning all Ecclesiastical Meetings, and Matters to be proposed and determin'd there-
Mr. Rhind's Title Page.

in, as they, in their Royal Wisdom, shall think fit. Did she alter this Principle upon the Revolution? No. In the Year 1692, no fewer than 180 of the Episcopal Clergy with Dr. Canaries on their Head, in their own Name and in that of the whole Body of the Episcopal Clergy in the North, addressed the General Assembly to be assumed into Ministerial Communion and a Share of the Church-Government upon a Formula whereof the First Words are. I A. B. 

do sincerely declare and promise, that I will submit to the Presbyterian Government of the Church as it is now established in this Kingdom---. This they could not, without exposing themselves to Damnation, have promised to do, had they judged Presbyterian Government to be Schismatical; But their Doing so was very well consistent with the Erastian Principles. Now Mr. Rhind's Principles are directly opposite to these: For he hath not only taught, 'That the Church is a Society independent upon the State, P. 29. but that Prelacy is the only Government of the Church by Divine Right, and that exclusive of all others. This is the avowed Design of almost one half of his Book.

Secondly, His suffering Church was Calvinist in point of Doctrines. Knox's Confession of Faith was formed in the Year 1560; exhibited to and ratified by the Parliament that same Year and oftimes afterward. It was owned as the only Conession of this Church, without Rival without Controll either by Prelates or Presbyterians for almost sixty Years. I need not tell any Body who has seen it, that it was Calvinist all over. In the Year 1616. the General Assembly at Aberdeen, wherein Arch-Bishop Spotswood was Moderator, formed a new Confession of Faith, which we have at length in Calderwood's History from P. 638. This was yet more expressly and rigidly Calvinist than the other. In the late Episcopal Times, Knox's Confession of Faith was again revived and sworn to in the Oath of the Test. The whole Episcopal Clergy, except some few that were Whiggishly inclin'd and refused it on other Accounts, went into that Oath: And therein not only ' declared that they believed the said Confession to be founded on, and agreeable to the written Word of God; but also promised and swore to adhere thereto during all the Days of their Life-time, yea and to endeavour to educate their Children therein. After the Revolution the Westminster Confession of Faith was ratified and esta-
blished as the avowed Confession of this Church. How much Calvinist that is every one knows. Yet in the Year 1692, the Episcopal Clergy, who desired to be assumed upon the Formula before mentioned, promised that they would subscribe the said Confession of Faith and larger and shorter Catechism confirmed by Act of Parliament, as containing the Doctrine of the Protestant Religion professed in this Kingdom. This Promise, if it signified any more than a Juggle, which we ought never to suppose a Clergy Man guilty of, could import no less, than that they own’d the Doctrine of the Said Confession and Catechisms to be true, at least, that they did not judge them to be fundamentally False and Pernicious. This is a short History of all the Confessions of Faith were ever received in Scotland since the Reformation. All of them were formed upon the Calvinistic Scheme, all of them have been assented to by the Episcopal Clergy, yet all of them directly contrary to Mr. Rhind’s Book in the Doctrine of the Decrees, Predestination, Perseverance, universal Redemption, universal Grace &c.

Thirdly, His suffering Church had her Worship without a Liturgie. Knox’s Liturgie was falling into Desuetude ere Episcopacy was established in the Time of King James VI. Besides, Ministers were never bound to the constant Observance of it. On the contrary, the Book itself allows them to use the several Forms, or THE LIKE IN EFFECT. And, faith one of its Rubricks, ‘It shall not be necessary for the Minister daily to repeat all these Things before Mentioned, but beginning with some manner of Confession to proceed to the Sermon; which being ended, he either useth the Prayer for all Estates before mentioned, or else prayeth as the Spirit of God shall move his Heart, framing the same according to the Time, and Matter which he hath treated of;—. ’Tis true there was an Attempt made in the Time of K. Charles I. to bring in a Liturgie much after the English Model. But I need not tell the World, that it miscarried. No wonder: For, not only the Body of the Nation and the Bulk of the Presbyters, but even the Wifest and most experienced of the Bishops were against it. This, Gilbert Burnet has Ingenuously confessed (b). This the Author of the Short Account of Scotland, though
Episcopal, frankly owns page 56. "It was set on Foot by a Foreigner (A. B. Laud,) upon the Importunity of some young Bishops in the Kirk of Scotland, who made it their Business, to oppose the Ancients and thought it Matter of Triumph to carry any Point against them. Thus he. In the late Times before the Revolution, the Episcopal Clergy did not so much as Essay to bring in a Liturgie. For many Years after the Revolution none of them publicly used any either in their Churches or Meeting-houses. And to this Day some of the best of them, to my certain Knowledge, are against the English Liturgie. How then can Mr. Rhind pretend to be of their Communion, when he argues not only for the Excellency, but even the Necessity of Forms; and declares that Flat Impertinencies, substantial Non-sense and horrid Blasphemies are UNAVOIDABLE in the Extemporary Way. And yet I heard the Extemporary Prayers of Episcopal Ministers five Hundred Times. It seems I have been well employed. And I have known five hundred People harrassed in the late Times for not going to Church to hear such Prayers. It seems it was a mercifull Government that persecuted People for not putting themselves under the unavoidable Necessity of hearing horrid Blasphemies by way of Address to God Almighty.

Fourthly, His Suffering Church exercised her Discipline by Lay Elders; and this every one knows that lived before the Revolution. I conclude then that Mr. Rhind is not of the Communion of the Suffering Church either in point of Government, Faith, Worship or Discipline; unless he can prove that she hath changed her Principles in all these within a Score of Years or so; which I suppose it will be hard for him to do. And when he has done it, I cannot think it will contribute much to the raising her Character to represent her as a CHANGELING.

Let us go on in our Search after his Church. He gives us a Third Hint for finding her, by telling us p. 169. "That he has embraced the Communion of that Church whose Worship is the best in the World with Respect to both Matter and Manner. By which Character he would have us to understand the Church of England."
England. But, though he has embraced her, yet she is so far from embracing him, that he stands DE FACTO Excommunicated by her. I shall have ample Occasion to shew this when I come to consider his second Reason for his Separation. In the mean Time, to satisfy the Reader’s Longing, I shall give one Instance for Proof of it. Among the other Presbyterian Doctrines which he has declared Fundamentally False and Pernicious &c, he reckons this as one, That the best Actions of Men, without Grace, are but so many splendid Sins. The Truth of this Presbyterian Doctrine is obvious even to common Sense: For, how busy soever a Servant may be, yet if he has no Regard to the Will of his Master in what he does, can his Diligence be reckoned Obedience? Nay, must not the neglect of his Master’s Authority be imputed to him as a Fault? But, it is not the Truth of the Doctrine I am now concerned about. Be it true or false, is it not the Doctrine of the Church of England as much as of the Presbyterians? Hear her.

Art. XIII.

Works done before the Grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God; For as much as they spring not of Faith in Jesus Christ, neither do they make Men meet to receive Grace or (as the School Authors say) deserve Grace of Congruiity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath commanded and willed them to be done, We doubt not but that they have the Nature of Sin.

’Tis plain then that he has impugned and rejected the Doctrine of the Church of England. Now let us hear what Censure she has awarded to such as do so.

Canon V. 1603:

Whosoever shall hereafter affirm That any of the XXXIX Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces and whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at London
London in the Year of our Lord 1562 for the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the Establishing of Consent touching True Religion, are in any Part Superstitious or Erroneous, or such as he may not with a Good Conscience subscribe unto; let him be Excommunicated IPSO FACTO, and not restored but only by the Archbishop, after his Repentance and publick Revocation of such his Wicked Errors.

Who now will say that Mr. Rhind is of the Church of England Communion, when she has excommunicated him. I conclude then upon the whole, That it is not possible to find that Church wherein he can be classed, I mean, here on Earth. As for the UN-SPOTTED Church † of which the late Edinburgh Addressers professed themselves to be, I don’t believe it to be on this side the Clouds.

Sect. II.

Containing Remarks on Mr. Rhind’s Preface.

OUR Apologist is earnest to have his Reader believe that it was not upon any sinful Byas or Wordly Consideration that he changed Sides. And therefore in the Beginning of his Preface tells us, 'That a forcible Conviction, which was the Result of an Impartial Enquiry, determin’d him to abandon the Presbyterian Party SOME YEARS AGO when the Church was under severe Pressures in this Nation and when there were small hopes of Deliverance. But, he has been too General in the Date of his Conversion, and some People are tempted to think there was a Reason for it. Her Majesty was pleas’d SOME YEARS AGO to write a Gracious Letter to her Privy Council of Scotland of the Date Feb. 4. 1703. in favour of the Episcopal Clergy and others of that Profession. Her Majesty was, so far from intending that the said Letter should have any ill Influence on the Presbyterian Establishment, that on the Contrary she recommended it to Her Council.

† See London Gazette Numb. 5089.
Council to give them all Due Countenance and Encouragement. Yet it is abundantly well known in this Nation, That the Episcopal Party constructed the said Letter as a Preface to the overturning of Presbytery and the Reestablishment of Prelacy; As if her Majesty, like a kind Mother teazed with hungry Children, had bid them content themselves a little with that Morsel, till she could get Dinner provided for them. And, in Opposition to all her Majesties Promises and Assurances to the Contrary, the Distinction between a Secret and Revealed Will was industriously propagated. And from that Time some young Divines, who hitherto had been warmed and Fledged, under the Wings of Presbytery, began to look with a more kindly Eye towards the Prelatick Party, and to alter their Conduct accordingly. If Mr. Rhind's Separation was prior to that Time, there is the more Charity to be had for him, and he was not Kind enough to himself in not signifying so much. But if it was after it, I can see nothing Extraordinary in it: For, to run from under a falling House, and to Worship the rising Sun, is what People do every Day.  

Besides, how little Encouragement foever Mr. Rhind might hope for from the SUFFERING Church in Scotland, yet he might very reasonably, upon his revolt, expect more elsewhere than ever he could have found among the Presbyterians. A Presbyterian Minister is like the Heath in the Wilderness that never grows higher. When once he has got himself possessed of a Church, however shmeing his Parts are, there is a ne plus ultra set to his Ambition. But in the Prelatick Way there are various Degrees of Dignity to animate the generous Spirit. 'Tis possible one may Rise from a Curate to a Reitor from thence to a Dear, Archdeacon or so, at length obtain a Mitre, and never cease advancing till he hath lodged himself in Lambeth. Though I will not suppose Mr. Rhind so airy as ever to have Dreamed of mounting the highest Pinacle of Honour; yet had he so humble an Opinion of himself as not to allow himself to think that he might one Day merit some of the greater Church Dignities? Was it no Motive to him to know that there are People in the World much fonder of a Protelyt from Presbytery than from Paganism. And that the writing of an Apology might very much contribute to his Advancement? He does not seem to be
to be very much a Stranger to good Authors, as not to have heard of Juvenal's Secret for rising in the World.

Wouldst thou to Honours and Preferments Climb,
Be bold in Mischief, dare some mighty Crime.
Mr. Dryden sat. i. l. 73.

And is not Dr. Sacheverell a Fresh Instance of the Wisdom of that Precept, whose high Misdemeanours made him to once the Idol and Darling of high Church, the Theam of her Praise, and Object of her Bounty.

II. He has been pleased in his Preface to give his own favourable Judgement of his Performance, of the Plainness of his Stile and Thought, the Linking of his Arguments and so on. And I think it cannot be amiss to give mine too, before I enter on the Book itself. Besides the ill Nature (already noticed) which bewrays it itself almost in every Page, and is sometimes continued through many, without so much as one Ray of Truth to qualify it. Besides this, I say, his Book bears Three other Characters, none of the most lovely indeed yet too Remarkable to escape Notice. I mean, Vanity, Dogmaticalness and Prophaness.

1. Vanity. With a very distinguishing Air he assures the Reader that he meant something else by the length of his Narrative than to add to the Number of his Pages. This was so necessary an Innuendo, so pretty a Phrase, that he thought fit to repeat it again in his own Favours p. 79. He had before told, in his printed Sermon on Liturgy, That his Genius and the Course of his Studies had habituated him to some Application of Thought. This was of so great Moment to be known, perhaps so hard to be gathered from his Writeings, that he now tells it over again in his Apology p. 159. Again p. 199 he dispenses with himself from writing a Lecture on the Animal Economy and accounting Mechanically for all the Phenomena of the Presbyterian Devotion, because he wants Leisur. No doubt. Yet some People think it had been not only as Modest, but as True an Excuse to have said he wanted Ability. In the mean Time

---

† Preface p. 1.
he is not so just as to own that what he has already advanced on
that Head he owes to Dr. Scot in his Sermon on Bodily Exercise from
1 Tim. 4. 8. and other Places of his Works.

2. Dogmaticalness. He writes with the same Positive Air as if he
were infallible. Every thing adduced on the Presbyterian Side is
with him Weakness, Prejudice, an Argument of a Desperate Cause and
the like. What he himself advances, is put beyond all Doubt, and
he hopes Every discerning and unprejudiced Reader will take the Hint, and
be convinced as well as he. Nay it shall be an Impeachment of the Divine
Wisdom to think differently from him. Nay our Lord himself behaved
to do according to Mr. Rhind's Dictates. Repeated Instances of this
Presumption we shall meet with afterwards. The most Learned of
the Arminian Side in the Church of England have owned, that the
Calvinists have to say for their Opinions on the Controverted Points,
what is not to be easily answered. But there is nothing too hard for
Mr. Rhind. Conditional Decrees, Freewill, the Apostacy of the Saints,
Universal Redemption, Universal Grace are all as clear to him as Self-
evident Propositions. Nay, so strong has his Fancy wrought; that,
as if he had for ever decided the Episcopal, Arminian, and Liturgical
Controversies, He concludes his Book in the Mathematical Stile with
a Q. E. D.

3. Profaneness. He sets himself industriously from pag. 189. to pag.
207. to put the most sacred Things in the most Burlesque Air possible.
The Presbyterians, faith he, pag. 200, tell a long but senseless story of the
Manner of Gods dealing with the Souls of his Elect, how the Work of Grace
is carried on there, and how their Regeneration is compleated.-- 'Tis true,
the Presbyterians do talk of these Things; but how long and senseless
forever the Story is, the Substance of it is what every good Man feels;
'Tis what the Spirit of God works; 'Tis a Story which the Church
of England Divines, the most judicious of them (i), Bishops too a-
mong the Rest, have told a thousand times over, and some of them
very lately (k). I am not to repeat the rest of his impious Stuff vomit-
ed out on that Head; once printing it was too much. I only wish
that our Prelack Writers, tho' they don't regard Man, yet would

Edward. &c.
at least fear God. For I suppose that no Man that reads the latter Part of Mr. Rhind's Book will stick to acknowledge that Lucian; Celsus, Varinia, Spinosa, Blount, may be reckoned modest Christians in Comparison of him.

III. Towards the End of the Preface, Mr. Rhind, apprehending someone or other might essay to disprove his Apology, thinks fit to bespeak civil Usage for himself; with Certification, that in Case he is not thus used, He will expose the Presbyterians yet more fully to the World. Were I of his Council, I wou'd advise him, ere he proceed further, once to prove the Characters whereby he has already attempted to expose them, lest he establish a Character upon himself and the Party He serves that will be none of the most honourable. Not let him fear it will be reckoned Pedantry to studd his Margin with Vouchers: For I can assure him, the World is now so much Infidel, Whigs especially, as not much to regard Assertion without Probation. If the Presbyterians are such as he has represented them, he cannot expect civil Usage from them. And if they are not such, he may be sensible he has not deserved it. However, to make him easy, I shall promise him all fair Quarter, and resent his Invectives no otherwise than by Neglect: Or if I chance at any Time to draw his Picture, it shall be with Canvas and Colours of his own furnishing.

IV. I am now to enter on the Book itself. I have heard it both from Prelates and Presbyterians, that it was not done by Mr. Rhind himself, but that his Separation having given the Occasion, a better Hand than his did the Work, and borrowed his Name to it. The Prelates possibly give out this to gain the greater Reputation to the Performance. But is it, 'tis a very mean Politick: For, by how much it magnifies the Book, it disgraces the Man, and at once lessens their own Trophy and the Presbyterian's Loss. The Presbyterians found on this, that while he attended his Studies among them, tho' his Zeal against the Prelats was flaming high, yet his other Accomplishments did not seem proportional. In a Word, That he did not make such a Figure as promised an Author. But this Conjecture also is too weak. For Years and Application do oftentimes make surprizing Changes on Young Persons. I do indeed believe that the Book was written at the Desire, and published upon the Approbation of the Leaders
Leaders of the Party. But I as firmly believe Mr. Rhind to be the true Father; and seeing he owns the Book and none else claims it, I can see no Reason why any Body should believe otherwise. I am so much convinced it is his, that I take the whole Book to be pieced up of Sermons, he had preached at several Occasions, or at least of large Shreds of them artfully tacked together. Some such Sermons were necessary to ingratiate him with his new Masters, his harangueing Way seems rather adapted for Sermons (according to the Episcopal Way of Sermonizing) than for a Dispute. And which confirms all, I find a good Part of his Sermon upon Liturgie, which he preached and printed in the Year 1711 engrossed verbatim into his Apology, tho' he has not acquainted his Reader therewith.

Sect. III.

Containing Remarks on Mr. Rhinds Narrative of the Manner how He separated from the Presbyterian Party. From P. 1. to P. 29.

The Sum of his Narrative is, That he was educated Presbyterian, turned Sceptick upon Choice, that he might find out the Truth; the Result of which was that he separated upon Conviction. He has indeed gone far to scarce one from Quarrelling the Account he has given, by promising p. 6. to deliver the same with as much Sincerity as shall be these Words with which he hopes to commend his Soul at last to God. And yet I must needs declare; I do not find My Self obliged even in Charity, much less in Justice to believe it. I cannot help thinking it is a Piece of Poesie rather than History, a handsome Fiction of the Method he thinks he ought to have taken, rather than a real Account of what in Fact he did take. I am aware how hardly this is my Judgement may be construed of. But I crave to be heard, and then let the Reader give Sentence.

By Mr. Rhind's own Account p. 6. He was educated Presbyterian.
When he had run through the ordinary Course of the Languages and Philosophy and commenced Master of Arts, He applied himself, to the Study of Divinity. After several Years Attendance on that, he went home to his own Country the Shire of Roñis to undergo Trials in Order to be licensed a Preacher.

All this while he was so far from being suspected to incline to Prelacy, that he received particular Favours from the Presbyterians, as he himself owns p. 7. And as he was not suspected, so indeed there was no apparent Reason why he should: For he owns p. 8. not only that he was really Presbyterian in his Judgment, but that he was a Zealot in that Way.

By all this Account we find him at least 21 Years of Age Complete: For no sooner do the Presbyterians admit Men to be Preachers, or enter Them on Trials for that End. And yet all this Time he had not entertain'd a Thought of Separating; nay he had not brought his Mind to a Suspence or Equilibrium about the Controversy: For, how could he essay to Commence Preacher amongst the Presbyterians, while he was undetermined to the one Side or the other?

Again he tells us p. 152 that he was but 22 Years among the Presbyterians. There is then but one Year left for doing all these Things, and making all these Enquiries he mentions in his Narrative, and at last determining himself. But if he did 'em all in one Year, I dare be bold to pronounce it was a Miracle: Being well assured it would have employed any ordinary Man seven. A short abstract of his Narrative will sufficiently demonstrate this.

1. When the Luckie Minute was come that was to give a Beginning to his Conversion, he conceived a very just Suspicion that the many Opinions, wherewith he found his Mind crowded, were not all either well come by or right founded. From this he concluded, that therefore it was reasonable if not necessary to examine and bring them to the Test. But in order to this Prejudices were to be shaken off. p. 9. 10. Every Body that has a competent Knowledge of himself will allow that this was not to be done without Time.

2. Thus prepared, He made the first Experiment in some Philosophical Points. And, after a most Impartial and Accurat Examination
nation found, That what formerly he had admitted upon a suppos’d scientifick Evidence was in it self absolutely False p. 11. Every one will own that this was not to be done at a Start.

3. Thence he proceeded to try whether his Religious Opinions were not as ill founded as his Philosophical ones. For that End he threw himself into a State of absolute Scepticism, and found that he had yeilded too Implicite an Assent to them. p. 12. Supposing this had been Lawfull, yet, I hope, it will be granted it was not the Work of a Day.

4. After all this Labour to unhinge himself, he next began to search where he might fix. To that Purpose he entered upon the most Impartial and Accurat Examination of the Essential Articles of Religion he was able to make; and ceased not till he was rationally per¯swaded about the Truth of a Natural Religion. p. 13. This, considering how many fine Books have been writ on that Subject, and how many shrewd Things have been advanced against it by such as are called the Wits of the World, and, which Mr. Rhind’s curious Genius would undoubtedly engage him to peruse, wou’d be sufficient to exercise him a very considerable Time.

5. He next carried his Enquiries to revealed Religion; and examin’d the necessity of Revelation, the certainty of that which is owned as such by Christians, in a Word the Truth of the Christian Religion, and the Divinity of the Holy Scriptures. Ibid. What a large Subject of Disquisition this is, and how much Time it wou’d require may be easily conjectured.

6. When he had got himself convinced of the Truth of the Christian Religion, his Labour was but beginning: For Christians being multiplied into so many Sects, which of them could he believe in the Right, when each of them pretended to be so? He resolvd then only to examine the Pretensions of the most considerable Parties viz. The Roman Catholicks and Protestants. For that End he laid aside all Prejudices and seriously examin’d all that is commonly adduced for or against the Roman Catholick Way. p. 14. 15. Now, who knows not, that the Popish Controversies are so very large a Field, as to require several years Travel to get through them to Purposo? 

7. He parted Ways with this Intallable Church; though upon a very
very small Quarrel, as we shall hear afterward. But then he found the Protestants canton’d into to many Parties, that he was in a great Quandary where to find rest for the Sole of his Foot. Wherefore, to shorten his Work, he resolved to confine his Examination to the Episcopal and Presbyterian Persuasions. And here it cost him both Time and Pains to divest himself of his Preposessions in favours of Presbytery, and to shake of the Prejudices he had contracted or been educate in against Episcopacy, and to fortifie his Soul against the Tentations of Persecution and Want in Case he were determined to the Episcopal Side. p. 16—20.

This being done he entered upon a very huge Task.

1. He did read the Old and New Testament all over p. 20.
Now though a Shift may be made to get through that Book in a short Time, yet it is a large one, and when one applys himself to read it with a View to be determined by it in controverted Points, which was Mr. Rhind’s Cafe, He’ll find it a considerable Labour.

2. After the Bible, he engaged himself in reading the Works of the Fathers, especially those of the three first Ages. In which Course of reading he narrowly observed whatever could serve to determin the Controversies in Hand. p. 21. 22. This was a yet larger task than the Former; for tho’ he had never gone beyond the third Age; yet, to get through the Works of Clemens Romanus, Barnabas, Ignatius, Polycarp, Hermas, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tatianus, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Minatius Felix, Origen, Cyprian, Arnobius, Lactantius, &c. To get through all these I say, with the Histories relateing to their Times, was Sufficient to employ one a longer Time than Mr. Rhind’s Account can well admit of.

3. And yet he was not near an End of his Toil: For being curious to know whatever was written on the Head of Government, he read the Controversists of both sides on all the Subjects in Debate. In which, he declares, He was so scrupulously exact that he does not remember any Author of any Name whom he did not peruse except Salmasius alone, which he could not come by. p. 22—25. This was to be diligent in good Earnelt: For, to read on the Episcopal Side Andrews, Bancroft, Bilson, Burges, Chil-
lingworth, Dounham, Dodwell, Hooker, Hall, Heylin, Hammond, Honneyman, Maurice, Monro, Saravia, Sage, Scot, Sutlivius, Tilen. On the Presbyterian Side Beza, Bain, Bucer, Blondel, Bailie, Cartwright, Calderwood, Clarkson, Gillispie, Forrester, Jameson, Rutherfoord, Rule, with a long et cetera on both sides, to read all these Authors, I say, and to read them so as duly to weigh the Arguments, Objections, Answers, Exceptions and Replies was a Herculean Labour. But where is there Time for it by Mr. Rhind's Account? And yet he had not done with it. For

4. As to the other Controversies that relate to Doctrines, Worship &c. He consulted the respective Authors pro and con. p. 26. That is to say, he studied the Arminian and Liturgical Controversies, which, Every one knows, require both much Time and great Application. Yet after all this he was only shocked, not absolutely determin'd. For

5. To the Study of Books he added Conversation with learned Men, he collected his Observations on the Spirit and Principles of the Party of which he had so long been; and took Time to inform himself about what he did not know of the other. And narrowly observed how the Spirit and Principles of both discovered themselves by overt Acts. All this he did, not once but many Times, and after all this he had his Soul to work up to a due Seriousness and Intention of Thought; and then once more recollected what he had learned from Men, Books, or his own Experience for or against either Principle or Party. Not till this was done, and the Aid and Direction of God invoked, was he determin'd in his Judgment. And even when he was determin'd, Bashfullness or Fear restrained Him, till at last a forcible Conviction and the severe Remonstrances of his Conscience obliged him publicly to declare himself p. 26--29.

This is his Account, but now, how a Man could do all this within the Space of 22 Years, when he had not so much as a Thought of doing any Thing of it at an Age wherein he was capable to be a Preacher, which we cannot suppose earlier than 21; that is, in a Word, how Mr. Rhind could do that in one Year, which would have kept any ordinary Man constantly busy Seven Years, He has yet to account for to the World. And till it be done, he must excuse his Readers, Me at least, from believing the Sincerity of his Narrative;
notwithstanding the Solemnity of his Assueration. And so I pro-
ceed in my Remarks.

II. Tho' Mr. Rhind has told us p. 6. That he owns his Birth to Pres-
byterian Parents, yet he has conceal'd his having been baptized by a
Presbyterian Minister. Did it look like Sincerity to dissemble that
which was of so great Moment to be known? I seriously declare I
do not intend Banter or Raillery by this particular; but touch upon
it, because, according to Mr. Rhind's Principles, it is of the last Con-
sequence not only to himself but possibly to many others. He is in a
much worse Condition than if he had been baptized by a mere Lay-
man or Midwife in the Church of England: For, tho' Baptism as
dispens'd by them is irregular, yet being Christians, within the
Church, and having at least the Connivance of the Bishop, it is not
Invalid and therefore is not repeated, ordinarily at least. But Pres-
byterian Ministers are no Christians. They are by his scheme, not
only without the Church, but Enemies to it. Their Baptism then is
null and can have no Effect, even tho' the Person is afterwards
confirmed by the Bishop: For, what is in its own Nature null can
never be made valid by a Posterior Deed: And therefore, as Dr.
Hicks informs us (1) the Church has provided the Office for the
Baptism of those of riper Years, which was not Originally in the Liturgy,
on Purpose to answer the Case of Persons in such Circumstances.
This must needs affect Mr. Rhind very heavily: For, according to
his own Principles concerning Baptism *, He is no Christian, is
without Grace, incapable of Salvation, can neither be Priest nor Dea-
con, consequently the Baptism dispensed by him to others is Null;
Consequently, by his Principles, they must all be Damned if Extra-
ordinary Mercy interpose not. I could not think of all this without
Horror, and therefore am in Pain till I hear how he extricates him-
sself. By all I can apprehend there is but one Way to save him and
prevent further Mischief, viz. to get Episcopal Baptism. If he is not
convinced of the Necessity of this by what I have said, I recommend
to him to read Mr. Laurence's late Book of the Invalidity of Lay-Bap-
tism, where he may have all Objections answered, and both Argu-
ments and an Example to perswade him...

III.

III. Mr. Rhind still professes that, while he was among the Presbyterians, he was without the Church and incapable of Salvation. One would think therefore, that he should have ascribed to God the first Hint was given him to make his Escape out of so dangerous a State. Even the Church of England Divines themselves who have gone off the Calvinian Scheme do yet acknowledge a preventing Grace. But does Mr. Rhind this? No. He ascribes it to himself and his own Thought; and that, as I take Him, under a favourable Planetary Aspect. When I had arrived, faith he p. 9. at a competent Age, in some lucky minute, my Thoughts suggested to me the reasonableness of my enquiring into my Opinions about Things. "God is not brought into the Account here, Nay he has not so much as a Hint of addressing him by Prayer, till he had DETERMIN'D himself as to Natural Religion, till he had got himself persuaded of the Truth of the Christian Religion, and till he had resolved himself against the Romish. After all this, and no sooner, did he address the God of all Truth p. 19. This Conduct of his was design'd and founded upon two Reasons which the Reader may weigh at his Pleasure. First, He is so much an Enemy to Enthusiasm, that he did not think it would become him to impute any Motion in his Soul to the Spirit of God: For the Manner of God's Dealing with the Souls of his Elect is but a senseless Story, and it was below his Philosophical Genius to ascribe that to a Divine Efficiency which might otherwise be accounted for. Secondly, His Story would not have told right, if he should have owned God. For he was resolved to throw himself into a State of Scepticism, wherein he was to suspend the Belief of the Being of a God. And in that State it had been very unaccountable to pray to him: For every one that comes to God, must believe that he is. It will therefore be very necessary that Mr. Rhind in his next explain a little upon the lucky Minute, because People are much in the Dark about it.

IV. Mr. Rhind p. 7. makes Mention in general of his Obligations to the Presbyterians. But did he intend thereby to testify his Gratitude? No. The whole Strain of his Book is Evidence that he had left all Impressions of that; but he does it, that he may raise his own Character, by shewing, against how great Tentations to the contrary he had separate from Them, and upon what Disinterested Views he had come over to the Episcopal Side. This is plain from his own Words
Words p. 8. ' And if now that I am none of theirs; and if after having received so many Discourtesies from them, I do still entertain a gratefull Resentment of their Favours, Imagine how deep the Impression must have been, and how much I would be prejudi- cate in Their behalf, when actually allowed very liberal Ex- pressions of Their Favour and Esteem———. I cannot perswade My Self that such Artifice would become a Man recommending His Soul to God in His last Minutes.

V. I said before That He parted Ways with the Church of Rome upon a very slender Quarrel. What was it? Take it in His own Words p. 15. ' Though I had been convinced of the Truth of all the Articles of Pope Pius's Creed, (which you may think, would argue a strong Faith, & a great Deal of Violence offered to my Reason) yet could I never be perswaded, That the Damning of all who did not believe as I did, should be a Condition of My Salvation. In a word, the absq; qua Fide, &c which They had made a Term of Communion and an Article of Their Faith, was so choaking that it would not believe for Me: And as the Disbelief of this one Article, would hinder Their receiving Me, into Their Communion; So indeed, this alone abundantly con- vinced Me, that I should never enter into it? For understanding this, the Reader must know, that Pope Pius's Creed, after a Re- hearfal of the several Articles, hath this affixed, and the same true Catholick Faith, WIHOUT WHICH NO MAN CAN BE SA- VED—— I the same N do vow and swear. This damning Clause was the Quarrel; but I affirm that, supposeing he had been convinced of the Truth of all the other Articles, it was no good one; because he has already done the same. The Church of England, to which Mr. Rhind has join’d himself, hath engrossed the Athanasian Creed in her Liturgy: And yet that Creed has at least two such damning Clauses, and in harder Words too; one in the Beginning. ' Who- ever will be saved, before all Things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith, which Faith except every one do keep Holy and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. ' Another at the End. This is the Catholick Faith, which except a Man believe faithfully he cannot be saved.

Why then did He refuse the Roman Catholick Communion, for
that which he has approved of in the Church of England Communion? I cannot say it was unwisely done: For, the smaller the Quarrel was, the easier may the Reconciliation be.

VI. While Mr. Rhind is giving an Account of his own Study of the Fathers, he falls heavily p. 21 upon the Presbyterians for their want of Respect to them. But has he adduced in all his Book one Instance from the Writings of the Presbyterians to prove his Charge? Not one. What meant he then? Why he knew that was a Common-place for declaiming on among his Party, and it had been a Pity to miss it. No other Proof has he for his Charge, unless you'll be so kind as to take his own Assertions. They who had the Directions of my Studies, faith he, never recommended to me the reading so much as of one Father. No wonder truly, it was soon enough to begin the Study of the Fathers at the Age of 22. Most part of young Men are not sooner Ripe for it; and at that Age Mr. Rhind separated. Bishop Burnet is thought to have tolerable good Skill in training young Theologues, now hear him (m). It may seem strange, that in this whole Direction, I have said nothing concerning the Study of the Fathers or Church History. But I said at first, That a great Distinction was to be made between what was necessary to prepare a Man to be a Priest, and what was Necessary to make him a compleat and learned Divine. The knowledge of these Things is necessary to the latter, though they do not seem so necessary for the former: There are many Things to be left to the Prosecution of a Divines Study, that therefore are not mentioned here, without any design to dispa-rage that sort of Learning. Thus He. But, proceeds Mr. Rhind, I frequently heard them talk contemptibly of them and their Works, excepting still St. Augustines Books of Predestination and Grace. That excellent Person Mr. George Meldrum, late Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh was he who had the Direction of Mr. Rhind's Studies. If He talked contemptibly of the Fathers, I can lay from my own personal Knowledge of Him, to be confirmed by many Thousands yet alive; that it was what he hardly ever did of any Body else. Mr. Rhind then must prove this ere he is Believed.

But
But while he charges the Presbyterians so fiercely on this Head, why does he himself give such a Contemptible Hint of Augustin? Why p. 14 talks he so contemptibily of Jerom That he contradict’s himself &c? Why, Augustin was for the Doctrines of Predestination and Grace, and Jerom for Presbytery, both which are Mr. Rhind’s Aversion; yet one would think he should not deny that Freedom to Presbyterians which he takes to himself. The Presbyterians willingly acknowledge that the Fathers have done excellent Things; yet they don’t believe They were infallible. They stick not to say that the Fathers were subject to the same Infirmities with other Men, and their Works as full of gross Escapes as these of latter Authors, and that they wrote (as themselves acknowledge) crudely and loosely till Heresies and Schisms arising taught them more Correctness. And do not the Church of England Divines talk as contemptibly of them as all this, or whatever else Presbyterians have said of them can amount to? Yes. Never was there a Set of Writers in the World that treated the Fathers more homely and coarsely than they do. The only Difference is, that they fall into this Strain, when they find the Fathers to be against Them. But then when they either are On, or can be screwed over to their own Side, Oh then! the Fathers are all Oracles, and ’tis the Sin of Cham to open a Mouth against Them. Need I cite Instances to prove all this? No. ’Tis clear to every one that’s acquaint with their Writeings, yet I shall give one or two for fatisfieing the Reader. One of Mr. Rhind’s learned Brethren of the Clergy † has lately appeared very loudly in Defence of the Book about Antichrist ascribed to Hippolitus, though no Man that had not quite prostitute His Sense would have done it. He has been told how Coke, Fulk, Whitaker three famous Divines of the Church of England have disparaged it, and how Monsieur le Fevre that eminent Critick hath made a Jest of it, and how, supposeing it were, what he would have it to be, it yet makes nothing for his Purpose. Yet he, like a true Teague, is resolved to keep his Text, whatever he say on it. To put him in Humour then, after so much Wrath, it shall be allowed that Hippolitus’s Book is Genuine. Now hear

† Mr. Calder.
with what profound Respect Jewell Bishop of Salisbury treats (n) the Reverend Father and his Work. 'Tis a very little Book, of small Price and as small Credit.-- It appeareth it was some simple Man that wrote the Book, both for the Phrases of his Speech in the Greek Tongue, which commonly are very Childish, and also for the Truth and Weight of the Matter. He beginneth the first Sentence of his Book with Enim which a very Child would scarcely do. After a Recital of several of his Blunders he adds. And this he faith without either Warrant of the Scriptures, or Authority of the Church--He alledged the Apocalypse of S. John in the stead of Daniel, which is a Token of great Ignorance or of marvellous Oblivion. Say now, what Discipline a Presbyterian had deserved, had he treated so worthy a Father so familiarly. Take another Instance. Bishop Whitgift (o) runs a Comparison twixt the Fathers and the English Bishops in Truth of Doctrine, Honesty of Life, and Right use of External Things, and very mannerly gives the Preference to himself and his Colleagues in all the three. If these Instances are not sufficient, Mr. Rhind may have five hundred more upon demand, and perhaps some of them ere we have done *. To put an End for ever to this Topick of declaiming against the Presbyterians, I here challange the Episcopalians to make a Collection of all the Contemptible Things the Presbyterians have written of the Fathers. And if I do not make as large a Collection of as Contemptible Things that the Episcopal Authors have written of them, it shall be owned they have Reason for their Declamations. If they refuse this, they must give us a Reason why they may make bold with the Fathers, and the Presbyterians not. Have Prelatifs only the Privilege of railing at 'em?

VII. Mr. Rhind gives an ample enough Commendation to the Writers of his, own Way. I found them all, faith he, p. 23. to be Men of Discretion and Sense, so that should I name all whom I thought to have acted their Part handsomely, I should have none unnamed. Is this the Sincerity he promised? Could he find never one senseless Author on the Episcopal Side? Why certainly he has looked on them with a Lover's Eye; for who is there that knows not, that the Confusion of Languages
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Languages at Babel was never greater than is among the Episcopal Writers? Where shall we find any two of them that go entirely upon the same Scheme? Does not every Body know how they mutually reject each other's Arguments? Should I instance any of their Writers whom I judge to have performed but so and so, I know I would be declined as a partial Judge; but let us hear one of Themelves giving the Character of his Fellows that went before him. Mr. Thomas Edwards afferts (p) of them, That as to their Proofs out of Scripture, They understood not what they said, nor whereof they affirmed. And in a later Book (q) He is so far from repenting of these hard Words, that he hopes every Body will grant he had reason for Them. And he would not have this meant of one or two only of his Fellow Writers, but of the whole Bulk of them. And therefore he pulls down the whole Frame of Episcopacy to build it after his own new and better Fashion. Now either M. Edwards has not acted his part handsomely, or none of the rest have: For it is sure but a sorry Way of acting, when one knows not what he says, or whereof he affirms.

VIII. Of all the Episcopal Authors Mr. Rhind gives the Preference to M. Dodwell and M. Sage. To the first particularly for his Book of Schism, and that of the One Priesthood and one Altar; and to the latter for his Principles of the Cyprianick Age and the Vindication thereof.

That M. Dodwell was a Man of vast Reading and Abstract Life every one must acknowledge; but his Books are of a most pernicious Tendency, I am well persuaded, no one ought to deny. For, in Order to make Room for planting Prelacy; He hath, so far as his Principles prevail, not only destroyed Charity, but grubbed up the very Roots of Christianity, yea of Natural Religion. Whether this be an unjust Censure, I refer it to the Reader upon hearing of the following Account.

His Book against Schism he published in the Year 1679 When the Civil Government did not want to have a bad Opinion of the Nonconformists. Therein he attempts to prove not only that the Separatists from Episcopal Government are Schismatics, but (r) That no Prayers made by themselves, nor by others for them can find Acceptance with God, except such Prayers as are put up for their Conversion.

version from the Schism, and that their Separation is the Sin unto Death spoken of by S. John i Ep. chap. 5. ver. 16. That, (s) that dreadful Text Heb. 6. 4, 5, 6. It is impossible for those that were once enlightened --- is applicable to them. That (t) they are guilty of the same Crime, and as real Enemies to Christ as those who in Terms professed him to be an Imposter. That (u) such Separation is a Sin against the Holy Ghost, and (x) an Interpreta-
tive disowning Christ for our Master. Nay (y) that it is as Criminal as the Sin of the Angells, and the Old World, and the Sodomites, and the Israelites in the Wilderness. In a Word, That nothing is effectual to Salvation without being in the Episcopal Communion. I pose now Mr. Rhind to find any thing more impious and scandalous in Spinoza's Book, to which, he saies, the Presbyterians compare M. Dodwell's.

This, one would have thought, was enough for one Man in his whole Life. But M. Dodwell did not think so. The Parliament of England, considering the great Danger the Nation was in from Pope-ry; saw it was necessary to have better Thoughts of the Disenters, and to give them more Countenance than would have followed upon his Principles. And therefore shortly after the publishing of his Book; viz. upon the tenth of January 1680 the Commons declared by their Vote nemine contradicente. ' It is the Opinion of this House that ' the Prosecution of Protestant Dissenters upon the Penal Laws is at ' this Time grievous to the Subject, a weakening the Protestant In-' tereft, an Encouragement to Popery, and dangerous to the Peace ' of the Kingdom. This was plainly to blast all Hopes of the Fruits ' might otherwise have been expected from M. Dodwell's Book. Where-' fore he makes a second Ataque, and in the Year 1683 published his ' Book of the One Priesthood, one Altar, wherein he, over again attemp-' ted to prove the Nonconformists Schismaticks, and imagining he had ' done it, inferrd (z) that they can lay no Claim to the One Altar ' nor to the One Priesthood, to the Favor of God here, nor the Enjoy-' ment of him hereafter.

It was no Wonder he was thus severe upon the Dissenters: For he proceeded, and... made the Church of England her self upon the Re-
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volution Establishment Schismatical, and in the Year 1704 publish-
ed his Latin Book entitled Parojesis ad exter nos de nupero Schismate
Anglicano to advertise Forreigners thereof. What, you'll say, was his
Quarrel with the Revolution Church of England? Was it her Injuries
to the late K. James? No. Was it her renouncing the Doctrines of
Passive Obedience and Non-Resist ance on any Pretence whatsoever?
No. Was it the scandalous new Prayers she had put into the Liturg-
ity? No. All these Things, he expressly tells us p. 3. He, with those
of his Principles, made a Shift to bear with; perhaps so much the
more easily that, as the Writer of his Life tells us, he had been pro-
claimed a Rebel for not coming in and taking Part with the Forces
of the said K. James when they endeavoured to keep Possession of
Ireland in the Year 1689. What was it then disbanded him? Why the
Bishops Mitre was touched, and that was of more Consideration than
the Kings Crown. The Non-juring Bishops were dispossessed; their
vacant Sees, after much Patience, filled with as good Men as them-
selves. That was never to be digested, and therefore he declared
the Establishment a Schism.

This was a pretty high Flight, and yet he was not at his Pitch.
In the Year 1706 he published his Epistolary Discourse, proving from
the Scriptures and First Fathers, That the Soul is a Principle naturally mor-
tal, wherein is proved, that none have the Power of giving the Divine im-
mortalizing Spirit, since the Apostles, but only the Bishops. Here was a
very New and surprizing Scene opened. The Heathens that never
heard of Christ were made happy by it. The worst they had to fear
was, that their Souls should vanish into thin Air. But then sad was
the Case of all Separatists from the Episcopal Communion: For though
their Souls were neither by Nature Immortal, nor Immortalized by
Episcopal Baptism; yet, he found a Cue to have them Immortalized actu-
ally by the Pleasure of God to Punishment. Was ever such horrid Do-
ctrine heard of among Christians? However, that Book, though per-
haps the very worst ever saw the Light, had, by accident, one very
good Effect. For, such as were before in Danger of being implicitly
carried into his Principles by the Fame of his Learning; when they
saw that he would force even the Scriptures and Fathers to vouch for
the Natural Mortality of the Soul, very justly presumed, that his Rea-
onings from them in his other Books were to be suspected.
Remarks on  

Chap. I:

'Tis now worth the while to see how Mr. Rhind refines on this.

'Tis true, faith he p. 24. M. Dodwell seemed to have given his Enemies a Handle against him, by the uncouth Thoughts which he vented in his Book of the Soul, but this he did in a manner so learned, & so far above the Comprehension of Ordinary Readers, that, allowing his Opinion to have been Erroneous, yet would not many be in Hazard of being perverted by it. Withall, I considered that my then Search was not to be employed about that Supposed Singular Opinion of his; for what I was then Desirous to know, was only, whether his Arguments for Episcopacy were forcible or not.

Here is a Text worth the commenting on. Did M. Dodwell seem only, did he not really give a handle not only to his Enemies but to all the World that had any Regard for Religion? But why does M. Rhind call it his Book of the Soul? Why does he not call it his Book for Episcopacy? Episcopacy was the Conclusion intended, the Mortality of the Soul only a Medium for enforcing it. Why does he say it was writ above the Comprehension of ordinary Readers? Did he not write it in English? And is not this a tolerable Presumption that he design’d he should be understood? Is not the Doctrine, to wit, the Mortality of the Soul, so Plain that every Plowman may understand it. But M. Rhind is right: For the Arguments for proving this Doctrine are above the Comprehension not only of ordinary Readers but of extraordinary too, even of all understanding. This I am sure of, that the Floribity of the Wills of Dead Souls (a), separate Souls receiving Water Baptism (b) and the like, are Notions as much above the Capacities of Presbyterians as Jacob Behmen’s Lucubrations are. I hope many are not in hazard of being perverted by it. But M. Rhind himself is so unhappy as to be one, for it is not really but a Supposed Singular Opinion, he will not positivly say it is Erroneous, but allowing it to be so, it is not dangerous because of its Obscurity. But how in all the World could he suffer these Words to drop from him, 'That his search was not to be employed about that Singular Opinion of M. Dodwell’s, but to know whether his Arguments for Episcopacy were forcible or not: Is not the natural Mortality of the Soul,
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Soul, and its being immortalized by Episcopal Baptism, or in defect of it, by the Pleasure of God to Punishment, one of his Arguments for Episcopacy? What meant Mr. Rhind by such a Jugle, thinks he M. Dodwell's Book is not extant, or that all the World is turned quite Senseless and wants Eyes to read it? I cannot think that Mr. Rhind himself upon a Review will say, That he has used the Sincerity that would become an expiring Soul.

But to go on with the History of M. Dodwell. As he had proved the Dissenters and Low-Church Schismatics, so the Nonjuring High Church Tories, who continued the Separation after the Death of the deprived Bishops, must, in their Turn, be declared Schismatics too. For this Purpose he published a Book, the last he wrote, entitled, The Case in View, now in Fact, proving, that the Continuance of a separated Communion without Substitutes, in any of the late invalidly deprived 'Sees, since the Death of William Lord Bishop of Norwich, is Schismatical. With an Appendix proving, That our late invalidly deprived Fathers had no Right to substitute Successors, who might legitimate the Separation, after that the Schism had been concluded by the Decease of the last Survivor of those same Fathers. Thus, I think, there were very few in England, Episcopal or Dissenter, of High Church or Low Church, that were not, successively at least, Schismaticks by M. Dodwell's Account. Plainly, his Head was turned with immoderate Zeal, and therefore Schism, Schism, was his everlasting Clack. Mr. Rhind indeed has given p. 25 another Character of him. viz. 'That he has stated the Controversy fairly, that his Authorities are pertinent and justly allledged, and that his Deductions from them and all his other Reasonings do proceed in a Mathematical Chain. This Character I shall, ad hominem, allow: For, whenever I shall, find M. Dodwell's and M. Rhind's Reasonings quite contrary; which I hope not seldom to find in the following Sheets, it will necessary follow that Mr. Rhind is fully answered, a Mathematical Chain being more Invulnerable than an Adamantine one. So much for M. Dodwell.

As for M. Sage, our Apologist's other Celebrated Author, all he saies of him is, 'And in Truth, faith be p. 25, 'tis as much as can be said of any Man, That he thought he pursued the Argument in the same Manner with M. Dodwell and improved upon it.
Of this Character the Panegyrical Part is Hyperbolical, the Historical Part false. First, I say, the Panegyrical Part viz. That it is as much as can be said of any Man, is Hyperbolical. No Man that is not blindly Partial will make him a Standard. 'Tis true he was Master of several good Qualities, of a good Capacity and great Application; but the Revolution had foured his Temper, which carried him out often to transgress the Rules of Religion as well as Decency; witness his Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, particularly his long Preface prefixed to it, upon the Account of which, I acknowledge, he deserves the Character of an Incomparable Author: For, he has therein treated his Adversary after a Fashion, which, to say no worse of it, will not be easily paralleled. And which makes it so much the more intolerable is, that he did it upon some Points of History, in which his own Friends (c) have at last acknowledged he was mistaken. And how False and Weak his Historical Argueings were in the said Charter upon the Usage of the English Liturgy in Scotland has been sufficiently shown in the Country-man's Letter to the Curat on that Subject.

'Tis true there is lately published a Vindication of the Fundamental Charter in Opposition to the said Letter. But I hope, upon comparing the two, The Vindication will appear to be a very harmless Piece: For 1. Who is likely ever to be moved by an Author that tells, as that Vindicator does p. 165, 'That it is not Sufficient Proof, that a Thing is not because the Historians are silent about it, no, not suppose they should all contradict it. Has that Gentleman his History by Inspiration? No, but he would have us to Judge by Histories yet to be written, p. 166. p. 13. 2ly, Who will be moved by his Argueings on Buchanan, when, notwithstanding that Buchanan is acknowledged to be the sole Relater of what he Argues for, he yet saies, 'That Buchanan was doating when he wrote his History, if it came from his Hands, as we have it in all the Editions hitherto published p. 165. 3ly, Who that professes, as the Vindicator does p. 9. to write with all possible Candour would say with him p. 164. that Buchanan Contradicts himself about Arthur's Oven, when no Man ever dealt more candidly than

(c) Vindication of the Fundamental Charter. P. 79.
than Buchanan has done in that Matter, even though it was of no Consequence. He begins the Civil History of his Nation at the fourth Book; there, in the Reign of K. Donald I. He saies, 'That Work now called Arthur's Oven, some have falsly related to have been the Temple of Claudius Cesar.' We, so far as we can guess, believe it to have been the Temple of Terminus. You see he makes but a Guess of it. To the Civil History of his Nation he thought fit to prefix the Geography of it and an Account of its Antiquity; and there, like a most Candid Soul, he retracts his former Guess upon better Information, and in the first Book delivers himself thus. 'I indeed was once induced by a Conjecture (by this it appears, that the Civil History was written before the Geographical Part) to believe it to have been the Temple of Terminus, which (we have learned) used to be built Round and open above: But then he tells, that he was informed by creditable Persons that there were several other Buildings of the same Form in other Places of the Nation. This, faith he, forced me to suspend my Opinion---. Say now, good Reader, is there any Doating here in Buchanan, when he is so watchfull even over his Escapes in Guessings? Is there any contradiction here? Did not Augustine write two full Books of Retraetions, and one of them too of what he wrote when he was a Bishop? And does not every Man applaud his Ingenuity for doing so? Nay, has not M. Dodwell himself retraeted (d) even in point of History? And yet who blames him for it? 4thly, Who, to avoid the Force of Dr. Burnet now Bishop of Sarum his Testimony from the Pulpit before the House of Commons, concerning what he had seen, and Papers he had had in his Hands, would put off the Matter by telling, as the Vindicator does p. 36, that the Bishop is not Infallible, and that all he preached in 1688 was not Gospel, and that he sometimes preached Extempore? Was not this a most Bitter Way of giving him the Lye, and, which makes the Treatment still the more Rude, he at the same Time declares, that it were uncivil and uncharitable in him to Question the Doctor's Candour and Veracity. Is this the grave Vindicator! Is the World to far lost, as to take Slynness for Sincerity, and Affetation for

---

Remarks on

Chap. 1.

Gravity? 5thly, Who that reads the Dr's Sermon, knows his Character, or ever heard of his Concernment in the Project of Comprehension will allledge his Words to be Capable of any other Entendre than the Country-man has put on them? 6thly, Who would deny that the Dr's Testimony bears, That the Ceremonies 'tis narrowly of being thrown out by an Aff of the Convocation, when it was carried by the greatest Number of the Voices of the Members that were present in the lower House that they should be laid aside; And when the Bishops (who make the upper House) were the same Way affected, the Queen's Stiffness in maintaining them, faith the Dr, not flowing from their Counsels, but from disguised Papists; Will any Man, that designs not to trifle, deny that this was a narrow Miss? But the Vindicator overlooked the Bishops in the Dr's Testimony. 7thly, The Author of the Charter had affirmed that our Country-man Alys was a Member of the English Convocation. The Country-man had proved beyond Contradiction that Alys was not a Member. What fates the Vindicator to this? It was only an Impropriety of Speech in the Accurate Author. Every Man ought to delpair, after such an Answer, to convince the Vindicator that it is Light at mid-day. But the Answer is indeed as solid, as the Epithet of Accurate is Judiciously chosen in that Place.

But I acknowledge all this is a Digression from M. Rhind's Book. I have only adduced these Instances to convince the Reader that if the Country-man, who is my good Friend and next Neighbour, don't give himself the Trouble of making any Return to the said Vindication, 'tis plain it is, because it needs none. The reading over his Letter once more after the Vindication being at once an Easie and Sufficient Answer to it. I return then to Mr. Rhind.

In the second Place, his historical Part of M. Sage's Character viz. that he has pursued the Argument in the same Manner with M. Dodwell, is false. M. Dodwell in all his Books upon Church Government (e) affirms the Bishop's Sole Power, and though he is content to give a Consultory Power to the Presbyters, which every Christian Man and


[15, 16, 17]
and Woman has, it being lawfull to all or any of the People to say to Archippus, Take heed to the Ministry---, yet he peremptorily refuses them a Decretery Power. M. Sage on the other Hand not only denies the said Sole Power, but applys himself in his Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianick Age to disprove the Bishops claiming of it. Was this to pursue the Argument after the same Manner? That Excellent Person M. JAMESON wrote His Cyprianus Isotimus in Answer to the said Vindication. And answer it he did beyond Possibility of Reply. M. Sage Himself was abundantly Sensible of this, He lived half a Dozen Years after M. Jameson's Book was Published, but never essayed to make a Return. He could not but see how he had mistaken his Measures and prejudged the Cause. And therefore as he could not with any ground of Reason, so he would not, out of Love to the Cause, insist. And I doubt not but it was very heavy to his Spirit to Survive the Reputation of his principal Book; and to think that he should have wasted the precious Lamp of Life in so voluminous a Work, for proving that Bishops did not claim a Sole Power, when not only his learned Adversary had proved, beyond Contradiction, that they did so, but the most learned of his own Party allowed, that it was Their Right to claim it. So much for Mr. Rhind's Narrative.
CHAP. II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's first Reason for Separating from the Presbyterian Party viz That They are Schismatics in Point of Government, is Examined. From P. 29. to P. 119.

FOR Justifying this Reason of Separation Mr. Rhind uses the following Method. First. He lays down two Principles from which he subsumes some Corollaries. 2dly. He states the Debate, and 3dly advances his Arguments.

SECT. I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Principles and Corollaries P. 29, are examined.

His two Principles are. I. That the Church is but one. II That it is a Society distinct from and Independent upon the State.

From the first of these Principles he infers these two Corollaries. I That the ordinary Means of Salvation are confined to the Church. II. That whoever, are without (but more especially they who separate from its Communion) are out of the ordinary Way of Salvation.
Sect. I. Presbyterian Government.

From the Second of these Principles he infers these three Corollaries. I That the Church has distinct Laws, and a Government and Governours of its own which can serve all the Purposes of the Society. II That that which does properly denominate one a Member of the Church is the Acknowledgement of its Laws and Government, and a Submission to the Authority of its Governours: Nor is the owning any one of those enough without the other. III. That the Contempt either of its Laws or Lawfull Governours, requiring no Terms of Communion that are truly unfull, justly deprives one of the Priviledges of this as well as any other Society.

From all this he concludes p 30. 31: "That that Society which is not only Defective with respect to that Form of Government that obtain'd in the Days of Christ and his Apostles and downwards (which is undoubtedly the Rightfull one) but does likewise disown and oppose those who govern after that Manner, is without the Church by the third Corollary, and consequently out of the ordinary Road to Heaven according to the Second Corollary from the first Principle. And that the Presbyterians are thus Defective in, and disown and oppose that Government, he is, after stating the Debate, to make good by Arguments.

This is his Scheme, but notwithstanding its Mathematical Face; as it will not please the Presbyterians, so yet far less the Church of England which he has joined.

First, it will not please the Presbyterians, as he too confidently presumes. For, tho' they willingly admit his first Principle, That the Church is but one, and do firmly believe that there is but one Government by Divine Right viz. the Presbyterian, and zealously wish that it might obtain all the World over; yet by no Means will they asser that such as either oppose or want that Government are without the Church. The Government of many of the Protestant Churches in Germany is Superintendency, that of New England Independency, that of Old England Prelacy. The Presbyterians believe, They are each of them in an Error; the last especially in a Hugely great one; And yet they believe them all to be within the Church and capable of Salvation; if they are otherwise good Christians; And that, as an English Poet has it somewhere,
The God that pardons Sin will pardon Errors too.

They own the Road to Heaven is narrow, yet they don't believe it so narrow, but that they can charitably hope that one Company may walk to it with a Presbyterian Minister on their Head; and another ( tho' not in so straight a Line ) with a Bishop on theirs. 'Tis told of Mr. Rhind ( and he allows us p. 9. to represent him to have been a Presbyterian of the most rigid Kind ) that while he was studying Theology at Edinburgh among the Presbyterians, he made it a Question in a Society of his Fellow Students, Whether an Episcopal Minister dying in that Opinion cou'd be saved? I suppose he was the first Presbyterian ever started the Question, and possibly may be the last. But some Peoples Brains are figured for Bigotry, on whatever Side they are. Whether it be by Nature or Accident They are so, I refer it to such as have Skill in the Animal Economy.

Secondly, I say Mr. Rhind's Scheme will yet far less please the Church of England which he has joined; Which I shall make good in two particulars; when once I have premised, That by the Church of England I do not mean only this or the other particular Doctor, but that I mean her Articles, Homilies, Liturgy, Canons and such other publick Formula's.

First. Tho' the Church of England thinks Prelacy the best Government, yet she is very far from unchurching those that want it. In her Nineteenth Article she defines the visible Church of Christ to be ' a Congregation of faithful Men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's Ordinance, in all those things that of Necessity are requisite to the same? In her twenty third Article She declares, ' That those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent which be chosen and called to this Work by Men who have publick Authority given to them, in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's Vineyard? In neither of these Articles, tho' they were the only Place for doing it, is any one particular Form of Church-Government declared Necessary. Nay, the Articles are conceived in such general Words on Purpose, that they might not be thought to exclude other Churches that differ from them in point of Government. So faies
the Bishop of Sarum (f) whose Sufficiency to understand the Intent of the Articles was never doubted, and whose Concern for the Episcopal Cause in Reason cannot. 'And, adds he, wherever some hotter Spirits have thought of this, since that Time; Yet we are very sure, that not only those who penned the Articles, but the Body of this Church for above half an Age after, did notwithstanding those Irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches to be constituted, to be true Churches as to all the Essentials of a Church. And p. 260. Neither our Reformers nor their Successors for near eighty Years after those Articles were published, did ever question the Constitution of such Churches. And the Noble Historian Clarendon † who was abundantly zealous for the Church, represents it as a false Step in the Government of K. Charles I that the English Ambassador with his Retinue separated from the Protestant Church at Charenton contrary to former usage. Yet further, the Church of England was powerfully attacked by the Romanists in the Days of the late K. James; and upon the very same Scheme, too which Mr. Rhind hath advanced viz. Metaphysical Inferences from the Unity of the Church; from which they would needs conclude her to be Schismatical. The English Divines never made a more noble Appearance than on that Occasion. They engaged with the Romanists and defeat them to the Conviction of all the World, but then it was by Reasonings which quite overturn Mr. Rhind's Scheme. Dr. Sherlock first enters the Field, and with open Mouth declares (g) against the Unchurching Doctrine for the want of Episcopal Government. 'I am sure, faith he, that is not a safe 'Communion where there is not a Succession of Apostolical Doc- 'trine; but whether the Want of a Succession of Bishops, will in all Cases unchurch, will admit of a greater Dispute: I am 'sure a true Faith in Christ, with a true Gospel Conversation, 'will save Men; And some learned Romanists defend that old 'Definition of the Church, That it is Cæsus Fidelium, the Com- 'pany of the Faithfull, and will not admit Bishops or Pastors into 'the Definition of a Church. Thus he. Dr. Clagget succeeds him, and goes yet more roundly to Work. He affirms indeed (h) as we

we do, the Church to be one in many Respects viz. of Head, Faith, Sacraments, Service and Government too. But expressly denies that any of these Kinds and Instances of Unity are necessary to the Being of a Church, except these of one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. And further asserts, that from the Apostles Times till the Council of Trent, the constant Universal Doctrine concerning the Church was this, That it is the Society of the Faithfull, without ever inserting into the Definition of it any Thing relating to its being united to the Pope, or ANY OTHER BISHOP as to a visible Head. To both these you may add Mr. Stillingfleet afterwards Bishop of Worcester, who has proved (i) beyond Contradiction that the main Bulk of the Ancient Bishops and Divines of the Church of England, from the first Dawning of the Reformation almost down to Laud, have expressly declared against the Necessity of Episcopal Government, and maintained the Mutability of Church Government according to the Will of the Prince or Circumstances of the Kingdom; and herein they were against Mr. Rhind and his Fellows. And that they have also acknowledged the Scripture Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, asserting the Names to be interchangeable and the Office the same. And herein they were for the Presbyterians.

Secondly. This is not the only Quarrell the Church of England has against Mr. Rhind’s Scheme. No one wonders to find the Presbyterians ascerting the Intrinsic Power of the Church. They still claim it, have been always wrestling for it, to be sure they never renounced it; but it certainly very ill becomes one who has joined the Church of England to lay it down for a Principle, as he has done, that the Church is independent of the State. If so, what then means the 21 Article which declares, “that General Councils may not be gathered together without the Commandment and Will of Princes? Are not these necessary for serving the Purposes of the Society? The Church independent of the State! What then means the 37 Article which declares “the Queen’s Majesty to have the Chief Power and Government of all Estates whether Ecclesiastical or Civil and in all Causes? The Church independent of the State! What then means the first Canon 1640 concerning the Regal Power, wherein the King’s Supremacy
Sect. I. Presbyterian Government.

premacy over the Ecclesiastical State and in Causes Ecclesiastical is not only asserted but argued for: And the Government of the Church declared to belong in Chief unto Kings, and that the Power to call and dissolve Councils both National and Provincial is the true Right of all Christian Kings within their own Realms and Territories, and that when in the first Times of Christ's Church Prelats used this Power, it was therefore only because in those Days they had no Christian Kings. The Church Independent of the State! What then means the first Canon 1603 the very Rubrick whereof is, The King's Supremacy over the Church of England in Causes Ecclesiastical to be maintained! The Church Independent of the State! What then meant the Bishop of Norwich Anno 1709 in his Visitation Charge to spend a good Part of his Discourse and a large Appendix in cautioning his Clergy against that Principle? Say now, good Reader, if Mr. Rhind has not been competently furnished with Assurance when he declared p. 29 His Principles and Corollaries to be Truths so evident, that he thought it needless to enlarge on them. Had he intended only a Dispute against the Presbyterians he might indeed have assumed the Independence of the Church for a Principle: But when he was to tell the World what satisfied his own Conscience, and determin'd him to go over to the Church of England, which in the most solemn Manner has renounced that Principle, the insisting on it was one of the greatest Inconsistencies a Man could be guilty of.

I shall conclude this Discourse upon his Scheme with one Observation. Mr. Rhind would needs have the Presbyterians to be Schismatics, and thence infers That they are without the Church. But this is horridly false Reasoning: For, I affirm That, if they are Schismatics, then it will follow that they are within the Church. I know this will be surprizing at first to some Readers, yet it is certainly true. The Romanists, in the Days of the late K. James, reasoned, exactly after the same Manner with Mr. Rhind, against the Church of England: But that great Author before mentioned, I mean Dr. Sherlock demonstrates that pretended Reasoning to be flat Nonsense, and his Words will abundantly clear my Assertion.
A Schismatical Church, faith be, (k) signifies a Church too, and
defends it, still being in the Church; when there is but one Church, is somewhat Mysterious. And
therefore Schism is not tearing off a Part of the Church, but
one Part dividing from the other in external Communion, which
supposes that both Parts still belong to the same Church, or else
the Church is not divided. For Apostacy and Schism are: two
different Things; Apostates cease to be of the Church, Schismatics
are of the Church still, though they disturb the Peace of the
Church and divide the external Communion of it —. Does St.
Paul, who reproves the Corinthians for their Schisms, shut them
out of the Church for them too? Does He deny them to belong
to the Church, when He directs His Epistle to the Church of God
at Corinth. Thus he. So very loofly knit is Mr. Rhide's Scheme,
that the one Part of it destroys the other. And if he can prove
the Presbyterians Schismaticks, eo ipso it will follow, that they are
not without the Church. Dr. Sherlock's Reasoning is Plain, Strong,
palpable Sense, against which Mr. Dodwell's usual Stile, though
founded upon some loose expressions of the Fathers, will never bear
out Mr. Rhind. Nor is Mr. Rhind altogether a Looser by this
Observe: For whereas he hints in his Preface, that he has been
upbraided with Apostacy by some; though I am as well assur'd he
is a Schismatick, as I am, that there is such a Sin as Schism; yet,
upon the former Reasoning, he ought not to be called an Apostate,
till he declare himself a little more Explicitly. I hope then he will
digest the Observation the more easily, that what he looses by it
in Argument, he saves in Character.

SECT.

(k) Ubi supra p. 27. 28. 39.
S E C T. II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's State of the Debate between the Presbyterians and Episcopalians, P. 31, 32. is Examined.

The Stateing of a Debate aright is always a principal Point in Controversy. Take it in Mr. Rhind's own Words. It is sufficient to answer my Design in this short Apology, if I can prove that the Government of the Church, from the Beginning, was managed by Officers of different Orders, and such as acted in Capacities, superior the one to the other; among whom there were neither Ruling Elders, nor Deacons, such as the Presbyterians have. This, saith he, is all that the Episcopal Writers plead for. And therefore he thinks it needless to determine more explicitly, what are the distinguishing Characteristsicks of the several Officers, or to fix the Bounds of their Respective Powers. Thus he. Now let us Remark a little upon it.

I. Why does he State the Debate upon a Subordination of Officers? Was there ever Presbyterian denied, that there should be a Subordination among the Officers as well as Judicatories of the Church? Do not they own Christ to be the Chief Shepherd, the absolute King and Monarch of the Church? Don't They own Presbyterists to be under him, Deacons under both? Is not here a fair Subordination of Officers? If he had stated the Debate upon a Subordination or Imparity of Pastors or Ministers, taking these Words in their Current Ecclesiastical Sense, it had been to the Purpose; but to State it upon a Subordination or Imparity of Rulers or Officers was to lay a Foundation to himself for Chicane.

Possibly he may think to ward off this Remark by what he has added,
added, That among these Subordinate Officers, there were neither Ruling Elders nor Deacons such as the Presbyterians have. This, I acknowledge, when proved, will be a considerable Point gained against the Presbyterians. But then why. Why has he not restricted himself to the Proof of this? For, in all his State of the Debate, there is not one Syllable more to the Purpose; and yet of the 90 Pages he has spent in the Prosecution of it, he has employed only five of them, and these two only by the by, against the Ruling Elders and Deacons. With what Success we shall afterward hear. 2dc. When he has proved, which yet I despair of finding done, that among these Subordinate Officers, there were neither Ruling Elders nor Deacons such as the Presbyterians have, it will indeed follow that the Presbyterians, are mistaken in the Characters and Functions of their Subordinate Officers. But by no means will it follow That they are against a Subordination of Officers. On the Contrary, Mr. Rhind's Disputing against the Presbyterian Ruling Elders and Deacons proves irrefragably, that they are for a Subordination of Officers. I desire every Reader of Mr. Rhind's Book to attend carefully to this, and they will see there is no more needfull for discovering the Uselessness of all his Arguments for a Subordination of Officers, the Presbyterians being as much for it as the Prelates are; and that his latter Part of the Debate is a most effectual Confutation of the former.

II. Why does he say, That a Subordination of Officers, without such Ruling Elders and Deacons as the Presbyterians have, is upon the Main all that the Episcopal Writers plead for? Of all Things in the World unsincere Dealing is the most Odious. Certainly he has taken it for a Principle, That none who was to read his Book had ever read the Episcopal Writers, or would ever be Capable of reading them. Is he yet to learn, That the sole Power is pleaded for by them? Haveing read so many Books of that Side, can his Judgement be so weak as not to have discerned, or his Memory so frail as to have forgot, that all the Elevations of an absolute Monarch accountable to God only are pleaded for by them? If so, Care shall be taken ere I have done to clear up, his Discernment and refresh his Memory. Does he, Imagine, that a Subordination and sole Power are all one? Or will, a mere Subordination, with-
out Presbyterian Elders or Deacons please him? If so, he is too well natured: For, alas, it will not please his Brethren. To Humour him a little, I shall suppose the Presbyterians content to accept of Constant Moderators for Term of Life, and that such Moderators have the Presidency in all their Assemblies: But would that save them from the Guilt of Schism? Mr. Dodwell has expressly said it will not. Hear him (I). 'This (a Principle of Unity) none of our Modern Sects, except the Presbyterians, can so much as offer at. None of them (the other Modern Sects) have any single Minister, who by their Principles can pretend to Superiority over his Brethren. And all that they (the Presbyterians) can pretend is a Moderator over their Classes, either for a certain Time or at the utmost for Term of Life. Yet even that is not Sufficient for a Principal of Unity. Seeing the Sacrifices are they which are the Cement of this Unity, it must be a Presidency, not in their Assemblies only but their Sacrifices, which can entitle to a Principle of it. Thus M. Dodwell. And what now would it signify though Presbyterians should grant all that Subordination which Mr. Rhind pleads for, when notwithstanding. They must still remain Schismatics by M. Dodwell's Verdict.

III. Why did he think it needful to determine more explicitly the several Characteristicks of the several Officers and to fix the Bounds of their Respective Powers? About what, I pray, is all the Controversy betwixt Prelatifs and Presbyterians? Is it about the Title of Bishop? 'Tis yielded on both Hands to be a Scriptural one. Is it whether there should be Bishops in the Church? The Presbyterian was never yet created who denied it. Is it that these Bishops should have Officers subordinate to them? The Presbyterians loudly assert it. Is it not then the Controversy about the Characteristicks and Powers of Bishops, wherein the Choak lyes? And yet Mr. Rhind thinks it needful to determine them more explicitly. If so, 'tis very plain he should have thought it needful to have written his Book. If the Prelatifs can prove, that Bishops by Divine Right should be absolute Monarchs; or, to come lower, that they should have a Negative Voice simple or even Reciprocal; If they can prove, that by Divine Right they,

they have the sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction or either of them. If they can prove, that by Divine Right they should have some Hundreds or even Scores of Congregations under their Inspection; Presbyterians are heartily content to yield the Cause, and to accept of Bishops with all these Powers or so many of them as they shall prove of Divine Right to belong to them. On the other Hand, if the Prelatists are content with Bishops that are neither absolute Monarchs, nor have a Negative Voice, nor sole Power, nor a greater Charge than they can personally inspect, that is, preach and dispense the Sacraments to, with the Assistance of Elders to oversee the Manners of the People, (and of Deacons to take Care of the Poor) and that Discipline may be duly exercised; the Presbyterians offer to prove that they have such Bishops already, or are content to take them where they have not. Is it possible fairer Conditions can be either demanded or offered? Why then did Mr. Rhind decline to explain himself? The Reason is obvious, He designed to harangue a while, and disputing would have marred the Cadency of his Periods.

IV. Supposing Mr. Rhind's State of the Debate had been more distinct than it is, it would answer only the one Half of his Undertaking in the Title Page. For tho' it might be a Reason for His separating from the Presbyterians, yet it would be none for His embracing the Communion of the Church according to his present Practice, unless he had proved that the Subordination of Officers in the Church of England Constitution, into which he is gone, were of Divine Institution; Which he has not so much as attempted to prove, I add nor can be proved. For, that Primats or Arch Bishops having a Power over and being Ordinaries to the other Bishops, that Bishops exercising a Sole Power or even a Negative Voice, that Presbyters serving as the Bishop's Delegates without Power of Ordination or Jurisdiction, that Preaching Deacons vested with a Power of Baptizing, but deprived of all Management of the Churches Stock or Care of the Poor, which was the Original Design of Their Office; that, I say, all or any of these Officers considered under these peculiar Characters, are the Creatures of God, or of Divine Institution, I positively deny, and want to be directed to any Author that has proven it.

So much for Mr. Rhind's Way of stating the Debate; And, I believe,
lieve, 'tis obvious to every Body, that thereby he has projected for his own Ease rather than the Reader's Conviction. For, let one, in perusing his Book, dash out the Word Officers or Rulers, an Impar-
ity or Subordination among which the Presbyterian grant, and substitute in Place thereof the Word Pastors or Ministers, a Parity among whom was his Business to disprove; and it will presently appear that several of his Arguments are just as much to the Pur-
pose, as an Ode of Horace would have been.

But there is no need of running into Niceties in this Matter. Every Body has a tolerable Notion in the Gross what is meant by Prelacy and Presbyterian. If Mr. Rhind's Arguments prove, that the latter is a Schismatical kind of Government, the former that which should obtain in the Church, I shall grant he has gained his Point. If they prove not that, 'tis nothing to us what else they prove. And whether they do so or not, I am now to apply my Self to try.

S E C T. III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Arguments for Prelacy are summed up.

He has cast his Arguments into the Form of a Harangue; but so far as I can distinguish them they amount to the Number of Nine. The three first of which are calculate to argue, that Prelacy should have been instituted; the six latter to prove that it actually was instituted.

First That it was necessary that Prelacy should be instituted, he argues 

I. From
I. From the Nature of the Thing which made it Indispensably necessary in itself. A Monarchical or Subordinate Form being able to answer the Ends of Government better than the Contrary.

II. From the Form of Government in the Jewish Church, seeing God must be uniform in his Actions.

III. From the Form the Rules of political Prudence, seeing a levelling Form of Government would have been distasteful both to the Jews and Romans, as being Opposite to the Hierarchy of the former, and Monarchy of the latter.

Secondly That it actually was instituted, he attempts to prove.

I. From its obtaining in the Days of Christ, as appears from the Subordination of the LXX to the Twelve.

II. From its being continued in the Days of the Apostles, as appears from the History of their Acts, and their Epistles, and a Succession in the Apostolate.

III. From the Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus.

IV. From the Apocalyptick Angels.

V. From Testimonies of Antiquity.

VI. From the Impossibility of its Obtaining so early and universally, if it had not been of Divine Institution.

All these (besides what he has advanced against the Presbyterian Ruling Elders and Deacons) I shall examine in Order.

SECT. IV:

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Arguings for proveing, that it was Necessary that the Prelatick Form of Government should have been at first Instituted, is Examined. From P. 32. to P. 49.

I have just now observed that he attempts this by three Arguments, which I shall examine in so many Articles. Let me only once
once more advertise the Reader, that Mr. Rhind's expressing himself in this Controversy by a Subordinate Form of Government on the one Hand, and a levelling Form of Government on the other, with such like Phrases, is a very Ridiculous as well as unjust Style: For, the Presbyterians are against a Levelling, they are for a Subordinate Form of Government, yea, they are for a Monarchical Form of Government, understanding our Lord to be that Monarch; as Mr. Rhind Himself does p. 49. Though then Mr. Rhind found it necessary for amusing his Reader and filling his Pages to use such Forms of Speaking as a Monarchical or Subordinate, a Republican or Levelling Form of Government; yet I must either neglect his Arguments altogether, as signifying nothing in this Controversy, or else I must plainly understand by these and the like Phrases Prelacy or Presbyterian respectively, as common Usage has fixed the Notion of them in this Controversy. This premised I now proceed.

ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Argument, for the Indispensable Necessity of Instituting Prelacy, from the Nature of the Thing is examined. From P. 32. to P. 39.

The Summ of his Argument is this. God could not but institute the Best Form of Government for his Church. A Government of a Monarchical or Subordinate Form is such, that is, it can answer the Designs of Society better than any other. Therefore
fore the Church ought to have that Form of Government, that is to say, Prelacy. Now let us consider this, and

I: I affirm this Way of Arguing labours under three very considerable Infirmities. First. It is not Modest. Secondly, not secure. Thirdly. Suppose it were both; yet, as he has laid it, it is quite Impertinent, and does not in the least affect the Presbyterians.

First. It is not Modest. Does it become the Creature to prescribe to God? Is it sufferable that one should talk at Mr. Rhind's Rate, That such a Form of Government, abstracting from and antecedently to the Divine Establishment, OUGHT to be, MUST be, is indispensible Necessary in it fell, that it does not look like God that it should be otherwise, all which are his Phrases? Is not this to let Bounds to God's Wisdom and Will? I must needs read a Lecture to Mr. Rhind from the judicious Hooker (m) to teach him more Reverence towards God. 'As for those marvellous Discourses, whereby they adventure to argue that God must needs have done the Thing which they imagine was to be done, I must confess, I have often wondered at their exceeding Boldness herein. When the Question is, whether God have delivered in Scripture (as they affirm he hath) a compleat particular, immutable Form of Church Polity; why take they that other both presumptuous and superfluous Labour to prove He should have done it, there being no Way in this Case to prove the Deed of God, saving only by producing that Evidence where-in he hath done it. When we do otherwise, surely we exceed our Bounds; who and where we are we forget. And therefore needfull it is that our Pride in such Cases be controll'd, and our Disputes beaten back with those Demands of the Blessed Apostle, How unsearchable are his Juugments, and his Ways past finding out? Who hath known the Mind of the Lord, or who was his Counsellor? — In Matters which concern the Actions of God the most dutifull Way on our Part is to search what God hath done and, with Meekness to admire that, rather than to Dispute what he in Congruity of Reasone ought to do. I'm sure it is Mr. Rhind's Duty to chew the Cud a while on this.

Secondly. It is not Secure. For, Circumstances may make that
best in one Case, which would not be so in another. Hear M. Dodwell (n) who will clear the Matter. ‘ The Way of Arguing from the actual Establishments of God, as it is much more Modest, so it is also much more Secure for finding out the Right of Government than any Conjectures we can make from the Reason of the Thing. It is certainly the most becoming Course for a Modest Christian in all Things to acquiesce in God’s Judgment, how great Evidence ever there might seem for differing from it.——

The Reasons from the Nature of Government in General, and particularly of Government as Ecclesiastical, are not proper to any one Age. But for bringing these Reasonings down to determine the Rights of any particular Government, many particular Matters of Fact are requisite to be known. Thus he.

Thirdly. His Argument, as he has laid it is quite Impertinent, and does not in the least affect the Presbyterians: For he adduces it to prove that there should be a Subordination of Officers in the Church, which the Presbyterians are for, as well as he.

II. Supposing his Argument were otherwise tolerable, How does he prove that a Monarchical or Subordinate Form of Government is the best? Why, waving the many Arguments of several learned Authors he will needs advance three of his own. The first is taken from the British Monarchy. The second from the Principles. The third from the Practices of the Presbyterians Themselves.

The first from the British Monarchy stands thus. All the Subjects of Britain must own Monarchy to be the best Form of Government for the State; and therefore he sees no Reason from the Nature of the Thing why it should not be reckoned such for the Church also. Nay that it looks not like God it should be otherwise p. 33. But this is as unhappy an Argument as Mr. Rhind could have pitched on. For 1mo. Unles he could prove (perhaps Dr. Lesly may help him to it) that Monarchy is the only Government by divine Right for the State, and that all the Nations of the World who are under any other kind of Government, are, on that Account, in a State of Mortal Sin, his Argument must do a great deal more Hurt than Good to the Episcopal Cause. For it will plainly follow
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that such Nations as have an Aristocratical or Democratical Form of Government in the State, and are persuaded it is best, should have the like in the Church too. The British Subjects are indeed persuaded that Monarchy is the best Government for Britain, and I believe, will always be of this Mind, while so Benign a Prince as Her Majesty fills the Throne; but these same Persons are not persuaded that it would be the best for the United Provinces, the Republicks of Venice, Genoa, Lucca, the Swiss Cantons, Geneva, &c; and consequently, they must be persuaded too, according to Mr. Rhina's Way of Reasoning, that a Monarchical Government in the Church would not be best for them. His Argument then would quite alter its Nature by a Voyage, and from being a good one for Episcopacy at Home, would become a good one against it beyond Sea. 260 Is it not pretty odd to find one who has read the Bible all over, as Mr. Rhind faith he has done, and has heard our Saviour not only declaring that His Kingdom is not of this World, but expressly discharging his Disciples to exercise such Dominion and Authority as the Princes of the Gentiles do, Is it not odd, I say, to find such a one urging the Cutting the Church Government by the Pattern of the State? Does he not know that it was the Fancy of Modelling the external Government of the Church according to the Civil Government of the Roman Empire that brought in such Officers to the Church, of whom there is just as much Mention in the Scripture, as there is of the Present Emperour of Morrocco or Czar of Muscovy (o). I refer it then to the Reader to Judge, if that can be a good Argument for determining the Government of the Church, which was the greatest Cause of her Corruption. 360. As Mr. Rhind has laid the British Monarchy in the one Scale, so he must allow me to lay some Instances in the other, and let the Reader weigh both. The Romans, who were the greatest Masters of civil Prudence ever the World knew, when once they had expelled the Tarquins and abolished Regal Government, though they used sometimes Aristocracy, sometimes Democracy or a Form next of both, yet were never so idle or ill advised as to think of setting up Monarchy again till Barbarians and Tyrants oppressed them, and by main...
main Force wrung their Liberties out of their Hands. Lycargus and
Solon were the wisest Men of their Age by the Verdict of all the
World: yet they set up, the One Aristocracy, the other Democracy,
and recommended them for ever to their People. Plato and 
Aristotle are Names will be ever had in Veneration, yet they had but very
indifferent Thoughts of Monarchy because of its Liableness to degene-
rate into Tyranny. And that which makes the British Monarchy
so desirable is that the two Houses of Parliament qualify it, and
give it a Mixture both of Aristocracy and Democracy; Whereas the
Prelacy contended for by its late Patrons, is a downright Tyranny,
a Monarchy after the French Form, none daring to say to the Bis-
shop, what doest thou? as we shall hear afterward. 4to. Is it not strange
that the Church of England Divines (Dr. Whitaker, for Instance, 
Regius Professor of Divinity in Cambridge) when disputing against
the Church of Rome should argue against a Monarchical Govern-
ment in the Church; and yet that Mr. Rhind, who pretends to be of
that Communion, should argue for it when disputing against the
Presbyterians? I want mightily to be satisfied about his Conduct in
this.

His Second Argument from the Principles of the Presbyterians runs
thus p. 34. I would know of them, why they are for a Subordination of
Judicatories, while they are at the same Time against an Imparity of Ru-
lers? Really the Presbyterians own themselves so dull, as not to be
able to give a Reason for that which is not. Let Mr. Rhind once
prove they are against an Imparity of Rulers, and then it will be
soon enough to give a Reason why they are so: For they are not dis-
posed to philosophize on the Golden Tooth. He never suspected that
his Medium wanted Truth, and therefore he goes on very innocently
in his Harangue thus. 'To what Purpose, I would ask them, serves
a Subordination of Judicatories, where the Judges are supposed
to be still the same? Did Mr. Rhind never hear that plus vident Oculi
quam Oculus, Two Eyes see better than One? Does he not know
that all the Apostles were Equal in their Apostolical Character, and
when the Controversy about Circumcision was started at Antioch Acts,
15. Doubtless Paul, being under an infallible Conduct, could have
determined it as Orthodoxy as the whole College of 'em; yet, for
satisficing Peoples Minds, it was judged expedient that the Advice
of the rest should be had, and their Authority interposed. O but faith he, In the Presbyterian Subordination the Judges are still the same. Now, what could put this in his Head, or how he could possibly stumble into it, I cannot conjecture. Was he so long among the Presbyterians and does not know it to be false? Could he meet with never one in the whole Country to tell him it was so? When I'm sure there are very few in the Nation but could have done it. All Matters that come from a Subordinate to a Superior Judicatory are transmitted either by way of Reference or Appeal. In the first of these Cases the Judges are not meerly the same, but a vast Plurality added to them, for Instance, when a Matter is Referred from a Presbytery to a Synod, the whole Ministers of the Province with a Ruling Elder from each Parish are Judges in the latter: Whereas in the former, only the Ministers of that particular Presbytery with one Ruling Elder from each of its Parishes were the Judges. In the Case of Appeals, not one Member of the Inferior Judicatory is admitted to be a Judge in the Superior. They are indeed allowed to plead, but the pleading being over, they are not allowed to advise much less to vote in the Proceeds. The Use then of a Subordination of Judicatures is obvious, to wit, that the Superior may rectifie the Mistakes &c of the Inferior. But this will not go down with Mr. Rhind: For he cannot understand how their Fellow Members (to whom they are supposed in all Respects equal) shall judge better than they. I know no Body obliged to find him in Understanding. The Thing is abundantly Intelligible in its self, Solomon a wise enough Master having told us, that In Multitude of Counsellors there is Safety. But whence did Mr. Rhind learn that all the Members of a Presbyterian Judicatory were to be supposed in all Respects Equal? Was it from the Presbyterians? Surely not. They willingly own, that all the Ministers, for Instance, in one Presbytery are not Equal in all Respects. One of them is more Learned than another. Another perhaps, tho' he hath not so much Learning, is yet Wiser, for the greatest Clerks are not always the Wisest Men. Was it from his Fellow Writers of the Episcopal Side? No. On the contrary, They plainly declare, that the Presbyterians neither plead nor suppose any such Thing. Thus the Author of the Seventh Book of Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity Sect 3d. & They, saith he, which cannot brook the Superiority which Bishops have
have, do not withholding themselves admit that some Kind of Difference and Inequality there may be lawfully amongst Ministers.

Inequality as touching Gifts and Graces they grant, because this is to plain that no Mist in the World can be cast before Men’s Eyes so thick, but they needs must discern through it, that one Minister of the Gospel may be more Learned, Holier and Wiser; better able to instruct, more apt to rule and guide than another? Let Mr. Rhind then say at his best Leisure, whence he got that supposed Equality in all Respects.

His Third Argument is taken from the Practices of the Presbyterians themselves, The Sum of which in his own Words p. 35. is. That, though by their Principles all Church Officers are allowed an equal Authority, yet in Effect the whole, or at least the Chief Power is in the Hands of a Few, who are the most knowing and Wise. And for proof of this he brings an Instance, how that in three several General Assemblies, though the most numerous Party in the Assembly were earnest to have the intrinsic Power of the Church asserted by an Act, yet the Authority of a leading Junto, who were upon the matter so many Bishops, crushed that Dangerous Affair. Why then, saith he p. 37. do they oppose that kind of Government, which is not only indispensably necessary in itself, but does in despite of their Principles actually obtain among themselves. Thus he. In Answer to which, How lucky so ever Mr. Rhind may be in some of his Minutes, yet perhaps he is the most unlucky in his Arguments ever Man was: They being generally so ill natured as to cut their own Throat. For who told him that it is against Presbyterian Principles, that one Minister should have a greater Hand in manageing affairs than another? Not the Presbyterians, they refuse it. Not his Brethren the Authors on the Episcopal Side; Witness him last cited who tells us (Ibid.) ‘A Priority of Order they deny not but that there may be, yea such a Priority as maketh one Man amongst many a Principal Actor in those Things whereunto sundry of them must necessarily concur, so that the same be admitted only during the Time of such Actions and no longer. 2dly; is it indeed true, that the Presbyterian Government is in effect in the Hands of a Few, who are upon the Matter Bishops? Then it is certainly true, that they are not Schismatics, consequently that Mr. Rhind’s separating from them on that Score is unjustifiable.
justifieable. Is this my reasoning only? No, but of one of the best Men
perhaps ever wore Mitre, I mean Dr. Bedell afterwards Bishop of Kil-
more in his Answer to Mr. Wadsworth once a Minister in Suffolk, then
a Roman Catholic and Pensioner of the Holy Inquisition in Sevil. Wad-
sworth in his Scripts after his Revolt fell foul upon the Reformation in
these Words. 'In France, Holland and Germany they have no Bishops.
To this Dr. Bedell answers (p). What if I should defend they have?
because a Bishop and a Presbyter are all one, as S. Jerom maintains,
and proves out of Holy Scripture, and the Use of Antiquity. Of which
Judgment, as Medina confesseth, are sundry of the Ancient Fa-
thers, both Greek and Latine, S. Ambrose, Augustine, Sedulius, Prima-
sius, Chrysothe, Theodore, Oecumenius and Theophylact: Which point
I have largely treated of in another Place. Thus he. But Mr. Wad-
sworth was an Adversary much of Mr. Rhins Tempe, not to be satis-
ished without Bishops superior to Presbyter. Dr. Bedell therefore
finds a Way to make all the Protestant Churches Episcopal. In Ger-
many the Superintendents were Bishops. But what was to be done
with France and Geneva where these were not? Why, faith he, there
are usually certain Chief Men, that do in a Manner bear all the Sway.
And what are these but Bishops indeed unless we shall wrangle about
Names. I hope Mr. Rhins is here fitted with a Wedge of his own
Timber. Common Sense Dictates that Superiority in Wisdom and
dexterity for managing Business attended with a due Integrity should
bear Sway among all Societies, even where the Constituent Mem-
bers are otherwise equal in their Character: Which amounts to no
more than this, that the Weaker should follow the Counsel of the
Wiser, and no other Superiority but this could the Doctor find neces-
Sary by the Word of God among Ministers. But, faith Mr. Rhins,
Why do those whose Superior Abilities entitle them to the Chief
Power, and who exercise the same in Fact, refuse to be regular-
ly admitted to the Exercise thereof, that is plainly, to be confecrate
Bishops? I answer from the excellent Lord Falkland who died in the
Bed of Honour fighting for the Royal Martyr (q). There was
once a Hen in Aesop, which upon a moderate Proportion of Barly
laid

[p] Burnet's Life of Bishop Bedell p. 453. 454. [q] See his Speech before the House of Commons con-
laid every Day an Egg. Her Mistress enlarging her Diet in Hopes
she would proportionally encrease her Eggs, She grew so fat upon
that Addition that She never laid more. Dignities and Preferments
oftimes turn Men's Heads, blunt their Wits, or rebate the Edge of
their Diligence. How often has it been seen that a very good Minis-
ter has made but a very indifferent Bishop? So long as they are equal
in Authority, they know it is only their Superior Wisdom and Ver-
tue that can entitle them to Respect from or Sway among their Bre-
thren. This first excites their Spirits, and then keeps them on the Bend:
But when once they are settled in the Dignity by a formal Instal-
ment, they know that Reverence is due to their Character, how unac-
countable soever their Conduct is. Of all sorts of Bishops, these are
the most desirable whose Dignity rises and falls in Proportion with
their real Merit and wise Management. This puts them upon their
good Behaviour, which is necessary for Clergy-men as well as for
other People. And this is plainly the Case of our Presbyterian Bi-
shops. To all this Mr. Rhind may please to add, that they refuse, and
their Brethren will not allow them to be consecrated to the Dignity,
because it is not only without Warrant, but against the Precept of our
Lord Matth. 20.25, whereof afterwards. In the mean Time Mr.
Rhind having acknowledged that the Presbyterians have such as are
Bishops upon the Matter; 'tis plain He has separated from them for
the Want of what is not Material. 310. As to his Instance of the Act
Assertery of the Intrinsick Power. If he had said, that the Junto, as
he calls them, by Importance prevailed on, or by pure Dint of Rea-
son persuaded the Rest that such an Act was either not necessary or
not reasonable at that Time; I believe he had spoke Truth, but noth-
ing to the Purpose, because Presbyterians still own, that some, who
in Point of Authority are only on a Level with their Brethren, may
yet be superior to them in the Ecclesiastical Politicks. But to say that
they got it crushed by their Authority was to be too prodigal of his
Credit, the whole Nation knowing it to be false. 410. I know that
Mr. Rhind mentioned this Instance by Way of Reflection against the
Presbyterians, and therefore I must take the Freedom to tell him, that
the General Assembly has done more, even since the Revolution, for
afferting the Intrinsick Power than all the Prelates in Scotland ever had
the Courage to do. These latter, upon the Restauration of K. Charles
II, meanly truckled to an avowed Erastian Usurpation without the least Remonstrance or Reclaiming. And when the late K. James sent down his Proclamation of the Date Feb. 12. 1687. for an unbounded Toleration, wherein, by his Absolute Power and Prerogative Royal, he annulled and revoked the Penal Laws against Papists; the Archbishop of Saint Andrews and the Bp. Archbishop of Glasgow were the second and third Persons who subscribed a Letter of Thanks to him for the said Toleration and Proclamation. The Letter bears Date Feb. 24. 1687. It is stuffed with the most fulsome Flattery, and a Soothing of the King in those Measures which took away the Barrier of the Protestant Religion and at last ruin’d himself. So unwilling were that Unfortunate Prince’s best Friends to venture their Posts by giving him free and honest Counsel; when they might have possibly favored their King, and certainly their own Consciences by the doing it. The General Assembly on the other hand have acted a somewhat better Part: For when in the Year 1692 the Earl of Lothian would needs dissolve it in a very abrupt Manner, to say no Worse; the Moderator, with all due Respect to the Civil Powers, and yet with that Courage that became a Churchman possed of the Chair in the highest Judicatorie, boldly asserted the Intrinsick Power even in the Face of a frowning Government, and the whole Assembly adhered to him in so doing. I hope then Mr. Rhind will see that he should have been wise in his Wrath, and not needlessly have given Occasion to such a Piece of History. 510. His Reasoning concludes alike against Bishops as well as the Members of the General Assembly; for the World does not want to know that Bishops are not always the Wisest, any more than the best Men. And he himself was aware of this. But, saith he, p. 38, When such is the Government of the Church, that there are different Spheres in which Men are to act, 'tis presum’d they are chosen with Qualifications proportioned to each. But why should that be presumed which no Man can prove, and every Man will deny? and does not he himself own, That it has too frequently happened, that Men of inferior Abilities have attained to the highest Ecclesiastical Dignities. And does not the History of the late Times confirm this? Witness M. Wallace, who, in the Year 1662 was preferred to be Bishop of the Isles, though he understood not one Syllable of the Native Language of his Diocess; yet a powerfull Recommendation and the good
good Quality of Pliancy procured him the Crofier. But, faith Mr. Rhind, *This is not the Fault of the Constitution but of those who prefer them.* Very mannerly! And fo all the Faults of the Bishops must be charged upon the Prince. But the very Constitution has been always such in Scotland, that it was at least a very great Hazard if ever a worthy Person was chosen. Generally Men of Merit are modest and love Obscurity; the most unworthy Persons are most forward to put in for Preferments; Courtiers, by whose Eyes and Ears the Prince must see and hear, are most ready to recommend such as are likely to be the most serviceable Tools to themselves in their Political Designs. The Prince's Conge d'élire makes the Election of the Chapter a Sham. So that upon the whole there was a Fault in the very Constitution, even though the Office had been in itself lawfull.

III. Mr Rhind is resolved to end this Argument with one bold Stroke. According, faith be p. 38. to the Presbyterian Platform, the less knowing and Wife are allowed an equal Authority with those who deserve it best: An Establishment which seems to bid Defiance to Common Sense. Did Mr. Rhind never hear of the Roman Senate? 'Twas reckoned the most venerable Bench in the World; yet there did Parity reign in Perfection, and that notwithstanding the Inequality among the constituent Members in Point of Prudence. That fine Gentleman the younger Pliny giving his Friend Arrianus an Account of an Action before the Senate in which he had been employed to plead, tells him *. Thus it seemed good to the Plurality: For the Votes are numbered not weighed. NOR CAN IT OTHERWISE BE IN PUBLICC COUNCIL, in which there is nothing so unequal as the Equality it self: For the Right of all is equal tho' their Prudence is unequal. Did Mr. Rhind never hear of the House of Lords or Commons in Parliament? Are not all the Members in these several Houses allowed an Equal Authority? yet who ever said that they were equally qualified, or that it was necessary They should be so? If he has never travelled so far as Westminster in his Views, yet did he never hear of the Lords of Session or Senators.

---

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Argument for the Necessity of instituting Prelacy from the Form of Government in the Jewish Church, is Examined. From P. 39. to P. 45.

Before I state this Argument, I must put (yet once more) the Reader in Mind, that though the Presbyterians are against a Subordination of Pastors, yet they are for a Subordination of Officers, as well as the Prelatists are. And that therefore when his Argument concludes against a Parity of Officers, or for a Subordinate Form of Government, it is only a Parcel of Empty insignificant Words huddled together, unless by the former we understand Presbytery, and by the latter Prelacy. This premised, His Argument stands thus.

A Government constitute by a Subordination of Rulers was
Section IV. Presbyterian Government.

Actually approved of by God under the Old Testament: For the Form of Government which by Divine Institution obtained in the Jewish Church was constituted by Officers acting in an Imparity; such as the High Priest, Priests and Levites; each of which were Orders distinct from, and Subordinate to the other. p. 40. This is his whole Medium, and the only Inference that can justly be made from it is (which every Presbyterian grants) That such an Imparity was not only Lawfull but also best for that State of the Church. But Mr. Rhind's Inferences from it are of a higher Nature, viz. That if it was best under that Dispensation, he cannot conceive how it can be reckoned unlawful in the Christian Church. I cannot but pity the Weakness of His Conception: For if our Lord has changed the Jewish Priesthood, and dissolved their Polity, and set up the Christian very different from it, will not this make it unlawful? O but, by Mr. Rhind's Account, our Lord did not this, he could not do it was not consistent with his Wisdom to do it, plainly, it is, faithbe, p. 41, an Impeachment of the Divine Wisdom to think that God would alter that Form of Government which he had instituted to establish another quite different from it. And now you have his whole Argument, an Argument which he thinks sufficient to prove the Perpetuity of that Form.

In discoursing it I shall shew, First. That, as he has laid it, it is horridly Impious. Secondly. That his Management of it against the Presbyterians is Ridiculous. Thirdly. That it is in it self Weak, and concludes nothing to the Purpose in this Controversie. Fourthly. That if it conclude at all, it concludes for an Universal Papacy rather than a Diocesan Prelacy. And Lastly. That it is rejected as insufficient by the Episcopal Authors themselves.

I. The Argument as he has laid it is horridly Impious. God must not be Wife, that is, he must not be God, unless Mr. Rhind please. No Christian ought to pass that Way of talking he has got into without Resentment. Sauciness against the Almighty is Intolerable. What! Was it not consistent with the Wisdom of God to alter a Form of Government he had formerly instituted? Has Mr. Rhind read the Bible, and knows not that God governed Israel first by Judges and then by Kings, and yet was infinitely wife in both? If he did this in the State, why should it reflect on his...
Wisdom to do it in the Church? Nay has he not actually done it in the Church? For, was not both the Civil and Ecclesiastical Power originally in the same Person, in Adam, the Patriarchs, and Moses; and yet under the Law did He not put the Ecclesiastical Regiment into the Hands of the High Priest, Priests and Levites, so that the King was no longer Priest? And might he not have learned this from Dr. L---y Himself (r)? The Jews fondly dreamed that their Polity was to last with the World, and persecuted the first Martyr Stephen to the Death, because he had taught, that Jesus of Nazareth would change the Customs which Moses delivered Acts 6. 14. But, if Mr. Rhind's Argument is good, Stephen's Doctrine was False, and the Jews Murdering of him was only the Effect of a laudable Zeal. Is it not more agreeable to the Divine Wisdom to think, that the Circumstances of the Church being so vastly altered, her Government should be so too. Under the Jewish Dispensation the Church was empaneled within a narrow Enclosure, but the Gospel was to be preached to every Creature. And is not here a fair Foundation for altering the Government? And does not the Apostle to the Hebrews C. 7. V. 12 lay it down for a Principle, that the Priesthood being changed, there is made of Necessity a Change also of the Law. How Impious is it then to insinuate that such a Change is inconsistent with the Divine Wisdom.

II. His Management of this Argument against the Presbyterians is Ridiculous. Take it in his own Words p. 43. 'Seeing there was one of the highest Order in the Jewish Church, it follows unanswerably (taking along with you what I have said above upon this Head) that there ought to be one at least in the Christian Church. This, faith he, is enough to prove the Point against the Presbyterians, and I defy them if they shall answer directly to evade it. This Defiance of Mr. Rhind's is the very prettiest I ever heard of. Let the Presbyterians take along with them what he has said above upon this Head, that is, let them grant that it is an Impeachment of the Divine Wisdom to think that God would alter that Form of Government which he had instituted among the Jews to Establish another quite different from it among the Christians.
Christian, and then it will follow unanswerably, that as there was one high Priest in the Jewish Church, there ought to be one at least in the Christian Church. That is, as if he had said, Pray, you Presbyterians, let me bind your Hands, and then I'll undertake to knock out your Brains. I truly cannot imagine what Clas of Men Mr. Rhind wrote for. Presbyterians will be so far from taking along with them his Assertion, that they cannot otherwise look on it than as a most rude Attaque on the Divine Majesty. He goes on with his reasons. 'I ask them, faith be p. 44. whether it be just to condemn the Order as useless among Christians, because one is not able to perform all the Offices belonging to it? Or whether it be not rather reasonable to acknowledge, that as there was in the Jewish Church, one Ecclesiastical Ruler of the highest Order, and no more, because one was sufficient; so should Christians have one at least and as many more as are needful? The Presbyterians are heartily content with the Proposal: For, they believe every Gospel Minister to be an Ecclesiastical Ruler of the highest Order, and are very well persuaded that one of them is needful in every Congregation. They are so far from being against multiplying of Bishops, that where there is one in England, they wish there were three hundred. But, faith Mr. Rhind, 'Let them allow one Bishop for every District, in proportion to that, to which the High Priest's Authority did extend, and the Debate is at an End. The Presbyterians will be content with this likewise upon two very reasonable Conditions. 1st. If he can prove that there is any Divine Institution appointing it to be so. But Mr. Rhind's dictating to God and thinking it reasonable it should be so, will not be admitted by them as a Proof of this. 2d. If he can prove that the Ecclesiastical Rulers of the highest Order in the Christian Church are appointed for the same Functions the High Priest was under the Law. The High Priest, that I may speak in M. Dodwell's Stile, was to offer up the National or Popular Sacrifices for appropriating to the Jews only (whether by Birth or Proselytism, it is the same Thing) the Privilege of the Segullah, and the Patronage of the Supream Being. But in all the New Testament I cannot find, that any such either National or Provincial Appropriation was ever designed to be the End of any of the Functions of any Gospel Ruler. Nay, we find all on the
the contrary: For, by the Gospel Constitution, all that worship the same Supreme Being and in the same Way that he has appointed are within the Church, whatever National Distinctions they have.

III. The Argument is in itself weak, and concludes nothing to the Purpose in this Controversy, because from the whole Strain of the Scriptures it is plain, that the Aaronick Priesthood was Typical, and had at once both its End and Accomplishment in Christ. Mr Rhind was aware of this Exception, and therefore Essays to take it off by two Answers. 1st. If the Constitution of the Levitical Priesthood was Subordinate, the Christian must be so too, otherwise the Type is not adequately represented by the Antitype p. 42. This the Presbyterians grant: For Christ is the great High Priest of our Profession Heb. 3. 1. And all other Christians are a Royal Priesthood 1 Pet. 2. 9. Subordinate to him. But otherwise, that the Orders of the Clergy among Christians should be adjusted to these among the Jews is a ridiculous Dream; seeing, from the one End of the New Testament to the other, the Title of Priest is never given to the Ministers of the Gospel as such. His 2d Answer is, 'That though these Parts of the Priestly Office which did prefigure the Sacrifice and Intercession of Jesus Christ were to cease upon his Crucifixion and Ascension, yet that the High Priest was also a Governor in the Jewish Church, and that the Ordinary Priest had a Share in the Government with Him, though Subordinate to Him, and that the Levites were Subservient to both. And he is Confident that the Presbyterians will not affirm that the High Priest or Inferior Priests did Typify any Thing under the Reduplication of Rulers, or the Levites as under them, or that there was any Thing Typical in their Subordination as such. But this Answer is in all its Parts unserviceable, and in some of them quite Opposite to himself. For 1. We have already heard Mr. Dowlle declareing, That, it is the Bishop's Presidency not in the Christian Assemblies only, but in their Sacrifices which can entitle to a Principle of Unity. Therefore Mr. Rhind destroys the Argument by abstracting from the Sacrifices and insisting on the Government, and by considering the Jewish Church Officers not as Priests but as Rulers. 2. If the Subordination as such among the Jewish

† See before Chap. II. Sect. II.
Jewish Church Rulers was not Typical, then where is there any Necessity, by that Argument, for any such Subordination in the Christian Church? 3. Why is he so Confident that the Presbyterians will not affirm, that the High Priest or Inferior Priests did typify any Thing under the Reduplication of Rulers? He owns he had read the Presbyterian Authors with a Scrupulous Exactness particularly the Altar Damascenus. Now the Author of that Work expressly affirms it (s). 'The very Eminency, faith he, of the High Priest, in which the Episcopal Writers place the Order and Eutaxy of that Government, was Typical, and shadowed the Supereminent Dignity of our High Priest above all other Priests, whose Priesthood has an Influence on all the Faithfull, and makes them Priests and Pastors in an Ethical though not Political Sense. 'Tis then plain that Mr. Rhind's Confidence in this Point has been much greater than his Caution. 4. Seing under the Jewish Dispensation the Ordinary Priests had a Share in the Government with the High Priest, Why did not Mr. Rhind tell us what Share the Ordinary Priests in the Church of England have with their Diocesan or High Priests in the Government? I cannot find it. No wonder truly, for the great Bacon Lord Verulam could not. This is one of the Things wherein, he confesseth, he could never be satisfied, viz. the Sole Exercise of their Authority. 'The Bishop, faith he (t), giveth Orders alone, excommunicateth alone, judgeth alone. This seems to be a Thing almost without Example in Government, and therefore not unlikely to have crept in, in the Degenerate and Corrupt Times. Thus he, Where is then the Subordination in Government which Mr. Rhind pleads for?

IV. His Argument, if it conclude at all, concludes for an Universal Papacy rather than a Diocesan Prelacy: For there was but one High Priest over the Jews, and consequently there should be but one Supreme Bishop over the Christian Church. And indeed Mr. Dodwell has roundly asserted, that the Original Government of the Christian Church was a Papacy. That the whole Christian Churches were

---

(s) Alt. Damascus. p. 140. Sic dictum sancti omnem sint Deo facerdotes, nonnunquam ludit. 
were subject to the Church at Jerusalem, and that the Bishop of Jerusalem was the Principle of Catholick Unity, and that there were no other Bishops in the World but himself, and that the setting of Bishops in particular Dioceses was an Aftergame. This is M. Dodwell's Doctrine. And it agrees very well with the Argument from the Jewish Priesthood. He indeed took Pains to prevent the Consequence that this Doctrine might seem to have in Favour of the Church of Rome, by teaching, as we shall hear afterwards, that the Government was altered in the Second Century; but Mr. Rhind by declaring an Alteration Inconsistent with the Wisdom of our Lord, has plainly betrayed the Protestant Cause. He foresaw that this Objection would be made against his Argument. Let us hear how he wards it off: This Cavil, faith he, p. 43. is, I confess very Plausible, and our Adversaries do triumph upon it as unanswerable; but they do not perhaps know whom they oblige by this. Well, pray who are they? Let me tell them, faith he, That the Roman Catholicks are no less fond of it than they. But let me tell Mr. Rhind, that this is to write not only weakly but ridiculously. When the Prelates go in to the worst Part of Popery by insisting on an Argument which, supposing its Solidity, must needs found the Pope's Supremacy, must not the Presbyterians (who have proved a hundred Times, that 'tis absurd to infer the Form of Government in the Christian from that of the Jewish Church) tell them so much for fear of obliging the Roman Catholicks? This is a new Way he has got of turning the Chace, which may be admired, but, I believe, will scarcely be followed by any Wise Man. But after all this, how does he defend his Argument against the Papists? He indeed refers his Reader to the Authors who have managed this Controversy against them; but his own Defence is absolutely Naught. 'Tis this p. 43. In fo confused a Society as was the Jewish Church, any more than one Officer of the highest Order was needless; seeing the People could easily repair to him, from the remotest Corners of Judea, upon all the proper Occasions; and one was sufficient.

cient for the Discharge of all the Duties of that Office. But since the Partition Wall is broken down, the Church is become a Society of so large an Extent, that all the Faithfull cannot have Access to one, nor can one serve all the Purposes of that Office. But why may not one serve all the Purposes of that Office, now, as well as during the whole first Century and a Part of the second according to M. Dodwell? 'Tis true the Professors of Christianity are more numerous now than they were then: Yet not more widely dispersed. For if we may believe Antiquity, Christianity got considerable footing in the Apostles Days even in the Nations most remote from Jerusalem the Center. And that S. Andrew, S. Simon the Canaanite, and as some say, S. Paul himself planted the Gospel in Britain. And if the Bishop sitting at Jerusalem, could be a Principle of Unity to us then, why might not the Bishop of Rome, who is much nearer hand, be so to us now? Let Mr. Rhind satisfie the Roman Catholicks, how, for Instance, all the Faithfull in the Cities of London and Westminster amounting to about a Million of Souls, how all the Faithfull in the rest of Middlesex, Essex and Part of Hartfordshire on this Side the Globe, how all the Faithfull in the forreign English Plantations on the other Side the Globe and in both the Indies can have Access to the Bishop of London their Diocesan, or how he can serve all the Purposes of that Office to them. Let Mr. Rhind, I say, satisfie the Roman Catholicks in this; and then I believe they will find it no hard Matter to shew how all the Faithfull through the World may have Access to one Pope at Rome, and how one Pope alone may serve all the Purposes of that Office to the Church Universal. 'Tis plain then that Mr. Rhind's Argument must needs inferr the Necessity of the Pope's Supremacy.

V. His Argument is rejected as Insufficient by the Episcopall Authors themselves. It will be enough to establish this from the Mouth of two Witnesses. The first is Bishop Bilson (x) 'From these superior and interior Degrees, faith be, amongst the Priests and Levites under Moses, haply may no necessary Consequence be drawn to force the fame to be observed in the Church of Christ. First, For that the Tribe of Levi might not be unguided without manifest Confusion, and was not subjected to the Regiment of any other

(x) Perpetual Gov. of Christ's Church Chap. II. p. 12:
"other Tribe," but had the same Manner of Government by her
Prince, Elders, Judges and Officers over Thousands, Hunders,
Fifties and Tens. And afterward this Preeminence grew unto
them according to their Families by Inheritance and Birthright.
The Father was Chief of his Offspring whiles he lived and alter
him his Eldest, which is no Way imitable in the Church of Christ. Thus
Bilson.

A Second Witness is the famous Stillingfleet a much greater Man
than Bilson. He not only afferts (1) but proves irrefragably that the
Christian Church was formed not upon the Temple but the Synagogue
Model; where there was no such Thing as a Hierarchy, but a Ruler
of the Synagogue one or more, with a Primacy in Point of Or-
der, but an Equality of Power with the rest of the Elders of the
Synagogue: Mr. Rhind then, ere his Argument can hurt the Pres-
byterians must both answer the Reasons and refuse the Authority
of his Brethren and Fathers.

And thus I have done with this Argument; And cannot but wish,
that the Episcopal Writers of the New cut were somewhat less Jewishly
given. They are not content to plead for a Jewish Government in
the Church, but have turned also our Communion Tables into Altars,
our Ministers into Priests, and the Communion into a Propitiatory
Sacrifice; yea M. Dodwell (2) has found the Ancient Bishops
wearing the Sacerdotal Frontlet in Imitation of the Jewish High Priest.
Yea he has found their Succession Hereditary. Who knows where
the Humor may stop? If they go on at the same Rate, 'tis to be fea-
red they may turn Christianity into somewhat more than a Mystical
Israelitism, and revive upon us the old Controversy, that except
we be circumcised, we cannot be saved.


ART.
ARTICLE III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Argument for the Necessity of instituting Prelacy from the Rules of political Prudence in Compliance with the Jews and Romans, is examined. From P. 45. to P. 49.

THIS is an Argument which, as Mr. Rhind has discoursed it, is, I dare affirm, a pure Original Piece; and that as no Man ever used it before him, so no Man readily will after him. The Summ of it is. The Jews were Zealous for their Hierarchy, the Romans were under a Monarchy. A Parity of Officers or levelling kind of Government (such as he, with equal Justice and Accuracy, supposes the Presbyterian to be,) would have quite alienated the Jews from, and raised the Jealousy of the Romans against Christianity. Therefore it was not Consistent with the Wisdom and Goodness of our Lord and the Inspiration of his Apostles, who became all Things to all Men, to provoke their Aversion by determining against their Inclinations p. 46. And if they had Institute such a Republican Form as the Presbyterian is, their doing so would have justified the Persecutions were raised by their Enemies against them. "For, saith he, p. 47. would they be justly blamed, if, for their own Security, they should endeavour to Crush a Society of so dangerous a Constitution. And therefore he leaves it to the Consideration of all Wise and Impartial Readers, whether it be not a Thought too unworthy to be entertained of Christ and his Apostles, that They should have given Occasion to so reasonable a Jealousie, and
and exposed Christians to Persecution, upon an Account about which they might have Innocently agreed with Their Enemies.

Here is indeed a masterfull Stroke. Here is Infinite Wisdom limited and Infinite Freedom confined in the most Effronted Manner. All the Business of the Sons of Men is to know what Government Christ and his Apostles actually did establish, and upon finding that, to take it upon Trust that it was the very Best. But to prescribe, what Government Christ and his Apostles were obliged in Prudence to Establish, is Presumptuous in the highest Degree. But waving this, let us try whether his Premisses will infer his Conclusion.

I. As to the Jews. They were Zealous for their Hierarchy. Ergo, faith Mr. Rhind, Christ and his Apostles institute one too, because it would have been disobligeing to them to institute Presbytery. But is it not much more reasonable to argue the quite contrary Way, viz. That because the Jews were Zealous for their Hierarchy, therefore Christ and his Apostles did not institute one; because if they had, it would have exasperated the Jews to the greatest Height, and provoked them to rivile the Christians as Schismaticks, yea to curse them as they did the Samaritans for setting up Altar against Altar? Yes, this is so very obvious to common Sense, that M. Dodwell (a) Himself gives it as the Reason, why during the first Times of the Apostles they did for a while forbear the Setting any Bishop up in any considerable Superiority over his Brethren. For, saith he, if this Superiority of the Bishop were a Substituting him in the Place of the High Priest, and the Multiplying such Superiors in several Cities were the multiplying High Priests in several Cities; it plainly appears how this must have been interpreted by those who were Jewishly affected, from the Principles already mentioned. They must have looked on such Persons as not only Violators of their Law, but as breakers of their mystical Union, and consequently obnoxious to the same CURSES and EXECRATIONS which on the same Account had been thundered against the Samaritans. Thus he. Yea, he tells us else-

elsewhere (b), that Christ was so far from instituting a Hierarchy, that he did not so much as intimate to his Disciples that ever any Hierarchy distinct from the Jewish which already obtained, was to be set up; yea, that if he had intimate any such Thing, the Disciples themselves had been in Peril of Revolting from him on that very Account. I hope then we are in no great Hazard from the Jews.

II. As to the Romans. 'Tis True they were under Monarchy. Ergo say I. i. m. Such a Constitution in the Church as made every Bishop a Monarch in his own City, and raised him to a Throne (I hope Mr. Rhind knows the Episcopal Stile) would have heightened their Jealousie and provoked their Indignation against the Christians. For, tho' our Lord disclaimed all medling with Secular Affairs, and at length became invisible, upon which Accounts the Romans had no just Reason to be in any Apprehension from himself; yet who knows not that States are Jealous even of the smallest Appearances? Was it not Christ's being called King of the Jews that stung Herod so sharply that he sought to murder him in his Cradle? Was it not on the same Pretence that Pilat condemned him in Judgment, when he had acquitted him in his Conscience? If they were thus Jealous of a Monarch who owned His Kingdom not to be of this World, and was shortly to leave it; would they not have been much more so if a visible Monarch, Independent of the State, had been set up in every City? And has not the Event shewed that they had had Reason for such Jealousie, when Bishops in most Kingdoms have made such Encroachments on the Civil Government, and the Bishop of Rome has set his Foot on the Necks of the greatest Emperours. And does not Mr. Dodwell himself confess, (c) That it was the Supremacy of the Bishop of Jerusalem, upon whom, as he fancies, all the Christian Churches through the World did depend, that provoked the Gentiles to Rage so much in Persecution against that Church, that the Head being once lopt off, Christianity might be ruined at once. 2do. If a Prelatical Form of Government would have any Way recom-

---
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recommended the Christian Church to the favour of secular princes, or even alleviate their Spire against her. Is it not strange that none of the Apologists for Christianity ever insisted on that Topick? Is it not strange that the younger Pliny, (d) who gave the Emperor so discreet an Account of the Christians, never mentioned how well their Government was suited to that of the Empire? 310. Why should Mr. Rhind imagine that a Parity of Officers would appear any uncouth Thing to the Romans: For, had they not a Couple of Consuls of equal Dignity chosen annually? Nay, did it not shortly after this grow in use to have a Couple of Emperours (sometimes moe) reigning with consent, Aequo Jure as Eutropious (e) express it. So far were they from having an ill Opinion of Parity. 410. Does not Mr. Rhind know that most of all the brave Spirits among the Romans in the Apostles Days secretly groaned under the imperial Chains; impatiently longed for, and sometimes bravely attempted the Recovery of their ancient Liberties and Government? Does he not know that upon the Death of Caligula the Senate decreed that the Memory of the Cezars should be extinguished, and the Temples built to their Honour thrown down, and that, by the Tribune of the People they Discharged Claudius, who had been saluted Emperour by the Army, to enter on the Administration, though indeed they were at last overpowered by a military Force? If therefore we were to reason on such Common Place Arguments, 'tis plain that a Monarchical Form of Government in the Church would have most excited the Jealousie of the Prince; and that a Republican Form would have gained her most Proselyts among the People.

But, faith Mr. Rhind p. 48, we do not find that ever their Persecutors did charge it upon them as a Crime, that the Church was of a Republican Constitution. True indeed they did not: For they knew that the Christians owned Christ as their Head and King, and on that Account misrepresented them as Rebels and Sedulous Persons, and raised Persecution against them. Judeos (faith Sueton) (f) Impulsore Christo affidique tumultuames Roma expulit.

But

[a] Ep. 97. Lib. x. (c) Breviar. Lib. viii. (f) In Claud. Cap. xxv.
Sect. V. Presbyterian Government.

But I have insisted too long against an Argument the most Maggotish was ever bred in the Head of a Living Creature. I doubt not but the Reader is Curious to know what could put him upon it. The Discovery of this is no hard Matter. 1 mo. It was even pure Love to the French King, that he might Justifie Him in all his Barbarous Usage of his Protestant Subjects. Who could have blamed the Roman Emperours, if, for their own Security they had crushed the Christian Church, in Case her Government had been Presbytry? This is his Doctrine; and is not the Use of it very obvious, viz. The Government of the French Protestant Churches was Presbytry; who then can blame His most Christian Majesty for Crushing a Society of so dangerous a Constitution? 2 mo. It was to teach our own Princes at Home how they are in all Time coming to treat us. We are Presbyterians, and Presbytry alone is a reasonable Ground of Jealousie and just Cause of Persecution. Thus Mercifull and Gospel-like is the Prelatick Spirit. But I go on.

S E C T. V.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Proofs for evincing that Prelacy actually was instituted, are examined. From P. 50. to P. 119.

Mr. Rhind p. 40. falls a Haranguing with a very disdainfull Air, which yet becomes a High-Flyer admirably well. A Government, faith be, consisteth by a Subordination of Rulers is actually approven of by God, and this he has so fully notified in his Word, that to prove it, I am not put to the wretched Shift of ob-
two or three controverted Texts, as the Adversaries in this Case are obliged to do. 'Tis very true that a Hierarchy under the Jewish Dispensation was both institute and approved of by God: And how very serviceable to the Cause of Prelacy this is, I believe the Reader is by this Time sufficiently convinced. But now he resolves to rally his Forces and attempts to prove the Actual Institution of Prelacy by six Arguments, the first four whereof are pretended to be fetched from the Scripture. And no doubt his Reader is in great Expectation: For, after the Harangue you have heard, would not a modest Perton be tempted to think, that Prelacy were legible in the Bible, that one needed only open his Eyes to find it there? And yet 'tis Mathematically certain it is not there. How Mathematically you'll say? Why the Incomparable Mr Dodwell, who has stated the Controversie fairly, whose Authorities are Pertinent and justly allledged, and whose Deductions from them, and all his other Reasonings do proceed in a Mathematical Chain, has frankly owned (g) it is not there. Plainly, that Prodigy of Learning has acknowledged, That 't is not needful that the Form of Government 'tis now observed, should have been delivered in the Canonical Scriptures; That there is no Place of them which openly professes that; That there is none of the Sacred Writers treat of Church Government on Design. Nay that the Holy Ghost has never described any one Form of Government that was to take Place every where and at all Times. Mr Rhind's Attempt then was too hardy, and he was too desirous to undertake that which the ablest Champion Prelacy ever had owns to be impossible to be done. And now I come in so many Articles to examine his Proofs; and 'tis a Lucky Prefage that they will not be very dangerous, seeing We are sure neither to be oppressed

---

pressed with M. Dodwell's Authority, nor straitned with his Reasonings, but on the contrary will find him frequently helping us to answer M. Rhind.

**ARTICLE I.**

*Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof for the Institution of Prelacy from its obtaining in the Days of Christ, is Examined.* From P. 50. to P. 61:

Mr. Rhind in Discoursing this Proof proceeds in the following Method. I. He attempts to reason his Reader into a Belief that Christ as Monarch of the Church behoved to institute Officers of different Orders under Himself, by which we must either suppose him to mean Prelacy, or else his Argument concludes nothing against the Presbyterians. II. He adduces the Instance of the Twelve Apostles subordinate to Christ, and the Seventy Disciples inferior to them in the Government of the Church. III. He labours with great Industry to prove that the Text Math. 20. 25. *The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion &c* with its Parallels carries in it no Institution in Favour of Presbyterian Government; and that much less can its Institution be inferred from it. All this I shall examine in Order.

I. He attempts to reason us into a Belief that Christ as Monarch of the Church behoved to institute Prelacy. This he does by asking two Questions. First, asks he, *After what manner was the Church Governed in the Days of Christ?* I answer, after no Manner at all. I doubt not but this Answer will surprize him, but I am sure
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Sure to convince him 'tis a good one. Hear M. Sage (b) 'It is obvious observably in the Evangelical Records that the Christian Church was not, could not be founded till our Lord was risen, for it was to be founded on his Resurrection.' Is not this plain Sense and Truth too? and if the Christian Church had no Being before Christ's Resurrection, then certainly no Government; if no Government, then certainly not Prelatical Government; and consequently M. Rhind's Argument is lost to all Intents and Purposes. 'Tis clear as Light, that such as lifted themselves with Christ in the Days of his Flesh were under no distinct Government but that of the Jewish Church with which they were still incorporate, and from which, as we have already proved, no Consequence can be drawn for the Nature of the Christian Government. 'Tis plain then, that all further Consideration both of M. Rhind's Reasonings and Instance are utterly Needleless.

But short Answers cut one's Houghs, and are apt to be very provoking. Wherefore, that his Harrangue may not be lost, I shall answer his Question according to his Heart's Will viz. That Our Blessed Lord himself was its sole King and Head. And if this will content him for making the Government of the Church Monarchical, I dare promise him no Presbyterian will contradict him. But then, upon his Concession, he has a second Question to ask. Was there ever a Government of a Monarchical Constitution, where the Monarch did not, yea behoved not to derive of his Authority in an orderly Gradation upon several Subordinate Ministers? You see here good Reader M. Rhind's Modesty, But was Christ under the same Necessity with other Monarchs? O yes, Shall we suppose, faith he, that he who is King in Zion shall do otherwise in His Church, than all wise Princes have ever done in their Kingdoms? So now you have Mr. Rhind's Heart. Christ, the Wisdom of God, must take his Measures from the wise Princes of the Earth. But what though all this were True; that not only all the wise Princes of the Earth, but even our Lord Himself not only had, but behoved to derive of their Authority in an orderly Gradation upon several Subordinate Officers; and that a Parity of Rulers under

(b) Vind. of the Prim. of the Cypr. Age Chap. VI. Sect. 2.
under a Monarch would make a Monstrous, and in it itself a Contradi-
tious Constitution, how would this affect the Presbyterians? For tho' they deny, that Christ while on Earth institute a Subordination of Officers, and have a very good Reason for it, as we shall just now hear, yet they both plead for and actually exercise a Government by Subordinate Officers. And I hope 'tis very easie to conceive how a Thing may be not only of Scripture in the General, but even of New Testament Institution, which yet was not Institute by Christ while he was upon Earth. 'Tis then evident that Mr. Rhind's Reasoning, suppose it had no other Faults, yet imports nothing a-
gainst the Presbyterians.

But, if Mr. Rhind please, let us abstract from what Christ be-
haved to do, and consider what he did. I affirm that while he was upon Earth he was so far from Instituting Subordinate Pa-
sters, that he did not so much as institute Subordinate Officers. And this brings me to Mr. Rhind's Instance.

If. He adduces the Instance of the Twelve Apostles Subordinate to Christ, and the Seventy Disciples Inferior to them in the Govern-
ment of the Church. 'Tis needless to spend Words on it. Let us see if the Episcopal Authors have not fitted him with an An-
swer.

The first is Dr. Whitby a late fresh Writer. 'Whereas, saith he, (i) some compare the Bishops to the Apostles, the Seventy to the Presbyters of the Church; and thence conclude that divers Orders in the Ministry were instituted by Christ Himself. It must be granted that the Ancients did believe these two to be divers Orders, and that those of the Seventy were Inferior to the Order of the Apostles; and sometimes they make the Com-
parison here mentioned: But then it must be also granted, that this Comparison will not strictly hold; for the Seventy received not their Mission as Presbyters do from Bishops, but immediately from the Lord Christ, as well as the Apostles; and in their first Mis-
ion were plainly sent on the same Errand and with the same Pow-
er. Thus Dr. Whitby.

The Second is M. Sage. "Our Martyr Cyprian, saith he, (k) (as it appears

---

appears from his Reasonings on divers Occasions) seems very well to have known, and very distinctly to have observed, that the Apostles themselves got not their Commission to be Governors of the Christian Church till after the Resurrection. And no wonder, for this their Commission is most observably recorded John 20. 21. 22. 23. No such Thing anywhere recorded concerning the Seventy. Nothing more certain, than that that Commission which is recorded Luke 10. did constitute them only temporary Missionaries and that for an Errand which could not possibly be more than temporary. That Commission contains in its own Bosom clear Evidences, that it did not install them in any standing Office at all, much less in any standing Office in the Christian Church, which was not yet in Being when they got it. Could that Commission which is recorded Luke 10. any more constitute the LXX standing Officers of the Christian Church, than the like Commission recorded Matth. 10. could constitute the Twelve such standing Officers? But it is Manifest, that the Commission recorded Matth. 10. did not constitute the Twelve Governors of the Christian Church; otherwise what need of a new Commission to that Purpose after the Resurrection? Presumable therefore it is that S. Cyprian did not at all believe that the Seventy had any Successors, Office Bearers in the Christian Church, seeing it is so observably that they themselves received no Commission to be such Office Bearers. Thus M. Sage. And what now is become of the Orderly Gradation. The Apostles themselves were not constitute Governing Officers before Christ's Resurrection, How then could the Seventy be inferior to them in the Government of the Church?

And thus now we have heard Mr. Rhind's whole Proof of the obtaining of Prelacy in the Days of Christ: For not one Instance or Declaration more has he for this Purpose. Yea indeed he is so Ingenious p. 53. as to disclaim a positive Institution; and only pleads p. 61. that the Subordination, which obtained among the Twelve Apostles and Seventy Disciples, declares what Form of Government Christ liked best, and consequently is a Precedent Equivalent to an Institution. And We have heard that there was no such Subordination, and that therefore it can be no Precedent.
But Mr. Rhind is resolved to be equal with the Presbyterians, and
to make it good that there is no positive Institution of Parity in the Four
Gospels.

III. He labours with great Industry to prove that the Text Math.
20. 25. "The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion &c with its
Parallels, carries in it no Insinuation in Favour of Presbyterian Gov-
"ernment; and that much less can its Institution be inferred from
it. For my own Part, I cannot find any one Presbyterian Author
that ever insisted on the said Text for a Positive Institution of Presby-
try, but they urge it as an express Interdiction of Prelacy; and from
thence in Conjunction with other Scripture Warrants infer, that,
by Scripture Institution, the Government of the Church should be
Presbyterian. But by no means will Mr. Rhind allow that the said
Text has the least Aspect that Way; and he affirms p. 55. That the
Intent of it is to correct the Disciples Mistake concerning the Temporal
Kingdom of the Messiah, and to warn them against Pride and Tyranny,
but
not at all to forbid a Subordination of Officers, Pastors, he should have
said. Now that I may do Mr. Rhind Justice; I shall consider every
Thing he has advanced for wresting this Text out of the Presby-
terian's Hands.

1. It seems, faith he p. 53, to favour an Equality, but be it known to you
others have made use of it with much more reason to prove a Preeminence.
The Reader, no doubt, will be in Pain to know who these others may
be. Plainly 'tis Bellarmin, who from thence attempts to prove the
Pope's Supremacy; with as much Reason no Doubt, as he does the
Lawfulness of denying the Cup to the Laity from these Words Drink
ye all of it.

2. There are no other Texts, faith he ibid. in the four Gospels which the
Presbyterians do, that I can remember, so much as alledge to this Purpose.
But here his Memory has failed him: For if he had consulted Didocla-
"nius or Stillingfleet he might have found another Text, viz. "Math.
18. 15. Tell the Church, which the Presbyterians insist on to the same
Purpose, with the former.

3. "The learnedest Authors of that Perswaion, faith he p. 54, can-
didly own, that the Equality which they contend for cannot be
\[\text{\textsuperscript{3}}\text{Alt.-Dam. Cap. IV. p. 132. Irenic. Part II. Chap. V.}"
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ferred from this Place. Well, who are these learnedest Authors? He instances M. Pool. But why does he mention him? He answers, because he is of so great Authority with them at this Time. Well, shall the Presbyterians consult him? By all means, and faith he, 'tis they will be convinced that I have done him no Injustice. But what Book of his shall they consult? The Annotations, faith he, which pass under his Name. Now, good Reader, M. Pool was Dead and Rotten ere these Annotations were written. Plainly it was Dr. Collins wrote them, who was indeed a Dissenter, though I have not yet heard whether he was a Presbyterian. But whatever he was, he was very much inferior in Abilities to M. Pool. Are not Presbyterians now mightily straitned with M. Pool's Authority.

4. They are the lesser Presbyterian Authors, faith he ibid. by whom it is still insisted on. I am truly sorry that Mr. Rhind should so frequently shew himself unacquainted with the Writers on both Sides, after he had told he had read them with a Scrupulous Exactness; or which is much worse, that he should so often bid defiance to the Sincerity which the Nature of his Composure required. Calvin, Beza, Chamier, Cartwright, Didoclauius, Turretine, the Belgick, the English, Diodati's Annotations do all of them, besides Scores of others, assert that not only the tyrannical Exercise, but a Dominium or Prelacy itself is thereby forbidden to the Pastors of the Church. Were these the lesser Authors? But why do I mention them? The English Divines themselves from that very Text prove the Pope's Supremacy to be unlawfull by what humble Methods ever attained to, or with what Moderation ever exercised. And how the Pope's Supremacy should be unlawful by Virtue of that Text, and yet the Supremacy of the Primate of all England, who is alterius Orbis Papa, not be so; it will be hard to give a Reason, except that which the Lord Falkland in his forementioned Speech has suggested viz. That they oppose the Papacy beyond Sea, that they may settle one beyond the Water. Hear Dr. Whitaker. It is not, faith he, (1) Humility in the Domination that is required, but the very Domination it self that is forbidden. And then goes on answering the Criticisms advanced by Mr. Rhind, but whereof Bellarmin was the true Father. The Church of

of England Divines, to give them their Due, have oftimes made a Noble Stand against the Church of Rome. No wonder, They had both Truth on their Side, and considerable Dignities to lose in case they got the Worse. But of all Men in the World they are the most to be pitied when they have to Dispute against the Presbyterians, for the very same Arguments wherewith they defeated the Romanists, with the very same Presbyterians defeat them; whereby they make the exact Moral of the Goose in the Fable which was wounded with an Arrow feathered from her own Wing. 5. The Original Word, faith he p. 56. which our Translators have rendered To exercife Authority (Dominion he should have said) does properly signify such an exercise of it as is Tyrannical; which he endeavours to prove First from Beza, Secondly from the Septuagint, Thirdly from S. Luke Acts 19. 16. which, faith he, is the only other Place where it occurs in all the New Testament, and certainly implies Violence and Tyranny, being used to signify how the Domoniack overcame the Sons of Sceva. Now let us examine this. In the First Place, Beza, on that Place, is not Criticizing on the Word, or telling what it naturally imports, but is Describing the actual Practice of the Princes of the Gentiles. And expressly saies (m) ' That our Lord there deborts ' that none amongst the Ministers of his Word seek Preeminence ' and Power. Secondly, As for the Septuagint, he has produced no Place where they take the Word in such an ill Sense. 'Tis none of my Business therefore to consider where they do so; but this is certain that they frequently use it in a good Sense. For Instance Gen. 1. 28. Have Dominion over the Fishes of the Sea. Psal. 72. 8. He shall have Dominion from Sea to Sea. Psal. 110. 2. Rule thou in the Midst of thine Enemies. In all those Places the Greek Word used by Them is the same with that in the Text. But will any Body say that Adam's, Solomon's or Christ's Dominion was to be Tyrannical. Thirdly, Is that Place Acts 10. 16. which relates the Domoniack's overcoming the Sons of Sceva the only other Place in all the New Testament where the Original Word is used? I wish some Body had helped Mr. Rhind to a Greek Concordance. For

[m] Exhortatur ne quis inter Miniftris Verbi fui quercr Præcellentiam et Potentatem. Beza in Locom.
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1. Peter 5. 3. where Ministers are forbidden to carry as Lords over God's Heritage the Original Word is the same. Thus you see all this Criticism is quite lost. But why did not Mr. Rhind, when he was in the Criticizing Vein, observe, that though the compound Verb which Matthew and Mark use signifies sometimes Violence and Tyranny; yet that Luke in the Parallel Place used the simple Verb, which, however it may be sometimes applied, yet in its own Nature signifies only Dominion without the Superaddition of Tyranny or Violence. Why, I say, did not Mr. Rhind observe this? The Reason is Plain, it would have made against him and quite spoiled his Argument; and why should a Man harm himself?

6. He endeavours to make good his Gloss on the Text by Criticising on the Word Euergetes which our Translators render Benefactors. 'If, faith he p. 57, these Gentile Princes, whom their mean Flatterers firnamed Euergetes, were some of them Guilty of Violence, then doubtless the Authority, which was exercised by those who were so called is meant to be Tyrannical, and, in that Respect, 'tis that our Saviour forbids his Apostles to Copy after them. Now, that some of these who had this Sirname given them, did abuse their Authority to the worst of Purposes, he proves by the Instance of Ptolemy VII. King of Egypt firnamed Euergetes II, who was indeed a very ill Prince. This is a very deep Criticism. But in the First Place who shall secure us that our Saviour so much as alluded to any of those Princes that had born that Sirname, there being no hint thereof either in the Text or Context. 2dly, Be it that He did allude to them, yet who shall secure us, that it was to such as were ill rather than such as were good of them? But it is Nauseous to dispute against a Trifle, though there were other Princes whom their Flatterers upon Occasion now and then called Euergetes or Benefactors in a Way of Complement, yet I do not find any that bore that for their Sirname, save two of the Race of the Ptolemyes in Egypt. And as the Second of them was very vitious, as Mr. Rhind has observed; so the first of them viz., the Son of Ptolemy Philadelphus was a brave Man, engaged in a Just War against Antiochus Callinicus for the Murder of his Sister and her little Son, had Success in it, and in Token of his Devotion and Gratitude offered Sacrifices to the God of Heaven at Jerusalem. On which Account
Josephus (n) makes honourable Mention of him. Now, when there were only two Princes that bare that Sirname, whereof as the one was Bad, so the other was Good; why should Christ allude only to the Ill one? For, to affirm he did so, without proving it, is to beg the Question.

7. Mr. Rhind argues † from the Opposition, which our Lord states twixt his own Example which he proposes for their Imitation, and that of the Princes of the Gentiles which he forbids the Apostles to follow. It cannot, faith he, be said without Blasphemy, that he put himself upon a Level with his Apostles, with Respect to Authority and Jurisdiction; and consequently that Authority which they were to exercise, in Imitation of him, does not import, a perfect Equality among them in Opposition to that Imparity which obtained in the Heathen Governments. The Answer is easy, Mr. Rhind has mistaken (whether willfully or otherwise I shall not determine) the Design of the Argument and the Way how it proceeds. For when our Lord commanded ver. 27. 28. ‘Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your Servant; even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister,’ he argued from the greater to the lesser thus: For as much as I your Lord and Master have humbled myself to the basest Service, therefore you who are indeed Servants, and each upon a Level with other, should be ashamed to be thinking of or aspiring to be Lords and Masters over one another. This makes our Saviour’s Words Plain and Intelligible, whereas Mr. Rhina’s Gloss, instead of extinguishing, would have enflamed their Ambition, by supposing it Lawfull for one or two of them to Lord it over the Rest.

8. ‘Our Lord, faith he ibid., cannot be supposed to forbid in this Text such a Subordination of Rulers in the Church, as was that, which at that Time obtained in most of the Gentile States; seeing this were to condemn that Form, by which he thought fit the Church should be governed in the Days of his Flesh, which was Monarchical. The Answer is short. 1. We have already heard M. Sage owning that there was no Christian Church in Being at that Time, consequently no Christian Governours, consequently

---

no particular Form by which the Church was then governed. 2dly, supposing both the Twelve and the Seventy had been Governours, yet we have heard Dr. Whitby confessing that they were both vested with the same Power. There being then no Subordination of Pastors, no different Orders of them under Christ at that Time, it necessarily follows that Christ's Words in the controverted Text, according to Mr. Rhind's Peremptor Sentence p. 61, ' Doubtless, whatever Kind of Government obtain'd in the Church in the Days of Christ was designed to be perpetual, must needs condemn such a Subordination in all Time coming.

Lastly, Mr. Rhind argues p. 60. That if the Sense of our Saviour's Words were not according to his Gloss, 'tis probable he would have stated the Opposition, not 'twixt them and the Princes of the Gentiles; but rather 'twixt them and the High Priest, Priests and Levites among the Jews. 'Tis answered. Christ had the greatest Reason to State the Opposition as he did. He had the greatest Reason not to State it as Mr. Rhind thinks probable he would have done upon Supposition of the Presbyterian Sense. First, he did State the Opposition 'twixt them and the Princes of the Gentiles, because the Disciples having a Notion of a Temporal Kingdom of the Messiah, and being swelled with the Expectation of Dignities in the Same; our Saviour thought it needful to answer them agreeably to the Notion they had entertain'd, and withheld to insinuate to them that no one of them was to expect any Superiority over the rest in any Capacity Civil or Ecclesiastical; but that they were all to be on a Level in Point of Authority. And thus in Fact we find afterwards they were, though indeed on the Account of Personal Excellencies some of them seemed to be Pillars. Secondly, He did not State the Opposition 'twixt them and the Jewish High Priest, Priests and Levites, because the Disciples themselves did not yet think of any other Church Government than what at present obtained among the Jews; and Christ did not find them yet ripe for receiving any Intimation thereof; but thought it enough to give them a general Rule to be observed by them afterwards; and whereof, when it was to be put in Practice, they would easily conceive the Meaning, after their Understandings were opened, and Things brought to their Remembrance by the Holy Ghost which was to be communicated to them. This Thought is suggested to us by Mr. Dod-
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Thing with Universally) the whole Princes of the Earth as a Knot of Tyrants counteracting the Design of their Office which is the Good and Happiness of Mankind, by their Violence and Oppression? What else could have been the Effect of this but to produce in his Followers an utter Aversion to Monarchy, and to make 'em all State Whiggs? This Sense then is absurd, and therefore ought not to be put upon our Saviour's Words. And I cannot enough wonder how Mr. Rhind could stumble upon it. Had it dropt from some old Republican, the Matter had been the less; but in Mr. Rhind, who has made Loyalty so great a Part of Religion, and has recommended it to the World in so very pointed a Sermon, 'twas an unpardonable Escape. To confirm my Thoughts upon this Text, let us hear Dr. Whitby on it. ' Nor do I think, saith he, † Christ only hear forbiddeth such Dominion as is attended with Tyranny, Oppression and Contempt of their Subjects. First because S. Luke ues only the Simple Verbs which bear no such ill Sense. 2dly, Because Kings and Governours were not always guilty of this Male-Administration. And 3dly, Because Christ does not oppose unto their Government a just Dominion, but a Ministry only. 

And now upon the Whole I referr it to the Reader, if the Argument for Prelacy from its obtaining in Christ's Days is not even Ridiculous; when the greatest Episcopal Writers own there was no Christian Church in Being at that Time, therefore no Subordination of Pastors in it, therefore no Prelacy. Or supposing the Twelve and the Seventy had been Church Officers, yet that they had both the same Power, and so it becomes an Argument for Parity.

† Annot. on Matth. XX. 23.
ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof for the actual Institution of Prelacy from its being continued in the Days of the Apostles, and from a Succession in the Apostolate, and from its having been confirmed by Miracles, is examined, From P. 61. to P. 74.

Upon this I shall I. Examine Mr. Rhind's Transition, which is indeed very Remarkable. II. His general Reasonings from the Acts and Epistles. III. His particular Argument from a Succession in the Apostolate. IV. His Demonstration for the Divine Right of Prelacy from its being confirmed by Miracles.

I. I am to examine Mr. Rhind's Transition, which is indeed very remarkable: I mean it would be so in any other Author, though it is very familiar with Mr. Rhind. He, presuming he had proved That our Saviour by His Authority established the Imparity he pleads for, contends, not only that that Establishment was not Abrogate afterwards, but that even Christ himself could not abrogate it: For, faith he p. 61, it would reflect odiously upon his Wisdom to have settled a Government, which must be almost as soon altered as instituted. It is indeed the known Character of the Generality of the Writers on the Episcopal Side, that they di&ate their crude Notions with the same Masterfull Air as if they were demonstrating one of Euclid's Propositions; yet generally this Positiveness amounts to no more than ill Manners, and therefore may either be neglected, or
or chastised with a little Railley. But that a Nothing of a Creature should at every Turn give Measures to the Divine Wisdom is Insupportable, and most of all in this Case. For 1st. Who that has any Reverence for our Blessed Saviour will presume to affirm that because he used one Method for constituting the Church, therefore it was inconsistent with his Wisdom to alter that Method in Governing Her when constituted? 2dly. M. Dodwell, who has reasoned in a Mathematical Chain, has very prolixly attempted to prove (p) That the Original Government of the Christian Church not only might be, but actually was altered. Yea that the Episcopal Constitution of Government, which now obtains, is later than all the Writings of the New Testament, and therefore is not to be sought for there. If it was not inconsistent with the Wisdom of Christ to alter the Government of the Church from a Papacy to a meer Prelacy, why should it be so to alter it from Prelacy to Presbytery? 3dly. Mr. Rhind himself must needs confess that the Original Government of the Christian Church is altered. For by his own Principles there were Bishops in the Time of the Apostles; for Instance, He has declared p. 78. Timothy and Titus to have been the ordinary and fixed Prelats of Ephesus and Crete. Yet the Apostles were then Superiour to them. But now all Bishops by Divine Right are Equal, and have no Superiour above them. If then it is consistent enough with the Wisdom of Christ that there should be at this Day Bishops without superior Apostles, notwithstanding it was otherwise at the Beginning, How is it inconsistent with his Wisdom that there should be Presbyters without superior Bishops? But then Lastly to compleat all, If Mr. Rhind’s Assertion be true, then Prelacy is undone for ever. For it has been already proved from the Episcopal Writers of the best Note, that our Lord did not establish an Imparity, that the Twelve were equal among themselves, the Seventy among themselves, and the Twelve and the Seventy compleatly equal without any Subordination of the latter to the former. If then the first Institution could not be altered, Parity must obtain for ever.

II. I am to examine Mr. Rhind’s general Reasonings from the Acts and

[p] Patrum. Sect. 13. p. 53. Hodierni Regimini Ecclesiae Constatio, licet emanarit ab Apostolis, est tamem scriptus N. T. omnibus recensior, & prorsus non ibi expediebatur...
and Epistles. He cannot find in his Heart to enter on 'em till he have spent a Page the 62 in Philippicks against the Presbyterians for their invincible Obstinate which will not yield even when he levels Demonstrations against them. Hard hearted Creatures they! But Mr. Rhind must e'en comfort himself with this, how small ever his Success is likely to be, that yet he is in the Way of his Duty. I shall give the Reader every Word of his Reasonings, that he may judge whether his Party must not be (to use his own Courtly Phrase) an Implicita Hard indeed that keeps it self in Contenance by them. The Acts and Epistles, faith he p.63. favour the Presbyterians as little as the four Gospels. Nay, if they favour them as much, they are not likely to be great Losers. 'These Acts and Epistles, adds he, are so far from intimating that the first Establishment was altered by the Apostles, that on the contrary they plainly shew its Continuance. Why then Adieu Prelacy for ever: For the first Establishment was only of the Apostles, they were the first Officers in the Church, for a while the only Officers, and still acted in a perfect Parity. ' Don't the Acts and Epistles, proceed he, all along make Mention of several Orders of Men who were undisputedly Church Officers, that is, who were solemnly separated for Ecclesiastical Offices by the Imposition of Hands? And don't they assign to each their Different Powers? I answer, not all along; for, as I have said just now, there was at first but one Order viz. that of the Apostles, and even these too solemnly separated for their Office without Imposition of Hands, at least we read nothing of it in the Scripture. What he goes on, does more frequently occur thro' these Sacred Writings, than the Mention that is made of Presbyters and Deacons, the one Subordinate to the other, and of the Apostles Paramount to them all. 'Tis answered. There is indeed frequent Mention of Presbyters and Deacons, the one Subordinate to the other, and of the Apostles Paramount to them all, but how came he to lose Prelats in his Enumeration, who ought to have been inferred twixt the Apostles and Presbyters? Were there none such in the Days of the Apostles? If not, what hath the Church to do with them now? If there were, why did he drop them in his Catalogue in this Place when he avers it afterward, tho' at the Distance of 16 Pages, that Timothy and Titus were the ordinary and fixed Prelats of Ephesus and Crete. The Reason of this Artifice is obvious. The inferring Prelats here would have quite spoiled his Reasoning; it would have made four Orders of Officers in the Apostolick Times, viz.
viz. Apostles, Prelats, Presbyters and Deacons, and if there ought to be as many different Orders now as there were at first, which is the Scope of Mr. Rhind's Reasoning, and without which it signifies nothing; then Prelacy is lost: For they have but three different Orders among them viz. Prelats, Presbyters and Deacons, for which they do so much as pretend Divine Right. But to go on with Mr. Rhind's Reasonings. What though the Acts and Epistles make Mention of the different and Subordinate Orders of Apostles, Presbyters and Deacons, what follows? Why, faith he, could one wish a clearer Proof than this, to evince that there was then an Imparity among Church Officers. I answer, none. For every Presbyterian owns that there was then viz. in the Days of the Apostles an Imparity not only among the Church Officers, but Pastors too. No doubt the Apostles were superior to the Presbyters. But he has a Second Inference to make viz. 'That the same also is a most clear Proof that that Imparity was of Divine Institution. The Presbyterians grant it: For the Apostles were certainly acted by the Divine Spirit. His Third Inference which compleats the whole is, that consequently that Imparity viz. of Pastors, ought to be still continued. But here the Presbyterians and Mr. Rhind part Ways: for tho' the Presbyterians acknowledge that the Apostles were superior to the Presbyters; Yet they affirm that a Superiority among Pastors is unlawful now, because the Apostolate was an extraordinary Office not to be continued, the Apostles extraordinary Officers not to be succeed ed to, except in the Ordinary Functions, Preaching, Dispensing the Sacraments and Governing the Church, in which they are succeeded to by every Minister. And this brings me to examine

III. His particular Argument from a Succession in the Apostolate. He expressly denies p. 64 &c. that 'the Apostolate was an extraordinary Office, or that the Apostolick Government was Temporary, and asserts that the Bishops of the Church, meaning Prelats as superior to Presbyters, do succeed them therein. Is this true? First, Davenant Bishop of Sarum not only denies but disproves it (q), Multitudes of others of the Church of England do the same. The Church of Rome a Society of a very large Extent, of a long Standing, and such as has produced not a few Wise and Great Men expressly contradict it, deny-
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ing that any of the Apostles had Successors save Peter in the Papal Chair. Secondly. Which must conclude Mr. Rhind, M. Dodwell (r) Himself has denied it, and afferts that the Office of the Apostolate failed with the last Apostle, and that never any of them had a Successor but Judas the Traitor. Did this escape M. Dodwell through Inadvertency? He repeats it over and over and over again in different Places. But Thirdly, which is worst of all, Ignatius himself, who is both Stem and Stern of the Episcopal Cause always makes the Presbyters to succeed to and represent the Apostles, but the Bishops never. (s) 'I exhort you that you study to do all Things in a Divine Concord, the Bishop presiding in the place of God, your Presbyters in the Place of the Council of the Apostles. (t) Also be subject to your Presbyters as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ our Hope. (v) Reverence the Presbyters as the Sanhedrim of God and College of the Apostles. (x) Continue inseparable from Jesus Christ our God and from the Bishop and from the Command of the Apostles. He that does any Thing without the Bishop and Presbyters and Deacons is not pure in his Conscience. (y) Follow your Bishop, as Jesus Christ the Father, and the Presbytry as the Apostles. I hope then this Matter is abundantly Plain, so far as human Testimony is needfull. But then Lasty. If to all this we add the Judgment of the Scripture, it may be put beyond Doubt. I am indeed amazed to find any Man who has read the first Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles plead for a continued Succession in the Apostolick Office. Judas had disposed of Himself, and the Vacancy was now to be supplied; the requisits necessary for qualifying one to stand Candidate for the Place are set down Ver. 21. 22. 'Wherefore of these Men which have Companied with us, all the Time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us: Beginning from the Baptism of John, unto that same Day He was taken up from us, must one be ordain'd to be a Witness with us of His Resurrection. In which Words we are plainly told that none could succeed into the Apostolate, but such as had known Jesus before His Death, and seen Him after His Death.

Defence of the Chap. II.

Resurrection and at His Ascension. If any Man now living, Bishop or any other, can be found thus qualified, we are content He be esteem’d a Successor in the Apostolate, but otherwise it is a very shameless Thing to talk of it.

But Mr. Rhind is of a different Judgment, and therefore is resolved at any rate to disprove the Assertion, that the Apostolate was an extraordinary Office, or that the Apostolick Government was Temporary. I shall examine what He has advanced for this Purpose.

First. He will not allow it to have been extraordinary or Temporary upon any Account, because it was not so upon one particular Account, viz. The Apostles being blessed with extraordinary Gifts. The Reader may possibly suspect that I misrepresent Him; but take it in His own Words. 'The Apostles, saith He p. 64. were indeed blessed withundy extraordinary Gifts, which proves them to have been extraordinary Persons; and it was highly necessary They should be such. But it does not at all follow from this, that the Apostolate was an extraordinary Office, or that the Apostolick Government was Temporary. But who can discern the least Shadow of an Argument in this? Where is the Presbyterians who ever said that these extraordinary Gifts wherewith the Apostles were blessed are alone an Argument that Their Office was extraordinary? What Presbyterians ever denied that Presbyters and Deacons, yea and some of the Laity were sometimes blessed with Them? The Presbyterians own these extraordinary Gifts were necessary for the successful Discharge of the Apostolick Office, They own that some of them were peculiar to the Apostles, particularly the giving of the Holy Ghost in His extraordinary Charismata; but besides these They had an immediate Call, an universal Commission, and were under an infallible Conduct, all which concurred to make them extraordinary Officers, and in which every Body sees. They neither are nor can be succeeded to. If any one now in Being can lay claim to these Characters, we shall allow Him to be a Successor to the Apostles, and even dispense with the other extraordinary Gifts.

Notwithstanding this Reasoning of His was so ill founded, yet He goes on to harangue upon it. 'If, saith he ibid. the Presbyterians will have these extraordinary Gifts to be an Argument of an extraordinary Office, yet must they at the same Time grant, that
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that Office should continue as long as these Gifts were Necessary, at least as long as they actually lasted. And upon this Concession He attempts to prove p. 67. 68. by the Instance of Melito Bishop of Sardis, Irenæus Bishop of Lyons, Gregory the Wonder-Worker Bishop of Neoæaria, Cyprian Bishop of Carthage, and by the Testimony of Eusebius that these Extraordinary Gifts lasted for several Ages; and from thence inferers that consequently Episcopacy must have lasted so long. This Reasoning, faith He, is good enough, ad Hominem, and does sufficiently expose the Weakness of the Presbyterian Evasion. But it is neither good ad Hominem nor ad Rem, nor exposes any Thing but Mr. Rhind’s Want of Arguments. First it is not Good ad Hominem: For the Presbyterians make no such Evasion; as we have already heard. Nor Secondly is it good ad Rem: For the Instances of Miraculous Bishops which He has instanced on are very Injudiciously chosen. I do not deny that extraordinary Gifts were continued in the Church even down to the Third or Fourth Century; or longer; if Mr. Rhind Please; but then, so far as relates to their having been pollitied by Bishops, He has had the ill luck to pitch upon the most suspected Instances. First. As for Melito. This was the Eunuch who was Bishop of Sardis. I shall easily believe what Tertullian as cited by S. Jerom and Polycrates as cited by Eusebius say of Him viz. That He was a Man Divinly inspirèd, and in all Things directed by the Aflatus and Suggestion of the Holy Ghost, if no more be meant thereby, than that He was a Man of eminent Piety: For the Spirit of Christ dwells and acts in every Man that is Christ’s: And I think'tis plain Polycrates in Eusebius meant no More: For he says only that He was led in all Things by the Grace of the Holy Spirit. But if Mr. Rhind will needs have us to understand thereby, that He was in all Things under an infallible Conduét, I assure Him I do not believe it: For the Apostles themselves were not always so; even Peter sometimes stept awry, and walked not with a straight Foot Gal. 2. 14, and I hope to make Mr. Rhind Himself confess that Good Melito was wrong in some Things. The Church of England never keeps Easter upon the Day of the full Moon, but upon the Sundry after, when it falls upon a working Day; or that Day seven nights, when it falls upon a Sunday. But Melito always kept Easter after the Jewish Fashion upon the very Day of the full Moon, whether
it fell on Sunday or Saturday &c. and Polycrates in Eusebius cites Him for that very Purpose in Opposition to Pope Victor. 'Tis Plain then that Melito was sometimes Wrong, or the Church of England is. Mr. Rhind may chuse as likes Him best. Secondly, As for Irenaeus Bishop of Lyons. Mr. Rhind saies that He converted many Pagan in his Dioces by the Miracles which He wrought, but He has not instanced any of them, nor told us where the Relation of them is to be found, and I am not willing to condescend, lest I should be suspected to do it too favourably for my Self. He tells us indeed both from Irenaeus Himsel and Eusebius that Miraculous Gifts and Powers were very Common in His Time; but what saies this to Irenaeus's Share in Them? When Mr. Rhind is more particular I shall be so too. Thirdly, As for Cyprian. All that Mr. Rhind alledges is, that He assures us concerning Himself that He was blessed with uncommon Measures of the Divine Spirit, and so I believe is every Good Christian; and do think Mr. Rhind was very Wise in not being more particular upon Cyprian's Miraculous Gifts. But then Lastly, Gregory Thaumaturgus or the Wonder-Worker is Mr. Rhind's great Man, yea even a Second Moses for Miracles. Well, what Vouchers does He bring for them? Two indeed of a very great Name viz. Gregory Nyffen in the Life of the Wonder-Worker, and S. Basil de Spiritu Sancto Cap. 29. But what Credit is to be given to them? In the first place hear the great Spanheim (z). The Learned, saith He, deservedly doubt about the Canonical Epistle ascribed to the Wonder-Worker. But much more about the Prodigies and Miracles which, almost without End, are attributed to Him by Nyffen in His Life and by Basil Himself; whence He got the Name of the Wonder-Worker and another Moses. Certainly many Things in Nyffen bare the Credulity even of an old Wise. Thus Spanheim. 2dly, Erasimus, in the Epistle Dedicatory prefixed to Basil's Works, rejects the latter half of His Book de Spiritu Sancto as Spurious, and at the end of Cap. 14. observes on the Margin, that here the Author Changes. Conseqently the 29. Chapter which

which Mr. Rhind insists on is of no Credit. 3dly Coke a Church of England Divine and sometime Fellow of Brazen Nose College, Oxford, proves (a) from the Body itself of that 29. Chapter that it is Spurious. And Lastly, which is worst of all, Dodwell Himself (b) reproaches these Dreams and Miracles of the Wonder-Worker. Was not now Mr. Rhind very well provided with Miracle-working Bishops when these were the best He could pitch on.

Secondly, Mr. Rhind having vainly spent ten Pages in pleading for a Succession in the Apostolate without the least Limitation, or dropping so much as one Syllable for explaining himself; at length p. 70. He tells us; that by 'the Apostolick Office, abstracting from it all 'Accidentals,' he means that Superiority of Power with which the 'Apostles were invested in the Ordination of Inferior Church 'Officers, and in Governing them and the Church: And pleads 'that it was not extraordinary in this Respect; and as such to cease. But the Prelats (supposing there were then any such) were Church Officers inferior to the Apostles, the Apostles were invested with a Superi-'ority of Power in the Ordination of them. I ask now whether that Superi-ority was Ordinary or extraordinary. If Ordinary, then there ought still to be Officers Superior to Bishops. If extraordinary, then the Superiority of Power with which the Apostles were invested in the Ordination of Inferior Church Officers, and in Governing them and the Church must be extraordinary too. I challenge Mr. Rhind and all his Party to take off this by a sufficient Answer.

Thirdly, He argues p. 72. 'If that Form by which the Church 'was governed in the Days of the Apostles, be in all Respects 'as good; and in many undeniably better than any other, then 'I think I may safely conclude, that it never ought to be altered. If Mr. Dodwell's Judgement be of any Weight, then this Reasoning is horribly false: For he teaches (c) That the Form of Govern-ment which obtained in the Days of the Apostles was altered, notwithstanding

---

notwithstanding that it was better calculate for gathering and planting Churches, for suppressing Heresies, for propagating the Faith, for the publick Good of all the Churches, than that which took place afterward.

Lastly. 'If, faith He p. 72, the Presbyterian were designed to be the Standing Form of Church Government, it would seem to reflect disparagingly on the Wisdom of Christ and his Apostles, that they could not make it serve all the Purposes for which such a Government ought to be appointed; but that to supply its Defects, they must usher it in with a Form, not only inconsistent with it, but which also in After Ages would be declared an unsupportable Yoke. Is it to be supposed, if they had foreseen that Party would be ever after the fittest Form of Government in the Church, or that it could be useful in it, that any other would have at all obtained? No. Or was there any Necessity that any other should obtain? Doubtless none at all. Is not this a very mannerly Harangue? Mr. Rhind must Discipline both Christ and his Apostles into their Duty, and teach them what was Consistent with their Wisdom, what would reflect disparagingly upon it. But admitting it were mannerly, Is there any Truth in it? No, not one Syllable even according to the Principles of his own Master the Great Dodwell, according to whom the Apostles did not appoint Several Orders of Men, as Mr. Rhind allidges, for the Work of the Ministry, but one Order only viz. of Simple Presbyters. Plainly Mr. Dodwell's Account of the Matter is this, 'That the Bishop of Jerusalem (as we have already observed) was Primate of the Christian Church all the World over. That the Church of Jerusalem by her Itinerant Missionaries exercised the whole Discipline in all the Christian World (a). That these Itinerant Missionaries (e) whether Apostles or others, were extraordinary Officers. That wherever they came, they never ordained any Bishops but Simple Presbyters only with a Chair Man among them for Orders sake; all which had indeed a Power of

of preaching the Word, and dispensing the Sacraments, but neither they nor their Chairman were to touch the Government with one of their Fingers. Plainly they had no Power to exaudtorate or depose any of their Number how Criminal soever, nor to surrogate new Presbyters in Place of such as dyed, nor to exclude any from the Communion, nor to restore such as had been excluded though never so penitent (f).

This Establishment continued till after the Destruction of Jerusalem and the Death of Simeon the Son of Cleophas. At length about the Year CVI. the Name of Bishop before common to all Presbyters was appropriate to one in each Presbytery. And this was the first Year, saies he; of asserting Episcopacy.

The Bishop thus let up was, if we will believe Mr. Dodwell, ended with alswingeing Power indeed. The dispensing all Rewards and Punishments in the Christian Society was in his Hands ALONE; in his Hands was the WHOLE Government, and that Legislative Power that is Competent to the Church and that without a RIVAL or Mate (g). Yea so uncontrollable was his Power, that tho' he might cast himself out of the Church by his Schism, Heresy or Sacrificing to Idols; in which Case the Episcopal College might supply his Place with another, yet it was not in the Power of that College, much less of his Presbyters, nay not of any Creature to depose him, how Immoral soever he were in his Life, how ill soever he governed the Church, but he was to be left to the Judgment of God alone (h). This was the Ignatian, this the Cyprianick Bishop, this the Episcopacy that should always obtain (i).

N

---


[g] Ibid. Sect. 37. p. 176. Sic penses SOLUM Episcopum cruent societatis Christianæ Praemia omnia atque Penae. Inde fequeuentur penses eundem esse vicibus Ecclesiæ Regimen OMNE, Pareitatemque, quales in hac Societate locum habet, Legislatuam. E quidem fine AMULO.
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I am fully perswaded that this Dodwellian Scheme, so far as it Narrates the Powers of Bishops, is the most extravagant, chimerical and false; yea indeed the most scandalous to Christianity that ever was or perhaps will be heard of; but let his Followers look to that the best Way they can: Only 'tis plain that, so far as M. Doanwell's Judgment or Authority reaches, Mr. Rhind's Argument is utterly lost: And the First Form of Government certainly might be altered; because, by the preceding Scheme, it actually was altered. I am then long- ing after this Representation to hear what Judgment Mr. Rhind will pass upon his above. Reasonings.

I should now proceed to the next Particular, but I crave leave ere I go further to make an Observe or two.

In the First Place I observe that there is nothing the Episcopal Authors, and Mr. Rhind as much as any, more frequently and willingly slide into than Harangues against a Government by Parity, Here they lay out all their Colours, exert their utmost Eloquence, and even bear down their Reader with a Torrent of Rhetoric. But I hope by this Time the Reader is abundantly convinced that these same Harangues against Parity are very senseless Things. For, First, by the former Account from M. Doanwell we have heard that Presbyters had not the least Share in the Government, and that the WHOLE Government was in the Bishop's Hands, and in his A-LONE. Secondly, the same M. Dodanwell assures us, and he is certainly right in it, that all Bishops were originally equal. By Divine Right are so, and continued to be so till towards the Reign of Constantine the Great that Archbishops and Metropolitans were brought in, not upon any Divine Warrant, but by Pactsions among themselves (k). Thirdly, he assures us in like Manner, that the Church in each Nation and Province was governed by the Episcopal College (l), and that too acting in a Parity. Fourthly, That the said Parity of all Bishops (m) was most consistent even with a flourishing Discipline both of Faith and Manners, and that the very Parity it self would

would take away all these Contentions which often arise from Worldly Pride, Emulation or Envy. Is it not then plain that the Government of the Church Universal, and the Government of every National Church was and ought to be by Parity? And what then signify all their Declamations against Parity? Will they not equally serve the Presbyterians against an Episcopal Parity, as they do the Episcopalians against a Presbyterian Parity? Or is Parity so Nimble a thing as to alter its Nature according as the Side is that espouses it? I would then advise our Episcopal Brethren to reserve their Harangues on that Subject till they hear of a new Edition of the Formula Oratoria; for though they import nothing in the Controversie of Church Government, yet they may be worth their Room there; and possibly be usefull to some School Boy of a Barren Fancy to furnish out his Oration with.

In the Second Place, What a very Jeft do the greatest Authors on the Episcopal Side make themselves. Dr. Hammond in innumerable Places (n) will have us believe that the Apostles at first ordained no Meer Presbyters but Bishops only. No, faith Mr. Dodwell, the Apostles at first ordain'd no Bishops but simple Presbyters only. Here are the two greatest Champions of the Cause by the Ears together on the moft Material Point of the Controversie. What can the Presbyterians do in the mean while but gather the Spoil, which, I think, very plainly falls to their Share which foever of them two gains the Victory. For if Dr. Hammond be right, the Presbyterians cannot be Wrong; a Bishop without Presbyters under Him being the likeft Thing in the World to a Presbyterian Minifter. But if Mr. Dodwell is right, the Presbyterians clearly gain the Cause; there being no Mention of Episcopal Government in the New Testament; and the Year of Christ CVI being the first year of its Settlement. For my own Part I am perfectly convinced that the Apostles ordain'd no Presbyters but such as were Bishops too in the full Scripture extent of that Word, that is, who had Power of Ordaining, exercising Discipline and Governing the Church as well as of Preaching and dispensing the Sacraments. But that these Bishops had (as Dr. Hammond fancies) a Power of Ordaining under themselves Sim-
ple Presbyters as they call them, that is, Men impowered to Preach and Dispense the Sacraments, which is the worthier Part of the Office, and on the Account of which especially the double Honour is due; without Power of Ordsining and Governing, which is the lesser Part of the Office, I shall believe it when I see it proved. In the mean Time I am not more persuaded that there is such a Book as the Bible, than I am that there is no mention in it of any such Creature as a Simple Presbyter or of a Power lodged in the Hands of a Bishop to make any such; or that there is in all the Kingdom a Presbyterian Minister who is not as much a Bishop, in all that Sense the New Testament means the Word, as the Primate of all England is. I now proceed to Examine.

IV. His Demonstration for the Divine Right of Prelacy from its being confirmed by Miracles. The Reader heard before of Mr. Rhins’s Miracle-Working Bishops. This He tells us p. 69. has given him the Hint of a Thing which in His Opinion is a Plain Demonstration for Episcopacy; which is this in His own Words.

Seeing after that Time, in which a Proper Episcopacy is acknowledged to have universally obtain’d, severals (whom the Adversaries of that venerable Order cannot deny to have been Bishops in the Ordinary acceptance of that Term) were allowed the Gifts of the Holy Ghost; ’tis certain that Their Office was of Divine Institution. For it is not to be supposed that our Lord would have vouchasfed them these special Donatives of Heaven, which they employed in the Discharge of the Episcopal Office, had it been (what the Presbyterians commonly call it) an Antichristian Usurpation. Thus, if the Office of an Apostle be of Divine Institution, that of a Bishop must be so too, the Credentials for the Mission of Both being of the same Authority. This is His Demonstration.

I do not wonder to find M. Dodwell (o) hint at this Argument, his Scheme had need of it: For he ingenuously owns that Episcopacy is not to be found in the New Testament; nor indeed can be, as be

---

ing later than all the Writings thereof. But for Mr. Rhind who was so well furnished with Arguments from the Scripture, to oppress us with these and with Miracles too was very unmercifull. However seeing he will needs go upon the Topick of Miracles and extraordinary Gifts, I think it but reasonable that Presbytery should put in for its Share. Bishop Spotswood himself relates (p) of John Knox, that he prophesied of Thomas Maitland a younger Brother of Lethington's, who had insulted upon the Murder of the good Regent Murray, That he should die where none should be to lament him. And the Prophecy was literally accomplished. He relates also (q) that he foretold of the Earl of Morton That his End should be with Shame and Ignominy if he did not mend his Manners; which the Earl remembred at the Time of his Execution, and said ' that he found these Words to be true and ' John Knox therein to be a Prophet. He relates also (s) how he prophesied that the Laird of Grange should be pulled out of his Nest, and his Carcase hang before the Sun, which accordingly came to pafs. He relates also (t) a Couple of Miraculous Providences interpos'd in behalf of M. John Craig another Presbyterian Minister. Twenty other Things, as miraculous and at least as well attested as these of Melito, Irenæus, or Gregory might be related of other Presbyterian Ministers; but for the greater Credit, I have satisfied my self with these recorded by the Episcopal Historian.

In the mean Time I am fully convinced that there cannot be a greater Weakness than to bring such Things in Argument on the one Side or the other. Had ever a Bishop or any Body else come and preached to the World that Episcopacy is of Divine Right, and that all the Passages of the New Testament relating to Church Government are to be understood in a Sense consistent with that Doctrine, and had offered to work a Miracle for Confirmation of all this. Had the Event Answered, and an uncontest'd Miracle been wrought; I acknowledge it might have superseded all other Arguments, and put an End to all further Disputes. But I suppose it will puzzle Mr. Rhind to find where this was ever done; nay which is a great unhappiness to him, by his Account such a Miracle

[p] Church Hist. p. 234, [q] Ibid. p. 264, [r] Ibid. p. 266, [s] Ibid. p. 463
Miracle in those early Days had been unnecessary; because no Body then was in any Doubt about the Divine Right of Prelacy: No Calvin was not born for many hundreds of Years after; nay, Aervius himself that Father of Presbyterian Schismatics was yet sleeping in his Original Causes. There are several good Protestantsthat do not think that all the Miracles reported to be wrought by the Jesuits in their Missions among the Pagans are meer Forgeries. If there was any Thing real in Them, it was a Seal to the Truth of Christianity in General which was the great avowed End of their Mission. But will any Body infer thence that the Order of the Jesuits is of Divine Institution? Balaam was endued with Extraordinary Gifts, does it therefore follow that God approved of his Character as a Diviner or Soothsayer? Cyprian, disguising of some who had broken off the Church by Schism, yet supposes it possible for Them to signalize themselves by Miracles (t). In like Manner Augustine. Let no Man, faith he (v), vend Fables among you. Both Pontius wrought a Miracle, and Donatus prayed and God answered him from Heaven. First either They are deceived themselves, or else They deceive others. However suppose he could remove Mountains, yet, faith the Apostle, If I have not Charity I am nothing. Let us see whether he hath not Charity, I should have believed it, if he had not divided the Unity: For my God hath warned me against all such Wonder-mongers saying In the latter Days there shall arise false Prophets doing Signs and Wonders. Thus Augustine. Here then is one Demonstration for Episcopalcy fairly spoiled. But as it is not the First, so it is not likely to be the Last.

ARTICLE III.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof for the Institution of Prelacy from the Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus, is Examined. From P. 74 to P. 84.

Upon this Argument I shall I. Examine His Reasonings by which He introduces Himself to it. II. The Argument itself; and what He has advanced for making it a Good one.

I. I am to Examine His Reasonings by which He introduces Himself to the Argument. I have so good an Opinion of His Judgment as to believe He Himself was convinced of the Weakness of what He has hitherto advanced. But, faith He p. 74, there is yet still something behind which ALONE does SUFFICIENTLY prove, that that Superiority of Power which the Apostles exercised over the Subordinate Orders of Clergy Men, that is, over Priests and Deacons (and why not over Prelats too, seeing there were then such? Wou'd He have us to believe They were hail Fellow with the Apostles? was not peculiar to Them; and consequently not EXTRAORDINARY. Now pray what may this be? Tis this, 'That the same was communicated to others, even to so many, that perhaps there was not a Church constituted by the Apostles, where there was not such a Superior Officer appointed; at least this holds True of the greatest Number of these where there is Mention made in the New Testament. It will be very strange if Mr. Rhind can make good this: For First, There is the Church of Corinth, the Churches of Galatia, the Churches of Philippi and all Macedonia, the Church of Thessalonica, with a great many more mentioned in the New Testament; but of any such Superior Officer in any of 'em there is a deep Silence in the Scripture. Secondly, 'Tis the very reverse of Mr. Doane's Doctrine;
according to whom, as we have already heard, there was no such Superior ORDINARY Officer appointed in any Church constituted by the Apostles, the WHOLE Government being managed by EXTRAORDINARY Officers sent from Jerusalem. But Mr. Rhind challenges the Presbyterians to condescend from the Acts and Epistles, upon one Act of Ordination and Jurisdiction, about which such an Officer was not principally employed. And I challenge Him again, indeed all His Party, to condescend upon one Act about which such an Officer, not EXTRAORDINARY, was employed. Mr. Rhind forewah that His Challenge would be thus returned. And this brings Me

II. To Examine His Argument or Instance in Answer to the said returned Challenge. This, faith He p. 74, was the Case of Ephesus and Crete, where Timothy and Titus acted with such a Superiority of Power. I Answer, not Good: For Timothy and Titus were Extraordinary Officers, and therefore it cannot be thence inferred that that Superiority of Power was design'd to be perpetual. Mr. Rhind was aware that this Answer would be made to Him; and therefore having, with unusual Ceremony and Good-breeding, declared p. 76, that it is not so contemptible as some would represent it, He applies Himself with all His might to defend against it; and to prove that Timothy and Titus were not Extraordinary Officers, but the Ordinary and fixed Prelats of Ephesus and Crete.

This He argues First, from the Silence of the Scripture, that there is no Intimation made in all the Acts and Epistles that They were such Extraordinary Officers. Secondly, From the Postscripts to their Epistles which expressly call them the first Bishops, that is, Ordinary and fixed Prelates of Ephesus and Crete. Thirdly, From the concurring Testimony of the Ancients, who with one Voice declare as the Postscripts do. Fourthly, From Scripture Authorities proving that Timothy and Titus were of an Order Superior to Presbyters and Deacons, and such as was always to be continued in the Church. A Set of very strong Arguments I acknowledge. Let us Examine whether he has made them good.

First, He affirms that there is no Intimation made in all the Acts and Epistles that Timothy and Titus were such Extraordinary Officers, p. 77. I affirm the contrary. No, Mr. Dodwell, I should have said,
laid, affirms the contrary; and Proves, from the very same arguments drawn out of the Epistles which the Presbyterians have always insisted on, that their Office was not fixed with respect to Ephesus and Crete, but that They were Itinerant Missionaries. This he proves with Respect to Timothy from S. Paul's BESEECHING him to abide at Ephesus, from his being called an Evangelist, from his frequent Journeys with S. Paul, and the like. And with Respect to Titus, he affirms that he was not more confined to any one place than the Apostle Paul himself was. I have set down his Words on the Margin (x) that the Reader may see all this.

Secondly, he argues from the Postscripts to the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, which, saith he p. 78. do expressely call them the first Bishops, that is, Ordinary and fixed Prelates, of Ephesus and Crete. Well, is it true that they were so? We have already heard M. Dodwell; let us hear another, who was as much concerned to keep the Episcopal Cause Right as ever Mr. Rhind is likely to be. The Person I mean is Dr. Whitby. 'First, saith he (y), I assert, that if by saying Timothy and Titus were Bishops, the one of Ephesus the other of Crete, we understand that they took upon them these Churches or Dioceses as their FIXED and PECULIAR Charge, in which they were to preside for Term of Life, I believe that Timothy and Titus were not thus Bishops. Thus he. But what now shall become of the Credit of the poor Postscripts by this? Why the same Dr. Whitby proves them to be false from the very letter of the Text itself in the Epistles. But Mr. Rhind is more tender hearted. 'Though, saith he, they are no Part of the Canon of the Scriptures; yet are they of so much Authority, that the Presbyterians themselves have not yet dared to cancel them in the Common Bibles. Very pleasantly! But then let me ask, in the First Place, seeing they are no Part of the Canon, what Authority can they have beyond what the Reputation of
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of the Authors of them can give them? Now who were the Authors of them? I doubt if that can be discovered unless one would go to Endor. Were they at least early? No, I will yield the Argument to Mr. Rhind if he can find them for at least 500 Years after the Epistles were written; nay, saies Dr. Hammond (2). We know that the Subscriptions of the Epistles are not to be found in all the Ancient Copies. 2dly, 'Tis true the Presbyterians have not dar'd to cancel them in the Common Bibles. But then I would ask him Who first put them into the Common Bibles? I doubt very much if they came there by fair Play. The Oldest English Translations have them not. I have by me Rycharde Taberner's Translation Prynted in the yer of our Loide God M. D. XXXIX. wherein there is not one Syllable of the Bishopricks of Timothy and Titus. For Instance, the Postscript to the Second Epistle to Timothy, bears this only, Written from Rome when Paul was presented the second Tyne up before Empeur Nero. But not one Word of Timothy's being ordained either First or Second Bishop. I ask Mr. Rhind, Secondly, who caused print these Postscripts in the same Letter with the Text, whereas they were put in a different Letter that they might be known to be no Part of the Canon? Good Mr. Rhind, pray purge your Party. In the mean Time it is not very generous to take Advantage of the Presbyterians for their not cancelling them, when they dar'd not do it; the Power of printing Bibles being the Prince's Gift nor the Church's. However from the whole tis plain, that it is Ridiculous to make an Argument of these Postscripts.

Thirdly, He argues from the concurring Testimonies of the Ancients who with one Voice declare as the Postscripts do. And to this, faith he p. 78, the Presbyterians will find themselves straitned to rejoin. No Doubt. Well, where are these Testimonies of the Ancients? Oh, how easie were it for Him to add to the Number of Pages by Quotations to this Purpose? But still I ask where are they? Nay not one of these Ancients has he quoted to this Purpose. Nay, nor so much as Named. Who now can doubt but the Presbyterians must find themselves straitned to rejoin? But if an Episcopalian rejoin, will

{2} Preface to the 2 Ep. to Timothy.
will it not do as well? Hear then Dr. Whitby. "The great controversy, faith He (a), concerning this and the Epistle to Timothy, is, whether Timothy and Titus were indeed made Bishops, the one of Ephesus and the Proconsular Asia, the other of Crete, having Authority to make, and Jurisdiction over so many Bishops as were in those Precincts. Now of this Matter, I confess I can find Nothing in any Writer of the first three Centuries, nor any Intimation that they bore that Name. Thus he. And the Presbyterians being secured from the Ancients of the first three Centuries, any Hazard from the rest is not much to be regarded: For, as M. Le Clerc most Judiciously observes (b) "The Testimonies of the Antients about this Matter, who Judged rashly of the Times of the Apostles by their own, and spake of them in the Language of their own Age, are of little Moment; and so do no more prove that Titus was Bishop of the Island of Crete, than what Dr. Hammond saies, proves Him to have been dignified with the Title of an Archbishop.

Fourthly, He argues from Scripture Authorities which prove, as he saies p. 79, that Timothy and Titus were of an Order Superior to Presbyters and Deacons, and such as was always to be continued in the Church.

First. With respect to Timothy he observes from Acts 20. 31, compared with Acts 19. 10. and Acts 19. 26. and Acts 20. 17. that Ephesus was furnished with Pastors e're the Apostle Paul left them. And yet he besought Timothy to abide there to charge some that They should teach no other Doctrine, and to perform several other Functions which import a Superiority of Power, with respect to Ordination and Jurisdiction: "For, faith He p. 81, Is it to be supposed, if the Presbyters and Deacons of Ephesus could alone have discharged these Offices, that St. Paul would have continued Timothy there, encroaching on their Divine Right. The Answer is abundantly obvious; for First, when the Apostle was a departing out of these Bounds, he warned the Elders of Ephesus that after His Departure Grievous Wolves should enter in not sparing the Flock. To give a Check
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Check to such it was Expedient in the Infancy of that Church; (none of Her Ministers being then above three Years Standing in the Office Acts 20. 31.) that a Person both of Extraordinary Character and Gifts should be among them. Which, when once the Government was settled and Things brought into a fixed Order, there would be no such Occasion for. Secondly, Paul's beseeching Timothy to abide at Ephesus is a certain Argument, as we have heard from Mr. Dodwell, That he was not there established Bishop: For to what End should He beseech a Bishop to reside in his own Diocese, when he could not do otherwise without offending God and neglecting his Duty. Thirdly, The Elders of Ephesus already ordained were Bishops. So, saies Dr. Hammond, nay, so saies the Sacred Text Acts 20. 28. over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops: And therefore, as Bishops They had Power to perform all Ministerial Functions, and only wanted such an Extraordinary Person as Timothy to direct and assist them in their present Circumstances. The Romans, sometimes when the Common Wealth was in Imminent Danger, created a Dictator with an Absolute Power for Six Months, without bounding him with any other Instructions but that he should take care Ne quis Detrimenti Republicae caperet. But will it therefore follow that the Dictatorship was a standing Office, Or will the Roman's making Choice of such an Officer in their Extremity justify or excuse Sylla or Julius Cæsar who would needs have themselves declared Perpetual Dictators, and thereby enslaved their Native Country. Though one takes Physick when he is sick, yet it would be a very unpleasant Diet for Ordinary. Though a Gentleman wears leading Strings while he is a Child, and is under Tutors or Curators till he is one and Twenty, does it follow that he must always be so?

Secondly, With respect to Titus, Mr. Rhind suggests that he was left at Crete with a Power to inspect the Qualifications of such as should be ordained Chap. 1. 7. to rebuke Elders as well as others Chap. 2. 15. to reject, that is to Excommunicate, Hereticks, and all this notwithstanding there were other Church Officers ordained there before: For He was left to set in Order the Things (relating to Ordination and Jurisdiction) which were wanting, which must needs infer that he acted in a Capacity Superior to them. 'Tis answer.
ed. Crete was as yet in a great Measure unplanted when Paul left him there. He was left there on Purpose to Ordain Elders in every City. These Elders whom he ordain'd were Bishops; the Text expressly saies it Chap. r. 5--7. Dr. Hammond Himself owns it. When therefore they were once ordain'd, they had Power to perform all Acts any Bishop is capable of. But Mr. Rhind afferts p. 83, 'That Titus, after he had ordained Elders in every one of the Cities of Crete, continued there exercisinc what we properly call an Episcopal Jurisdiction over them when ordained. But 'tis plain he did not continue in Crete to exercise either: For, Fourthly, Dr. Whately not only confesses, but proves from Scripture that he did not continue there. 'As for Titus, he was only left at Crete to Ordain Elders in every City and to set in Order the Things that were wanting. Having therefore done that Work, he had done all that was assigned him in that Station. And therefore S. Paul sends for him the very next Year to Nicopolis Tit. 3. 12. Thus He. If therefore Mr. Rhind's Instance prove any Thing, it must be the Divine Right of Non-residence, which indeed would be no ungrateful Performance to several People in the World.

Thus I have gone through whatever Mr. Rhind has advanced on this Proof. And now to Conclude it; there is Nothing Surer than that there was a perfect Equality among Bishops for the first three Centuries, and so M. Dodwell affirms. There is Nothing plainer from the Scripture than that there were Bishops at Ephesus before Timothy was left there; and that those whom Titus ordained in Crete were Bishops in all that Sense of the Word the New Testament owns. How then Timothy and Titus could be the fixed and ordinary Prelates of Ephesus and Crete is beyond the Power of Natural Understanding to conceive. If Mr. Rhind can solve me in this one Scruple, or if any other of his Brethren can, I shall own it as a singular Obligation. And therefore I desire them to take pains on their Answer, and to Labour it with all due Care.
ARTICLE IV.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof for Prelacy from the Apocalyptick Angels, is Examined.

From P. 84. to P. 86.

Mr. Rhind is much shorter on this than on any of the Preceding Proofs. The Reason, no doubt, is, because his much clearer. And therefore he puts on all his Airs, and treats the Presbyterians with a Noble Disdain in the Confidence of it; wondering they can be so Senseless or Obstinate as to resist its Evidence. That I may not wrong him, I shall set down every Word of what he has on it without the least Omission.

And that such a Superior Order did obtain a considerable Time after this, is evident from the Instances of the Seven Apocalyptick Angels, to whom our Lord directs so many Epistles by his Servant St. John: A plain Indication of his Approbation of that Authority which they exercised; especially considering that there is no Insinuation made to its Disadvantage in the Epistles directed to them. And that these Angels were single Persons, and the Governors of these Churches, will be evident to any who shall impartially consider the 2d and 3d Chap. of the Revelation, where they are plainly characterized as such, so very plainly, that perhaps all the Authors who ever commented upon them, whether Ancient or Modern, have supposed them to be such. Nor was it ever questioned by any, till the Interest of a Party obliged some to search for Criticisms, by which they might seem with their Followers to answer the Argument drawn from these Instances for Episcopacy: But the Evasions they have been forced to use, are so senseless, and have been so often exposed as such, that I am saved the Labour of exposing them further, or of repeating what has
has been already said to disprove them; only I must add, that
groundless are they, and such is the Evidence of Truth on the
Episcopal Side, that it extorted from some Presbyterian Authors and
particularly from Beza, one of the most Zealous and Learned Pa-
trons of Parity, a Confession that these Angels were single Per-
sons, and the Governors of these seven Asian Churches.

Now let us examine all this.

In the First Place. Were these Apocalyptick Angels the fixed Bishops
of these Churches? 'Tis true Mr. Dodwell, in his Book of the One
Priesthood and one Altar which he published in the Year 1683, is of
the Opinion (c) that the Bishops are here represented in a Mystical Way,
and personated by the Name of Angels; but in his Parænesis, a Book
which he published above 20 Years after the former, and
which consequently must be supposed to be the Wiser Book of the
two, he frequently inculcates, as we have heard before, that there
were no fixed Bishops in the World at that Time; and particularly
as to these Apocalyptick Angels, though he is in a very great Doubt
what to make of them (d), yet by no means will he allow them
either to have been Bishops or indeed the fixed Presbyteries of the
Place; but guesses them to have been Itinerary Legates sent from
Jerusalem answering to the seven Spirits Zach. 4. 10. that are the Eyes
of the Lord which run to and fro through the whole Earth. (e) Was Mr.
Rhind then to seek for Confidence when he would be so positive
in a Matter of which the greatest Man of his Party cou'd not have
a clear View; and in which, so far as he could guess, he has de-
termined against Him.

Secondly, How came Mr. Rhind to number these Apocalyptick
Angels, calling them the SEVEN Apocalyptick Angels? The Apocaly-
pse it self does not call them SEVEN. It is
said indeed Chap. 1. 20. that the seven Candelsticks are the seven
Churches, there both the Symbols and Things represented by them
are

[ec] Parænes. Sect. 10. p. 32. Hæ tuisse necesse erat, si quidem vere Episcopi suficiént Angeli Apocalypic
Sed de illis fœnetram nostram invia explicabimus. p. 30. 40. Si non sufseremus, sic alius tuisse veritati illumnum
offert Angelos Ecclesiœ Inneraricis ab antiquis locorum Presbyteris.--Erant ergo etiam ipsi tertialis Hiero-
Loyntorour Legatis, sed Apostolis ipsis obnoxii.-- ut prœnde Oculis Domeni septem Spiritibus respond-
d. ut Angelis Ap. p. 90. qui necessebant per universam Terram.--Sic tunc etiam hi Ecclesiœrnum Praeclæ-
gone loco or·vindicati, sed nulli Hierofolymis Innerarici.
are numbered: But it is not so in the other Branch. 'Tis not said The Seven Stars are the Seven Angels, but indefinitely are the Seven Angels of the seven Churches. Is not this a plain Indication that the Holy Ghost would not oblige us to take the Word Angels singularly?

Thirdly, are these Angels characterized as single Persons? Though Mr. Rhind indeed is more than ordinarily Sharp sighted, yet I am so far from seeing this Evident, that I cannot discern one Shadow of it; but on the contrary, I think I see them, and that too as plainly as ever I saw any Thing, characterized so as to denote a Collective Body.

Possibly my Sight is vitiated; but then much greater Men I'm sure than I, and at least as good Friends to the Episcopal Cause, have seen them just the same Way. Dr. Henry More, a Man of an Apocalyptic Genius himself, frankly owns (f) 'That by Angels, according to the Apocalyptic Stile, all the Agents under their Presidency are represented or insinuate. And this, saith he, is so frequent and obvious in the Apocalypse, that none that is versed therein can any wise doubt of it. Wherefore Christ his Writing to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus in this Mystical Sense is his Writing to all Bishops, Pastors and Christians in the first Apostolical Interval of the Church. Thus Dr. More. Yea Mr. Dodwell himself owns (g) That the whole Churches of the Lydian or Proconsular Asia are to be understood by the Mystical Representation in the Apocalypse, and that the Reason why S. John confined his Number to Seven is, 'not that by any Geographical Distinction those Seven Cities were incorporated into a Body more than others of that Province, but that he had a particular Regard to the Number of the Angels of the Presence. How is all this consistent with their being characterized as single Persons? But let us wave Human Judgment and appeal to the Text.

Fourthly. I ask, Are these Angels characterized in the 2d and 3d Chap. of the Revelation as single Persons and the Governors of these Churches? 'Tis true each Epistle is directed to the Angel in the singular Number. But 'tis as true, that that Title agrees to every Minister of the Gospel, and to everyone that bears the Message of

(1) Expos of the seven Ep. to the Seven Churches p. 29 [g] See Priesthood Chap. XII. Sect. 2.
of the Lord. And it is as true, that the Word Angel even in the singular Number bears a Collective Sense; as when it is said Psalm 34. 7. The Angel of the Lord encamps round about them that fear him. So that nothing can be inferred on the Episcopal Side either from the Title it self, or from the Usage of it in the singular Number. But then if we look into the Body of the Epistles themselves, consider the Way how they are ushered in, and the Solemn Clause with which each of them concludes, 'tis plain that Angel must be taken in a Collective Sense, as including not only all the Ministers of the Church but indeed the whole Church itself. Thus, in the first Place John directs his Revelations to the Seven Churches which are in Asia. Rev. 1. 4. Thus the Voice behind him ordered him, What thou seest write in a Book, and send it unto the Seven Churches which are in Asia Rev. 1. v. 10. 11. Thus at the End of the whole Vision, I Jesus have sent mine Angel to testify unto you these Things in the Churches Rev. 22. 16. Thus at the End of every of the Epistles there is that Solemn Clause, he that hath an Ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit faith unto the Churches. Secondly, if we look into the Bodies of the Epistles themselves, we shall find the Thing still more clear. First in the Epistle to the Angel of the Church of Ephesus shall we think that the Commendation for Labour and Patience, the Reproof of the Decay of the first Love, the Exhortation to Repentance, the Threatning to remove the Candlestick out of his Place, were directed to or concern'd only one single Person? Would our Saviour punish a whole Church so grievously as to deprive them of the Gospel for the Fault of their Bishop? No. When he saies the Angel of Ephesus, He means the Church in it faith Aretas Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia (h). 2ly, When he bids the Angel of the Church of Smyrna. Fear none of these things which thou shalt suffer: Is it not presently added, Behold the Devil shall cast SOME of YOU into Prison that YE may be tried; and YE shall have Tribulation ten Days. Is this the Characterizing of a single Person? When he exhorts to Faithfulness, and makes Promise to him that overcomes, does he direct to the Bishop only? No, faith Augustin (i) He saies it to the whole Church. 3dly, When he faith to the Angel of the Church of Pergamus, I know thy Works, and where thou dweltest.

[h] Comment. in Apost. 

[i] Augustin Tom. IX. Homil. 2. in Apost. Omnis Ecclesia digni.
dwelleth, even where Satan's Seat is, was it the Bishop only had such bad Quarters, when 'tis instantly added in the end of the Verse, Antipas my faithfull Martyr was slain among YOU where Satan dwelleth? No, faith Augustin (k), ' these things under a singular Word are said ' to the whole Church, because Satan dwells every where by His Body: Now the Body of Satan are Proud and wicked Men, ' just as the Body of Christ are such as are humble and Good. Indeed the whole Church in these Parts was in the greatest Danger of Idolatry, or of Persecution in Case of not complying with it: For in Pergamus stood the famous Temple of Æsculapius, whither the greatest Personages went, or sent their Gifts because of the Fame of his Oracle. Thither Earinus Domitian's freed Man sent his consecrated Hair with a Mirrour and a Box set with Jewels (l). Thither the Emperour Antonius Caracalla went to be cured of his Sickness by the God, and to ly in for Dreams (m). Thither also Apollonius Tyaneus, who was set up to mate our Saviour, went to be Director of the Oracle, and to instruct the Votaries that came there how They might obtain Divine Dreams from the God (n). To this God Dragons and Serpents were Sacred, and maintained on the Publick Charge in His Temple. Fittly therefore was Satan that Dragon and old Serpent Rev. 12. 9. said to have His Seat there. Add to all this, that admitting there had been such Officers as Prelates in those Days, yet it would be probable that the See was Vacant at this Time: For, as the Tradition goes, Antipas was the Bishop of that Place; but He was Martyred in the Tenth Year of Domitian, as the Roman Martyrology bears; which was the very Year in which, as the most common Tradition carries it, John the Divine was banished to Patmos. And Dr. Hammond, foreseeing, it seems, this Difficulty, placed John's Banishment in the Reign of Claudius. And makes the Relation of the Martyrdom of Antipas Rev. 2. 13. to be not History but Prophesie; and whereas

[k] Ubi supra - omni Ecclesiae dicet in unius vocabulo, quia ubique habitat Satanas per Corpus sium.
Corpus autem Satane homines sunt superbi & mali; Sicut & corpus Christi humiles & boni.

[l] Dulceflis Capillos

Pergameo posuit dona sacrata Deo. Mtr.

[m] Herodian. Lib. 4. Cap. 5. 11.

whereas the Text reads, Antipas my Faithful Martyr was slain, He paraphrases it, Antipas, for His Fidelity and Courage in preaching the Gospel, will be (I foresee) cruelly Martyr'd. And if the See was Vacant at that Time, how could the Epistle be directed to the Bishop? 4thly, When He writes to the Angel of the Church in Thyatira, was it the Works, Charity, Service, Faith and Patience of the Bishop alone that He commends verse 19? Was it the Bishop alone whom He reproved for suffering that Woman Jezabel? No, faith, Augustin (0). ‘It was such (in the Plural Number) as were set over the Church, who neglected to impose that Severe Discipline upon Fornicators and other riotous Livers which They ought. Is the Angel of that Church characterized as a single Person, when ‘tis expressly said verse 24. But unto YOU I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira. Are not here two Parts of the Church plainly distinguished, viz. the Ministers thereof in the plural Word YOU, and the people described by the rest in Thyatira? The only Answer which the Episcopal Party have for avoiding the Force of this Observe is, That the Word and is not to be found in some Copies; and so they read the Text thus, Unto you I say the rest in Thyatira. But all Answers are to be suspected that invade the Text. ’Tis true, the Word and is wanting in some Copies; but it is as true it is to be found in many more, and these too of as good Credit and as great Antiquity. In the Year 1546, Tonstall Bishop of Durham found an Exposition on the Apocalypse bearing the Name of St. Ambrose the Bishop (p), which He published in the Year 1554, and in His preface to the Reader He is earnest to have him believe that it is the Work of Ambrose Bishop of Milan, and He expressly reads it with the And. I believe indeed Tonstall was deceived about the Author. But this is certain that whoever He was, He was a very Ancient Writer, and accordingly.

[0] Quod autem dicit Angelo Thyatirae Ecclesie [Habeo adversum te pance] dicit Præpositis Ecclesiis, qui Luxuriosis & fornicanibus, & aliud quod liber malum agenciis servitatum Disciplinam Ecclesiasticae non impenant. Hom. 2. in Apoc.

(p) Expositio Beati Ambrosii Episcopi super Apocalypsin.
ly the Work is inserted among those of St. Ambrose (q). And though that Writer sometimes mentions the Bishop in His Exposition of these seven Epistles, yet he not only interprets the Stars by Holy Preachers in the general, but also lays down (r) this as a general Rule, That all the Governours of the Catholick Church are signified by these Angels, and that because of their being Messengers of the Word of God, to the People, seeing the Word Angel signifies a Messenger. And though Beza upon the Authori-

ty of the old interpreter and of the Complutensian Edition and two other Copies did read the said 24 verse without the AND, yet in other Editions (s) He has inserted it, and always expounds the Phrase To the Angel, by these words To the Pastors: 5thly, When he gives this Character of the Angel of the Church of Sardis, Thou hast a Name that thou livest, and art Dead, Is it a Description of one single Person in that Church, whether Bishop or Presbyter? Is it not rather of that whole Church excepting these few Names mentioned verse 4. Chap. 3. which had not defiled their Garments? Yes certainly, and so the forecited Augustin saies, and gives it for a general Rule, much after the same Way with Ambrose before cited. That because Angel signifies a Messenger, therefore whoever either Bishop or Presbyter or even Lay-Man speaks frequently of God and tells Men how They may come to eternal Life, is deservedly called the Angel of God (t). 6thly, When he saies to the Angel of the Church in Philadelphia, I have set before Thee an open Door, Thou hast a little Strength, and hast kept my Word &c. Did He mean thereby to characterize a single Person? No, 'tis plain it is the Character of the Church, and so the forecited Augustin expressly saies (u). Indeed there is not one Clause in the whole Epistle that so much as seems to describe a single Person, yea even
that Promise verse 9. Behold I will make them of the Synagogue of Sa-
tan to come and Worship before thy Feet, imports Nothing of peculiar
Priviledge to the Bishop, but meerly signifies the Effect that the
Preaching of the Gospel should have upon these Enemies, as the
forecited Ambrose explains it (x). Lastly, the like is to be said
of the Church of Laodicea in the whole Epistle to the Angel thereof
there is not one Clause that Characterizes a single Person. I add fur-
ther, that in none of these seven Epistles is there one Act of Epis-
copal Jurisdiction so much as hinted at; not any Act which is not
competent to all the Ministers of the Gospel, yea indeed to the
People themselves; for Instance, when it is said of the Church of
Ephesus Chap. 2 ver. 2. "Thou hast tried them which say they
are Apostles, and are not, and hast found them Liars; it is no
more than what is the Duty, and will be the Practice of every
good Christian, all being enjoined 1 John 4. 1. ' Beloved, believe
not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they are of God
because many false Prophets are gone out into the World. Again,
when the Church of Thyatira is blamed for Suffering that Woman
Jezabel, every Christian may be guilty of the like, being dis-
charged to own or countenance Infamous and Obstinate Hereticks.
2 John 10. ' If there come any unto you and bring not this Doc-
trine, receive Him not into your House, neither bid him God's
Speed. Besides, several Authors relate, and Dr. Fulk against the
Rhemists upon the Place takes notice of it, that the said Jezabel
was the Bishop's Wife; though I do not believe this, because I
am very sure that there was no such thing as a Bishop in the Mo-
dern Sense at that Time; yet, upon that Supposition, His Fault
would have been rather a Neglect of his Marital Authority than
of his Episcopal Power; consequently it cannot be inferred thence
that he is described there as a Governour of the Church. Upon
the whole then, Mr. Rhind has been too unwary, and His For-
wardness has mightily outrun his Judgment when he asserted, That
these Angels are characterized in the 2d and 3d Chapters of the
Revelation as single Persons Dr. Hammond Himself, though so earn-
est:

(x) [Ambrose's explanation is cited here, but the text does not provide the specific reference or explanation.]
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to have these Angels believed to be single Persons, yet he had not Courage enough to affirm, that They are characterized there as such, nay indeed he confesses the contrary (y). Though the Angels, faith He, were single Persons, yet what is said to them is not said only to their Persons, but to the Universality of the People under them, whose Non Proficiency, or Remission of Degrees of Christian Virtue, especially their falling off from the Constancy and Courage of their Profession, do deserve (and are accordingly threatened with) the Removal of that Christian Knowledge, that Grace, those Privileges of a Church which had been allowed them, C. 2. 5. which is not so properly appliable as a Punishment of the Bishop, as of the People under him. And therefore in the Paraphrase I have generally changed the singular into the plural number, by that means to leave it indifferently to the Bishop of each Church and the People under Him, and yet further to the other Churches subordinate to each of the Metropoles here named. Thus Dr. Hammond. And elsewhere (z) He is forced to acknowledge, That those Expressions, which are used in the singular Number, do not all belong to the Bishop, but to the Church wherein he presides. The very Truth is Dr. Hammond has absolutely destroyed this Argument of the Apocalyptick Angels. For First, He has made them not simply Bishops, but Metropolitans, a Notion wherein his whole Party, I believe, have now deserted him; yet he very Judiciously saw that the Argument could not be so much as coloured without some such Notion. 2dly, He elsewhere (a) makes a twofold Bishop in the same Place; of which the one was set over the Jewish and the other over the Gentile Christians. How then could these Angels be single Persons? Were the Epistles written only to the circumcised, or only to the uncircumcised? But to go on with Mr. Rhind.

Fifthly, Is it true that all the Authors Ancient and Modern who have commented upon the 2d and 3d Chap. of the Revelation have supposed these Angels to be single Persons and the Governors of these Churches? I suppose this Question may be abundantly satisfied, from what I have already

---

already discoursed: For we have heard Arethas, Ambrose, Augustin applying the Seven Epistles to the whole Collective Body of the Church. Arethas is an uncontroverted Author; of Ambrose I have spoke before. The only Question is about Augustin whether these Homilies on the Revelation, which I have cited, are indeed his. But this Question does not affect the Controversie. For, though Erasimus (b) suspects them not to be Augustin's, yet it is agreed on all Hands that they are the Work of an Ancient Writer, which sufficiently confutes Mr. Rhind. And besides these, if Mr. Rhind's Memory had served him, which one might have expected after his telling that he had studied the Controversie with a Scrupulous Exactness, He might have remembered that there are many other Authors both Ancient and Modern insisted on by the Presbyterians (c) viz. Ambrosius Ambertus (whom some mistake for the Ambrose whom I have cited), Primasius, Gregory the Great, Haymo, Beda, Richard, Thomas, Falk, Fox, and Perkins. But Mr. Rhind made choice of the easiest Way of doing his Business: For who would undergo the Drudgery of examining Things that imagines His Reader is to be put off with bold and blind Assertion? We have indeed very few Ancient Writers on the Apocalypse. It was some Time before it was Universally received as Canonical, and the Commentaries of such as wrote upon it, (such as Justin Martyr and Irenæus) in the first three Centuries are now lost; and though such as wrote upon it afterward, when Prelacy turned Rampant, had interpreted according to the Episcopal Scheme, it cou'd make no Argument against the Presbyterians: But when the Evidence of Truth, notwithstanding that Temptation, forced them to interpret, as we have heard them doing; it is an irreparable Loss to the Episcopal Cause. And for Mr. Rhind to alledge at random, that all Authors both Ancient and Modern are on the Episcopal Side, without citing, nay without so much as naming any one of them, except Beza alone, of whom just now, was to be too Prodigal of the Credit of his Judgment, and is no great Argument of the Discretion of His Brethren who Midwif'd His Book into the World.

Lastly,

[b] Prefat. ad Leg. Non vide tur Augustini, quanquam opus lectionum. (c) Gerfom II 133. 5. 7. 8.
Lastly, Has Beza said any Thing upon this Argument that favours the Episcopal Cause? Mr. Rhind brings him in with a great Deal of Parade as if he were clear on the Episcopal Side. But why did he not cite his Words? Why does he give us his own Commentary without Beza's Text? Why truly there was Reason for it. Beza's Words are these (d). 'To the Angel, that is, to the Presi-
dent (or Moderator) whom, to wit, it behaved in the first Place to be admonished concerning these Matters, and by him the rest of the Colleagues, and so the whole Church. But from thence to infer the Episcopal Degree, which was afterwards brought into the Church of God by Human Inventions, is what neither can nor ought to be done. Nay, not that that Office of President or Moderator should necessarily be perpetual, as the Oligarchical Tyranny (whose Head is the Antichristian Beast) which arose thence now makes it manifest, with the most certain Ruin, not only of the whole Church but World also. Judge now, good Reader, of Mr. Rhind's Modesty, and say whether Beza is on the Episcopal Side. If he could find Testimonies of Presbyterian Authors on his Side, I'm sure he is sufficiently qualified to improve them, when he could be so confident on a Testimony that was clearly against him.

So much for the Argument from the Apocalyptic Angels, And I hope I may appeal to the Reader if ever he knew any more senseless or more groundless used by any Party on any Cause: For, supposing it were plain even to a Demonstration, that these Angels were single Persons, yet where is there the least Intimation that these single Persons had the Sole Power either of Ordination or Jurisdiction; or even a Negative over the Presbyters in these things? Without this it can be no Argument for the Modern Episcopacy. Yet so true is it that there is no Intimation thereof, that Dr. Hammond will not allow that there were any more Presbyters at that Time, wherein he is certainly right. And as that Notion quite destroys the Argument from the Apocalyptic Angels, so Dr. Whitby has observed (e) That the same Notion de-
s

---

(d) Beza in Apocalyp. 2. 1. Angelo, id est, προφητη, quem opportuerit nimium imprimis de his rebus admonerit, ac per eum ceteros Colleagias, totumque adeo Ecclesiaram, sed hinc statui Episcopaliam ille Gradus, postea humanitus in Ecclesiaram Dei inveniatur, certe nec potest nec debet. Imo ne perpetuam quidem iudicat ποσερωτας δομου effe necessario opportu-nisse, sic ut eversa indi Tyrannos Oligarchicas [cujuς apex est Antichristia beta] certa statuam cum totius, non Ecclesiam modo, sed etiam Orbis Pernicie nunc tandem declarat.

(e) Annor. on 1 Peter 5. 2.
Sect. V. Presbyterian Government.

Stroyst two other Arguments already adduced by Mr. Rhind, and ordinarily insisted on by the Episcopal Writers viz. That from the Form of Government which obtained among the Jews; and the other from the Subordination of the Seventy to the Twelve. 'If faith be', the Middle Order had been wanting so long as is supposed, viz. by Dr. Hammond, the Government of the Church would not have been formed after that (the Jewish) Plat Form; which, as Epiphanius and the Jews inform us, had these several Offices in it. The same may be said of those who make the Elders or Presbyters to be answerable to the Seventy, appointed by Christ as inferior Officers under the Apostles, and make this an Argument of an Inequality betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, established in the Church by Christ. Thus Dr. Whitby. The Presbyterians then are obliged to Dr. Hammond for calling them of three the most noisie Arguments of their Adversaries.

ARTICLE V.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Proof of Prelacy from Testimonies of Antiquity. is Examined.

From P. 85. to P. 111.

HAVING cleared our Hands of the Arguments from the Scripture, we proceed next to consider the Testimonies from Antiquity. Mr. Rhind is at a great deal of Pains for six Pages together to perswade the Presbyterians to appeal to the Ancients; and runs through all the common Places of Rhetorick to shew how competent and unexceptionable Witnesses they are. But all this is wretched Affectation: For First, the Episcopal Authors themselves own that the Presbyterians have the Fathers on their side. We heard before Dr. Bedell justifying Medina in owning that Ambrose, Augustin, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Tho-
doret, Oecumenius and Theophylact are on the Presbyterian Side. This then was only a Stroke of Mr. Rhind's Politicks to gull his Reader into a Belief that the Fathers are against the Presbyterians. 2dly, In all Cases the Presbyterians are content to be concluded by the Testimony of the Fathers, or to give a good Reason why they cannot. And I know no Class of Christians that goes further, or gives an implicit Assent to their Dictates. The Fathers Themselves required no such Thing of such as were to come after them, and in a Thousand Places have desired their Readers to try before they trusted. And I'm sure there is abundance of Reason for doing so. For there is no Man that has dipped ever so little into the Study of 'em, but is convinced, that any that would swallow their Doctrines by the Lump must at once believe the greatest absurdities and most palpable Contradictions; and none have noticed this with greater Freedom than the Church of England Divines. 'The Scripture, faith Dr. Sherlock (f) is all of a Piece, every Part of it agrees with the rest; the Fathers many Times contradict themselves and each other: And He tells, how it has often made him smile, with a Mixture of Pity and Indignation to see what a great Noise the Roman Disputants made among Women and Children and the meanest sort of people with Quotations out of Fathers and Councils, whom they pretend to be all on their Side. I shall be glad if this be not the Character of some other Folks as well as the Roman Disputants. To the same Purpose the Incomparable Chillingworth (g). 'I for my part, faith He, after a long, and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial Search of the true way to Eternal Happiness, do profess plainly, that I cannot find any rest for the Sole of my Feet, but upon this Rock only, viz. the Scripture. I see plainly and with my own Eyes, Councils against Councils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against themselves, a Consent of Fathers of one Age against a Consent of Fathers of another Age, and the Church of one Age against the Church of another Age. Thus He. And thus from two of the greatest Men the Church of England cou'd ever boast of

[f] Preservative, against: Popery Part I Chap. 2d Sect. 3d.
[g] Prot. Rel. a Safe way Chap. VI Sect. 56.
of we may learn what habile Witnesses the Fathers are, and how great Weight will hang upon their Testimony: For, if such a Character of the Fathers be both Sense and Truth in the Mouths of these great Men when disputing against the Romanists, is it possible but it must be the same in the Mouths of Presbyterians when disputing against the Prelatists? But indeed the Presbyterians need no such Common-Place Considerations for defend ing themselves. So far as Mr. Rhind has gone I am content the Debate be compromised, and referred to the Fathers and the Testimony of Antiquity.

He insists on Five viz. Ignatius, Clemens Romanus, the Emperor Adrian, Irenaeus and Tertullian. All which I shall consider in Order.

The First is Ignatius, who, saith He p. 91, was constituted Bishop of Antioch, upon IGNATIUS the Death of Evodius, the immediate Successor of Saint Peter, and who in His Epistles testifies most favourably for Episcopacy. To which it is answered. In the first Place. 'Tis ridiculous to affirm that S. Peter was Bishop of Antioch; the Apostolick Character and Office being inconstant with the fixed Charge of any particular See. 2dly, Supposing it had not been so, yet both Chrysolom and Theodoret (h) affirm Ignatius to have succeeded immediately not to Evodius but to Peter himself. But waving these Things, I answer Thirdly, That the Epistles of Ignatius are so far from testifying favourably for the Modern Episcopacy, that they quite destroy it, and the Principles upon which it is pretended to be built. This I hope to make good to every Man's Conviction by the FOUR following Particulars.

In the First Place. Supposing that Episcopacy had obtain'd at the Time when Ignatius wrote His Epistles, yet this is so far from being an Argument that it had obtain'd in the Apostolick Age, that the whole strain of these Epistles are an Evidence of the contrary. This, I am aware, will at first be thought a very surprizing Assertion: But I shall make it good from an unexceptionable

---

able Hand, I mean Mr. Dodwell (i). The matter in Short is this. The Presbyterians had oftimes excepted against the Ignatian Epistles either as not Genuine, or at least as vitiated and corrupted, On this Head, because they insist so much on the Absolute Power of the Bishop; they could not believe that such Rhodomontado Expressions as are used on that Subject were consistent with the Spirit, Character or Circumstances of Ignatius when he wrote his Epistles. Mr. Dodwell saw the Force of this Objection; and therefore carefully applies Himself to take it off. But how does he it? Plainly by telling us, that the Reason, why Ignatius insisted so much on the Power of the Bishop, was because Episcopacy was an Order but newly introduced into the Church, that therefore it was necessary that with all His might He should assert their new Rights, and urge and establish a Power formerly unknown. In a Word, Episcopacy was not instituted, says Mr. Dodwell, till the Year CVI. Ignatius wrote His Epistles in the Year 116 saies Bishop Lloyd, in the Year 110 saies Eusebius, in the Year 107 saies Bishop Usher. By the longest of these Accounts Episcopacy was but of ten years standing when Ignatius wrote, and by the shortest of them but of one. And now let the Reader say if these Epistles will prove that Episcopacy obtain'd in the Apostolick Age.

Secondly, I ask Mr. Rhind if any where in these Epistles He finds a Bishop that had more than one Congregation under His Charge. The Episcopal Writers have oftimes been called on to shew this; they have never done it to this Day, and I believe no wise man will ever attempt it: For Nothing is more plain from these Epistles, than that the Bishops whole Charge met in one Place and communicate at one Altar. Whether then does this look like the Scots Presbyterians or the English Diocesan Bishop?

Thirdly, Through all the Ignatian Epistles, as I have shewn before, the Presbyters are always said to represent the Apostles, the Bishops never. Now upon this I ask 1st How Mr. Rhind's Argument.
Scd.V. Presbyterian Government.

ment holds that the Bishops succeed the Apostles, and the Presbyters the Seventy. 2dly, If the Presbyters succeed the Apostles, how is it possible but that they must have the Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction as well as of Preaching and dispensing the Sacraments? Surely the Apostles had it, how then can the Presbyters their Successors want it? 3dly, Seeing by the Ignatian Doctrine the Presbyters were in Place of the Apostles, How is it True that the Presbyters cannot do any Pastoral act in their own Right, but as the Bishops Delegates. The Apostles had our Lord Jesus Christ for their Immediate Superior, why should it be otherwise with the Presbyters their Successors?

Fourthly. The Ignatian Presbytry had a Share in the Government, as appears from many Places of these Epistles. 'And that being Subject to your Bishop and his Presbytry, ye may be wholly and thoroughly sanctified (k). Obeying your Bishop and the Presbytry with entire Affection (l). But be ye united to your Bishop and those who preside over you, that is, the Presbyters (m). So neither do ye anything without your Bishop and Presbyters (n). But he that is without, that is, does any Thing without the Bishop Presbyters and Deacons, is not pure in his Conscience (o). Being Subject to your Bishop as to the Command of God and so likewise to the Presbytry. (p) Thus it was in the Ignatian Times. But where now is there any such Thing as this in the Church of England which Mr. Rhind has joined? Are not the Presbyters entirely deprived of the Exercise of Discipline? Nay are not the Lay Chancellours risen up against the Bishops themselves their Creators? Have they not engrossed the Discipline wholly into their Hands? Hear Dr. Burnet (q) even before he became Revolutioner. 'Our Ecclesiastical Courts, faith he, are not in the Hands of our Bishops and their Clergy, but put over to the Civilians, where too often Fees are more strictly looked after than the Correction of Manners...Excommunication has become a Kind of Secular Sentence, and is hardly now considered as a Spiritual Censure, being judged and given out by Lay Men, and often upon
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upon Grounds, which, to speak moderately, do not merit so severe and
dreadful a Sentence. Before I go further I cannot but take Notice
that Mr. Rhind, in summing up the Evidence from Ignatius’s Epistles,
has not dealt fairly when he saies p. 94. That this Exercise of the Epis-
copal Authority over subordinate Presbyters and Deacons was not peculiar
to the Churches to which S. Ignatius directed his Epistles, but did EXT-
TEND (to use that Saints Words) to the utmost Bounds of the Earth;
which, faith he, in my Opinion, afferts the UNIVERSAL Exercise
of the Episcopal Office. Did Ignatius use that Word EXTEND, I
mean the Greek that signifies it? If not how can the UNIVERSAL
EXERCISE of the Episcopal Office be inferred upon it? And yet
'tis certain first that He did not use it but a Greek Word * which
signifies Defined or Appointed, and that too without any Men-
tion of the Earth in the Clause. Secondly, That Bishops did not
at that Time extend to the utmost Bounds of the Earth: For,
Mr. Dodwell gives it as the very Reason why Ignatius insisted so
much on the Episcopal Authority, because it had not yet univer-

cally obtained. * The Power of the Bishops, faith He (r), was
'so long to be urged till it should be universally received, and
'Men were brought in Use to obey it. Why then did Mr. Rhind
in his Reasoning use the Word EXTEND instead of APPOINT-
ED, especially when before p. 93 He had used the Word AP-
POINTED in citeing? Did he not design to take Advantage of
his Reader’s Inadvertency? But how shall his Conclusion of the
Universal Exercise of the Episcopal Office in Ignatius’s Time stand,
when it is founded upon a false Bottom? This now is our first
Defence against the Ignatian Epistles, that they quite destroy the
Modern Episcopal and the Principles on which it is built, which
I must needs still believe they do, till I have got a satisfying
Answer to the former Particulars. I add

Secondly, That these Ignatian Epistles, as to the main of the Contro-

* ου και η επιστολη ο η κατω το περατα δεοδιτυς

[1] Paracel. Sect. 25. p. 106. Tantipiper certo urgenda erat nova illa Potecias dum a Subditis passim resi-
percus, & dum illius Obsequio Homines alluevissent.
is a great Encouragement to me to venture on that Assertion that so great a Man as Stillingfleet has done it before me. ' In all those thirty five Testimonies, faith he (s), produced out of Ignatius's Epistles for Episcopacy, I can meet but with one which is brought to prove the least Semblance of an Institution of Christ for Episcopacy, and if I be not much deceived, the Sense of that Place is clearly miflated ken too--. I laid, as to the main of the Controversie, to prevent triffling in any Body that shall attempt to answer this. Mr. Rhind alludes on the Presbyterians that they affirm the Ignatian Bishop to correspond to their Parish Minister; the Presbyters and Deacons to their Ruling Elders and Deacons. p. 101. I do not know any Presbyterian Author that ever wrote so widely, I do not believe ever any of them did, and want to have them named. But if any of them ever did so, I here enter my Dissent from them. 'Tis certain the Presbyterian Deacons do not correspond to the Ignatian Deacons, because the Ignatian Deacons do not correspond to the Scripture Deacons. 'Tis evident from Acts 6 that the Deacons were instituted to serve Tables, and take Care of the Poor and of the Churches Stock. The very Reason of their Institution was the giving Relief to the Apostles, who could not at once attend the Word of God and serve Tables. And to this Mr. Dodwell accords (t) declareing that the first Institution of the Office of Deaconship was for the distributing of the Treasures of the Church. But such is not the Ignatian Deacon: For, faith He (v), the Deacons are not the Ministers of Meat and Drink but of the Church. 'Tis certain likewise that the Presbyterian Parish Minister does not correspond to the Ignatian Bishop as to His Intensive Power. The Presbyterians believe that the Power ascribed to the Ignatian Bishop is greater than ought to be allowed to any Creature that is not under an Infallible Conduct. For Instance, when it is said * Whatsoever the Bishop approves is acceptable to God. But then I affirm that the Ignatian Bishop as to His Extensive Power corresponds better to the Presbyterian Parish Minister than to the English Diocesan Bishop, seeing, as I observed before, the Ignatian Bishop's whole Charge did meet in one Place and communicate at one

---

Defence of the

Chap. II.

one Altar. I affirm likewise, that there is not the least Hint in all the Ignatian Epistles of an Imparity among the Pastors of the Church. I take Pastors here in the current Ecclesiastical Sense of that Word for such as labour in the Word and Doctrine, for otherwise I know that the Word Pastor may signify any Officer or Governour whatsoever.

And this now brings me to the main Point in Debate: For I know the Reader will presently ask, what I make of the Ignatian Presbyters, were not they Pastors in the current Ecclesiastical Sense of that Word? I affirm positively that there is no Hint in all the Ignatian Epistles that they were, and that nothing Mr. Rhind has produced proves that there is any such Hint in them. He has but two Arguments for that Purpose, and that I may not wrong him, I shall set them down fully in his own Words.

The first runs thus p. 103. 'I say, that the Presbyters mentioned by Ignatius, did preach and administrate the Sacraments: Thus in the Epistle to the Smyrn. Let that Eucharist be looked upon as firm and just, which is either offered by the Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop has given his Consent. Again, 'Tis not lawful without the Bishop, neither to Baptize nor to celebrate the Sacrament, but whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also well pleasing to God; which plainly proves, that though the Bishop was invested with the Chief Power of Dispensing these Holy Ordinances, yet might the Presbyters perform them by his Allowance, and therefore they were not Elders according to the Presbyterian Fashion; seeing they pretend to no such Power, nor can their Parish Minister (who, they say, is the true Ignatian Bishop) communicate the same to them. Thus be.

Before I answer directly, I must give a literal Translation of the two Passages produced by him from the Original *. The first runs thus, Let that Eucharist be held firm, which is under the Bishop or to whom he shall permit. The other runs thus, It is not lawful without the Bishop either to Baptize, or to make a Love Feast. But whatever he shall approve

* Τεταίω χαρακτηριά γεγίστην ὑπὸ τῶν επίσκοπων τοῦ, ἢ μὲν αὐτὸς εἰπεῖτο ἢ μὴ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπίσκοπων τοῦ, μη δὲ αὐτὸς εἰπεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπίσκοπων τοῦ.
prove, the same is also well pleasing to God. Now I ask first, Is there in either of these Testimonies the least Intimation that the Presbyters did Preach? No. Neither the Word Preaching, nor any Thing Equivalent to it, is mentioned in either of them: Nor indeed any where else in these Epistles is Preaching ascribed to the Presbyter. 2dly, Is there the least Intimation in either of these Testimonies that the Presbyters administer the Sacraments? No. Presbyters are not so much as named in either of them, nor is there the least Hint given, that either Baptizing or giving the Eucharist—was more peculiar to the Presbyters than to any of the Laity. Upon the whole then it does not appear by these Testimonies, that the Ignatian Presbyters could either Preach or administer the Sacraments.

I know nothing can be reponed to this, unless it be said, that it ought to be supposed that the Bishop would not give his Consent to any to Baptize or to make a Love Feast but to the Presbyters. But this is a plain begging the Question, and is contrary to what the Fathers have taught us: For, faith Ambrose or Hilary the Roman Deacon who wrote the Commentaries annexed to Ambrose's Works (x) 'that the Christian People might encrease and be multiplied, in the Beginning it was allowed to all Persons both to preach the Gospel, and to Baptize, and to explain the Scriptures in the Church. And particularly as to Baptism 'is known that it was usually dispensed by Lay Persons and Tertullian expressly afferts the Lawfulness of it, as we shall Hear when we come to his Testimony; and the forecited Ambrose or Hilary relates the Practice of it even in the Presence of the Apostles. At first, faith he (y), all Taught, and all Baptized on whatever Days or Times Occasion offered. For Philip did not wait for a Time for a Day in which he might Baptize the Eunuch, neither did he interpose a Fast. Nor did Paul and Silas delay but that they instantaneously Baptized the Jourly with all his House. Neither had Peter the Deacons, or fought a Day wherein to Baptize Cornelius with all his House:

[x] Ut ergo crederet Plebs & multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est & evangelizare, & Baptizare, & Scripturas in Ecclesia explicare. Ambro. Vol. 1. Tom. 5. p. 239. in Ephel. cap. IV.
House: Nor did he himself Baptize them, but commanded the
Brethren who came with Him from Joppa to do it. Thus he.
One then might as well say that the English Midwives are Presbyters,
because they have at least the Connivance of the Bishop to Baptize;
as say, that these in Ignatius, who Baptized with the Bishop's Con-
sent were Presbyters, when not only Deacons might do it; which
Mr. Rhind himself will not deny, but every Lay Person too. And
as to the other Sacrament viz: the Eucharist there is no Men-
tion in either of the two Testimonies of Consecrating it, and as
for the Distribution of it, 'tis certain that not only Deacons but
even Lay Persons used to be employed about it. Thus Chrysot-
tom tells us (a) 'That it was given in Charge to the Deacons
to keep notoriously unworthy Persons from the Table, and that
the Holy Gifts should not be distributed to them. And by the Fourth
Council of Carthage (b) it is allowed that in Case of Nece-
ssity the Deacon, the Presbyter being present, may being ordered give the Eucha-
rist of the Body of Christ to the People. And Justin Martyr (b) tells
us that it was usual in his Days for the Deacons to carry the Eu-
charist to the Absents. But not the Deacons only, but even Lay
Persons were sometimes thus employed. Thus Eusebius tells us
(c) of Serapion that deferring the Eucharist on his Death Bed, He
sent his Grand Child to bring a Presbyter to administer it to him. The Presbyter happened to be sick and was not
able to come; but he sent the Eucharist with the Boy ordering him
to administer it to his Grand Father which accordingly was done.
And who knows not that the Eucharist used to be given to Infants
after their Baptism? But I very much doubt if there was always
a Church Officer at the doing of it. Plainly the Elements used
tobe consecrated by the Bishop, and the People oft times kept them,
and by his allowance gave them to others. How then does it ap-
ppear from the Testimonies produced by Mr. Rhind, that the Ignat-
ian Presbyters did either Preach or Administrate the Sacraments, when
there

there is neither Mention in either of them of Presbyters; nor, suppose there were, is there any Thing ascribed to them but what might be and was frequently done by Deacons, yea by every Lay Christian? So much for his first Argument.

His Second is in these Words p. 103, 104. 'But I add, that the Presbyters in St. Ignatius's Days, were Subject to the Bishop: This does fully appear from the Testimonies formerly cited: If then these Presbyters were such as the Modern Ruling Elders, either this their Subjection must relate to the Bishop's Superior Power in the Administration of Sacraments and Ordination, or to the Power of Jurisdiction: Not the former; for how can they be accountable in these respects, when they are not supposed to be at all concern'd in these Matters; and to say that this Subjection relates to Acts of Jurisdiction, is to destroy that Parity of Power, of which all Presbyters, whether Preaching or Ruling are equally possessed according to the Presbyterians. Thus he.

The Answer to which is very easy, and therefore may be very short. Through all the Ignatian Epistles there is no Subjection required from the Presbyters to the Bishop but what every Presbyterian Ruling Elder will own, and that too, agreeably to Presbyterian Principles, to be his Duty to pay to the Minister. Every Presbyterian Ruling Elder owns the Minister to be an Officer Superior to himself as having the Key of Doctrine as well as of Discipline, whereas himself has that of Discipline only. Every Presbyterian Ruling Elder gives, though not a Negative, yet the Precedency to the Minister in all Acts of Jurisdiction. In a Word every Presbyterian Ruling Elder is ready to yield all Reverence to the Minister, which is all that is required of the Ignatian Presbyter to the Bishop. So much for his Second Argument. And this is our Second Defence against the Ignatian Epistles, That, as to the Main of the Controversy, they contain Nothing contrary to the Presbyterian Scheme. And I hope every Reader is satisfied that there is no more needful on this Subject. Yet because Mr. Rhind mentions another Defence which the Presbyterians make against them viz. That these Epistles are either Spurious or Corrupted: Tho' I do not think such a Defence needful, yet I homologate the same, and justify my Brethren in it. And therefore
In the Third Place. I assert that these Epistles which go under the Name of Ignatius either are not Genuine, or at least that they are vitiated and interpolated. For proveing this, I am not to insist on what the Learned. Stillingsfleet has suggested (d) that the Story of transporting Ignatius from Antioch where he was condemned, to Rome where he suffered, and of his many Excursions by the Way, and of the Freedom he got to write these Epistles, smells rank of the Legend; seeing Ignatius himself informs us that He was bound to ten Leopards, that is to say, to such a Band of Soldiers; who, though treated with all manner of Kindness, were the worse for it. Waving this, I affirm that nothing Mr. Rhind has advanced, though he has taken very great pains on this Particular, is in the least sufficient to vindicate them.

He insists on these Six Topicks: I. That several Fathers do mention these Epistles, and cite sundry Passages from them which are to be found in those now extant. II. That Calvin who was a Party was the first who ever allledged such an Interpolation. III. That at least Vossius’s and Usher’s Editions of these Epistles are the Genuine Issue of that Holy Father. IV. That such an Interpolation was hardly if at all Practicable. V. That the alleding that these Passages which assert the Episcopal Authority are Interpolations is a mean begging of the Question. VI. That no one can give a reasonable account why any such Interpolation should have been attempted. Of each of these in order.

I. He alledges p. 95. 96. S. Polycarp, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebias, Athanasius and Theodoret. All which, faith he, with many other Authors do mention these Epistles and cite sundry Passages from them which are to be found in those now extant. To which it is answered, that this proves only that Ignatius did write Epistles, and that some Sentences of them are still preserved. But how will it follow thence, either that these Epistles are Genuine, or that they are not vitiated? Especially when we consider. 1st, That all the Passages cited from Ignatius by the Ancients are not to be found even in the best Editions of him which we have. For Instance, there is a Passa...
Passage cited by Ierom thus (f). Ignatius an Apostolick Man and Martyr writes boldly, *The Lord chuseth Apostles who were Sinners above all Men.* Now, in which of the Ignatian Epistles is there any such Passage to be found? Dr. Hammond answers (g), *That it may well be his saying, though it is not found in these Epistles: just as Our Saviour spake many Things which are not written in the Gospels. But this is a mere Whim; for Ierom is not testifying about what Ignatius spoke but about what he wrote.* This is a pretty good Presumption that the Epistles are at least mutilare. 2dly, *If the Ancients citeing of him be an Argument, Is it not very strange that no one of them has cited these Passages that are insinled in in Favour of Episcopacy? Is it not strange that his Authority was never insinled in on the Dispute with Aerius where there was so fair Occasion for it? Would not one be tempted from this to think that such Passages are foisted in?* 3dly, *Some of these Expressions that the Ancients cite which are now found in these Epistles are neither cited as from Ignatius, nor as from Epistles either of his or any Body else. For Instance, that Passage which Mr. Rhind p. 95. cites from Irenaeus, *I am the Wheat of God and shall be ground by the Teeth of wild Beasts, that I may become the Bread of Jesus Christ,* though it is found in Ignatius's Epistles, yet Irenaeus does not say that it was written, much less that it was written in an Epistle, least of all that it was written in any Epistle from Ignatius, but only indefinitely, *One of our Brethren hath said (b), which Eustathius understands of Ignatius.*

II. He allidges p. 97. that *the Presbyterians cannot name an Author who ever allledged such an interpolation before Calvin, whom all Men know to have been a Party. And this (he thinks) might be allowed a sufficient Answer. This sufficient Answer of his is to gros an imposing upon People's Understanding, that I am even amazed he shou'd have been so very Prodigal of his Credit. The Matter is plainly this. Calvin wrote that excellent Book of his Institutions in the Year 1536.*

---


[b] Quemadmodum quidam de nostris dixit, propter Martyrium in Deum adjudicatus ad Beliias. Quoniam frumentum &c.
Therein he has Occasion to defend the Doctrine of the ever Blessed Trinity, against which Doctrine the Antitrinitarians objected the Authority and Testimony of Ignatius. Calvin in Answer thereto rejects (i) the said pretended Authority, and gives a very bad Character of the Work. ' As for Ignatius (faith he) let these who attribute any Thing to his Authority prove that the Apostles made a Law about Lent and such like Corruptions: There is Nothing more flinking than that Trash which is published under the Name of Ignatius. Whence the Impudence of such is the least tolerable, who furnish themselves with such Fgeries wherewith to impose on the World. Now, will the Reader ask, Did Calvin find any such thing in Ignatius as Expressions against the Doctrine of the Trinity, a pretended Apostolick Law for observing Lent and such like Corruptions? Yes indeed, in the Old Editions, which alone were known in Calvin's Time, there was a great deal of such Stuff; as even Coke a Church of England Divine has noticed (k). Thus, in the Epistle to those of Tarsus, it is mentioned as one of the Heresies disseminate by Satan, that Christ was God over all. And in the Epistle to the Philippians, it is denied that the Word which was made Flesh dwelt in Man. And it is asserted, that 'if any fast on the Sabbath Day he is a Murderer of Christ; and that if any keep Easter with the Jews he is party-taker with those who flew the Lord and his Apostles. And in the Epistle to the Antiochians, Wives are discharged to call their Husbands by their own proper Name. In a word, the Divines of the Church of Rome cited these Epistles to prove that the Blessed Virgin Mary was void of all Sin. I hope it is plain that as some of these Things were great Fooleries, so others of them were Gross Heresies. And must then Calvin be traduced as a Party-Man because he would not Sacrifice the fundamental Doctrines of Christianity to the Reputation of Ignatius's Epistles? But let us hear Dr. Wake Bishop of Lincoln (l). ' Before I enter upon that Account


count which it will be fitting for me to give of the Epistles of
S. Ignatius, it will be necessary for me to observe, that there have
been considerable Differences in the Editions of the Epistles of this
Holy Man; no less than in the Judgment of our latter Criticks
concerning them. To pass by the first, and most imperfect of
them, the best that for a long Time was extant, contained not
only a great Number of Epistles falsely ascribed to this Author,
but even those that were Genuine so altered and corrupted, that
it was hard to find that true Ignatius in them. The first that began
to remedy this Confusion, and to restore this great Writer to
His primitive Simplicity, was our most Reverend and Learned
Arch Bishop Usher, in his Edition of them at Oxford Anno 1644.
Thus Dr. Wake. Now if, by the Judgment of the most Learned
of the Episcopalians, there was not so much as any tolerable Copy
of the Ignatian Epistles extant till the Year 1644, that is, 108 Years
after Calvin had excepted against them; who that has not thrown
off all Modesty would talk at Mr Rhind's Rate, or would seek to
blast the Fame of that Great Man Calvin in a Matter wherein the
Episcopalians themselves have justified him; or would represent
him as a Party Man, when he was defending the Common Cause
of Christianity. But it seems Ignatius's Epistles must stand, though
the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Divinity of our Blessed Savi-
our should Sink. Dear Episcopacy, what art thou not worth! Who
would not Sell even his Religion to purchase Thee, without which
all Religion is Nothing?

III. He adds p. 97. 'That however the Name of the Holy
Man Ignatius may have been abused by ignorant or designing
Men, who fathered upon him their own impious or interpolated
Work, yet the Epistles of Usher's and Vossius's Edition are his Ge-
nuine Issue. But does not Dr. Wake himself own (m) ' That no
one that Reads (even these Editions of) them with any care or Judg-
ment can make any doubt of it, but that Letters or Words have
been mistaken, and perhaps even Pieces of some Sentences too
corrupted. And does not every one know what a great Altera-
tion the Mistake of one Letter sometimes will make? I shall give
one

[m] Ubi Supra, p. 135.
one signal Instance of this, which is related by Dr. *Wake* (n). In the *Acts* of the Martyrdom of *S. Polycarp*, as set out from the *Barroccian Manuscript* by Archbishop *Usher*, there is this Passage. 'That the 'Souldier or Officer having struck his Launce into the Side of the 'Saint, there came forth a *Pigeon*, together with a great Quantity of 'Blood. Here is a fair Plump Miracle. A *Pigeon* coming out of a Man's Side being a very curious Sight; but now by the Alteration of one single Letter in the Original †, it dwindles into no Miracle at all; and the Passage imports only that there came out of his left Side a great Quantity of Blood, the Greek Word which signifies the *Left*, and that which signifies a *Pigeon* being near in Sound to one another. If the Mistake of one Letter can make such a Change, what may the Mistake of a Word do? And what may the Corruption of a Piece of a Sentence do? But Mr. *Rhind* is a Writer of Courage who sticks at nothing.

IV. He alledges p. 99 *That such an Interpolation was hardly, if at all, Practicable*. But pray why not Practicable? For 1st. Did Mr. *Rhind* never hear of the Ignorance or Knavery of Transcribers? Does he not know that the Works of the Fathers were a long Time in the Hands of Monks or others of the like Stamp, who, with all their Religion, were yet so familiar and used such Freedom with the Fathers, as not only to pare their Nails that they might not be scratched by them; But even to alter their Habit and Dress, to fit them to the Modes of their own Times, and make 'em fashionable (o)? Even the *Vossian Greek Manuscript* is not judged to be above eleven Hundred Years Old, that is, about 500 Years latter than the Times of Ignatius; and—how corrupt the Church was about the Six Hundred Year of God needs not be told. 2dly, Is it not a very good Argument that the *Ignatian Epistles* might be interpolated, when it is plain beyond Contradiction that they actually were interpolated? What Security had Bishop *Usher’s* or *Isaac Vossius’s* Copies against the Possibility of Interpolation, any more than other Copies? Why, faith Mr.
Mr. Rhind p. 98, 'Considering the great Simplicity of these pious Times, it is scarce credible that the greatest Ornaments of the Christian Church after the Apostles were wicked enough to be guilty of so base a Fraud, or Weak enough to be imposed on by these who might be thus Wicked. Is not this a Powerfull Orator, who will needs harangue People out of Matter of Fact? Let the Great Ornaments of the Church be as far from being either Wicked or Weak as Mr. Rhind pleases, yet that some Persons were so Wicked as to be guilty of such a Fraud, and others so Weak as to be imposed on by it, is so far from being incredible, that it is confessed on all Hands, that not only that, but even Twenty other Things of the like Nature have been done. And all Mr. Rhind's Reasonings against the Possibility or Practicableness of interpolating Ignatius's Epistles labour under this one small Absurdity, that if they prove any Thing, they will prove that no false Writing could have been palmed on the Church, nor any Genuine one Corrupted. And whence then came so many spurious Pieces, such as Abgarus's Letter to our Blessed Saviour, and our Saviour's Answer to Him; which Eusebius tells us, with as much Confidence as he does the Story of the Ignatian Epistles, he had faithfully Translated out of the Syriack Language as he found them in the Archives of Edessa? Whence came St. Paul's Epistle to the Laodicans? Whence came the Letters that passed 'twixt Seneca and Him? Whence came St. Peter's, St. Mark's, St. Matthew's and St. James's Liturgies, which Mr. Rhind * makes an Argument of, as being of considerable Antiquity, though Dr. Wake (p) twenty Years ago declared, that the learned World seemed to be universally agreed about the Falsity of them. Not to speak of many others mentioned by Hottinger, Coke, Du pin and Dr. Wake, whence came the Apostolical Constitutions, which Mr. Wilsdon an Advocate for Episcopacy afferts (q) to be the most Sacred of the Canonical Books of the New Testament? Is there any Age can be named upon which more false Pieces were fathered than the First and Second? And what Charm then was there in Ignatius's Name, that none should be fathered on him? Or why should we

---

we believe there were not, when the Contrary is Manifest and
confessed by all the World? For let us take a short View of
'em.

The Ignatian Epistles, saies Coke (r), a Church of England
Divine, were first published at Strasburg Anno 1502: And though
they are now only Seven, yet then they were eleven in Number.
In process of Time it seems they begot another among 'em: For
when in the Year 1562 they were published in Greek and Latine at
Paris, they were found to be Twelve. At length as if the Blessing
Be Fruitfull and Multiply had been pronounced on them, they encrea-
ted to the Number of Fifteen with a Letter also annexed from the
Virgin Mary to Ignatius. Nor did they alter in Number only, but in
Bulk too: For in some Editions some of the Epistles were
twice as large as in others. Notwithstanding all this Variety, yet
some of the Church of Rome, Canisius by Name, insulted the World,
as our Episcopal Friends do us now, with a great deal of Scorn, be-
cause they doubted of any of these Epistles. But the World is
never all at once to be bullied out of their Senses. Mafræus a Pa-
rifian Doctor published a new Edition of them, and without Scruple
discarded Four of them as Apocryphal viz. two to St. John the E-
vangelist, one to the Virgin Mary, and her Letter to him. Yet even
so the remaining Twelve did not please learned Men. Archbishop
Usher has asserted and proves (s) that Six of them were spurious,
Six of them mixed, and so none of them sincere and Genuine.
Vedelius in the Year 1623 published an Edition of the Ignatian
Epistles at Geneva; but he went so near to Work, and caustigate
them so severely; that the Church of England Divines were not
pleased with him (t), as indeed they seldom are with any Thing
that comes from that Quarter, or almost any other except their own.
Hitherto then the Ignatian Epistles made but a sorry Figure
with all who were not willing to Sacrifice their Sense to their
ZeaL At length Archbishop Usher fell upon two Copies of them,
one in Cambridge, another in Bishop Montague's Library; yet these

were not Originals but Latine Translations and these too very Barbarous. But then to supply this Defect Isaac Voßius found in the Medicean Library a Greek Manuscript of them and published it at Amsterdam 1646. Yet, even after all this, the Latine Editions are thought to be best by learned Men; and Archbishop Ußer doubts whether the Seventh Epistle viz. that to Polycarp be Genuine or not. Nay he was so ill satisfied with it, that he would not publish it with the rest. Nor, saies Dr. Wake (v), does Isaac Voßius himself deny but that there are some Things in it that may seem to render it suspicious. Besides, the Epistle to the Romans was not found in the Medicean or Florentine Manuscript; but made up, in some Measure, from the Latine Versions, by the Conjectures of learned Men, as the same Dr. Wake takes Notice (x). And even as to the whole of the Epistles, though the Doctor translated from the Text of Voßius, yet he owns, that where a Place was manifestly Imperfect he has sometimes taken the Liberty to express his own Conjectures. And now after all let any Man, who can, doubt of the Possibility or Practicableness of these Epistles having been interpolated. But, adds Mr. Rhind p. 98, if that should be granted, 'I see not how the Presbyterians can Answer the Enemies of our Religion, who complain that the like Freedom may have been used with the Bible in some fundamental Points much about the same Time. Pray, Good Mr. Rhind, were the Ignatian Epistles as universally spread as the Bible was? Or was it of as great Importance to keep them uncorrupted as the Scriptures? I do not think but either of these Thoughts much more both jointly, besides what else might be added, would answer the Enemies of our Religion. But, to compleat the Answer, does not Mr. Rhind know that there were false Gospels obtruded upon the World, obtruded too in Ignatius's own Days? Does he not know that Ignatius himself mistook the Spurious Gospel for the True one? Does he not know that Mr. Dodwell Himself has owned that Ignatius was thus mistaken. 'The Holy Martyr, saith...
be (y), did not cautiously enough distinguish twixt the Genuine Gospel of S. Matthew and the interpolated one which the Ebionit Heretics now raging in Asia used. Now if false Gospels could be minted in those Days, could not false Ignatian Epistles be so too? If so great an Ornament of the Church as Ignatius himself could be imposed on by them, why might not others as great Ornaments be imposed on by false or interpolated Pieces fathered on Him?

V. But Mr. Rhind p. 98. 'would know of His Adversaries, what these Interpolations are. He hopes they will not allege that there are any favouring the then or after Heresies; and to say that these Passages, which affect the Distinction of Ecclesiastical Orders and the Episcopal Authority, are of this kind, is a mean begging of the Question; and so much the meaner still, that this can be proven from other Monuments of that Age though Ignatius had never written an Epistle. For Answer. In the first Place, has he read the Authors on this Controversie with a Scrupulous Exactness and knows nothing of what these Interpolations are? Why then I recommend him to Cooke, Dale, Salmasius, Blondel, Owen, the Jus Divinum Ministerij Evangelii, L'arroque, Jameson, Sueton, Rivet: For why should I repeat what has been so often insisted on? After all that Hammond, Pearson, Beveridge, Wake or Dupin have advanced in Vindication of these Epistles, I am as well satisfied as I can be of any Thing, that they are either Counterfeit or Corrupted. 2dly, 'Tis true such Interpolations as favoured the then or after Heresies are pretty well weed out of the New Editions: But I have already shewn what Gross Heresies were in the Old ones. Now I ask Mr. Rhind, how they could creep in when the Genuine Epistles were scattered through Rome Antioch and several Cities of Greece? The Depositories themselves of this sacred Treasure could have confronted these interpolated Pieces with the Genuine Epistles. They themselves could not be the Criminals: And Persons removed at such a Distance could not.

not have universally conspired towards such a Deceit: Or if People had been inclined, they would rather have made Bold with the Bible than any inferior Authority. This is certainly good Reasoning because it is Mr. Rhind's p. 99. And yet how impossible for ever it was that such Interpolations should creep in; All the World knows and confesses that they did creep in. Why does Mr. Rhind say that it is a begging of the Question to allege that the Expressions about Episcopacy are Interpolations? 'Tis so far from a begging, that it is a proving of the Point directly. For, when the pretended Ignatius extravagantly ascribes that to his Bishops (whether they be supposed Parochial or Diocesan it alters not the Case) which the Apostles never assumed to themselves, 'tis a plain Evidence that the Author of such Expressions was a Man of no Judgment or Conscience, consequently was not the Holy Martyr Ignatius. Is not this the very Reason why the Church of England Divines themselves have rejected the old Editions of these Epistles, because they are so very immoderate in their Exaltation of the Bishop? For Instance, when in the Epistle to the Trallians in the old Editions the Bishop is said to be above all Principality and Power, and more excellent than all as far as it is possible for Man to excell. And when in the Epistle to the Philadelphians, all of what sort soever, not only Presbyters, Deacons and the whole Clergy, but all the People, Soldiers, Princes, Cæsar Himself are enjoined to perform Obedience to the Bishop. And when in the Epistle to the Smyrnaans the Bishop is placed between God and the King, and that by way of Correction of the Words of Scripture. My Son fear God (the Bishop) and the King. Does not Dr. Hammond himself (z) call these immoderate Expressions? Does he not pronounce the Doctrine contain'd in them to be rebellious, extravagant and senseless? Does he not conclude that they were intert by some Imposter? And is there not as good Reason why we should except against the New Editions, when there is in them a great deal of such extravagant Stuff yet unpurged out? Can any one read even the Usberian and Vossian Editions, and not observe such a Turgid, affected, Hyperbolical Stile as wou'd never probably.

probably have been used by one that had heard and conversed
with the Apostles, the Character of whose Writings was Simpli-
city? Is it possible one of Ignatius's Spirit and Character could
have made that Boast (a) that he was 'able to know things heav-
ely, the Orders of Angels, their Constitutions, Principalities, things
Visible and Invisible? 'Tis true Dr. Hammond (b) has criticised,
and Dr. Wake translated that Passage to a contrary Sense; as if He had
said I am not able to know things Heavenly——: But both these
Doctors have done Despite to the Context as well as forced the
Words; for the very Paragraph, in which the Passage begins thus
even according to Dr. Wake's Translation in his second Edition.
' Am I not able to write to you of Heavenly things? But I fear lest I
should harm you, who are yet but Babes in Christ: (Excuse me this
Care;) and lest perchance being not able to receive them, ye should
be choaked with them. Could so wise and Holy a Man have dropped
such unguarded Assertions as these, Whansoever the Bishop approves
is acceptable to God. My Soul for such as obey the Bishop, Presbyters and
Deacons. Is not the very Foundation of Popery, viz.: an Implicate Faith,
wrap up in these Expressions? 4thly, Why did Mr. Rhind say
that the Episcopal Authority can be proven from other Monuments
of that Age? Where are these Monuments? Why did he not
produce them, or at least name them? Had Mr. Rhind considered
that things were not to be taken upon his meer Affertion; I'm
sure he had found Cause to make his Book at least a hundred Times
bigger than it is, or to leave out five hundred things he has put
into it. Polycarp was the most contemporary Writer with Ignatius
that can be named. But though he prescribes Deacons and Pres-
byters their Duty, yet he does not so much as once name Bishops,
or any thing equivalent to them above the Degree of Presbyters;
but plainly supposes that there were then no other Orders in the
Church but those of Priests and Deacons. Wherefore ye must needs abstain
from all these things; being subject to the Priests and Deacons, as
unto God and Christ (c).

VI. Mr. Rhind asks further p. 100. 'Why any such Interpe-

tion should have been attempted. For if the Testimonies in these Epistles that favour the Episcopal Authority are not agreeable to the Faith and Practice of the Ignatian Age; then many living about the Time of the Interpolation might have been sensible of this. And as it was next to Impossible to deceive such by spurious Epistles so it is highly improbable that they would suffer others to be deceived. To this Purpose he. But this is the very same Thing he has said to often over, and which I have so largely exposed. 'Tis beyond Contradiction, and is confessed on all Hands that there were Interpolations made, and that too in the Matter of Episcopacy, whereof I just now gave Instances. This being clear, where is the Necessity of giving either the How or the Why of such Interpolations? Let Mr. Rhind or any of his Brethren give us the How or the Why, these extravagant Expressions in the Matter of Episcopacy which I have just now instanced, and which are confessed to be Interpolations, were foisted into the Ignatian Epistles; and I here promise to give Him the How or Why of all the rest which he thinks do make for his Purpose. So much then for Mr. Rhind's Vindication of the Ignatian Epistles.

To conclude it, he refers his Readers p. 107, if any of them are not yet fully Satisfied to the Incomparable Dr. Pearson's and the learned Dupin's Performances on that Head. And I refer my Reader to the Authors whom I have already cited. 'Tis true the greatest Men of the Church of England have made their utmost Efforts in behalf of these Ignatian Epistles: But 'tis as true they have been taken up by as great Men as themselves. 'Tis true likewise the Church of England Divines got the last Word: But it is as true, it was, not because they won it, but because they begged it, and owed their keeping the Field not to the Strength of their Reasons but to the earnestness of their Importance, as appears from Monsieur L'Arroque's Life prefixed to His Adversaria Sacra, from Walker's Translation of L'Arroque's History of the Eucharist; and from the Author of the Elogium on Monsieur L'Arroque in the Nouvelles de Republique de Lettres. They have been told of this before (d), but
but it was needfull to tell them over again, because they sometimes affect to be dull of Hearing. But enough of Ignatius.

The next Testimony He produces is from Clemens Bishop of Rome, in his first Epistle to the

**Clemens Romanus** Corinthians Sect. 40. in which the Argumentative Words are. For the Chief Priest has His proper Services, and to the Priests their proper Place is appointed; and to the Levites pertain their proper Ministries; and the Lay-Man is confined within the Bounds of what is commanded to Lay-Men. From which He infers p. 109. that to the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons in the Christian Church such a Distinction of Offices does belong, as formerly obtain'd among the High Priests, and Levites under the Jewish Dispensation; which is further confirmed by the Authority of St. Jerom (that pretended Patron of Parity) who saies, what Aaron and his Sons were, that we know the Bishops and Presbyters are. Thus Mr. Rhind. Now let us examine all this.

In the first Place. Was Clemens Bishop of Rome when he wrote this Epistle? Hear Dr. Wake (e) I conclude then, faith He. that this Epistle was written shortly after the End of the Persecution under Nero: Between the LXIV and LXX Year of Christ:

And that, as the Learned Defender of this Period supposes, in the Vacancy of the See of Rome; before the Promotion of S. Clement to the Government of it. Thus He. Plainly, this Epistle was written at least forty two Years before Episcopacy was institute, by Mr. Dodwell's Accompt; and before there was any such thing as a Bishop in the World except James Bishop of Jerusalem who was in Place of Universal Pope. This, I hope, is more than Sufficient to take off Clemens's Testimony: For how could he speak of a Thing which was not yet in Being. Yet left Mr. Rhind should complain of Neglect.

In the Second Place. I ask, does that Passage, which he has cited from Clemens, in the least tend to prove that there were then three Distinct Orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons in the Christian Church? No. He uses it only by way of General Accommodation,
commodation, that the Christians at Corinth shou'd be Subject to their Spiritual Guides; as the Jews, whose Polity was yet standing, were to theirs. But it never entered into his Thoughts to run a Parallel 'twixt the Officers in the one and the other Polity. And Mr. Rhind might as well have proved that the Officers in the Christian Church corresponded to those in the Roman Army, because the same Clement saies Sect. 37. 'Let us consider the Souldiers who obey their Leaders in War, how orderly, readily and with all Subscription they execute their Orders. All are not Pretors or Chilarchs, nor Centurions nor Commanders of Fifty. Every one performs, in his Order and Station, what is commanded by the King and the Leaders. Plainly, one needs no more to convince Him that Episcopacy did not obtain in that Time, but to read Clement's Epistle. The Occasion and Subject of it is this. The People of Corinth had raised a Sedition against their Presbyters, and would not be regulated by them. Clemens wrote his Epistle on Purpose to compece that Sedition. 'They are shamefull yea very shamefull things beloved, faith he Sect. 47, to be heard, that the most firm and Ancient Church of the Corinthians should by (or for the Sake of) one or two Persons rise up in Sedition against the Presbyters. Does he ever recommend it to them to referr their Quarrel to the Bishop? Not once. What could be the reason of this? had he been absent, Clement might have entreated them to wait his Return. Had he been Dead, he might have desireed them to keep Quiet till there were a new one Cholen. Yet Clemens advises to neither of these, no not by a Hint. Does he acknowledge any moe than two Orders of Officers in the Church Bishops and Deacons? No. 'The Apostles, faith He Sect. 42, preaching through Countries and Cities constituted their first Fruits, having proved them by the Spirit, for Bishops and Deacons of those that should afterwards believe. No mention of Presbyters here. Did he not positively own that these Bishops were no other than Presbyters? Yes. 'For it would be our no small Sin, faith He Sect. 44, should we cast off those from their Bishopsprick who without Blame and Holily offer the Gifts. Blessed are those Presbyters who having finished their Course have obtain'd a fruitful and perfect Dissolution. To confirm all. Grotius in his Epistle to Bignonius proves this Epistle of Clement
Clement to be of undoubted Antiquity. "Because, faith he (f), no
where therein does he make Mention of that Paramount or Pe-
culiar Authority of Bishops, which, by Ecclesiastical Custom, be-
gan after the Death of Mark, to be introduced at Alessandria; and
from that Precedent into other places; but He plainly shews, as
the Apostle Paul had done, that the Churches were governed by
the Common Council of the Presbyters, who are all called Bishops
both by Him and Paul. Thus Grotius. But Grotius was a Dutch-Man.
True. But his Reasoning was right English. "They, faith the Learned.
"Stillingfleet (g) that can find any one single Bishop at Corinth when
Clement wrote his Epistle to them, must have better Eyes and
Judgment than the deservedly admired Grotius.

In the Third Place. I ask how Jerom's Words, What Aaron
and his Sons were that we know the Bishops and Presbyters are,
contribute to the clearing or confirming Clement's Testimony. Why did
not Mr. Rhind tell where Jerom has these Words? 'Twas too much
Niceness in him to think that citeing Authors in such a Cafe as
this would be reckoned Pedantry: The industrious avoiding of it
rather deserves that Name. But the Reason is Evident, Mr. Rhind
knew very well, that if any one would look the Place, He would see
how absurdly it were allledged. Plainly the words are taken out of
Jerom's famous Epistle to Evagrius, the Occasion and Contents of
which are these. A certain Deacon of the Church of Rome had start-
ed a pretty odd Opinion viz. that Deacons were Superior to Presbyters.
For chaffing the Arrogance of that Spark, Jerom wrote the said
Epistle. 'A Fool, faith he (h) will speak foolish Things, I hear
there is one who has broke out into such a Height of Folly as to
preferr Deacons to Presbyters; that is, to Bishops. Then He
proceeds to confute Him by Arguments. And the great Argument
upon which he goes is this. Bishops and Presbyters were in the Ap-
postles

[f] Quod huc anum meminit exorsis illius Episcoporum autoricatis, quae Ecclesiae Consuetudine, post Mar-
ci mortem, Alexandriam, atque co exemplo, alibi introduci cedit; sed plane ut Paulus Apollinarius ostendit,
Ecclesiae Communis Presbyterorum, quia idem omnes et Episcopi, ipsa Pauli dicatur, condito subio
 gubernant. [g] Irenic p. 282.
[h] Legatius in Elia; Fatius fatis loquetur. Audio quendam in sanctam Erupisse verodiam; Ut Di-
azonos Presbyteris, id est, Episcopis antecorret. Nam cum Apollinarius perficere doceat eadem esse Presby-
teros quos Episcopos, quid paulum Memoramus & Viduorum Minister, ut supra eos se timidus effusc.
Quod autem poleta. unus eleus est, qui ceretris praeponeeret, in Echinatis remedio tatum et.--- Nam
et Alexandriam est Marco Evangelista atque ad Hecadam & Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper eum
ex se Eraturn in Exceilion. gradu comlocatum Episcopum nominabant.--- Quid enim facit, excepta Or-
dinatione, Episcopus, quid Presbyter non fatait.
Sect. V. Presbyterian Government.

... but it were a palpable Folly to prefer Deacons to Bishops. *Ergo* it is the same Folly to prefer Deacons to Presbyters. The first of these Propositions *viz.* that Bishops and Presbyters were in the Apostles Time all one, He proves from the very same Scriptures which the Presbyterians have ever insisted on. And tho' Episcopacy was so far advanced in his Time, which had been set on Foot after the Apostles Days *for a Remedy of Schism*; yet even then he declares, That excepting Ordination the Bishop does nothing which the Presbyter might not do. Is it then Imaginable that after all this, *Jerom* in that very same Epistle should allow Bishops to be Superiour to Presbyters by Divine Right, as the High Priest under the Law was to the ordinary Priests? No. 'Tis plain that the Comparison runs, not between *Aaron* and his Sons under the Law, and Bishops and Presbyters under the Gospel; but between *Aaron* and his Sons as one Part of the Comparison under the Law, and the *Levites* under them as the other. So under the Gospel Bishops and Presbyters make one Part of the Comparison, answering to *Aaron* and His Sons in that wherein they all agree *viz.* the Order of Priesthood, and the other Part under the Gospel is that of Deacons answering to the *Levites* under the Law. And this Gloss upon *Jeroms* Words, as the Context necessarily requires, so the learned *Stillingfleet* (*i*) has expressily confirmed. And besides, Dr. *Hammond*, as we have before observed, by denying the middle Order of *Presbyters* in the Apostles Days, has quite destroyed the Argument from the *Jewish* Priesthood. Was not then Mr. *Rhind* very well advis'd, when he would press *Jerom* into his Service in the very Face of his own Protestation to the Contrary; and that too for confirming *Clement's* Testimony who never drop'd so much as one Syllable in favours of a Bishop above a Presbyter. So much for *Clemens*, and I don't think but the Reader is by this Time convinced, that Mr. *Rhind* could have been at no losst though he had never mentioned Him.

His Third Testimony is from a Letter of the Emperour *Adrian* to *Servianus*, but, supposing it were for his purpose, 'tis so very shamefull a one, that for the Honour of the Episcopal Order it ought to have been buried in Silence. But Dr. *Monro* (*k*) had touch'd

The Emperour *Adrian* upon

---

[i] Irenic. p. 268. [k] Enquiry into the new Opinions.
upon it, and therefore Mr. Rhind thought it necessary he should do so too. The Words of the Letter intitled on by Mr. Rhind p. 109 are. There are Christians who Worship Serapis, and they are devoted to Serapis who call themselves the Bishops of Christ. There no Ruler of the Synagogue, no Christian Presbyter, who does not, &c. From this he infers, 'That when Adrian was in Egypt Anno Christ. 131. the Distinction of Bishops and Presbyters was so notorious, that the Emperor supposed it as an undoubted Truth. But the very contrary is evident from the Emperor's Words. And 'tis clear as Light that these whom he calls Bishops in the first Clause are the same with those he calls Presbyters in the next: A way of Speaking which every Body knows to be according to the constant Stile of the Scripture, and consequently of all such as knew any Thing of the Christian Affairs. I have set down 't the Emperor's Words as He wrote them, that the Reader may see this the more evidently.

His Fourth Testimony p. 110. is from Irenæus Lib. 3. Cap. 3: contra Heres. who says, We can reckon them, who IRENAEUS were appointed Bishops by the Apostles in the Churches, and their Successors to our Day: To whom also they committed these Churches, delivering to them the same Dignity of Power. 'Tis answered.

First, Supposing Irenæus were against us, yet his Judgment about Traditions is of no great Weight. For, in that same Chapter which Mr. Rhind has cited, He affers (1) not only the Preeminence of the Church of Rome, but the necessary Dependence of all other Churches upon Her. And elsewhere (m) he affers Christ to have been past the Fortieth and near the Fiftieth Year of his Age, when he suffered: And that the Elders who were with John in Asia testifified, that they had that by Tradition from John himself, yea that the Gospel it self Teaches

---


[m] Lib. 3. Cap. 52. 49. A quadragestimo aut quinquagésimo Anno declinavit partem Armeniæ seniorum, quem habens Dominus noster docebat, sicur Evangelium & omnes Seniores te tentant, quia in Asia apud Jo- annem Discipulum Dominii convenerunt, idipsum tradisse eis Joanne--- Quinquagésimo autem anhurn...
Teaches it, and he is very angry with those who think otherwise. When he stumbled so prodigiously in so plain a Case; Pray what Credit is to be given to his Traditions about the Succession of Bishops, which is generally acknowledged by the Episcopalians themselves to be a most perplexed and uncertain Piece of History.

Secondly, Does Irenæus say, as Mr. Rhind has Translated him, that the Apostles delivered to the Bishops the same Dignity of Power? No, his Words \((n)\) Whom also (viz. the Bishops) they left their Successors, delivering to them their own Place of Mastership. That is, the Apostles constitute them the Supream Officers in the Church, so that they were to have none above them any more than the Apostles had. But, that they delivered either to Bishop or Presbyter the same Dignity of Power, Irenæus never said. But

Thirdly, There is no need either of Declining Irenæus's Testimony, or refining upon his Words. Mr. Rhind tells he cou’d improve upon his Testimony: And I cannot but wish he had made all the Improvement of it he could. For that the Apostles appointed Bishops in the Churches, every Presbyterian owns. But that he appointed Prelats or Diocesan Bishops, no Episcopalian has yet proved. If they will still go on to expose themselves by insisting upon the Word Bishop no Body can help it. Presbyterians must take Care they be not imposed upon by meer Sounds. 'Tis certain that Irenæus took Bishop and Presbyter for one and the same Officer. ‘Wherefore, saith he (o), it behoves us to hearken to those who are Presbyters in the Church, to those who, as we have shewn, have their Succession from the Apostles; who, together with the Succession of the Episcopate, have also received the certain Gift of the Truth according to the Pleasure of the Father. Thus Irenæus. And what strange Confusion, saies Stillingfleet (p), must this raffe in any one’s Mind that seeks for a Succession of Episcopal Power over Presbyters from the Apostles by the Testimony of Irenæus, when he so plainly attributes both the Succession to Presbyters, and the Episcopacy too which he speaks of. So much for Irenæus.

His
Defence of the

Chap. II.

His Last Testimony, p. 110, is from Tertullian, who, faith He, began to flourish at the same Time with Irenæus, TERTULLIAN. that is, in the Declension of the Second Century, and saies Lib. de Baptismo, 'The High Priest, who is the Bishop, has the Right of giving Baptism, after him the Presbyters and Deacons, but not without the Bishop's Authority. For Answer.

In the First Place. I should be Glad to know where Mr. Rhind came by this Piece of Chronology. 'Tis true Tertullian began to flourish in the Declension of the Second Century, viz. after the Year 192: And wrote his Book de Baptismo, from which Mr. Rhind cites about the Year 201 (q). But Irenæus's Flourishing was well nigh blown off e're that Time: For he died, saies Mr. Dodwell (r) before the Persecution under Severus which began in the Year 202 or 203. 'Tis then something Hard to conceive, how Tertullian began to flourish at the same Time with Irenæus. But passing this

In the Second Place. I ask What would Mr. Rhind infer from Tertullian's Testimony? Is it that there were three distinct Orders of Ecclesiastical Officers, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons in the Beginning of the third Century? Every Presbyterian owns it. Is it that the Bishops had this Paramount Power of Baptizing, beyond the Presbyters and Deacons, by Divine Right? Tertullian Himself denies it, and that in the very next Words to those cited by Mr. Rhind. 'It remains, faith He (f), for concluding this little Matter, to advise also concerning the Observation of giving and receiving Baptism. Of Giving indeed the High Priest who is the Bishop has the Right, then the Presbyters and Deacons; yet not without the Authority of the Bishop FOR THE HONOUR OF THE CHURCH, which being Safe, Peace is Safe. Otherwise EVEN LAY-MEN HAVE THE RIGHT: For what is equally received, may be equally given. Thus Tertullian. Say now

now, Good Reader, if Mr. Rhind was not either very ill furnished of Testimonies, or very well with Assurance, when he insisted on this.

And thus now I have gone through His Antiquity, and hope'tis plain that when he was a enting on it, he might have spared his Harangue wherein he would persuade the Presbyterians to appeal to the Fathers: For I can hardly believe he has gained much by referring to these Judges. And if his own Conscience was satisfied with these Testimonies he has produced, I must needs say it is no Ill-Natured one.

ARTICLE VI.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Argument for Prelacy from the Impossibility of its obtaining so Early and Universally if it had not been of Divine Institution, is Examined, From P. 111. to P. 119.

There can be nothing more Ridiculous than to dispute against the Possibility of a Matter of Fact. If I had seen Mr. Rhind some Time at Edinburgh; and, within a Short while after, had heard from unexceptionable Witnesses that he was at a Hunder Miles Distance from it, must I believe notwithstanding that he never changed Places; because I am not able to tell How or When he did it, nor perhaps answer all the Objections one might puzzle me with against either the Physical or Moral Impossibility of his having done so. Because Mr. Rhind was educated Presbyterian, was a Zealot in that Way, and profited (more Ways than
than one) above many of his Equals; must I therefore deny that he is now Episcopalian, and of the new Cut too; because neither I, nor indeed any Body else, can account for his Change. Has he not heard Mr. Dodwell too often affirming, that the Government was changed about the Year CVI; changed too, not only without any Account of it, but without any Warrant for it contain'd in the Scriptures? Why then will he dispute against the Possibility of a Change? But 'twas his Pleasure, as it has been of many of his Brethren Writers to do so; and we must attend Him in His Performance.

That a Change, of the Government of the Church by a Parity of Pastors; into a Government by Prelacy, had been morally Impossible, he argues I. From the Piety and Zeal of the Primitive Times. II. From the Universal spread of Episcopacy. III. From the Vigilance of the Governours of the Church. IV. From the Unparallel'dnesf of the Case. V. From the No-Opposition made to the Change, and the Want of any Infinuation that ever the Church was governed according to the Presbyterian Model. Of these in Order.

I. He argues p. 111, 112. from the Piety and Zeal of the Primitive Times. ' If the Presbyterian had been the Divine Form of Government, it could never once have entered into the Thoughts of Men who had shared in or been Subject to this Government, to attempt or allow its Change. Would these Primitive Persons who were Bishops in the first Ages, have usurped an Antiscriptural Authority. What could have tempted them to it? Not the Love of Riches, they forsook all for the Sake of Christ. Not Ambition; for they knew their Promotion rendered them the more Obnoxious to the Fury of their Persecutors. Supposing they had been act'd either by Worldliness or Ambition, yet would the Presbyters and Deacons have suffered such an Encroachment to be made upon their Divine Right? Or would the People have submitted to such an Usurpation? To this Purpose he. For Answer. It cannot be denied, that the Zeal and Piety of the Primitive Times was much greater than of ours: But why would he impose upon People by a Chimerical Representation of these Times, contrary to the Faith of all History? Men still were, and always will be Men; that is, very Corrupt, how Holy soever the Religion
Religion is which they profess. And Church-Men are Men too; and, even in the Primitive Times, gave many and very Scandalous Examples, and were the greatest Cause of the Corruption of Christians, and sometimes of their Persecution too. What a tragical Complaint does Eusebius (t) make of the Wickedness of Christians in general, and of Church-Men in particular? 'Bishops, faith He, rushed (like mad Beasts) against Bishops. Most detestable Hypocrisie and Diffimulation advanced even to the very Height of Wickedness. We were not touched with any Sense of the Divine Judgment creeping in upon us, used no Endeavours to regain his Favour; but wickedly thinking that God neither did regard nor would visit our Crimes, we heaped one Wickedness upon another. And those who seemed to be our Pastors, rejecting the Rule of Piety, were enflamed with mutual Contentions against one another; and while they were only taken up with Contentions, Threatnings, Emulation, Mutual Hatred and Enmity; and every one eagerly pursued his Ambition in a Tyrannical Manner, then the Lord covered the Daughter of Zion with a Cloud in His Anger, and remembered not His Footstool in the Day of His Anger, but raised up the Dioclesian Persecution against them. Thus Eusebius and a great deal more to this Purpose. Fifty Years before that, Cyprian (v) complain'd of an Universal Depravation in the Clergy as well as the Laity. 'That the Priests had no Devotion, the Ministers or Deacons no Fidelity, That there was no Charity in Works, no Discipline in Manners. And does not Jerom * tell us, that 'the Primitive Churches were tainted with many gross Errors whilst the Apostles were alive, and the Blood of Christ yet warm in Judea? But why do I insist on Human Testimony? Does not the Apostle Paul himself make the like Complaint. Phil. 3.18. MANY walk, of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the Enemies of the Cross of Christ; whose God is their Belly, who mind Earthly Things. And Chap. 2.21. ALL seek their own, not the Things which are Jesus Christ's. Even in those early

[v] Non in Sacerdotibus Religio devota, non in Ministri fides integra, non in operibus Misericordia, non in Moribus Disciplina &c. Cyprian De Lapsis.
* Adversus Lucifarian.
early Times, and while the Church was under Persecution, a Diotrephes could aspire to the Preeminence. John 9. And even the Peoples Liberality made it considerable a Provision for the Maintenance of Church-Men, that the Apostles found Cause, ofter than once, to Caution them against Undertaking the Office for filthy Lucre's Sake. Where then was the Impossibility of a Change even upon the Principles of Ambition and Covetousness? Might not one at Mr. Rhind's rate of Reasoning prove, that it was not possible there should have been any such Officers as Sub-Deacons? The Deacons (Good Men) would not be so Ambitious as to seek to have Underlings. There could be none so mean spirited as to submit to be such. Suppose both these, the People (of whose Charity the Deacons were the Trustees) would not have suffered it. Yet Cyprian (x) makes Mention of them as undisputed Officers in his Time; though 'tis certain there was no Divine Institution for them, any more than for Acolyths and Exorcists whom he also speaks of. Again, 'tis certain all Bishops were Originally equal, how is it possible then that ever there could arise Arch-Bishops or Metropolitans? Would any of the Bishops have usurped the Honour? Would their fellow Bishops have submitted to the Encroachment? Would the People have suffered it? Yet, how Impossible forever it was that they should be; Mr. Rhind himself I hope will not deny that they were; yea and that they were brought in so early and with so little Noise that some Learned Men have thought they were from the Beginning. We see then how Insufficient Mr. Rhind's first Argument is.

II. He argues p. 112. from the Universal Spread of Episcopacy: Though such a Change might have happened in a Corner; yet, if Prelacy had not been of Divine Institution, how could it have obtained Universally? Which yet it did: 'For, faith he p. 117, it was fully established over all the Earth, without any Opposition or Noise a Dozen of Years or so after the sealing of the Sacred Canon. 'Tis answered. This is a very Insufficient Argument. Episcopacy spread it self through the whole Earth: Why so did Arrianism. The whole World, saies Jerom (y), groaned and
and wondered to see it self turned Arrian.** Besides, 'tis false that Prelacy prevailed Universally. Many Instances might be given to the contrary; but not to wander from Home: Though Christianity was planted here in Scotland in the Days of the Apostles, and got the Legal Establishment in the Beginning of the third Century; yet we had no such Thing as Prelacy till near the midle of the fifth that Palladius brought it hither from Rome; as Bede, Fordun, John Major, Hector Boathius, Buchanan and Craig with others do testify.

III. He argues from the Vigilance of the Governours of the Church. ' For, faith he p. 115. if Errours in Doctrine, which may more easily pass without Notice, did not escape their Observation and Censure; how can it be supposed that they wou'd not have observed and condemned any Incroachments made upon the Constitution of their Society? But who sees not how false this way of arguing is? Whence came all the Ulurpations and Corruptions both in Principle and Practice which began to take Place from the earliest Ages of Christianity? Does not every Body know, that at leaft a great many of them crept in Insensibly; and that the Tares were sown while Men Slept? ' No, says Mr. Rhind p. 117. these did not obtain till after some Centuries. They were remonstrated against by many. They were never allowed by one half of the Church. This, I must needs say, is confident enough talking. I shall give one Instance for Mr. Rhind to try his Skill on: It is the giving of the Eucharist to Infants. It obtained early. Cyprian (z) speaks of it, not as a new thing, but as an Ordinary Practice. It obtained universally: Augustin (a) calls it Apostolical Tradition. No Wonder; for it was pretended to be founded on that Text of Scripture John 6. 53. Except ye eat the Flesh &c, and he is so brisk on that Head, that he affirms ' that none who minds He is a Christian of the Catholick Church denies that Exposition or doubts of its Truth. It prevailed so long, that the Famous Benigne Bossuet Bishop of Meaux (b) brings it down to the Twelfth Century; and

---
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'Tis plain that the Practice was unaccountable, and the Principle on which it was built false. But can Mr. Rhind name the Person that remonstrated against the Introducing it? Can he name any Church that refused it? Can he tell the Century in which it began? No, nothing of all this is possible. Where is now the Vigilance of the Church Governours? If it could not secure in one Thing, how shall it do in another?

IV. He argues, p. 116, from the Unparallel'dness of the Case, 'That the like never happened in the Government of any other Society, whether of former or latter Times. For Instance, the Establishment of the consular Dignity upon the Expulsion of their Kings by the Romans, and the Change of the Republican into a Monarchical Form occasioned a vast Expence of Treasure and Blood. And in the Days of our K. Charles I the Monarchy was not destroyed nor the Common-Wealth established till after a considerable Resistance. From all which he infers, that such an insensible Change in the Government of the Church ought not to be supposed. This reasoning is built upon Grounds so notoriously false, that it scarce deserves the Name of a poor Piece of Sophistry. For it is contrary to all History and Experience, which shews us there have been great Changes, the Authors and the Beginnings and Opposers of which cannot now be known: Tho' no Man can doubt there hath been an Alteration made. For the Body Spiritual and Civil too, is like the Body Natural; in which as there are some Diseases which make such a violent and sudden Assault that one may say, at what Moment they began; so there are other, which grow so insensibly and by such slow Degrees, that none can tell when the First Alteration was made, and by what Accident from a good habit of Body to a Bad. 'Tis true, the instanced Changes both in the Roman and English Government occasion'd a vast Expence of Blood and Treasure. But within the Memory of Man the Portugueze in the Year 1640 shook off the Castilian Yoke and set up the Duke of Braganza for their King: And yet, so far as I can learn, there was neither a Earthing Treasure spent, nor a Drop of Blood spilt in
the Quarrel. Because the Protestants cannot (which Bellarmin (c) challenges them to do) in all Cases give an Account of the Author of the Change, the Time when it began, the Place where, who opposed it and so on; must we therefore believe that the Church of Rome hath made no Change at all as to her Doctrines and Practices which Christ and his Apostles settled? Who can give us the History of the Communion in one Kind? It grew by Degrees to be a general Custom; but no Body I suppose can tell where or when it began? Who is able to trace the Beginnings of the lying Oracles among the Pagans? But must we therefore ascribe them to God? According to Mr. Rhind's Way of Reasoning, the Traditionary Law of the Jews must pass for true, and that it came from Mount Sinai by Word of Mouth, as the Written Law did: For none can shew its Original, much less name the Authors of the several Traditions, and who opposed them, as Dr. Symon Patrick late Bishop of Ely has observed (d), and from whom I have taken the Substance of all this Answer, that the Episcopal Party may see how their Reasonings against the Church of Rome quite destroy their Reasonings against the Presbyterians. Nay are indeed the very Reverse of them. This might be Sufficient to take off his next Argument, yet ex Superabundantia I shall consider it particularly. I should, according to the Order of his Book, have inserted it before; but for a Reason which will just now appear, I have delayed it till the Last.

V. He argues from the No-Opposition made to the Change, and the want of any Insinuation that ever the Church was governed according to the Presbyterian Model. Thus. 'When Antichristian Prelacy is supposed to be universally established upon the Ruins of Jure Divino Presbytery; there is no considerable Body of Difsenters, not one Presbytery, not a Single Presbyter or Deacon, nor so much as one Contemporary Christian testifying against the one, or declaring for the other, or once insinuating that ever the Church was governed according to the Presbyterian Model. Nor did any in the succeeding Centuries pretend it did obtain, except Aerius and

[d.] On Bellarmin's second Note of the Church.
and St. Jerom in the Fourth. The one an infamous Heretick; witness Epiphanius Heres. 75. So that his Testimony can be of no great Advantage to any Cause, and Jerom's as little Serviceable on many Accounts. Thus he p. 113, 114. For Answer.

First, Does not Mr. Rhind know how insufficient a Negative Argument in this Case is? Does he not know how few Monuments we have of these Times? Or has he himself recovered them? Does he not know how ill furnished even Eusebius himself was with Documents when he wrote his History, & what broken Scapes he went on? 'Tis no Wonder we cannot give a distinct Account of the Rise and first Steps of Episcopacy: For, from the Death of the Apostles Peter and Paul in the End of Nero's Reign about the Year 68 for the space of 28 Years, that is, till the Year 96; we have either no History to give us Light; or what is worse than none, a parcel of fabulous Legendary Stories. The learned Jesuit Petavius (e) speaking of that Period delivers himself thus. 'The Christian Affairs of this Period stand in a faint Light rather through Scarcity of Writers than Matter. For it is not Credible, but that the Apostles and Disciples of Christ in all the World acted Things both great & worthy to be known. But they are generally blended with Fables and uncertain Narrations. And 'tis very observable, and I desire the Reader to remark it; that, at the very Time wherein by Mr. Dodwell's Account Episcopacy was set up, that is about the Year CVI or somewhat sooner, the Christians are represented as faint and languishing in their Profession and inclined to Apostatize. The Author of the younger Pliny's Life prefixed to his Epistles (f) observes p. 33. that he wrote his Letter to Trajan concerning the Christians betwixt the Moneth of September CIII and Spring Time in the Year CV. Now in that Letter he gives a most lamentable Account of the Christians. For, though, as he there relates, Christianity had spread it self through Cities, Villages and Country, yet he was of the Mind that a stop might be put to it. And as Evidence of this he tells the Emperour that the Temples of

---


of the Heathen Gods which were formerly almost desolate now began to be frequented, and that Sacrifices, hitherto neglected, were coming from all Hands; and that the Return of the Christians to Paganism might be yet greater, if they were pardoned for what was past (f).

2dly, Is there any improbability in conceiving, that Testimonies given against a Government which afterward obtain'd universally might be neglected and lost, perhaps industriously smothered and destroyed. 'Tis certain that there were Passages so stiled into Books, in Favour of Episcopacy, as we have already proved in the Case of the Ignatian Epistles, and as is confessed, as to the old Editions of them, even by the Episcopalian themselves. And these that could find in their Heart to foist in Passages for themselves, would make no Bones of razing out such as might be against them. 3dly, What though we had not the Contemporaries who testified against the Change, or at least insinuate that Parity of Pastors did at first obtain; may not those that lived shortly after do as well, especially when it was against their Interest to give any such Testimony? But indeed we need not run to this. The Fathers of all Ages (so far as their Testimony is worth the Regarding) have given as ample Testimony in favours of Presbytery as Heart could wish; whereof it will not be amiss to give some Instances.

**Testimonies for Presbytery from Antiquity**

The Epistle of Clemens to the Corinthians is the Earliest, and perhaps the purest Piece of Antiquity extant. We have already heard Grotius observing, that it is written on the Presbyterian Scheme. And I need not add to what I have already advanced, to

---

to shew that Father to be on our Side. Only 'tis no unpleasant Diversion to behold the Episcopal Scuffle about him. By Mr. Dodwell's Calculation there was no Bishop (in the Episcopal Sense) in the World at the Time of the Writing of that Epistle, save James sitting Pope at Jerusalem: All were Presbyters. No wonder then that Clemens was silent of Bishops above Presbyters. No, faith Dr. Hammond (h), Clement's Presbyters were all Bishops, there was no middle Order of Presbyters at that Time. Nay, faith Dr. Burnet (i) now Bishop of Sarum, you are both wrong, Clemens makes Mention both of Bishops and Presbyters. But pray where? For in all that Epistle there are but two Orders of Ecclesiastics spoken of viz. Bishops and Deacons: That's nothing, Clemens, faith he, by Deacons means Presbyters. I'm sure, how ever Decent it may be, yet 'tis pretty Difficult for one to be Witness to this Skirmish and keep His Gravity.

Ignatius, who wrote his Epistles, as Dr. Wake testifies (k), Ann. Chr. 116 is the first who distinguishes betwixt Bishop and Presbyter. And he, as I have shewn quite Ann. Chr. 116, destroys the Modern Episcopacy. And, that the Ignatian Presbyters were employed either in Preaching, Baptizing or giving the Eucharist I have shewn to be meer Supposition which there is not one Title in the Epistles themselves to support. Dr. Hammond (l) mocks Salmasius mightily for saying, 'that the Ignatian Epistles were written when Episcopacy, properly so called came into the Church, because in all his Epistles he speaks highly in Honour of Presbytery as well as of Episcopacy, that so the People, that had been accustomed to the Presbyterian Government, might the more willingly and easily receive this NEW Government by Episcopacy, and not be offended at the NOVELTY of it. And yet I have already produced Mr. Dodwell saying the very same thing on the Matter.

Polycarp who wrote his Epistle to the Philippians immediatly after

after Ignatius, as Dr. Wake (m) would have us believe; though he had the fairest Occasion for it, POLYCARP yet, as I observed before, makes not the least Ann. Chr. 117. Mention of two Orders of Pastors, but of Priests and Deacons only. And Dr. Hammond (n) Himself can find no other Way to shift the Force of this, but by turning these Priests or Presbyters into Bishops, and is content to drop the Presbyters to save the Bishops, who yet, without Presbyters to back them, can make but a very Whigges Figure.

Justin Martyr in his Apology for the Christians relates that in Every of their Assemblies there was one, whom he calls President, who Preached, Prayed, ed, consecrated the Eucharistical Elements, Ann. Chr. 150.

which by the Deacons were distributed to those that were present, and sent to those that were Absent (o). But that this President, whereof there was one in each Christian Assembly, was under the Jurisdiction of another Superior to himself; or that he had any others, except the Deacons, Inferior to Himself; Justin gives not so much as the leaft hint from the one end of his Works to the other.

Irenæus, as we have heard the Learned Stillingfleet already confessing, Attributes both the Apostolick Succession and the Episcopate to the Presbyters; and most IRENÆUS expressly makes them both one Order (p). 'It is Necessary, faith be, to withdraw from all fuch wicked Presbyters, but to cleave to fuch who, as we have said before, both keep the Doctrine of the Apostles, and Sound Speech with their Presbyterial Order, and also shew an Inoffensive Conversation to the Information and Correction of the rest.------- Such Presbyters does the Church bring up, concerning whom the Prophet also faies, I will give thy Princes in Peace, and thy Bishops in Righteousness. And concerning whom the Lord faid, Who is that Faithfuii and Wise Steward whom the Master fets over His Houfhold. 'Tis plain then that Iren.us makes his Presbyters Bishops, and Bishops and Presbyters to be one and the fame Order; and

---
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and, by necessary Consequence, Presbyters must needs have all the fame Powers with Bishops; which is the main thing contended for. In a Word, though Bishop and Presbyter were distinguished in Irenaeus's Days, yet in all his Writings he has not given so much as the least Hint that that Distinction was of Divine Right: But on the contrary still insinuates, that They are one and the same Officer in Point of Order.

Tertullian, as I have observed before, sounds the Distinction 'twixt Bishop and Presbyter not upon Divine Right,

TERTULLIAN but the Honour and Order of the Church; and

Ann. Chr. 203. represents the Presbyters as presiding in the Ecclesiastical Courts for the Exercise of Discipline.

Judgment is passed, faith he (q.), with great Weight as by those who are persuaded that God is Eyeing them; and it is the greatest Fore-Token of the Future Judgment, if any one have so offended, as to be excluded from Communion in Prayer and of the Assembly and of all Religious Commerce. Certain approved Elders preside who have obtain'd that Honour not by Price, but by Testimony. Thus he.

Clemens Alexandrinus is manifestly on our Side. Those Offices, faith he (r), are an Imitation of the Angelick Glory, and of that Dispensation,

ALEXANDRINUS which, as the Scriptures say, they wait for,

Ann. Chr. 204. who trading in the Steps of the Apostles, live in the Perfection of Evangelick Righteousness; for these the Apostle Writes, shall be taken up into the Clouds, and there first as Deacons attend, and then according to the Process, or next Station of Glory, be admitted into the Presbytery; for Glory differs from Glory, till they increase to a perfect Man. Which Passage, as Sir Peter King has most Judiciously observed (s), proves, that in the Judgment of this Father there were but two Ecclesiastical Orders: The Inferior, that of Deacons, who never sat at the Ecclesiastical Conventions, but like Servants stood; as the Saints, when caught up in the Clouds at the last Day,

Sed. 183.

Day, shall stand and wait on Christ’s Judgment Seat. The Superi-
sour, that of Presbyters, design’d also by the Name of Bishops; who, in the Ecclesiastical Consistory, always sat on Thrones or Seats; just as the Saints when the Judgment is over shall be relieved from standing or waiting, and have their Glory perfected, in being placed on the Celestial Thrones of that Sublime Presbytery, where they shall be for ever Blessed and Happy. In a Word, as there are but two Processos of the Saint’s Glorification viz. standing before the Judgment Seat, and being seated on a Throne of Glory, beyond which there is no higher Dignity: So Clemens makes but two Orders of Church Officers, Deacons to attend and serve, and Presbyters to sit and Judge.

Origen indeed distinguishes ’twixt Bishops and Presbyters. But nowhere can I find him founding the Distinction on Divine Institution. But I frequently find him ORIGEN making most horrid Representations of the Pomp Ann. Chr. 226. 
& Pride and Prodigality of the Bishops even in these Times of Persecution. Thus, upon these Words The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion, but it shall not be so among you, He runs out into a most Lamentable Complaint. Thus, faith he (†), the Word of God teaches us. But we, either not understanding the Will of God laid down in the Scripture, or contemning Christ’s Recommendation, are such that we seem to exceed the Pride even of the wicked Princes of the World: And we not only as Kings seek Armies to go before us, but we make our selves terrible and most difficult of Access to the Poor; and are such to those who apply to us for any Thing, as even Tyrants and the more cruel Princes of the World are not towards their Subjects. And we may see in some Churches especially of the greatest Cities the Princes (that is the Bishops) of the Christian People have no Affability, or allow Access to themselves. And the Apostle indeed charges even Masters concerning their Servants saying, Masters give unto your Servants that which is Just and Equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in Heaven. And he commands them also to forbear Threatning. But some Bishops threaten cruelly, sometimes indeed upon the Occasion

†) In Matth. Tract. XII.
casion of Sin, but at other Times out of Contempt of the Poor. Thus Origen. And all this State which the Bishops took on was the more Intolerable, that their Title to the Chiefly seem'd somewhat Dubious to him. 'It shall not be so among you, that is, faith he, Let not those who SEEM to have SOME Chiefly in the Church act the Lords over their Brethren, nor exercise Power over them.

Gregory Thaumaturgus, as Dr. Burnet (v) from his Life written by Gregory Nyssen relates his Story, 'Being much set on the Study of Philosophy, was afraid of engaging in the Pastoral Charge, Ann. Chr. 233. and therefore avoided all Occasions in which he might have been laid hold on and Ordain'd: Which Phedimus a Neighbouring Bishop observing, though Gregory was then Distant three Days Journey from him, he did by Prayer De- dicate him to the Service of God at Neocesaria where there were then but Seventeen Christians; to which the other submitted, and came and served there. Whether he received any new Orders, is but dubiously and darkly expressed by that Author. Thus Dr. Burnet, From which two Things appear. First, That Impostion of Hands is not absurdiy necessary to make a Church Officer as Mr. Rhind would have us believe. Secondly, That though Gregory was a Bishop, yet it was but of one Congregation, and a very small one too at first, so that he neither had nor needed Presbyters.

Cyprian needs not be insistad on. Mr. Jameson † and Mr. Land- der * have so learnedly and largely proved that the CTPRIAN Cyprianic Bishop had neither absolute Power, nor Ann. Chr. 240. Plurality of Congregations, nor a Negative Voice, nor, in a Word, contributes any Thing to support the modern Episcopacy; that, to add were superfluous: And therefore I must refer the Reader to their Labours.

Basilius


Basilius Magnus in terms asserts the equal Power of all Pastors and Doctors. And this, faith he (x), we are taught by Christ himself when he constituted Peter BASILIUS Pastor of his own Church after himself. For he MAGNUS faith; Peter loves thou me more than these; feed my Ann. Chr. 370. Sheep. And to all Pastors and Doctors that were to come after, he gave an equal Power. And it is a Sign of this, that they all in like manner bind and loose as he did. Thus he.

Aerius is confessed to have been Presbyterian. But, faith Mr. Rhind, He was an Infamous Heretick. Be it so, yet not a greater one than Tertullian, whom yet Mr. AERIUS Rhind cited in favours of Episcopacy. For, besides Ann. Chr. 371 his Montanism, some of the Learnedst Doctors in the present Roman Church have taken a great deal of Pains, faith Dr. Symon Patrick (y) to make the World believe that Tertullian and a Number of other Ancient Fathers were infected with the Arian Heresy. But who saies that Aerius was a Heretick? Mr. Rhind answers, 'twas Epiphanius Heres. LXXV. But who knows not that Epiphanius's Testimony is of very small Weight? Is it not his known Character that his Learning was above his Judgment, but his Invention above them both? Was there ever a more pittfull Piece written than his Book about Heresies? Was there ever any thing weaker than what he has advanced against Aerius even upon the Point of Episcopacy? Do not the Episcopal Writers (z) themselves own, that he has spoken Nonse on that Head? Must not every Protestant own that Aerius was a better Man than himself and more Orthodox in the Faith, when he condemned Prayers for the Dead which Epiphanius undertakes to justify against Him. Is it not known that a great deal more has been said to purge Aerius from the Charge of Arianism than ever was, or perhaps, can be said for proving him Guilty of it? Mr. Rhind then ought to have been a little more modest in his Character of Aerius, till he had discoursed the Matter more fully.

Ambrose,

Ambrose, or the Hilary whom I cited before, upon these Words Eph. IV. iij. And he gave some Apostles, Gives a plain Account of the Change. ‘After, faith he Ann.Chr. 376. ’ (a), that Churches were planted in all Places, and Offices ordain’d, Matters were setled otherwise than they were in the Beginning.--------And thence it is that the Apostles Writings do not in all things agree to the present Constitution of the Church because they were written under the first Rise of the Church: For he calls Timothy, who was created a Presbyter by him, a Bishop: For so at first the Presbyters were called, among whom this was the Course of Governing Churches, that as one withdrew another took His Place, and in Egypt even at this Day the Presbyters Ordain in the Bishop’s Abilence. But because the following Presbyters began to be found unworthy to hold the first Place; the Method was changed, the Council providing that not Order but Merit should create a Bishop. Thus he And Augustin, as Stillingfleet (b) observes, cites these Commentaries with Applause, without Stigmatizing him for a Heretick.

Chrysostom delivers himself with a abundance of Freedom on the Presbyterian Side. ‘The Apostles, faith he (c), having Chrtsostom * discoursed concerning the Bishops & described Ann. Chr. 398. * them, declaring what they ought to have, & from what they ought to abstain; omitting the Order of Presbyters, he descends to the Deacons; and why so, but because between Bishop & Presbyter there is no great Odds; and to them is committed both the Instruction & the Presidency of the Church: And whatever he said of Bishops agrees also to Presbyters. In Order alone they have gone beyond, and in this only they Seem to defraud † the Presbyters. Thus he. And, faith Willet (d)

---


[b] Ireneic. p. 313. [c] In Prior Ep. ad Tim. Hom. XI.

[c] Vide I Thess. C. IV. v. 6 in the Greek, and compare it with Chrysollom's.

the Distinction of Bishops and Presbyters, as it is now received, cannot be directly proved out of Scripture: And of this Judgment Bishop Jewell against Harding sheweth Chrysostom to have been. So that here we have two Church of England Divines owning Chrysostom to be on our Side.

Augustin in his Epistle to Jerom disclaims the Divine Institution of Prelacy and founds it upon Ecclesiastick Use. Although, faith he (e), according to the Words of Honour, which Use has now made fashion- able in the Church the Episcopate is greater than the Presbyterate: Yet, in many Things is Augustin inferior to Jerom. That this Testimony is not strained, I appeal to Bishop Jewell's Declaration. 'In St. Jerom's Time, faith he (f), there were Metropolitans, Archbishops, Archdeacons and others, but Christ appointed not these Distinctions of Orders from the Beginning. This is the Thing which we defend. St. Jerom faith, Let Bishops understand that they are in Authority over Priests more by Custom than by Order of God's Truth. And Augustin declares, That the Office of a Bishop is above the Office of a Priest not by Authority of the Scripture, but after the Names of Honour which the Custom of the Church hath now obtain'd. Thus Bishop Jewell.

Theodoret in like manner faith (g), 'The Apostles call a Presbyter a Bishop, as we shewed when we expounded the Epistle to the Philippians, which may be also learned from this Place, for after the Precepts proper to Bishops, he describes the Things that agree to Deacons: But, as I said, of Old they called the same Men both Bishops and Presbyters. Thus Theodoret.

Primasius, who is said by some to have been Augustin's Disciple puts the Question Why the Apostle leaps from the Duties of Bishops to the Duties of Deacons without any Mention of Presbyters; and answers Anno Chr. 440.

plainly)

[f] Apolog. Part. II. C. III. Div. 5.
[g] In prior Ep. ad Tim. C. III.
plainly as before, *That Bishops and Presbyters are the same Degree (h).*

Sedulius our Countryman, in his *Commentaries on Tit. i.* affirms the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, that not only the Names are interchangeable, but the Office the same; many of them being to be found in one City; which could not be true of Diocesan Bishops.

And for Proof and Instance he adduces the Elders of Ephesus Acts XX, who dwelling all in one City, though they are called Elders or Presbyters in the 17 verse are yet called Bishops in the 28 verse. Indeed it was no wonder Sedulius was Presbyterian: For though he wrote not his *Commentaries* till he went abroad, yet in Scotland, where he was born and bred, there was no such thing as a Bishop while he lived in it (i); whatever Spotswod hath said to the Contrary.

The Second Council of Sevil plainly declares, *That though there are many Functions of the Ministry common to the Presbyters with the Bishops, yet by the Hispalense.II. Modern and Ecclesiastical Rules, there are some Functions denied to them, such as the Ordination of Presbyters (k).*

That Council, we see, does not insist upon Divine Right, but upon Ecclesiastical Rules, and owns the Appropriation of Ordination to the Bishop to be a Modern Practice.

I might also give the Testimony of Theophylact, who is said by some to have flourished about the Year Eight Hundred and Eighty, but placed by Baronius in the Year 1071. But his Testimony being the same with that of Chrysostom whose Echo Stillingfleet calls him, I need not repeat his Words.

Oecumenius, said by some to have lived in the Eighth, by some in the Ninth, and by others put off till the Eleventh Century. Upon Acts XX. 17, thus delivers himself. *Many are Ignorant of the Manner especially of the New Testament, whereby Bishops*

---

(h) *In 1 Tim. III.*  
(i) *See Dalrymple's Collect. C. IV. V.* Sedulius Poem. *Prefat*  
Bishops are called Presbyters, and Presbyters Bishops. This may be observed both from this Place, and from the Epistle to Titus, and from the Epistle to the Philippians, and from the first Epistle to Timothy. From this Place therefore of the Acts we may arrive at the Certainty of this Matter: For thus it is written, From Miletus he sent and called the Elders of the Church. It is not said, the Bishops; and yet afterwards he subjoins, Over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops to feed or rule the Church. And from the Epistle to Titus, That thou mightest appoint Elders in every City, which Elders are afterwards called Bishops. And from the Epistle to the Philippians. To all that are at Philippi with the Bishops and Deacons. And, as I believe, the same may be gathered from the first Epistle to Timothy. If any Man desire the Office of a Bishop, he desires a good Work. Thus Oecumenius.

To all these we may join the Canon Law, in which we find Pope Urban pronouncing in these Words. We call the Diaconate and the Presbyterate the Sacred Orders, CANON LAW for these ALONE the primitive Church is read to have had (1).

And now I think I may conclude with Jerom’s Testimony, who has declared more roundly for Presbytry, than any, perhaps all the Fathers together ever did for Episcopacy. 

Jerom, I say, of whom Erasmus witnesseth, Ann. Chr. 385. that He was, without Controversy, the most Learned of all Christians, Prince of Divines, and for Eloquence that he excelled Cicero. We have heard him already in his famous Epistle to Evagrius. And Mr. Rhind p. 114 seems as if he would have his Reader believe that is the only Place in which he declares for Presbytry. But herein he imposes upon his Reader: For elsewhere viz. in his Commentaries upon the Epistle to Titus, he declares yet more explicitly for Presbytry, if more can be, than in that famous Epistle. Nor does he manage his Business, as the pretended Patron of Episcopacy the false Ignatius does his, by a Flow of Words and high ranting Expressions which must needs give Scandal to all the World; but he talks like a Learned Man, reasons Y

---

the Matter, applies himself to his Reader's Understanding, does not put him off with Rapture and Harangue, but convinces him by plain downright Argument. I shall give his Testimony at large, & so much the rather, that it contains almost all the Scripture Arguments for Presbytery.

Let us, saith he (m), carefully heed the Words of the Apostle saying, That thou mayest Ordain Elders in every City as I have appointed thee. Who, discoursing in what follows what sort of Presbyter ought to be Ordained, says this, If any one be blameless, the Husband of one Wife &c afterwards adds, For a Bishop must be blameless as the Steward of God. A Presbytery is therefore the same with a Bishop. And before that, by the Devil's Instinct, there were Parties in Religion: And it was said among the People, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the Churches were Governed by the Common Council of Presbyters. But after that every one began to think that those whom he had Baptized were his own not Christ's: It was decreed in the whole World, that one chosen from among the Presbyters should be set above the Rest, to whom all care of the Church should belong, and that the Seeds of Schisms might be taken away. If any one think that this is our Judgment, and not the Judgment of the Scriptures that a Bishop and Presbyter are one; and that the one is a Name of Age, the other of Office: Let him read again the Words of the Apostle to the Philippians saying, Paul and Timotheus the Servants of Jesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons, Grace to you and Peace and so on. Philippi is one City of Macedonia; and surely in one City there could not be a Plurality of such as are called Bishops. But because at that Time they called the same Persons Bishops and Presbyters: Therefore he spake indifferently of Bishops as of Presbyters. This may yet seem doubtfull to some, unless it be proven by another Testimony. In the Acts of the Apostles it is written, that when the Apostle had come to Mile- tus, he sent to Ephesus and called the Presbyters of that same Church, to whom afterward among other Things he said: Take heed to your selves and to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops, to feed the Church of the Lord, which he hath purchased with

(m.) Comment. In Tr.
with his own Blood. And here observe carefully, how calling
the Presbyters of the one City of Ephesus, he afterwards calls the
same Persons Bishops. If any will receive that Epistle, which is written
to the Hebrews under the Name of Paul: There also the Care of the
Church is equally divided among many: For he writes to the People,
Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves, for they
watch for your Souls as those that must give an Account, that they may
not do it with Grief, for this is unprofitable for you. And Peter
who received his Name from the Strength of his Faith, spea-
keth in his Epistle saying, The Presbyters who are among you Teftobt,
who am also a Presbyter, and a Witness of the Sufferings of Christ and a
Partaker of the Glory that shall be revealed, feed the Flock of the Lord
which is among you, not as of Necessity but willingly. We have allledged
these Things, that we might shew that among the An-
cients the Presbyters were the same with the Bishops: But that by
little and little the Roots of Diffention might be plucked up, the
whole Care was devolved upon one. As therefore the Presbyters
know that by the Custom of the Church they are Subject to him
who is set over them: So let the Bishops know that they are
greater than the Presbyters rather by Custom, than the Truth of
the Lord's Disposition or Ordering, and that they ought to govern
the Church in Common, imitating Moses, who when he had it in
his Power alone to govern the People of Israel, chose Seventy with
whom he might Judge the People. Thus Jerom. And I know not how
any Scots Presbyterian could have written more patly in Favour of
Presbytry. Yet Mr. Rhind has many Things to except against Jerom's
Testimony: Whom therefore I referred to the Last, putting him out
of the due Order of Time, that I might consider these Exceptions with-
out interrupting the Lift.

I. He excepts p. 114. That Jerom lived too late to Teftifie
concerning Matters of Fact that happened about the Beginning
of the Second Century. Now Jerom was born Anno Chr. 329: Did he live too late to Teftifie of what happened within lefs than
200 Years before his Birth? If so, the Testimony of most Part of
the Fathers, nay indeed of almost all Historians will be of very little
worth. Do we at this present live too late to Teftifie concerning
the Form of Government which obtained in Scotland about the Year
1520, when almost every Plowman can tell it was Popery?

II. He excepts, that Jerom is but Teftis Singularis. Ibid. 'Tis true,
if a score or more be the same Thing with one, then Jerom is Tectis Singularis. But when we have found so many of the Fathers concurring with him, I need not tell how false that Exception is.

III. He excepts, Ibid. * That Jerom destroys the Credit of his own Testimony, by contradicting himself in this very Point. In Epist. ad Heliodor. and Nepotian & in Comment in Ps. 45. vers. 16. The very Truth is, there are few of the Fathers who do not in some Points contradict themselves as well as one another. But, for these Places which Mr. Rhind has cited; they signify nothing, unless he had pointed to the particular Words of them wherein he thinks Jerom has contradicted himself. For Instance, in the Epist. to Helidor. he makes the Presbyters to succeed to the Apostles, and to have the Power of Excommunication &c (n). I apprehend this is no Argument either for Episcopacy, or that he has contradicted himself. And that he has neither there, nor indeed any where else contradicted himself in this point; Stillingfleet is a pretty competent Witness. * Among all the fifteen Testimonies, saith he (o), produced by a learned Writer out of Jerom for the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, I cannot find one that does found it upon Divine Right; but only on the Convenience of such an Order, for the Peace and Unity of the Church of God.

IV. He excepts, Ibid. That it reproacheth the Wisdom of our Lord and his Apostles to suppose that they did establish a Form of Government necessarily productive of Schisms: This is to his old Tune of prescribing to Christ and the Apostles. The Government which they established, which, I hope, we have proven to have been Presbyterian, did not necessarily, that is, in the Nature of the Thing, produce Schisms; but by Accident only. Our Saviour foresaw that Schisms would arise even under the Government of Divine Institution. Suppose ye, that. I am come to give Peace on Earth, I tell you may, but rather Division. Luke XII. 51. And the Apostles not only foresaw but felt it. I hear that there be Divisions among you. 1 Cor. XI. 18. And yet they would not prevent them by setting up a Government that should

---

[n] Abide we de his quicumque sinistrum loquar, qui Apostolico gradu succedentes Christi Corpus a-
o ore coniciunt.—Muti ante Presbyterum sedere, non licet: IIIi, si pecayen, licet tradere me Satan. 
[o] Irenic p. 277.
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should be utterly incapable of them. No. God had infinitely wise
Ends to serve by not doing it. I hear that there be Divisions (Schisms)
among you; and I partly believe it. For there must be also Heresies (Septs)
among you that they which are approved, may be made manifest among you.
1 Cor. XI. 18. 19.

V. He excepts p. 115, 'that it is too severe a Charge to be of-
fered against the Catholick Church, that it would endeavour to
heal these Breaches by a Device of its own Invention, that is,
'Do Evil that Good might come of it. I answer. 'Tis confessed,
the Charge is Severe; but that which makes it so is, that it is
perfectly true; and not in that only, but in a Thousand other Cases;
as is evident from the innumerable Corruptions, which, by De-
grees, did overspread the whole Church. And Whitaker (Their
own Whitaker) discoursing of Jerom's foresaid Testimonies very
frankly tells 'that the Remedy was almost worse than the Disease.
'For as first one Presbyter was set over the rest, and made Bi-
ishop; so afterwards one Bishop was set over the rest. And so
'that Custom begot the Pope with his Monarchy, and by little
'and little brought them into the Church. Thus he (p). And
'tis certain that Schisms were never so frequent as after Epis-
copacy prevailed; and Bishops themselves were generally either the Au-
thors, Occasion or Fomenters of them. And Ancient Histories sup-
ply us with such dreadful Accounts of such Murder, Bloodshed and
Horrid Barbarities, committed by the contending Parties at the E-
lection of Bishops, as are not to be paralleled among the Heathens.
So much in Vindication of Jerom, who, I hope, is still safe to us
after all Mr. Rhind's Exceptions.

And now to conclude this Argument: It was so far from be-
ing morally impossible that Prelacy should obtain, even in spite of
the Divine Institution of Presbytery; that, considering the Corru-
ption of Human Nature, it had been next to a Miracle if it had not
obtained. For is there any Thing to which Man is more violently
addicted than the thwarting God's Institutions? Did not this
Humour

[p] Sed ipso morbo deterius pene Remedium fuic; nam ut primo unus Presbyter reliquis praepatus est,
& factus Episcopus; Ita potest unus Episcopus reliquis eff. Praepatus. Sic ita Confuetudo Papam cum
Humour begin to work even in the Paradisical State? What a
fine Speech could Mr. Rhind make to disprove the Israelits making
the Golden Calf at Horeb! 'No. 'Twas morally impossible they
should. God had delivered them out of Egypt with a mighty
hand, and in a wonderful Manner: He had dryed up the Red
Sea before 'em, and drown'd their Enemies in it: He had given
them the Law with all the Solemnities of Majesty and Circum-
stances of Terrour; Therein he had expressly inhibited 'em to
make unto themselves any graven Image: They had in the most
Solemn Manner Stipulate Obedience. Would they now after all
this, within forty Days too, so impiously oppose God, so perfidi-
ously violate their own Engagements as to contravene that Law?
No. The Men of 'em surely were Masters of more Reason: The
Women and Children were more fond of their Jewels and Ear-
Rings, than to part with them to be melted down into an Idol.
All of 'em had either a warmer Sense of God's late Mercies, or
a more terrible Impression of his Majesty and Justice from the
late Appearance he had made on Mount Sinai, than to venture
on such a Prank. Suppose they had been all willing, yet, would
ever Aaron have complisyed with the Motion? No. It must needs
be all Legend and Fable. And, which confirms this; Josephus,
who has given us so Judicious and accurate a History of the Jews,
is utterly Silent of it. And yet, how impossible forever it was,
there is notwithstanding a certain Book which common Folks call
the Bible, and Christians believe to be the Divine Oracles that
assures us that the People urged it Aaron did it, and the molten
Calf was set up and consecrate with great Triumph and without
Contradiction. These be thy Gods O Israel which brought thee out of
the Land of Egypt: And without any further Act for Conformity
the People got up early next Morning, and offered up their Oxen
to the Calf, the God and the Sacrifice being out of the same Herd.
So ease a Thing is it to make a Change in Religion to the worse,
yea and to bring about an universal Compliance with the Change.
Vain Man would be wise, though He be born like a wild As's Colt.
There is Nothing Men in all Ages have been more bewitched
with than an itch of Refining upon God's Appointments. And
a Conceit that they were able to better them, and that execrable
Principle
Principle, That they had Power to do so, have been the Original of all the Corruptions that have ever defiled or pefter’d the Church. 'Tis Plain that all the Fopperies and Ceremonies that have crept into the Worship of God owe their Birth to this. And 'tis no less plain from Jerom’s former Account, that Prelacy was hewn out of the same Quarry. Some aspiring Men have coloured their Ambition with the Pretext of remeeding Schisms; and the rest, either through want of Thought or Courage, have been gull’d into a Compliance, or blinded possibly with the hopes, that the Dignity might one Day fall to their own Share. But enough of this.

S E C T. V I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Reasonings against the Presbyterian Ruling-Elders and Deacons, are Examined. From P. 102 to P. 107.

The Main Part of the Controversy viz. Whether the Order of Bishops as Superiour to Presbyters be of Divine Apostolical Institution, being thus discussed; we are next to consider what Mr. Rhind has advanced against the Presbyterian Ruling-Elders and Deacons. And first against the Ruling Elders.
ARTICLE I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Reasonings against the Presbyterian Ruling-Elders, are Examined.

I. He objects that the Presbyterian Ruling-Elder is an Officer of Calvin's Institution p. 102. But here His History has failed him: For the Churches of Bohemia had such Officers before ever Calvin set up the Discipline of Geneva. And Martin Bucer Divinity Professor in Cambridge approved and commended the Bohemian Practice; and justified it both from the Scripture and from the Writeings of the Fathers. This was long since suggested by the Presbyterian Authors (q): And I do not find that ever any Answer was returned to it; But there is no other way of furnishing out of the Episcopal Books, but by repeating the same baffled Arguments over and over again. 'Tis plain then, how Modern forever the Order of Ruling-Elders may be, yet it is not of Calvin's Institution.

II. He objects, ibid. 'that such an Officer was never heard of in the Church, till 1500 Years after the sealing of the Canon of the Scripture. But here he is out again in Point of History, yea and contradicts his former Argument: For, by the common Account, the Canon of the Scripture was not sealed before the Year of Christ 96. The Discipline and Ruling-Elders were established at Geneva in the Year 1542. So that he is wrong in His Account by more than 50 Years, even keeping within the Bounds of the Reformation by Calvin.

III. He
III. He objects, *ibid.* that there is not a Title concerning them in the Bible. This is not arguing, but Impudence. We have an Account of them Rom. XII. 8. in these Words, *He that ruleth, with Diligence.* And 1 Cor. XII. 28. we have them mentioned under the Title of Governments. And 1 Tim. V. 17. *Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the Word and Doctrine.* By which Words, *faith Dr. Whitaker in his Prelections,* the Apostle manifestly distinguishes betwixt the Bishops and Inspectors of the Church. If all that rule well are worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the Word and Doctrine, it is clear there were some who did not labour: For if they had all done so, the Text had been Nonsense. But the Word especially makes the Difference. If I should say, that all these who study at the University are worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the Study of Theology; I behoved either to mean, that all do not apply themselves to the Study of Theology, or I should speak Nonsense. Wherefore I confess that to be the most genuine Sense of the Text by which the Pastors and Doctors are distinguished from those who only governed Rom. XII. 8. And concerning whom we read in Ambrose on 1 Tim. V. Thus that great Light and Patron of the Church of England (r). But what faies Mr. Rhind to it? Not one Syl- lable. He owns the Presbyterians found upon Texts of Scripture, but is so wise as not to name them, far less to essay to wring them from the Presbyterian Sense. And indeed his Conduct in this is wiser than any where else in his Book: For, it would touch any Man of Bowels with Commiseration to see into what various Forms the Episcopal Writers twist themselves to avoid the Force of the Text last cited. It has but fourteen Words in the Original even Particles included; and they have put at least fourteen Sensors on it. *Didoclavius discussed ten* of them in his Days, and they have been ever since inventing new ones: And had Mr. Rhind told us which of them he pitched on, I don’t believe it would be any hard Matter to discuss.

discuss that too, unless it be one of his own which the World ne-
ver yet heard of; for indeed the Sense of the Text is so very obvi-
ous, that none can mis it who does not industriously resolve to tor-
ture it. He saw very well that he could have made but a scurv-
Figure, had he tried his Critical Talent on it; and therefore he
had recourse to the Popular Art of Declaiming against the Ignorance
or Disingenuity of the Presbyterians: And every Body must own
that this was both more easie and innocent, than if he had fallen to
the wresting of Scripture, which would have both exposed his
Weakness, and made him Liable to Damnation. And yet he is
unlucky even in that same Popular Art, the Episcopal Writers them-
selves having proclaimed it Ignorance to take the said Text in any
other than the Presbyterian Sense. ' Art thou so Ignorant; faith
the forecited Whitaker (s) to Dury the Scots Jesuit, that thou
knowest not that there are Elders in the Church of Chrift whose
Work it is to govern only, not to preach the Word or dispense
the Sacraments.

IV. He Objects p. 103, that this, viz. the business of the Ruling-
Elders, seems to be the weak Side of the Party, their more Learned Ad-
voates having abandon'd its Defence. Who are these pray? Nay,
we must wait for a Second Edition of his Book e're we know that.
'Twas his Business to a fert not to prove. For my own part I nei-
ther know, nor can hear of any Presbyterian, Learned or Unlearn-
ed, that has abandon'd its Defence. 'Tis true Mr. Jamfon of late
has faid (t), that the Ruling-Elders are not in a Strift Sense Church
Officers, and retracts any Thing he had faid before to the contrary.
And him indeed I acknowledge to be a very Learned Man. But
has he therefore abandon'd the Defence of the Ruling-Elders? No.
He owns they are the Representatives of the Sacra Plebs, He has
proved by very many Authorities, Episcopal too among the ref that
fuch ought to be in the Church. Nay, the very Argument of his Chap-
ter is The Divine Right of Ruling Elders Sustained. Where then is that
Advocate for Presbytry that has abandon'd its Defence? If any has,
has, we are not likely to be altogether losers, the Advocates for Prelacy having taken it up. Not to name again the Learned Whits, on the forecited Text has delivered himself according to our Hearts with. ‘The Elders, faith he, among the Jews were of two Sorts. 1st. Such as governed in the Synagogue. And 2dly, Such as ministered in reading and expounding their Scriptures and Traditions, and from them pronouncing what did Bind or Loose, or what was forbidden, and what was law-ful to be done. And these the Apostle here declares to be the most honourable, and worthy of the chiefest Reward: Accordingly, the Apostle reckoning up the Offices God had appointed in the Church, places Teachers before Governments.

V. He Objects, p. 104, That all the Ecclesiastics in the Apostolical Age were initiated into their respective Offices by the Impostition of Hands; whereas Ruling-Elders are admitted by no such Ceremony; or if there be any Solemnity used at all in their Designation to the Office, it is performed by every Parish Minister in his private Congregatio, which is contrary to Presbyterian Principles; and is to exercise the sole Power of Ordination, which is not so much as pretended to by Bishops. ’Tis Answered 1st, The want of the Impostition of Hands will not argue them to be no Church Officers. Not to mention the Apostles and Gregory Thaumaturgus, of whom before; Ignatius himself (if all Traditions are true) was not ordain’d by Impostition of Hands (v). No Body doubts it is very lawfull; and for my own Part I heartily wish it were practised; but I deny that it is absolutely necessary, there being no Precept enjoining it, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost in his extraordinary Charismata which accompanied the Impostition of the Apostles Hands being now ceas’d. And of this Judgment are not only Presbyterians, but even the most learned Men of the Church of Rome her self, though otherwise so much addicted to Ceremonies. Of this, to omit other Testimonies, that Judicious Historian Father Paul informs us (x). ’Melchior Cornelius a Portugal, faith He seem’d to speak much to the Purpose, who said, the Apostles did un-
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[v] Dr. Wake’s Genuine Ep. 2d. Edit. p. 44.
doubtfully use Impo\sition of Hands in Ordination, §o that none
is mentioned in the Holy Scripture without that Ceremony; which,
in succeeding Ages was thought to be so essentia!; that Ordination
was called by that Name. Notwithstanding Gregory the Ninth
faith, It was a Rite brought in, and many Divines do not hold
it to be necessary, howsoever others be of the contrary Opinion.
And the famous Canonists, Ho\stiensis, Joannes Andreas, Abbas and
others do affirm, that the Pope may Ordain a Priest with these
Words only, Be thou a Priest, and which is of more Importance,
Innocentius Father of the Canonists faith: That if the Forms had
not been invented, it had been sufficient if the Ordainer had used
these Words only; or others Equivalent, because they were insti-
tuated by the Church afterwards to be observed. 2dly, That Bish-
ops do not pretend to the Sole Power of Ordination is blamelessly
false. We have given Testimony before p. 65 that they not only
pretend to it, but practice it. And after that Heap of Proofs which
Mr. Jameson has brought in his Cyprianus Isotimus for that Purpose,
a Man must be even steel'd in the Forehead that denies it. And
even when the Presbyters are admitted to join with the Bishop in
Acts of Ordination, it is meerly as Witnesses or Consenters, not as
having the least Share of Power. This, Mr. Drury has most round-
ly asserted in the Vindication of his Answer to Mr. Boyse's Sermon
concerning the Scriptural Bishop; and, as I am informed is digni-
fied with the Title of DOCTOR for his Pains. 'All, faith he, that
the Presbyters had to do was only to give their Content, and to
let the Church know that so Sacred an Action was not done rashly,
nor out of Favour and Affection. That they had no Divine
Right to concur with the Bishop, that the Power of Ordination was
in the Bishop alone, the Presbyters were only allowed to perform
a share in the outward Ceremony. 3dly, That the Solemnity used
in the Designation of the Ruling Elders to their Office is contrary to
Presbyterian Principles, Mr. Rhind ought to have proved nor meerly
asserted: For by doing so he has mightily exposted himself. 'Tis true
it is performed, by every Parish Minister in his private Congrega-
tion, he alone enjoins them their Duty, takes their Engagements, and
by solemn Prayer sets them apart for the Office. And, as this is
their constant Practice, so they have still own'd it to be their Prin-
ciple.
Sect. VI. Presbyterian Government.

... principle, that it is lawfull to do so. But then the Tryal is made by the Minister and Eldership of the Congregation; or, in want of these, by the Presbytery; and the whole People are by a publick Edict allowed, nay required to represent their Objections against their Admission, if any they have. This is to treat the People like rational Creatures: Whereas, the Bishop's putting men into Deacon's or Priest's Orders privately in his own Chamber, which was the constant Practice in the late Episcopal Times, not only choaks Reason, makes Beasts of the People; but is contrary to the whole Stream of Antiquity, 'The People themselves, as it is in Cyprian (y), having especially the Power of chusing worthy Priests, or of rejecting such as are unworthy.

VI. He Objects p. 105, that the Scriptural Presbyters were to continue ad Vitam aut Culpam. I answer, so are the Presbyterian Elders. For once an Elder still an Elder, unless he is deposed for Malversation. If in some great Towns they are relieved in Course by others, or Honourably dismissed upon their Desire, when Age disables them for Service, this is only such an Allowance as was made to the Levites under the Law; and therefore is not inconsistent with the Character of a Church Officer.

VII. He objects, Ibid: ' That the Scriptural Presbyters were allowed their proper Maintenance, whereas the Presbyterian Elders plead no Title to any such Thing, but are rather losers by the Interruption of their Trades. The Answer is plain. The same Scripture which founds their Office, entitles them to Maintenance. For the double Honour certainly imports no less. But that they do not plead it, is, because the Government has setled no Fund for that Purpose, and that in the present Circumstances they know it would be in vain to plead it. But will that make them no Church Officers? Was Paul no Church Officer, because he made the Gospel of Christ without Charge i Cor. IX 18? Are not the Episcopal Deacons Church Officers? They are not now provided in any Maintenance, whereas in the Primitive Church, they were, as Jerom witnesseth, better seen to than the Presbyters themselves (z). 'Tis true the Presbyterian Elders

Elders are sometimes advocate from their Employments by their Office: But this only speaks forth their Generous Temper, in that they prefer the publick Service of the Church to their private Interest. Nor are they likely to be losers thereby: For, God will not be unmindfull, nor forget their Work and Labour of Love.

VIII. He argues, Ibid. 'Were there any Foundation for such an Office in the Holy Scriptures, whence was it that Ruling-Elders did so early, so universally and so tamely give up their Divine Right, that there is no once Mention made of any such by Divine Right in the Homilies and Commentaries of the Fathers. For Answer, I shall read to Mr. Rhind a Homily from the Commentaries of one of the Fathers. 'Age, saith the forecited Ambrose or Hilary(a), is honourable among all Nations, whence first the Synagogue and afterwards the Church had Elders, without whose Counsel nothing was done in the Church. Which by what negligence it is fall'n into Disueritude, I know not, if it be not through the Sloath or rather Pride of the Doctors, whilst they alone will seem to be something. Thus he. I think it is tolerably clear from this Testimony that there were such Elders in the Church at first: For it is not possible Hilary could understand either Bishops or preaching Presbyters by them, seeing these still continued in the Church. And I think it is as clear, that their being disused was owing to the Prelatick Spirit of Ambition, which has been the Mother of so many Mischiefs to the Church. 'Tis therefore no wonder that we don't find the Names of the Ruling-Elders in the Acts of the General or Provincial Councils, when the Doctors were of such an usurping Temper. And perhaps that is the Reason why there are so very few Councils that had a good Issue, or of whom we have a comfortable Account. Even the Fathers of the first Council of Nice were in Peril of throwing their Bibles at one another's Heads, had not Constantine wisely moderated their Choller, and charitably burned their scandalous Libels against one another. Mr. Rhind indeed p. 218 taxes the Presbyterians that they dubbed here a Godly Webster, there a Sanctified

[a ] Nam apud omnes unque Gentes honorabiles est Senecius, unde & Synagoga & postea Ecclesia Seniores liabit, quorum fine Confilio nihil aegebatur in Ecclesia. Quod, qua negligentia absolveret, nullo, nulli forte Doctorum defidia aut magis superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid vider. Comment. in 1 Tim. 5. 1.
Sanctified Cobbler Ruling Elders. But I cannot see why either the Webster or the Cobbler might not be as usefull Members in a Council as many of the Bishops. For, we have uncontested Evidences (b) that many of them could not read or write their own Name. Mr. Rhind ought to have been aware how he inferred that the Ruling-Elders are no Church Officers, because they were not present at Councils, nor their Names recorded in the Acts of them: For, if that Argument be good, it will prove that even the Episcopal Presbyters are not Church Officers; Bellarmin having shewn (c) at great length, that Prelates alone have Power to Sit and Vote in Councils. However, this is enough for the Presbyterian Practice, that in the first and best Council that ever was, I mean that at Jerusalem Acts XV. both the Apostles and Elders, yea and the whole Church v. 22. were Members; and the Acts and Decrees thereof passed, not only by their Advice, but with their Suffrage.

Thus now we have seen that the Ruling-Elders are of Divine Institution, that they obtained in the Primitive Church, that they fell into Desuetude through the Pride of the Bishops; and that in the best constituted Churches in the World, they were revived again upon the first Dawning of the Reformation.

And indeed the Wisdom of our Lord and his care of his Church is very much seen in the Institution. For, as he has appointed Ministers, that the Faith of the Church may be kept sound; and Deacons that the wants of her poor Members might be supplied: So he has appointed Ruling-Elders to oversee the Manners and outward Conversation of Christians, that they be such as become the Gospel. Besides, by this Constitution the Discipline is the more willingly submitted to by the People, being exercised by Persons chosen from among themselves, appointed to represent them, to take care of their Interest, and that they may have no Reason to complain of the Rigour or Severity of the Ministers. To illustrate this a little from the

Constitution of the Civil Government. Princes ordinarily live in State, see Nothing but Coaches and Six, fine Rooms and full Tables; nor does any Body appear before 'em but in his Sunday's Cloaths. All this is very necessary and reasonable; yet it leaves Them very much unacquainted with the Condition of the Country; nor can They have other than a very faint Sense of the Pressures and Calamities Their People may be groaning under: And were the Legislature solely in Their hands, They cou'd hardly escape being blamed for every Thing the People might think a Grievance. But now when a Parliament meets once a Year, the Prince gets the Condition of the People in the most remote Corners of the Kingdom represented: And the People cannot but be satisfied, when they consider they are governed by no other Laws, nor burden'd with other Taxes, than what were asked and enacted with their own Consent; or, which is the same Thing, by Representatives of their own chusing. Just so, Ministers, through their retired Course of Life, are ordinarily very much Strangers to the Way of the World, and are ready to measure the World by the Abstract Notions they have gathered out of Books or from their own Solitary Musings, which don't always suit with the Practical Part of Life. Hence it comes to pass that, till Age and Experience have mellowed 'em, they are apt to have too much Keensf on their Spirits, and to express too much Rigour in their Actings. But Ruling-Elders are more conversant in the World, know better what the Times will bear, and what Allowances are necessary to be made in this or that Case. Now when the People (in the Case of Scandals) see themselves judged by such Persons, and that there is no other Discipline exercised on 'em but what even their own Neighbours, as well as their Ministers, think reasonable, they can have no just Cause of Complaint.

To conclude. It is very Strange that the Episcopal Writers shou'd inveigh against Officers whose Province it is only to Govern, not to Preach, I mean by themselves, seeing they have loudly proclaimed to the World, that they look upon their Bishops only as such. Thus, Dr. South (d) in his Sermon preached
ed at the Consecration of the Bishop of Rochester upon Titus II. verse ult. These things speak and exhort, in a flat Contradiction to the Text saies, 'That a teaching Talent is not absolutely ne-
cessary in a Bishop, nor is of the vital Constitution of his Function.
' If he have it, it is not to be refused; but if he have it not, it
is not much to be desired. And if any of their Bishops do make
Conscience of constant preaching, as some of them have done, it is
reckoned a Labour of Love, as not having a Care of Souls. Thus
the Bishop of Sarum in his Funeral Sermon on Dr. Tillotson the
late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury. 'In his Function, saith He, He
was a constant Preacher: For tho' he had no care of Souls upon
him, yet few that had laboured so painfully as he did. And
yet the Arch-Bishops and Bishops have, above all the other Clergy,
the greatest Honour and the largest Provision. I wonder upon what
Account, if it be none of their Duty to labour in the Word and Do-
ctrine. And I wonder how Episcopal Ruling-Elders can be lawfull,
and Presbyterian Ruling-Elders not so. But enough of this.

ARTICLE II.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Reasonings against the Presby-
byterian Deacons are Examined.
P. 106. 107.

I. H E Objects that the Primitive Deacons did Preach and Bap-
tize, which the Presbyterian Deacons cannot do, therefore
they are not the same. 'Tis answered. The Scripture Deacons by vir-
tue of their Office were neither to preach nor Baptize, but to serve
Tables: For the Apostles unloaded themselves of the latter Function,
A a
because they could not, with it, discharge the former Acts VI. 2
It is not reason that we should leave the Word of God and serve Tables.
But, saies Mr. Rhind, Philip who was ordain'd a Deacon Acts VI.
did Preach and Baptize Acts VIII. 12. 13. 'Tis answered. 1st, We
have heard Hilary before declaring, that it was allowed to all in
the Beginning to preach the Gospel and to Baptize. 2ly, Philip
was an Evangelist, and in that Capacity preached and Baptized.
But, saies Mr. Rhind, we read of no second Ordination He had for these
Purposes. Is not this pretty? Is he not expressly called an Evangelist Acts XXI. 8. And shall we think he took up the Office at his
own Hand, without being ordain'd to it; because we do not
read of his Ordination? Or does he think that Evangelists had not
Power to Baptize? But, adds he, ' we find Peter and John com-
misioned by the Apostles to confirm the Samaritans, which Office
Philip cou'd have discharged had he been an Evangelist. I answer.
He could not. For the Confirmation that is there meant is the
giving of the Holy Ghost in his extraordinary Charismata, as is e-
vident from the whole History: And this none but the Apostles
could give; nor is there one Instance, either in the Scripture or
Church History, where ever any but the Apostles either did or
could give it. But Mr. Rhind has strongly imagined that the pre-
fent Ufage among the Prelatists is according to the New Testa-
ment Practice; whereas indeed Episcopal Confirmation is a thing
unheard of in the Scripture, and so is a baptizing Deacon. Nor can
I look upon Baptism administered by an Episcopal Deacon, any
otherwise than as if it had been administered by a Webster or Coblcr
Ruling Elder or Deacon among the Presbyterians. I'm sure there
is not the least Countenance for it in the Scripture. I'm sure the
very Design of the Deacon's Office declares that Baptizing is no
part of it. I'm sure likewise the Presbyterian Deacon is the only
Deacon by Scripture warrant, when the word is taken as signifying
an Officer inferior to a Presbyter.

II. He objects ' That the ancient Deacons did constitute one
of the Ordinary and perpetual Orders of Ecclesiasticks, whereas
' the Presbyterian Deacons are only in a few of the larger Towns,
' there being none such in any other Part of the Nation. 'Tis an-
twered. They are in every Congregation where they can be had.
And
And to my certain Knowledge in the lesser as well as larger Towns; yea in many Country Congregations. And every Minister is pos'd upon it by the Presbytery twice a Year, whether his Session be constitute with Deacons as well as Elders. Possibly some Congregations may have little or no Stock; and perhaps as few Poor that want it. What is the great Hazard tho', in such a Case, they have no Deacons? O, faith Mr. Rhind, It's a fundamental Defect if they believe them to be of Divine Institution. Very well argued! As if Deacons were absolutely necessary to the Constitution of a Church. But Time was when there were no such Officers in Being, nor any Order for them: Nor in all probability would there ever have been any, had not the emergent Circumstances of the Church made it necessary. How many Instances have we in Church History of Bishops without Presbyters? But was that a fundamental Defect? Or would it be sufficient whereupon to infer, that Presbyters are not Church Officers; or that the Office is not of Divine Institution? 'Tis Naus-eous to answer such Stuff. So much for the Presbyterian Deacons.

The Conclusion of the Chapter concerning Church-Government.

Thus now I have got through the Controversy of the Government of the Church; and hope I have made it sufficiently clear that, neither from the Nature of the Thing, nor the Form of Government among the Jews, nor Political Necessity, nor the Institution of our Lord, nor the Practice of the Apostles, nor the pretended Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus, nor the Apocalyptick Angels, nor the Testimony of Antiquity, nor indeed from any Thing else Mr. Rhind has advanced, does it appear that by Divine Right there is, or ought to be any Officer in the Church superior to the preaching Presbyter. Consequently the Presbyterian Government is
is not Schismatical, but that which was originally instituted, and did at first obtain. Consequentially Mr. Rhind in separating from it (the same is to be said of all others in his Case) is become a Schismatick. Consequentially Episcopal Ordination is so far from being necessary, that it is without, and therefore contrary to Divine Institution.

And now to conclude. I cannot but look upon it as one of the nicest Turns I ever heard was given to a Cause, that our Scotch Episcopalians who, the other Day while they were in Possession, were glad to find a few Colours, and watery ones they were God wet, to prove Episcopacy Lawfull; and would have been heartily well content if People would have acquiesced in it as Tolerable; that they, I say, should, now when they had lost all, set up for the Absolute Necessity of it, and hope to recover the Sadle by that Politick; I cannot help saying in the Words of Catullus.

Res est Redicula & nimis Jocosa.

'Tis much such an other Trick as the Church of Rome serves the Protestants: When she finds her Religion almost one continued Scab of Errors and Corruptions, she puts on a brazen Impudence, and will needs have them to dispute her Infallibility. I must then advise our Episcopal Writers to be so modest as not to grasp at all; but to content themselves, as their Fathers did before them, with Essays to prove the Lawfulness of Episcopacy, without insisting on the Necessity of it. And as for others, besides the Clergy, who are become Disciples to this new Hypothesis, I cannot but seriously exhort them to consider the horrid Uncharitableness and bloody Cruelty of it, no where to be paralleled except amongst the most bigotted Papists. I crave leave then to address you in a few Words.

I hope, Gentlemen, you know that there are other Churches in the World besides the Presbyterians in Scotland, which neither believe the Necessity of Bishops, nor maintain Union with them. There are our Brethren Dissenters in England and Ireland, a pretty considerable Body. There was the French reformed Church while she stood, and what yet remains of Her in a dispersed Condition. There are the Belgick Churches, the Church of Geneva, the Reform
med Cantons with their Protestant Confederates; and New England on the other Side of the World, all which own no such Office as that of a Diocesan Bishop. Now, pray Gentlemen, do ye think it Nothing to unchurch all these; and, which is the necessary Consequence of that, to give them to the Devil; when yet all the World sees that, generally speaking, their Conversation is at least as good and as becoming the Gospel as your own? Do ye think it nothing, by your bigotted Notions thus to weaken the Protestant Interest, and to make such a dangerous Concession to the Papists, that so fair a Part of the Protestant World is in a State of Schism, out of Favour with God, and incapable of Salvation? And all this merely for the want of Prelates, of whom there is not the least Mention in Scripture?

And yet the malign Influence of your Principle does not sist within these Bounds I have mention'd. No. All the Churches who have only Superintendents are in quite as dangerous a Condition as the former. For, besides that these Superintendents positively disown their Superiority over their Brethren to be by Divine Right; we have p. 45 heard M. Dodwell declaring, that they are not sufficient for a Principle of Unity, and consequently cannot be the Medium of Union with Christ. Now, pray consider what a Havock this must needs make of the remaining Protestant Churches. Left you should think me partial in giving the Detail of 'em, take it in Stillingfleets Words. 'In Holstein, faith he (e), Pomeren, Madelenburg, Branswick, Lunenburg, Bremen, Oldenburg, East Friesland, Hessen, Saxony, and all the upper Part of Germany, and the Protestant Imperial Cities, Church-Government is in the Hands of Superintendents. In the Palatinate they have Inspectors and Propositi, over which is the Ecclesiastical Consistory. And so they have their Propositos in Wetteran, Hessen and Anhalt. And in Transylvania, Polonia and Bohemia they have their Seniores. All these, he adds, acknowledge no such Thing as a Divine Right of Episcopacy, but stiffly maintain tron's Opinion of the Primitive Equality of Gospel Ministers. And therefore they must all go over at the same Ferry with plain Parity Men; and you know you

[e] Irenic p. 415...
you have assigned them but indifferent quarters against their landing.

Yet further, even in Denmark, Norway and Sweden, tho' there are a few that have the name of Bishops; yet they are very far from being looked on as the Center of Union, or mystical High Priests, or the visible representatives of God and Christ, by whom alone People can have Union with the Divine Persons, which is your Scheme. No, they have no such Whimsies among them on the contrary Writers speak most diminutively of their Power. 'Here, viz. in Denmark (faith the Author of the present State of Europe for the Year 1705 p. 134) are Bishops, but they are not much different in Effect from Superintendents in other Places, depending on the Superior Conscriptory.' And (faith the excellent Author of the Account of Denmark for the Year 1692, Third Edit. p. 231.) there are Six Superintendents in Denmark, who take it very kindly to be called Bishops and My Lord. There are also four in Norway. These have no Temporalities, keep no Ecclesiastical Courts, have no Cathedrals, with Prebends, Canons, Deacons, Sub-Deacons, &c. But are only Primi inter Pares. Thus he. And 'tis certain, that in the Beginning of the Reformation it was Bugenhagius (who was but a Presbyter) that ordained their first seven Superintendents or Bishops from whom all their Succession to this Day does flow. The same is the Case of Sweden. 'The Archbishops and Bishops of this Kingdom (faith the forecited Author of the Present State of Europe p. 147) retain little more than the Name, and a bare Primary fort of Superiority over other Superintendents, the establishing of the Lutheran Religion having deprived them of the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, which they exercised before the Reformation. Thus he. And to the same Purpose Stillingfleet (g) concerning both these Kingdoms. 'In Sweden, faith he, there is one Archbishop and Seven Bishops, and so in Denmark, though not with so great Authority.

By this Calculation, the whole foreign Reformed Churches will be found to be of Presbyterian Principles, and consequently not

---

[i] Vide Chytræum Saxon p. 434.
[i] Itemi, sib spiritu.
not a true Church among 'em all by your Scheme. You'll perhaps say that as for Sweden and Denmark 'tis enough to save 'em from the Guilt of Schism, that they have such as are called Bishops, how small soever their Authority be, and tho' the Divine Institution or Necessity of them is not believed. But, pray Gentlemen, consider, if their Practice save them from the Guilt of Schism, does not their Belief involve them in the Guilt of Herefie? If Union with the Bishop be by Divine Command a necessary Duty, then certainly the Belief of it is a fundamental Article, and consequently the denying thereof, as all those of the Lutheran Communion do, must be Herefie. And so you have very charitably disposed of all the Protestant Churches, sending them whole Sale to Hell upon the Account either of Herefie or Schism.

I foresee what Reply you'll make to all this, viz. that the Uncharitableness of a Doctrine is no Argument against the Truth of it. That our Thoughts don't alter the Nature of Things, nor can change Divine Establishments: And therefore if it be true that Episcopal Ordination is necessary to make a Minister, without which his Acts are not valid; and that Union with the Bishop is necessary to external Life, without which People cannot expect it: Be the Consequences of this never so heavy, or extend themselves to never so many, that is what you cannot help: The Truth must be maintained; and that you express your Charity sufficiently by telling us of our Danger, and that it would be the most uncharitable thing in the World to conceal the same from us, or to shew it less than really it is. To which I answer, 'Tis very true, our Thoughts don't alter the Nature of Things, nor will your Rigour or our Charity make the other's Principles either truer or sicker. But tho' it do not make, yet it may go a great length to shew whether they be true or false. For, 'tis a shrewd Presumption in most Cases, that the Opinion which wants Charity is not from God, and that the Error lyes on the Damning Side. This the Divines of the Church of England have oftentimes observed in their Disputes against the Church of Rome: But their late Writers for Episcopacy quite forget it in dealing with the Presbyterians. A good and wise Man, even tho' he have the Truth on his Side, will yet make all the Allowances the Case will reasonably bear; for those that differ from him. He will consider that
that their dissenting from him may proceed from Education, the Difficulty of the Controversie, the want of due Helps or of a suitable Genius and Capacity. And if he himself make Allowances for them on these or the like Accounts; He will readily believe that a mercifull God will do so much more. But when a Man's Mind is darkned with Errour, at the same Time his Temper is fowred: And because he cannot Reason others into the fame Opinion with himself, therefore he effays to fright them into it with the Argument of Damnation. And this, Gentlemen, I must take the Freedom to say, I apprehend to be your Case. For, Pray, whence all this Height? On what is all this Assuming in your own Case founded? Mr. Rhind, to give him his due, has laid out all your best Arguments in their Strength, and fet them off with Abundance of Elegancy; I appeal to your selves whether every one of them is not answered to Satisfaction.

I. Is it on the Scriptures you found? M. Dodwell has fairly quit ted that Fort, and frankly owns that your Prelacy is not to be found there: And that the Original of it is at least ten Years Posterior to the Sealing of the Canon of the Scripture, and half a Dozen years to the Death of John the longest lived of the Apostles. And as to the Business of Ordination which you so much inftit on, He not only supposes (b) that Presbyters might chufe their Bishop, might use all the Ceremonies of Confe ration to him, might in feft him in his Office by Prayer and Impofition of Hands: But also tells, ' that he is apt to think that this must have been the Way obfer ved at first in the making of Bishops. Now, if the Presbyters have Power of Ordaining Bishops, is it not strange that they should want the Power of Ordaining Presbyters like themselves? Has God any where forbidden it? No. But Mr. Dodwell would perfwade us of it by a Simile, which yet is but a weak way of arguing, viz. That as though a Prince is inaugurated by his Subjects, yet when once he is inaugurated, they have not any Power over him, nor can act any thing without him, or withdraw their Obedience from him, so neither can the Presbyters, when once they have Ordain'd a Bishop over themselves, do any Thing either without him or in Opposition to him; and that all fuch Acts are not only

only punishable but invalid. But all this Reasoning is founded on two most precarious Suppositions *viz.* 1st, That the Presbyters are obliged to have a Bishop over them. And 2dly, That every Bishop is a Monarch in his own Diocess, for which there is just as much to be said as there is for the French King's being Universal Monarch of the World, or the Pope of the Catholick Church. Such Things ought to be proved not presumed; so much the rather that in Fact we find the Presbyters of the Church of England, even the High-Church Presbyters, have disowned that Principle. For, in the late famous Contests between the two Houses of Convocation, the Plurality in the lower House assumed to themselves a Power over, and set themselves in opposition to their Superiors: And would needs have their Metropolitan and Bishops to be accountable to them for their Conduct in their Visitations, they would needs censure the Bishop of Sarum's Book on the XXXIX Articles: Nay would need's sit, and act too, after the Metropolitan their President had adjourned them. By this Conduct of theirs they broke through the Ignatian and Dodwellian Scheme at once, and loudly proclaimed to the World that they did not believe their Bishops to be absolute Monarchs. Thus the Presbyters were beholden to the lower House of Convocation. But indeed the upper House obliged them no less. For, the lower House, apprised of the Constructions were made of their Actings, on Dec. 11. 1702 sent a Declaration to the upper House whereof the Import was, That whereas they had been scandalously and Maliciously represented as Favours of Presbytry, in Opposition to Episcopacy, they now declared, That they acknowledged the Order of Bishops, to be of Divine Apostolical Institution. Several of the lower House had dissentent from this Declaration, and refused to subscribe it. But did not their Lordships in the upper House go in to it? No. Notwithstanding the lower House by an additional Address begged their Lordships to abett and support the foresaid Doctrine, yet their Lordships objected against the Legality of asserting it, and in end flatly refused it. So that, even in England it self, to this Day there has never been any Declaration made of the Divine Institution of Prelacy either by Parliament or Convocation: Nor can I find that there is any Thing in any of their publick Formu- la's asserting it, except some Words in the Preface to the Form of B.b
Defence of the

Chap. II.

Ordination, which are too loose and weak to bear such a Weight. And 'tis certain, that, at the Reformation, Prelacy was set up in England on a far different Footing from that of Divine Right. For in K. Henry the VIth's Reign Anno 1539. ' The Bishops, faith Dr. Burnet (i), took out Commissions from the King, by which they acknowledged that all Jurisdiction Civil and Ecclesiastical flowed from the King, and that they exercised it only at the King's Courtesie, and that as they had it of his Bounty, so they wou'd be ready to deliver it up at his Pleasure, and therefore the King did empower them in His stead to Ordain, give Institution, and do all the other Parts of the Episcopal Function. Upon which the Historian makes this Remark, By this they were made the King's Bishops indeed.

Nor was the Matter mended by K. Edward VI. ' In the first Year of whose Reign, says the same Historian (k), all that held Offices were required to come and renew their Commissions. Among the rest the Bishops came, and took out such Commissions as were granted in the former Reign viz. to hold their Bishopricks during pleasure, and were empowered in the King's Name, as His Delegates, to perform all the Parts of the Episcopal Function, and Cranmer set an Example to the rest in taking out one of them. And indeed Heylin acknowledges (l) that K. Edward's first Parliament forced the Episcopal Order from their strong Hold of Divine Institution, and made them no other than the King's Ministers only.

Upon this Footing was Prelacy settled even in England at the Reformation: And I challenge any Man to produce Documents where ever to this Day they have bettered its Foundation, or settled it upon Scripture Authority or Divine Institution. And muft the Scots Presbyterians be Schismaticks for not believing what the whole Forreign Protestant Churches have declared against, and England her felf durft never afferr. Gentlemen, I can affure you there is Nothing in the World makes a Party appear with a more Contemptible Figure than weak Arguments and a high Air. Please there.

therefore only to low'r your Air in proportion to your Arguments, and I hope it will be no hard Matter to deal with you. 'Tis true your late Writers will needs perswade you that all Christianity depends on Prelacy, and that there cannot be any Church where it obtains not; and their Plot, viz. The Ruin of the whole Protestant Interest through the World, is too evident either to be mistaken by us, or coloured by themselves. But I must tell you that Cranmer, Therleby, Redman, Cox, Whitgift, Cosins, Low, Bridges, Hooker, Dounham, Willet, Mason, Chillingworth, Sutcliffe, and all those great Names who, for several Scores of Years after the Reformation, baffled Popery by their Arguments, or gave Testimony against it by their Blood; tho' they were deeply engaged in the Interests of Prelacy, and loved it with their Soul; yet they still either denied the Necessity of it, or frankly disowned its being founded on Scripture. And when the Scripture Fort is forsaken, pray what will ye betake your selves to. For

II. Will you found on the Fathers? 'Tis true your Writers amuse you with their Names, and dazzle your Eyes with Citations out of 'em which mention Bishop and Presbyter as distinct. But, pray desire them to cite the Fathers declaring for the Divine Right of that Distinction, as the Presbyterians cite them declaring for their Scripture Identity. Without this, all their Endeavours are only a Learn'd Labour to bubble the World, and does either discover their own, or presume their Readers want of Judgment. Stillingfleet has spoken ingenuously on the Head. ' As to the Matter it self, faith he (m), I believe upon the strictest Enquiry Medina's Judgment will prove true; That Jerom, Austin, Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, were all of Aerius's Judgment as to the Identity of both Name and Order of Bishops and Presbyters in the Primitive Church. I have shewn how, not only these but several others of the Fathers are on the Presbyterian Side; and acknowledge not only that the Names Bishop and Presbyter are Common; but also that the Office and Character was the same in the Apostolick Times. I have produced them interpreting the Scriptures that relate to this Controversy, as
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the Presbyterians now do. I have shewn that the Divines of the Church of England, even her Bishops and Doctors acknowledge the Fathers to be one the Side of Presbytry. If the Episcopal Writers can produce as many of the Fathers declaring as expressly for the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters by Divine Right; if they can find them interpreting the Scriptures that Way, and then back all with the Approbation of our Presbyterian Writers, as I have done what I alleged with the Approbation of the Episcopal; I hereby engage to become their Profelyt. If this is not to be done, you must blame your selves you have not more Disciples. But, tis high Time to proceed with Mr. Rhind.

---

**CHAP. III.**

Wherein Mr. Rhind’s Second Reason for separating from the Presbyterian Party viz. That their Articles of Faith are fundamentally False and Pernicious, is Examined. From P. 119. to P. 148.

This is a very high Charge, and for making it Good He insists against the Doctrine of the Decrees in general; the Decrees of Predestination and Reprobation in particular, the Doctrine of the Efficacy of Grace, and the Doctrine of the Perseverance of the Saints. For Answer, I shall first particularly consider his Objections against these Doctrines, and Secondly prove that they are the Doctrines of the whole Christian Church.
SECT. I.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Objections against the Presbyterian Articles of Faith, are considered.

In the First Place Mr. Rhind insists against the Doctrine of the Eternal Decrees in General, which in the Westminster Catechism are defined to be God's eternal Purpose, according to the Counsel of His own Will; Of the Divine Decrees whereby, for his own Glory, He hath foreordained Events in General. whatever comes to pass. One would think the

Truth of such a Doctrine was beyond Debate. For, doth not the Infinite Perfection of the Divine Nature, and the Dependence of the Creature upon God, in its Actions as well as Being, argue such Decrees? Does not the infallible Omniscience of God necessarily infer them? Is it possible otherwise to conceive how Events, that flow from Rational free-Agents, or depend upon Contingent Causes, should be certainly known, when they are not certainly to be? Does Mr. Rhind think that God has forsaken the Earth, or laid the Reins on the Neck of the Creatures, allowing them to hurry both themselves and him whither they list? Has he formed his Notions of the Deity upon Lucretius's System, who would Complement him out of his Concernment for the World

Immortalis aevi summa cum Pace fruatur
Semita a nostris Rebus sejunctaque longe.

Or doth he think Him such a one as himself, to take His Measures upon
upon the Spot as he sees Things are likely to frame? In the Con-
sidence of what did he oppose such a Doctrine?

Why, faith He p. 120, Nothing comes to pass more frequently
than Sin: And therefore if God has foreordained whatsoever comes
to pass, then it will follow that God has ordain’d Sin, and conse-
quently must be the Author of Sin, which is Blasphemous, and de-
strays the Essential Distinction ’twixt good and evil, all Just No-
tions of God, the Natural Freedom of Man’s Will, takes away Re-
wards and Punishments, and in a Word excuses the Sinner and
lays the Blame upon God. This is the full Sum of what he has
offered against the Presbyterian Doctrine of the Decrees. But

I. These are not Arguments against, but Consequences wrung from
it; Consequences too which the Presbyterians refuse with Abhorrence,
and that in their publick Formula’s. Thus in their Confession of
Faith (n) They Teach, ‘ That God from all Eternity did by the
most wise and Holy Council of His own Will freely and un-
changably Ordain whatsoever comes to pass: Yet so, as that
neither is God the Author of Sin, nor is Violence offered to the
Will of the Creatures, nor is the Liberty or Contingency of second
Causes taken away but rather established. ’Tis therefore not only
uncharitable but unjust to load the Doctrine with such Consequences,
when they expressly declare that they do not understand the
Doctrine in such a Sense as to admit of these Consequences.

II. Cannot Mr. Rhind conceive, that ’tis very possible for the
Divine Majesty to decree the Event, without decreeing the Sin
that adheres to it, any further than that he will permit, direct, and
overrule it, to serve his own wise and Holy Ends? Whether he
can conceive it or not, there is no one Thing more expressly laid
down in the Scripture than this. I am very sure that Shimei sinned
grievously in cursing David, and yet I am as sure that the
Lord said unto him Curse David (o). I am sure it was with
wicked Hands that Herod, Pontius Pilate and the People of the Jews
took and crucified and slew the Son of God (p). But I am as sure,
not only that He was delivered by the determinate Council and Fore-
knowledge of God, but also that They did Nothing to him but what
God’s
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God's Hand and Council determined before to be done (q). Are the Expressions in the Presbyterian Catechism harder than these of the Scripture? And must not Presbyterians teach as the Scriptures do, because Mr. Rhind will needs harangue a little against them?

III. How does the Decree of God excuse the Sinner? Does not Mr. Rhind know, that it is not the Decree but the Precept that is given to be the Standard of our Obedience? No indeed; this Mr. Rhind knew not, or did not advert to: For he has expressly made the Decrees and the Commands of God the same Thing; and the Decrees to be the Rule of our Duty. If, faith he p. 121, God has decreed Sin, it is our Duty to commit it, His Commands being the Standard of our Obedience. This is a horrid Blunder he has made. So far are the Decrees from being the Rule of our Duty, that it is both impossible to know them, and a Crime to enquire into them any further than as God has revealed them in his Word. Secret Things belong unto the Lord our God: But those Things which are revealed belong unto us. (r) And therefore God very justly punishes the Sinner, not for fulfilling his Decrees in which he was not concerned; but for transgressing his Precepts which he had revealed to him. God decreed that the Son of Man should be betrayed & betrayed by Judas. The Son of Man goeth as it was determined (s), yet this Decree could not excuse Judas, because he neither designed the fulfilling of it by his Treachery, nor indeed was it given him as the Rule of his Behaviour: And therefore 'tis presently added Wo unto that Man by whom he is betrayed. And therefore when Mr. Rhind affirms p. 130, 'That it is Nonsensical and Blasphemous to suppose that God's secret and revealed Will are not one, He contradicts express Scripture, and thereby makes himself guilty of that Blasphemy he imputes to others.

IV. Whatever Difficulties there are in the Presbyterian Doctrine of the Decrees, the Arminians must be intollerably fancifull, if they do not own, that they are at least equal on their Side; with this very considerable Difference, that generally the Objections against the

the Presbyterian Doctrine arise from pretended Reason: Whereas the Objections against the Arminian Doctrine are founded, not only upon plain Reason, but express Declarations of Scripture: And where these are, and the Contest is 'twixt seeming Reason and the clear Revelation of God; it seems but good Manners to yield to God. Mr. Rhind cannot digest this Doctrine of the Decrees, because he cannot (without submitting his Judgment to the Scriptures) by meer Strength of Natural Reason answer all the Difficulties & Objections that may be brought against it. But can he answer all the Difficulties & Objections against a Trinity of Persons in the Divine Nature? Can he answer all the Objections that may be made against the Resurrection of the Body after the Infinite and inconceivable Changes which Time and Corruption bring upon it? If he can answer these, I say, upon the meer Strength of Reason; it must be owned he is the ablest Divine the World was ever yet blessed with. If he will not believe them, because he cannot answer all Objections against them; then 'tis plain he ought to have continued in his State of Discreet Scepticism to this Day. But if he can believe these Doctrines notwithstanding his inability to solve the Difficulties that hang on 'em; why might he not also believe that God has decreed whatever comes to pass; for the one is as plainly revealed in the Scripture as the other. And

V. There is so much the more Reason for this, that the Belief of the Decrees is necessary in order to the Conduct of Life. For when I am afflicted by the Hands of wicked Men and suffer from their Sins, how shall I possess my Soul in Patience, or keep myself from Revenge; if I don't believe that, tho' God is absolutely free of their Sin, yet he uses them as the Tools and Instruments of his Providence for serving his Purposes upon me, and that such Things were measured out for me by his Decree. It was upon this Consideration that Job sinned not, nor charged God foolishly, notwithstanding the Injuries the Sabezans and Caldeans had done him. It was this preserved Joseph from all Resentment against his Brethren for their Barbarous Uage of him, Ye thought Evil against Me, but God meant it unto Good. Gen. 50. 20. It was upon this that David quieted his Spirit, and was Dumb not opening his Mouth, because the Lord had done it Psalm XXXIX. 9. And what God does in Time without Sin, might he
he not from all Eternity decree without Sin. It was upon this Argument that our Blessed Saviour bore the Contradictions and Cruelty of Sinners with a perfect Composure of Spirit. The Cup that my Father hath given me to drink shall I not drink it. John XVIII. 11. Nay, even a Heathen Seneca prescribes the belief of the Doctrine of the Decrees to his Friend as a Remedy against all ruffling of Spirit under Injuries and Troubles. ‘ Losses, faith he (r), ‘ Wounds, Fears are come upon you; these Things are usual. That’s ‘ little, these Things are needful, they are Decreed and don’t come ‘ by Chance. I hope then in all this Doctrine there is nothing either false or pernicious, much less any Thing that is Fundamentally so.

In the Second Place, Mr. Rhind insists against the Presbyterian Doctrine of Gods Irrespective Decrees relating to Mankind contain’d in their Confession of Faith Of the Decree of Chap. III. viz. That God has, by his Eternal and immutable Purpose & the secret Counsel and good Pleasure of his own Will, chosen some to everlasting Life, without any Foresight of Faith or good Works or Perseverence in either of them. And that he hath, by the same Eternal and unchangeable Counsel of his own Will, passed by, and ordained others to Wrath for their Sin. ‘ This Doctrine, he argues, contradicts the Holiness, Justice and Truth of God, is contrary to the Design of all Revelation, and to express Testimonies of Scripture, and is perniciously influential upon Christian Life.

p. 122.—135. ’Tis against my Will that I engage in this mysterious Controversy, in which every Man ought to be Wise to Sobriety. But, I hope, it will not be difficult to suggest as much, as will take off Mr. Rhind’s Objections, without going beyond my Line. For answer then

I. It is abundantly Strange that this Doctrine shou’d be opposed by such as have read the Scripture and the Epistles of Paul, who has insisted on it at large in the Eight and Ninth Chapters of the Epistle to the Romans; and besides has frequently asserted it here and there in particular Hints which Mr. Rhind p. 132. very man-
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nerly calls dismembred Shreds, as if the Apostle had lost his Connexion always when he touched on that Doctrine. But what can Mr. Rhind say to those many Places of Scripture, which he cannot but know are insisted on by the Presbyterians in Defence of that Doctrine? Why, he has rid his Hands of 'em by one fearless Stroke, boldly pronouncing, in the place just now cited, That these are the Passages hard to be understood pointed at by the Apostle Peter, II. Ep. III. 16, which some wrest to their own Destruction. But who told him that Peter pointed at these Passages? Did any Spirit reveal it to him? Do the Church of England Doctors teach him so? No surely. Drs Hammond and Whitby, the two most famous Expositors that have yet appeared, assert, that it is the Doctrine of the coming of our Lord that Peter there points at, and not the Doctrine of Predestination, or any Thing near it. And, if Mr. Rhind had consulted the Greek Original, he had seen that Peter did not refer to Paul's Epistles, but to the Subjects he had been treating of, when he used these Words In which there are some Things hard to be understood.

II. 'Tis very true the Presbyterians teach, that by the Decree of God, for the Manifestation of his Glory, some Men are Predestinated unto Everlasting Life, and others foreordained to Everlasting Death: And there does indeed lye a Threwd Objection against it viz. That it is not in the Power of Man to prevent his own Damnation, if he has been foreordain'd to it: But then (which might have discouraged Mr. Rhind to bring it into the Field again) the Apostle Paul both foresaw it & silenced it Rom. IX. 14. &c. What shall we say then? Is there Unrighteousness with God? God forbid. For he faith to Moses, I will have Mercy on whom I will have Mercy, and I will have Compassion on whom I will have Compassion. So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth Mercy....Therefore hath he Mercy on whom he will have Mercy, and whom he will, he hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto Me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his Will? Nay but, O Man, who art thou that repliest against God? Here is a full Assertion and fair Vindication of the Presbyterian Doctrine; and whatever Objections our Minds may raise against it, yet there is no one Doctrine more clearly expressed or strongly asserted in all the Scripture than this. And, which confirms all, it is beyond all Controversy; by Observations from Providence; that...
God acts with an Absolute Soveraignty even in the Dispensations of the Means of Grace in Time, which is a certain Document that he acted the same Way in His Eternal Decrees. The World was for many Ages delivered up to Idolatry; and since the Christian Religion has appeared, we see vast Tracts of Countries which have continued ever since in Idolatry: Others are fallen under Mahometanism: And the State of Christendom is in the Eastern Parts of it under so much Ignorance, and the greatest Part of the West is under so much Corruption, that We must confess the far greatest Part of Mankind has been in all Ages destitute of the Means of Grace, and great Numbers of Men are born in such Circumstances, that it is morally Impossible that they should not perish in them. If God thus leaves whole Nations in such Darkness and Corruption, and freely chooses others to communicate the Knowledge of Himself to them, then We need not Wonder that he holds the same Method with Individuals, that he doth with whole Bodies: For, the rejecting of whole Nations by the Lump for so many Ages, is more hard to be accounted for by us than the selecting of a few, and the leaving others in that State of Ignorance and Brutality *. But it becomes no Man to quarrel with God, and impeach Him on His other Attributes, because He will exercise His Soveraignty, when we are both assured by the sacred Oracles, and see it with our Eyes in the Course of His Providence, that His Judgments are unspeakable and His Ways past finding out.

III. There lyes no Just Objection from this Doctrine against the Holiness, Justice or Sincerity of God. First, not against His Holiness. He has given Men Holy Laws, he forces none to transgress them. 'Tis true they cannot keep them without his Grace, but is God a Debtor of that to any Man? Who has first given unto Him, and it shall be recompensed? Secondly, Not against his Justice: For he damns no Man but for Sin, nor does he damn one repenting Sinner and save another; but he damns all Impenitents and saves all Penitents without Respect of Persons. 'Tis true he gives Repentance to some which he denies to others; but that is an Act of his Grace, upon which his Justice can no more be quarrelled,

---

than for his giving the Means of Grace to Christians, which he has
denied to Pagans. Plainly, he created our first Parents Perfect
and Upright, he gave them a Power to stand, he did not force them
to fall; yet he permitted them to do so through the Freedom of
their own Will to which they were left. By their Fall their whole
Posterity became at once Guilty and Corrupt, just as a Leprous
Parent begets a Leprous Child, and a Rebel Father forfeits the E-
state, not only for himself, but for all his Posterity that are, by
the mere Strength of Nature, to descend from him, unless they be
restored by the Prince's Grace. If when God found all Mankind
in this Condition, and from all Eternity foresaw that, by his Per-
mission, they would throw themselves into it; where is the In-
justice in chusing some of them as Vessels of Mercy; and passing
by others, leaving them to inherit the Choice which their First
Parents or themselves or Both had made for them, and then repro-
bating them to Damnation for their Sins? Where is there any
Thing of Injustice in all this? Nay, is there not here a most Glo-
rious Scene opened, wherein at once Justice is magnified, and Mercy
gratified; and both Love and Reverence secured to the Divine
Majesty? And it is upon this Consideration that We find the Apo-
aste satisfying the Objection which formerly we heard him silenced.
What if God, willing to shew his Wrath, and to make his Power
known, endured with much Long-suffering the Vessels of Wrath fitted to
Destruction: And that he might make known the Riches of his Glory
on the Vessels of Mercy, which he had afore prepared unto Glory. Rom.
IX. 22. 23. Thirdly, Not against his Sincerity. For, why may not
God require Obedience from the Elect, when his very Requiring
it is one of the Means by which he determines them to it. Why
may not he threaten them with Damnation in Case of Disobedience,
when the Threatning is the Mean appointed for scaring them from it.
Is there any Thing here but the Use of a most Rational Mean
for compassing a most Holy End? Is it any Objection against Pro-
vidence that the Sun is suffered to shine and the Rain to fall on
the Tares as well as the Wheat growing together in the same Com-
mon Field, tho' the first are to be burned, the latter to be gathered
into the Barn? As little Objection is it in this Case, that, while the
Elect and Reprobate live mixed together in the visible Church,
the Exhortations of the Gospel are directed, and the Offers of
Life
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Life and Salvation made in a general Stile. And, to call this 

Dissimulation and a Cruel and Disingenuous Procedure, as Mr. Rhind 

does p. 129, when it is so easie to be accounted for by Reason 
even upon the Presbyterian Hypothesis, was the most Presumption 
Blasphemy.

IV. The said Presbyterian Doctrine is no way contrary to the 

Design of Revelation, nor to any one Testimony of Scripture. 
First, it is no way contrary to the Design of Revelation: And 

Mr. Rhind's Medium, for proving that it is, discovers either a 
most vitious Mind, or a most Prodigious Ignorance of the Con- 
troversy. 'According to this Doctrine, faith He, p. 130, our Faith 
and Obedience cannot make our case better nor Worse; it be-
ing unalterably fixed by a Prior Will, Without Regard to either. 
Was it Malice or Mistake made him talk at this Rate? Does 
not the Apostle teach * that God has chosen us to Salvation through 
Sanctification of the Spirit and Belief of the Truth? Did ever any 
Presbyterian teach otherwise? Do they ever separate 'twixt the 
End and the Means? Don't they constantly affirm that Holiness 
and Happiness, Sin and Misery are linked together, as in the Na-
ture of the Thing, so also in the Decree of God? To assert then, 
that the Doctrine of the Decrees supposeth God to admit to Hea-
ven, and dispatch to Hell without Respect either to Faith and O-
bedience on the one Hand, or Infidelity and Impenitence on the 
other, was to bid a Defiance both to Modesty and Truth. Se-
condly, It is not contrary to any Testimony of Scripture. Mr. 
Rhind instances two. The first is 1 Tim. II. 4. That God would 
have all Men to be saved. But, were that to be understood of 
God's Secret Will, pray how cou'd any Man be lost; For who hath 
refisted his Will? The Council of the Lord standeth fast, and the Thoughts 
of his Heart to all Generations †. The meaning of the Place then is ob-
vious viz. That we should pray for Kings and all that are in Au-
thority as well as for others, because there is no rank or Order of 
Men whose Faith and Obedience he will not accept of, and upon it 
save them at the last; In Token whereof he has given them his re-
vealed Will which commands all Men everywhere to repent; And this 
with respect to this, that he is said to will that they should be saved, 
and
and not with respect to any uncertain hovering Purpose to be determined by the Creature, which is a Thing inconsistent with the Perfection of his Nature. The other Scripture is Mark XVI. 16. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned. ' Which, faith he, plainly supposeth, that a Man may or may not believe. But this is manifestly false. The Design of the Text is not to shew what Man may or may not do, but to express the Connexion there is 'twixt Faith and Salvation, Insignity and Damnation. Faith is not of the Growth of our own Nature or Will, but is the Effect of the Operation of the Spirit of God; and to deny this, as Mr. Rhind does all along, is quite to subvert the Gospel. To these two Scriptures he adds p. 131 an Argument which is this. ' All to whom the Gospel is preached are obliged to believe that Christ is their Saviour and died for them. But none can be bound to believe a Lie, therefore Christ most certainly died for all to whom the Gospel is revealed; and if so, then the Doctrine, which asserts the Salvability only of a select Few, is demonstratively false. But this Argument stands on a lame Foot. All to whom the Gospel is preached, are indeed obliged to believe in the general, that Christ died for, and is the Saviour of all that believe; and from thence, if they (with the joint Testimony of God's Spirit) are conscious to themselves, that they do believe with such a Faith as is necessary to Salvation; They may confidently infer that Christ died for them and is their Saviour; but to believe that Christ died for me in particular, while I make no Conscience of answering the Terms of the Gospel, is to believe without both Warrant and Evidence. The Foundation then of his Argument being false, the whole Frame of it must needs fall to the Ground.

V. I add that this Doctrine has no pernicious Influence on the Christian Life, when it is improved as it ought to be. Mr. Rhind expressly afferts, p. 132, that it has, as running People into the most finfull Security, or into the height of Despair, beyond the Capacity of a Calvinist Casuist to give Check to either. But, in Opposition to Mr. Rhind, I affirm with the Church of England, in her XVII. Article, ' That tho' for Curious and Carnal Persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ, to have continually before their Eyes the Sentence of God's Predestination, is a most Dangerous Dounfall, whereby
the Devil doth thrust them either into Desperation, or into wretchedness of most unclean Living, no less perilous than Desperation. Yet the Godly consideration of Predestination and our Election in Christ is full of Sweet, Pleasant, and unspeakable Comfort to Godly Persons, and such as feel in themselves the Working of the Spirit of Christ, mortifying the Works of the Flesh, and their Earthly Members, and drawing up their Mind to High and Heavenly Things, as well, because it doth greatly establish and confirm their Faith of Eternal Salvation to be enjoyed through Christ, as because it doth fervently kindle their Love towards God. Thus far the Church of England. Besides, 'tis plain from the Nature of the Thing, that the said Doctrine teaches one to think meanly of himself, and to ascribe the Honour of all to God: Which lays in him a deep Foundation for Humility; and that it inclines to secret Prayer, and to a fixed Dependance on God; which naturally both brings his Mind to a good State; and fixes it in it (v). And, which confirms all, we see in Fact that these that believe that Doctrine, are generally serious and concerned about their Soul, so that the Goodness of their Heart is an Argument of the Rightness of their Head. I don't know if as much can be said of such as go on the contrary System. Sure I am, they are under shrewd Tentations to procrastinate the Work of their Souls: For when the Scripture tells one, that all that believe and repent (at what Time soever it be) shall be saved: And Mr. Rhind tells him, that he may repent and believe when he will, that he has it in his own Power to do so, without the Assistance of any uncommon Grace; if the Man believe both these; I mean, both the Scriptures and Mr. Rhind's Doctrine; I refer it to any one to say, whether in that Case, Corruption will not incline him to take his Swing in Sin, in hopes that he may have a quiet Hour at Death to dispatch all his Business. But enough of this.

In the Third Place, the next Presbyterian Doctrine which Mr. Rhind attaques is that concerning the Efficacy of Grace. They teach, faith he p. 135, that God, to Of the Efficacy attain his Eternal Purpose, does by an irresistible Force of Grace.
work Grace in the Elect, and at the same Time denies it to the Reprobate. This is horridly False: For they expressly disown all Force Resistible or Irresistible in the Operation of Grace; and teach (x), that tho' the Elect are effectually drawn to Christ, yet it is so, as that they come most freely, being made willing by his Grace. And is it not very easy to conceive how there may be Efficacy, yea and insuperable Efficacy too (which the Presbyterians own in this Case) without the least Force? Is it not plain, that the greater Evidence there is for any Truth, and the stronger Motives there are to any Duty, the more Pleasure the Soul feels, and consequently the greater Freedom it exercises, in assenting to the one, or complying with the other? Is this to make Machines of Men? When a Man tells me, that two and three make five, the Native Evidence of the Proposition commands my Assent. But is there therefore any Force offered to my Understanding? Is it not very possible for the Spirit of God to set Home the sense of my Danger through sin upon My Conscience so powerfully, that I shall be necessarily, tho' without the least Force, determin'd to fall in with the Overtures of the Gospel in order to my Salvation? And is it not needful that the Spirit of God do a& thus; considering how deeply we are immersed in Corruption, blind to Duty, dead in Trespasses and Sins, who cannot of our selves so much as think on good Thought! And does not the scripture assure us that the Spirit of God does a& thus; that He works in us both to will and to do; that His People shall be willing in the Day of His Power; that He puts His Spirit within us, and causes us to walk in His Statutes? But Mr. Rhind cannot away with this Doctrine, it is with him opposite to Truth, and Destructive of Christian Life.

First, faith He p. 135. 'it is opposite to Truth. For how can I be reasonably commanded to believe and repent, who am supposed to have no strength to do either? How could Christ reasonably bid Lazarus, Come forth; or the Lame Man, Take up thy bed and walk, when the one was Dead, t'other an absolute Cripple? Has Mr. Rhind with Presbytery renounced the Gospel too? Does he believe there is never any secret Efficacy attends the Dispensation thereof? But, adds he, 'How can that in Propriety of Speech be called my Act, which was never elicited by me? Very Strong! Because another raised
raised me up, therefore my standing or walking is not my Act! Because, when I was lying Dead in Sin, the Spirit of God quickened me to repent and believe; therefore, repenting and believing, when I am quickened, is not my Act! Because Christ draws me, therefore it is not that run, notwithstanding he has made me willing to it! Was this to Argue?

Secondly. ' It is, faith be p. 136, destructive of Christian Life, in that it excuses the greatest Villanies under Pretence of exalting the free Grace of God, and discourages all the good Endeavours that should be used. To make this good, he introduces a Calvinist Teacher endeavouring (but without Possibility of Success) to reclaim a Debauche of the Party. Mr. Rhind has acted the Debauche, furnishing him with Arguments, formed, as he imagines, upon the Presbyterian Hypothesis. I shall crave leave to act the Calvinist Teacher; and dare promise, tho' not actually to convert the Debauche, that is God's Work, yet to satistis his Objections even by the Presbyterian Scheme of Principles. The Dialogue then stands thus.

**Dialogue between a Calvinist Teacher, and a Debauche of the Party.**

Calv. Sir, I find you still going on in a Course of Debauchery; I have often told you before, and now tell you once more, that unless you reform you'll go to Hell.

Deb. Alas, Sir, you know, that I cannot effectually reform without irresistible Grace, and I am not to blame that I am not yet Passive of it. p. 136.

Calv. What, Sir! cannot you give over your Debaucheries, your Drinking, Cursing, Swearing, Whoreing, Gameing, without irresistible Grace? Did I ever teach you so? Have not I always told you, that a Man may reform these Vices without Special Grace? How can you say, that you are not to blame that you have not yet been Passive of Grace? Have you used the Means, cultivate your Natural Faculties, improved your Reason? When you have not
been faithfull in that which is less, why should God commit to your
Trust that which is more? Are not you then to blame? That
which God has already given you was sufficient whereupon to have
either prevented or broken off a Course of Debauchery; nay, as I
have often told you before, you might have gone, upon the meer
Strength of Nature, as far as ever a Plato or Seneca went.

*Deb.* True, Sir. But even then my best Actions, without this
Grace, wou'd be but so many *Splendid Sins.* p. 137.

*Calv.* Right. But is it not better that you should be guilty on-
ly of these *Splendid Sins*; that is, Actions which, tho' not fully
acceptable with God through want of a right Principle and Chris-
tian Motive; yet have not only the Colour, but Matter too, of
Virtue; and make one that he is not far from the *Kingdom of God*;
were not this better, I say, than that you should swill (as you do)
in Vice and Sensuality; and make your self the Reproach of Hu-
mane Nature, and the Scandal of the Town?

*Deb.* But, Sir, the Reformation which you preach can be of no
Advantage to my Soul without Grace; and seeing this Grace is not
in my Power, I hope you will, and it is but reasonable you shou'd,
allow me to gratifie the Body, seeing the contrary cannot in the least
advance the Interest of my Soul. *ibid.*

*Calv.* What do I hear! Wou'd such a Reformation be of no
Advantage to your Soul? Not in the least advance the Interest there-
of? Where did you learn such Divinity? Are there no Degrees
in Guilt? And is it not a huge Advantage to want the least De-
gree thereof; seeing your Punishment in *Hell* must rise in Proportion
thereunto, in Case you repent not: Or the Stingings and Remorse
of your Conscience here, even suppose you do? And is the unsin-
cere and transitory Pleasure of Sin to be laid in the Ballance with
either of these, even in Point of plain Reason? But, abstracting
from the Advantage such a Reformation wou'd be of to the Soul,
is it reasonable I shou'd allow you to gratifie the Body with Vice?
Vice I say, whose Pleasures are hollow in the present Enjoyment,
and will at long run ruin your *Body*, and all your temporal Interest.
When even that Virtue, which you may attain to by Strength of
Reason, carries its own Reward in its Bofom; and recommends
it self both by the much more manly Pleasures which attend its Ex-
ercise.
ercise, and the solid Advantages that follow upon it even in this Life. Don't you see the Drunkard for the most part reduced to Poverty, while the Sober Man by good Management and industrious Frugality enjoys a comfortable Competency? Have not you observed the first seized with burning Fevers? or surprized with a sudden Death, drowning in his own Vomit; while the other has enjoyed a healthful and vigorous Age? Did you never see the Ruins of Lust in the old Adulterer; his weak Limbs, and meagre Carcase, and his Body as loathsome as his Name? Have you not observed what Confusion, Jealousies, Discords and Misunderstandings such leud Persons have begot both in their own and their Neighbour's Family? Has not this one Sin ruined some of the greatest Families, and left the fairest Estates without Heirs? While on the other Hand the chast and continent Person has retained a healthfull Body, a favoury Name, and left a numerous Posterity behind him. So that, upon the whole, your reforming from your open Debaucheries is in your Power by the Strength of Nature: And is the most preferable Course, in Point of Reason.

Deb. But I am uncertain whether I be one of the Elect or Reprobate. Ibid.

Calv. No wonder truly; seeing you still continue in your Debaucheries: For, the Sanctification of the Spirit, and the Belief of the Truth are both the Fruits and Evidences of Election; of which no Man can possibly be certain without them; nor, in an ordinary Way, but by them.

Deb. But my Practice depends upon my Knowledge of this. For if I be one of the Elect, I will sometime, were it only at the Hour of Death, be determined by this Grace, and so will certainly be saved, notwithstanding the Leudness of my bygone Life; and if I be not, why should I abstain from Sin, when an Abstinence, without Grace, can be of no use to me? And this Grace I cannot command. And if I be none of the Elect, I am not to expect it: Therefore, seeing I am to forfeit the Joys of Heaven, which is my Misfortune not my Fault, you must excuse me if I do not lose the Pleasures of Sin, which I may so freely enjoy? Ibid.

Calv. Pray Sir, does either Reason or Scripture dictate such a Conduct to you? Or are these rational Inferences from the Do-
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Arines of Election and Grace which you have been taught? Is it not necessary in all Sciences to begin at what is most easy and obvious, and thence to come to the Knowledge and Certainty of what is more difficult? Are you not sensible that (besides all the other Flaws in your Reasoning, such as, the uselessness of an Abstinence from Sin, which I have already discoursed) you begin at the wrong End? Whether you are of the Elect or not is a secret with God; not otherwise to be discovered by you, but by the Fruit of it, I mean, Holiness in Heart and Life. This God has enjoined in his revealed Will; and, therefore it is your Duty to Study and endeavour it, without fear of any latent Decree lying against you: And if you attain to it, you may then most certainly infer from it both your Election and Salvation. But you will needs invert God's Order, you must needs first know his secret Will, before you apply your self to obey his revealed Will; whereas he has enjoined you to obey his revealed Will; and thence to gather his secret Will concerning your self. For shame, Sir, make better use of your Reason. Apply your self to your Duty which you are sure you ought to do; and don't expect to be saved in the Neglect of it upon the Account of your Election; when God has expressly said that he has chosen us that we should be Holy. Neither be discouraged from it with the Aprehension of your Reprobation; seeing you own your self to be uncertain of it: For who would baulk certain Duty for uncertain Danger? No rational Man would reason so weakly about his temporal Affairs.

Deb. But, Sir, whether I be of the Elect or Reprobate, there is no doing of my Duty, should I never so much endeavour it without Grace; and therefore whether I will or not, I must continue as I am untill it shall please God to determine me by his irresistible Power. Ibid.

Calv. How Sir! May not ye do more than ye do? Have not I shewn you how far you may go upon Strength of Nature or common Grace? What necessity then are you under to continue as you are? Besides, if together with other Means you would pray to God for effectual Grace, you should certainly obtain it; if you do not, you are inexusable.

Deb. Oh, Sir, what an idle Exhortation is that? For, tell me I beseech
beseech you, is it not the Prayer of Faith which only prevaileth with God? *Ibid.*

Calv. Right. It is so.


Calv. True. Of his *insuperable* Grace it is: For, as for these Terms of *Resistible* and *Irresistible*, they were first contrived or occasioned by the Arminians in this Controversy.

Deb. Well then, if my Prayer be acceptable, I have this Grace, and it is needless to pray for what I have already. *p. 138.*

Calv. That's a false Inference: For Faith and every other Grace is both preserved and increased by Prayer and other Means to be used by us; tho' it is indeed needless to pray for the first Gift of Faith, after I am sure that I have it, which, I suppose you are not.

Deb. Well then, if my Prayer be not acceptable, why should I pray for what I am not to obtain? *Ibid.*

Calv. Poor Sophistry. God *commands* you to pray, and that Command makes it your Duty: And it is while People are in the way of their Duty that God ordinarily comes with his *free* Grace; whereas the Neglect of it renders them certainly inexcusable. Up then and be doing. Break off your Course of Debauchery which you are under no other Necessity of continuing in, but what the Habit of it has brought upon you; and ply Prayer with all your Might, which you see you are obliged to do by virtue of God's Authority. And assure your self that God will not condemn you for what you cannot, but for what you will not do. Observe these Things I say, and I hope shortly to have a good Account of you. And I heartily pray God it may be so. Adieu

Thus I have allowed the Debauché to argue with all the Strength Mr. Rhind cou'd furnish him with from the Presbyterian Scheme. And upon the same Scheme I have answered him: And I refer it to the Reader whether, if Corruption don't prevail over Principle, the Debauché is not obliged even by the Presbyterian Principles to mend his former lead Life, and in a hopefull Way to make a good Christian (if he will be true to his principles) in Spite of all his Objections. Therefore, which was the thing to be proved,
the Presbyterian Doctrine concerning the Efficacy of Grace is not Destructive of Christian Life. And I have taken this Pains, and been so large on this Subject; that I might convince all Debauchés on the Presbyterian Side, who yet I hope are not more numerous than these on the other, that their Leudness is not owing to their Principles, but to their own vitious Inclinations: And I pray God may blest what I have advanced for the reclaiming them.

In the fourth Place. The last Presbyterian Doctrine which Mr. Rhind impugns is that of Perseverance, that the Saints cannot fall away totally nor finally from the Estate of Grace, but shall certainly persevere therein to the End, and will be Eternally saved.

Now, too sad Experience teaches, that even the Saints may through the Temptations of Satan, and the World, the Prevalency of Corruption remaining in them, and the Neglect of the Means of their Preservation, fall into grievous Sins: And for a Time continue therein; whereby they incur God's Displeasure, and grieve his Holy Spirit, come to be deprived of some Measure of their Graces and Comforts, have their hearts hardened, and their Consciences wounded, hurt and scandalize others, and bring temporal Judgments upon themselves. All this the Presbyterians acknowledg (y). But that they shou'd totally and finally fall away, the Immutability of the Decree of Election flowing from the tree and unchangeable Love of God the Father; the Efficacy of the Merit and Intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit and of the Seed of God within them; and the Nature of the Covenant of Grace will not suffer us to believe.

But Mr. Rhind is of a contrary Mind, and endeavours to disprove this Doctrine from four Arguments. P. 138----148.

I. The Exhortations to Perseverance, faith he, the Encouragements promised upon it, and the severe Threatnings in case of Apostacy do evidently suppose the Possibility of a Fall. I deny it, they are only Means appointed by God for their Perseverance; and do in their own Nature contribute to that End. That cannot be, faith Mr. Rhind: For that were to contradict the Confession of Faith which saies That
That the Perseverance of the Saints does not depend upon their own Free Will. Strongly argued! Their Perseverance does not depend upon their own Free Will, Ergo Exhortations, Encouragements and Threatnings cannot contribute to determine and fix their Will! Our daily Bread comes from God, Ergo He cannot require our daily Labour for gaining it! God has infallibly promised that the Saints shall persevere; Ergo he must not use rational Means to make them do so! Mr. Rhind it seems must be incurably gone in the Logicks.

II. He argues from a Text of Scripture viz. Heb. VI. 5. 6. It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the Heavenly Gift, and were made Partakers of the Holy Ghost, and of the Powers of the World to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto Repentance. 'These, He alludes p. 140, are Epithets peculiar to the truly Faithfull, that he challenges us to shew where any of them, much less all together, are applied to any other in the Scriptures, and yet such might fall away. A fair Challenge. But then very unhappily, there is not one of these Epithets peculiar to the truly Faithfull. Not one of them but what is found to be applied to Wicked Men or Hypocrites; yea sometimes they are all applied together to such. Plainly the Meaning of the Text is, that such as have been convinced of the Truth of the Christian Religion, and have made publick Profession thereof by Baptism; both which are included in the Term Enlightened; and thereupon have tasted of the Heavenly Gift, that is, have not only been affected with a temporary Joy, as People naturally are upon Changes; but also, which was very frequent in the Apostolick Times, have been blessed with the extraordinary Charisma, Miracles, Tongues, Gifts of Healing and the like, expressed in the Text by being made Partakers of the Holy Ghost, and of the Powers of the World to come; if, faith the Apostle, such Persons thus privileged shall afterwards apostatize to Paganism, their Apostacy so hardens them, and lays wait their Conscience in so dreadfull a Manner, that it is impossible for them to return again by Repentance; nor ought they, as some say, be readmitted to the Peace of the Church. This is the Sense of the Text; but where is there any Thing here peculiar to the truly Faithfull, any Thing which notoriously
ouly wicked Men or Hypocrites have not been priviledged with? Balaam was enlightned, he was the man whose Eyes were open, and who had a Vision of the Almighty. Numb. XXIV. 3. 4. Simon Magus believed and was Baptized Acts VIII. 13. The stony-ground-Hearers received the Word with Joy, and yet they had no Root in themselves, and therefore dared but for a while Matth. XIII. 20.21. And many will say to our Lord at the Last Day, Have we not prophesied in thy Name? And in thy Name cast out Devils? And in thy Name done many wonderfull Works? to whom our Lord notwithstanding will profess, not only that He does not know them; but that He never knew them.

III. He argues from Examples viz. the Glorios Angels who became incorrigible Devils, the Innocent Adam who became a Child of Wrath, David who was deliberately guilty of Adultery and Murder, Solomon who was guilty of repeated Adultery and Idolatry, Hymeneus and Alexander who were Guilty of Apostacy and Blasphemy.

As for the two first Examples, the Angels and Adam, they are impertinent. It is the Perseverance of the Saints under the Covenant of Grace which the Presbyterians affirm, and not of any Creature in its natural State. 'Tis true the best Saints cannot pretend to equal either the Angels or Adam in Holiness; but it is not upon the Measure of Holiness; but the Immutability of God's Decree, and such other Grounds as I have already mentioned, that the Perseverance of the Saints depends.

As for David and Solomon, Mr. Rhind does not affirm that they fell finally away and were damned; and therefore I need not stay to disprove that they were. The Presbyterians grant that their Grace was not only impaired, but laid asleep for a Time like live Embers raked up under the thick Ashes choaking both the Light and the Heat. But Mr. Rhind avers it was totally lost. Let us consider on what Grounds he avers this.

First, As to David. And here Mr. Rhind falls into a Couple of the most prodigious Blunders I have readily heard. Take his Words. 'If, faith he p. 142, this Commimation, viz. that Murderers and Adulterers cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, be not false and delusory, David was upon the Commission of these Sins liable to Damnation; and if so, he had certainly fallen from the
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the State of Grace; seeing, according to our Adversaries, none who are in that State can be thus liable. Thus he. Now, First, did ever the Presbyterians teach, that none who are in a State of Grace can be liable to Damnation? So far from it, that they teach, that there is not one Man even in a State of Grace, who is not liable to Damnation. Secondly, Is every one who is liable to Damnation fallen from a State of Grace? Why then the most Righteous Man on Earth falls from a State of Grace every Day: For he sinneth every Day, and the least Sin makes him liable to Damnation, unless Mr. Rhind will distinguish Sins into Venial and Mortal. He has another Proof against David viz. ' That having by his Adultery become one with an Harlot, he must at that Time have been disjoined from Christ according to the Apostle’s Doctrine 1 Cor. VI. 15. Know ye not that your Bodies are the Members of Christ—. But God is represented in Scripture as bearing the Bowels of a Father towards his People. Now a Father may oftimes Cause to be Angry with his Son, and not only to frown upon him, but to chafren him. But to renounce the Relation of a Father and disinherit him is the last Thing he will do. So in this Case, the thing that David had done displeased the Lord, yet as God had a Reserve of Kindness for him, as appeared in the Issue: So it is plain that David did not totally renounce God: And therefore, in his Penitential Psalm on that Occasion, tho’ he prayed indeed that God would restore unto him the Joy of his Salvation, which intimates that he was under the Frownings of his Countenance, and Tokens of his Wrath: Yet he does not pray that God would restore his Holy Spirit unto him, but that he would not take it from him, which is at once an Acknowledgment of his Justice, that he might do it; and yet of his Goodness, that he had not done it.

As for Solomon, Mr. Rhind aggravates his Crimes at a mighty Rate and in the burlesque style; and indeed they were very great; yet it does not become him nor any Man else to be harder upon him than the Spirit of God in the Scriptures has been. The Scripture indeed says, * That his Heart was not Perfect with the Lord his God, and that he went not fully after the Lord: But no where does it infinuate that ever he fell quite off from Him. Mr. Rhind urges that the plainest Philosophy teacheth that two contrary Habits can not

* 1 Kings XI. 4. 6.
not lodge at once in the same Subject; And 'tis very true, that in the most intense Degree they cannot: But all the Philosophy that ever was heard of teacheth, and Experience convinceth, that in more remiss Degrees they may; and that this was Solomon's Case, the forecited soft Expressions of the Scripture allow us to believe.

As for Hymenæus and Alexander, the Apostle indeed saies I Tim. 1. 19. 20. that they had made Shipwrack concerning the Faith, that is, they had thrown off the Christian Profession: But he does not say that they had made Shipwrack of the Faith; for indeed he never so much as insinuates that ever they had been endued with the genuine Grace of Faith. But, saies Mr. Rhind, 1st, How cou'd it offend God, or harm them to lose that which was not the true and saving Faith? It seems then that when a Wicked man openly renounces Christ, it does not, by Mr Rhind's Account, either offend God or harm Himself. This is pretty strange Doctrine. 2dly, faith He, why should they be delivered unto Satan for renouncing the Faith, if it was not that genuine Grace, when without this (according to our Adversaries) they were already in his Clutches? Strong Sense! A scandalously wicked Man is in the Clutches of Satan, why then should the Church in Cafe of his Obstinacy, by Excommunication declare Him to be so? Is not this mighty judicious Reasoning? 3dly, faith he, it was the same Faith which Timothy is advised to hold in the 19.verse. Right. It was the Christian Faith, the Profession whereof they had cast off, but how does it appear that ever they had been subjectively possesed of it? 4ly he excepts upon the 5 and 6.verse, where it is said, Now the End of the Commandment is Charity, out of a pure Heart, and of a good Conscience, and of Faith unsiezed: from which some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain Jangling. But the Original Word Ἰτρέβη, which is rendered swerved from properly signifies not to aim at; and so it cannot import that these Persons had ever been possesed of the genuine Grace of Faith. Plainly the Meaning of the Text is, that some Preachers aimed not at the great Design of the Gospel, but went out of the Way to a Divinity made up of empty Words. Thus even Dr. Hammond expounds it. But what Relation hath this either to falling or not falling from Grace.

IV. He argues from the Nature of the Thing. If, faith he p. 146, the truly Gracious not only may be, but actually are guilty of very
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hainous Sins, which cannot be denied; then either these sins are Offensive to God or they are not. I answer they are Offensive, and thereby God's Displeasure is incurred, and his Holy Spirit grieved, as we have already heard from the Confession of Faith; and therefore Mr. Rhind shews what a wretchedly abandon'd Creature he is, when he represents us as teaching, that the most horrid Impieties are not such when committed by the Saints. But what would he infer from this, that the Sins of the Saints are offensive to God? Why, faith He, if He be angry with Men because of them, they cannot at the same Time be in His Favour; and if they have lost his Favour, they have fallen from his Grace. Monstrous Nonsense! A Father cannot frown upon or correct His Son out of Love! He cannot be Angry with Him unless He disown Him! A Prince cannot be displeased with His Subjects, but He must instantly denounce them Rebels! This is such weak Stuff that I doubt if it can be paralleled.

Thus now I have gone through the Doctrine of the Decrees with its Dependencies impugned by Mr. Rhind. And tho', I acknowledge, these Doctrines are such as that one cannot have full and adequate Notions of them, the largest Mind being too narrow to comprehend them, the most penetrating Wit to sound all their Depths, and the most indefatigable Study to conquer all the Difficulties that may be charged upon them, any other Way than by submitting our Judgments to the Revelation of God; yet I hope I have made it evident that they are so far from being false; that they are indeed the very Doctrines of the Gospel, and most consistent with a Christian Life. But the Writers of Mr. Rhind's Stamp form to themselves an imaginary Scheme of Chimerical Notions, and having Christened them Presbyterianism, they fall a disputing against them; and when they have demolished the Brat of their own Brains, they crow over the conquest as if they had confused the Presbyterian Doctrines. That no Body may be imposed upon by their Misrepresentations; as the Presbyterian's Doctrine may be easily known by their publick Formulæ, so I shall give a just Representation of the Conduct of their Ministers relating to these Doctrines, which is this.

We never teach our People to take it at first Hand for granted; either that they are of the Elect, or that they are of the Reprobate. But we teach them first to examine, and then to conclude. And in the
the Exercise of this Examination, we never teach them to begin at that Question, _Am I elected?_ but at these, _Do I believe?_ _Do I repent?_ Have I a Conversation suitable to the Gospel? If their Consciences, when thoroughly examined, give a satisfying Answer to these, we bid them from thence conclude their Election, and exhort them to go on in working out their Salvation with Fear and Trembling. But if their Consciences bring in a negative Answer upon these Questions, we tell them they are in a most dangerous State; yet we forbid them to conclude themselves Reprobate: For we do not think that in the militant Church the Words Elect and Believer are of the same Extent: All Believers are Elect, but all the Elect are not as yet Believers, tho' they certainly shall be so. Upon this Principle we exhort them to use the Means Reading, Hearing, Meditation, Prayer and the like. And tho' we dare not teach them the Doctrine of Merit, either _de congruo_ or _condigno_; yet we assure them upon God's Promise, that, in the Use of Means, he will not be wanting to them with his Grace. But if they shall continue to neglect the Means, we assure them that final Impenitency is an Infallible Mark of Reprobation, and the Cause of Damnation: And that it is presumption to conclude themselves elected when they feel not the Gospel Evidences thereof; telling them in the Words of the Apostle, that _God hath chosen us to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit_ and _Belief of the Truth_. And to bring home the Title of Elect to themselves, otherwise than upon these Evidences, we dare not teach them.

I hope there is Nothing in all this but what is both agreeable to the Scripture, and tends to promote Holiness. Here then I might put an End to this Subject: But there is something further to be done for humbling the Pride of these Gentlemen who are so full of themselves upon Mr. Rhin's Scheme.
SECT. II.

Wherein is proved, that the Presbyterian Articles of Faith, impugned by Mr. Rhind, are the same with those of the whole Christian Church.

For making this good I assert I. That these Doctrines are the Doctrines of the whole foreign Churches that go by the Name of REFORMED: And that, in the Judgment of the highest and most learned Episcopalians, neither in these, nor indeed in any Thing else relating to Doctrine, do they maintain any Thing that is fundamentally false. II. That these Doctrines are the Doctrines of those of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland. III. That they are the Doctrines of the Church of England. IV. To compleat all, That the CATHOLICK Church of Christ hath declared these Doctrines to be the Orthodox Faith; and that such as oppose them are worthy of an ANATHEMA. If I shall prove all these Things, and that from uncontested Documents, which I am tolerably sure of doing; I hope it will follow, that these Doctrines can be no just Ground of Separation from the Presbyterians; and that such as do separate on the Account of them cannot claim Communion with any Church in the World. Let us try it then.

I. I say that these Doctrines are the Doctrines of the whole Foreign Churches which go by the Name of Reformed. For proving this I need not appeal to this or the other particular Divine. No. I refer the Reader to the Syntagma Confessionum, where he may have the Confessions of all the Reformed Churches under his View at once. And that they all assert these Doctrines is so evident that no Man ever to this Day denied it; so that I need not insist. But then, to make this Argument compleat, I add, that in the Judgment of the highest and most learned Episcopalians, neither in these, nor indeed in any Thing else relating to Doctrine, do they maintain any Thing that is fundamentally false. For this, the Testimony of Mr. Dodwell will be sufficient. He, in His Book which I have so often before cited,
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cited, I mean the *Panenéis ad Externos*, in order to recommend *Episcopacy* to the *Foreign Churches*, by shewing how much it would conduct to the Good of the Reformation if Bishops were restored, writes thus, 'Were this done, *faith be* (z) I do not indeed see why Communion might not be held with at least all the *Reformed Churches* : For, 'as for *Socinians*, and *Socinianizing Arminians*, I don't think them worthy the Name of Reformed. But as to the rest, I see no fundamental Doctrines in which they differ, I mean, which are clearly delivered in the Scripture. And that such only can be called fundamental Doctrines, the Reformed at least are agreed, nor ought any Doctrines, which are not fundamental, obstruct Communion with other Churches. Thus far *Mr Dodwell*. 'Tis then a plain Case, by His Judgment, that these Doctrines which *Mr Rhind* has quarrelled are not fundamentally false, and that none ought to separate from any Communion on the Account of them; and as little from the Presbyterians in Scotland as any. For, I suppose, every Man will own that there is no Society under the Cope of Heaven more free of *Socinianism*, or that favours *Socinianizing Arminians* less than they. I hope then the first Point is fairly gained.

II. These Doctrines which *Mr Rhind* has quarrelled are the Doctrines of those of the *Episcopal Communion* in Scotland. In all the Revolutions since the Reformation wherein ever *Episcopacy* got the Ascendant, we hear but of one *Confession of Faith* formed by them, and that was in the Assembly at *Aberdeen Anno 1616* in which *Archbishop Spotswood* presided. Now hear some Articles of it.

This Glorious God, from all Eternity, out of his Wisdom and Infinite Knowledge decreed all things that were after to be done. This God, before the Foundation of the World was laid, according to the good Pleasure of His Will for the Praise of the Glory of His Grace did predestinate and elect in Christ some Men and Angels unto eternal Felicity, and others He did appoint for eternal Condemnation, according to the Council of His most Free, most Just and most Holy Will. and that to the Praise and Glory of his Justice.

By

[z.] Nec sane video cur, id si fierer, cum omnibus, saltem *Reformatis Ecclesiae*, Commercium illud haberi non potuit. Nec enim dignos eo nomine puto *Socinians*, nec qui *Socinianis latent* *Arminianis*. In religiosis *fundamentalis* dogmata nulla video in quibus difserent, quo quidem proprie tradamur in *Scripturis*. Hic enim *alia fundamentalia* appellari posse, conveniunt saltem *Reformati*. Nec *debent alia* *dogmata obhare* quo minus cum *Ecclesiae aliae* Communes reverber, praeter quam *fundamentalia*. Panenéis. Sect. 34. p. 24.
By the Fall of Adam all His Posterity are so corrupted from their Conception and Nativity, that none of them can do or will any Thing truly acceptable unto God, till they be renewed by the Will and Spirit of God, and by Faith ingrafted in Christ Jesus.

Albeit all Mankind be fallen in Adam, yet only those who are elected before all Time, are in Time redeemed, restored, raised and quickened again; not of themselves or of their Works; left any Man should glory, but only of the Mercy of God.

We believe, that albeit the Ele& of God, through Infirmity and through the Enticements thereof, sin grievously to the Offence of God, yet they cannot altogether fall from Grace, but are raised again through the Mercy of God and kept to Salvation. Thus the Scotch Episcopal Confession of Faith.

All this they subscribed with their Hands, confessed with their Mouths, and professed to believe with their Heart, and at the same Time declared the Church of Scotland to be one of the most pure Kirks under Heaven. What an unaccountable Thing then is it in our Episcopalians to object against the Doctrines of their own Confession of Faith as fundamentally false and pernicious? Have they quite foresworn all Modesty? Will they say that they have altered their Faith? If so, let us know when they did it. Let us know where we may find their new Confession of it? If these Doctrines are fundamentally false and Pernicious, I can never come over to the Episcopal Side, nor indeed any Man that regards his Soul: For how well pleased forever I may be with their Government, yet their Doctrines are damnable. So much for the Second Point, which I hope is fairly enough cleared.

III. These Doctrines are the express Doctrines of the Church of England in Her XXXIX Articles. I before produced the XIII Article declaring Works done before the Grace of Christ to have the Nature of Sin. Two Articles more will be sufficient for my Purpose.
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ARTICLE X.
Of Free-Will.

The Condition of Man after the Fall of Adam is such that He cannot turn and Prepare Himself by his own Natural Strength and good Works to Faith and calling upon God. Wherefore we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the Grace of God by Christ Preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will.

ARTICLE XVII.
Of Predestination and Election.

Predestination to Life is the everlasting purpose of God, whereby (before the Foundations of the World were laid) He hath constantly decreed by his Counsel, Secret to us, to deliver from Curse and Damnation those whom He hath chosen in Christ out of Mankind, and to bring them by Christ unto everlasting Salvation as Vessels made to Honour. Wherefore they which be endued with so excellent a Benefit of God, be called according to God's Purpose, by his Spirit working in due Season. They through Grace obey the calling, they be justified freely, they be made Sons of God by Adoption, they be made like the Image of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ: They walk religiously in good Works, and at length by God's Mercy they attain to everlasting Felicity.

These Articles were agreed to in the Year 1562, and are the only authorized Standard to this Day. There are but two Things can be offered to take off the Weight of this heavy Objection viz. That the Clergy don't receive them as Articles of Faith, but as Vincula Pacis; or to use Mr Rhina's Words p. 119 where he seems to have designed to anticipate this Objection, that it is only an Acquiescence.
esence not an inward Assent that is required. I crave Leave to consider this Defence: And if any Man can take off what I am to offer against it, I shall yield that He has answered my whole Book.

In the first Place, admitting the Articles were designed not for Articles of Faith, but to be Vincula Pacis, and that it were only an acquiescence in, not an inward Assent that were required to them; yet how is it consistent with common Honesty in any Clergy-Man of that Communion to Preach, Print, Dispute against and ridicule the Doctrine contained in them? Is that to acquiesce in them? 2dly, If the Doctrines contain'd in these Articles are fundamentally false and Pernicious, how can any Clergy-Man with a good Conscience promise to acquiesce in them? If they are of such a damming Nature, is he not obliged under Pain of Damnation to himself to warn People against them? These two Things I have suggested upon Supposition that no more but an Acquiescence in them were required. But then I add 3dly, That that Alledgance is even impudently false. For first, the very Title of the Articles bears, that they were agreed upon, not only for the avoiding of the Diversities of Opinions, but for the establishing of Consent touching true Religion. Secondly, By the XXXVI. Canon 1603 all Bishops are discharged to Ordain, admit or License any so much as to Preach, till such Person acknowledge all and every the Thirty Nine Articles to be agreeable to the Word of God, and subscribe the same willingly and ex Animo. Is it Possible that Articles can be agreeable to the Word of God, and yet at the same Time fundamentally false and pernicious? Is it Possible one can subscribe them as agreeable to the Word of God ex Animo without inward Assent. Thirdly, By the Statute 13 Eliz. 12. It is ordain'd that every Person, to be admitted to a Benefice with Cure, shall, within two Months after his Induction, publickly read the said Articles in the Church whereof he hath the Cure in Common-Prayer Time, with Declaration of his Assent thereunto; and if afterward he shall maintain any Doctrine repugnant to the said Articles, and shall persist therein, it shall be lawfull for the Bishop to deprive him. So much for the first Defence.

The Second is, 'That these Articles being conceived in such general Words, that they may admit of different literal and grammatical Senses, even when the Senses given are plainly contrary
to one another; the Arminians may subscribe them with a good
Conscience and without any Equivocation (a). But this De-
fence is yet worse than the former, if worse cou'd be. For 1st,
Can there be a greater Scandal upon a Church than to represent
her Articles of Religion as a Nose of Wax, that may be twifled ei-
ther to this or the quite contrary Side? Is it Possible to elicite
Sound and Orthodox Doctrine, and Doctrine fundamentally fal
tive and pernicious out of the fame Words? Doth the fame Fountain
Send forth sweet Waters and bitter? 2dly, Dr. Sacheverell moft juftly
reckons them (b) False Brethren who expound any of these Articles
of Faith in such a loofe and vagrant Way as may fute them as well
to a Mahometans as a Christian's Creed. 3dly, The Calviniftick Sense
(as it is commonly called) was the only Sense defigned in these
Articles: For, the Framers of them were Calvinifts themfelves *;
and therefore 'tis never to be thought they wou'd frame them fo
as to be Capable of any other Meaning. For pray what cou'd be
the Ufe or Effect of an Acknowledgment of, or Subscription to
them on that Supposition. 4thly, The Church of England has loud-
ly proclaimed to the World, that She owns these Articles only in
the Calviniftick Sense: And till Loud the Britifh Herostratus began
to set the Nations on Fire, the Church of England till prosecuted
those that impugned that Sense of them; And the Noble Lord
Falkland in his forecited Speech tells us, that the contrary Doctrines
had not been oftner preached than Recanted. Plainly, the English
Universities, the Supreme Ecclefiaftical Governours of the Church,
the Court, and the Delegates to Forreign Synods have all declared
for these Calviniftick Doctrines, and afferted them to be the Do-
ctrines of the Church of England.

First I fay the English Universities have done fo. In the year 1595;
one Mr Barret of Caius College in Cambridge, preaching in the Uni-
versity Church called St Maryes, adventurred on an Invective againft
the Doctrines of Predestination and Perfeverance. This Sermon, tho'
preached in Latine, and which therefore cou'd not much affect the
Vulgar, yet instantly gave the Alarm to the University. The heads

Burnet Ubi Supra p. 151, 152.
heads of the Several Houses viz. Dr. Some, Dr. Duport, Dr. Goad Dr. Tindall, Dr. Whitakers, Dr. Barwell, Dr. Jegom, Dr Preston, Mr. Chadderton, and Mr. Clayton presently met upon it, and upon Mature Deliberation and Advice, by their unanimous Vote adjudged Mr. Barret to recant his Affertions as false, erroneous and manifestly repugnant to the Religion received and establissh'd in the Church of England by publick and lawful Authority. This was a very bitter Pill to Mr Barret; yet either his Stomach or His Conscience prevailed with Him to give it Throat. Accordingly, upon the 10th of May in the said Year, He appeared in the University Church where he had offended, and made a fair Recantation. The Sermon is still extant in Print, and I shall beg Leave to give one Note of it. ‘ These Words, faith 'He, escaped Me, viz. As for those that are not saved, I do most strongly believe, and do freely protest that I am so persuaded against Calvin, Peter Martyr, and the rest, that Sin is the true, proper, and first Cause of Reprobation. But now being better instructed; I say, that the Reprobation of the Wicked is from everlasting, and that that Saying of Augustine to Simplician is most true viz. If Sin were the Cause of Reprobation, then no Man should be elected, because God doth foreknow all Men to be defiled with it. And (that I may speak freely) I am of the same Mind; and do believe concerning the Doctrine of Election and Reprobation, as the Church of England believeth and teacheth in the Book of the Articles of Faith, in the Article of Predestination.--- And I acknowledg, that by the Virtue of the Prayer of Christ, every true Believer is so stayed up, that his Faith cannot fail.--- So that He which once hath this Faith shall ever have it. Thus Mr Barret. The whole Sermon is worthy Mr Rhind's perusal: For I have the Charity to wish that He may one Day have Use for it. Secondly, The Supream Ecclesiastical Governours of the Church have declared yet more positively for these Doctrines. Upon the 20th of November in the said Year 1595 they met at Lambeth and framed the famous Nine Lambeth Articles, which are as follows
The Nine Assertions or Articles of Lambeth, composed, and agreed upon at Lambeth House on the 20 Day of November, in the yeere of our Lord 1595 by John Archbishop of Canterbury, Richard Bishop of London, Richard elect Bishop of Bangor, and sundry other Reverend and Learned Divines there present.

1. God from Eternity hath Predestinated certain Men unto Life; certain Men he hath Reprobated unto Death.  
2. The moving or efficient Cause of Predestination unto Life, is not the Forelight of Faith, or of Perseverance, or of good Works, or of any Thing that is in the Persons Predestinated, but only in the Will of the well pleased God.  
3. There is a definite and certain Number of the Predestinate which can neither be Augmented nor diminished.  
4. Those who are not Predestinated to Salvation shall be necessarily Damned for their sins.  
5. A true, living and justifying Faith and the Spirit of God justifying is not extinguished, it falleth not away, it vanisheth not away in the Elect either finally or totally.  
6. A Man truly faithfull, that is, such a one who is endued with a justifying Faith, is certain with the full Assurance of Faith, of the Remission of his Sins, and of his Everlasting Salvation by Christ.  
7. Saving Grace is not given, is not communicated, is not granted to all Men by which they may be saved if they will.  
8. No Man can come unto Christ, unless it shall be given unto Him, and unless the Father shall draw him: And all Men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to the Son.  
9. It is not in the Will or Power of every one to be saved.  
Thus far the Lambeth Articles. And this was as plain going to Work as one cou'd wish.  

Thirdly,
Thirdly, The Court was not behind with the Church. When afterwards Arminianism prevailed in the United Provinces, and had caused terrible Convulsions, K. James VI was aware of the Danger the British Dominions were in. He was a Prince very well seen in the Roman Classics, and no doubt had read the

\[ \text{Jam proximus ardet} \]

And therefore thought it reasonable to bestir Himself to prevent the spreading of the Flame. For this Purpose He sent over his Ambassador Sir Dudley Carlton to perswade the States to provide some Remedy and to smother the Sparks which might set Him on Fire. Sir Dudley upon the 6 of October 1617 attended their High-Mightinesses assembled at the Hague, and delivered Himself in a most elaborate Speech, wherein He declares the Doctrine impugned by Arminius to be the true and ancient Doctrine, and to have been received and authorized by the common Consent of all the Reformed Churches; and that the Schism which prevai'd within the Church, and the Faction in the State were both owing to Arminius. I hope none will deny that Sir Dudley had His Great Master's Allowance for saying all this (c). And upon the whole He solicits them to call a Synod for determining the controverted Points.

Fourthly, The English Delegates to foreign Synods, have declared the same Way. Upon the foresaid Solicitation the Synod of Dort met, and was assist'd by Divines from the Church of England: And in the said Synod such Conclusions were made upon the five Articles, as I need not tell any Body, are the very same with the Doctrines contain'd in the Westminster Confession, maintained by the Scots' Presbyterians, and now impugned by Mr Rhind and the Men of his Kind (d). Somewhat after the Return of these Delegates from the Synod, they were attacked by a certain Scribler on their Conduit and the Doctrinal Conclusions they had gone in to. They thought it necessary to defend themselves, and accordingly wrote A JOINT ATTESTATION (e), whereof take the last Words. 'Whatsoever there was assent'ed unto and subscribed by us concerning the five Articles either in the Joint Synodical Judgment, or in our particular
particular Collegiate Suffrage (styled in the Acts of the Synod Theologorum Magnae Britanniae Sententia, and at large extant there) is not only warrantable by the Holy Scriptures, but also conformable to the received Doctrine of our said venerable Mother. Which we are ready to maintain, and justify against all Gainstayers, whenever we shall be thereunto called by lawfull Authority. Ita attestamur.

GEORGIUS Ciceretriensis Episcopus

JOHANNES Sarisburiensis Episcopus.

Gualterus Balcanquall Decan. Roff.


Thomas Goad Sacra Theol. Doctor.

I hope all this is more than sufficient to prove, that the Doctrines impugned by Mr. Rhind, as fundamentally false and pernicious, are the Doctrines of the Church of England, and that they are not only Articles of Peace, but Articles of Faith too. Think then what a wise Part He has acted in separating from the Presbyterians upon the Account of these Articles, and joining the Church of England, which has expressly declared such as affirm them to be in any Part erroneous to be Excommunicated ipso Fatto (f). So much for the Church of England.

IV. These Doctrines are the Doctrines of the Catholick Church of Christ, which has also declared, that such as oppose them are worthy of an Anathema. What Method shall I take to prove this? Shall I go through the several Authors in the several Ages? That were too tedious. But, which will be equally sufficient, I shall prove it from the Account of one who was Episcopalian Himself, a Scots Man too, and who was inferior to none in Theological Abilities, and is held in the greatest Veneration by all of the Episcopal Communion. The Person I mean, is Dr John Forbes a Corse Divinity Professor at Aberdeen; I shall prove it from His Instructiones Historico Theologicae, a Work, which, to give Bishop Burnet's Character of it (g), 'If he had been suffered to enjoy the Privacies of His Retirement and Study to give us the Second Volume, had been the greatest Treasure of Theological Learning that perhaps the World has yet seen. The whole Eight Book of the foresaid Work is written on Purpose, to shew that these Doctrines, which Mr. Rhind has impugned, were the Doctrines

---

[f] Canon V. 1603. [g] Preface to His Life of Dr Beddell.
Doctrines of the Catholic Church of Christ, and to answer the Objections of the Palagians and Semi-Pelagians against them; which Objections are the very same with those Mr. Rhind has advanced. He has comprehended the Sum of the Controversy in the XII Chapter of his said VIII Book in seven Questions, in which he runs the Difference betwixt the Faith of the Catholic Church and the Opinions of the foresaid Hereticks. These Questions will set the whole Matter in a true Light, and they are as follows

1. Quest. Whether are the foreseen good Things of those who are Elected, their Will and Faith and good Works and Perseverance in them, or any of these Things the Cause for which they are Elected, or a Condition prerequisite in those that were to be Elected? Or whether all those Things in the Elect are the Effects of Election and Predestination? The Semi-Pelagians affirmed the First, and denied the Latter. But the CATHOLICKS denied the first and affirmed the latter.

2. Q. Whether is not the Number of the Elect and of Men Predestinated by God to Grace and Glory from Eternity, definite and determined: So that of them none shall perish, and besides them none shall be saved? The Semi-Pelagians denied it. The CATHOLICKS affirmed it.

3. Q. Whether hath God from Eternity Predestinated some to Evil? The Semi Pelagians utterly deny that any Man was Predestinated either to Sin or to Destruction. The CATHOLICKS distinguished, and denied that any Man was Predestinated to Sin, but affirmed that they were Predestinated to Punishment.

4. Q. Whether of the Reprobate did God find the Demerits more and worse than of those whom he Elected, and therefore Reprobated the former and Predestinated them to Destruction, and Elected the latter and Predestinated them to Life Eternal? Or whether he did not find them both equal in their Demerits and worthy of eternal Death? The Semi-Pelagians affirmed the first. The CATHOLICKS affirmed the latter.

5. Q. Whether, of this Difference or Discrimination whereby some are Predestinated to Life Eternal, there be any other Cause assigned in the Scripture, besides the most free Will of God, who hath Mercy upon whom He will have Mercy, and hardneth whom He will.
will; and if it be Lawfull for us to search for any other Cause? The Semi-Pelagians affirmed it. The CATHOLICKS denied it.

6. Whether does this Doctrine of the CATHOLICKS attribute either Injustice or Cruelty to God, or render Exhortations, Prayers and the Study of Piety useless to Men? The Semi-Pelagians affirmed it. The CATHOLICKS denied it.

7. Whether, supposing this Doctrine of the CATHOLICKS true, is it expedient to Preach it openly and in earnest to the people? The Semi-Pelagians denied it. But the CATHOLICKS affirmed that it was to be preached openly and in earnest, yet prudently and seasonably as all Divine Mysteries ought to be, and with a right dividing of the Word of Truth.

Thus far that great Man. And in confirming these Catholick Doctrines He employs the rest of the said Book: And does it mainly from the Testimonies of the Fathers, in which no Man was better seen. And, to crown all, in the IV Chapter of the said VIII Book He declares, that the contrary Doctrines were, by Maxentius, Petrus Diaconus and the whole eastern Churches with him: By Fulgentius and the African Bishops: And by the European Western Churches, Judged HERETICAL, destructively alien from the CATHOLICK Sense, and worthy of an ANATHEMA in case of Obstinacy in them.

And now what melancholy Reflections must Mr Rhind make, when he considers that, as by the former Part of his Book he made Himself a Schismatick so by this part of it, he has made himself a most gross Heretic? When he considers that Mr Dodwell himself has given him the Lye, and that the whole Forreign Reformed Churches, our Scotch Episcopalian, the Church of England, and the Catholick Church of Christ have all of 'em declared for these Doctrines which he has rejected as fundamentally false and pernicious: And when he finds himself, by the Judgment of the Catholick Church through the world, enrolled amongst the worst of Hereticks, pronounced worthy of an ANATHEMA, and standing de facto excommunicated by the Church of England!

That I may conclude. I have heard indeed (tho' I think it but a Fable) of a Protestant Church somewhere on this side Nova Zembla; though I cannot now name the precise Bearing of the Place, where Nothing
Nothing is required in Law to qualify a Clergy-Man, but that He do not openly deny or impugn the Doctrine of the Trinity. Though He does not believe that, and tho' He publickly impugn all the other Articles of Christianity, it is Nothing. I grant Mr Rhind might serve for a Priest under such a Constitution: But how He can be capable to serve as such in Britain is more than I understand. But let those who put Him into Orders look to that. I proceed.

CHAP. IV.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Third Reason for Separating from the Presbyterians viz., that their Worship is chargeable with fundamental Corruptions and Defects as to the Matter, and that it is very Imperfect as to the Manner, is examined. From P. 148, to P. 185.

This Mr Rhind afferts p. 149. And if it appear he has proved it, I shall own his Separation was Just. Imperfections we acknowledge, as I think all Mankind ought to do, even in our best Performances. But fundamental Corruptions & Defects we refuse, & want to find them proved against us. In the mean Time, to separate
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parate from the Scots Worship, because of its Corruption; and to go over to the English Worship as purer, looks so very like a Jest, that for my Heart I cannot but smile at it, as I am sure five hundred others have done before Me, and twice as many, 'tis likely, will do after Me.

Mr Rhind essayes the Proof of His Charge in two Particulars viz. Prayers and Sacraments. I shall distinctly consider what He has advanced on each.

S E C T. I.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Exceptions against the Presbyterian's Prayers are examined. From P. 149 to P. 177.

Against these he excepts two Things I. That the Matter of them is Corrupt and Defective. II. That the Manner of them is so far from being the best, that it is very Imperfect. His Proof of these Exceptions I shall consider in so many Articles.

A R T I C L E I.

Wherein Mr Rhind's Proofs, That the Matter of the Presbyterian's Prayers is Corrupt and Defective, are Considered. From P. 149 to P. 156.

For making good this Charge First, He argues, that it must be so. Secondly, He makes an Induction of the Particulars wherein it is so.
First, He argues that it must be so. 'If, saith He p. 149, their Doctrine be Corrupt, so must their Worship be too; because the Doctrines, which are the common Subjects of their Sermons, do likewise constitute the Substance of their Prayers. The Answer is easy. I have proved in the preceding Chapter, that these Doctrines, which he charges as Corrupt, are the Doctrines of the Catholic Church of Christ, believed by every Christian, long before the Upstart Sect of the High Flyers was heard of in the World. Therefore the Prayers which are formed agreeably to these Doctrines cannot be Corrupt. Suppose now I had been Preaching the Doctrine of Absolute Election: After Sermon I break out into a Prayer to this Purpose.

O GOD We thank thee that Thou hast Predestinated Us unto the Adoption of Children by Jesus Christ to thy Self, according to the Good pleasure of thy Will, to the Praise and Glory of thy Grace, whereby Thou hast made us accepted in the Beloved; & hast from the Beginning chosen us to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the Truth. Thou mightest have designed Us for Vessels of Wrath, as Thou didst the fallen Angels, and then we had been eternally undone without all possible Remedy. There was Nothing in us to move Thee when we lay all together in the general heap of Mankind. It was Thy own free Grace and Bounty, that made Thee to take Delight in us, to chuse us from the Rest, and to severe us from these many Thousands in the World who shall perish everlastingly. Give us Grace we beseech Thee, that we may give all Diligence to make our Calling and Election sure—?

This Prayer is exactly formed upon the Scheme of the Irrespective Decrees. But is there any thing in it which any Christian may not join with? Mr Rhind must needs say there is. In the mean Time I must tell him, I was taught it by Wilkins Bishop of Chester (h) who shou'd have known what was Sound what Corrupt Doctrine, at least as well as Mr Rhind.

Secondly, He makes an Induction of the particulars wherein the Presbyterian's Prayers are Corrupt or Defective. Which take as follows in Ten particulars.
1. They pray, faith he p. 150, for the Continuance of Presbyterian Government, and bless God for the Extirpation of, and beseech him to preserve this Nation from Prelacy. But I have already proved that Presbytery is of Divine Institution, and that Prelacy is without all Scripture Warrant. Therefore such Prayers are so far from being a Corruption, that they are a Duty, even as much a Duty as it is to pray, that every Plant which our Heavenly Father hath not planted may be rooted up.

2. They thank God, faith he Ibid, for continuing the Presbyterian Doctrine. But this I have proved to be the Doctrine of the Gospel, and believed by all the Christian Church. It were therefore the worst ingratitude not to thank God for the Continuance of it.

3. They never omit, faith he Ibid, in their Publick Prayers to ask a Blessing upon the Word that is to be, or has been Preached. 'Tis true we do so, and let him make his worst of it. And when he gets a new Revelation to prove the Word which we Preach to be Injurious and False, we beg he may let us hear of it.

4. They bless God, faith he Ibid, for, and entreat him to continue the Purity of their Worship. 'Tis true we do so, and I hope God shall hear us. But it was too soon for him to assert it to be Corrupt, before he had proved it to be so. This is the Thing they call Begging the Question, or, which is worse, proving a Thing by it Self. The Presbyterian Worship is Corrupt, because it is Corrupt! A very handsome Way of Discoursing, and no doubt very convincing!

5. They pray, faith he p. 151, that God may stop the Progress of the English Liturgy. *Amen, even so be it. But why cou'd not Mr. Rhind join in such a Prayer? Why, he cou'd not do it without offending God, it being the most excellent of all others. I shall not say what it may be in its Nature, but sure I am it has not proved such in its Consequences: For, since ever there were Liturgies in the World, never any of 'em, no not all of 'em together have occasioned so much Strife and Division, so much War and Blood-shed, as that has done. But he gives another Reason why he could not join in such a Prayer, which is indeed a very notable one. I could not do it, faith he, without Treason against the Queen, it being that which
which her Majesty Practises, and has authorized (tolerated he shou’d have said) the Exercise of, to those of the Episcopal Perfwation in Scotland. Now I ask. 1st, When was the Law made which makes it Treason to pray against the Progress of the English Liturgy. I don’t think there is any Thing Treason, but what the Law has declared to be such. Pray, Good Mr. Rhind, cite the Law in your next, that we may be aware of our Danger. 2dly, May not one with a very good Conscience both pray against and practise contrary to what the Prince practises. I suppose the Apostle Paul did both in his Time, and I suppose the Church of England Her self did to in the Time of the late K. James. Mr. Hobbes indeed was a very Learned Man who made the King’s Conscience the Standard for the Consciences of all his Subjects, just as the great Clock rules all the lefser Clocks in Town; yet that Gentleman’s Principles have not been always well spoken of. But it seems Mr. Rhind intends to revive them. 3dly, Has not her Majesty and the Parliament Authorized the Presbyterian Government and Worship? And yet do not the Episcopal Clergy in their Conventicles every Day both pray and preach against the fame, and that without any Fear of Treason? 4thly, If the Scots Episcopal Ministers are so chary of Treason against the Queen, why don’t they so much as pray for her? Why do they skip over that part of the Liturgy which is designed for Her? ‘Tis notourly known that the Generality of ’em do this.

6. They pray, faith he ibid, for a Blessing upon their Kirk Judicatories in the Exercise of their Discipline, which, in many Instances, I knew to be scandalously partial, and highly Unjust. Well. Let us hear one of these Instances? No. He may perhaps give you that in the next Edition. But his Business in this was to Assert. Mr. Rhind pretends to have gone over to the Church of England. What is the Character of Her Ecclesialitical Courts? It wou’d perhaps be thought Ill.Nature in Me to give one; but let us hear the Noble Historian Clarendon who has sav’d my Pains to purpose. ‘I never yet, faith He (i), spoke with one Clergy Man, who hath had the Experience of both Litigations, that hath not ingenuously confessed
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tessed, he had rather, in respect of his Trouble, charge, and Sa-
tisfaction to his Understanding, have three Suits depending in West-
minster Hall, than one in the Arches, or any Ecclesiastical Court.
Now tho' Mr. Rhind cou'd not pray for a Blessing on the Kirk
Judi-catories, yet may he not, after this, with great Freedom pray
for one upon the Church Judicatories? I'm sure they have much
need of Prayers.

7. They do not, saies he p. 151, 152, pray for the Forgiveness of their
Enemies. And he is so high upon this, that he afferts, During the
22 Years I was among them, I don't Remember that ever I heard one
of them (and I have heard some Hundreds) præs it as a Duty, or once
offer it a Petition to Almighty God. I with Mr Rhind had given
us some better Testimony than his own; But seeing he has con-
tented himself with it, I think it may be enough to lay Mine in
the Ballance against it: But then I shall qualifie it, that it may be
enquired into. I have very seldom Occasion to hear others
preach. I am now writing this upon the Eleventh day of November
1713. The laft Sermon I heard preached by another was upon
Thursday the 22 of October laft. It was preached by Mr Alexander
Muir Minister of Rutherglen in the High Church of Glasgow in that
Part of it commonly called the Inner-Kirk before a Numerous Audi-
ence upon Rev. III. 15. 16. I declare I never conferred with him
upon the Subject of Forgiveness of Enemies, either before or since;
and that he knows Nothing of my intending to publish this Passa-
He is known to be a Zealous Presbyterian, and always was so. And
now after all these Circumstances I declare, and I appeal to the Au-
dience for the Verity of it, that I heard him after Sermon pray in
Terns That God would forgive our Enemies. This I hope is some better
than Mr Rhind's Negative, and I pitched on this Instance, only
because it was at the last Sermon I heard. For tho' as I said, I have
rarely Occasion to hear Sermon from others, yet when ever I chance
to be assistat at the Communion any where, I always hear all Per-
sons having Malice solemnly debarred the Lord's Table, and solemn
Prayer put up to God for the Forgiveness of Enemies. But enough of
this, we may possibly hear more of it afterwards.

8. They pray, saith he p. 152, for the Destruction of their Enemies. How!
Of their Personal Enemies? If so, 'tis a very great Crime; and we
want
want to have the Criminals named, and the Vouchers adduced. Has he done this? No. But, faith he, I am ready to do it. Was he in so great haste that he could not stay to give so much as one Instance? Gentlemen of the Episcopal Per\satisfaction who have adopted and cherish\ed this Book of Mr Rhind's, I appeal to you upon your Honour, Sense and Conscience, whether this was a rational Way of Writing; and whether it is not scandalous in the last Degree to approve of it. 'Tis true, faith Mr Rhind, they pretend to do this, because these against whom they pray, are Enemies to Truth, and Persecutors of its Professors; Very well. And if that Pretence be true, are they not just in doing so? No, faith he, no Pretence can excuse the Impiety of it. Strange! Are there not innumerable Precedents for it in Scripture? When God has promised to consume the Man of Sin with the Spirit of his Mouth, and to destroy him with the Brightness of His coming II Thes. II. 8. Is it not lawful, nay is it not a Duty to turn this Promise into a Prayer? To come yet a little nearer, did Mr Rhind never hear of an Address made by the Scots Prelates to the late King James, wherein they prayed that God would give him the Hearts of his Subjects, and the Neckes of his Enemies (k). Was not this to pray for the Destruction of Enemies in good Earnest? And can any Pretence excuse the Impiety of it?

But Mr Rhind had a secret powerful Reason for insisting on this Topick, as will appear by his Enlargement on it. He alludes that this Pretence and Practice of the Presbyterians argues the most scandalous Partiality and vilest Hypocrisy. Pray how? 'Why, faith He, at the same Time that they pray for the Destruction of some, upon Pretence that they persecute the Servants of God; They immediately offer up their most fervent Address for the Prosperity of others who are no less Persecutors, and neglect to offer up one Petition for a third Sort who have signalized themselves in Behalf of such as suffer for Righteousness Sake. I doubt not but several Readers may want a Key to this fine Harangue, but I believe I can supply them. By the some, whose Destruction the Presbyteri\ans pray for, upon Pretence that they persecute the Servants of God, He means the French King. By the others no less Persecutors, whose prosperity the Presbyterians pray for, He means the House of Austria.

Savoy and such other Popish Confederates in the late War. By the Third Sort whom the Presbyterians neglect to pray for, notwithstanding they have signalized themselves in Behalf of such as suffer for Righteousness Sake, he means the King of Sweden, who piously gave Diversion to the Allies in Behalf of the French King: And no doubt the Presbyterians were very Guilty in not praying to God for Success to him in so laudable a Service. And now, Good Reader, you have Mr Rhind's heart, and an account of that which, beyond peradventure, he cou'd leaft of all others dignit in the Presbyterian Devotions. His Book bears Date in the Preface. 6th December 1712, that is about half a Year e're the Peace was concluded. It was then an Unpardonable Crime in the Presbyterians to pray for the Queen and her Allies, whereas they shou'd have prayed for the French King and his Aunts. I believe there is no Man that knows any thing of the History of Lewis's Reign, but knows too, that Nero, Domitian and Diocletian were Merciful Princes in Comparison of him; and therefore such as would alleviate his Tyranny and Persecution by calling the Imputation of it a Pretence ought no otherwise to be look'd on than as avowed Enemies to the Reformed Interest. And tho' many in Britain and Ireland are now bewitched with a Spirit of Infatuation in Favour of that Tyrant, yet I hope they may one Day have their Eyes open'd to fee both their Wickedness and their Folly. I pray God it be not too late, and at the Expence both of our Religion and Liberties. But now as to the Business of the Prayers. How often did Her Majesty declare from the Throne, that the reducing the French Power was necessary for securing, not only the Protestant Religion, but the Liberties of Europe too? And was it not lawfull to pray for Success to those who joined with Her Majesty in so good a Work? And must not every good Man in the three Nations have been sensible of this? Because the People of Mr Rhind's Kidney are content to barter Religion, Liberty, and all the most valuable Interests of Mankind, for the dear Enjoyments of Slavery and Superstition; was it needful that the Rest of the Nation shou'd run mad with them? 'Tis true the House of Austria, Savoy &c persecuted the Protestants in Hungary, Bohemia, Piemont and perhaps with little less Fury than the French King did his Subjects. But it is as true that the Presbyterians prayed for the Persecuted in
in these Places, and against their Persecutors, so far as concerned the Matter of Religion, in the same Terms that they prayed for the persecuted in France and against the French King. And 'tis true also they blessed God for any Freedom was procured to the Protestants, whether by the King of Sweden or any other. But still they prayed against the French King, and so did the Church of England. For did not Her Majesty order Forms of prayer and Thanksgiving, to be composed by the Bishops at the Opening and Ending of each Campaign, for Success against him? Nay did not the Clergy by Direction of the Liturgy (1) pray every day during the War that God would abate the pride of their Enemies, assuage their Malice, and CONFOUND their Devices? And did ever the Presbyterians pray against the French King or any Body else in harsher Terms? And is it not the Duty of every good Christian to pray for the Destruction of the Power of one who, besides his bloody Enmity to the Reformed Interest, is notoriously known to be an Oppressor of the Liberties of Mankind? Add to all this, that to my certain Knowledge the Presbyterians usually pray; that, if it be Possible, God would give him Repentance, which I hope is a kinder Office done to him, than to justify his unparalleled Wickedness, as some others do.

9. He Objects p 154. 'That they offer up many Nonsensical petitions to God, commit many Blunders and Tautologies, transgress the most fundamental Rules of Grammar, Rhetorick and Logick. Well, how does he prove all this? You are not to ask that; he CAN do it, and that must stand for as good as if he had done it. But how can he do it? Why, the Expence of a Shilling, faith he, will procure from some short Hand Writer a Copy of one of their Prayers at some of their Weekly Lectures in Edinburgh, where one would suppose their Men of best Sense did officiate. But why would he hazard his being branded as a Malicious Slanderer, rather than go to the Expence of a Shilling? However nigardly he is of his Purse, it seems he is abundantly prodigal of his Fame. Besides, when he has published one such Prayer, I hope no Man in his Wits would sustain that as a just Exception against the whole Communion. There are

are no doubt weak men among the Presbyterians. But does not the same objectionly against every other society, tho' against none so much, that I can hear of, through the broad world, as against the English inferior clergy? The much greater part of those (as the Bishop of Sarum told us last year about this same time) who come to be ordained are ignorant to a degree, not to be apprehended by those who are not obliged to know it. The earliest part of knowledge is that to which they are the greatest strangers; I mean the plainest parts of the scriptures, which they say, in excuse of their ignorance, that their tutors in the universities never mention the reading of, so that they can give no account, or at least a very imperfect one, of the contents even of the gospels. Those who have read some few books, yet never seem to have read the scriptures, many cannot give a tolerable account even of the catechism itself, how short and plain forever. They cry and think it a sad disgrace to be denied orders, tho' the ignorance of some is such, that in a well-regulated state of things, they would appear not knowing enough to be admitted to the holy sacrament. This does often tear my heart. The case is not much better in many, who having got into orders come for institution, and cannot make it appear that they have read the scriptures or any one good book since they were ordained, so that the small measure of knowledge upon which they got into holy orders not being improved, is in a way to be quite lost. Thus far Bishop Burnet. I hope this is some better testimony than a copy of a prayer, not yet delivered, from some short hand writer.

After all this, to make Mr. Rhind easy, I shall ingenuously confess how far his charge may be true against the presbyterian ministers. Neither these of 'em at Edinburgh, nor any of 'em elsewhere are fond of that which Tillotson calls rumbling rhetoric alias bombast: Nor are they careful to make their sentences run like blank verse, or fall into a musical cadence, as if they were just come from reading an English tragedy. They don't affect the English accent without the English phrase: Nor do they aspire to have their language soaring in the clouds, and their thoughts mean while creeping on the flat. No, they think it sufficient to deliver themselves in plain Scotch, without
without Flights of Fancy or Points and Turns of Wit; being sensible that such Things are both unsuitable to the Simplicity of the Gospel; and besides, that they would be thrown away on the greatest Part of their Audience. For, They don't believe that every one that wears a fine Hat or a fashionable Head-Dress is a deep Scholar. They know there are vulgar Wits under long Wigs oftimes, as well as under the Natural Hair; and within Silk Scarfs as well as coarse Plaids. And therefore, both in their Prayers and Preachings they adapt their Discourse to Men of low Degree; being convinced of Mr Dryden's good Sense when he said

That the strict Gate would be made straitest yet
Were none admitted there but Men of Wit.

All this I confess, the Presbyterians are guilty of; and let Mr Rhind improve on it as far as he ever can. The rest of the Charge we shall acknowledge after hearing Probation, which equal Judges I hope will sustain as a Relevant Dilator.

10. In the last Place Mr Rhind objects the Omission of the Lord's Prayer. He does indeed bring in this Objection in his Arguings against the MANNER of our Prayers; and there we shall consider it as an Argument for Forms. But he insists upon it likewise as a fundamental Defect; and therefore I shall consider it here while treating of the Matter of our Prayers. Now take the Objection in his own Words P. 164. 'If, saith he, the Lord's Prayer be a Form, which when we pray we are commanded to use; and if the Presbyterians totally neglect to use it as such, I appeal to the Reader, whether they are not chargeable with an Impious and fundamental Omission; and in Consequence, whether all who would not be involved in the Guilt, or run the hazard of offering up an unacceptible, because an Imperfect Worship, should not separate from them. Thus He. For Answer

The Judgment of a Church is to be gathered from her publick Formulæ. Now in all these the Presbyterians own it lawfull to use it as a Prayer. The lesser Catechism calls it a Form. The larger Catechism saies it may be used as a Prayer. The Directory recommends it to be used as such. The General Assembly 1705 recommends the Observation of the Directory. Accordingly many Ministers do use the Lord's Prayer. I my self use it sometimes, my next Neighbour Minister does the same. His next Neighbour...
of 'em Genuine Presbyterians) uses it every Lord's Day. The like do others in several parts of the Nation. 'Tis therefore false what Mr Rhind affirms, that the Presbyterians totally neglect to use it even in the very Words thereof. But then, to make the Omission of it an Impious and Fundamental Defect, and a necessary Cause of Separation is an uncommon Stretch which hardly any Man wou'd have ventured on, who has Modesty enough to stick at any Thing. And therefore I must crave Leave to reason this Matter somewhat particularly with Mr Rhind. And

In the First Place I ask. Is Mr Rhind or any of his party sure that the Lord's Prayer was not mainly intended as a Pattern rather than a Form. Their Confidence will indeed bear them out to assert any Thing: Yet Grotius, one of the most Judicious Criticks the World has yet known, has expressly said upon the Place, 'That Christ did not command the WORDS to be recited. But that we should take the Materials of our Prayers thence: And He gives this Solid Reason for it, 'That tho' it may be used with great Profit as a Form or in the very Words, yet we don't read that ever the Apostles used it so. Now let us hear what Mr. Rhind has advanced to prove it a Form. 1st; 'That it is a Form of prayer, faith he, is hence evident, because it is conceived in the same Manner as other prayers, that is, with Invocation, Petitions, Doxology and concluding Amen. I answer it has all these parts in Matthew; but it was twice prescribed upon different Occasions, and so faith Joseph Made himself upon the Subject. And when it was prescribed in Matthew, 'tis plain it was designed only for a Pattern: For the Precept runs thus, After this Manner therefore pray ye. Therefore the Argument, that it is conceived there in the same Manner as other prayers, is Naught; seeing it was not there designed as a prayer but as a Pattern. 2dly, 'We are, faith Mr. Rhind, expressly commanded to SAY Our Father &c. But it is Nonsense to command us to say a Pattern, Therefore we are to use it as a Form. Thus he. I answer, Mr. Rhind's former Argument destroys this: For it is in Luke's Gospel that we are commanded to SAY Our Father &c. But in Luke's Gospel there is neither the Doxology nor the Amen. Therefore it is not conceived in the same Manner as other Prayers, in that place where
we are bid SAY it. Nay, Grotius is of the Mind that these Clauses Which art in Heaven, and Thy Will be done, as in Heaven so in Earth, and Deliver us from Evil, were not Originally in Luke's Gospel, but crept into it out of Matthew's. And he gives this Reason for it, That the first Clause Which art in Heaven is not extant in the old Latine Copies. And the Second Clause, Thy Will be done as in Heaven so in Earth, is neither extant in the Old Latine Copies, nor in some of the Greek Copies. And it is very false what Mr. Rhind alledges, that it is Nonsense to bid us Say a Pattern: For in every Language, that I know any Thing of, there are greater Ellipses usual than this After this Manner or To this Purpose. And so Luke's Way of Speaking is very plain, When Ye pray, Say viz. After this Manner, or to this Purpose. Upon the whole, seeing the Lords Prayer was at least mainly intended for a Pattern, which I hope, is now tolerably evident, 'tis pretty hard to conceive how the Omission of it as a Form can be a fundamental Defect.

In the Second Place I ask Mr. Rhind and his Party, if they have not observed, that the Words of the Lord's Prayer in the Original are not the same in both Gospels. In Matthew's we read 

Deo *omnis sancti,* in Luke's didi *omnis* venturum. In Matthew's the *tis* omnis venturum, *as* in *ou* omnis *omnis* venturum. In Luke's *tis* omnis *omnis* venturum, *as* in omnis *omnis* venturum. *Tis* true, our Saviour probably did not speak in Greek. But when the Evangelists have varied so in their Wording of it, 'tis plain that they did not understand our Saviour as meaning to bind them up to Words and Syllables. The like Variation of phrase, which I take Notice of for the English Reader's Sake, is observable in our Translation. In Matthew's Gospel we read Thy Will be done in Earth as it is in Heaven. In Luke's Thy Will be done, as in Heaven so in Earth. In Matthew's Give us this Day our daily Bread. In Luke's Give us Day by Day our daily Bread, and on the Margin For the Day. In Matthew's Forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors. In Luke's Forgive us our Sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And which is strange enough, the English Liturgy varies from both: For thus it has it Forgive us our Trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us; and in it generally the Doxology Forthine is the Kingdom &c is wanting. Now after all this Variety, is it to bethought that we are tied up to the Form of Words, or that the Omission of them can be a fundamental Defect...
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In the Third Place. I ask Mr Rhind and his Party, if they are sure, even supposing it were a Form, that the Precept for using it was intended for PUBLICK Worship? I don't now ask if it be lawful there, that is granted. But that it was not originally intended for it, I conceive to be somewhat more than probable. 1st, Because in all the publick Ministrations related in the New Testament we never find it used. 2dly, Because our Saviour took Occasion from discoursing on secret Prayer to prescribe and give the Command for it. And 3dly, The Disciples did not then look upon themselves as Ministers, nor expected ever to be employed as Officers in the Church: Seeing, not only now, but even a long Time after this, yea after Christ's Resurrection, they still imagined that the Jewish Polity was to continue, in which those of the Family of Levi alone were by Divine Right Church Officers. Now if it was not originally intended for Publick Worship, how can the Omission of it in Publick Worship be a fundamental Defect? Especially, when we are sure, that this, which I have given, was the Sense which the primitive Church had of this Matter. For thus Augustine expressly declares (n) 'That Christ, in the Delivery of these Petitions, did not teach his Disciples how they shou'd speak, or what Words they shou'd use in Prayer; but to whom they were to pray, and what Things they were to pray for, when they were in the Exercise of Secret or Mental Prayer?

In the Fourth Place. I ask, how can the Episcopal Party account for that Sense which they have given of the Precept? And how can they justify that horrid Doctrine which they have founded it on? In the 1st Place, They make the Sense of the Precept When ye pray, Say, to be, When ye have done with your own Prayers, annex this. This is such an Infpid Gloss, and to unheard of among the Ancients, that I admire they are not ashamed of it. We are sure that the Ancients either used it alone, or prefixed it to their Prayers when they used it. Thus Tertullian (o) after a large Commendation of the Lord's Prayer

---


Prayer adds, 'We may add thereunto; For since the Lord the Provider for all Human Necessities, has in another Place, after He had delivered this Prayer, said, Ask and ye shall receive: And every one has particular Circumstances to beg for, therefore having promised the lawfull and ordinary Prayer, there is place for accidental Requests. Thus He. But whether they prefixed it, or annexed it; they had no Opinion of the fundamental Necessity of doing so; an infallible Argument of which is, that we find them frequently praying without the Lord's Prayer, either at the Beginning or Ending of their Prayers. Thus, as Sir Peter King has already noted (p) In the Heavenly Prayer of Polycarpus at the Stake, The Lord's Prayer is neither at Beginning nor Ending. Thus Clements Alexandrinus concludes his last Book of Pedagogy, with a Prayer which neither ends nor begins with the Lord's Prayer; and Origen (q) prescribing a Method of Prayer, speaks not a Word of the Lord's Prayer; but advises both to begin and end with Doxology, or a giving Praise to God. This they would never have done, had they believed that it was fundamentally necessary to join the Lord's Prayer with their own. With what Reason then can our Scots Episcopalians make that the Sense of the Precept? But then 2dly, The Principle upon which they found this Sense is a most horrid one: For they assert, that the joining it with our own Imperfect Prayers renders them acceptable before God; as, on the other Hand, the Want of it makes them unacceptable. This is plain from Mr Rhind's Words before cited. Now what else is this but to turn that Excellent Prayer into an Idolatrous Charm, and to make the Repetition of it supply the Place of the Merit and Intercession of our Saviour? I ask now whether the Presbyterian's Omission of it, or the Episcopal's Usage of it upon such a Principle be the more accountable?

To conclude this Matter. 'Tis true the Lord's Prayer was early used in the publick assemblies of Christians. But it was not used more than once at one Assembly: Not in Prayers before or after Sermon, not at all in the Catechumen's Office, but in the Eucharistical Office, and even there they did not apprehend that Christ enjoined them
them to use the Words. And thus many others (r) both of the Protestant and Roman Communion have understood it. So much for the Exceptions against the Matter of the Prayers of the Presbyterians. Part of which Exceptions are manifestly false in Fact, and all the Rest of the things excepted against, Justifiable, at least as Lawfull, and for the most Part as Duty.

**ARTICLE II.**

Wherein Mr Rhind's Exception against the Manner of the Presbyterian's Prayers, is considered.

From P. 156. to P. 177.

Mr Rhind frequently affirms them to be **highly Imperfect** in this Respect. The only Reason he gives is, that they are performed in the *Extemporary Way*, as he expresses it. For making this a **high Impefition**, He I. Insists upon the huge Disadvantages of it. II. Essays by Arguments to prove the Excellency, if not the Necessity, of the Liturgick Way.

I. He insists upon the Disadvantages of the Extemporary Way among the Presbyterians, which he lays out in Three particulars.

The First Disadvantage is, 'That a Man is discharged the use of all helps, and is desir'd to depend only upon the Motion of the Spirit' p. 157. The Result of which is, that when one is not blessed with the Gift of prayer, he is tempted to neglect it altogether; or if he esay it once, and finds that he cannot perform it to any tolerable purpose, he is discouraged from any further Attempt; and so

must continue in Ignorance and Irreligion; the obtaining of which  
among the Generality of people, faith He, is in a great Measure  
owing to the Want of Forms. Or if a person grossly Ignorant  
yet adventure to pray, his performance must be crowded with  
flat Impertinencies, Substantial Nonsense and horrid Blasphemies, all 
which is unavoidable in the Ex temp orary Way. To this purpose  
he p. 156, 157. Is it possible Mr Rhind cou'd be 22 Years among the  
Presbyterians, and not know that what he has laid down for the Foun-
dation of all this, is even a transparent Falshood. Was he not sensible 
that every one, that cou'd open his Eyes and read English, was in a Ca-
cacity to convince him of the grossest Calumny and Slander? Do the 
Presbyterians Discharge the Use of all Helps in Prayer either to Ministers 
or Private Christians? Was not the Directory for the Publick Worship 
of God compiled on purpose to give them both Help and Furniture? 
(c). Is not every Minister therein exhorted to be careful to furnish both 
his Heart and Tongue with further and other Materials, as shall be need-
full upon all Occasions? Hath not the General Assembly given Direc-
tions (t), and suggested Materials for Private Prayer? Nay do 
they not expressly recommend Forms of prayer to the Rude and 
Weaker (v)? What meant he then to say, that they are discharged 
the use of all helps; and desired to depend only upon the Motion of the Spi-
rit? Did he presume that his party were given up to believe a Lie? 
With what Confidence cou'd he impute the Stupid Ignorance and 
Height of Impiety to the Want of Forms? Does he not know that in  
England, where there is no Want of them, a brutal Ignorance pre-
vails among the Vulgar, and Impiety reigns, yet, I hope, unknown 
on this Side Tweed. Mr. Rhind has taken a great deal of Pains to 
represent the Gift of Prayer as an unattainable Thing. But hear  
Bishop Wilkins upon it. ' As for the pretended Difficulty of it  
's faith be (x), I shall in this Discourse make it evident, that if it  
'be Seriously attempted (as all Religious Business ought to be)  
'tis easie to be attained by any one that has but common Capaci-
ty. And I suppose every Body who has read his Discourse is con-
vinced he has made his Word good.  
I i  
The  

[ s ] See Preface to the Directory.  [ t ] See them annexed to the Confeff. of Faith. Edinburgh  
The Second Disadvantage of Extemporany Prayer is the Danger, or at least the Uncertainty of the Lawfulness of Joining in it. For suppose, faith he p. 157, a Man who is Master of a tolerable Ex- temporary Faculty, is the Orator; yet even in that Case, before he begin, ye are under an Uncertainty whether what he shall say be Right or Wrong: This keeps the Spirit in Suspence. Perhaps the third or fourth Petition is dubious or untound, which ye cannot offer up to God. Perhaps the next ye hear is flat or Im- pertinent, and therefore grating to a Man of Sense. To this purpose he. Is not this a pretty Way of arguing by Perhaps's? I need not spend Time upon such Chimerical Stuff. Take the Answer from Bishop Wilkins in the place last cited. ' Whereas, faith he, 'tis commonly objected by some, that they cannot so well join in an unknown Form with which they are not before Hand-ac- quainted. I answer, that's an Inconsiderable Objection, and does oppose all Kind of Forms that are not publickly prescribed. As a Man may in his Judgment assent unto any Divine Truth del-ivered in a Sermon, which he never heard before; so may he join in his Affections unto any Holy desire, which he never heard before. If he who is the Mouth of the Rest, shall through Im- prudence deliver that which we cannot approve of, God does not look upon it as our prayer, if our Desires do not say Amen to it. Thus he. And Nothing cou'd have been said more parti to the present Objection.

The Third Disadvantage attending Extemporany prayer is, ' That even where there is Nothing amiss in the Matter of the prayer, yet the Hearer cannot at once exercise that Seriousness and In- tention with Respect to God, and that Attention which is Ne- cessary to catch what drops from him who prays. Thus Mr. Rhind p. 158. But this is an Objection of the same Nature with the former; an Objection to which His own whimsical Imagination is both Father and Mother. Tho' Mr Rhind pretends he cannot do both at once. Yet I believe every Man else in the World finds it not only possible but easie to do. When there is Nothing amiss in the Matter of the Prayer, which is his Supposition, a Man must be very Glib of the Tongue, if my Thoughts cannot hold Pace with him: And the Intensness of my Affections will be.
be so far from being a Hinderance, that it will be a Help to the
Attention of my Thoughts.

But now are not all these Imaginary Disadvantages as frequent
and as obvious in the Liturgick Way. For what if a Man have
not a Common Prayer Book, or cannot read, or has not the Form
by Heart, all which are Cases that most frequently happen? Must
he not quite neglect Prayer at Home? And is it not impossible for
him to exercise both Attention and Intention at once when he comes
to Church? Is not the looking upon the Book and reading, a greater
Diversion to the Affections than any Thing can be mention’d in the
Extemporaneous Way? Besides, does not Mr Rhind, who is so well
acquainted with the Animal Economy, know, that when one is accu-
stomed to a Form, there is the greatest Danger of falling into Lip-
Service and Formality; and the greatest Difficulty in exercising ei-
ther Attention or Intention? 'Tis certainly so. Every Man knows it
who has tried it; and Bishop Wilkins, who was a great Philosopher
as well as a great Divine has observed it (y). In this Case, saith he,
't should be specially remembered, that in the Use of such prescript
Forms, to which a Man hath been accustomed, he ought to be
narrowly watchful over his own Heart, for fear of that Lip-Service
and Formality, which in such Cases we are more especially exposed
unto. Thus He. So much for the pretended Disadvantages that attend
Extemporary Prayer, which I think are pretty real in the Liturgick Way.

II. Mr. Rhind essays by Arguments to prove the Excellency of
the Liturgick Way. And he argues it to be the Best. First, from
the Nature of the Thing. Secondly, From Universal Practice.
Thirdly, From the Approbation of Heaven both in the Old and
New Testament. Fourthly, From the Usage of the Primitive and
Ancient Church. And Lastly, From the Practice of the Reformed
Churches. And then he concludes all with answering the Objection,
that Forms Stint the Spirit.

First, He argues for the Excellency of the Liturgick Way from
the Nature of the Thing p. 159, 160. God, faith he, ought to be
worshipped in the best Manner possible. 'Tis granted. A Form of
Worship, subserves he, which always presupposes Fore-Though is incom-
parably better than the Extemporaneous Way, which requires little or none

[y] Ubi Supra p. 9.
at all. Who told him that the Extemporary Way requires little or no Fore-Thought? Did ever the Presbyterians teach so? Have they not in their Directory enjoined each Minister to stir up the Gifts of Christ in himself, and, by Meditation as well as by observing the Ways of Divine providence and other Methods, to furnish himself with Materials of prayer? Does not every Presbyterian who treats of that Subject enjoin the same? Have they ever taught otherwise than Bishop Wilkins himself has taught in this Case (z) viz. That generally it is both lawfull and Necessary to prepare our Selves, as for this Gift in general, so for every particular Act of it, by premeditating, if we have Leisure for it, both Matter and Order and Words: And that tho' it be a Gift of the Spirit, yet it is not to be expected, that it should suddenly be infused into us without any precedent Endeavours of our own. Again how shall he convince us that the Liturgick Way always presupposes Fore-Thought? 'Tis true it did so in the Compilers; but it is well enough known that it does not so in the Users. How often is it seen that while they are crying, Be Merciful to us Miserable Sinners, they are, as a late Excellent Author hath told us, ogling their Sweet Hearts in the next pew? And does not every Body feel it, that when they know before Hand what is to be said, they are very rarely attentive to it. But let us hear him proceed. If it be Best, faith He, to have the prayer formed before I pronounce it, what is the Harm though I transcribe it from my Memory? None at all that I know of. Nay, faith He, will I not be so much the more sure of it, if I do this? Certainly. For Litera Scripta Manet, and the pocket is oftimes a Surer Repository than the Memory. And if I may safely write it, adds He, why not READ it too? I know no Reason why he may not, a Hundred Times over if he pleases. And yet it is very possible he may all this while not pray it once over: For I cannot see why reading a prayer, where there is no more, should be called praying, any more than why reading a prophesie thou'd be called prophesying. But now to discourse this Business of Reading prayers a little.
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I ask Mr Rhind where does he find in the First place that prayers were Read in the primitive Church? Is there the least Vestige of it for several hundreds of years after Christ? Do not Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, Cyprian, Arnobius, Laërtius, Dionysius Alexandrinus, all tell us that the Ancient Christians in prayer lifted up their Eyes to Heaven (a). Does not Chrysostome observe from Christ’s Posture in prayer expressed John XVII. 1. ‘That thereby we are taught when we pray to lift up both the Eyes of Body and Mind? Is not the Emperor Constantine represented on his Coins and Medals in a Praying posture, yet not reading on a book, but with Eyes lift up to Heaven (b)? Does not Augustine intimate as much when he tells us upon John XVII. 1. that Christ so prayed, as minding to teach us how we should pray? Where is now the Warrant from Antiquity for reading prayers? 2dly, Is there any more Warrant for it from Scripture? Did the humble Publican, tho’ in the Temple, Read his prayers? Or did the Pharisee pray by a Form? Did the Disciples, when caught in the Storm, pull out their Common-prayer Book, and read the Forms to be used at Sea? Did Jonah or the Mariners do it? Is there so much as a Whisper of this in the Bible? No indeed. A Sense of present Danger is worth Twenty Common-prayer Books; according to that known Saying Qui nescit Orare disce Navigare, who would learn to pray, let him go to Sea.

And ‘tis a plain Case, no Man wants a Prayer book who is in a Frame for praying: And he that is not in such a Frame, may indeed Read Prayers, but I don’t think he can be said to pray.

But let us go on with Mr Rhind’s Argument. ‘If that prayer, faith be, which I form before hand be better than that which I utter off hand, then certainly the Form prepared by the joint Endeavours of Many (allowing each of them to be neither better nor wiser than my self) is by great Odds preferable to my single Endeavour. Here Mr Rhind and I differ: For I have seldom yet observed a Composure by several hands so well done, as that wherein only one was concerned. And the Reason is evident; that, which is done by one, is

[a ] See Sir Peter King Ubi Supra Part II Chap. II. Sect. 3. & Clarkson on Liturgies. p. 9. &c
[b ] Euseb. de vita Constantini Lib. IV. Cap. 15.
is usually all of a piece; whereas that, which has many hands at the
doing of it, generally makes but a linsey-woolsey kind of Stuff. Be-
5ides, tho' a prayer, formed before hand either by myself or others
may be more pointed as to its Wording, and have more of a Lo-
gical Method in it; yet 'tis very possible that abrupt and inde-
dendent Sentences, breaking from a Contrite Heart, and a Soul
flaming with the Love of Jesus, may be more acceptable to God
and more profitable to myself.

From all this Reasoning Mr. Rhind concludes that, that Form which
the Church has provided (He means the English Liturgy) has un-
speakable Advantages above any one Man's Performance. But herein
Mr. Rhind's Taste and mine differ as much about the Preference of
Forms, as our Judgments do about the Use of them. For I am
perfectly convinced that the Devotions of the Author of the whole
Duty of Man, or Symon Patrick's Devotions, or Jeremy Taylor's De-
votions, or even Dorington's Devotions are incomparably better
than those of the Liturgy; and I wonder how any Man that has
read both can make the least doubt of it: Pray what should
make the English Liturgy so preferable? He answers, be-
cause it is the Result of the wisest Council and most Mature
Deliberation, the Effect of the United Endeavours of Men Holy
and Wise, who no doubt implor'd and obtained the Assistance and
Direction of the Blessed Spirit, in compiling a Form which they
were persuaded was the best and most acceptable Manner of
worshipping God. But if, Has Mr. Rhind considered how small
the Part of the Compilers was? They did indeed Tack the several
Parts together; but the Materials were formed to their Hand. The
Lessons out of the Old and New Testament and Apocrypha, the
Psalms to be read Monthly, the Epistles and Gospels, the Passages
of Scripture at the Beginning of Morning and Evening Prayer, the
Lord's Prayer so often repeated, the Venite Exultemus, the Bene-
iditus, the Benedictus, the Jubilate Deo, the Cantate Domino, the Mag-
nificat, the Nunc Dimittis, the Deus Misereatur, the Litany, the Ten
Commandments, the three Creeds, the Te Deum were all of 'em form-
ed long e're the Compilers of the Liturgy were born. The Collects
are generally out of the Breviary; the Prayers in the Standing Of-
fices out of the Missal and Ritual. Abstract these Parts from the
Liturgy, and I suppose the Compiler's Work will appear to be very
casie.
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easie. 2dly, Why did Mr. Rhind say that the Authors of the Liturgy compiled a Form which they were persuaded was the best and most acceptable Manner of worshipping God? Does he not know that all History contradicts this? They did not so much as aim at that which was in itself best, but at what the Times could best bear, with any Colour of Reformation; and therefore composed the Liturgy so as was most likely to gain the Papists, and to draw them into their Church Communion, by varying as little as well they could from the Romish Forms before in Use. This K. Edward ingenuously told the Devonshire Rebells. 'Tho' faith He, it seemeth to you a New Service, yet indeed it is no other but the old, the same Words in English that were in Latine: For nothing is altered but to speak with Knowledge that which was spoken with Ignorance, only a few Things taken out, so fond that it had been a Shame to have heard them in English. Thus He (c). And indeed the Reformers acted prudently, according to the then Circumstances, in striving what they could to gain the Papists: But, to go on in the same Method now after a Hundred and Fifty Years Experience of its Unsuccessfulness, and when it is plain that the altering it would gain the Dissenters; this Conduct, I must needs say, argues a better Memory than a Judgment; and shews a much greater Regard to the Popish than the Reformed Interest. 3dly, What Assistance of the Spirit was it which the Compilers implored and obtain'd? It was not Assistance as to the Matter. It was not Assistance as to the Form: For Mr Rhind has expressly said p. 175, that our Prayers are not dictated by the Spirit either as to Matter or Form. 'Tis then beyond my Comprehension to understand wherein they were assisted; For, to say that they were assisted in tacking the several Parts together, were to assign too low an Office to the Holy Ghost.

It will not be unpleasant, ere I leave this Argument, to consider the Motives which, Mr Rhind alleged, prevailed with the first Compilers and Imposers of the Liturgy, to restrict Ministers and People to the Use thereof.

"They were sensible, faith He p. 161, of the Disadvantages of the Extrem-
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Extemporary Way, even in their own Experience: They observed moreover, that the Ignorant, that is, the Graft of Mankind, could not, and therefore did not pray at all; that the Gifted Brethren and their Hearers too often mistook the Warmth and Quickness of the Fancy, and the Readiness of Expression for the Dictates of the Spirit, which swelled the former with a High Conceit of themselves (a Frame of Mind of all others the most unsuitable in Devotion) and made the latter Lie against the Holy Ghost: Besides, they found that this Liberty which Men were allowed, sometimes tempted them to vent their New and dangerous Notions, as the Inspirations of the Holy Ghost; and therefore the Church, to assist the Weakness of the one, and to check the Vanity and Presumption of the other, restricted both to the Use of Forms. Thus He.

A very pointed Speech this! But is there the least Footstep in History to support it? Is there the least hint given that the Compilers and Imposers of the Liturgy proceeded upon these Motives? Nay, is it not certain that they had not these Motives to Proceed on? Were the Extemporizers so early, as that the ill Effects of their Extemporizing appeared even before the compiling of the Liturgy? Is it not certain that till the compiling of the Liturgy, and the Primer that went before it, the People still worshiped according to the old Popish Forms? Yes. Every body that knows any thing of the history of the Liturgy knows all this to be true. Is it not strange then that Mr Rhind shou'd abuse his Reader with a whole String of Fictions? I cannot but heartily wish that our Scots Prelatick Writers wou'd consult one another ere they publish their Productions: For, if Mr Rhind is right, he has quite defeat Doctor South, Mr Calder, the late Vindicator of the fundamental Charter, and I know not how many more of 'em, who make Faithfull Camming and Thomas Heath a Jesuite the first Authors of Extemporary Prayer in Q. Elizabeth's Reign, about twenty Years after the compiling of the Liturgy. Plainly, the other Writers of the party make Extemporaty prayer an Invention to put the Liturgy out of Request after it was formed. But Mr. Rhind makes Extemporaty Prayer to have been first, and the Liturgy to have been compiled and imposed on purpose to Remeed the ill Effects of it, and to prevent them for the future. Did ever any party before blow thus cold and hot? Was ever party so doom'd,
as they are, to contradict one another, or to blurt out what comes first, without regarding what they say or whereof they affirm.

Some perhaps may allledge in Excuse of Mr Rhind, that he meant all this of the Scots Liturgy sent down by K. Charles I. Anno 1637. No. Through all his Book he does not so much as once mention that Liturgy; the English Liturgy he does, and sets it in opposition to the Westminster Directory p. 174. Besides, there was no need of the Assistance of the Spirit in composing that: For, except in some things wherein it comes nearer to Popery, and some few other things utterly indifferent, it was copied verbatim from the English Liturgy. And as they did not need, so the Event plainly shewed, that they had not the Assistance of the Spirit either in composing or imposing of it. It was imposed without Law by the Arbitrary Will of the Prince; and I'm sure the Spirit of God never assists Men in illegal practices. And for the Composition of it, 'tis known Archbishop Laud was the Father of it, with the consent of some others no whit better than himself. And that Common Prayer proved indeed the Common Fire of both Nations. 'We shall find them (the Bishops) faith the Excellent Lord Falkland in his forecited Speech, to have kindled and blown the Common Fire of both Nations, to have both sent and maintained that Book; of which the Author, no doubt, hath long since wished with Nero, Utinam nesciisse Literas! And of which, more than one Kingdom hath Cause to wish, that when he wrote that, He had rather burned a Library, tho' of the Value of Ptolemy's.

Plainly the great Intendment of that Book was a Conformity with England, by which we were never much Gainers in former Times; tho' no doubt we shall be so, now that we are upon the Footing of an Union, so legally founded, and whose Articles have hitherto been so sacredly maintained. But enough of this Argument.

Secondly, Mr Rhind argues for the Excellency of the Liturgick Way from Universal Practice. 'It has been, saith he p. 161, undeniably the practice of all Men in all Nations and Ages (if we shall only except these who truly were, or falsely pretended to be inspired) to address the true God, or their supposed Deities, by certain Forms. Mr Rhind is too positive. For as he cannot but know that this has been denied, so, without the Spirit of Prophecy I can foretell,
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foretell, it will be denied to the End of the World. The Practice of all Men, faith he, in all Nations and Ages? Why, first, did our first Parents in the Estate of Innocence worship by Forms? No Man ever dreamed it; and I think Milton would charm any Body from the belief of it by his incomparably beautiful Lines, wherein he describes their Morning Devotions which they payed to their Maker at the Door of their Bower (d).

Lowly they bow’d adoring, and began
Their Orisons, each Morning duly pay’d
In various Stile, for neither various Stile
Nor Holy Rapture wanted they to praise
Their Maker, in fit Strains pronounced or Sung
Unmeditated, such prompt Eloquence
Flow’d from their Lips in Prose or Numerous Verse
More tuneable than needed Lute or Harp
To add more Sweetness...........

This was the Original Practice, and ’tis to that we ought to aspire. 2dly, Did any of the other Antediluvian Patriarchs Worship by Forms? Not a Word of this in the Scripture, and that is the only Book which gives us the History of that Time. ’Tis indeed said Gen. IV. 26. Then began Men to call upon the Name of the Lord. But, waving other Senses of that Text, Bishop Patrick tells us, that a great Number of the Jewish Writers, with whom M. Selden joins in his De Dijs Syris, and the Arabick Interpreter expound it thus Then was there Prophanation by invoking the Name of the Lord vix. by giving it impiously to Creatures. Whether that be the exact right Sense and Translation or not, is not to our present Purpose, yet thence we may gather that ’tis impossible ever to hammer a Liturgy out of it. 3dly, Did Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, or any other down to Moses use a Liturgy or worship by Forms? No. There is not the least Intimation thereof in the Scripture. Here then we find 2000 Years, that is, the third Part of the World’s Age fully spent, without so much as a Hint of Forms. How then could it be the Practice in all Ages to worship by them? Yet further 4dly, Is there any Hint of Forms for the Space of five Hundred
Hundred Years after viz. from Moses to David? 'Tis true we read of a Form of Words used upon some Solemn Occasions, such as the Priest's blessing the People Numb. VI, and the Thanksgiving at the Offering of the First Fruits Deut. XXVI, and when the Ark went forward or rested Numb. X. But, that there was a stated Form for their Daily Service, there is a deep Silence in the Scripture; which is a certain Argument that there was none, seeing the Scripture is so minute in observing Particulars of much less Moment. 'Tis hardly to be thought that the Scripture, which noticed almost every Pin in the Tabernacle, and every Fringe and Plait in the Priest's Vesture, would have omitted the Form of Words to be used in the daily Service, if any such had been prescribed.

As there is no Mention of any Liturgy among God's Peculiar for so long a Time, so, I believe, 'tis as plain that there was none used elsewhere. Homer in his Iliad is the most Ancient, Authentick and Judicious Witness extant of the Devotions of the Pagans both Greeks and Barbarians. He hardly ever brings forth his Heroes to fight, or leads the Armies into the Field, but he sets them a Praying; and indeed he makes Them pray very well according to the then Theology. Yet he never makes the particular prayers of the Heroes, nor even the publick Prayers of the Army such as any Form directed, but such as Their present Circumstances suggested: And Homer knew the Rules of Decorum better than to have made Them pray Extempore, if it had been the then Custom to pray by Form.

Thirdly, He argues for the Preference of the Liturgick Way from Heaven's Approbation of it both under the Old and New Testament p. 162. Well where is this Approbation to be found. 'Why, 'faith he, what else are the greatest Part of the Psalms but Forms of Prayer and Praisés, which were compos'd for, and used in the Service of the Temple? Right. And the Presbyterians make use of them to this Day in their publick Worship as much, perhaps more than ever the Jews did. So that thus far we are for Forms as much as they. And 'tis a most horrid and gross Calumny, that the Presbyterians as't the Unlawfulness of set Forms.* I desire the Reader to advert to this, because, not only Mr Rhind, but his whole Fellow Writers charge them with it, without so much as offering

---

*NB: The asterisked text is not clearly visible in the image.
at Proof of it. The restricting either Ministers or People to Forms, to pray so and no otherwise, they avow to be impious Tyranny: But, that Forms are in themselves unlawful, they never asserted. Besides, it is ridiculous to argue from inspired Forms to Human Compositions. But, adds Mr Rhind, the Jews used Forms of their own Composition in the Synagogue, where our Lord was so often present, and yet he never declared against them. But 1st, Why did not Mr Rhind point us to where these Forms might be found? There is not the least Mention of them in the Four Gospels. The curious, faith he, may consult them in the Original Hebrew, or as they are translated into the more known Languages. But why did he not name the Book? Every Body knows that many of their pretended ancient Forms of Devotion are mere Forgeries. And their Modern Forms are ridiculous in the last Degree. 2dly, Why has he not proved that these Synagogue Forms were imposed, and that such as officiate were restricted to them? Without this his Argument signifies nothing. 3dly, Was every Thing lawful which our Lord did not declare against? By the Law of God the High Priesthood was fixed in the eldest of Aaron’s Family. In Christ’s Time it was set to Sale in the most mercenary Manner. Caiaphas was both Sacrilegious and an Usurper. But where did Christ declare against either the Person or the Practice? But, urges he, Christ himself prescribed a Form, which is a precedent, whereas for the Extemporaneous Way there is neither Precept nor warrantable Example in the Scripture. Is not this strange Confidence? Are there no Examples of Prayer in the New Testament but the Lord’s Prayer? Is there the least Hint that any one of them was made by a Form? Is there the least Hint that the Lord’s Prayer itself was used as a Form? Does he think none of the Prayers in the New Testament were warrantable? Let him find, if he can, from the Beginning of Matthew to the End of the Revelation, so much as any one Prayer made by a Form, and I’ll quit him the Cause? Even the Lord’s Prayer itself when it was prescribed by Christ, yet was not put up to God by Him; nay indeed He could not put it up to God. He could not say forgive us our Sins, because He had no Sin to be forgiven. And as for His Prayer in the Garden, will any Man say that Christ followed a Form in it? Nay indeed is not an Agony incompatible with a Form? A Form is too cold a Kind of
of Service for such a violent Exercise of the Soul. Besides, it is certain that Christ did not thrice repeat the same Prayer in the same very Words. Nor does the Scripture assert any such Thing, as has been lately made out (e) beyond Possibility of Reply. And to make an Argument for stated and prescribed Forms, as Mr Rhind does p. 173, and his Brethren commonly do, from the Apostles using frequently the same Form of Blessing, is below even Meaness itself. The Apostle Paul himself does not always use the very same Words, and the Apostles Peter and John differ in their Words both from him and from one another. Suppose they had all three used the same Words always, it could not have so much as the Semblance of an Argument for a Liturgy.

Fourthly, He argues for the Liturgick Way from the Usage of it in the Primitive and Ancient Church. Certain stated Forms, faith he p. 166, being then universally used in the most solemn Administrations. It were some Comfort to have to do with an Adversary who at least pretended to Proof; but, to be obliged still to dispute against mere Assertion, is the most irksome Thing in the World. Our Episcopal Liturgists, a considerable while ago, gave Advertisement to the Nation (f) that they were to reprint a Body of Liturgies, to shew (I keep their own Words) that in all Churches and Ages of Christianity Liturgies have been used. They were instantly taken up on this (g) and desired to begin at the Right End, and to publish the Liturgies of the three first Centuries, which would be a more prevailing Argument with the Presbyterians, then the Liturgies of ten Centuries immediately back from our selves can be. But Nothing of this have they done, And I am very well assured it cannot be done. They are so far from being able to give us the Liturgies of all Churches, that I here defy them to give us the Liturgy of any one Church through the Broad Earth during that Period. But this is the ordinary Politick of the Writers of that Side, to gull their Lay Friends with Promises of what every Man in the World, who knows any Thing of these Matters, knows to be impossible to be performed. Certainly the Lord's Supper is the most Solemn of all the Christian Administrations; and if prescribed Forms had been used any

---

[g] See Letter to a Friend concerning M. Calder's Return p. 15.
any where, they wou'd be most likely to be found there. The Liturgical Party then is desired, as they value the Reputation of their Judgment or Learning, and as they wou'd not be held for mere Quacks and Mountebanks, to publish the prescribed Forms that were used in the Administration of the Lord's Supper for the first three Centuries: Nay, to make their Task easier, to prove that there were prescribed Forms used in the Administration of it. In the mean Time let the Reader say, what unparalleled Confidence it was in Mr. Rhind, to boast of universal Usage, and yet not to adduce so much as one small Instance for the Proof of it. But there is a People in the World that make Lies their Refuge, and therefore we are not to wonder at it.

Lastly, He argues from the Practice of the Reformed Churches p. 167. It is very true the Reformed Churches have their Liturgies. But I have already * proved, that the Scots were not restricted to Knox's Liturgy, but allowed to use their own Freedom. The Like is plainly observable in the Belgick, French, Geneva and German Liturgies. Nay some of the foreign Liturgies are not so much Liturgies as Directories. Such is the Liturgia Tigurina published by Lavater. The Reformers found it necessary in the Beginning of the Reformation, both upon the Account of People's Ignorance, being newly come out of the Popish Darkness, and upon the Account of their having been accustomed to Forms, to continue on in the same Method of Worship; and Things not being yet come to a Settlement in England, and the Clergy being exceeding weak, Calvin in His letter to the Protector advised a stated Form of Prayers: But that, when Things are brought into a regular Channel, and the Church furnished with able Ministers, They shou'd yet be bound up from praying to God as His Spirit should direct them, and as the emergent Necessities of their People might require, the Reformers never intended, Calvin never advised. On the contrary, immediately after he has advised the Protector to settle a stated Form of Prayers; he excites him, by all Means to seek out for able Ministers, that so the Native Vigour of the Gospel might not languish through Occasion of that Poli-

* See before P. 8.
Political Settlement (h). So much for Mr Rhind's Arguments for the Liturgick Way, which this Nation, I'm sure, has no Reason to be fond of, when 'tis remembered that we never knew in earnest, from the first Dawning of the Reformation, what War, Confusion and Bloodshed meant, till a certain Headstrong Party would needs impose it upon us in an Arbitrary Manner, and restrict the Nation to it, not only without Reason or Argument, but even without Shadow of Law.

He proceeds next p. 169 &c to answer the Objection against restricting People to Forms viz. that they hint the Spirit. And in Answer to this he absolutely denies that the Spirit of God dictates the Substance and Manner of Prayer. A Doctrine hitherto, I believe, unheard of among Christians. For, it is one of the peculiar Titles of the Holy Ghost to be filled the Spirit of Supplication, because of that special Influence which He hath in the bestowing of this Gift. And as a Spirit of Grace and Supplication He is promised Zech. XII. 10. to all God's People. And Gal. IV. 6. it is given as the Character of all true Christians that God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into their hearts crying Abba Father. But Mr Rhind does not find this Gift Viz. the Spirit of prayer enumerated I Cor. XII. among the other extraordinary Gifts which were bestowed upon the Church at Pentecost. No Wonder truly. For it is none of the extraordinary Gifts, but what every good Christian, without Exception, is endued with. Nor did ever any Man (before Mr Rhind) that worshipped the true God, since the Creation of the World deny, that ever there was any good Prayer which was not suggested by the Spirit of God. But why do I speak of the Worsippers of the TRUE GOD? Even the Pagan Idolaters had a better Sense of Religion than Mr Rhind. Thus Homer in his ninth Iliad brings in old Phænx Preaching to Achilles.

Prayers are the Daughters of Almighty Jove. Upon which Madam Dacier comments thus. For 'tis God inspires Prayers, and teaches Men to Pray. The Apostle Paul affers expressly Rom. VIII. 26. That
we knew not what we should pray for as we ought: But that the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities and maketh Intercession for us with Groans that cannot be uttered. But if, according to Mr Rhind's Doctrine, the Spirit dictates neither Matter nor Words, neither Substance nor Manner of Prayer, how can he be said to help our Infirmities? Mr Rhind saw how crost this Text lay to his Doctrine, but, to avoid the force of it, he puts such a Comment upon it as was never heard of before, such a Comment as is heretical in the highest Degree, nay such a Comment as subverts the very Foundation of the Gospel. Plainly, he affirms that Men's Fervency and Sincerity in prayer is the sole Effect of their own Endeavours: And that the Office of the Holy Ghost is not to excite to, or assist in Prayer, but to intercede for the Acceptance of it.

That I may not be thought to aggravate Matters, take his own Words p. 170. 171.

And if the Spirit helpeth our Infirmities, it is supposed that we do something our Selves, and that whatever is wanting to make our prayers acceptable, that, and that ONLY the Spirit supplies.

Now, that the Spirit does not furnish the Matter or Words of our prayers, appears from the very Text, where we are told, that the Assistance which it affords, is its Intercession, which is not made in Words, but with groanings that cannot be uttered. Thus You see this Text is so far from serving their purpose, that it rather proves against them; seeing it plainly supposeth that Men use their Endeavours: Now what Endeavours can they use, but to prepare the Matter, to reduce it to a Form, and to carry along with them as much Fervency and Sincerity as they can, AND THEN THE HOLY GHOST DOES IN AN INEFFABLE MANNER INTERCEDE FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE WHOLE. Thus he.

Here is Doctrine for Christians with a Witness. First an absolute Denial of all Internal Operation of the Spirit of God in us; not only in Opposition to the Scripture, which he appears to have no Regard to; but in direct Contradiction to the English Liturgy which teaches * that all Holy Desires proceed from God. Secondly, An inverting the Office of the Persons in the Sacred Trinity, by making

* Second Collect at Evening Prayer.
making the Holy Ghost our Mediator for Acceptance instead of Christ. Hear Dr Whitby on the forecited Text. 'The Spirit of God, saith He, is said to interceded for us, not as an Advocate or Mediator betwixt God and us, that being the office of our great High Priest, but as an Exciter or Director of us in our Addresses to God, to render them for MATTER according to the Will of God, and for MANNER fervent and effectual. Thus He in a peremptor Contradiction to Mr Rhind's Doctrine. To Dr Whitby let us join Bishop Wilkins (i) 'The Spirit of God, faith he, must be our Guide and Assistance in this Duty. He must help our Infirmities and make Intercession for us. Not that the Holy Ghost is our Mediator of Intercession, that is properly the Office of the Son, who is therefore still'd our Advocate. There is one Mediator betwixt God and Man the Man Christ Jesus. 'Tis He only that in Respect of His Merits and Sufferings does make Intercession for us Rom. VIII. 34. But now, because the Spirit of God does excite our Hearts to pray, and infuse in us Holy Desires, stirring us up to, and instructing us in this Duty, therefore he is said to interceded for us. Thus he, And thus all the Christian World ever taught.

And thus now I have laid out this Particular with all Fairness. * Mr Rhind's Doctrine is evidently Heretical and subversive of the Gospel: And I lay it before the Episcopal Clergy for their Censure. If they shall in a publick Manner disown it, it is not to be imputed to them, nor any more Noise to be made about it. But if not, they must excuse us, if we look upon them as Abettors of the avowed Enemies of Christianity.

Whatever else Mr Rhind has advanced on this Head is like the Talk of a Man troubled with a Delirium. Such as first, that Means are useless if our Prayers be immediately inspired, and that they ought to be registered among the infallible Dictates of the Spirit which the Modern Prophets pretended to. p. 171, 172. For, the Presbyterians neither do, nor ever did pretend to an unerring Dictament of the Spirit in their Prayers, but to such gracious Infusions, Excitations and Directions, in the Use of Means, both as to the Matter and Manner of our prayers, as we have just now heard Dr Whitby and Bishop Wilkins pleading for. And as to the Modern Prophets, he ought, out of Respect to

\[ i \] Ubi supra p. 45.
to his own Party, to have been silent about them, seeing all their
Proselytes were gain'd from the Episcopal Side, according to the best
Information I can have. Of the same Nature is what he says. 3dly, 'That
the Presbyterians can have no Title to the Influences of the Spirit,
because they have departed from the Communion of the Church p.
172. I hope indeed there is no Presbyterian within the Communion
of Mr Rhind's Church. For, to deny the Assistance of the Spirit as to
the Matter and Manner of our Prayers, making them the Fruit of
our own Endeavours allenearly; and to assign to the Spirit the
Office (which is Christ's peculiar) of pleading with God for his Accep-
tance of our Prayers; is, I affirm, such execrable Doctrine, as is inco-
sistent with the Possibility of Salvation, if continued in. To as good
Purpose is what he adds. 3dly, 'That the Presbyterians praise God by
certain Forms, without Regard to the Stiming of the Spirit, when
'tis undeniable that the Spirit can as freely dictate Prases as Prayers,
and Metre as well as Prose. p. 173. Right, he can do so. And has he
not dictated the Matter of the Psalms? And does he not assist as to
the Manner, I mean, with Fervency and Sincerity in singing 'em? And
is not every Minister in his Congregation left at Freedom to pitch
upon such a Portion of 'em, for the Spiritual Solace of his People, as the
Spirit of God, in the Use of rational Consideration, suggests to him
to be most suitable to their Case? Here is all the Freedom was
ever pleaded for by the Presbyterians. Whereas by the Liturgy Min-
isters are oblig'd to such particular Psalms according to the Day of
the Month appointed by the Book, how unsuitable soever they may
be to the present Case of the Congregation. 4thly, He would know
of his Adversaries what they understand by Stiming the Spirit. p. 173.
He had Reason indeed to ask them, because 'tis very plain he himself
knew not. I can impute it to nothing but Vapours, that he imagines
they constitute the Spirit of Prayer in a Freedom of Changing the
Phrases, and transposing the Petitions. But I shall explain the Mat-
ter to him by some few Instances which may make it easily under-
stood. A Minister, I shall suppose, is to meet with his Congregation
for worshipping God. Before he comes forth to them, he has taken
Pains to get his Soul impressed with a deep Sense of the particular
Sins and Wants of the People committed to his Charge. When he
is come to Church; according to the Presbyterian Way, he is at Free-
dom in Prayer to break out into a particular Confession of their Sins
with
with their particular Aggravations; and to make a particular Representation of their Cafe before God, and to use such pleadings with him for them, as are warranted or preceded in Scripture, and to the like Cafe. This is surely the most reasonable Service, most acceptable to God, and most likely to affect & edifie both the Minister and People. But on the other Hand, by the Liturgick Way a Minister must not so much as venture on any Thing of this, but is obliged to content himself with that dry and general Confession which is in the Book, and under all the Pains of Nonconformity; which, how heavy they are, many Thousands have felt, in the Ruin of all their Worldly Concerns. Is not this a Stinting of the Spirit with a Witness.

Cant is a Term of Reproach, which the Episcopalians (Mr Rhind too among the rest p.190,197.) never fail to twit the Presbyterian's with. This they improve so mightily upon, that if some Young Fellow of 'em, when setting out into the World, have pick'd up that word anywhere where at a Conversation over a Bottle, the empty Thing concludes himselfe stock'd, and strait Commences both Wit and Atheist upon it; and thenceforth pronounces all serious Piety especially the Presbyterian prayers to be CANT; because forsooth, there was one Mr Cant once a Presbyterian Minister at Aberdeen. I confess it is not through any Defect of Duncery, any more than of Debauchery, that they talk at this Rate. Cant is truly a Term borrowed from the Begging Trade. When the idle feigned Fellows are got into, and Chime over to every Passenger, a Rote of Words, not which the sense of Want suggests; but which they have contrived and Conn'd for their purpose. This is indeed Cant, and there is too much Cause to impute this to the Liturgick Worship, where they still Tone over the self same thing the self same Way, whatever Disposition they find their Souls in. But on no Account can it be charged on the Presbyterian Way, even in Sense much less in Justice: For it is their Cafe and their Want which is their Prompter; and they think it a ridiculous thing to be obliged to Beg by Rule*. Yet further, that I may make Mr Rhind understand what the Presbyterian

* Men moverat quippe, et Cantes in Nun fugavus a'sem
Protulcrim? Cantas, cum fufa te in trabe pictum
Ex humero portes. Verum, necnoce patrum
Florabis, qui me volet incurvasse quarta.

Fers. Sac. I. L. 82.
sbyterians mean by 

flinting the Spirit, I shall suppose the Minister has read the Morning Prayers in the Liturgy with his Congregation; and now he intends to Preach to them. Is it not reasonable that, ere he begin, he should put up a particular petition for Assistance, to himself in speaking, and to the people in hearing? There is no such petition in the prayers which he has read; and if he venture upon a prayer of his own; afraid all the Highflyers are on his Back, and Dr South tells him, (k) that it is a senseless and absurd practice, and that the Canons and Constitutions of the Church are not responsible for it; And he shall be sure not to escape without being branded for a Puritan. The same will his Fate be, if he adventure to pray over his Sermon after he has preached it. We heartily desire (said the Eleven Bishops and the other dignified Clergy at the Savoy Conference) (l), that GREAT Care may be taken to suppress those private Conceptions of prayer BEFORE and AFTER Sermon (m). Is not this to flint the spirit. Are general petitions enough, as Mr Rhind would persuade us p. 174. When we are called to be particular? If so, then I propose this prayer as sufficient for the whole. Almighty and Mercifull God, we beg that Thou may give us whatever thou knowest to be necessary and convenient for us, through Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen. I'll undertake, this prayer is as comprehensive, not only as any, but even as all the prayers of humane Composure in the Liturgy: Yet who would endure to be restricted to such a General? Yet further, when People are restricted to the Liturgick Way, not only necessary Petitions are omitted, but they are oftentimes forced upon Petitions which are either absurd in themselves, or against which their Conscience recoils, so that they cannot put them up in Faith. To give an Instance or two, When the Prince of Orange landed in England 1688, 'tis very well known the Body of the English Clergy favoured his Attempt, yet for several Months after, they not only were obliged in Law, but actually did pray for K. James, begging in the Words of the Liturgy, that God would confound the Devices of his Enemies. Once more, When Prince George of Denmark Her Majefty's Husband was dead, the Clergy continued as formerly to pray for Issue to
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[m] See second Dialogue on the Liturgy, p. 6. 7.
to her Majesty, till that Clause of the Liturgy was discharged by
an Order of the Council. This is no Secret, for we had it in the
Publick News Prints. Were these Petitions either reasonable or
decent? I hope by this Time Mr. Rhind understands what the
Presbyterians mean, when they say the Spirit is stinted by Forms.
5thly, He Objects p. 174. that ' if the preparing the Substance of
a Prayer does stint the Spirit, then are they who are obliged to
follow the Westminster Directory, no less guilty than they who use
the Liturgy of the Church of England. ’Tis answered. No Man
is obliged to follow the Westminster Directory so closely, but that he
may leave out some of the Petitions mentioned in it, or insert others
as in prudence he shall think meet. Thus It self directs, ‘ We
judge this to be a Convenient Order, in the Ordinary publick
Prayers, yet so, as the Minister may defer (as in prudence he
shall think meet) some part of these petitions, till after his Ser-
mon, or offer up to God some of the Thanksgivings hereafter ap-
pointed in his prayer before his Sermon. And as to the very
Words in the Directory, the Minister is not at all restrained to them,
but only to call upon the Lord to this Effect. ’ But Mr. Rhind was re-
solved to be throughout Chimerical. Lastly, He objects p. 176.
‘ that all publick Prayers are unavoidably Forms to the Congrega-
tion, and therefore stint the Spirit as much as any Liturgy in the
World. Senseless Stuff! The people meet in the Congregation not
to offer up their own Separate Prayers, but to join with the Minister,
who is their Mouth to God in prayer, as he is God’s Mouth to them
in Preaching. There is then Nothing required of them, in that Case,
but Fervency and Sincerity in joining with the petitions that are
put up for them; nor does the Spirit operate other wise, in that Case;
than to help them to such Sincerity and Fervency, not at all to sug-
gest to them Prayers of their own distinct from the publick Prayers.

Thus now I have gone through Mr. Rhind’s Arguments which
the’ contemptible in the last Degree, yet are not only the best, but
indeed the whole of what the party have to offer. They are either ig-
norant of, or willfully mistake the Presbyterian principles concerning:
prayer, and then instead of disputing against them, they dispute
against their own Frantick Notions. They still dispute as we heard
Mr. Rhind doing, against the Infallible Inspiration of the Spirit in
prayer.
Defence of the

Prayer. But such as cannot conceive, how one may be assisted by the Spirit either in Prayer, or indeed in any Holy Exercise, without being under his infallible Conduct so as to be kept altogether from Error or Imperfection, such, I say, who cannot conceive this are beyond arguing with, and should be left to themselves. That every good Man is acted by the Spirit of God, is the common Belief of the whole Christian World. But if any Man should deny this, and allledge that it would follow thence, that every good Man were perfect and infallible, what else should people do but pity and pray for the foolish Objector? How often does the Church of England Her self pray for INSPIRATION? Thus in the Collect before the Communion, Cleanse the Thoughts of our Hearts by the INSPIRATION of Thy Holy Spirit. Thus in the Collect on the fifth Sunday after Easter, Grant to us thy humble Servants, that by Thy holy INSPIRATION we may think those things that be Good. Thus in the prayer for the whole State of Christ's Church Militant—Befeeching Thee to INSPIRE continually the Universal Church with the Spirit of Truth. Does any Body think that those prayers import an Infallible Guidance and Assistance? As little do the Presbyterians mean, that They are under an Infallible Conduct, when They say Their prayers are Inspired. But our Scotch Episcopal Clergy neither know the Scriptures nor indeed the English Liturgy which they are so fond of. Let them tell us in what Sense they understand what is said in the Preamble to the Liturgy, viz. That by an Uniform Agreement it was concluded on BY THE AID OF THE HOLY GHOST, and then we shall easily explain to them how our Prayers are Inspired.

I shall conclude my Defence of CONCEIVED Prayer (which I have hitherto call'd Extemporaneous, only in Compliance with Mr. Rhina's Phrase) with the Words of Bishop Wilkins, who at once shews the Meanness of Mr. Rhina's Objections, and reproves the Prophaneness of his Spirit (n).

But now, in the Second Place, for any one so to sit down and satisfy himself with this Book-Prayer, or some prescript Form, as to go no farther, this were still to remain in his Infancy, and not to

[n] Ubi Supra p. 9. 10,
to grow up in his new Nature: This would be, as if a Man
who had once need of Crutches, shou’d always afterwards make
use of them, and so necessitate himself to a continual Impotence.
’Tis the Duty of every Christian to grow and encrease in all the
parts of Christianity, as well Gifts as Graces; to exercise and im-
prove every Holy Gift, and not to stifle any of those Abilities
wherewith God hath endued them: Now how can a Man be
said to live suitable unto these Rules, who does not put forth
himself in some Attempts and Endeavours of this Kind? And
then besides, how can such a Man suit his Desires unto several
Emergencies? What one saies of Counsel to be had from Books,
may be fitly applyed to this Prayer by Book; that it is commonly
of itself, something Flat and Dead, floating for the most part too
much in Generalities, and not particular enough for each several
Occasion. There is not that Life and Vigour in it to engage the
Affections, as when it proceeds immediately from the Soul it self,
and is the Natural Expression of those particulars whereof we
are most sensible. And if it be a Fault not to strive and labour
after this Gift, much more is it to jeer and despise it by the Name
of ex Tempore Prayer, and praying by the Spirit; which Expressi-
ons (as they are frequently used by some Men by Way of Re-
proach) are for the most part a Sign of a * Prophane
Heart, and such as are altogether Strangers from the
Power and Comfort of this Duty. Thus Bishop Wil-
kins. And had others, more nearly concerned, treated Mr. Rhind
with the same Freedom, he had never publish’d such a Book, so
much to the Scandal of Religion and the Shame of the Party He
writes for.

---

N. B.
S E C T. II.

Wherein Mr Rhind’s Objections against the Presbyterian Doctrine concerning the Sacraments, and his Exceptions against their Manner of Dispensing them, are considered. From P. 177 to P. 185.

To Begin with Baptism. Concerning this Mr Rhind afferts roundly and without Fear First, That Baptism with Water is indispensably Necessary, seeing without it none can reasonably expect to be baptized with the Spirit, or that they shall enter into the Kingdom of God, nay that, if God’s extraordinary Mercy does not interpose, they shall be damned without it. Secondly, That the Water is the Vehicile of the Spirit, and that the inward Grace does always accompany the outward Mean, when it encounters with no Renitency in the Recipient. Having laid down these Principles, He objects First, That the Presbyterians teach that Baptism is of no Efficacy. Secondly, That they suffer Children to die without it. Thirdly, That their Confession of Faith, whereof some Doctrines are dubious and some impious and false, is the Creed into which they baptize. Fourthly, That the genuine Presbyterian urge the Obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant, and press it as a necessary Condition of the Child’s Admission to Baptism.

As for his First Affection. That Baptism with Water is indispensibly necessary, it is directly Popish. The Presbyterians willingly grant that the Contempt or willfull Neglect of Baptism is damnable, I mean, in an adult Person, or to the Parent who neglects to procure it for his Child. But that the meer Want of it is damnable to the Child, or to an adult Person when he cannot have it in an orderly Way.
Way, that is, according to Christ's Institution, this I affirm is a damnable Error, an Error which gives one the most unworthy Notions of God, an Error which hath been the fruitfull Mother of many others and of the most scandalous Practices. It is to this Error the Limbus Infantum owes its Being, to this is owing the Practice of Lay Baptism by Women as well as Men in the Church of England; yea by Jews, Turks and Pagans, as well as by Christians, as is allowed in the Church of Rome. It is to this Error these hasty Baptisms are owing, where there is no Profession by, no Sponsor for the Party baptized; than which there can hardly be a greater Scandal on the Christian Religion. For, it exposes that Holy Mystery to the same Reproaches wherewith the Heathen Lustations were so justly loaded *. But I need not insist on this. The excellent Forbes a Corse before cited has sufficiently exposted that execrable Doctrine at large in Six Chapters (o). The Church of Rome has found it too hard for her to answer him on that Head. But indeed there is nothing too hard for our Modern Episcopalians, who do all their Business by Assertion, Proofbeing too great a Drudgery.

Mr Rhind's Second Assertion is like unto the First. When the Council of Trent decreed (p) That the Sacraments confer Grace non ponentibus Obicem, it gave Scandal to all the World: For it turns these sacred Ordinances into mere Charms. Yet Mr Rhind has new vamped it, requiring Nothing else but a Non. Repitency in the Recipient, whereas the Scripture expressly requires the positive Qualifications of faith and Repentance. Yea, the Scots Episcopal Liturgy supposes these Qualifications even in Infants. Thus in the Catechism.

Q. What is required of Persons to be baptized?
Ans. Repentance, whereby they forfake Sin, and Faith, whereby they steadfastly believe the Promises of God, made to them in the Sacrament.

Q. Why then are Infants baptized, when by Reason of their tender Age they cannot PERFORM them?

Mm  Ans.

* Omne movens, omnemque malis purgamine causiam
  Credere nobis sitque posse Sines.
  Gracia principium moris sui: illa necentes
  Impia lustrare ponere facta putat.
  Ab nimium faci esset, quae tanta crimina cadit
  Flumina tolli posse putatis aquae.
  Ovid. Fast. Lib. II.

Sacramentis in Generis.
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Anf. Yes: They do PERFORM them by their Sureties; who promise and vow them both, in their Names: Which when they come to Age, themselves are bound to perform.

Thus also it was in the English Liturgy, but after the Restauration they altered it, and dath'd out the Word PERFORM in the beginning of the answer to the last Question. And they had good Reason to do so: For a vicarious Performance of Faith and Repentance is a pretty dark Mystery. I'm sure it would be Nonsense in a Presbyterian; and yet the Alteration they have made mends not the Matter a Whit. But that is not it we are at present concern'd about, 'tis plain that the Doctrine of Non-Renivency is a Stranger to the Scriptures. But Mr Rhind was for bruising forward in his Chat; displease whom he will, he has the Church of Rome on his side. So much for his Assertions. Next to his Objections.

First, He objects, That the Presbyterians teach that Baptism is of no Efficacy p. 178. What Answer is to be given to this? None so proper as that of the Psalmist, What shall be given unto thee? Or what shall be done unto Thee, thou false Tongue? Sharp Arrows of the Mighty, with Coals of Juniper. Ps. CXX. 3, 4. Hear the Presbyterians declare themselves in their Confession of Faith (q). 'The Efficacy of Baptism is not tyed to that Moment of Time wherein it is administred: Yet, notwithstanding by the Right Use of this Ordinance, the Grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of Age, or Infants) as that Grace belongeth unto, according to the Counsel of God's own Will, in his appointed Time. The Presbyterians have no where declared that any baptized Infants are Damned: But to assert, as the English Liturgy does (r), 'That Children which are baptized dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly saved, is so far from being certain by God's Word, that I affirm there is not one Title from the Beginning of Genesis to the End of the Revelation to support it. God has his own Way of dealing with

with Infants, which we are sure is most just and Holy. But it is secret to us. And therefore to determine, that all that die in that State unbaptiz'd are damn'd, and that all that are Baptized are undoubtedly saved, is very high Presumption. 'Tis a very usual Thing among the Popish Missionaries to Baptize the Infants of the native Indians Clanculary, without the Knowledge or Consent of their Parents, when They can find any secret Occasion. Will any Protestant determine, that such of them thus baptized as die in their Infant State are therefore undoubtedly saved? Must the absurd and unwarrantable Action of a vagrant Fellow conclude God as to the Disposal of His Creatures? This is such nonsensical Doctrine as is fit only for the Church of Rome which God has given up to Delusions.

Secondly, He objects, 'That the Presbyterians cruelly suffer wretched Children to die without Baptism, than which Nothing can be more opposite to the Doctrine of Christ who expressly says John III. 5. 'That except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. Might not one have expected, that he would have adduced so many Instances as might have made his Charge presumably true, and justified it so far, as that it might affect the Body of the Presbyterians? Nay but he has not even offered at so much as one Instance. 'Tis very true Presbyterian Ministers will not baptize Children in a Hurry, nor content themselves with pronouncing the solemn Words without a previous Profession or Sponson. And in this both Scripture and Reason justify them. They are still ready to baptize Children, when 'tis desired, in a regular and orderly Way: But, when it cannot be done but in such a Manner as represents Baptism as a Charm, and exposes the Christian Mysteries to the Contempt and Reproach of profane Persons; they don't think it lawfull for them to dispence it, and herein they are Justified by Bishop Hull (5) who expressly says, that as Baptism is not to be negligently deferred, so 'tis not to be superstitiously hastened. But, which is of much more Import, they are very sure that, in such a Case, the Want of Baptism is not prejudicial to the Salvation of the Child;
For it were most horrid to think, that a Mercifull God shou'd damn Infants for what was not their own Fault in any Respect.

As for that Text which Mr Rhind insists on Except a Man be born &c it is most ridiculously applied in this Case. For that, as well as all Scripture Declarations of the like Nature are calculated, not for Infants, but for adult Persons and such as are come to the Exercise of their Reason. To such it is not only necessary (as it is also to Infants) that they be internally sanctified, but also that they make an outward Profession by receiving Baptism. For Christ will own none for his Disciples that are ashamed of Him before Men. Plainly, the Import of that Text may be easily gathered from the Occasion of it. Nicodemus was a discreet Person, and had a honourable Opinion of our Saviour, that He was a Teacher come from God. But then he had come to Jesus by Night, which argued that he was timorous, and loath to profess publicly the inward Sentiments of his Soul. Wherefore Christ knowing his weak Side, and understanding the Reason of his Night Visit, instantly and at first Dafh tells him the Uselessness of internal Perswasion without an open Profession; that it was necessary he should be born again (which is a Phrase taken from the Jewish Doctrine about Proselytism) not only of the Spirit by Sanctification and the renewing of the inner Man, but of Water too by an open and undaunted Profession before the World, of which Baptism would be the Badge and Token, without which latter he cou'd not own him for His Disciple, any more than without the former. This is the plain Sense of that Text; but what Relation has this to Infant Baptism, which is not founded upon that Text, nor indeed reasonably can be, but upon other Scripture Grounds which I need not now mention. And that the said Text does not prove the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptism, I shall produce the Judgment of two Bishops. The First is of Hopkins late Bishop of London-Derry in his Sermon upon it. Having narrated that Comment upon it which Mr Rhind has given us, He adds. ' But this Opinion is unwarrantable, and contrary to the received Judgment of the Church in the Primitive Times, who, if they had thought the baptismal Regeneration was indispensible necessary to Salvation, wou'd not certainly have stnted and confin'd the Administration of it only to two Times of the Year Easter and Pentecost,
Pentecost, thereby to bring upon themselves the Blood of their Souls that should in that Interim have died without Baptism. Thus he. The other is Joseph Hall Bishop of Exeter in his Letter, to the Lady Honoria Hay, just before cited on the Margin. Throughout all that Epistle, which I recommend to the Reader's Perusal, he disputes with the greatest Force of Reason against that Opinion of the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptism, and in Terms calls it The hard Sentence of a Bloody Religion.

All this Doctrine of the Damnation of Infants dying without Baptism is founded upon another false Doctrine licked up by Mr Rhind, viz. That the Water is the Vehicle of the Spirit, and that the very act of Baptism carries always with it an inward Regeneration, and that none can have the Spirit without or before Baptism. This is plainly contrary to the whole Tenor of the Scripture, and tho' it was too early entertained by some of the Fathers, yet, 'tis certain it was not the received Doctrine of the Primitive Church; as, besides many particular Testimonies that might be adduced, will appear from these three general Considerations.

First, It was a very prevailing Custom among them to delay their Baptism till they were in extremis. In some indeed this proceeded from a Tincture of the Novatian Heresy: But others, for Instance, Constantine the Great who was no Novatian, delayed it upon other Considerations. But now, if Christians had believed that they could not have the Spirit, nor be internally regenerated, nor be Members of Christ or the Children of God till they were made such in Baptism, and that they should certainly become such in Baptism; would all the World have been able to persuade them to delay it? 'Tis very hard to think so.

Secondly, The same appears from the History of the Catechumens. During that State they were Probationers, not only as to their Knowledge, but likewise their Piety and Manners; and were obliged, before they could be admitted to Baptism to give moral Evidences of the Grace of God in their Hearts, in a Word to have every Thing in Christianity, but the Solemn Investiture, which both confirmed what they had, and entitled them to further Degrees.

Thirdly, Tho' Infant Baptism was still allowed as lawful in the Catholic
Catholic Church, yet it did not universally obtain for several Centuries; so that (if I am not much mistaken) the necessity thereof was not asserted before the Council of Carthage in the Year 418. Certainly had Christians believed, that the Water is the Vehicle of the Spirit, and that we cannot be spiritually Regenerated without it or before it, and that in the very Act of it we are spiritually Regenerated, they would never have omitted it. I do not adduce this to justify them in that Omission, but only thereby to shew that Mr. Rhind's Doctrine was not the Belief of the Primitive Church as he without proof alludes.

In a Word Faith and Repentance are prerequisite to Baptism in adult Persons at least. If they can have Faith and Repentance without the Spirit and spiritual Regeneration, which is not obtained (as they say) but in and by Baptism, I don't see why they may not go to Heaven without the Spirit or spiritual Regeneration. For I'm sure Repentance towards God and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ is the Sum of the Gospel. But Enough of this for this Time.

Thirdly, Mr. Rhind objects, 'That the Confession of Faith, whereof some Doctrines are dubious, some Impious and false, is the Creed into which the Presbyterians baptize. I answer first, That however dubious, false and impious these Doctrines are, yet I have already proved them to be the Doctrines of the Catholic Church of Christ. 2dly, 'Tis false that the Confession of Faith is the Creed into which they baptize. They baptize into the Belief of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and only declaratively assert Their Confession of Faith to be agreeable thereto. 3dly, Suppose they did baptize into their Confession of Faith, why is not that as lawful as baptizing into the Apostles' Creed? Are they not both humane Compositions? Or does he dream that the Apostles themselves were the Authors of it? But this only ad Hominem. For my own Part I assert, that it is unlawful to baptize into the Belief of any human Composition otherwise than as I have explain'd above.

Lastly, He Objects, 'That the genuine Presbyterians press the 'Obligation of the Solemn League and Covenant as a necessary Con- 'dition of the Child's Admission to Baptism. 'Tis denied, and Mr. Rhind
Rhind is challenged to prove it. I affirm further, that there is no Presbyterian Minister in the Nation who will refuse to baptize in the Terms of the Directory, among which Terms there is not so much as Mention of the Solemn League and Covenant. Mr. Rhind is challenged to disprove this if he can. So much for Baptism.

I proceed next to consider his Objections relating to the other Sacrament viz. The Lord’s Supper. As to this he Ob jects upon. I. The Infrequency of it among the Presbyterians. II. The Indecency with which They celebrate it. III. The hard Terms upon which They admit to it. IV. That it is indeed no Sacrament at all as dispensed by them. Of these in Order.

I. He objects upon the Infrequency of the Lord’s Supper among the Presbyterians. In the Presbyterian Communion, saith he p. 182, my Lot might fall in a Place where the Holy Eucharist would not be administered once in a Dozen of Years. For answer. 1st, Has he given Instance of any such Place? No, not so much as one. 2dly, Suppose he had given one, two, three, nay even a Score of Instances, were the Constitution to be charged with that? There are, no doubt, careless Ministers among the Presbyterians, as well as in other Communions, but none but a mean malicious Soul will load the whole Body with the Defects of a few. 3dly, Was the Episcopal Clergy, during their Reign before the Revolution, less guilty than the Presbyterians are? I am content it be put to a Trial through the Nation. And, to begin the Work; within the Presbytery of Dumbarton, where I serve, there are Seventeen Parishes. I affirm that in these Seventeen Parishes taken complexly, the better to mend the worse, the Communion has been celebrated three times oftener within these Dozen Years last by past, than it was during the whole twenty eight Years under the Episcopal Reign before the Revolution. 4thly, Is the Church of England, to which Mr. Rhind is gone over, innocent in this Particular. Hear Dr. Wetenhall late Bishop of Kilmore in his Book entitled Due frequency of the Lord’s Supper, dedicated to Her Majesty, and printed at Edinburgh 1706: ‘Amongst the Laws of our Church (faith he in his Dedication) as there is none perhaps more excellent and truly Christian, than those touching the Lord’s Supper; so it is hard to assign ANY MORE NEGLECTED, than the
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the Rubricks which injoin Due Frequency of it; and the Neglect
is not only in COUNTRY-PARISHES, but even in some GREAT-
ER CHURCHES. Thus the Bishop. Why then would Mr Rhind
leap out of the Frying Pan into the Fire? Why would he charge
the Presbyterians with that whereof his Brethren both in Scotland and
England have been so notoriously guilty? But, an impudent Way
of writing is become the Characteristick of the modern Episcopal
Authors.

II. He objects upon the Indecency wherewith the Lord's Supper
is celebrated among the Presbyterians. Wherein lyes this Indecency?
Why, saith he p. 182, the Convocation has more of the Conflufion
of a Fair, than of the order and Decency of a religious As-
sembly. And how can it otherwise be, when they not only al-
low, but encourage, on these Occasions, such Rendevouzes of the
promiscuous Rabble, who desert their own Churches, to the great
Hinderance of their Devotion who communicate, and Scandal too,
when they see so many professed Christians neglect their Lords'
express Command of keeping up the Memorial of his Death and
Passion for them. For Answer. Ist, Tis true, Communicants
have been very numerous among the Presbyterians ever since the
Revolution. Not only the Inhabitants of the Parish in which the
Communion is celebrated, but many from the neighbouring Pa-
rishes, attested by their respective Ministers, have usually joined
in it; But is the Numerousness of Communicants either a Fault or an
Indecency? So far from it, that cou'd the whole Christian Church
communicate at once, it wou'd be so much the more of the Nature
of a Communion, and tend so much the more to the Honour of our
Blessed Saviour. But this Objection of Mr Rhind's proceeds from
Silliness, or, which is the same Thing, from Envy; because during
the Episcopal Government, in many Places the Minister and his Family,
with the Sexton and his, and perhaps two or three more made up the
whole Communicants. 2dly, 'Tis true likewise, that there are many
others present oft times besides those that Communicate. But where is the
Harm of this? Does it hinder the Devotion of the Communicants, that
others are looking on them? Is it not rather an Engagement upon Them
to carry Themselves with the more solemn Gravity? Or how can the
presence of such as do not communicate be a Scandal to those
that do? For, tho' They do not communicate at that time, it
cannot
cannot infer a Neglect of our Lord's Command, seeing people are not at all Times in a Frame for Communicating. And when a Minister comes to assist his Neighbour Minister in dispensing the Communion, is it either Fault or Scandal for his People to follow him where they are furnished with Sermon? Is not this better than that they should loiter idly at Home all the Lord's Day, which would be both a Sin in them, and give Scandal to others? But this Objection of his was indeed too mean to have been noticed.

I would only ask Mr Rhind if there are not incomparably greater Indecencies in the Way of the Church of England, to which he has separated. Is it possible there can be a greater Scandal, than to see a known Rake, notour for all Manner of Vice and Leudness, partaking of those holy Mysteries, before he has given the least Proof or Evidence of his Reformation? Yet this is every Day seen in the Church of England, and the Priests cannot, dare not help it.

I am not to allege this without proof, that were the Episcopal Way of writing, which I don't envy, I shall give good and sufficient Documents of it. Mr Bisset a Presbyter of the Church of England has lately told us (t) of a Minister who was warned out of his Living and Life too, for denying the Communion to a Rake, before the Chancellor had excommunicated Him. Again tho' the Rubric require, that so many as intend to be Partakers of the Holy Communion shall signify their Names unto the Curate, at least sometime the day before. Yet (says the same Author p. 51.) 'this is more than I ever knew done. I'm sure 'tis omitted in all or most of the London Churches. Yet further he tells us p. 54 that Dr F----r was suspended for denying the Sacrament to such as only came to it as a Qualification to sell Ale and Brandy. Lastly, he tells us (ibid) of a Solution that was given to one (who doubted of coming to the Communion) in these Words What Damage is it to pledge the Parson in a Cup of Wine, supposing only the Wine be good. To Mr Bisset let us add the Author of The Case of the Regale and Pontificate, who is known to be most violently High Church. He roundly asserts p. 179 'that an Action lies against the Minister who shall refuse
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refuse the Sacrament, to them who he knows, sees and hears in 
their Conversation and Principles, to be never so much unqualifyed. 
These are not Presbyterian Allegiances, but true Episcopal History. 
III. He Objects p. 183. upon the Hard Terms, on which the 
Presbyterians admit to the Communion, in Two Particulars. The 
First, relating to the Persons, the Second to the Posture. First, As 
to the Persons. He alleges They will admit none who in the 
least favour the Hierarchy and Liturgy of the Church of England, 
but Excommunicate them with the vilest Blasphemers and Adul 
terers. I ask him, Does he know any of the Favourers of the Hi 
erarchy and Liturgy who were ever denied the Sacrament on that 
Account? Has he given any Instance of this? Not one. The 
Presbyterians debarr none from Communion with Them in the Sa 
crment, whose Principles and Life do not debarr Them from the 
Christian Communion. They don't look upon that Holy Ordinance 
as the distinguishing Badge of a Party or of any particular Com 
munion of Christians; but as the Common Priviledge of all the 
Faithfull. And therefore They usually Fence the Lord's Table in 
the Words of the Scripture I Cor. VI. 9. Know ye not that the 
Unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God? Be not deceived: Nei 
ther Fornicators, nor Idolaters— or some such like Scripture ; or by go 
ing through the Ten Commandments. If Mr Rhind can name any Pres 
byterian Ministers who do otherwise, I suppose the Church will not 
think herself obliged to defend them. But, to exclude the Impenitent 
Breakers of any of the Ten Commandments from the Priviledge 
of Gospel Mysteries; to debarr those from the Lord's Table, whom 
the Lord has, by the express Sentence of his Word, debared out of 
the Kingdom of Heaven; is, what every one, who is not quite lost 
in Impiety, must own to be not only lawful but a Duty. 

This is sufficient to vindicate the Presbyterians: But who shall 
vindicate the Church of England Constitution? Mr Rhind is the most 
unlucky Man in the World. He has separated from the Presbyterian 
s, upon a Chimerical Imagination of the Narrowness of their Cha 
rity, that they admit none to the Communion, who in the least Fa 
vour the Hierarchy and Liturgy; tho' I suppose, there is no one 
living can bring Instance, where ever they refused it, on that 
Score, to any who desired it: And yet he has gone over to the 
Church of England, whose Divines, I mean the High-Church 
Party
Party of 'em, have declared in the strongest Terms, that they will not admit to it Dissenters or Presbyterians, whom they, in their equally wise and charitable Style, call NOTORIOUS SCHISMA-
TICKS at the same Time that they declare them to be without the Church. This is plain from the Representation made by the lower House of Convocation to the Archbishops and Bishops in the Month of De-
cember 1704, which the Reader may consult. And Mr. Barclay a Teacher of the Party, just come* from London, has told his Mind very honestly in this Case. I shall not, says he *, stick to say that I would not admit a NOTORIOUS SCHISMATICK, to Catholic Communion, till he recanted his Error, upon any consideration of Laws or Statutes. I don't think but Mr. Barclay may be ease on that Head: For, I suppose, these NOTORIOUS SCHISMATICKS he speaks of will not give him much Trouble that Way. However, 'tis plain that High-Church has made the Communion a Badge of a Party. Was not Mr. Rhind then very well advised in going over to Her?

Secondly, As to the Posture. Mr. Rhind Objects, ' That the Pre-
byterians discharge that as Idolatrous, which others think most expressive of their inward Devotion, and debarr such from the Communion who wou'd use it. There is no doubt he means the Posture of Kneeling which is enjoined both by the Scotch Epis-
copal and the English Liturgies. And as to that, I here engage that no one Presbyterian Minister in the Nation shall, on that Ac-
count, refuse the Communion to any Person who can prove, or find any other to prove for him, either 1st, That that Posture was com-
manded by Christ. Or 2dly, That it was used by the Apostles when They communicate in Christ's presence. Or 3dly, That there is any Hint of its Ufage in the New Testament. Or 4thly, That it was praftised in the Primitive Church for the first Five Centuries at least after Christ. If none of these Things can be proved, as I am sure none of 'em can, and which every Writer on the Episcopal Side, of any Character, owns; why shou'd a Church break Her Order to gratify people in their Fancies, when 'tis confessed on all hands That, that Posture of Kneeling in the Sacrament has been used to the most Idolatrous Purposes. But Mr. Rhind allidges
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* Perswasive to the People of Scotland p.167.
That such as are for that Posture are ready to attest the Searcher of Hearts that their Adoration is only directed to the one True and Living God, and His Son Jesus Christ, who is exalted at his Father's Right Hand. I answer. So is the Church of Rome ready to attest with the same Solemnity, That when She worships before the Picture of an Old Man, She does not worship the Image but God the Father by it. Yet who will excuse Her from Idolatry on that Account? And, which renders this Business of Kneeling still so much the more Suspicious, the late Vindicator of the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery is angry at the Rubric in the Liturgy which explains the Reason of Kneeling at the Lord's Supper, and expressly says p. 79. That neither hath the Church gained, nor can the Liturgy be said to have been made better by it. But of this, and the dreadfull Blunder in History he has committed to support this His Opinion, the Reader may perhaps hear more elsewhere. Yet further, why may not Presbyterians confine People to the Table Posture in the Sacrament which the Episcopal Divines themselves own was the Posture used by the Disciples in Christ's presence; when the Church of England confines People to the Posture of Kneeling for which there is no such Warrant, and appoints (v) every Minister to be suspended who wittingly gives the Communion to any that do not Kneel. Some may perhaps think that our Scotch Episcopalians are milder in that Matter, and indeed the above mention'd Vindicator of the Fundamental Charter would have us believe so. 'It is true, saith he p. 34. all communicate in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, kneeling; but I know none, that would deny the Sacrament to one, who could not without Scruple take it in that Posture. This is spoken with Abundance of Gravity, but with what Integrity let the Reader judge, when he considers 1st, That the Rubric in the Scots Episcopal Liturgy is as strict for kneeling as in the English Liturgy. And 2dly, the Scots Episcopal Canon with Respect to that Posture is equally strict with the English, as may be seen both in the Canon itself and in Clarendon's History. Does not this shew their Spirit and Principles, tho' they yield at present to gull unwary People?
Before I proceed to Mr Rhind's next Objection, there is one thing I cannot but take notice of. The Episcopal People have lately caused reprint the Liturgy which was sent down for Scotland by K. Charles I, and which began the Troubles Anno 1637, and I am informed that it is begun to be practised in some of their Meeting Houses instead of the English Liturgy. I think my self obliged in Charity to advertise People, That that Liturgy, in the Office for the Communion, is a great deal worse than the English, and is plainly calculated for Begetting in People the Belief of the Corporal Presence. I shall at this Time give three Evidences of this. 1st, The English Liturgy has a long Rubric declaring that, by the Pottage of Kneeling no Adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporeal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood. The Scots Liturgy neither hath this Declaration, nor any Thing equivalent to it. 2dly, the English Liturgy has a Rubric enjoining the Minister at the saying these Words in the Consecration, When he had given Thanks He brake it, to break the Bread. The Scots Liturgy has no such Rubric, nor any Appointment for breaking the Bread, any more than the Roman Ritual has. 3dly, The English Liturgy enjoins the Minister to deliver the Bread to the People in Order, into their Hands all MEEKLY Kneeling, but the Scots Liturgy Words it, All HUMBLY Kneeling, that we might know They intended Adoration by that Posture, tho' they have not told, to what. I may possibly have Occasion, sometime after this, to shew particularly how much worse the Scotch Liturgy is than the English. But I thought it needfull to give these Hints now, because the Episcopal Clergy bear their People in Hand, that it is upon the Matter one and the same with the English. Particularly Mr Smart, one of their Teachers at Edinburch, in his short Discourse after Sermon, commending the Service told them p 8. 'That there is no Material Difference between the Scotch and English Books of Common-Prayer; and that they differ as little as the Scotch and English Tongues. The first of which Assertions is false, as I have just now made out; and the latter Nonsense. For, so far as it follows the English in Matter, it is the very same in Words and Phrase; and no Wonder, for every Body knows it was of English.
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English Birth, which perhaps made it take so ill with the Scots Air. But enough for Mr Smart, whose Name and Pamphlet are so very ill suited, and whose Character seems to be the very Reverse of the Apostle’s Precept; Being in Understanding a Child, howbeit in Malice he is a Man.

IV. Mr Rhind objects p. 184. That it is no Sacrament at all as dispensed by the Presbyterians. Pray why? There is, faith he, no due Application of the Form to the Matter. Very strange! They always read the Words of Institution either out of the Gospels or out of I Cor. XI. They have still, after our Lord’s Example, a Prayer, Thanksgiving or Blessing of the Bread and Wine. Is not this a due Application of the Form to the Matter? ‘No, saies Mr Rhind, the Form in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, are the same Words by which our Lord did at first constitute the Sacrament viz. Take, eat, This is my Body, Do this in Remembrance of Me, and Drink ye of this Cup, for this is my Blood: Do this as oft as ye Drink it in Remembrance of Me. Very well. Do not the Presbyterians use these Words? Are they not in the Institution? Nay, but, faith he, if they be at all, they ought to be used in that Prayer by which they intend to consecrate the Elements? Is there any Precept for this in the Scripture? No. Any Example there? None. Any Evidence for the Practice, for at least four or five Centuries after Christ, in the Writings of the Fathers? Not any. The first Account we have of it is in the Books of the Sacraments (x) which pass under the Name of Ambrose, and are inserted among his Works. But I hope Mr. Rhind knows that these Books were not writ till some Ages after Ambrose’s Death. And if Mr. Rhind’s Doctrine be true, the Church of England Her self, for a long Time after abolishing the Mass had not the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. For, that which is call’d the Prayer of Consecration, and in which the Words, Take, eat, this is my Body &c are, was not in K. Edward’s first Liturgy: But instantly after the Prayer We do not presume &c. They proceeded to the Distribution. Nay, which is worst of all, we are assured from the Infallible Chair, that the Apostles used no other Prayer of Consecration but the Lord’s Prayer.

[x] Lib. IV, Cap. V.
Prayer (y). And, I suppose ever Body knows that these Words, Take, eat, this is my Body, are not in that Prayer; and I think 'tis plain they were never intended to stand, in that Form, in any Prayer.

But now to gratifie Mr. Rhind, let us suppose that these Words shou'd be in the Prayer of Consecration, what follows? Why, there, faith he, they are never once mentioned by the Presbyterians, and too often there is—Nothing equivalent to supply the Defect. Did he ever consider what he said? Did he ever regard whether it was true or false? Is not every Minister Directed (z) upon that Occasion to pray, 'That God may sanctifie the Elements both of Bread and Wine, and so bless his own Ordinance, that we may receive by Faith the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ crucified for us, and to feed upon Him, that He may be one with us, and we with Him; that He may live in us and we in Him and to Him, who hath loved us and given himself for us. Is not here something equivalent to these Words? And can Mr. Rhind name that Minister who does not pray either thus or to the same Purpose. But proving was none of his Business, all he had to do was to Assert.

I doubt not but after all this the Reader will think strange that Mr. Rhind should have mentioned such an Objection. But the Case is plain, as he was avowedly Popish on the other Sacrament, so is he upon this; and wou'd insinuate upon People the very rational Doctrine of Transubstantiation to be effected by the pronouncing of these particular Words. And Bellarmin led the Way to him (a), so that he has indeed a Man of a very considerable Name for his Master.

Thus now I have gone through the Episcopal Objections against the Presbyterian Worship both as to Prayers and Sacraments. And I hope I have made it plain that there is not any one of the Things objected against, but what (so far as the Objection is true) is so far from being a Ground of Separation; that it is highly justifiable. But then, I must ask Mr. Rhind, why, as he has given us the Grounds of his sepa-

---

Defence of the

Chap. IV.

rating from the Presbyterian Worship, he has not also answered the other half of the Title of his Book, and justified the known Objections against the Worship of that Church whose Communion he pretends to have embraced. I have hinted at several of 'em as I came along, and they may be found more at length in some small Tracts lately published (b). Was there Nothing in the Liturgy that he startled at? I observe, the above cited Mr Smart p. 9. with much Assurance, bids his Audience read it all over, and among all the Prayers that are in it, see if there be any Prayer for the Dead, any worshipping of Images, any praying to Saints and Angels. I do not say that there are any Prayers for the Dead in it, but the Famous Author of the Case stated expressly says p. 189. there are, and proves it from the Order for the Burial of the Dead, and from the Prayer for the Church militant in the Communion Office: I do not say that there is any worshipping of Images in it. But I say, that many of the Common Prayer Books are filled with such Pictures as are condemned by the Homilies of the Church of England, yea and by the High Church Divines themselves; witness the last cited Author (supposed to be Dr Lefly) who, in his Conversation with the Roman Catholick Nobleman, tells him p. 135. We abstain from the Pictures or Images of the Saints in our Churches, because they have been abused to Superstition and to avoid Offence. Now if they are unlawful in Churches, how is it possible they can be lawfull in Books appointed for the Church-Service? That same Author likewise in the same Place approves of the Zeal of Euphianthus, who finding a Linnen Cloth hung up in a Church Door (it is likely to keep out the Wind) whereon was a Picture of Christ or of some Saint, tore it and ordered a dead Corps to be buried in it. And lamented the Superstition he saw coming by these Pictures and Images then beginning to creep into the Church. Yet in England not only the Common Prayer Books, but even the Bible itself is filled with Pictures of Christ and the Saints; witness the Bible, printed London by Charles Bill, and the Executors of Thomas Newcomb deceased Printers to the Queen's most excellent Majesty, 1708. Many Copies of which Impression are stuffed with such Pictures. Are they more innocent in the Bible, than upon a Linnen Cloth

---
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Cloth hanging in the Church Door? Yea, which is most abominable, there are several Obscene Pictures among 'em, particularly that of Noah Uncovered Gen. IX, Lot and his two Daughters Gen. XIX, David and Bathsheba 11 Sam. XI. Finally, I do not say there is any praying to Saints and Angels in the Common Prayer-Book. But I do say, that the consecrating Churches and Days to them, and the appointing particular Offices upon these Days to their Honour is the likest Thing to worshipping them that I can conceive. Besides, did Mr Rhind's nice and scrupulous Conscience never boggle at the Ceremonies of Human Invention? If the Church have Power to institute such, she has certainly Power to make a new Bible; For there is no such Power given her in the old one: Or if there is, certainly Protestants have been much in the Wrong to the Church of Rome. But I am not now to insist on these Things.

CHAP. V.

Wherein Mr. Rhind's Fourth Reason for His Separating from the Presbyterians viz. That Their Spirit is diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel, is Examined. From P. 185.

to the End.

The Meaning of this Reason is, That Presbyterians are incarnate Devils: And the Intendment of it is, That all Persons who regard Conscience or Duty should hang out a Bloody Flag against 'em, and rise up with one accord, and spoil Their Goods and destroy
froy. Their Persons; or, to speak in Dr. Sacheverel's much more elegant Stile, That the Bishops ought to thunder out the Ecclesiastical Anathema's against Them, and let any Power on Earth DARE reverse them; and that the People shou'd treat Them like growing Mischiefs or infectious Plagues *. This is indeed somewhat hard; but such is the Episcopal Charity, such are the mercifull principles wherewith they season Their new Converts, and such is the Ufage we are to expect whenever the Sins of the Nation shall ripen to that Height as to provoke a Holy God to let in Prelacy upon it. But to make way for Particulars.

The Presbyterians neither are nor desire to be of those who justify themselves. They know and confess that there are Tares in Their Field as well as Wheat; and are sensible that They have the utmost Reason to cry with the Publican God be mercifull to as Sinners: But they think it a very shameless Thing in the Episcopalians, that They, shou'd be the first who take up Stones to cast at Them: For, if the Presbyterians are great Sinners, I'm afraid (were that the Enquiry.) the Episcopalians would not be found to be very great Saints.

Our Saviour has given us an excellent Rule whereby to judge of Men's Spirits, By their Fruits ye shall know Them. I hope it needs not be deem'd a Reflection upon Them, or an immoderate flattering of our Selves to affirm, That the Presbyterians, generally speaking, are as Devout towards God, as frequent at Their Prayers; and, to outward Appearance (for God only knows the Heart.) as fervent in Them as the Prelatists. That They swear as seldom by the Name of God, as seldom tear open the Wounds of our Blessed Saviour, and as seldom imprecate Damnation upon Themselves or others as the Episcopalians. That They are as Sober and Temperate, go as seldom Drunk to Bed, are as mild in Their Carriage, as little given to Bullying or Blustering, as those of High-Church. That They are as just in Their Dealings with Their Neighbours, as open Handed to the Indigent, Their Poor as content; Their Rich as Humble, that They make as kind Husbands, as dutifull Wives; as carefull Parents and as obedient Children; as just Masters and as faithful Servants, as those that live in Communion with the Bishop.

* Serm. Falfe Brethren p. 36.
No Man that's capable of making Observations, and is not quite lost to Ingenuity, will deny any of these Things. If I had said more, and affirmed, That ' Outrage, Murder and Assassinations are the known Practice of the Highflayers, as well as of the bigoted Papists, and that Their true Mother Tongue is, I will not fail to cut your Throat by G--d, it would be thought hard; yet I might be very well excused, because Mr. Biffet a Presbyterian of the Church of England has said every Word of it before Me (c).

But, that Mr. Rhind may have all due Advantage against the Presbyterians; There are many Things he has charged Them with as very odious, which They not only freely confess, but boldly avow. Such as, for Instance. First, When He charges Them p. 189. That They believe uncommon Measures of the Spirit of our Lord to be still necessary in the Work of Conversion. The whole Catholic Church of Christ in all Ages still believed so; and I never suspected but that those of the Episcopal Communion had believed so too, till their new Disciple, whom, no doubt, They have instructed in all Their Arcana, inform'd Me otherwise. The Scripture tells us That if any Man have not the Spirit of Christ He is none of His: But to say, that this Spirit is common to all the Baptized Swearers, Curfers, Whoremongers and Adulterers through the Country, or that it is common to such who live in a habitual Neglect of God or Unconcern'dness about their Souls and Eternal State, even tho' They are free of Scandalous Sins, This I judge to be the rankest Blasphemy. And if that Spirit be not common to all such Persons, then certainly it is an uncommon Spirit, or there are uncommon Measures thereof by which good and Pious Men are act'd. Secondly, When He charges Them, ibid, with teaching That the best Actions of Men before the Grace of God are but so many splendid Sins. They own They do believe this, as we have seen before p. 10. the Church of England does. Thirdly, When he charges Them p. 195. That They have a hidden Spice of Devotion in Their Tempers. They are so far from being ashamed of this, that They pray, Would to God there were more of it. Fourthly, When He Charges Them ibid. That upon the Commission of some Grievous Sin, They are affected with horrible Apprehensions. The Presbyterians

own

[ c ] Ubi Supra p. 2.
own that, in that Case, they ought to be so: For, they know that it exposes them to the Wrath of God; and believe, that it is a fearful thing to fall into his Hands. And tho', in that Case, Their Souls (that I may use Mr Rhind's Words p. 189,) and commonly their Bodies too are in the greatest Disorder, yet, they find that the Holy Men of God upon Scripture Record have been the same Way affected in the like Case. Thus David Psal. XXXVIII. 3, 4, 5. There is no Soundness in my Flesh, because of thine Anger: Neither is there any Rest in my Bones, because of my Sin. For mine Iniquities are gone over mine Head: As an heavy Burden they are too heavy for me. My Wounds stink, and are corrupt: Because of my Foolishness. In like Manner Heman Ps. LXXXVIII. 14, 15: Lord why castest thou off my Soul? Why hidest Thou Thy Face from me? I am afflicted and ready to die, from my Youth up: While I suffer thy Terrors I am distracted. The Bishop of Sarum, when instructing Ministers (d) how to deal with those of their People that are troubled in Mind, delivers himself thus. 'Some have committed enormous Sins, which kindle a Storm in their Consciences; and that ought to be cherished, till they have completed a Repentance proportioned to the Nature and Degree of their Sin. Thus he, and thus every one, who is not quite abandon'd of God, would teach. But Mr Rhind is not for having People affected with horrible Apprehensions upon the Commission of grievous Sins, much less for having these Apprehensions cherished till they are brought to Repentance. What Times are we referred to! Fifthly, When he charges them with a serious Air p. 202, with a peculiar Vehemency in Preaching, with a Preciseness of Conversation p. 204, with Discourses of the Love of God and Christ, and sweet Communion with the Father and the Son p. 205. The Presbyterians are so far from being angry at this Charge, that They are sorry there is too little Ground for it; and They are heartily sorry that the Episcopal Clergy shou'd have had so little Regard to Piety, to the Honour of Religion, and to their own Reputation with all serious People, as to have cherished such a Book.

For besides these Instances, Is it possible any thing can be more Prophane, than to jest, as he does p. 194 &c, upon People's Exercise of Soul about their Eternal Concerns? Does not the Apostle com-
mand Timothy i Ep. IV. 7 to Exercise Himself unto Godliness? Nay does he not command all Christians to work out Their Salvation with FEAR and TREMBLING? Has the Episcopal Party found out an easier Way of getting to Heaven? Is it possible any Thing can be more proflane than His charging Presbyterians p. 200. with resolving much of the Spirit of Religion into Amorous Recumbancies, and that They think that They'll recommend Themselves to God after the very same Manner as to their Mistresses? Was not this plainly intended to burlesque the Scripture? Is there any thing more familiar in the Scripture than to represent the Intercourse 'twixt God and the Soul by the Love of the Bridegroom and the Bride, of the Husband and the Wife? And if these study to recommend themselves to each other by an Agreeableness of Temper, and doing what They know will be well-pleasing to each other; is it culpable in the Soul to study to be assimilated to God, to be made Partaker of the Divine Nature, and to do what is well-pleasing in His sight? What are his amorous Recumbancies but a Comical Phrase whereby he designed to ridicule the Scripture Expression Cant. VIII. 5. Leaning upon her Beloved, which is literally the English of it? Is it possible any thing cou’d be more Proflane than to strik at (as he does p. 190) the Work of Regeneration through the sides of the Presbyterians, whom he represents as talking of 'Their feeling, 'the strugglings of the Babe of Grace in the Place of bringing 'forth of Children, a passage, faith be, of the Prophet impertinently 'applied by them to this purpose? For was there ever any Christian that denied the Turning of the Soul to God to be expressed in the Scripture by the Birth of a Child? Don’t the Arminians, Does not the Church of Rome herself own this? And is there not the greatest Reason for it, if we consider either the Difficulty or the Greatness of the Change wrought upon the Soul thereby? Was there ever any Christian who applied that passage of the Prophet to any other purpose than that of the Turning the Soul to God? Even Grotius Himself upon the place applys it thus, 'That Ephraim 'was not wise who so long delayed to repent and turn to God, 'and so to deliver Himself out of his Calamities. Cou’d there be any Thing more Wicked than to load the Presbyterians (as he does p. 197.) with the Scandal of Major Weir that Son of Perdition,
tion, who, faith he, prayed those who joined with him into Raptures: For, supposing it were true he had done so, which yet Mr Rhind and all his Party can never prove, how could this affect the Presbyterians? Was there not a Judas among the Twelve Disciples? Can any Man prove but that He was equally gifted with the Rest? Yet who ever reproached either Christ or the College of the Apostles on his Account? Or who dare say but that God may employ such as are Sons of Perdition themselves as Instruments of Salvation to others? Cou'd any thing be more Wicked than to represent (as he does p. 190, 196) the Presbyterians as doing Execution upon themselves through Despair? There is no doubt but Presbyterians are liable to be oppressed with Melancholy as well as others, and that some in that Communion may sin themselves so far out of the Favour of God, as that in his just Judgment he may give them up as a Prey to Satan. But why shou'd the Presbyterian Spirit be reproached with this? Tho' the News Prints from London * tell us that, last Year, from the 16th of December 1712 to the 15th of December 1713, there were 34 Persons, within the Bills of Mortality, guilty of Self-Murder, will any Body therefore charge Prelacy and Liturgy therewith, tho' rampant there? Because I can name a famous Divine of the Church of England who trus'd up himself in his Canonical Belt, were it therefore juft that I shou'd load the Spirit of the Church of England therewith?

Mr Rhind does indeed name Two Books viz. Shepherd's Sincere Convert, and Guthrie's Trial of a saving Interest in Christ, as leading Men into that Course, or into deceitfull Hopes founded upon Animal Impressions. As for Mr Shepherd's Book, I am not so much concern'd about it, he was a Man that as I'm informed had Episcopal Orders, and was sometimes of Emanuel College in Cambridge. And I will not undertake to defend some Peculiarities he has in his Writings; let Mr Rhind, who is more obliged, do it at his best Leasure. But that there is any Thing in that Book that has the least Tendency either to drive Men into Despair, or to encourage them to bottom their Hopes of Heaven upon false Grounds, I absolutely deny, and challenge Mr Rhind

* See the Evening Post. Numb. 683.
Rhind to prove it: For hitherto he has acted as an avowed Calumniator, in not daring to cite so much as one Passage of the said Book for making good his Charge.

As for Mr Guthrie, he was a genuine Presbyterian, his Book is written in a most familiar Style, adapted to the Capacity of every common Reader, and to the Feeling of every good Christian: And God has so signally blessed it with Success, that no one Book can be named, written by any Scots Man of either Communion, that has been so instrumental in bringing off People from a Course either of Vice or Indifference, and in engaging them to Thoughtfulness and a Concern about their Eternal Interest, as this has been. Can then Mr Rhind instance, wherever the Father of Lies was guilty of a greater than what he has alleged against that Book? No. He was self-condemned, and therefore dare not adventure to cite so much as one Line of it for verifying his Charge. But we are not to wonder at this his Conduct. For when once a Man proclaims Hostility against Piety in the general, He finds it necessary to blow upon every serious Book that tends to promote it. I thought it necessary to give these Hints by the By, that the World may see what Men They are that separate from the Presbyterians, and are received by the Episcopal Party.

I am now to consider His Argument as he has laid it. First, As to its Weight, and then as to its Truth.

In the First Place as to its Weight. Supposing it were true, that the Spirit of the Presbyterians is diametrically opposite to that of the Gospel, would that ALONE justify a Separation? Mr. Rhind affirms it would; and positively saies in his penult Page, "That each of his Arguments separately is sufficient to warrant the Change he has made; and as to this argument particularly, He saies p. 185. That it might serve instead of all these He hath urged. I affirm the Contrary; and that, even supposing its Truth, it could not justify a Separation, abstracting from the Rest. The Truth or Being of a Church is never to be measured by the Manners of the Members, which may be Good and Bad at different Times, and vary as Men do. The Church of Israel was always, as God had fram'd it, a true Church. But if Holiness of Life had been made a Note of it, it might in some Juncutures have been called no Church at all. When our Saviour visitid the World, He cou'd scarce find any Probity,
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Probity in it; and the formal Religion of the Pharisees had made void real and solid Piety. The Blood of all the Prophets was lying upon them, and through their own Traditions they had made void the Commandments of God. And yet, notwithstanding all this, Christ did not separate from them. Consequently the like Objection cannot be a justifiable Ground of Separation in any other. Thus Dr Tenison now Primate of all England, and who is at once the Honour as well as Head of his Order, Reafon'd (e) against the Romanists urging (with the same Modesty as Mr Rhind does) Holiness of Life as a Note of their Church. And I suppose the Reasoning will still hold Good. It was then a very Unchristian Act in Mr Rhind to separate from the Presbyterians, when his shining Virtue and bright Example cou'd not have fail'd to have reclaim'd 'em, or at least to render 'em inexcusable. But it is not the first sad Loss they have sustained, and overcome too; as, I hope, they shall do this.

However, supposing the Weight, let us consider the Truth of his Argument. This I shall do by examining the Particulars he insists on. Having spent Two or Three Pages in describing the Spirit of the Gospel, and what he means by the Spirit of a Party: He alledges I. That the Presbyterian Spirit is Enthusiastic. II. That it is a meer Animal or Mechanical Spirit. III. That it is a Partial Spirit, damning and denying Grace to all but their own Party. IV. That it is a narrow and mean Spirit. V. That it is a Malicious, unforgiving Spirit. VI. That it is an unconvertible Spirit. VII. That it is a Disloyal, Rebellious Spirit. VIII. That it is a Spirit of Division. IX. That it is an Unneighbourly, Cruel and Barbarous Spirit.

Here is a very formidable Muster; yet, after all, not very dangerous. For, Mr Rhind has been so well natured as not to cite so much as one Line out of any Presbyterian Author for proving any Thing of all this; Tho' that was, I'm sure the most, perhaps the only habile Way of doing his Business effectually. Nay, tho' the greatest Part of his Charge turns upon Matter of Fact; yet he has not cited so much as one Historian, great or small, of either Side, for making it good. But such is the Episcopal Way of writing, and we must not complain. Ha-

[e] On Bellarmin's X. Note of the Church.
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Vague and Declaration are All-Powerfull Engines when play'd by a Canonical Hand: And when They are at too much Pains to labour Their Periods into a Cadence, 'tis Rudness and Ill Manners in us to ask for Proof, the insisting on which would spoil the Harmony of their Rhetoric. However, we must crave Leave to enquire a little into the Particulars of this Charge.

I. He charges the Presbyterians with an Enthusiastical Spirit. But on what Grounds? 1st, faith he p. 200, Their most admired Practical Systems contain Nothing but the very Dreg of Mysticism, and a Jargon no less unintelligible, than that of Jacob Behmen or Molino. Well what are these Practical Systems? He is so far from citeing any Thing out of 'em, that he does not so much as name any of 'em, except the Two already mention'd viz. Shepherd & Guthrie. For Vindication of Mr Guthrie's Book, I ask no more of any Person, but that he'll peruse it seriously; and if, after he has done, he can say there is any other Mysticism or Enthusiasm in it, than what the Gospel teaches; Nay, than what every Man who is concern'd about his Soul feels, I'll frankly forgive him.

Plainly, the Import of that System is this. That the great Work every Man has to do in this World is to secure Eternal Happiness to Himself. That there are indeed some Persons blessed with the Advantage of a Religious Education; and the Grace of God falling in therewith; They are insensibly train'd up to Piety and Virtue, and find Themselves in a fixed Habit thereof, without being able to give a distinct Account how it began, or by what sensible Steps it has arrived at such a Height. But then the far greater Part of Baptized Persons spend a great Part of their Life either in a Course of Vice and Leandness, or at best in Indifference and Carelessness about their Eternal Salvation. God, who is an Infinite Lover of Souls, and wills not that they shou'd perish; is graciously pleased, in His own good Time, by His Spirit, working by these Ways He has appointed, to awaken them into a thoughtfull Temper, and to alarm them of their Danger. He engages them seriously to compare their Heart and Life with the Law of God. And, upon the doing this, they cannot but discover a vast Contrariety and Contradiction between them. He engages them
likewise seriously to lay to Heart the Threatnings of God, and the
dreadfull Things His Law has awarded against such Criminals as
they are: And this cannot but affect them with the most horrible
Apprehensions. For, who can be easie either in Body or Mind un-
der the Thoughts of having God for his Enemy; and under the prospect
of getting Hell for his Portion? God is pleased to excercise them with
such Thoughts, till he sees they are duly humbled, and in Earnest
convinced that it was a bitter and evil Thing to depart from the Living
God. But then, God does not project for the Uneasines of His Creatures;
nor require Sorrow for Sorrow's Sake, but that they may be the
more watchfull against Sin in Time coming, and the more affected
with His Goodness in providing a Method of Delivery for them.
And therefore, when He has Exercised them so long and to such a
Height as is needfull for attaining these Ends upon them; He is
pleased to begin their Relief by intimating to them, by means of
the Gospel, a Possibility of Salvation through Jesus Christ. Yet even
this is not sufficient to determine the Soul to God. For, be the Re-
medy never so soveraign, yet it can do no good to such as don't
apply it; whether through Despair, that it will not be effectual;
or through a false Hope that the Wound will not prove deadly.
And therefore, yet further, God, by the Internal Operation of His
Spirit, in the Way of Gospel Means, gives a new Turn and Byas
to the Soul, not only perswades it that it is possible to be saved;
and that it is absolutely needfull to fall in with the Gospel Method
of Salvation; but effectually determines it to do so; so that the Soul
heartily renounces all Sin, sincerely engages in a Court of Universal
Holiness; and, in that Method, trusts to the Merit and Righteous-
ness of Christ allenarly for Acceptance with God, Pardon of Sin, and
coming to Heaven at last. Now, when a Person finds his Case
altered thus so much to the better; is it possible but that he must
needs rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of Glory? While he goes
on in the Way of Holiness, is it possible but he must find that the
Ways of Wisdom are Ways of Pleasantness, and Her Paths Peace?
When he is sensible that his Eternal Happiness is secured by an In-
terest in Christ, is it possible but that he must rejoice in the Hope of
the Glory of God? If at any Time he slack his Diligence, and fall
into Sin, through the Infirmity of Nature or the Violence of Sa-
tan's Tentations, and thereupon the Consolations of the Holy Ghost are withdrawn, has he not the greatest Reason to be dejected both in Body and Mind, and to pray with the Psalmist Ps. LI. 8. 11. Make me to hear Joy and Gladness: That the Bones which Thou hast broken may rejoice. Cast me not away from thy Presence: Take not Thy Holy Spirit from Me. Or, if God, even in a Sovereign Way overcast His Soul; that he may long so much the more for the uninterrupted joys of Heaven; Is this any other than what the most Holy Men recorded in Scripture have felt?

This is the Import of Mr Guthrie's Book, and indeed of all the other Practical Systems written by the Presbyterians on the same Subject. Is there any thing of Enthusiasm in all this? Any irregular Heats? Why then would Mr Rhind adventure to expose the internal Part of Religion in so ludicrous a Manner as he has done? Certainly, if ever any Man was guilty of the Sin of doing Despite unto the Spirit of Grace, he is so. This, which I have told, is that which he calls the Long and senseless Story of the Manner of God's dealing with the Souls of his Elect. These the strange Things they talk of their Manifestations and Desertions. This the sudden and irresistible Manner of God's influencing them by his Spirit, which Mr Rhind thinks so much a Jest; but which no Man that fears God will allow himself to think the same Way of. 'Tis true, the determining Turn that the Spirit of God gives to the Soul is acknowledged by the Presbyterians to be Instantaneous; but then They acknowledge too a great Deal of Preparatory Work, and Mr Guthrie, in particular largely insists on it: So that Mr Rhind's representing the Presbyterians p. 193. as pleasing for Conversions; attended with such Circumstances as these of Paul &c were, is only an Instance of that Calumny to which he has so intirely given up himself.

2dly, Another Ground, whereon Mr Rhind would have found the Charge of Enthusiasm against the Presbyterians, is, That they pretend, as he alludes p. 190, to Illuminations and Raptures and to the most extraordinary Inspirations; and then he falls a disputing very wightly in order to disprove their being extraordinarily inspired, and very frequently compares them to the Modern Prophets in their Agitations. But how does he prove that They pretend to any such Thing? No Way. He has not so much as offered at doing so, nor adduced one Syllable for that Purpose. What then is to be thought of
of him and his Fellow-Writers who ordinarily talk at the same Rate? Is it not plain that they are under the Power of Hypocritical Melancholy, whereof wild and extravagant Imaginations, for which there is no Ground, are a most Infallible Symptom?

But why did Mr Rhind charge the Presbyterians with Enthusiasm, when his own Beloved Party had been so scandalously Guilty of it? In the First place, when Enthusiasm was in Fashion in the Time of the late Civil Wars, who were the great Masters of it? The Presbyterians in Scotland preach'd and wrote against it; but the Episcopalians in England cherished it; and some of their Clergy were the principal Writers for it, for Instance, Mr William Erbery who owns Himself to have been Episcopally ordain'd. There is a thick Quarto Volume of his Lucubrations extant under the Title of his Testimony, from which 'tis evident that Jacob Behmen might have gone to School to him to learn Enthusiasm. 2dly, Does not Parker who writes against the Confession of Faith, and has prefixed to it a Poem against the Synod of Dort and in praise of Arminius, and who was just such another Protestant as Mr Rhind, does not he, I say, avow Himself an Enthusiast, and recommend Jacob Behmen and such others as divinely inspired? 3dly, Who knows not that Dr George Garden, one of the first Character among the Episcopal Clergy, is the great promoter of the Bourignian Principles? 4thly, Who were they that were mostly carried away by the Modern Prophets and seized with their Agitations? I suppose the Episcopal Clergy cannot purge their own Families. 5thly, Does not the Author of Mr Dodwell's Life confess that, toward the latter Part of it, He seemed to grow not a little Enthusiastical? And is it possible any one can read his Epistolary Discourse and not be convinced of this. For Instance, when he teaches that our Saviour preached to the Separate Souls who deceased before His Incarnation, Sect. 41. When he teaches that Water Baptism was given to the separate Souls of them who had no Means of obtaining it when living Sect. 42. When he teaches that Renunciation of the Devil was performable in the separate state by those who cou'd not know their Duty, before Sect. 43. When he teaches that the Gentiles received the Spirit by our Saviour's Baptism in their
their separate state Sect. 44. When he teaches that the Apostles being themselves deceased preached to the deceased Gentiles. Sect. 45. Were there ever more distracted Notions than these vented in Bedlam? I think then it were the Wisdom of the Episcopal Party for their own sakes to drop the Charge of Enthusiasm against the Presbyterians. I shall conclude this with observing by the By, That Mr Rhind writes inaccurately when he Yoaks Jacob Behmen and Molinos together. Molinos's greatest Errors, for which He seems to have been so severely persecuted by the Church of Rome, were according to the best information the Doctrines of Predestination and its Dependencies, and his teaching People to place their Devotion rather in internal Prayer and Communion with God than in numbering their Beads (g): Whereas all the Enthusiasts, are mortal Enemies to the Doctrines of Predestination &c, and Mr Poiret owns that he levelled his Oeconomic Divin mainly against these Doctrines. And Dr Garden does the same in his Writings. So much for the Charge of an Enthusiastical Spirit.

II. He Charges the Presbyterians with a meerly Animal or Mechanical Spirit, and that all their Hopes and Fears, Joys and Sorrows in Religion are meer Mechanical, the Effect of Melancholy, Imagination and Animal Impressions. Hear him a little p. 196. ' He (that is, a Presbyterian after the Commission of some grievous sin) dreams of Nothing but of Hell and Damnation, which in the Hurry of his passions perhaps forces him to dispatch Himself. But if the black Blood shall chance to be sweetned by a Mixture of better, and if the Violence of His Passions is abated, He begins to conceive better hopes. And if He shall chance to recover from this Fever, so that his Blood does again glide after its due Manner, he concludes that all is well with him. Thus he and a great deal more to the same purpose.'Tis true, the Presbyterians own themselves to be compound Beings, and that they consist of Flesh as well as Spirit, and believe that God aplys

[g ] See Supplement to Dr. Burnet's Travels.
applys Himself to them according to the Make of Human Nature, and discovers Infinite Wisdom and Goodness in doing so; for He knows our Frame and remembers we are Dust. But, because the Animal Affections operate Sensibly, either upon the Commission of some grievous Sin, or upon our having made Peace with God, does it therefore follow that the Spirit of God did not excite them? Or that, because the inferior and bodily Faculties do operate, therefore the Superior Faculties do not? Is it possible but that the Soul and Body must work mutually upon and affect each other while we are in the embodied State? Nay, will they not do so even after the Resurrection which is the most perfect State? Does He not know that a Separate State is a preternatural one which Sin alone has made us liable unto. The truth is, I think Mr Rhind, after all his Boasts, to be but very indifferently qualified to write Lectures upon the Animal OEconomy, and that he is a perfect Stranger to Solon's Precept Nosce Teipsum, as well as to the Exercise of piety. And therefore, ere he begin to write his Lectures, I cannot but recommend to him the perusal of that excellent Discourse concerning the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit annexed to that very pious Book called A Tale of a Tub. If Mr Rhind can recover the papers necessary for the filling up the Lacuna p. 303. his Business is done: For the Bookseller has assured us, that In them the whole Scheme of Spiritual Mechanism was deduced and explained, with an Appearance of great reading and observation; tho' it was thought neither safe nor convenient to print them. Such devout Books tend mightily to the promoting of Religion, and many such the Church of England Clergy has blessed this sinful Age with: And it cannot but raise Mr Rhind's Character to Communicate such laudable Productions of his Brethren for the Benefit of the Publick. But to go on

If Mr Rhind was so great an Enemy to every thing of Animal Exercise in Religion, Why did He join the Church of England: For, of all other Protestant Churches in the World, She has aimed most at the raising the Animal Affections by her Way of Worship, though she is sou'nhappy as to attempt it by Methods which our Blessed Saviour never instituted: For what else means the Pom-
piousness of her Service? What else is designed by the Cope, Surplice, Racket &c? What else by the Ceremonies and all that Miming Cringing and Bowing (so much practised in the Chapel and Cathedral Worship) which is below the Gravity of a Man much more of a Minister? Can there be any thing else designed by all this, but to bear upon the Senses and affect the Imagination? What is the Surplice and all the other Sacred Accoutrements intended for, but to dazzle the Eyes? What are the Organs and singing Boys designed for, but to charm the Ears? Why are the Prayers and the whole Devotions parcel'd into such Shreds, but that the Animal Part may be gratified with Variety? Mr. Rhind then ought to have been aware of touching upon this Point: For, after all the Abstraction he and his Party pretend to, the World sees well enough that they are but Flesh and Blood like their Neighbours.

III. He charges the Presbyterians with a partial Spirit, damning and denying Grace to all but their own Party. 'So few, faith he p. 191 are they to whom they allow this Not a Partial, Saving Grace, that, if we shall except the Apostles, and those of that extraordinary Age, and St. Augustine, ing Spirit. They'll allow none to have been blessed with it, till it was vouchasafed to some Presbyterians in the West of Scotland, about a hundred Years ago, who convey'd it to their Successors, and infected some of their English Brethren therewith. And p. 204. They confine, faith he, the Grace of Conversion, and consequently Election to their own Party. This is indeed a hainous Charge. But how has he proved it? Nay not so much as the least Document has he offered to produce for that Purpose. The Episcopal Veracity must stand for all. But the Presbyterians deny the Charge till They shall see it proved.

In the mean Time I charge Mr. Rhind and his Party with a Partial, Damning Spirit, and shall prove it ere I go further. First I charge Mr. Rhind with it. For, speaking of the Spirit of the Presbyterians p. 216. He expressly says that it drives them from the Communion of the Church, and cuts them off from the ordinary Communications of the Holy Ghost. Besides, he has (as we have heard before) damned the whole Protestant Churches that want Episcopal Government. Nay, he has damned
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damned the whole Catholic Church of Christ by declaring her Doctrines fundamentally false and pernicious. Secondly, I charge his Party with it. Besides many Shoals of lesser Authors, I instance, for the Purpose Mr Dodwell the Standard-Bearer of the Party. In his Book of Schism, the Sum of the XV Chapter is, That the Spirit of God is not given, nor his Graces communicated, nor Pardon of Sin bestow’d, nor Salvation to be expected without the Sacraments. The Design of his XVIII Chapter is to prove, That the Validity of the Sacraments depends on the Authority of the Persons by whom they are administered. The Design of his XIX Chapter is to prove, That no other Ministers have this Authority of administering the Sacraments but only they who receive their Orders in the Episcopal Communion. The Sum of all is, No Bishop no Minister; No Minister No Sacrament; No Sacrament no Salvation; Ergo no Bishop no Salvation. Or take it in his own Words (b) 'The alone Want of Communion ' with the Bishop makes Persons Aliens from God and Christ, Strangers to the Covenant of Promise and the Common Wealth of Israel——.' They must certainly be deprived of all those real Enjoyments 'and Holy Relishes which devout Souls experience even in this Life 'in the Communion with their best Beloved. In a Word, he tells us, 'that on that Account we must want the Comforts of Religion here, and lose the Hopes of enjoying them hereafter. Say now, good Reader, if it is not modest in the Episcopal Party to charge the Presbyterians with a Damning Spirit. Whether Atheism, Laziness or Uxoriousness (as Mr Rhind alludes against the Presbyterians) can engage Men of Sense to entertain such Phantaftick Principles, I shall not say: But sure I am, they come not from the Spirit of God, nor are consistent with the Peace of the Church or Nation.

IV. He charges the Presbyterians with a Narrow and Mean Spirit. Upon what Evidence? If, 'Christ, Not a Narrow or Faith He, dyed for all Men, but the Pre-Mean Spirit. 'Presbyterians confine the Merit of His Death to a Predestinated Few p. 207. I answer, The Presbyterians acknowledge that Christ died for all Men in all that
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that Sense the Scripture meant ever that Expression. 'Tis true They confine the Efficacy of his Death to the Predestinated, and acknowledged that Christ’s Flock (comparatively speaking) is but a little one; but 'tis false that they confine it to a Few: On the contrary, they believe the Redeemed to be past numbrimg, and hope, upon the Assurance of the Scripture, Rev. VII. 9, to behold one Day a great Multitude which no Man can number, of all Nations, and Kndereds, and People, and Tongues standing before the Throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands, and Hymns in their Mouths. 2dy, 'Christ meant, saith be, that his Grace should extend universally, which the Presbyterians restrain to their own Party. I answer. The first Part of this Charge is false Doctrine, the latter impudent Calumny. The first Part of it I say is false Doctrine, for which (waving other Arguments at this Time) I appeal to the Church of England, which, in her Catechism, the Catechumens to say, I believe in God the Son, who hath redeemed me and all Mankind, yet she expressly restricts the Object of sanctifying Grace; and teaches the Catechumen to say, I believe in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifeth me and all the Elect People of God. The latter Part of the Charge, I add, is impudent Calumny. The Presbyterians are sofar from restraining Grace to their own Party, that they both believe and profess that in every Nation he that feareth God and worketh Righteousness is accepted of him.

But then, who knows not that High-Church is guilty of this Narrowness and Meanness of Spirit even to the last Degree of Scandal? Is it not known that They not only deny Grace to Presbyterians, but even confine the Church of England to their own Party, and reckon all such, even of the Episcopal Communion, Schismatics, as fall in with the Government; nay, in their most solemn Offices, rank their Episcopal Brethren of the lower Form in the very same Class with Pagans. Thus, in their new Liturgy (i) which they formed after K. William’s Accession to the Throne, They prayed in Terms, Restore to us again the Publick Worship of thy Name, the reverence
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verent Administration of thy Sacraments: Raise up the former Government both in Church and State, that We may be no longer without King, without Priest, without God in the World. 3dly, 'Christ's Charity, 'faith he, relieved all Men indifferently, Enemies as well as freinds while the Presbyterian Byass visibly sways them to favour the "Godly, that is, those of their own Way. 'Tis answered, The Presbyterians, as they have Opportunity, do good unto all Men; tho' indeed, according to the Apostles Precept, especially unto them who are of the Household of Faith, whether of their own or any other Way; tho' no doubt, they love those of their own Way best; and I suppose all the World does the like.

In the mean while, tho' 'tis both Vain and sinfull to boast on this Head, yet for stopping the Mouth of Calumny, the Presbyterians are content it be put to a Trial, which of the Parties have gone furtheft in their Publick Deeds of Charity to the other in their Distress. By all the Information I can have, the Episcopall Clergy, during the whole 28 Years of their late Reign, never relieved any of their Presbyterian Brethren with so much as one Shilling. The Truth is, they durst not ask it, but thought themselves happy enough, if they escaped without being relieved out of all their Miseries at once by the COMPENDIOUS Way then in Fashion: Whereas, to my certain Knowledg, the Presbyterians have often relieved the Episcopalians, and I hope shall always continue to do so in Imitation of their Heavenly Father who is kind even to the Bad and the Unthankfull, and in spite of the Apocryphal Prohibition Ecclus. XII. 5. Give not to the Ungodly: Hold back thy bread and give it not unto him.

V. He charges Them with a Malicious and Unforgiving Spirit p. 209. so contrary to that which Our Saviour Not a Malicious or and the Blessed Martyr St Stephen exemplified. Well how does He qualify or prove this Charge? Why, 'their Rebellious 'Martyrs, faith he, never expressed their Forgivness of the Injuries, 'which They thought were done them by their supposed Persecuters: Their last Speeches so faithfully recorded in Naphali, and so much admired by the party, containing rather too plain Indications of the Malice
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Malice and Rancour of their Souls, when they were stepping into Eternity. Thus he. 'Tis true, these rebellious Martyrs did not allow themselves to die as a Fool dieth, tho', their Hands were bound and their Feet (and Legs too) were oftimes put into the most pinching Fetters. They boldly avowed the Cause for which they died, and with all Freedom told their Persecuters of their Injustice and the wicked Course they were in. And for this Practice they had the Example of the Blessed Martyr Stephen, who treated the Sanhedrim with sharper Language than any is to be found in Naphthali. Te stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in Heart and Ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: As your Fathers did so do ye. Which of the Prophets have not your Fathers persecuted? And they have slain them which shew'd before of the Coming of the Just One, of whom ye have been now the Betrayers and Murderers. Acts VII. 51, 52.

But now as to the Charge it self. If we shall find these rebellious Martyrs expressing their Forgiveness of their Enemies: If we shall find them doing this in their last Speeches: If we shall find them doing this in their last Speeches recorded in Naphthali; will not this discover what a Spirit of Truth and Modesty that is, the Episcopal Party are possessed with? Let us try it then.

The Marquess of Argile who suffered May 27. 1661. 'And, saith He, as I go to make a Reckoning to my God, I am free as to any of these Calumnies that have gone abroad of me, concerning the King's Person or Government. I was real and cordial in my Desires to bring the King Home, and in my Endeavours for Him when He was at Home, and I had no Correspondence with the Adversary's Army, nor any of them, in the Time when His Majesty was in Scotland; nor had I any Accession to His late Majesties horrid and execrable Murder, by Counsel or Knowledge of it, or any other Manner of Way. This is a Truth, as I shall answer to my Judge----I desire not that the Lord should judge any Man; nor do I judge any but my Self: I wish, as the Lord hath pardoned me, so He may pardon them for this and other Things, and that what they have done to me, may never meet them in their Accounts.------And I pray the Lord preserve His Majesty and to pour out His best Blessings on His Person and Government. Naph. Edit. 1693. p. 285, &c. Mr. Qq 2
Mr James Guthrie Minister of the Gospel at Sterlin who suffered June 1. 1661. "God is my Record, says he, that in these things for which sentence of Death hath passed against me, I have a good Conscience." I bless God they are not Matters of Compliance with Sectaries, or Designs or Practices against His Majesty’s Person or Government of his Royal Father: My Heart (I bless God) is conscious unto no Disloyalty; nay, Loyal I have been, and I commend it unto you to be Loyal and Obedient in the Lord. 

"The Mistake or Hatred or Reproach of my Enemies I do with all my Heart forgive, and wherein I have offended any of them do beg their Mercy and Forgivness. I forgive all Men the Guilt of my death, and I desire you to do so also: Pray for them that persecute you, and bless them that curse you, bless I say and curse not." Ibid. p. 291. &c.

The Lord Wariston who suffered July 22 1663. "The good Lord give unto them (His Enemies) Repentance, Remission and Amendement; and that is the worst wish I wish them, and the best wish I can wish unto them. I am free (as I shall now answer before His Tribunal) from any Accession by Counsel or Contrivance, or any other Way to his late Majesty’s Death, or to their making that Change of Government: And I Pray the Lord to preserve our present King His Majesty, and to pour out his best Blessings upon His Royal Posterity." Ibid p. 301. &c.

Captain Andrew Arnot who suffered December 7. 1666. "And whenever they be that any Way have been Instrumental or incensed against me to procure this Sentence against me, God forgive them and I forgive them." Ibid. p. 316. And in his joint Testimony which he, with Nine others who were put to Death the same Day with him, subscribed in Prison immediately before they were brought to the Scaffold, he and they in Terms acknowledg the King’s Authority. "We are, say they, condemned by Men, and esteemed by many as Rebels against the King, whose Authority we acknowledge: But this is our rejoicing the Testimony of our Conscience." Ibid. p. 307. &c.

Mr. Alexander Robertson Preacher of the Gospel, who suffered December 14. 1666. "I wish that they may lay the Matter to Heart and repent of it, that God may forgive them, as I forgive all Men, and
and particularly Morton who did apprehend me. And he is so far from entertaining rebellious Thoughts that he declares There was just Reason to think, that if these rigid Oppressions had been made known to his Majesty, his Justice and Clemency would have provided a Remedy. *Ibid.* p. 320. &c.

Mr Hugh McKaile Preacher of the Gospel who suffered December 22, 1666. I do freely pardon all that have Accession to my Blood, and wish that it be not laid to the Charge of this sinful Land, but that God wou’d grant Repentance to our Rulers, that they may obtain the same Reconciliation with Him, whereof I my self do partake. *Ibid.* p. 330 &c.

John Wilson who suffered at the same Time with Mr McKaile. For my Part I pray that the Lord may blefs our King with Blessings from Heaven. And I pray for all that are in Authority under his Majesty. I can forgive the Wrong done to me in taking away my Life for this Cause, and wish God to be mercifull to those that have condemned me, or have had any Hand in my Death. *Ibid.* p. 351 &c.

Mr. James Mitchel while under the Torture of the Boots Anno 1676. And now my Lords, I do freely from my Heart forgive you who are Judges sitting upon the Bench, and the Men who are appointed to be about this Piece of horrid Work, & also those who are vitiating their Eyes beholding the same. And I do intreat, that God may never lay it to the Charge of any of you, as I beg God may be pleased for his Son Christ’s sake to blot out my Sins and Iniquities. *Ibid.* p. 431.

James Learmont who suffered September 27, 1678. As for Alexander Maitland who apprehended me, my Blood lyes direcly at his Door, who promisfed me then, that nothing should reach my Life, as he swore by Faith and Conscience, and his Brother is also guilty of my Blood. I desire the Lord to give them Repentance and Mercy if it be possible. *Ibid.* 445. And in his Large Speech p. 450. He thus delivers himself. I here most freely, before I go hence (without Desire of Revenge upon the forenamed Persons, or any other, who have been the Occasion of my Blood shedding, now in my last Words after the Example of my Lord and Master) say as is mentioned in that Scripture Luke 23. 34. And Jesus said, Father forgive them, for they know not what they do. My dear Friends, I give my Testimony against that Calumny cast upon Presbyterians, that they are Se-
Seditious and Disloyal Persons, the which Aspersiion I do abhor.
Therefore, I exhort all People, that they will shew Loyalty to
the King, and all lawfull Magistrats, and all their just and law-
full Commands.

Mr. John King Minister of the Gospel who suffered August 14.
1679. 'The Lord knows, who is the Searcher of Hearts, that
neither my Design nor Practice was against His Majesty's Person
and just Government, but I always intended to be loyal to lawfull
Authority in the Lord. I thank God, my heart doth not condemn
me of any Disloyalty, I have been loyal, and do recommend it to
all to be Obedient to Higher Powers in the Lord.— I bless the
Lord, I can freely and frankly forgive all Men the Guilt of it, even
as I desire to be forgiven of God. Pray for them that Persecute
You and Bless them that Curse You. Ibid. p. 469. 475.

John Nilson of Corsack who suffered December 14. 1666. ' I
pray that the Lord for Christ's Sake may freely forgive me, as I
have forgiven them that have wronged me. Ibid p. 327.

These are the Rebellious Martyrs recorded in Naphtali who never
expressed the Forgivness of the Injuries they thought were done
them. Rebellious Martyrs they were; for, when stepping into E-
ternity, they not only denied and disowned any Act of Rebellion:
But spent their laft Breath in praying for the King and in recom-
mending Loyalty to their Survivers. These laft Words of theirs
which I have cited are no doubt as good Evidence of the Presby-
terian Malice, as their Sufferings are of the Episcopal Mercy. I can-
not but wish that the Episcopal Authors wou'd retain, at least,
some Relique of Modesty and not advance Things, not only without
all Ground, but contrary also to the clearest and ampleft Testimony.
I'm sure they cannot but be sensible how odious such a Way of
Writing must needs make any Party that uses it to God and all
good Men.

They very frequently insist on this Topick of Forgiving Enemies
against the Presbyterians; but'tis in such a Way as sufficiently diso-
vers their Meaning. I remember betwixt the Year 1680 & 1688, there
was no Doctrine more frequently insifted on from the Pulpits of
Edinburgh than that of Forgiving Enemies. In the mean Time, the
Gibbet,
Gibbet, to save Expences, was left standing in the open Street from one Mercat Day to another for hanging the Whigs. People were mightily puzzled for a while to reconcile the Episcopal Preaching and Practice together. At last the secret was found out; that the Meaning was, that their Enemies should forgive them; But then, that they shou’d forgive their Enemies was a different Cafe. They must then take the Sponge to their late Books in which they have so often libelled the Presbyterians on this Head, and wait till the Memory of the late Times is worn out, ere they can perswade People that their insisting on the Forgivness of Enemies is any other than most odious Affection; just as when the Inquisition turns over a poor Wretch to the Secular Arm, intreating in the Bowels of Jesus Christ to be tender to Him; the Meaning of which is, that Secular Arm must burn the Poor Creature Quick, on Pain of Excommunication and a worse Turn besides. And is there any other Proof needfull to shew what a Jell the Episcopal insisting on Forgivness of Enemies is, than to read over Mr. Rain’s Book, especially the latter Part of it, which breaths pure unmixed Malice for Thirty Pages together, and that too which makes it so much the more Ridiculous, without the least Shadow of Truth or proof.

If a Man treat me harshly, however bitter the Things may be He saies against me, yet if they are true, and He convinces me that they are so, I ought to bear with Him, and ’tis my own Fault if I don’t profit by the Reproof. But if he charges me with the worst Things, without so much as offering to convince me, I contemn the Malice of the poor Impotent Thing, and cannot revenge My Self better than by suffering Him to fry in His own Greafe, and prey upon his own Spleen.

VI He charges the Presbyterians p. 209. with an Unconverible Spirit, in that they value themselves upon the Sullenness of their Tempers. A very great Fault truly. For certainly Christianity is superstruced upon Humanity, and the Grace of God was intended not to destroy, but to improve and refine it. And the Apostle has expressly commanded us (1 Pet. III 8.) Love as Brethren, be kind, be Courteous: Nor does Piety ever appear more charming and engaging than when adorned with
a good Behaviour. But how does Mr. Rhind prove his Charge? Why, Good Reader, He does not to much as attempt this, nor has offered so much as one Syllable for that Purpose. Is it not then as easily denied as affirmed. And is not the Defender, in all such odious Cases, presumed to be Innocent till the Contrary is proved. 'Tis true Our Saviour's Desire (as Mr. Rhind suggests) of doing Good carried Him into the Company of the Men of loose, as well as regular Lives, and I believe all Presbyterians, whether Ministers or others, who are piously inclin'd, are carried, by the same Desire of doing Good, into the Company of Men of loose Lives, when there is the least Hope that their doing so will not rather harden them in, than reclaim them from their Looseness. But then, That they keep at a Distance from them in their Revells, study a Preciseness of Conversation, and will not run with them to the same Excess of Riot, however strangely they may be thought of on that Account; This they are so far from reckoning a Fault, that they avow it, and are sorry there is not more Ground for charging them with it. Mr. Rhind may call 'em Puritans on that Score, or give 'em what other ill Names He pleases: But then, what comforts them is, that the Apostle Paul was just such another Puritan; and not only warrants them in, but obliges them to such Preciseness and Abstraction, commanding them I. Cor. V. 11. With such Persons not so much as to eat. And II. Thess. III. 14. To note such Persons, and have no Company with them. Our Blessed Saviour was such a Physician as was not in Danger of catching the Disease from the Patient. But when virtuous Persons allow themselves to haunt bad Company in their Bottle Conversation, I'm afraid it too often falls out, that they themselves are infected, and the vicious not reformed.

However, whatever Unconvivialeness the Presbyterians may be guilty of, I suppose Mr. Rhind might have kept at Home, and reserved His Lecture for High-Church: Not that they are very nice in their Practice; for, I believe, the best that can be said of 'em as to that is, That they are (if I may use our Country Phrase) but like Neighbour and other. But, if the Church of England Divines themselves may be believed, Mr. Bisset for Instance; The Height of their Principle makes them so much Enemies to the Rest of Mankind, that neither Presbyterians nor even Low-Church can walk the Streets
Chap. V. Presbyterian Spirit.

Streets in safety, but are every moment in danger of being jostled into the Kennel by High-Church.

Tantum Relligio potuit suader e Malorum!

But it is not this or that man's particular testimony we need depend on. 'Tis plain their principles oblige them to such hostility against the rest of mankind: for, were I of Mr Rhind's faith, and believed all the same ill things of the Presbyterians that he does, I would not only reckon it unlawful to converse with them, but I should think myself obliged in conscience to destroy them. If they are schismatics, heretics, and their spirit diametrically opposite to that of the gospel, &c. What should men do, but treat them as mad dogs, knock 'em on the head, and rid the world of such nuisances.

VII. He charges them with a disloyal, rebellious spirit. p. 210. I hope, every man ought not to be believed a rebel who has been at any time called one. I have observed before p. 29, that Mr Dodwell was proclaimed or rebellious a rebel by K. James, yet who, for all that, believes he was such? Perhaps the Presbyterians will be found as innocent.

Mr Rhind founds his charge both upon their principles and practices.

First, upon their principles. But, had he thought that any part of his business, I suppose he would have found the proof of this a very hard task. The principles of a church are to be gathered from her publick formula's. And I appeal to every body who has read the Westminster confession of faith, and the thirty nine articles of the church of England, if the first is not as loyal as the latter. But they are private authors not publick confessions that Mr Rhind was to build on. And, for his purpose, he names (for he cites nothing) Buchanan's Treatise de jure Regni, Rutherford's Lex Rex, Naphthali and the Hind let loose. 'Which books, faith he p. 211, the Presbyterians have not to this day branded with any publick censure, tho' they have been often upbraided, and solemnly challenged to condemn, otherwise to be counted abettors of them. The answer,
I hope, will be pretty easie. The Presbyterians love to walk by Example, and to give Place to their Betters. Mr Rhind certainly knows that the Bishops and other Clergy of the Church of England have publish'd at least a Hundred Books and Pamphlets with the same Principles and Schemes of Government as are in Buchanan, Rutherford &c. Let the Convocation once condemn these, and begin with the Bishop of Sarum, Dr Higden and Mr Hoodly; and then possibly the General Assembly may write after their Copy. 'Tis certain the Presbyterians maintain no other Principles of Government than what the Church of England has practis'd, no other Principles than these upon which She, with the Assistance of her good Neighbours, preserved the Protestant Religion in 1688. I am not for prying into the Power of Princes, remembering to have read somewhere Petrii plenam est de iis disputare qui possunt amputare, de iis scribere qui possunt proscribere, but I think the Principles of our Scots Episcopalians are beyond the Power of all Natural Understanding to account for. Claudius and Nero, who reigned successively in the Time of writing the New Testament, were both Usurpers and Tyrants, had neither Hereditary nor Parliamentary Right; yet both the Apostles Peter and Paul enjoind Submission to them, and commanded Prayers for them. Her present Majesty has both the fullest and clearest Right any Prince possibly can have. She has exercised it in the most obliging Manner, particularly with Respect to them. Now that, notwithstanding all this, they should have so long refused to pray for Her, and that most of 'em should do so still; this I affirm is unaccountable in Point both of Duty and Gratitude. Nor have the Actings of High Church in England been more accountable, as I hope we shall hear afterwards.

Secondly, He charges us with Disloyal Practices. They were no sooner hatched, faith he p. 212. than they rebelled. Sweet Popery! What a charming Thing art Thou; when even Protestants, nay those that will needs be the only Christians among 'em, affirm that a Reformation from Thee was Rebellion? But let us hear his Instances of their Rebellion?

First, He begins, where the Reformation began, viz. at Queen Mary's Reign, whose Reputation, faith he, they blackned, whose Authority and Government they resisted and reviled, whose Person
son they imprisoned, and whom they obliged to fly, in Hope to
save that Life which she cruelly lost. Thus He. Every Body
must needs own that of all others the Episcopal Writers are the
nimbleft Disputants. When we dispute with them about the Go-
"vernment of the Church in Q. Mary's Days, by no means will
they allow that it was Presbyterian. No. Superintendents were
the same Thing with Bishops (k). Well, be it so: And let us
dispute a little about Loyalty in the Government of the State. How
came it that under an Episcopacy, Q. Mary was so ill treated? Oh, now the Case alters, the whole Government was then in the
Hands of the Presbyterians. Rebellion was the very Egg out of
which they were hatch'd!

Quo teneam Vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

But let us suppose the Presbyterians had then the Government;
What did they? Why first, faith he, they blackned Her Reputation.
For Answer, I ask has Archbishop Spotswood whitened it? Does
not He tell the Story of Signior Davie much after the same Way
with Buchanan? Does He not tell of the horrid abuse the King
met with at Stirling, how He was neither admitted to be present
at the Baptism of His Son, nor suffered to come to the Feast?
How the foreign Ambassador were discharged to see or salute Him,
and such of the Nobility as vouchsafed him a Visit were frown'd
upon by the Court, and he at last dismissed with a Dose of Poison
in his Guts. Does he not expressly tell that the King was Mur-
dered by Bothwell and the Queen's Domefticks? Does not all the
World know that Her Majesty afterwards married the Murderer,
and that too, upon a Divorce from the Lady Jean Gordon his wife
obtain'd in the most Scandalous Manner? Does not Spotswood I
say relate all these Things? Was Spotswood Presbyterian?

Nor is Spotswood alone in the Relation of 'em. For, not to
mention other Scots or English Historians, Ruggerius Tritonius Ab-
bout of Pignerol, who was a Zealous Papist, a hearty Friend to Q.
Mary, lived in the Time, was Secretary to Vincentius Laurens Car-
dinal de Monte Regali, who was sent Nuncio from the Pope to the
Queen for assisting Her with his Counsel in the Extirpation of He-

[ k ] See the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, with many other Authors.
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This Author, I say, thus every Way qualified for bearing Witness in this Case, expressly relates * and that with the Permission of his Superiors, That when the Nobility told Her Majesty, that they had taken up Arms for bringing Bothwell to punishment for Murdering the King &c, Her Majesty justified Bothwell, and told them, He had done Nothing without her Consent. Did then the Presbyterians Forge any of these things?

But 2dly, faith Mr Rhind, they resisted and reviled Her Authority and Government, that is to say, they wou’d not allow Her to restore Popery, nor wou’d they commit the Young Prince to the Custody of Bothwell who had murder’d His Father. Were not these very unpardonable Faults?

Yet further 3dly, Q. Elizabeth took off her head; and no doubt she, and her Council that advised Her to it, were stanch Presbyterians. So much for Q. Mary’s Reign.

Secondly, In K. James VI’s Reign. Mr Rhind owns (which is very much from him) that in his Days they did not break out into open Rebellion. Why then, they cannot be so rebelliously disposed as He wou’d represent them: For if they had, it is not quite improbable but they might have made their own Terms of Peace. But, says Mr Rhind, they Occasion’d Vexations and Disturbances to Him; that is to say, they protected Him in his Cradle, set the Crown on his head, fought for him, and kept the Country in greater Peace, when he went to fetch home his Queen, than it had been known to be in for many Years before; which he himself acknowledged, and gave publick Thanks to God for. ’Tis true, they grudged the receiving Bishops and the five Articles of Perth, which he wou’d needs press upon us in Order to a Conformity with England. But I cannot think either England or we or the Royal Family cou’d have been much Losers, tho’ he had never fallen into that Politick.

Before I proceed to the next Reign, I must beg Leave for a short Digression, which, I hope, the Reader will the more easily excuse, that it is not so much from the Subject as from the Author; and is intended to do Justice to the Memory of the Dead, who are not in Capacity to redress themselves. The Matter is this.

The Right Honourable the Earl of Cromerty, very lately \textit{viz.}, in May last 1713. Publish'd a Book bearing this Title, \textit{AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CONSPIRACIES BY THE EARLS OF GOWRT, AND ROBERT LOGAN OF RESTALRIG, AGAINST K. JAMES VI.} Therein (Preface p. VIII.) His Lordship writes thus

"As to Truth in my Present Subject, the Malicious Designers, against the Royal Family in Scotland, did at first invent, and then foment, a most improbable Falshood, making it their Business to suggest, that Gowrie and His Brother did never Conspire against the King; But that the King did Murder them both. This was invented and clandestinely propagated by Bruce, Rollock, Dury, Melvil, and other Presbyterian Ministers. Thus His Lordship.

'Tis hugely afflicting to the Presbyterians to find their Forefathers represented, by a Person of His Lordship's Figure, under the Odioufs Character of MALICIOUS DESIGNERS AGAINST THE ROYAL FAMILY. What is usually advanced against 'em by the Common Herd of Episcopal Writers they can securely contemn: For, why shou'd that give them any Concern, which their Enemies Blurt out without any Care? But such a Charge from His Lordship cuts 'em to the Heart, and wou'd leave 'em Inconfortable, were it not that (as kind Providence wou'd have it) they find His Lordship's much weightier Affairs have hurried Him into some Mistakes; which, they make no Doubt, He will rectifie upon Advertisement; which I now humbly crave Leave to give.

In the First Place, As for Mr. Rollock. That He, did neither Invent nor clandestinely Propagate such a Story, as His Lordship allidges, 'tis certain. By this Token, that Mr. Rollock was Dead,
and Rotten too, before the Conspiracy. Every one knows that Gowry's Conspiracy fell out August 5th 1600. But Mr. Rollock died in the Month of February 1598. Thus Clerk relates in His Life. Thus Melchior Adams relates in his Lives of Foreign Divines. Thus the Manuscript Calderwood in the University Library in Glasgow relates. Nay thus Spotswood relates in his History p. 454. And thus, I presume, every Body, else relates, that writes of Mr. Rollock.

For preventing Mistakes I must advertise the Reader, that, as Spotswood informs us p. 456, the Year among us used to begin at 25 March, till a Publick Ordinance was made, appointing that the Beginning of the Year 1600, and so on thenceforward, thou'd be reckon'd from the first of January as now. 'Tis then no Objection against what I have advanced, tho' one find Mr. Rollock writing Books, or spoken of in History as living, in January or February 1599. The different Ways of Computation quite remove that Difficulty. And tho' Historians differ about the Day of the Month on which He died; Spotswood making it the last Day of February, whereas all the rest, whom I have seen, make it the eighth Day of that Moneth: Yet, that is not of any Import in this Case: For, even by the lowest Account, He was Dead at least seventeen Moneths before the Conspiracy; and therefore cou'd not, without a Miracle, Invent or Propagate false Stories concerning it.

2dly, His Lordship is in the like Mistake concerning Mr. Dury. For He died, as Spotswood also relates p. 457, upon the last Day of February 1600, that is to say, five Moneths and five Days before the Conspiracy, and so could not be Guilty.

These Observes, concerning Rollock and Dury, the Publick owes, not to me; but, to that Worthy Person and my very good Friend Mr. Matthew Crawford Minister at Inchenan in the Shire of Renfrew; who, in an accidental Conversation, first gave Me Notice of His Lordship's Book, and that He had observed the said Mistakes in it. Which Observes, upon Examination, I found to be Just.

His Lordship is not only out as to His reckoning, but is mistaken also in the Characters of the Men: For, they were so far from being DESIGNERS AGAINST THE ROYAL FAMILY; that, as Spotswood relates in the Places above cited, they spent their last Breath,
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Breath, Rollock, in exhorting His Brethren in the Ministry to carry dutifully towards the King; and Duty, in advising them to comply with His Majesty's Designs for restoring Prelacy.

I don't in the least incline to aggravate these his Lordships Mistakes. So much the less, that I find 'tis usual with great Men, when writing against the Presbyterians, to fall into the like. The famous Monsieur Varillas very gravely tells it as a Singularity * concerning Buchanan, that, After having declared himself against his Sovereign Lady, so far as to go into England to depose against Her in the Criminal Process then depending, he continued to persecute her after she was beheaded. This, faith he, is a Crime which they, who are most partial in Favour of Buchanan, must own he was guilty of. And yet after all this, 'tis certain, that Buchanan was not guilty of that Crime, for this good Reason, that he died some three or four Years before the Queen was beheaded. But there is a short and obvious Apology to be made for such Mistakes in Varillas or his Lordship, Aquila non captat Muscas. To go on.

3dly, As to Mr Melvill. 'Tis true he was on Life at that Time, yet I cannot find in any History that he was guilty of Inventing, Fomenting, or Propagating such a Story, or that he made any the least Noise about that Matter. His Lordship therefore would oblige his Country, if he would vouchsafe to give his Authors.

4thly, As to Mr Bruce. 'Tis true, he refused to give publick Thanks for the King's Deliverance from that Conspiracy, declaring, as Spotswood p. 46 relates, that he would reverence His Majesty's Reports of that Accident, but could not say he was persuad'd of the Truth of it: For which he was banish'd the King's Dominions, and went into France. But this is a very different Thing from what his Lordship charges him with. For, to suggest, that Gowry and his Brother did never conspire against the King, but that the King did murder them both, had been a Crime; because it was not possible, certainly to know that; and yet much less, to prove such a Suggestion. But to declare, that he could not say that he was persuad'd of the Truth of the Conspiracy, which is all that the Historians of that Time charge him with, was, at the worst, but a Weakness; it not being in a Man's Power to believe a Sto-

---
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ry, but according to the Impression which the Grounds of it, and Credibility of its Circumstances, make upon his Mind. And no one knows better than his Lordship, that there are several Circumstances, in the Story of the Conspicacy, which are not so perfectly clear, but that they require Time to believe 'em: Tho' indeed, I think his Majesty's Testimony, with the Presumption that the Earl and his Brother were out of their Wits, as his Majesty, before the Attempt, suspected the Earl's Brother to be, is sufficient to determine the Matter. For what may not mad Men do? However it was, it does not appear that Mr Bruce was guilty of what his Lordship charges him with; there being a very great Odds betwixt Contradicting a Report, and being reverently silent about it.

5thly, As for other Presbyterian Ministers whom his Lordship definitely involves in the same Guilt. The Accusation can be of no Weight till his Lordship is pleased to name them. 'Tis true the Ministers of Edinburgh, viz. Mrs. Walter Balcanqual, William Watson, James Balfour, and John Hall, demurred at first to give Thanks for the King's Deliverance, upon this Excuse, as Spotswood p. 461. informs us, that, they were not acquainted with the Particulars, nor how those Things had fall'n out. But how soon they were informed of the Particulars of the Conspiracy, they complied. Now, implicit Faith having been cried down, ever since the Reformation; it seems hard to blame such a Conduct: And 'tis no less hard to blame Presbyterian Ministers for a Fault which was common to so many others at that Time; Spotswood telling us that many doubted that there had been any such Conspiracy. This may be sufficient for Vindication of the Presbyterian Ministers against his Lordship's Charge. I crave Leave only to add two Remarks more on his Lordship's Book.

I. His Lordship p. 30, 31. has advanced a Piece of History in these Words. 'Upon the Information of Henderson, and other Witnesses, Cranston and Craigengelt were pannell'd before the Justiciary at St. Johnstoun; and upon clear Testimonies, and on their own Confession at the Bar (which they also adhered to on the Scaffold) they were both executed: Only alleging that they did not know of the Design to Murder the King; but that they intended to force the King to make great Reparations for the
the late Earl of Gowrie's Death; and that this Earl of Gowrie was to be made a great Man. Thus his Lordship.

But His Lordship has not thought fit to Document this; and Spotwood who lived in the Time has flatly contradicted it in these Words p. 459 'Another of Gowrie's Servants surname Craigenalt was some two days after apprehended, and both he and M. Tho. Cranston executed at Perth; tho' at their dying they declared that they knew NOTHING of the Earl's purpose, and had ONLY followed him as being their Master unto that Room, where if they had known the King to have been, they wou'd have stood for him against their Master and all others. Thus Spotwood. I dont for all this fay, that the Earl of Cromerty is wrong: But if he is not, certainly the Archbifhop is.

II. His Lordship has also given us in his Book a large and particular Account of the Process and Trial of Robert Logan of Restalrig. No one will suspect His Lordship's Exactness in the Extracts of the Documents of that Process which He has produced. But tho' His Lordship's Faithfullness is beyond Question, yet the Truth of the story it self is not. I shall give my Reason why I lay so.

Spotwood was at that Time at Man's Age, was Archbishop of Glasgow, was one of His Majesty's Privy-Council, was upon the Scaffold when Sprat the Notary, from whom that whole Process flow'd, was hang'd, and signs the Account of Sprat's Behaviour on the Scaffold, which we have p. 115 of His Lordship's Book: Spotwood, I say, who was thus every way qualified to give Judgment upon and a true Narration of this Process; Yet, in his History, tells the story in such a Manner, as wou'd tempt any Body shrewdly to suspect, that the whole Business was a Fiction. For thus His Words are p. 509.

Whether or not I should mention the Arraignment and Execution of George Sprat Notary in Eymouth, who suffered at Edinburg in the August preceeding, I am doubfull; his Confession, though voluntary and Constant carrying SMALL PROBABILITY. This Man had deponed, that He knew Robert Logan of Restalrig, who was dead two years before, to have been privy to Gowrie's Conspiracy, and that he underfool'd so much by a Letter that fell in his hand written by Restalrig to Gowrie, bearing that
that he would take part with Him in the Revenge of his Father's Death, and that his best Court should be to bring the King by Sea to Fasgale, where He might be safely kept, till advertisement came from those with whom the Earl kept Intelligence. It seemed a VERY FICTION, and to be a MEER INVENTION of the Man's own Brain; for neither did he shew the Letter, nor could ANY WISE MAN think that Gowry, who went about that Treason so secretly, would have communicated the Matter with such a Man as this Restalrig was known to be. Thus far His Grace, who, as we are told in his Life, had not only the Use of all the Registers both of Church and State in Scotland, but of all Letters of State that could any way concern the Work he was about. And yet his account not only differs from his Lordship's, but plainly contradicts it. 'Tis certain then there must be a Mistake somewhere, which I must leave to the Reader to judge upon as he lists.

I do not design by these two Remarks to derogate in the least from the Truth of the Conspiracy. For, in the Light wherein it now stands, I cannot conceive why any man should suspect it. The Earl of Gowry used the Black Art, wore Magicks Spells in his Girdle, which His Lordship himself was once Master of, and has very well proved in his Letter to his Printer prefixed to his Book. What Crime was not such a Person capable of? His Brother's whole Conduct in the Management of the Conspiracy speaks him Franckick. For 1st, That he should have shut up Henderson in the Chamber in order to perpetrate the Murder, and yet not have told him before hand that this was the Design. 2dly, That after having held the Whinger to the King's Breast, he should have fallen a parrying with him, and gone down stairs to consult with the Earl his Brother whether he should murder Him or not. 3dly, That he should have taken the King's Promise not to open the Window or cry out till he should return. 4thly, That when he had returned and sworn BY GOD there is no Remedy, you must die; he should have essay'd to try the King's Hands with a Garter, when, 'tis probable, he might have more easily dispatch'd Him without that Ceremony. Could there be greater Symptoms of a Man Distemper'd in his Wits than these and a great many other Circumstances that might be added? Why then should we any longer
longer doubt whether a Man in Compait and his Brother Non Compos wou’d attempt the greatest Villany?

But then, both the Earl and his Brother had always, till that very Day, pass’d under the Character of Wise, Sober and Virtuous Gentlemen, two Youths of great Hope, says Spotswood, at whose Hands no Man cou’d have expected such an Attempt. Was it any Wonder then if Mr. Bruce, and the other Ministers of Edinburgh who demurr’d a little, cou’d not at first Dash be perswaded, that they had all of a sudden become, the One of ’em a Devil, the other Distraacted? ’Tis plain there was a Difficulty here: And this is more than enough to vindicate the Presbyterian Ministers. Quod erat Faciendum.

I go on with Mr. Rhind, and proceed to consider His Charge of Rebellion.

Thirdly, In K. Charles I’s Time, I believe there is no wise Man will undertake to justify all that was done on either Side during those Troubles. The only Question is, who were the first Authors of them, and who gave the greatest cause of them?

Was it the Scots Presbyterians? My Lord Hollis has assolzied ’em. ’Twas proposed, saith he (1) that our Brethren of Scotland might be called in, who were known to be a wise People, Lovers of Order, firm to the Monarchy: Who had twice before gone through the Misfortune of taking up Arms, and wisely had laid them down again; still contenting themselves with that which was necessary for their Security, avoiding Extremities. Their Wisdom and Moderation, as was presumed, might then have delivered us from that Precipice of Misery and Confusion, into which our Charioteers were hurrying us amain. But these Men would none of it at that Time. Thus his Lordship.

Were not the Scots Prelates the first Authors of those Troubles? Did not they raise the Fire? Yes. Gilbert Burnet has expressly loaded them with it (m). ’Tis true, that Person has made a vigorous Appearance these twenty or thirty Years bygone against Popery, and in Behalf

of the Protestant Interest, which is a Fault never to be forgiven, in this World or in the next, if some Mens Doom hold: And, on that Score, any Testimony he cou’d give now, since he was Bishop of Sar- rum, cou’d be of no Weight. But this Testimony he gave when he was plain Gilbert Burnet, and was as through pac’d in the Principles of Pas- sive Obedience and Non-resistance as ever Mr Dodwell was, or Mr Leyly is. Plainly he tells, That the Scots Bishops, by reflecting on the Reformers, commending the Persons, and mollifying the Opinions of Papists, de- fending the Arminian Tenets, advancing a Liturgy without Law, provoking the Nobility by engrossing the King’s Favour, crying down the Morality of the Sabbath and prophaneing it by their Practi- ces, making themselves unsupportable to the Ministry by Simoniacal Pactioms and encroaching upon their Jurisdictions, by relinquishing their Dioceses and meddling in all secular Affairs, and by advising the King to introduce Innovations into the Church without Consent of the Clergy. By these and such like Things, faith he, the Scots Pre- lates raised that Fire in the Nation which was not soonest extinguished.

Is there any other Account to be brought from England? No. Those of the greatest Character and most unshaken Loyalty have told the Story as to that Kingdom the very same Way. I shall pro- duce two of them for the Purpose. The first is the Lord Falkland in his Speech before cited before the House of Commons, than which a more exact Piece of Eloquence with such rigid Truth, even An- cient Rome Herself cannot boast of. ‘ Mr. Speaker, faith He, He is a great stranger in Israel who knows not that this Kingdom hath long laboured under many and great Oppressions both in Religion and Liberty. And His Acquaintance here is not great, or his Ingenuity les, who doth not both know and acknowledge that a great if not a Principal Cause of both these have been some Bishops and their Adherents.—The Reader may peruse the Rest at His Leisure. To Him let us add My Lord Clarendon, an avowed Enemy to the Presbyterians, an Author who hardly ever allows Himself to speak one good Word of any Scots Man; and who, even when He has the brightest Characters of our Nation a drawing, yet lays on the Shadowing so thick, that the Piece appears but a very indifferent one. Even this Noble Historian, I say, has expressly charged the Troubles of those Times upon the unac- countable.
countable and fiery Measures of the Court and High Church Party. No less unjust Projects of all Kinds, saith He (n), many ridiculous, many Scandalous, all very grievous were set on Foot. The Council-Chamber and Star-Chamber held for Honourable that which pleased, and for just that which profited; and being the same Persons in several Rooms grew both Courts of Law to determine Right, and Courts of Revenue to bring in Money to the Treasury. The Council-Table by Proclamation enjoining to the People what was not injoined by the Law, and prohibiting what was not prohibited; and the Star Chamber cenfuring the Breach of those Proclamations by very large Fines and Imprisonment. And p. 223. That there were very few Persons of Quality who had not suffered or been perplexed by the Weight and Fear of these Judgments and Cenfures; and that no Man cou’d Hope to be longer free from the Inquisition of that Court than he resolved to submit to extraordinary Courses. So much for the Court.

Was High Church more Innocent? No, on the contrary She was the great Spring of all. The same Lord Clarendon owns (o) That when Laud was made Archbishop (which was in 1633) it was a Time of great Ease and Tranquility: The King had made Himself Superior to all those Difficulties He had to contend with, and was now reverenced by all His Neighbours; the general Temper and Humour of the Kingdom little inclined to the Papist and less to the Puritan. —The Church was not repined at, nor the least Inclination shewn to alter the Government or Discipline thereof, or to Change the Doctrine; nor was there at that Time any considerable Number of Persons of any valuable Condition throughout the Kingdom who did with either.

* And the Cause of so prodigious a Change in so few Years * N. B. after was too visible from the Effects. The Archbishop’s Heart was set upon the Advancement of the Church &c. —He never abated any Thing of His Severity and Rigour towards Men of all Conditions or in the Sharpness of His Language and Expressions. —And that He entertain’d too much Prejudice to some Persons.

Persons as if they were Enemies to the Discipline of the Church, because they concurred with Calvin in some Doctrinal Points, when they abhorred His Discipline, and reverenced the Government of the Church, and prayed for its Peace with as much Zeal and Fervency as any in the Kingdom, as they made manifest in their Lives and in their Sufferings with it and for it. Thus He, and a great deal more to the same Purpose, for which any Body may consult the History itself. Say now, Good Reader, who were the first and greatest Causes of the Troubles in K. Charles Ps Time?

But says Mr. Rhind, They betrayed Him into the hands of his Enemies, when He had entrusted them with His sacred Person. Let us hear my Lord Holles upon this p. 68. 'The Wisdom of the Scotch Nation foresaw the Inconveniences which must have necessarily followed had they been positive at that Time, how they had played their Enemies Game to their own Ruin, and even Ruin to His Majesty. Therefore they made for him the best Conditions they could, that is for the safety and Honour of His Person, and to avoid greater mischiefs were necessitated to leave Him in England and to march away. Here then the very Mouth of Iniquity was stoppt, malice itself had Nothing to say to give the least Blemish to the Faithfulness and Reality of the Kingdom of Scotland. Thus he.

Mr. Rhind urges, that They entered into the Solemn League and Covenant, and in Pursuance of the design thereof brought Matters to that Pass that the King's Death was unavoidable. That the English Sectarians intended the Solemn League for Nothing else but a Decoy I firmly believe. 'Tis plain that They, with Cromwell their Ring-Leader, were as very Villains as ever trode God's Earth, since the Days of Judas. But that the Scots entered into it upon the most Sincere and laudable Designs, the said Lord Holles has amply testified. And that it was not the Scots entering into, but the English breaking of that League that was the Cause of the King's Death is manifest as Light. And therefore the Scots justly reproached them with Breach of Covenant in all that they intended or acted against the King's Person.

Thus, in the Paper of the 5th of July, 1648, which was given in
in to the Speaker of the House of Commons the Commissioners for
the Kingdom of Scotland declared 'that they wou’d endeavour
' that the Rights and Privileges of Parliament may be preserved,
' that there be no Change in the Fundamental Government, and
' that there be no Harm, Injury or Violence offered to His Majest’s
' Person, the very Thought whereof the Kingdom of Scotland hath
' always abhorred, as may appear by all their Proceedings and De-
' clarations: And the Houses of Parliament have often upon fe-
' veral Occasions expressed a Detestation thereof in their Declara-
' tions. Wherefore we do expect that there shall be no proceed-
' ing against His Person, which cannot but continue and increase
' the great Distractions of these Kingdoms, and involve us in ma-
' ny Difficulties, Miseries and Confusions. Thus They. And
according to this Declaration they made their Protest. Again

The Commissioners of the General Assembly Jan. 16. 1649. emi-
ted their Necessary and Solemn Testimony against the Proceedings of
the Sectaries wherein they have these Words. 'If after somany
' Publick Professions and Solemn Attestations to the contrary,
' the Foundation shall be razed, Monarchy be destroyed,
' and Parliaments subverted by an Imaginary and preten-
' ded Agreement of the People: As it wou’d destroy the League and
' Covenant, and cause the Adversary to Blaspheme and insult, so it
' cannot but be the Cause of many Miseries and Calamities unto
' these Kingdoms. Thus they. Once more.

Upon the 18 of January 1649. The Estates of Parliament gave a
Return upon the said Testimony wherein they have these Words.
' Therefore the Estates of Parliament, after diligent Enquiry at all
' the Members of this Court, upon their publick and solemn Oath both
' concerning themselves and others, do declare and can assure their
' Brethren of England, that they cannot find that either this King-
' dom or any Person thereof had any Knowledge of or Accession unto
' the late Proceedings of the English Army in Relation to the King’s
' Person or the Houses and restrained Members thereof, but are very
' Confident there is no Ground for such Aspersions. Thus they. And ac-
' cordingly they instantly instructed their Commissioners that they
' should enter, in the Name of this Kingdom, their Dissent & Protest,That
as this Nation is free from all Knowledge of and Accession to these Designs
and Practices, so they may be free of all the Calamities, Miseries and Confusions which may follow thereupon to these Distraeted Kingdoms.

These are the most Publick and substantial Evidences that possibly can be brought to document any Matter of Fact, and will I hope be allowed to be of somewhat more Weight, than the furious Declarations of Mr Rhind and such others of the like Veracity, who stick to assert Nothing, and yet cite not to prove any thing. So much for K. Charles Ps Time.

Fourthly in K. Charles II's Time. After the English' had murdered the Father, the Scots proclaimed His Son King, invited him Home, crown'd and fought for him. And what thanks got they? Why the Cavaliers were glad that They had left so many of their Carcasses at Dumbar and Worcester. And Mr. L--ly speaking of the Sectarians (p) 'They bang'd, faith he, the Presbyterians heartily at Dumbar whose Word that Day was The COVENANT, 'the best Victory ever the King lost. Yet so obstinate were they in their Loyalty, that when the King had fled beyond Sea, and they were oppress'd with a raging Enemy in their Bowels, yet they still continued to own him, their Ministers prayed for him even in the Face of the English Forces, and encouraged and assisted General Monk to bring him home; and all this, notwithstanding they might have had their own Terms from Cromwell when he was in Scotland, in Case they would have submitted. So untrue is it what Mr Rhind says, that They were serving their own private Ends.

But says he, They made the Act of the West Kirk, wherein they declared, that They would not own him nor his Interest otherwise than with a Subordination to God, and so far as he owned and prosecuted the Cause of God, and disclaimed his and his Fathers Opposition to the Work of God and the Covenant. Well. And was this a Cause why Mr Rhind should separate from the Presbyterians? With what Conscience then could he join with the Church of England? 'Tis within the Memory of Man that the Prince of Orange came over to England in Opposition to K. James, and that upon the Invitation of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal. He sent his Declaration before him containing the
the Reasons and Intent of his coming. The King foresaw what a
Storm was brewing, and how heavy it was like to fall on his Head.
He called for the Bishops, and desired of 'em a Paper under their
Hands in Abhorrence of the Prince's intended Invasion. Did they comply with this Desire? No. They, even the Loyal and afterwards Non-Juring Bishops, the Bishops who had carried the
Doctrine of Loyalty to such an extravagant Height as had deluded
the King into all those false steps of Government which ruin'd
Him, even They, I say, flatly refused his desire; Yes, They re-fused it when He besought them in the Anguish of his soul. The Episcopalians are desired, always, when they tell the Story of the Westkirk
Act, to tell this too as a Counterpart to it. Salmasius wrote false
in the Case of King Charles I. when He wrote that the Presbyteri-
ans bound and the Independents killed the Sacrifice. Even Milton His
Adversary, tho, a bitter Enemy of the Presbyterians, has observed
( q ) that, in saying so, He has contradicted Himself, having else-
where wholly loaded the Independents with it. But 'tis plain beyond
Doubt, that in the Case of K. James, the Episcopalians both bound and
called the Sacrifice. For, To be deposed and after live, is something worse
than Death. I am fully perswaded that what they did was absolutely
necessary for preserving the Protestant Religion. But then 'tis a very
immodest Thing in them to upbraid the Presbyterians with such Acts
as themselves were guilty of. But to go on with K. Charles II's
Reign.
'Tis true that a small Handful of People, enraged with the
most horrid Oppression, made an Insurrection first in the Year 1666
at Pentland, and afterwards in the Year 1679 at Bothwell. But
first to exasperate Men with Cruel Usage, and then to upbraid them
for resenting it, is the utmost Barbarity the most spirituall Na-
ture can be guilty of, and that they were thus exasperated, simply
upon the Account of Nonconformity, before the Rising at Pentland,
I refer for Proof to a small Tract entitled A Short Memorial of the
Grievances and Sufferings of the Presbyterians in Scotland since the
year 1660. But indeed we need not refer to any Book, there
are many Thousands yet living who remember it to their Cost.

So

[q] Defenso pro Populo Anglicano. Cap. X.
So much for K. Charles II's Time, and as much as is necessary for K. James VII's Time.

In the Present and Preceding Reigns Mr. Rhind Himself cannot charge them with Rebellion; but He falls a Prophecying that they would Rebell if put to the Trial, and if their Interest did not oblige them to live in Peace. This is one of His Visionary Flights, so necessary to make up Dryden's Character of the English Corah.

Some future Truths are mingled in His Book,

And where the Witness fail'd, the Prophet Spoke.

But if Mr. Rhind act the Prophet upon the Presbyterians, may not I act the Historian upon the Episcopalian. I gave a Hint before of their new Liturgy. Now hear their Intercession in it. We pray Thee to be Gracious to our Prince, who for the Sins both of Priests and People, is now kept out. — Raise Him Friends abroad, convert or confound the Hearts of His Enemies at Home. — And by the secret Windings and Powerfull Workings of thy Providence, make the Stone which these foolish Builders have rejected, the Head Stone of the Corner. Was not this a very loyall Prayer? And has not their Practice been agreeable? For, whence all the Insurrections under Dundee, Cannon and Buchan? Whence the Assiffination Plot against K. William? I doubt not, but They'll affirm all those Efforts were act as of Loyalty, and so I'm sure the worst of Rebels generally Excuse themselves. Even Satan himself does not usually shew His Horns or put forth his cloven Foot. But enough of this part of the charge. And to conclude it, 'tis very true, the Presbyterians do not ascribe an unlimited Power to any Prince on Earth. And, for my own Part, I freely declare, that an unlimited Power, without an unlimited Wisdom to direct it, and an unlimited Goodness to qualify it, raises a more frightfull Idea in Me than is that of the Devil himself. Let the Episcopalian Party make as much of this as they ever can.

VIII. He charges Them p. 216. with a Spirit of Division, which faith, He, drives them from the Communion of the Church, and cuts them off from the ordinary Communications of the Holy Ghost. For Answer, 'tis true it drives them from the Communion of Mr. Rhina's Church: And I hope a Mercifull God will still keep Them and every good
good Christian from such a Communion; a Communion, as I have shewn, so absolutely void of the Spirit of Charity, that we are as sure 'tis not the Spirit of Christ by which they are acted, as we are sure that Christ the Son of God taught Charity. And 'tis better it were (as Archbishop Tillotson has most truly taught) there were no reveal'd Religion, and that Human Nature were left to the Conduct of its own principles and Inclinations, which are much more mild and mercifull, much more for the Peace and Happiness of Human Society; than to be acted by a Religion that inspires Men with so vile a Fury and prompts them to commit such Outrages. This then is the only Answer needs be given, That the more the Spirit of Presbytery drives People from Mr. Rhind's Church, the more it drives them into the Church of Christ.

He adds further That, this their Spirit throws them (like the De-moniack in the Gospel) sometimes into the fire and oft into the Water. By this I suppose He means that they are sometimes divided among themselves, which indeed in the former Times of Presbytery was too true, and I believe They all desire to be humbled for it before God; and I hope the present Generation will make so good a Use of the Failings of their Fathers as to keep united among themselves henceforth, as they have done hitherto to the great Mortification of their Adversaries. The best of Men will differ in some Things both as to Judgment and Practice. But I hope we shall never differ so far as to divide.

Non eadem sentire Bonos de rebus ijsdem
Incolumni licuit semper Amicitia.

In the mean Time it is shamelessly immodest in a Man that pretends to have join'd the Church of England, to upbraid the Presbyterians with their Divisions. For pray what has Low-Church and High Church been doing these Score of Years bypast, but damning each other, and separating from other? What have the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation been doing, but managing a Civil

Civil War in the most furious Manner, the latter accusing the former of Treachery, and the former upbraiding the latter with Ecclesiastical Rebellion? If Mr. Rhind knows Nothing of this, I recommend to his Perusal the Books cited on the Margin (s).

--- Tantane animis caelestibus ira?

IX. In the last Place, He charges the Presbyterians p. 216, 217, with an Unneighbourly, Cruel and Barbarous Spirit.

Not an ' That they slander their Catholic Neighbours, exert their ill Nature in a special Manner against their unneighbourly, Cruel, Ecclesiastical Superiors, pry into their Lives, and aggraves their Frailties, gladly hearken to, readily believe, and zealously propagate the most idle, false and malicious Stories of them. I know no other Answer this needs, but that it is an idle, false and malicious Representation: And when he subjoins his Proof, it will be Time enough to make a more particular Reply.

In the mean Time he hints at Five Things which are to be taken some Notice of viz. 1st, the Conduct of the General Assembly in 1638. 2dly, The Attempts made upon the Lives of Bishops. 3dly, The bar-

barbarous Murder of that Venerable old Man the Archbishop of St. Andrews. 4thly, The Rabbling so many Ministers at the Revolution. And lastly, The Deposing so many of them by the Church Judicatories. These are the particular Grounds of his Charge, and I shall consider each of 'em in Order.

First. As for the Conduct of the General Assembly Anno 1638. He complains that They trode under Foot the Bishops of the Church, and pretended to excommunicate them, while they were without the Communion of the Church themselves. To which 'tis answered 1st, That they themselves cou'd not without the Communion of the Church even by Mr Rhind's own Principles: For, they were generally, if not all of 'em, Episcopally ordain'd; and no Sentence had as yet past against them declaring them Schismaticks, when they Deposed all, and Excommunicate the most Part of the Bishops. 2dly, That they had just Reason to depose, and upon their Obstinance to Excommunicate them, Gilbert Burnet has assured us. For, if they were guilty of crying down the Morality of the Sabbath, and prophesying it by their Practices; if they were guilty of Simoniacal Pactsions, of relinquishing their Diocesses and introducing Innovations without Law, without Consent of the Church; who can be so harden'd as to deny that such Persons were justly dealt with? How cou'd they be Governors of the Church who were not worthy to be Members of it?

Secondly, As to the Attempts made by them upon the Lives of Bishops. I suppose he means by this Mitchell's wounding the Bishop of Orkney in the Arm with a Pistol shot Anno 1668. It was no doubt a most unjustifiable Act. But is the Body of the Presbyterians to be charged with it? Hear himself in his Letter after he was sentenced to die. ' I adventured on it, faith be (c), from my own pure and proper Motion with out the Inflation of any, yea without so much as the Privity of any of that Party; whom therefore, I earnestly desire that none may charge with it. And if any shall, I do with Confidence aver, that they deal with them most unjustly. Thus he. This, I hope, is sufficient to vindicate the Presbyterians. Mr Rhind is desired to vindicate the Episcopalians in taking his Life upon his Extrajudicial Con.
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Confession, after he had emitted it upon the publick Faith that it should not be brought in Judgment against him.

Thirdly. As to the Murder of that venerable old Man the Archbishop of St Andrews. 'Tis acknowledged that the killing of him (whoever did it) was Murder, and a most barbarous Murder. But I crave Leave to put in a Word first upon the Bishop's Character. Secondly, upon the Weight of the Argument, supposing Presbyterians had been the Murderers. And Thirdly upon the Truth of that Allegedance.

As for the First viz. The Bishop's Character. 'Tis true he was an Old Man: There is no denying of it, and therefore the Fact was the more inexcusable. Nor shall we grudge him the Stile of Venerable. In Titulus Honorarijs non est Falsitas. Why may not even a Fustus be called Most Noble? But then as to the Moral Part of his Character, I suppose his best Friends cannot deny but that he was guilty of the greatest Perfidy a Man cou'd be guilty of. The Question now is not, Whether Prelacy or Presbyterian be the righter Government; but whether Treachery under Trust be a Vice or a Virtue, a Crime or Commendable Practice. If Mr Sharp was under Convictions that the Presbyterians were wrong, and thereupon had design'd to revolt from them; as no Body cou'd have hindered him, so no Body cou'd have blamed him any further than some Hundreds of his Brethren who did the same. But to undertake the Management of the whole Presbyterian Interest which was then lying at Stake, to give the most solemn Promises to be faithfull in it; yea, to take their Money for bearing his Charges in that Service; and yet after all, instead of managing that, to manage over the Primacy to himself; this was so very Foul an Act, that as I'm sure it cannot be justified, so I doubt if it can be paralleled.

Whether he was guilty of other Things which were afterwards laid to his Charge, I shall not say: But I hope I may be allowed to tell a Story which Church of England Men have published to the World. Mr L-ly has given the World an Account (v) of a certain History yet unpublished, and therefore called by him The Secret History, but by the Author himself The History of his own Time. This Secret Historian, who was no Presbyterian, but of an eminent Cha-
Character in the Church of England tells us, 'That one of the Murderers fired a Pistol at the Bishop which burned his Coat and Gown, but the Shot did not go into his Body, upon which a Report was afterwards spread, that he had purchased a Magical Secret for securing him against Shot, and his Murderers gave it out that there were very suspicious Things found in a Purse about him. This was the dismal Fate of that unhappy Man who certainly needed a little more Time to have fitted him for an unchangeable State. But I would fain hope that he had all his Punishment in that terrible Conclusion of his Life. Thus far the Secret Historian as reported by Mr L. ly.

2dly, Supposing Presbyterians had been the Murderers, of what Weight would that Allegiance be against the Body of that Community, or against the Presbyterian Principles? How many ill Things are done every Day in every Nation by Professed Christians? But were it just to load the whole Christian Church with them, or to impute them to the Spirit of Christianity? It is equally unjust to load Presbytery with the Bishop's Murder. And so much the more, that the Secret Historian just now cited tells us, that the Murderers (who ever they were) had not resolved on doing this any Time before; but, seeing His Coach appear alone in the Moor, they took their Resolution all on a sudden. But

3dly, Is it true that Presbyterians were the Murderers? Mr L. ly tells us (§) of a Narrative that was published shortly after committing the Fact, wherein it is said 'That Five of their Accomplices, Comploters and Abettors of the Murder chose to die, and to be hung upon in Chains upon the place, rather than confess the Sinfulness of the Action by acknowledging it was Murder or a Sin. This I suppose is the best Evidence for charging the Fact upon the Presbyterians, and Mr L. ly triumphs upon it. Now, 'tis very true there were Five Men put to Death on Magus Moor (where the Bishop was Murdered) on that Account, and all the Five own'd themselves Presbyterians. But now let us hear them in their last Words, while they were upon, or at the Foot of the Ladder, just a stepping into Eternity.

Andrew Sword. 'The Bishop of St Andrews Death I am free of, having lived four or five Score of Miles from this, and was

[x] ibid. ubi supra.
was in this Place before: neither did I ever see a Bishop in the Face that I knew to be a Bishop.

James Wood. As for our coming here upon the Account of the Bishop's Death: For my own Part, I was never in this Place of the Country before; neither ever saw I a Bishop in my life, that I cou'd say there was the Man.

John Waddel. As for my Accession to the Bishop's Death whereas we are sentenced to die in this Place, I declare I was never Over the Water of Forth in this Country before this Time.

Thomas Brown. Some of you may judge our dying and hanging here is upon the Account of the Bishop's Death, and that I was necessary thereunto. But I must tell you as to that, that I was never in this Country before this Time.

John Clyde. I shall say no more but only two or three Words anent the Thing I was accused of by those that pursued me, and that was the King's Advocate and Bishop Sharp's Brother, anent the Bishop's Killing. --- I wish the Lord may not lay it to their Charge. For I never saw that Man whom They called the Bishop of St Andrews that I knew by another Man.

Thus these Five Men who ventured their Eternity upon their Innocence as to the Bishop's Death. Whether the Episcopalian can purge themselves of their Innocent Blood, I leave it to their own Consciences. So much for the Presbyterians Barbarous Ufage of Bishops.

But can High-Church purge Herself of using Bishops Barbarously? Who then were they that assaulted the Bishop of Worcester, broke His Coach Windows, pelted, abused, and put him in Danger of his Life? Does not the forecited Mr. Biffet tell us p. 8. that it was High-Church. Who was it call'd Archbishop Grindall a perfidious Prelate from the Pulpit. Is Dr. Sacheverell a Presbyterian? Who was it wrote all the scurrilous Lampoons against Bishop Burnet viz. Salt for the Leach. Sham Sermon dissected. Good old Cause. Proper Defence. Evil be Thou my Good? Is Mr. L--ly Presbyterian? Who is it affirms That the Spirit of Grace is conferred in Baptism after a Manner which neither Bishop Burnet nor the Author of the Dialogues, between the Curate and the Country-Man knows any Thing of?
Chap. V. Presbyterian Spirit.

Is Mr. Barclay Presbyterian (y)? Who says that all that Bishop Burnet preached in 1688. was not Gospel? Is Mr. G.--n. Presbyterian? But I shou'd never come to an End, shou'd I touch upon every Thing High-Church has both said of, and done to Bishops these Score of Years bypast. Had Mr. Rhind then no Shame to charge us with the Abusing of Bishops? Let such as have abused them be, all reckon'd Presbyterians, and I'm sure we shall be fifty thousand stronger than we are ordinarily reckon'd to be. But I proceed.

Fourthly, As to the Rabbling so many of their Clergy in the Beginning of the Revolution. 'Tis true, some of them were Rabbled out, and no Man can or ought to undertake to Justify the Rabble in doing so. But had not the Clergy exasperated them to the greatest Height? How often had the Government, upon their Relation, or by their Instigation, driven the poor People's Cattle, shut up their Shops, spoil'd their Goods, imprison'd their Persons, squeeazed the Marrow out of their Bones with Boots and Thumbkins, Hang'd up their Husbands, Fathers, Brothers, and other Relations, and all this upon the Account of Nonconformity? 'Tis true, the People ought to have forgiven them all these Injuries, as indeed generally they did. But was it to be expected, but that Corruption in some of 'em wou'd prevail over Principle, or, that, upon a Turn of Affairs, their Resentment wou'd not vent itself against the Authors of these Injuries? I don't talk without book when I say the Clergy were the Authors of these Injuries. No. Dr. Canaries will Justify me beyond the need of other Documents, which yet might be produced by Hundreds. The Doctor, when lately return'd from Rome, Published in the Year 1684. a Book entitled A Discourse representing the Sufficient Manifestation of the Will of God &c, which He Dedicated to the Earl of Perth, then Chancellor: Therein p. 187. He draws the Presbyterians in all the odious Characters that Malice cou'd devise, as light and wild Extravagants, the very Dregs and Feculency of Mankind, on the Account both of their Birth and Breeding, but especialy so, because of their very Souls and Immoralities; as being such a Herd of dull and untractable and whining and debauch'd Animals as scarcely go beyond those of the Hogs and Goats, which ever any of

[ y ] See Barclay's Persuasive p. 149. 150.
Defence of the

Chap. V.

them was ever born for to attend. Thus He. Now when he had thus
dressed them up in the Skins of Brutes, was it not natural that the
next step shou'd be to set the Dogs at 'em to worry 'em? Yes,
that He does with a Witness. He is at so much Pains to Smooth
over all the Severities of the Government against them, that he
reckons Hanging it self but a Trifle. The Worst, says he p. 192,
is to be flung over a Ladder, or for one's Neck to be tied to a Beam,
and then to have a Sledge driven out under Him. Was there ever a
clearer Comment than this upon Solomon's Words The tender Mercies
of the Wicked are Cruel? Was it any Wonder that People were
Irritated against such Furies? As the Clergy then excited the Go-

vernment to those Severities, so they have justifis them ever since,
and complain'd that our Princes were too Mercifull. Thus Mr. Rhind
in His Sermon on Loyalty Preached and Printed 1711, speaking
of K. Charles I. Others again (fath he p. 49, 50) find Fault with
His too great Clemency and Indulgence; and truly I muft own that THIS
was his Fault: And indeed there is TOO M'uch of it in the
Blood of his Family --; Of such a Gospel Strain are the Episcopal Ser-
mons!

But why are the Presbyterians alone charged with Rabbling? Do
the Episcopalians know nothing of that Trade? Did Mr Rhind
never hear of Sacheverell's Mobs, and the burning down the Di-
senter's Meeting-Houses? Did he never hear of the Rabbling Mr
Tullidaaff at Errol May 10, 1691? Did he never hear of the Rabble at
Old-Deer (z)? Did he never hear of the Episcopal Treatment
of Mr Chisbolm in March 1711 sent to read the Presbytery's Edict for
planting the vacant Church of Gearloch (a)? No Pagan History can
furnish such an Instance of Barbarity. But why do I insist on Parti-
culars? Even under K. William's Reign, their Rabblings were so
frequent, that the Parliament found it needful to make a very strict
Att against them (b) And even notwithstanding that, They are
still continued with the greatest Infolence, wherever they can hope
to make any Hand with them. Is it not modest then in the Episcopalians

---

lians to object Rabling to the Presbyterians? In the Episcopalians, I say, who persecute while they are in, and Rabble when they are out.

Lastly, As to the Deposing so many of their Clergy by Church Judicatories. Let us hear Dr Edwards an Eminent Divine of the Church of England in his Sermon on the Union, concerning the present establish'd Church of Scotland. 'They have, saith be, with the Patience of Confessors and Martyrs (and such a great Number of them were) borne the sufferings which the High-Church Men brought upon them, and now when they are able to re taille, they study not Revenge, but let the World see, they can forgive as well as suffer. This Testimony is of some more Weight than Mr Rhind's malicious Insinuations. I suppose the Presbyterians will be able to defend themselves upon a Condescension on Particulars. In the mean Time the difference between the Episcopal and Presbyterian Conduct in this is pretty remarkable. In the Year 1662, three hundred Presbyterian Ministers were Turned out of their Churches simply upon the Account of Nonconformity, because they would not receive Collation from the Bishop (upon a Presentation from the Patron) without any other Fault proven or alleged against them. At the Revolution there was not one Man of the Episcopal Clergy either deprived or deposed upon the Account of his Principle concerning Church Government. Say, Good Reader, which of these two Ways of acting was the more Christian and accountable? At the Restoration, not one Man, that I can hear of, was left in Possession of any Church in Scotland, who either had not Episcopal Orders, or at least received Collation from the Bishop. At the Revolution above two Hundred of the Episcopal Clergy were still continued in their Charges, many of which are alive, and in Possession at this Day, tho' in many Places Insolent to the last Degree in their Behaviour against the Establish'd Church. So that, if those who were still kept in, those who voluntarily dimitted, those who were deprived by the Council upon the Account of their Dis-loyalty, those who were censured by Act of Parliament April. 25, 1690, Restoring the Presbyterian Ministers who were thrust from their Charges since the first of January 1661: when all these I say are deducted, with those that complyed, and, upon doing so, were assumed, I suppose the Number of the Deposed will appear very small. And if Mr
Mr Rhind can prove them to have been innocent, I doubt not but He will oblige them and his whole Party. Let me only add, that a severe Treatment of Ministers is the Thing in the World a Church of England-Man shou’d be most loath to upbraid others with, as knowing how easy it is to reply. Were not three hundred Ministers deposed, deprived, excommunicated, imprison’d or banished in two Years Time after the Conference at Hampton Court 1603 simply for Nonconformity to the Liturgy, tho’ otherwise they were Episcopally ordain’d (c)? Were not two Thousand Ministers ejected at once by the Bartholemew Act 1662 (d)? All the Protestant Churches in Europe put together cannot, I suppose, furnish so many Instances of Ministers deprived or deposed on any Account whatsoever, as England can for simple Nonconformity to Prelacy and paulytry Ceremonies. Tho’ then the deposing or depriving of Clergy-Men might have tempted Mr Rhind to separate from the Presbyterians, yet had not his Affection been much more partial, than his Conscience was nice, He had never been, on that Account, sway’d to the Episcopal side, which has been vastly more guilty. So much for the Unneighbourly, Cruel and Barbarous Spirit of the Presbyterians.

Thus I have gone through all the Particulars of Mr Rhind’s Charge, wherein he essays to make the Presbyterian Spirit diametrically opposite to that of the Gospel. Every Reader, I suppose, will easily discern the Difference ’twixt his Accusation and my Defence. The Accusation (tho’ that is always an odious Part) is neither qualified nor proven. The Defence is made good, and the Charge disproved from the very Books the Accuser appeals to, or by the Testimony of the most eminent Episcopalians.

And now to come to an End, who can but pity Mr Rhind? Who, besides the SCHISM, HERESY, and SUPERSTITION he has run into, has brought himself under the crying Guilt of the most wretched PROPHANENESS and IMPIETY against GOD, and the most malicious CALUMNY against his Neighbours and Benefactors. I heartily
heartily wish he may Repent of this his Wickedness, and pray GOD, if perhaps the Thoughts of his Heart may be forgiven him.

UPON the whole I conclude, that the PRESTBYTERIAN GOVERNMENT is of Divine Institution. Their ARTICLES OF FAITH taught by the Scripture, and believed by the Catholick Church. Their WORSHIP Pure and Perfect in all Essentials. And their SPIRIT and Practice at least as becoming the Gospel as that of their Neighbours.

THE END.
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ART. VI. The Argument for Prelacy from the Impossibility of its Y y
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obtaining so early and universally, if it had not been of Divine Institution Examined, p. 151.
Proved that such an Impossibility cannot be inferred either 1st, From the Piety and Zeal of the Primitive Times p. 152. Nor 2dly, from the Universal Spread of Episcopacy p. 154. Nor 3dly, from the Vigilance of the Governours of the Church p. 155. Nor 4thly, from the Unparallel'dness of the Case p. 156. Nor 5thly, from the Ne-Opposition was made to the Change p. 157.
Testimonies for Presbyterianism from Antiquity p. 159.
Jerome. Ib.
The Exceptions against Jerome's Testimony examined, p. 171.

S E C T. VI.
Mr. Rhind's Reasonings against the Presbyterian Ruling Elders and Deacons, Examined, p. 175.
ART. I. His Reasonings against the Presbyterian Ruling Elders Examined, p. 176
ART. II. His Reasonings against the Presbyterian Deacons, Examined, p. 185.
An Address to the Gentlemen of High-Church Principles shewing the Uncharitableness of them, and how destructive they are of the whole Protestant Interest through the World, p. 188. Their confidence upon their Principles so much the less tolerable that they are Groundless. p. 192.

Chap. III.

Mr. Rhind's Second Reason for Separating from the Presbyterianists, viz. That their Articles of Faith are fundamentally False and Pernicious, Examined, p. 196.
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SECT. I.
Mr Rhind's Objections against their Articles of Faith Consider'd p. 197.

His Objections against the Doctrine of the Decrees in General, Examin'd, Ib. His Objections against their Doctrine of Predestination p. 201. Against their Doctrine of the Efficacy of Grace p. 207. shewed not to be inconsistent with a Good Life or unable to persuade one to Reform, in a DIALOGUE BETWEEN a CALVINIST Teacher and a DEBAUCHE of the Party p. 209.

His Objections against the Doctrine of Perseverance p. 214.

SECT. II.
The Presbyterian Articles of Faith the same with those of the Christian Church. p. 221.


Chap IV.
MR Rhind's Third Reason for separating from the Presbyterians viz. That their Worship is fundamentally Corrupt and Imperfect, Examin'd p. 233.

SECT. I.
His Objections against the Presbyterian's Prayers Examin'd. p. 234.

ART. I. His Argument and Ten Instances for Proving that the Matter of them must be and is Corrupt Examin'd. Ib.

ART. II. His Exceptions against the Manner of the Presbyterian's Prayers Examin'd, p. 248.

The alleged Disadvantages of Extemporane Prayer Consider'd. Ib. His Arguments for proving the Excellency of the Liturgick Way
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Mr. Rhind's Answer to the Objection against restricting People to Forms viz. That they Stint the Spirit, Considered p. 263. His horrid Comment on the Spirit's Helping our Infirmities. p. 264.

S E C T. II.

The Objections against the Presbyterian Doctrine concerning the Sacraments, and Exceptions against their Manner of Dispensing them, Consider'd p. 272.

These Discoursed. 1st as to Baptism. Ib. 2dly, as to the Lord's Supper. p. 279.


Chap. V.

Mr. Rhind's Fourth Reason for Separating from the Presbyterians viz. That their Spirit is Diametrically Opposite to that of the Gospel, Examined. p. 289.

The Meaning and Intendment of this Reason. Ib. Several Things Charged on the Presbyterians which they not only Confess but avow. p. 291. Mr. Rhind's Prophanenesis in Burlesquing the Scripture p. 292.


A Short Digression on the Right Honourable the Earl of Cromer's Historical Account of the Conspiracies by the Earls of Gowry. p. 317.


The CONCLUSION p. 340.