

A

699. e

**Brief Vindication**

OF THE

*Fundamental Articles*

OF THE

**Christian Faith,**

AS ALSO

Of the *Clergy, Universities and Public Schools*, from Mr. *Lock's Reflections* upon them in his *Book of Education, &c.*

With some *Animadversions* on two other late Pamphlets, *viz.* Of Mr. *Bold* and a *Nameless Socinian* Writer.

---

By *John Edwards, B. D.*

---

LONDON: Printed for *J. Robinson* at the *Golden Lion*, and *J. Wyat* at the *Rose* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*, 1697.

---

---

THE  
*Epistle Dedicatory*  
TO BOTH  
UNIVERSITIES.

HONOURED SIRS,

**A** *Late Writer hath taken the confidence to make very Disrespectfull, Indecent, Rude, and Scurrilous Reflections upon You, and hath with that Scorn and Insolence, which are peculiar to him, and cannot be supposed to be in any other Man, censured your Studies and Ways and Methods of Learning, which are at this day own'd and practis'd by you. They have always born the brand of Infamy who have shew'd their ill will to these Publick Schools of Education and Professed Seminaries of Arts and*

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

Literature. Pope Paul the Second and Sixtus the Fourth who succeeded him were infamous on this account, for both of them were observ'd to haare a Hatred to Universities, and publickly to declare their abhorrence of Academick Men and Learning. Mr. Hobbes is a Modern Instance, who was wont to decry the University-Studies and Learning, because he had espoused a Set of Notions which were destructive not only to Academick but all Religious Principles. But a later Instance we have in one Mr. Lock, who though he infinitely comes short of the forenamed Person in Parts or Good Letters, yet hath taken the courage to tread in his Old Friend's steps, and publickly to proclaim his dislike of University-Men, and to remonstrate against the Methods they take in bringing up of Youth. The Name of Publick Schools and Academies is as hatefull to him as that of Athanasius to a Socinian.

Nor

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

Nor is he pleas'd with our Old Christianity, but hath offer'd a New Scheme to the World, the same (the very same in words, as well as to the Thing) with what Mr. Hobbes propounded as the Perfect and Compleat Model of Faith, viz. To believe in Christ is nothing else than to believe that Jesus is the Christ: and no other Faith, besides this Article, is required to Eternal life. *De Cive* cap. 18. The belief of this Article, Jesus is the Christ or Messias, is all the Faith required for Salvation. *Leviathan*. Part. 3. Chap. 43. This is the Doctrine which is revived and furbish'd up in the pretended Reasonableness of Christianity: and you see whence it is borrow'd. When that Writer was framing a New Christianity, he took Hobbes's *Leviathan* for the New Testament, and the Philosopher of Malmsbury for our Saviour and the Apostles. See how naturally a Man passes from ar-  
raigning

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

*raigning and vilifying the Universities to affront and abuse Religion! He had with pride and contempt trampled upon the former, and now he attacks the latter, and treads Christianity it self under his feet.*

*It may be few of you have taken notice of the Affronts done to your selves by this Bold Assailant, as not busying your selves with such sort of Writers, or as thinking such Reflections below your Resentments. But I having had occasion to enter the Lists with this Gentleman, it falls in my way to take notice of his Double Insolence, i. e. to You and to Religion, but more especially the latter, which he hath miserably shatter'd and unsettled, and almost reduced to nothing; having baulk'd a great part of the Gospels, and wholly laid aside the Epistles, and renounced all Articles of Christianity but One as necessary to be believ'd to constitute a Man a Christian, and having every where shew'd*

## The Epistle Dedicatory.

*shew'd his disdain of the Ministry and Ministers of the Gospel, especially the Clergy of the Church of England. So that he deserves to be treated with Satyr rather than Argument. And therefore if there be in the ensuing Papers a kind of mixture of the former with the latter, I hope it will not be displeas'd even by the most Serious and Judicious Readers when they consider on whom it is bestow'd.*

*Gentlemen, I have now an opportunity of vindicating the Honour of those Renowned and Learned Bodies to which you belong, and likewise of asserting and defending the Cause of Christianity: wherefore I thought I should be defective as to both these Concerns if I did not offer these Papers to You, and humbly request You to take them into your patronage, with the Author of them, who is,*

Most Learned Sirs,

Your entire Servant and Honower

JOHN EDWARDS.

SIR,  
You know Books Printed at Cambridge are commonly Licensed by the University, and accordingly when I designed the following Papers for the Press there, I requested Mr. *Vice-Chancellor* and the *Regius* Professor of Divinity to peruse them, which they did, and then returned them to me with an *Imprimatur*: and two other Heads of Colleges (for I applied my self to no more) were pleased to sign the same. The Form was thus:

April 17. 1697.

Imprimatur.

*Hen. James Procan.*

*Jo. Beadmont Reg. Theol. Prof.*

*Jo. Covell S. T. P.*

*Jo. Bulderston S. T. P.*

But since I found it necessary to be printed at London, and that I might not seem neglectful of the Favour and Kindness of the worthy Persons before mentioned; And that you and the Reader may see that the Ensuing Undertaking was so far approved of by those Learned Gentlemen, that they Licensed the Printing of it: I have thought fit for their Satisfaction and yours to set down their Names.

Your humble Servant

J. E.

A  
Brief Vindication  
OF THE  
*Christian Faith, &c.*

After I had observed the rude and surly Genius of a late Penman, the *Author* and *Vindicator* of a Treatise which he entitles *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, I had a mind to see what was his Humour in some other of his Productions, and accordingly I look'd into his Papers of *Education*, and there I soon discover'd that it was his settled Nature and Temper to Traduce all ranks of Persons, and that he had taught his Tongue to Revel, and that he can't write three Pages without thrice as many Calumnies and Falshoods, and so I less wondered at his *Rudeness* to Me. There I found that he libels the most Learned and Celebrated Societies of Men in this Nation, that he strives to blast the reputation of the most *Useful Persons*, and to ridicule their *Publick Employments* and *Stattons*, that with an ungovernable pride and disdain he discards some *Arts* and *Sciences*, and laughs

at the Professors of them: And in brief, I found that he imperiously flies at all, and like some Barbarous Invader makes havock wheresoever he comes, and spares no Sex, Place, or Quality of Persons. Of which I will now give the Reader some particular Instances, and undeniable proofs.

For I conceive it will not be expected that I should first endeavour to make it clear, that the Author of *the Reasonableness of Christianity* is the same person that writ concerning *Education*, for all his Friends and Admirers, (who would not wrong him, we must think) make him the Father of both: And he owns it *himself*, for when I saluted him by the name of Mr. Lock in a late Treatise [The Socinian Creed. Chap. 6.] he readily answer'd to it. In his Socinian Creed, p. 120. he begins with *ME*, saith he, Vindicat. p. 358. and afterwards in the same Page and the four following ones, he particularly applies to *himself* what I said of him by *Name* in that Chapter; and he concludes p. 402. *This is all that is new, which I think My self concern'd in, in his Socinian Creed.* This *All* is what I had said concerning his *One Article*, and concerning his baulking of the *Epistles*, and concerning his crying down of *Systems* with a design to establish one of his own. All along I charg'd Mr. Lock with these things, to which the Author of the *Reasonableness of Christianity* submissively replies, *I think MY SELF concern'd in all this*, which is as much as to say, I am Mr. Lock whom you mentioned so often in that Chapter. And we shall find in p. 424, 425. of

of his *Second Vindication*, that he takes to *himself* whatever I had said with particular reference to Mr. Lock, whom I expressly named in the foresaid Chapter. Here we see the *Masker* pulls off his *Vizour*, and after all his *Disguises* owns himself to bear that *Name* which I call'd him by. I think then I may proceed.

First, to give the Reader a right Idea of this Gentleman, I will take notice of his way of treating the *Universities* whether at home or abroad, for we must know that he is a Catholick Hater of them all, as appears from his scornful censuring and disparaging the *Learning now in fashion in the Schools of Europe*, page 158 of his *Thoughts of Education*, by which general terms he means the Formed *Academies* as well as the meaner *Schools* and Seats of Education which are in these *European* parts. Our Universal Railer spares neither Foreign Nurseries of Learning, nor those in his own Country. It is as easie to him with the same infectious Breath, to blast the one as the other. And his Pride and Arrogance prompt him to blow upon both, and to defy all Methods of *Education* but his own. But chiefly his spight is heightned against those Two Famous Seminaries of Learning which our own Nation is blessed with, and thence it is that they fall under such Benedictions as these from him, which I shall next take notice of. *The Tutors* (saith he) *think it their great business to fill the Studies and Heads of their Pupils with such Authors as these, viz. Burgerseidicus and Schiebler. p. 162.* This is an unpardonable fault.

fault, and therefore the Lash is due from our Severe Educator, and accordingly he here bestows it on the *Cambridg* and *Oxford* Tutors. I charge you, young Men, as I am Tutor General, not to deal in such Authors. Read *John Lock* who writ of *Humane Understanding*, and hath had little of it since, and not over much then. If you would fill your Pupils heads with Whimsies, there is a Book for you, If you would have no Idea of the Supreme Being, and a false one of Christianity, and a fantastick one of Good Manners, then think it your great business, to fill your Studies with my *Essay*, and my Reasonableness of Christianity, and my Thoughts of Education. Though I know not whether *Burgesdicinus* and *Schiebler* be Authors in fashion amongst the generality of Tutors at this time, but rather think they are not; yet if they have been, or are among some, it is enough to ground an Out cry upon. In the same page he tells us that *Burgesdicinus's* and *Schieblers* did not swarm in *Seneca's* days, as they do now in these. No, good Sir, nor did such Whimsical Writers as *John Lock* and *Sam. Bold* swarm in those days, as they do now. He very worshipfully urges the little advantage of *Logick*, p. 234. and presently after adds, that the Skill of Reasoning well is seldom or never got by studying the Rules which pretend to teach it. Again, in the same place, merely to disparage the Academick Studies, he tells us that Right Reasoning is founded on some thing else than the Predicaments and Predicables, and consists not in talking in Mood and Figure: But we know, Good Sir, it is inconsistent with talking against them,

In

In an other place, p. 145. he hath a sting at *Latin* (as well as *Logick*) brought from the *Univerfity*. What would the Man be at? Is he against all *Latin*? It may be so, for what need he be at the pains to learn this Tongue when *Pedlars French* best suits his way of living, and those he converses with? And yet methinks this should not be his meaning that he is for no *Latin* at all, for he may stand in need of it upon occasion; the being able to read a little of it may serve him at a dead list. Or, is he against *False Latin* only? One would think that should not be, for this Half-quarter (if that be not too much) of a Student in *Physick* and *Ghyrurgery*, hath not Skill to tell when *Priscian's* head is broken, or if he had, he hath not Art enough to heal it. Or, doth he rage only against the *Latin* that is brought from the *Univerfity*? Ay, there it is, I will warrant you: He imagines that it must be brought by the *Carrier* (and perhaps this fanciful Gentleman thinks *Hobson* is alive still) and must be paid for, and this Hide-bound Gripple Man (who lays up all against the next rising and falling of *Guinea's*) will not be at the charges.

But heark! there is a Terrible Broad-side coming, for by way of a Concluding Stroke he boldly tells us, that the Education which is at this day in the *Univerfity* (and by this way of speaking you may perceive he intends one of our own *Univerfities*) is uselefs for the *World*, and *Mans Life*. Now we are sunk, and never can rise again. A Man of *Univerfity* Education is to be kick'd out of the *World*,

and deserves not to *Live* in it, because he is not bred up according to the Rules of one Mr. *Lock's Education*. His *University Learning* is not useful for the *World*, it will never make him a *Committee Man*, and help him to understand *Manufecture* and *Fishery*: And if it will not do that, what is it good for?

And this *Lewd Declaimer* is full of *Invectives* against the *Persons* as well as the *Studies* of *University Men*, for he lets us know that the *young Tutor from the University* is *neither well-bred, nor skill'd in the world, nor well principled in the grounds and foundations of true vertue and generosity*, p 145. His *Latin* and his *Logick* were bad, but his *Ethicks* are much worse; he hath been fooling with *Burgerfdicius*, but hath not look'd into *Machiavel*, and thence principled himself with the grounds and foundations of true *Vertue* and *Generosity*, which cannot be but from him alone. And then he is very sharp again upon the *University-Tutors* because *they are not well bred, and have not the knowledge of a man of Business*, p. 159. and *have no knowledge of the World*, p. 162, 163. and therefore are unfit to be *Tutors, and to read Lectures to Gentlemen, it being impossible* (as he adds) *that any one should come forth well fashion'd out of unpolish'd ill-bred company*, p 163. The *Universities* are this *unpolish'd ill bred company*, and how then can a *well fashion'd Tutor*, and one that is *fit to read Lectures to Gentlemen* proceed thence?

This is the best Language Mr. *John Lock* can bestow upon *University-Men*. He would have us know that *he* hath engrossed all *Gentility*

*lity* and *Good Breeding* to himself, that *University-Air* inspires Men with *Rusticity*, and makes them errant *Boors* and *Peasants*, that a *Fellow of a College* is a *Clown*, and must be so by the *Statutes*, that *Tutors* are the worst of *Corydons*, and belong to the *Rabble* and *High-Shoes*, that the *College Raven* hath more *Manners* than the *Scholars*, and that the very *Latin* which is brought from those places smells of *Barbarism*. Afterwards he rebukes the *Unmannerliness* and *Rudeness of Scholars*, p. 262. meaning the foresaid persons, and rattles them again for their want of *Good Breeding*. Again, in an other place he derides and scoffs at the *Liberal Arts, and the Tutors Learn'd Encyclopaedia*, p. 150. There is some unlawful *Magick* in this *Circle* of the *Arts*, and he would not have any one come within the *Compass* of it. In short, from what this *Tutorer of Tutors* hath let fly already against our present *Academies*, we may perceive him enclined to inveigh as heartily against them as *Gulpeper* ever did against the *College of Physicians*. But the two *Grand things* which he upbraids them with are their *Deficiency* as to their *Learning*, and to their *Breeding*. With respect to both which, if he were indulged his *Liberty*, it is not to be doubted he would use such Language as this:

'The *Students* in the *Universities*, as well as the *Books* in the *Great and Common Library* of one of them, are all *Chain'd*; they are *Tied* to certain *Methods of Study*, and their *Authors* are prescribed them. They live in perfect *Durance*, and the *Bocardo*



and *Toll-booth* are but representations of their respective *Colleges*. At their very entrance they are imprison'd and Shackled, a *Burgersdiciu* or some such *System-maker* is clapt into every youths hands, and they can't be matriculated without *Predicaments* and *Predicables*. There is nothing but Restraint and Imposition here. *Oxford* presents us with a *Bible* in its *Armorial Ensigns*, thereby pinning the *Epistles* upon us, as well as the rest of the *Scripture*. The *Light* and *Cups* (as *Sacred* as they are) of the other University are fantastick Emblems, and serve only to dazzle and intoxicate the minds of the enslaved Pupils of *Alma Mater*; who (poor Souls) are not skill'd in the *World*, and understand not *Trade* and *Commerce*, and know not that *Sturbridg-Fair* is the best *Commencement*. Again, as their *Knowledge*, so their *Breeding* is contemptible, for a Man cannot be a *Gentleman*, and read *Burgersdiciu* and *Scheibler*. *Logick* gives one an ill Mien and Shape, and therefore (as I hinted before) there is not a well fashion'd *Tutor* among them. They have no more *Manners* than what is left in the bare *Motto* of the Founder of *New College*. If those of this University were remanded back to *Greke-lade* and *Leche-lade* (their first Principles) those of the other were reduced to their old *Inns* and *Hofles*, it would be suitable to their merits: But it would be much more agreeable if they were remov'd out of the *World*. I ever thought that the best way to decide the Controversy between *Cairn* and *Twyne* about the Antiquity

quity of these Societies is to dissolve them both. They are so Useless and Insignificant a part of Mankind, so ill-bred a Company, that the Nation would not be a Farthing the worse if they underwent the same fate with the *Abbeys* and *Monasteries*. In short, I am one that like nothing which belongs to the *Ford* or the *Bridg*, No, not so much as the *Buildings* of the former, for in my judgment *Lowse-Hall* is as good a Structure as the *Theater*. I see nothing that is *Genteel*, or Learned in either of the so much Celebrated Universities. Both their *Behaviour* and their *Studies* are to be abhord because they are not according to the Pattern of my *Seraglio* which I intend to publish to the *World*, and have partly done it in my *Education*.

But where then can we suppose this Raving *Tutor* and *Reformer* to have been bred, who thinks and talks after this rate? And to what Society doth he belong? If *Charity* did not give a Check here, we might mention the Famous and Renowned *Gymnasium* at the entrance of *Moor-fields*, that Academy of poor shatter'd Noddles, that Receptacle of Inflamed *Meninges*.

Because the *Universities* are constantly supplied from the *Publick Schools*, therefore it is no wonder that he who is a profess'd Enemy to those Higher and Supreme Seats of the *Muses*, shews his rancour against the Inferiour ones, and such as are in order to the other. He is severe upon *School-masters* (though not so severe as he every where complains they are upon their Boys) and their way of *Education*,

ducation, and will not entertain a favourable thought of any thing they do. As before I observed that he routed *Burgesdicium*, so now he laughs at the Teachers of *Lily's Grammar*, p. 290, nay he would have *no Grammar at all*, p. 291. *The way of learning Latin in a Grammar-School* he declares against with great superciliousness, p. 291. He would not have *any Language learnt by Grammatical Rules*, p. 288. but only by *roar*, p. 295. In another place he shews his dislike not only of *Logical Disputes* (which is a Touch to the *Academick Gentlemen*) but of *Set Declamations*, and very vigorously appears against *making Latin Themes and Declamations*, p. 297. and 7 pages more, not only because he was so dull at these Exercises when he was in his Boyship, but because it is, as he saith, *the Vulgar Method of Grammar Schools*, which he hath a strange Antipathy against, and is so weak and indiscreet as to discover it by ill Language. Surely *the fear of the School-Masters Rod* (which with some emotion and trembling he mentions p. 268. and in other places) was betimes begot in his mind by his early deserving it: And that frightful Idea made so deep an impression on his thoughts, that it will continue with him all his days, and he will ever have a sting at that *Instrument of Education*, as he calls it.

A Publick-School is the worst of Prisons, that which we silly folks call a *Free-School* is a house of Bondage with him, *the Children are chain'd to the Oar seven, eight, or ten years*, p. 268. Again, in the same place, *They are put into the Herd, and driven with a Whip or Scourge,*

*Scourge, &c.* This is very sad and lamentable indeed, they are both Slaves and Beasts. You Gentlemen that are Masters of the Great Schools in *London, Westminster, Eton, Winchester*, and all the rest of you that are of that so Useful and Honorable Employment, you are all of you a company of *Tyrants, Oppressors, Task-masters, Herd-drivers, Overseers of Gallies*: You unmercifully as well as unjustly treat the poor-Children that are under you, cruelly chaining them to the Oar, and at the same time driving them like Beasts, as this Man of Sense expresses it. And you that are their *Parents*, how unreasonable do you act when you put them to School? You commit them to the *Common Gaol* (as you know *Westminster-School* is but one *Remove from the Gate-house*) you enter them *Gally-slaves*, and you make their condition equal with that of your very Brutes: And all this you do to get them a little *Latin and Greek*, which might be had at a great deal cheaper rate of pains and time, p. 268. And then after all this, you and their Masters give some of them their *Mittimus* to the Universities, where they are in Bondage and Jail again: There they tug at the Oar, there they run the Gantlet through *dry Systems of Logick and Philosophy*, p. 164. yea (which is worse, far worse) dull *Systems of Divinity*, p. 283. So that it seems not only the *Logick*, but the *Philosophy*, and the *Divinity* of the Universities are expos'd by this Instructor Paramount. No Books whatsoever that contain any *Set Rules* (so he phrases it) of any Art, even *Grammar* it self, must be taught

taught or sold; and so St. Paul's School and Church-yard must both of them be laid aside together. Hence we may interpret what he saith p. 267. where he calls himself a *Bookish man*, not because of his reading of Books, but because of his condemning the Sale of them. What think you? Is this not a new sort of *Bookish man*? What think you? doth he speak like one that is in a Post for the encouraging and improving of Trade in this Kingdom?

I had almost forgot an other freak of our *New Tutor*, and that is his undervaluing and vilifying of *Musick* and *Poetry*, two signs of an Ill-natured man, and one that hath a Harsh and Untun'd Soul. The former he censures, together with the Persons that are Masters of it, p. 346. telling us that he hath scarcely heard among men of Parts and Business any one commended or esteemed for having an Excellency in *Musick*. And it hath the last place among all Accomplishments according to our *Gruff Tutor*. p. 347. The latter viz. *Poetry* is condemn'd by him p. 302. where he is falling upon the *Schoolmasters*, and their way of educating of Youth. If a Child hath a *Poetical vein*, it is to me, saith he, the strangest thing in the world that the Father should desire, or suffer it to be cherish'd or improv'd, p. 302. He would have the Parents fistle and suppress it as much as may be, p. 303. His *School-master* must not so much as enter him in *Verse*, p. 304. Yea our Rough Reformer, who can rail only in *Prose*, is against making of *Verses*. *Verses* of any sort, p. 302. Who gives us a taste of the strange Genius of this Projector, and shews that he prefers his

his own Conceits and Whims to the judgment of the Wise, and that he hath the hardiness to censure and defame all those Brave Men of our own and other Countries that have been esteem'd and honour'd for their excellent *Poetical Vein*, and by their Ravishing Number have oblig'd the Learned World, as some of them by their Pious Raptures have been extremely serviceable to Religion. But neither *Universities* nor *Schools*, nor the *Studies* and *Arts* they profess, nor the *Persons* that teach or learn them, the *Books* which are read by them can find any acceptance with our Quaint *Educator*. If he be for any *University*, it is *Rakow*, though as yet he defers his *Matriculation*. If he be for any *Library*, besides his own Set of Books, it is *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, though he pretends he hath read nothing in it.

That the true Worth of this Gentleman, who is now under our consideration, may be further evidenced out of his Writings, and that the world may see that he who defames the *Academick Bodies* is disposed to be a *Catholick Railer*, I will in the next place remind the Reader how abusively he treats the *Nobility* and *Gentry* of this Realm who send their sons to *Travel*. He ridicules both the *Father* and the *Mother*, upbraiding the one for his Want, for he cannot stay any longer for the *Portion*, which is to come into his hands when his Son is married; and jeering the other for her Fondness and Childishness, for she must have new babies to play with. p. 372. And my *Young Master* is laugh'd at for his *Marrying* and

and *Propagating* as if these were two Ridiculous things, especially the former. This would well enough become a Town-Wit and have pass'd in a Play, but it sounds odly and prodigiously from a Grave Tutor, from a Stanch Metaphysitian, from a Formal Breeder up of Youth, and from one who lays down *Rules of Civility, Good Manners, and Breeding*, p. 256, 257, 258, &c. and in several other places inculcates this that a Teacher and Governor of Children (of which rank he thinks himself the Chief) must be a *well bred man*, nay *he must not fail to be a well bred man*, he must be *exactly well bred*.

Surely some Persons of Honour of either Sex will set a Mark on that foresaid passage in his book, and observe the Lightness and Scurrility of his expressions, and in the Margin note this, that this Writer hath no regard to his own Rules, that he teaches men to trample upon his own Dictates, and that he gives the world to understand that his Foppish Gravity is to be hiss'd at. If there were some real ground for what he saith, yet a Writer of a book on purpose (as he pretends) to chastise the *Indiscretion* and *Ill Breeding* of others, would not have used terms of that nature. Or, if a discreet man had censured the practice it self, yet he would have been careful to do it without those unmannerly and indecent Reflections on a great part of the present *Nobility* of our Kingdom, with others of the *Gentry*. Or, if he had made bold with *my Young Master* (as he calls him) yet he might have forborn reflecting so rudely on their *Honourable Pa-*  
rents,

rents, and speaking so disrespectfully of some on whom our Dependence hath been, and making himself and the reader merry with his Lampoons upon them. Is this the man that cries up himself for the Gift of *Educating*? Is this department which I have been mentioning the Character of a *Well-bred man*? Or is it not rather the Idea and Pourtraiture of an *Ill-bred* and *Wandering Pedagogue*, of an *Itinerant Tutor* who scampers from one Shire to another, to give documents about *reading Reynard the Fox* p. 279. which he calls *Education*, and hath writ a Book about it?

He flings at the *Reverend Judges*, by fixing a Pasquil upon one of them, p. 105, 106. of his *Second Vindication*. Which is either true or false; if we can suppose the former, yet no Discreet man would publickly mention it, out of respect to the Honourable Robe. Especially this Writer should not have expos'd any of that Order, seeing he had particularly commended and urged *decency of words*, p. 256. *Educate*. and had declared that *it is the part of a Well-bred Man to express a respect to persons according to their Rank and Condition*. p. 258. But on the other hand, if this Imputation be false, then he deserves to fall into the hands of those *Ministers of Justice*, and to be sentenced according to his Crime. But I return to his Treatise of *Education*.

It is observable that the *Softer Sex* have found no Protection from this Rough Man. He is not only an University Hater but a Hater of Women. He exposes the behaviour of two *Ladies of Quality*, that fell out with  
one

one an other in Company, and relates the Particulars of it. p. 265, 266. It is likely that one or both of them have been told of this passage in his book, and they can't but think it is an Affront to them, and must needs be so far from believing him to have any of that *Good Breeding* which he pretends to teach the world, that they will rather stigmatize him as a *Scandalous Blab* that tells all he hears, a *Tom Coriat* that relates whatever he picks up in his perambulations. Joyn this with his Reflections on those Persons of Honour before mention'd, and then give me your opinion of the *Breeding* of our *Gensorious Tutor*.

That he hath an Antipathy to the *Whole Sex*, one would guess from what falls from his Pen, p. 14. *If women were themselves to frame the bodies of their children in their wombs, we should certainly have no perfect children born,* which perhaps may go down very glib with his Admirers, but you see he ventures to border upon Prophaneness and Blasphemy rather than he will not express his dislike of the *Female Order*. Whether this be done in revenge to the Sex, who generally, where *some body* comes, dub him the *Hard-favour'd Man*, and sometimes upon occasion make use of him to *scare their Children*, I will not dispute. Or it may be he that hath been used to play with the Young Ones, thinks he may make bold to be rude even with the Mothers. Else he would not have given them the odious name of *Munkies*, p. 15, and in reproach have call'd the House of Office *Madam Gloacina*, p. 36. This is the cleanly, genteel,  
and

and polite language of *John Lock* that writes himself *Gent*. And this stile and behaviour are the more strange because they are observ'd in one that hath been freely admitted to the Concerns of that Sex.

I might here harmlessly divert the Reader with his *Scotchhoppers* and *Dibstones*, p. 115, 237, 275. with his Documents about *Milk-potage* and *Water-Gruel* p. 18. and his teaching Children to *evacuate* dextrously, p. 33 to p. 38. Which latter succeeds only when the Party is present, it being promoted by his *Vespasian-Looks*. *He hath spent some time*, he saith, *in the study of Physick*, p. 40, and especially of the *Guts*, which he very feelingly and concernedly discourseth of p. 34, 35, 36. as if they were that part of the Body which he most minds. Which is one reason perhaps why he hates *Colledg-Commons*, and for their sake the *Universities*.

But I will not make any farther Additions, because I will not prevent my self in what I design at an other time, and because what I have before produced out of his Pages is sufficient to convince us what a Talent of *Education* he hath, and how fit a person he is to have Youth committed to his charge. *He hath been consulted of late*, he saith, *by many about the breeding of their children*, Epist. Ded. but let me request such to *consult* their Reason, and demand of that to tell them whether a *Rash Gensor* of the Studies and Learning of our own Academies, whether a *Rude Reviler* of those in the most Honourable Station, whether a *Defamer of Laudable Arts*, whether

ther a Supercilious Innovator and a Fantastick Reformer in the Methods of Teaching, and lastly whether a Corrupter of our Holy Faith, and a profess'd Depraver of the Chief Articles of the Christian Religion (of which I shall speak anon) be a person fit to be *consulted about the breeding of their Children*. The *Orthodox* Parents (and I hope we have some of them left in England still) will surely be caution'd by this not to commit them to this bold Patron of so Bad a Cause, who prides himself in his *Heterodoxy*, and boasts that he hath renounced the receiv'd doctrines of the *Christian Church*.

And thus having in a preliminary way descanted on some part of his book concerning *Education*, that the Reader might thence have some insight into the Man I was to deal with, I shall proceed now to take notice of his other Papers, which relate to *Religion*: for his *New Education* was in order to the introducing of a *New Religion*. He had spoken before against the *Learning in fashion*, and now he comes to censure the *Religion in fashion*, (as he calls it) and the *Fashionable and Titular Professors* of it (as he Stiles them, p 93) *i. e.* the establish'd *Ministers* of it. He had shew'd his perverse spirit in his Notions about the breeding up of *Children*: next he will try how successful he can be in the perverting of *Men*. He will see what he can do with *Grown people*, as well as with his *Young Masters*. Having taken upon him to reform the *Universities and Schools*, and to cast off their *Studies and Learning*, he is encouraged to go

on,

on, and to reform Religion, and to give us a New Model of Christianity. Accordingly he publish'd a Treatise entituled *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, wherein he pretends to teach the world what they have been so long ignorant of, *viz.* that if a man acknowledg a God, there is but *One Article of Christian Belief* which is necessarily required to be embraced by him in order to the constituting him a Christian. As for all other Articles and Doctrines deliver'd by Christ and his Apostles in the Writings of the New Testament, he pronounces them to be unnecessary and useles as to the making a man a Christian, and capacitating for Life and Saivation. This Novel Conceit, which is an unwarrantable Restraining and Confining of the Christian Faith, and makes Christianity a far different thing from what it is represented by our Bless'd Saviour and his Apostles, hath been *Vindicated* by him once and again. And as I thought my self oblig'd to reflect upon his *First Vindication* in a Discourse which I published, and entituled *Socinianism Unmask'd*, so now I am designing to attack his *Second Vindication*, and by exactly setting down his *own words* (which I shall very faithfully do) and by impartially examining them, to convince the Unbiais'd Reader of the Vanity, Weakness and Inconsistency, of the Absurdity, Falshood and Dishonesty of his Argu- ing; and on the contrary to establish this Doctrine in mens minds, that *there are More Articles then One in the Christian Religion which are the necessary and indispensable matter of*

*our Faith, in order to our being True Christians.*

Only first let me be permitted to observe how the *Vindicator*, to bubble the Reader, insinuates that in my *Socinianism Unmask'd* I used *ill language* and *railing*; and again in the same place (his *Preface*) he complains of my *Stile* as *rude* and *scurrilous*: whereas any impartial Reader may satisfy himself that I always kept my self close to the matter which was before me, I attended to the Merits of the Cause, and made no Reflections but what his way of Discourfing drew from me. I will not deny that I labour'd to assert the Truth with that Concern and Earnestness, that Zeal and Ardour which so Good a Cause deserves. I don't love to dally with the Grand Articles of our Religion, for I look upon Languid and Timerous Assertors of Evangelical Truths as a sort of Betrayers of them. There is as much of *Judas* as *Nicodemus* in such persons. It is one of the most Ominous Defects and Miscarriages of this Age that such numbers of men are Faint and Indifferent in matters of this nature. I thank God I am not of so Phlegmatick a Mold, I have not so groveling and dastardly a spirit as tamely to suffer this Upstart Adversary to shock Religion, and pervert the Faith, and not to stand up in defence of it, and to detect his Errors and Cheats. Therefore I am now treated as his Mortal *Enemy*, because I tell him the Truth, and that without timerous mincing of it. It is this that hath rais'd in him an Angry and Malicious Ferment, and hath made him rage and huff, and fill the world with Clamours.

\* One

\* One hath rightly observ'd concerning his *Second Vindication* that it is an *Angry piece of work*, and that he was in a *Storm* whilst he was writing it. It is easily discernable that all along he is swell'd with Coler and Revenge. Being touch'd home, he equally raves against the *Truth* and *Me*.

We see the Physick hath work'd, as all the Filth and Excrements of his Papers shew. *Dirt* and *Ordure*, and *Dunghills* are the frequent embellishments of his *Stile*. I am charg'd with *popular calumnies*, *falsehood*, *absurdity*, *bawling*, *talking at random*, *malicious untruth*, *leger-de-main*. Nay, I am a *Conjurer*, though I never took *him* to be such. I am a *petulant Scold*, I am *Villainous*, and I am e'en what he pleases. I am sometimes an *Innocent* with him, and sometimes a *Jesuite* (for our Scurrilous Tutor is very happy in his wife and significant tacking of Calumnies together.) I'm a Reprobate with him as to my *Parts* and *Breeding*. I am honour'd with the Epithets of a *Buffoon*, and (with an *Innuendo*) a *Devil*. I have *Lying* and *Impudence* laid to my charge. Yea, this *Well-bred Governour*, calls me a *downright Impudent Liar*.

And abundance of such *Rhetorical Flowers* I could present the Reader with out of the *Vindicator's Garden*, for you must know that though he is a deadly Enemy to *Poetry*, yet he is a *Great Rhetorician*. The Strangenels of the Scene is, that though he plentifully Rails every where, yet he cries out against me as if

C 3

I did so. It is plain that he would suffer no body to Rail but himself: He is clearly for the Monopoly of this Trade. He seems to be of the Humour of him that would let no body where he was Swear but himself, Let him then engross the whole Commodity, I'll not pretend to be a Sharer or Rival with him. One that hath spent the greatest part of his time among Nurses and Gossips and the Loquacious Fry, is not to seek in the Art of Scolding, nay is supposed to Excel in it. To such a one I am ready to give the Precedence, because I question whether any of the Sisterhood at *Billingsgate* can outstrip him.

This Thorow-paced Railer flies to *Personal Reflections*, that is, such as he counts to be of that nature, or else he would not have fill'd his Papers with them. I am a *Preacher*, and a *Pulpit-Orator*, p. 61, 206, 352, 386. which are very scandalous imputations with him: Wherefore he often insists upon these, and touches upon my *Parish* and *Parishioners*, p. 203. and the very naming of an *Use of Exhortation*, p. 393. is a Jest, and a piece of Stringing Wit with him. In one place, p. 143. he is so Logical, that he infers I am no Good *Arguer* or *Writer* because I am a *Preacher*. And yet he will grant that a Man may be a *Commissioner for Trade* to the *Barbado's*, and yet be a Good *Writer*. But whether he can be so as he is a *Conceited Tutor*, I leave to be consider'd. He hath such a rude way of treating the most Eminent Persons (as you heard before) that I could not expect to escape him who am in an other Level. But it is observable, that whilest he

he maliciously strikes at *me*, he defames most of the Best Writers of our Age, who are known to be *Preachers and Pulpit Orators*, and this hath been the main Employment of their Lives. Nay, I could take notice that in his *Vindication* he uses the Testimonies and Authorities (though it is true he hath mistaken them) of some of those *Writers* that have been famed for their *Preaching* and *Pulpit Oratory*. Now, if *Preachers* be no *Arguers*, then why doth he make use of their Authority? If they be, why doth he vilify them? Good Mr. *Vindicator*, be perswaded to leave off these Contradictions and Nonsense. But any discerning man may see that here (as well as in several other places of his *Vindication*, and some of his other Writings) his design was to ridicule the *Sacred Office of Preaching*, and to blast the whole *Function*. We may guess what honourable thoughts he hath of it when he attempts to apply the term *Post*, in way of a rascally Quibble, to the *Ministry*, and the *Persons* concern'd in it, p. 422. Therefore his *Bitter Reflections on the Ministers of the Gospel and their Office*, are deservedly taken notice of and censured by a late *Writer*. *Occasional Paper*, Num. 1. and Num. 5. Truly there should be some care taken of this Gentleman; for the very mentioning of *Preaching*, though it be from his own mouth, inflames his blood, renews his Frenzy, and makes him Rave. This poor crazed *Tutor* should be look'd after, and soundly dosed with Hellebore, lest in the fits of his over-heated Brain he should lash out, and revenge himself on the



Wainſcot of our *Pulpits*, and with them of the *Reading Pews*, for the ſake of the *Epistles*, (of which hereafter :) And it is well if our whole Bibles eſcape his fury for the ſame reaſon.

But our Scolding Tutor falls upon me again p. 30. and now the Topick is *Preferment*, and *Admiſſion to Preferment in the Church of England*, p. 24. It may be this is done to invite me to take notice of *his Preferments*; and therefore though he be ſo rude as to upbraid me for my want of *Titles and Dignities*, yet I ſhall be ſo Civil to him as to acknowledge and recount thoſe which he is Maſter of. I own him to be *Cenſor-General* of the *Logick* and *Latin* of the *Universities*, *Corrigidore* and *Regulator* of all the *Publick Schools* in Chriſtendom, *Great Maſter* of the *Anti-Academick Order*, *Tutor in Eyre* and *Controllor* to the Youth of Seven Counties, *Curator in Ordinary* to *Coſtive Paunches*, *Principal Secretary* to the *Deiſts Office*, *Feoffee in Truſt* for *Sozzo's Pupils*, &c. And I beg his pardon that I forgot to mention thoſe *Offices* and *Places* before.

He is at me again, p. 67. and obliquely inſinuates (for he is full of his Squinting Hints) that I am for that Maxim, *The Doctrines in faſhion, and likely to procure Preferments, are alone to be received*, and ſo would imply that I am ready to receive any *Doctrines in faſhion*, be they never ſo Unreaſonable or Impious, and that *Gain* will tempt me to this or any thing elſe. Why, I tell you, Sir, you are in the wrong box, I am not the man you take

take me for, I was never hired to write for the *lowring of Guineas*, I never ſought or held a Place with the forfeiture of my *Honeſty*, and therefore I deſy your Impotent Raillery not only againſt me, but againſt the Whole *Clergy*, High and Low, for you look upon them all as *Mercenary*, and that *they receive no Doctrines but what are in faſhion, and are likely to procure Preferment*. Which you have learnt from your Brethren of *Racovia*, who tell us that the *Church of England men* are or would be \* *Penſioners of the World*.

Behold the Inſolence of our Libertine, who hath had the ſway among Children, and hath Lord-Mavor'd it over Nurſes and Chair-women! He hath been ſo worſhip'd and obey'd by the Striplings, and hath had ſuch an abſolute command of their Legs and Hats, that he expects the like ſubmiſſion and obeysance from all others, and he thinks he may ſay any thing, and not be oppoſed, for he cannot brook Contradiſtion. But I ſhall force him to it, and ſeeing he hath thought good to Riot thus with his Pen, he muſt not think to go untouch'd. Seeing he hath taken the liberty to reflect on my Calling and Function (and therein hath abus'd all of the ſame Character with my ſelf) he muſt not take it ill if I ſometimes glance upon the Poſt he is in, and his Studies and Employments. If I follow ſo laudable an Example as his, he is oblig'd to pardon me, and to remember that he was the Aggreſſor.

And

\* Answer to the Archbishop's Sermon, p. 44.

And though indeed we are forbid to answer such people according to their folly, yet in some Circumstances, *i. e.* when *Pride* and *Conceit*, and such like Ingredients are mix'd with their Folly, we are permitted by the Wise Man to answer them according to the merits of their willful and affected folly, lest they should be wise in their own conceit, lest they should be hardened in their Pride and Arrogance, and think themselves Wise because no body checks and bridles their folly. Indeed it is almost a Reproach to a man to encounter such an Adversary, who hath the second time gull'd the world with false Stories, and abandoning all shame and ingenuity, given himself up to obstinate resolves of maintaining a Cause which will prove so mischievous to *Christendom*: An Adversary that hath no sense of what he doth, but is blinded and infatuated by Prejudice, so that he hath left himself no power to judge of his own words or actions. Which renders him a person not fit to be treated with that respect and deference which are due to an Ingenuous and Civil Opponent. To use him Gently, is to handle a Bear with Ceremony and Caution. And sometimes he is not worth a *Serious Reply*, for he Cheats the people, and then makes Sport of it. But however, though I shall be somewhat free with him, yet I will not thrust upon the Reader any thing that is indecent, rude, spiteful, or entrenching upon Truth. When we deal with such men, our *Master's* Example forbids us to revile again, but the Apostle allows us, nay commands us to rebuke them sharply; I shall not be thought per-

perhaps to be defective in this, but none can censure me for Excess if they consider what the Badness of his design (as well as the Petulance of his Style) required. But where he gives me any scope for *Arguing* and *Reasoning* the case. I have with great seriousness applied my self to it, and I hope I have establish'd the Truth upon firm and solid grounds.

I will begin with his *Preface* to his *Vindication*, where he inserts a very Gracious *Epistle* to Mr. *Bold*, his late *Convert*, and now *Confederate*, and there pretends to tell him the *Birth* of his *Reasonableness of Christianity*. It was begot (if you will believe the Father of it) on the *Controversy of Justification*: He might have as well have said on the *Controversy of Predestination*: for it as much belongs to one as the other: And so you see it was a mere *By blow*, and worthy of the *Parent*. But he is extremely fond of this *Spurious Issue*, and applauds himself for being the Author of it. *The first view I had of it, saith he, seem'd mightily to satisfy my mind. I wonder that every body did not see and embrace it, though Systems of Divinity said nothing of it. I was pleas'd, saith our Narcissus, with the growing discovery, every day, whilst I was employ'd in this search.* And more to the same purpose in the same *Epistle*. Then he proceeds to applaud the *Godfather* of this *Brat* Mr. *Bold*. Concerning whom he declares, that he hath more readily entertain'd, and more easily enter'd into the meaning of his *Book* than most (he might have said any) he hath heard speak

Speak of it. And afterwards, Mr. Bold hath enter'd into the true sense of my Treatise, and his notions perfectly agree with mine. And therefore he must needs be (as he styles him) a *Calm Christian*, a *Grave Divine*, a *Man of Parts*, a *Well-bred Man*. And he hath (if you'll credit our Encomiast) a *settled repute*, &c. Would you know the reason of all this Coaking? It is no other than this, that same Mr. Bold who was Sponsor for the Bastard brood, had in a late Pamphlet mightily extoll'd the Dad of it, Mr. Lock. He calls him the *Ingenious Author* of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, Rep p. 3. and *that great and eminent Person*, p. 27. (It is a sign so when one of so little sense and discretion votes him to be such.) He is *no Disparagement to the Cause*, he saith, p. 27. and there is a good reason for it, I must tell him, for as a Person, so a Cause that hath nothing of worth in it, is not capable of being disparaged: Poor Creature, he thinks it a great matter to have One Pen (besides his own) wagging on his side. He is mightily rejoyc'd that he hath got a *Single Patron* for his *Single Article*, and is over-joy'd at such Fulsome Encomiums thrown upon him, and therefore he heaps up as many as he can on the other's head. The sum of all which is this, **CLAW ME, AND I WILL CLAW THEE.**

It is worth the observing that the *Vindicator* subscribes himself at the close of his *Letter* to Mr. Bold (which in a conceited manner he claps into the *Preface*) his *most humble servant*. A. B. Upon which these short Remarks

marks may be made, 1. That he is ashamed of his *Name*, and that with good reason. 2. He is ashamed of his *Cause* and dares not Personally own it, and set his Name to the defence of it. This and the former may be reckon'd as the only Instances of *Shamefacedness* and *Modesty*, that the man was ever guilty of. But 3. We may gather from those two letters which he hath affixed to the end of his Epistle *Who* he is, for though he hath only set down A. B. yet he hath left us to add the next letter C, and then we know what person is meant, *viz.* a Breeder up of Boys to learn their First Rudiments, a Learned Teacher of A B C. concerning which you may find more p. 272, 273. *Educat.*

From the *Preface* and *Epistle* I pass to the Book it self, the first part of which is spent in the old known way of *Malefactors* at the Bar: they are always willing to evade the *Charge*, to insist upon the little Niceties, and on the Formality of words, and the Exact Punctilio's of Matter of Fact. This is the practise of our Criminal, p. 6, 7. and he thinks thereby to palliate his Guilt. He is loth to own it, for he knows his demerit, and the Consequence of it. He is to be excus'd indeed for this, or rather there is a known *Proverb* that excuses him: that makes him so backward to *Confess*. I have given an account of this matter in my *Socinianism Unmask'd* p. 5, 6. and have also shew'd since that the Formal Words are agreed to by his late Profelite. So that his own Gizzard, Mr. Bold, comes

comes in Evidence against him, and lets us know that we have no reason to listen to him when he waves the Enditement. He will say and unsay, as it comes into his head, and will put the Reader off with any shuffling suggestions, merely to evade what I had justly lay'd to his charge. One of his great Cavils is that *I alledge matter of fact, but do not justify the Allegation*, p. 2 and 7. and undertakes to prove it from *my pretending* (as he saith) *to know and deliver his thoughts*, p. 8. *This* (saith he there) *is an Instance of False Allegations in matters of Fact, and such as are not capable of a Negative proof.* Such poor, little, trifling stuff doth he obtrude upon the Reader; as if one that had read his Writings could not in a probable way tell what his *thoughts* of such a subject were; unless you will say he dissembled when he wrote, and this perhaps is it which he means when he saith there concerning me, that *that I affirm what I do not know.* And so you see what he hath got by caviling against what I alledged, he hath before he was aware let the world know that he believes not what he writes, that his Thoughts and his Pen hold no correspondence, that when he pleads for *One Article only*, he doth not think that there is but One, but however he designs to root out All by reducing all the Articles of Christianity to One. Who would attend to any of his *Objections*, when it is plain that it is not his business to search out Truth, but to betray it?

He hath nothing to say to what I replied to his former *Vindication*, and therefore now to cheat

cheat the world, and amuse the Reader, and to give farther proof of his daring Confidences, he bids me p. 9, 25, 72, &c. go to work again, 1. to prove that there are these words in his Reasonableness of Christianity, *viz.* that *Nothing is required to be believed by a Christian, as absolutely necessary to make him such, but this Proposition, Jesus is the Messias*: 2. to prove that *he set himself on purpose to find but one Article of Faith*: 3. to prove that *he contends for One Article of Faith with exclusion and defiance of all the rest*: 4. to prove that *the believing of Jesus to be the Messias is not the only Article sufficient to make a man a Christian.* And several other things he calls upon me to prove, and the silly Accountant scores them up as he goes along, and sets down the *Figures*. And he would not have left off where he doth, but that the Innocent had number'd as far as he could go. There is not one Particular he mentions, which I have not proved and evinc'd in my *Socinianism Unmask'd*: and therefore I scorn, at the motion of such a Whiffling Objector, such a Crude Repeater of what he had said before in his *First Vindication*, but now hath lately vamp'd up, and sent abroad again, I scorn (I say) to produce the same Proofs again, and to affront the Reader with Needless Repetitions, which is the guise of this trifling Writer.

But seeing our *ABC darian* calls to me over and over again *to prove this, and to prove that*, I will now put him upon *Proving*, and see how he will discharge that part. In order to this I am to acquaint the Reader that

this Gentleman in his *Former Vindication* call'd for a *List of Fundamental Articles*, i. e. such as the Holy Scripture represents to us as requisite to be known and believ'd, that we may be True Christians. I obey'd the demands of this pert *Vindicator*, and perform'd the Task which he was pleas'd to set me: in my first Chapter of my forenamed Treatise I assign'd a considerable number of Articles of the Christian Faith, as absolutely necessary to be known, i. e. so far as they can be known, for there are Great and Profound *Mysteries* couch'd in some of them, so that I had reason to say they were in *some measure* ( which expression the *Vindicator* vainly objects against p. 70. ) to be known and understood, and to be believ'd: and I particularly and distinctly proved that all of them are of that nature, and consequently no man can be a *Christian* without a competent knowledge and belief of these Doctrines. I also there propounded a *General Rule* whereby all such Articles and Doctrines may be discern'd; i. e. they may be known to be such from the *Nature* of the things contained in them, for no Evangelical Truths are absolutely and indispensably necessary to be known and to be assented to in order to the constituting of us Christians but those that *have Immediate respect to the Occasion, Author, Way, Means, and Issue of Mans Redemption and Salvation*. But our *Vindicator* attempts not in the least to invalidate this Description of *Necessary Articles*; nay though he mentions it again p. 130. yet he can't invent any thing to object against it, only

ly asks this and the other *Question* nothing to the purpose. Our bold Reformer in Divinity scribbles on, and shews not himself concern'd to disprove what I propounded and asserted. No: he doth not so much as pretend to it. But he quarrels and shuffles, and makes a long Harangue about the Set Number of Fundamental Articles, and enquires p. 69. whether there be neither *more nor less* then I have assign'd. Which is nothing to the purpose, for Christianity consists not, as this Narrow soul'd Man would suggest, in a Point. If he will make it his business to score them up, so let him; it is none of mine.

I have assign'd several Articles of Necessary Belief, I have particularly Enumerated such Doctrines as have all the Marks of being *Fundamental*. Let him prove that they have not those Marks, or let him take what courſe he pleases to prove that they are not Fundamental Truths, and such as ought to be known and asserted to in order to make us Christians: and when he hath done this particularly and distinctly, I will be at leisure to tell him whether I think there be any more that belong to the Foundation. I have done my part, I have proved that *more then One Article* is absolutely requisite to make a man a Christian, and yet he is still craving, and *calls to me*; and *demands*, and *requires*, and *challenges* me to prove this and that, and yet will not prove any thing himself. This is a Mad way of Writing, to boast still of his *One Article*, and yet not shew that any one of these Articles which I nam'd ought not to be added to it.

D

This

This is the business he should have undertaken, and therefore for the future I expect that he either allows of those *Articles* as Fundamental or else particularly shew that they are not. Pray set your self to this work, and prove (if you can) that all those *Articles* which I have mention'd are not necessary to be believ'd, to make men Christians: and by that time you have done this, I shall find you fresh employment which will hinder a mans jaunting to my *Young Masters* houses, and his going a Gooding.

And the Justice and Fairness of my dealing with him will appear from this, that I hold him to his own Rule: *The Rule of Fair Dispute*, saith he, *is to prove where any thing is denied: to Evade this is shuffling.* p. 451. He stiffly denies that those Propositions which I assign'd are necessary to be believ'd, for the constituting a man a Christian: I call upon him to *prove* it, I have made it evident that they are all of them Fundamental *Articles*, but he will not own them to be such: then I say, Prove the contrary. I expect this of you, I demand and require it of you, and will insist upon it (to use your own peremptory stile.) Your Talk is this, to prove that those doctrines of the Gospel which I enumerated are not as necessary to be known and believ'd, to constitute a man a Christian, as that One *Article* which they have nam'd. And when you have tried what you can do towards a proof of this, I'll tell you then what I have more to say to you. But you see I put you upon following your *own Rule*, and if you do not ob-

serve

serve it, you are by your own sentence a *Shuffler*.

It is observable that this Long-winded Rambler hath spent above 20 pages (viz. from p. 48; to p. 71.) in *Little Queries, Evasions, Shiftings, Wranglings* about words, and yet with pretences of great *Seriousness*. But especially he is for his *Queries*, he is every where *Asking*, he hath *more and more Questions* to put, which verifies a good *Antient Saying* which we have concerning such a *Foolish Querist* as he hath shew'd himself to be. This strange Impertinent humour abounds so excessively in him that one would be curious to enquire what is the source of it, whence it is that throughout all these Papers he is ever starting of idle trifling *Questions*. I can resolve it into nothing but this, that one whose Converse hath been always with *Children* must needs assimilate and ape them, for (as he observes himself, *Educat.* p. 220) they are mightily given to this way of *asking of Questions*: and yet this *Pedantick Tutour* justifies this childish folly in himself of acting thus, p. 54, to p. 60.

Well seeing he is such an Intemperate and Lavish *Asker*, I hope he will not deny me the liberty of asking him only three or four *Questions*: and I conceive I have as much Authority to demand an *Answer* as he.

I. Why doth he pretend sometimes to assert more *Articles* than one, whereas at other times he peremptorily contends but for One, which he calls the *Sole Article* and the *Only Article*? In two or three other

D 2

places

places he talks of collecting *several Articles*, but how is that consistent with *One*? Concerning that Account of Faith which he offers to the world he thus speaks p. 232. *No one Article which the Apostles proposed as necessary to be receiv'd by unbelievers to make them Christians, is omitted in it.* When he saith, *no one Article is omitted*, it is implied that there are more Articles than one. If there be *More*, I demand of him to set down just how many they are, seeing he demands the like of me. But with all let him tell the world whether he talks thus as one that is Crazyed, and knows not whether *One* and *Many* Articles be the same, or whether his speaking thus be a Preparative to his Recanting his former Doctrine. Here are several Lesser Questions in the Great one that I propounded: let us have his Answer to them all.

II. What is the Reason that he hath not all this while undertaken to disprove that *Plurality* of Fundamental Articles which I asserted? Why neither in his *First* nor *Second Vindication* hath he dared to shew that those Articles are not to be believ'd in order to the denominating a man a True Christian, and a Member of Christ? If he could have done it, no body can doubt but that he would, and that with mickle Confidence, for no one will suspect that it is the want of that that hinders him from such an enterprize. This Judicious Player at *Dibstones* finds fault with my Collection of Fundamentals, and yet meddles with *no particular one* of them: only is so senseless and ridiculous as to deny them to be Fundamental

Do-

Doctrines of Christianity, and such as are necessarily to be received by every one that lays claim to Christianity. I demand a Reason of this, I require a particular and full Account why every one of those Articles is not to be receiv'd as Fundamental. I shall insist upon it till he either assigns some Reason, or confesses he cannot.

III. How can he expect that I should comply with *his* demands, which are very numerous, and particularly with that of assigning a Set Collection of Fundamentals, when he hath told me already that he is resolved (like a *Well bred man* and a *Good Christian of one Article*) to slight whatever I shall offer to him? If I should propound such doctrines as I verily believe to be Fundamentals, he before hand asks *why he should take them from me rather than from an Anabaptist?* p. 52. And in the same place he saith *he hath as much reason to believe an Anabaptist or Quaker, &c. as me.* Which is as much as to tell me in express terms that he hath taken up a resolution to attend to no Articles of Faith that I shall propound. Where were the Thoughts of our *Pilgrim-Tutour* when his unwary tongue dropt such words as these? Even when he is soliciting me, yea challenging me to give him a *List of Articles*, he proclaims to the world that he will not accept of any of them: he declares that he would sooner take a Set of Articles, and Fundamentals from a *Socinian* or a *Papist* (for he particularly names them both on this very occasion, than from me, p. 52. And, Sir, we will believe you without swearing.

D 3

IV. An

IV. An other Question I shall put to you, and require an Answer to it. Seeing you have taken part with the Follower of *Socinus*, and have adopted several of their Notions and Tenents, and interpret some Scriptures which relate to the *Trinity* in the same way that they do, and thereby have given occasion to be thought one of the Party, and yet you pretend to disown all acquaintance with them p. 222, 223. seeing you appear thus with a double face, and amuse the world with these disguises, I require of you to return an Answer to this Query, and the several parts of it, Whether you verily believe that *Jesus* is so the *Son of God* that he is really *God*, and that in the Unity of the Divine Essence there is a Trinity of Distinct Persons or Subsistencies, that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and that these Three are One God, as the Scriptures plainly and expressly declares. Seeing you are so brisk in your demands, I expect a positive Answer to mine, and hereby shall we know whether you are a *True Man*, or a *Spie*. When I see you have performed this work, I will still find you more employment.

I had proved (*Socinianism Unmask'd* chap. 2.) that his Opinion of *One Article* was founded, among other things, upon this Notion, that all things in Christianity must be so plain that they may be easily comprehended, and that there may be nothing difficult to mens understandings. This I made clear from the tenour and coherence of his words, from his way of reasoning, from the scope of his book, and

and from the plain sense of his expressions. But our *Vindicator* cannot bear this, and therefore puts himself into a posture of shifting and evading whatever was brought against him, and by all imaginable arts he labours to stifle my Reasonings and Arguings on that Point. One of his knacks is to frame a *Dialogue* between me and him, p. 34, 35, 36. and he is so silly in the contriving of it that it baffles him instead of favouring his Cause. Fearing that the *Dialogue* would not do the feat, he appears in the shape of a *Sylogizer* p. 39. though the Inconsiderate Man had derided *Logick* and *Sylogism*, because they are *University-Learning*. The next he falls into the old trade of *Questions*, *Where?* and *When?* and after this is done he begins his *Dialogue* again. This is one of the Distracted Scenes of his *Vindication*, and the Reader may thence form an *idea* of the Whole Work, and see with amazement what little Knacks and Conceits he applies himself to, that he may juggle men out of the Truth. He hath so accusom'd himself to shewing of Tricks among his Young Frie whom he hath had the Tutorage of, that we must never expect any other of him, whatever Subject he handles.

P. 93, 94. he will not admit of any *Mysteries* in Christianity, and therefore opposes what I had asserted, *viz.* that *there are some Doctrines in the Gospel which are not plain and clear, and yet are of necessity to be believ'd*. If he had been Master of any Sincerity, he would have observ'd how I explain'd my self, and shew'd that all the Doctrines and Articles of



the Christian Religion are not alike: some of them are in themselves Evident and Illustrious, others because of the Transcendency of their Matter are Obscure and Myste-rious, and not level to our humane understandings, as the doctrine of the Holy *Trinity*, *Christ's Incarnation*, &c. but yet are believ'd with a firm and unshaken Faith. This is so Rational that none but the hood wink'd *Masker* would have excepted against it. And he doth it after a very poor rate: He nibbles at the distinction I make between the *Certainty* or *Reality* of some Evangelical Doctrines, and the *exact manner of the things themselves* contain'd in those Doctrines: But he find's it pricks his chaps, and so he gives it over.

However, like the Gentlemen of *Racovia*, he cannot endure to hear of *Mysteries* in Christianity, and therefore here he takes occasion to express his great dislike of those who assert that in the Christian Religion there are *Mysteries* properly so called, *i. e.* such Truths and Articles, that as to the Manner of the things contained in them are not Intelligible, but exceed humane Reason, and cannot possibly be fathom'd by it. The denying of this is one of his last Artifices and Contrivances, for if we briefly recount the *Methods* of this New Projector, we shall find them to be in this order; first he presented the world with odd Concepts of the *Idea's of things*, thereby to undermine the Principles of Truth, and to discompose the receiv'd Notions in Philosophy and Divinity, as a very \* Reverend and Learn-

B. of Worcester in his Vind. of the Trinity, ch. 10.

Learned Writer ( though one of the chiefest and most Eminent of the *Pulpit Orators* ) hath lately proved against him. Then, that his Sentiments might prevail, he prescribes a new way of *Bringing up of Youth*, and seasoning them betimes in some *Private Nurseries* with such Principles as he and his Associates shall dictate, and accordingly all *Publick Schools* and *Universities*, and their Studies are cried down by him. Next, there comes forth a *New Plat form of Religion*, all the Fundamental Articles and Doctrines of Christianity are discarded by him, excepting *One* bare single Article, which he thinks fit to retain till he hath a fair opportunity of throwing that off too. Then he further advances, and every where very warmly inveighs against *Ministers* and *Preachers*, partly because of their *University-Learning*, but chiefly because they oppose his groundless notion of *One Article*, and assert the Fundamentals of Christianity. And lastly, to compleat his design, he strikes in with the *Deists* and *Socinians*, and laughs at the *Mysteries* of the Christian Religion, and thereby encourages men to cast off all *Reveal'd Religion*, the greatest part of which consists of Profound and Inexplicable *Mysteries*, and such as Humane Reason neither found out, nor can comprehend when reveal'd. These are the Ways and Methods he hath applyed himself to, in order to the undermining of the Orthodox Faith.

Here I will observe to the Reader how profoundly skill'd in *Greek* our *University Hater* is: He brings in these words (though alien

to his purpose) *νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται*, which, saith he, if we put into English, are [the dead shall rise] p. 100. He might have found it rightly translated to his hand in our English Bible, 1 Cor. 15. 15. but we know the Gentleman doth not much meddle with the *Epistles* (especially *St. Paul's*) as we shall hear afterwards. He thinks, good man, that *ἐγείρονται* is a Verb of the *future tense*. And here we see the reason why such as he declaim against *Publick Schools*, and against *Grammar*. It is no wonder indeed that he despairs of *setting up for a Critick for fear he should set the world of laughing*, p. 67. To this Eminent Skill of his in *Criticism and Grammar* we may refer *Cinnetus*, a new Name for a *Dictator of Rome*, p. 356. of his *Education*.

He plays upon the Sacred Names *Jesus* and *Messias* p. 107. and would perswade the Reader to believe that he ought no more attend to the meaning of the word *Jesus* and the word *Messias* when the Proposition, *Jesus is the Messias*, is tender'd to him to believe, than to the Signification of the Name *Saul* or *Arthur*, or any other Name whatsoever. But what is the reason then, I ask the *Vindicator* why these Names *Jesus* and *Christ* (which latter is the *Greek* for *Messias*) are so particularly and distinctly explained, and descanted upon by those Learned and Pious Writers who have commented upon the *Apostle's Creed*? We see they spend a considerable time in giving the true and full Import of these Denominations. There is mentioned a Man in the same *Creed*, under whom our Saviour suffered, but

but we do not find that his double *Name* is searched into and sifted by Expositors as those Blessed Names *Jesus* and *Messias* are. And the reason is plain, because Christian men are concerned to know the true meaning and Sense of these *Titles*, or else they can't know who it was that was *born*, *suffered*, and *died* for them. In the very *Names* themselves there is included the Nature of this Divine and Extraordinary Person, and therefore it was fit that they should not be ignorant of this. But it is not so with other Names, they need not any such Explaining and Opening: as for example *Pontius Pilate* and *John Lock* are well known to be such Persons, though the Extraction of the *Names* be not explained. I hope our Captious and Ludicrous *Vindicator* will consider this, and not ridiculously and impiously undervalue and debase the Names of the *Son of God*, and compare them with those of *King Saul* and *Prince Arthur*, and tell us (as he doth afterwards p. 108.) that this Proposition *Jesus is the Messias* needs no more Explication than this, *Cyrus was King of Persia*. And as to what he subjoyns p. 109, 110. that I own the Easiness of the foresaid Proposition, the *Masker's* Understanding is clouded, or else he would not have quoted these Words in p. 74. of my *Socinianism unmask'd* to the purpose he doth, for any one may see that I intended them to be but a General Description or Character of the *Messias*; and the Occasion of that Lax Character of him is discernible in that place to any one but our Muffled *Vindicator*.

He

He would shew himself a *Critick* p. 112. &c. in descanting upon the word *Integral* and *Essential*, which I made use of in a general meaning for whatever appertain'd to the *Essence* and *integrity* of a Christian: which shews that our Tutor was Over-nice, that his Exceptions are mean and low, and that he is but Practitioner in *Water-gruel*.

P. 117. he tells the Reader that all that part of my Discourse in *Socinianism Unmask'd* which reaches from p. 28 to 35. is nothing but *Pulpit-Oratory*. If the Reader will be pleas'd to consult that part of the Chapter, he may satisfy himself that there is Ignorance as well as Malice in this Imputation: for I there shew that he treads in the steps of those of the *Racovian* way who cast off several Articles of Christian Faith because they are in part Dark and Mysterious: I shew that this was the practise of *Grellius*, and is follow'd by the *English Socinians* at this day: I particularly assert the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*, and shew in what sense it may be said not to be *Difficult*: I prove that it contains in it *no Contradiction*: and as to the One Article so talk'd of by him, I make it evident that it is not more Intelligible than any of the Articles which I propounded as Fundamental. These are the Contents of that Part of my Treatise, and I appeal to the Reader whether this be the *Pulpit-Oratory*. That the Creature should give it this Name, is the highest piece of Nonsense, and the plainest proof of Stupidity that he could have divulg'd to the world: unless: you will say, it was only to have a fling

fling at the *Pulpit* ( which he often mentions with Contempt and Reproach ) and then it is *Prophane Spite*.

When I objected to him *his Contempt of the Epistolary Writings of the Apostles*, which I evinc'd from his *passing them by* and wholly neglecting to gather any Articles of Faith out of them, he replies, in way of Recrimination, that I *have pass'd by several Chapters and Verses in my Collection of Articles*, and thence infers my *Contempt* of them, p. 122. It is to be hoped there are but few men in the world whose brains are thus disorder'd. Could any one but this shallow *Vindicator* think that I should collect the Fundamental Articles of Christianity out of all the Chapters and Verses of the New Testament? Or, if I did not so, and mentioned not some of them, that this was any Argument of my despising those Writings? Could any but this poor Dandler of Infants imagine that there is a parity between these two, *viz.* my collecting of the Fundamental Articles out of the *Gospels, Acts, and Epistles*, and his presenting of us with one Article only out of the *Evangelists and Acts*, without so much as taking notice of the *Apostolical Epistles*? Could any but this Weak Arguer infer from my not mentioning every chapter and verse in the New Testament that this is the same with omitting all the *Epistles*? Could any one that hath not the like Hardened Front with himself publish to the world that this is a sign of my *Contemning* the Scriptures? and then upon this occasion he hath the vanity to vent a silly poultry Quibble upon *passing by*, which none but

but such an abhor'd *Pedant* would stain his paper with.

Then, as if he had discarded all Truth, and seared his Conscience with a hot iron, he hath the face to utter such words as these *viz*, that I, though a Minister of the Gospel, cannot bear the Texts of Scripture which he hath produced, nor his quotations out of the four Evangelists, p. 152. whereas any one that pursues what I have writt may see that I only objected against his Quotations as not being a Compleat Collection, and because in several places he distorted the Evangelists words. Yet according to his never-failing art of Falsifying he represents me as one that vilifies the Four Evangelists. Such another daring Falshood is that, that I think the Gospel, the Good News of Salvation, tedious from the mouth of our Saviour and his Apostles, p. 126. For which apparent forgery I claim the forfeiture of his Ears, if he hath not (as he hath deserv'd) lost them before. And from this you may gather what Sincerity there is in his objecting to me that I make bold with Truth, and that what I say is utterly false p. 403. you must not credit one word of it, for once a Forger, and always so. This is his master piece of Art to cheat and abuse the world with downright Falsties, and to betray Christianity, and yet whilst he is doing this to accuse others of being False.

He grants p. 127. what I had urged about the Four Gospels being writ to and for Believers, as well as Unbelievers, and yet immediately after he revokes his Grant, and sophistically shifts it off,

off, so that no man alive knows where to have the Gentleman.

But it is worth our remarking that it hath pleased God to leave this Man to his own infatuations, and to suffer him to produce and insist upon a portion of Scripture which is an absolute Confutation of what he brings it for. p. 125. He quotes a great part of the fifth chapter to the *Hebrews* to prove that the Necessary Articles and Principles of Faith are not to be gather'd out of the *Epistles*, particularly he makes use of those words, *You have need that one teach you again which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God.* v. 12. And the Apostle in chap. 6. v. 1. particularly sets down these *Principles of the doctrine of Christ*, (as he also stiles them.) Who but this Obstinate and Senseless *Vindicator* would hence infer (as he strenuously doth) that the Apostolical *Epistles*, and this especially, were not written to teach men the Fundamental Principles of Christianity? We have seen what a Talent he hath of *Grammar* and *Criticism*; now behold the mans Improvements in *Logick*? If you please we'll reduce what he saith into a *Syllogism*, because this profound Logician hath set us a Pattern before, and he will take it ill if we don't follow him.

“ If it be plainly express'd in the *Epistle* to the *Hebrews* that they have need to be taught again the First Principles of the Oracles of God, and of the doctrine of Christ, and accordingly the Apostle distinctly tells them what some of these Principles are, then neither this *Epistle* nor any other *Epistles* of the Apostles distinctly

“distinctly shew what were those doctrines,  
 “which were absolutely necessary to make  
 “men Christians (I use the Logitian’s own  
 “words):

“But it is plainly expressed in the Epistle  
 “to the *Hebrews* that *they have need to be*  
 “*taught again the first Principles of the Ora-*  
 “*cles of God, and of the doctrine of Christ,* and  
 “accordingly the Apostle distinctly tells them  
 “what some of those Principles are:

“*Ergo,* neither this Epistle nor any other  
 “Epistles of the Apostles distinctly shew what  
 “were those doctrines which were absolute-  
 “ly necessary to make a Man a Christian.

Or more briefly he argues thus, “This and  
 “other Epistles tell us what are the Necessary  
 “Principles of Christianity; Ergo, they do  
 “not tell us.

You have a taste of his *Logical* Faculty, and  
 I doubt not but you likewise have been draw-  
 ing a *Conclusion* from the Premises, *viz.* that  
 such Wild Reasonings argue a flaw in his  
 Skull that uses them. Is this the *Thoughtful*  
 man? A Creature that goes on all four, if it  
 could speak, would talk much better Sense.  
 Here is such a Heap of Contradictions, and  
 such Impiety in citing the Holy Text to patro-  
 nize them, that I question not but the Judici-  
 ous Reader will hence form such thoughts  
 of this Gentleman as his great merits require.

But surely in his next quotations out of an  
*Epistle* (though it be a part of Scripture  
 which he so much dreads) he will take care  
 to speak tolerable sense, and not to abuse the  
 Sacred Writ in this palpable manner. Let us  
 see

see then how it is with him in his Citation  
 out of the first Epistle to the *Corinthians*. In  
 order to prove his former wild Conceit, that  
 the *Epistles* of the Apostles are not to be con-  
 sulted for Fundamentals of Christianity, he  
 alledges chap. 3. v. 2. *I have fed you with milk,*  
*and not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able*  
*to bear it: neither yet are ye able.* The plain  
 meaning of which words without doubt is  
 this, that the Apostle had hitherto taught  
 them, and continued still to teach them the  
 Necessary and Indispensable Doctrines of  
 Christianity, such as were as needful for them  
 as *Milk* for babes. Because they were not  
 able to bear any heavy Superstructure, he  
 made it his chief business to *lay the Foundati-*  
*on,* and this *Foundation* is *Jesus Christ, v. 10, 11.*  
 The plain way of Salvation by this JESUS  
 the Son of God, the Plain and Easy Articles  
 of the Christian Faith (all of them Plain as  
 to the Truth and Certainty of them, though  
 some of them not Plain as to the manner of  
 the things comprehended in those Articles)  
 these plain and simple Truths (which are as  
 Pure and Unsophisticated as *Milk*, and there-  
 fore are so termed here) are those Doctrines  
 which the Apostle taught the *Corinthians*.  
 And now then let us see how this Man of  
 Logick argues from the Apostle’s words; and  
 to give you the better light into his excellent  
 way of Arguing, we will present it in Mode  
 and Figure, for Mr. *Chillingworth*, saith he,  
 bid his Adversary *write nothing but Syllogisms,*  
 p. 228. and besides we find that Good Mr.  
*Bold* is for *Syllogisms,* p. 4. of his *Reply*: So  
 E that

that upon these Weighty Authorities we must beake our selves to this way of Disputing. Thus then he argues,

"If the Apostle fed the *Corinthians* with *milk*, i. e. taught them the Plain and Necessary Articles of Christianity, and delivered such in his *Epistles* to them, then we are not to think that any Fundamental and Necessary Articles of the Christian Religion, such as are to be received to make a man a Christian, are to be found in this or any other of the *Epistles* :

"But the Apostle fed the *Corinthians* with *milk*, i. e. taught them the Plain and Necessary Articles of Christianity, and delivered such in his *Epistles* to them :

"*Ergo*, we are not to think that any Fundamental and Necessary Articles of the Christian Religion, such as are to be received to make a man a Christian, are to be found in this, or any other of the *Epistles*.

*Risum teneatis?* If the *Vindicator* can clear this from Nonsense, I promise him that the Reader and I will leave off laughing at him for his cathiering of *Burgersdicius*. But in the mean time we see the reason why this *Itinerant Innovator* is so zealous against *Logick*, and *University-Learning*. He trembles at the thoughts of Strict Sense and Argument, because these make against him: Yea, he makes the Blessed Apostle contradict himself, merely to contradict me.

And I would further remark, that immediately after he had quoted those foresaid words of the Apostle, he adds, THEREFORE very little

little is said in this *Epistle* for explaining any part of the Great Mystery of Salvation (and yet before he was against all Mysteries in Christianity) contain'd in the Gospel, p. 131. And presently after, *The same holds in all the other Epistles, and THEREFORE the Epistles seem'd not to me to be the properest part of Scripture* (he said before they were not at all proper) to give us the Foundation, p. 132. He complains of a *therefore* of mine, where there is no cause at all for it, p. 111. but here is such a pair of *Therefores* as never was heard of in any Age, and be sure never will be, unless it be in his Writings. It was St. Paul's way to instruct the *Corinthians* in the plain Principles of Christianity, he took care to settle them in the Foundation, seeing they were not fit at that time for any considerable Superstructure, and therefore (saith our *Vindicator*) we must not expect to meet with any such Principles in this *Epistle*, or in any others. There are several people in that Great Brick House he wots of at the lower end of *Moorfields*, that never bid for that place by talking so ravingly. Whether the *Childrens* Crying and Bawling, or the *Matthers Unkindnesses* to him have put him into these disorders, I shall not determine, but the poor Animal is certainly much shatter'd, and 'tis to be fear'd belongs to the Hospital of the *Incurable*.

Then he proceeds, p. 138, 139. to mention my taking notice of his feigned ground of Writing the *Epistles*, viz. because the *Fundamental Articles* are mix'd here with other Truths. But having nothing to rejoyn, he falls to *Railing*, a fault which he imputes to me, but is peculiar to himself.

And as for what I said of *Mixture*, that those things which are promiscuously put together are capable of being *distinguish'd* (which he boggles at) there is an Example of it in one he knows very well; a *Committee man* and a *Vindicator* are mix'd together, but there is a possibility of *distinguishing*, yea of separating the former from the latter, the Honorable from the Vile; though 'tis true some things are so *mix'd* in some persons that they will never admit of a separation, as a *Chamber-Quack* and an *Abhorrer of Universities*; or thus, an *Innovator* and a *Greed-Hater*. There is no parting of these. In the same place he thinks it Witty to reflect twice on my *Degree* in the University, as if B. D. were as Contemptible as A B C, which is his own Character.

He jogs on still p. 140, 141, &c. sometimes coyning matter, and fastning it upon me, sometimes impertinently asking of *Questions*, and requiring *Answers*, and every where falling into ridiculous Impertinencies, and weak reasonings: And what else could be expected from a Man that had all his days been us'd to the Tattle of Brats and Nurflings, and hath thereby perfectly learn'd all their humors, especially (as I observ'd before) their impertinent Queries, and troublesome Babblings? Thus our Old *Tutor* is twice a Child, though he doats so extremely that he can't see it, but verily perswades himself that all he hath writ against me is Strong and Nervous, and, like what he dictates to his *Young Masters*, must not be examin'd and censured.

Only

Only here it is to be noted, that what he saith p. 145. concerning *Popular Haranguing*, is a faucy Reflection on the Chiefest and most Eminent of the *Clergy of our Church*, whose constant employment hath been that which he contemptuously calls *Popular Haranguing*, and in other places *Pulpit-Oratory*, i. e. Preaching. Such is his Spleen against this Evangelical Institution, and the Ministers of it, though he makes a shew of being a *Christian*. But he that will bespatter the Universities, and Academick Learning, and expunge the Chiefest Articles of Religion out of the Bible, will not stop at any thing.

But our *Penny-Post* is upon the hoof still, p. 146, 147, &c. and his Quill is as Itinerant as himself, and like its Owner, fixes no where, hath no Habitation. Sometimes he quotes what I have said, and misinterprets it, at other times, to fill up his book, and to make it bulky, he gives you large shivers out of his own Writings, for he thinks none are so good as they, and that's the reason he never quotes an Author, unless it be to disparage him. He trifles to a prodigy, and according to his constant Method, he never fails at the close of a Paragraph to wind up all with *Railing*, his Mother-tongue.

But wondrous it is to see what work he makes p. 156. where the Reader will be puzzled to tell whether his Falshood or his Weakness be greater: He complains that I call him a *Betrayer of Christianity and a Contemner of the Epistles*, because he did not out of them name [Satisfaction:] Whereas the Reader

E 3

will

will find, if he thinks fit to consult my *Socinianism Unmask'd*, that I treat of his *Contempt of the Epistles* in one Chapter, and of his refusing to use the word *Satisfaction* in an other. And I mention his *not naming of Christ's Satisfying for us* on no other account but this, that it argues he is a favourer of *Socinianism*, because when he professedly and designedly enumerates the *Advantages* of our Saviour's Coming, he speaks not of his *making Satisfaction for us*. This is the true and plain account of the matter, whence it is obvious to take notice of his willful violation of Truth and Sincerity. He jumps from the Third Chapter of my Book to the Seventh to form a Falshood against me. He most untruly and perversly represents the thing he speaks of, and there is no shadow of Verity in what he saith: So that the Reader is sufficiently caution'd against depending upon his word for the future; and he must always suppose him to be an arrant *Masker*.

But he is as Silly as he is False, for, in the same place, to excuse himself as to his not mentioning of *Satisfaction*, he saith, *there is not any such word in any one of the Epistles, or other Books of the New Testament in his Bible as Satisfying, or Satisfaction made by our Saviour, and so he could not put it into his Christianity as delivered in the Scripture*. Very found and solid! It being such a Noble Strain of Logick and Reason, we will form it into a *Syllogism*, and leave it as Mr. *Lock's Memorial* to posterity. It is briefly thus:

“ If

“ If there be no such word as *Satisfaction* in any of the books of the New Testament, it cannot be put into *Christianity* as delivered in the Scripture.

“ But there is no such word as *Satisfaction* in any of the Books of the New Testament.

“ Ergo, it can't be put into *Christianity* as delivered in the Scripture.

Get thee gone, for a Cunning Disputant: thou hast not thy fellow, I verily believe, within the Comps of the four Seas. By the same way of Arguing I will prove that the doctrine of the *Trinity* is no part of *Christianity* as delivered in the Scripture. And so you may, saith the *Vindicator*, for I hold there is no such thing as the *Trinity* in Scripture.

But I will try again, by the same Argument I will prove that the *Divine Decrees*, and the *Attributes* of God, and his *Providence* are no Part of *Christianity*, because these words [ *Decrees, Attributes, Providence* ] (as it is understood of God) are not in Scripture. Nor do the *Sacraments* belong to *Christianity*, because that word occurs no where in the Sacred Writings, as *Barclay* (Apol: p. 292.) profoundly argues. Nay, The word *Christianity* is not to be found in Scripture, why then doth this man talk of *Christianity as delivered in the Scripture*? You see by this what strange and inconsistent things he obtrudes upon the Reader. He will not allow of *Satisfaction* because the word is not mention'd in the Bible: Is there any reason then to own such a thing as *Christianity*, seeing the word is not found there? But he will say, the Thing is. And

E 4

the



the same I say of *Satisfaction*; and so the *Vindicator* shews himself to be a sorry contemptible Wrangler, and lets the World know that he hath dealt so much with *Children*, that he's of that number himself.

But afterwards p. 157. he pretends to own the *Thing*, and to say it may be collected out of his *Reasonableness of Christianity*. Yet still the *Stubborn* and *Stomachful Man* (which disposition he observes reigns much in *Children*. *Educac.* p. 121, 122.) will not buckle to the *Word*. Surely this same word *satisfying* hath been some way or other very mischievous to him, that he so starts back at the naming of it. But to come close to the business, I appeal to any Impartial Man whether it can in any probability be believ'd that a person own such or such a *Truth* or *Doctrine* of the Gospel, and yet will not express it by that *Word* or *Name* which all the Professors of the Orthodox Faith have agreed to call it by. This is the Case of the *Vindicator*, he pretends to allow of the *Satisfaction* of Christ, and yet he absolutely refuses to use the *Word*. But till he can give us any Reason for this refusal, we shall believe that the true Cause why he will not admit of the *Word* is, because he disbelieves the *Thing* it self.

P. 159 he would be fastning two Properties of a *Jesuite* (as he saith) upon me; but every one saith they are his Own, and therefore I will not injure him by laying claim to them. And this I'll tell him moreover, that he hath an Other Property of one of that Order, which he hath not named, and that is

*Trudg-*

*Trudging up and down, and having no Home.* And if a man can be of *Loiola's Order* and a *Mendicant* too, then I'm sure he may put in for both.

What he jabbers p. 163, 164. about *Satisfaction* not being named at the Admission of those of Riper Years to Baptism, he might have seen answer'd, if he had had two eyes, in my *Socinianism Unmask'd*, p. 47.

P. 168. he comes to make little Whimsical Remarks on what I had said of the *Apostles Creed*, he raises Trifling Objections; he sets up a Phantom, a mere Shadow, and then encounters it; he is *wanton* and *freakish*, and in brief, the *Kitling* plays with his own Tail.

He insists upon the terms *Abstract* and *Abridgment*, p. 173, 174. and spends a great many vain words about them, but can't for his heart disprove what I asserted, *viz.* that the fore-said *Creed* is an *Abstract* or *Abridgment* of the Christian Faith, which is more fully express'd in the Holy Scriptures, not only in the *Gospel*, but in the *Epistles*, which our *Vindicator* cannot endure to hear of. At last I am to be the *Jesuite* again, and he is to take Mr. *Chillingworth's* place, and so the *Protestant* is to confute the *Papist*, and there's an end of that silly Fantastick Fiction of our *Masker*, not worthy of one of the poor raw Boys that he hath drag'd up in his time.

Further, it is to be noted that after he had banded as fiercely as he could against my notion of *Abridgment*, and, to thwart me, had produced *Chillingworth's* sense of the word, he confesses that he is ignorant *whether what Chillingworth*

lingworth had given, be the nature of an *Abridgment*, or no. p. 177. Which shews how fickle and restive he is, and that he builds upon precarious hypotheses, and is not careful whether there be any Ground for what he saith. This would make one doubt whether this Writer be in his right mind or no. Hath not former *Thoughtfulness* disorder'd his Brain, that he thus talks?

P. 177. he would seem to pay some honour to the *Primitive Church* and the *Church of England* (though no man believes it, no not himself) and to vindicate their practise in admitting persons to Baptism upon the Faith contain'd in the *Apostles Creed*, as if no more were to be believ'd by them than what is in *express terms* in that Form of Confession. But the Catechism of our Church may satisfy him that more is comprehended in that Form of Faith, than is *expressly* there mention'd, else it would not have been said that *we are chiefly to learn, in these Articles of our Belief, to believe in God the Father, in God the Son, and in God the Holy Ghost*. He may look long enough into the Creed, and never find there these words, *God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost*; but Our Church lets us know that these terms are really contain'd in that Profession of Faith. Whence it follows that when persons are baptized into the Faith of the *Apostles Creed*, they are baptized into the Faith of the *Trinity*, and consequently into more than is in *express words* mention'd in this Symbol of our Faith. Which is the thing that this Quarrellsome Animal objects against, but is not able after all his flut-

fluttering to effect any thing. Besides, it is evident that our Church thinks not this *Creed* to be absolutely Perfect and Compleat, because she adds other Creeds to it, as the *Nicene* and *Athanasian*. Which it is probable she would not have done if every thing to be believ'd were in *express, direct, and full words* set down in the other Form of Belief. And again, as to what he saith of the *Primitive Practise* of admitting persons to Baptism upon the bare confession of the *Apostles Creed*, he betrays his Ignorance, having not learnt from several Eminent Writers that this Creed is not exactly the same that it was in the First Ages of Christianity, but that some Articles have been added to it. But the heedless *Masker* attends to none of these things, but goes on Chattering, and loves to hear his Clack move. But you must pardon him, for he that is used to the Conversation of Nurses, and the whole *Posse* of the Chatting Crew, can't be thought to moderate his Intemperate Organ.

P. 183, 184. he heaves very hard to take off a *Blunder* that had been justly imputed to him, but he runs into a greater and more ridiculous one, and salves it by *Supposition*, for he would have it *supposed* (and that is a great word with him, you must note, in his Writings) that the Compilers of the Creed who lived in several Centuries, yet *lived in one age or time*. This is precious stuff, you will say. Though some of the Compilers of the Creed lived at some years distance from one another, yet by a *Supposition* they are Contemporary, and live together. Yes, it must be

be so by all means, he peremptorily vouches that *the supposition of their living together is easy, at what distance so ever they lived, and how many so ever there were of them.* p. 185. This is as if he should suppose that all the *Pedantick Tutors* that lived in King *Richard* the Second's, and King *Henry* the Eight's reigns should live at the same time with our *Vindicator* who is of the same race and kind. One would not think that a man that talks so much against *Poetry* as he doth, should have such a fanfiful knack of *Fiction*. The sense of this *Blunder* hath somewhat damp't him, and for some pages together he is down in the mouth, and only sneakingly desires me to shew him this, and shew him that, *i. e.* to shew him his Folly: which I need not do, he hath sufficiently done it himself.

Then p. 190, 191, 192, 193, &c. he is at his old work of *Repetition*, and quoting himself ( though he could not quote a worse Author ) and filling up whole pages with what he had said in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, and in his former *Vindication*. And truly this is his employment every where, so that a man may modestly compute that there are three parts of his book spent in Reiterating the same things, and in the very same words. He that is so much against *Themes* will not permit himself to vary the *Phrase*, but brings over his old matter again in the very same individual terms that he used before, which renders his Farce very ridiculous and irksom. But besides the impudent Vanity of the thing, there is a great deal of Knavery and Dishonesty in it, which he ought to answer for. None

but

but he that hath counterfeited his Name would impose upon the world by offering them a false number of Pages, to heighten the Price of them. The Reader is cheated into a book of above thirty sheets, when, if you pare off his Repetitions, there remain not above eight or nine. Here is a gross piece of Injustice, to make the Buyer pay five shillings for a Twelve penny Cut. This is a New way of Writing, to insert one book into an other *verbatim*, and so to chouse the unwary Chapman. Nay, it might be further observed that whatever he hath added in this last Pamphlet is run over again in some places of it, as if he studied to make it more Ridiculous then it seem'd to be at the first reading. But it appears it was his business to heap up a Multitude of words, and to eeke out his poor lank matter: for a Book was to come out against what I had writ, and there was a necessity of Stuffing it and Swelling it, and to say Much where Nothing could be said to the Purpose.

In his next pages 202, &c. he is stark mad at me for intimating that he and his Allies are *Under-hand Factors for Rome*. See how it pleases the Divine Disposer of all things that by occasion of a small Hint a man shall discover to the world his Inward Conscioufness, and together with that his Propensions and Designs which he with all the art imaginable labour'd to mask and conceal! When I but mention'd the Tendency of the Party to *Rome*, he, as a Concern'd and Guilty Criminal, starts up, and shews himself gall'd and pinch'd, he lies about and grows furious and outrageous.

What

What ! saith he, doth this Orthodox Railer tell us that we are *Factors for Rome*, and truck for *Popery* ? What ! doth he think that because I hate *Universities*, I am in love with the *Whore of Babylon* ? How can I be of the *Roman Church* that am of none ? But this is easily answer'd by the known Maxim, *One of no Religion will soon be of any*. Scepticism makes way for Popery. The doctrine which the *Author* and *Vindicator of the Reasonableness of Christianity* hath spread abroad, is contrived on purpose to bring me off from the Received Articles of Christianity, and to prepare them to be Scepticks and Infidels. I hope to give the Reader satisfaction about this and in a few words to convince the Intelligent and Serious Considerer that it is the design of this Writer to *unsettle Religion*, to introduce *Indifferency* and *Neutrality* into Christianity, to place all Opinions on a level, to represent all Doctrines to be alike, that there may be no contending for any Articles of Faith, that those which were look'd upon by the Primitive Church and by Our Own as Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity may for the future not be thought necessary to be known and believ'd in order to making men True Christians, He perswades men that *One Article* will do their business, and that those who pass for *Orthodox Protestants* confound people with *bundels* of doctrines, which are useles and unnecessary; that half the Bible, Yea a quarter of it is enough, that One of the *Evangalists* Writings contains all the rest ( for which he quotes Mr. *Ghillingworth* ) and therefore if all the rest

rest were lost, we need not concern our selves about it; as for the *Epistles* of the Apostles, we need not trouble our heads with looking into them, for there is only now and then dropt by the bye an Article of Faith.

And then, this Author under the pretence of declaring against *Systems of Divinity* ( which is his Common Subject ) strikes at all the Received and Celebrated Doctrines of the Christian Church, and represents them as indifferent and precarious. Every where he shews his abhorrence of the very word *System* ( as if it were as uneasy to him as *Satisfying* ) so that it is a singular and extraordinary favour he would quote ( as he doth, and that with Respect ) Dr. *Cudworths book* that bears the Name of *System*. Now, I am only to take notice of the Ground of his inveighing against *Systems*, which is his design of bringing an *odium* on the Sett'd Truths of Christianity, and to make way for his own Giddy Notions. Accordingly he pronounces concerning those Stable Fundamentals of Christianity that *they were framed and fashioned according to the humors, interests, or designs of the Heads of Parties, as if they were things depending on mens pleasure, and to be suited to their convenience*. These are his words p. 215, 216. and speak his heart; and the *Turkish Spye* doth not express his mind more fully. Thus he disposes his Readers to be of no Church, of no Religion. Or at least he would perswade them that one way of Religion is as good as an other : which is the prevailing doctrine of these days. Therefore Mr. *Bald* (one

(one whom I shall afterwards account with) was much mistaken when he said, *he never hardly appear'd on a fashionable subject*, Rep. p. 3. for this Opinion, and that *One religion is as good as another*, is the *Modish doctrine* every where. This Country Gentleman is in the *Fashion*, and doth not know it. (And thence you may judge of the Truth of what Mr. Lock saith of him, that *he takes not up his Opinions from Fashion*. Pref. to his *Vindicat.*)

Now this is a fair step towards *Rome*, for if one Religion be equivalent to another, and our Salvation is not concerned in the belief of the Necessary Articles of *our Faith*, then we are at liberty to embrace what Form and Model of Articles we please, and those of the Church of *Rome* will perhaps be thought as good as any. There is a strange passage in this Writer, p. 217, 218. which speaks his favourable opinion of the *Pontifical* way, *I have often wondred*, saith he, *to hear men of several Churches so heartily exclaim against the Implicit Faith of the Church of Rome, when the same Implicit Faith is as much practis'd and required in their own, though not so openly profess'd, and ingeniously own'd there.* First, he lets us know that from that Converse which he hath had with persons of *several Churches*, whether of the Communion of the Church of *England*, or those of the Dissenters, he finds that they are against the Church of *Rome*. Secondly, that though they are against the doctrine of *Implicit Faith* in the Church of *Rome*, yet they like it well enough in their *own*. Thirdly, they not only like it, but *practise* it, yea the very

very same *Implicit Faith*. Fourthly, they not only *practise* but *require* it, they command and enjoyn those of their Communion to believe all they say with an *Implicit Faith*. But fifthly, they do not this with so good a grace as those of the *Roman Church* do. For those latter are very *open and ingenuous* in their profession and *practise* of *implicit Faith*, but the former are not so. *Protestants* have not that Candor and Fairness which are to be seen in *Papists*; they neither so *openly profess*, nor so *ingeniously own* this doctrine, but yet as strictly *practise* it, and *require the practise* of it as they do. I leave it with the Reader to determine from the Premises which of these two, those of the *Roman* or of the *Reform'd Churches*, have the happiness to be most in favour with this Gentleman.

In the known stile of the *Roman Priests* and Writers he declares that *the Scripture serves but like a Nose of Wax*, p. 213. And as the Heads of the Church of *Rome* deny the *Bible* to the Common people, so he is advancing towards this apace, for he lops off three of the *Evangelists*, (for one he saith will suffice) and all the *Epistles*. And further to shew his good will to the *Roman Catholics*, and to their Beloved Notion of *Transubstantiation* he tells us p. 408, 409. that *if a man understands those words of our Saviour's Institution* [ *This is my body* ] and [ *This is my blood* ] *in a Literal sense, he must believe the Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper are changed really into his Body and Blood, though he knows not how.* And afterwards he saith, *He is obliged to believe it to be*

true, and to assent to it. And presently afterwards, To deny assent to this as true, would be to deny our Saviour's Veracity, and consequently his being the *Messiah* sent from God. Here he lets us know that his *One Article* is quite renounced if *Transubstantiation* be not admitted. You see what his making of [ *Jesus is the Messiah* ] to be the *Sole Article* of Christian Faith, comes to. But this doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is so grateful to him that he brings it over again, p 413, 414. assuring us that the *Old Gentleman* at Rome, who hath an *Antient Title to Infallibility*, may make *Transubstantiation* a *Fundamental Article* necessarily to be believ'd, as well as I make the *Divinity of Christ* and his *Satisfaction*, &c. (for these he means by the *Sense of any Disputed Texts of Scripture*, because the *Texts* concerning these *Points* are disputable with him) *Fundamental Articles* necessarily to be believ'd. It is brought to this issue it seems, that *Transubstantiation* is as *Fundamental* an *Article* of the *Christian Faith* as any that can be nam'd besides *Jesus's being the Messiah*. Thus by the *Over-ruling Providence* of *Heaven* this sort of *Writers* discover the *inward bent* of their *thoughts* and *inclinations*, though they labour to *hide* them from the *world*. This *Gentleman* would be thought to have no *kindness* for *Rome*, and yet his own words confute him. As I observ'd before that he stoutly *Rails* whilst he is *remonstrating* against that *practice*, so here he *stiffly patronizes Popery*, even when he had pretended to shew himself displeas'd at my charging him with it.

And

And I could produce several other passages out of his Writings which makes it appear that our *Prefter John* is inclined to receive the *Roman Missionaries*; I could make it evident that he is *Indifferent* as to the *Reform'd Religion*, and the *Doctrines* professed by the *Owners* of it, and that he inspires mens minds with a *disesteem* of those *Articles* which the *Christian Churches* since the *Reformation* have *unanimously asserted* and *vindicated*, and that he represents them as *Ridiculous*. You must not, saith he, give ear to what the *Preachers* and *Pulpit Orators* of these *Churches* tell you about more *Articles* than *One* as necessary to be known and believed, in order to making you *Christians*. If you assent to this *Single Proposition*, *Jesus is the Messiah*, I declare to you that you are, as to matter of Faith, as *Good Christians* as *St. Peter* and *St. Paul* were. When your *Parish-Priests* endeavour in their *Popular Harangues* to persuade you that this is not the *sum Total* of the *Christian Faith*, but that there are other *Necessary* and *Fundamental Doctrines* which are of the *Essence* of *Christianity*, you must roundly tell them from me, that the *Catalogue of Fundamentals* every one alone can make for himself: no body can collect or prescribe it to another, but this is according as God hath dealt to every one the *measure of light and faith*, and hath open'd each mans *understanding*, that he may understand the *Scripture*. These are the express words of our *Vindicator*, p. 85. and from them it undeniably follows, that though no body must be a *Creed-maker*, yet every one

one may be a *Fundamental maker*. Mr. *Hobbs* was pleased to give this power to the *King* only, but this Gentleman is more liberal, and grants it to every Subject: He may make what *Catalogue of Fundamentals* he pleases, and put this into it, among the rest, that the *Pope* is Infallible, and that the Religion of the Church of *Rome* is to be prefer'd to that of the *Reformed*. Fundamentals depend not upon the *Scriptures*, but upon mens *Understandings*, and therefore every man according to his apprehensions may make as many, and as few Fundamental Articles as he thinks fit. What think you now of our *Tutor*, our *Anti-Academian*? Is not this Man of *One Article* disposed to entertain the *Twelve New Articles* of Faith of the *Council of Trent*?

It is impossible to conceive how Great Mischief that person may do whose Head is stuff'd with such Notions as these, especially if we consider he is always *creeping into Houses*, and insinuating into *Families*, and wheadling the *Masters and Mistresses*, and infecting the early thoughts of *young Ones* with such Principles. Such a one the Commonwealth is concern'd to have an eye upon, for the safety of the Publick. And though all this while I don't suppose him to be set on work upon any consideration of his extraordinary Skill or Ability, as if I took him either for a Conjuror or a Jesuite, yet he may be made use of as a very fit Tool, as a Convenient Machin, and (as I said before) he may serve to be an Under-hand Factor. And if the Creature had not been some such thing, it is impossible he should

should startle and stare, and sing about (as the Reader may observe he doth) at the naming of *Popery* and *Rome*. He conceals the resentment as well as he can, but the Observing Reader may plainly discern it. None would have been guilty of this but our Ridiculous *Masker*, who, in imitation of the *Changling kind*, hides his face, and then thinks no body sees him. But notwithstanding all his *Artifices and Disguises*, he bewrays himself. As they vulgarly say of the Fiend, that when he appears in Humane Shape, he can never dissemble it so well, but he is some way or other discover'd, there is some mark to discern him by.

A little after, p. 229, 230. he returns to the *One Article* again, and upbraids me for *many*. *I have*, he saith, *a reserve of the Lord knows how many more*, p. 233. which is Irreverently and Prophanely spoken, because he uses the Sacred Name so slightly and vainly. By this we may guess what manner of *Education* his Children and Nurslings have: He that abuses that Holy Name himself will not check this fault in others.

Then in three pages together, 232, 233, 234. he falls into his old Trot of *telling* me, and desiring to *shew*, and let him *know*, &c. Without any shame or remorse he continues to stuff whole pages with Reiterations of his former Writings. Though he was lately not for *telling*, but for *weighing of money*, yet he hath other thoughts with respect to his *Books*, for he reckons *Number* to be *Weight*. Such *Writers glory* in the number of their *Lines*, and

and think to be Voluminous is to be Argumentative.

Next, p. 238, &c. he runs back to Object against the Reason which I assigned why the believing of *Jesus* to be the *Messias* is so frequently mention'd in the New Testament. And he busies himself with Wire-drawing every word that I had said, and scores up all along (as he had done before) what I must shew him, and what I must prove, and sets them down in distinct Figures: And yet after all these little devices and pedantick tricks, he hath not rais'd one Objection against me that hath any thing more in it than his *Childrens Rattle*. And indeed it must needs be so, and can't be otherwise: when men have taken up false deceitful Notions, and then labour to Vindicate them, it is presently seen that their pretences of Arguing are mere Sound, and are nothing but Childish and Noisy Amusements.

In no less than 20 pages afterwards he busies himself in hunting for Objections and Cavils against what I had said, and at last resolves to admit but of a single Article as necessary to be believ'd in order to the making of a man a Christian. But will not that Sermon of *St. Peter* in Acts 2. evidence that there are more Fundamental Points than that one, *Jesus is the Messias*? Are not our Saviour's *Passion, Death, and Resurrection* particularly mention'd in ver. 23, 24 and are they not *Fundamental Articles of Faith*? Can you believe *Jesus* to be the *Messias*, without believing him to have *suffer'd, died, and rose again*? To this it is an-

answer'd, p. 268. that these Articles were not propos'd by *St. Peter* to the unbelieving Jews as *Fundamental ones*, and consequently they are not to be reckon'd as Fundamental Articles, for it is certain that the Holy Apostle propos'd them as they were. I request the Serious and Judicious Reader to take an estimate of *Mr. Lock's Reasonableness of Christianity* from this one thing, viz. his denying the Articles of our Saviour's *Suffering, Death, and Resurrection* to be Articles of the Foundation, i.e. such as are necessarily required to be believ'd, for the constituting a man a Christian. That he denies this is plain, because he tells us that *St. Peter* propounded not these Articles as Fundamental, and because according to him there is but one Fundamental Article. If there be but One, then these are no Fundamental Propositions, unless you will say that three added to one make but one. Which I think he will scarcely assent to, unless his *Arithmetick* be proportionable to his *Christianity*. Besides, in an other place, p. 233. he is Positive as to this matter, for his words are these, [*The Death and Resurrection of Christ are recorded by the Spirit of God in Holy Writ, but are no more necessary to be believed to make a man a Christian than any other part of Divine Revelation*] that is, than any Inferiour Truth mention'd in the New Testament, as that Christ rid upon an Ass. This he declares to be as requisite to *make a man a Christian* as that Christ died and rose again.

But stay, we must not think the day is our own, the Adversary begins to rally, and pushes



upon us with his strong Reserves, as thus, p. 268. *Those Articles of the Crucifixion, Death, and Resurrection of Christ were not propos'd here as the Fundamental Articles which St. Peter principally aim'd at, and endeavour'd to convince them of. And afterwards, They are not the Principal thing aim'd at, p. 269. but only brought in by the bye. A Wager on it that he is good at Push pin. None but such a Trifler as the Vindicator could have been so shameless as to offer this to a Reader of any sense and consideration: for it is evident in this Sermon that our Saviour's Crucifixion, and Death and Rising again are equally urged with his being Lord and Christ: And the Apostle mentions his Resurrection again, v. 32. This Jesus hath God raised up, and therefore exhorts his Country-men and Brethren to imbrace this Jesus, to believe that he suffer'd, and laid down his life, and took it up again for the Good of the World. But our New Modeler of Christianity tells us that these are Articles occasionally brought in here by St. Peter, and only as Arguments to persuade the Jews, but were far from being Fundamental and Necessary Points of Christian Faith, such as they must needs believe. And how doth he prove that these were brought in as Arguments? Ay, that is worth our taking notice of. That our Saviour's Crucifixion, Death and Resurrection were us'd here as Arguments to persuade them into a belief of this Fundamental Article, that Jesus was the Messiah, is evident, saith he, from hence, that they preach'd here to Jews who know the death and crucifixion of Jesus,*

as

*as well as Peter, and therefore they could not be propos'd to them as New Articles of Faith to be believ'd, p. 269.*

The answer is obvious, that though those Auditors knew as well as their Speaker that Christ suffer'd on the cross, and there expir'd, and rose again, yet they were ignorant of the Design and End of all this, *viz.* that he suffer'd, and died and rose from the dead for the Benefit and Advantage of Mankind. Thus they were *New Articles of Faith* to them, and thus St. Peter propos'd them to be believ'd and receiv'd, as appears from that Question of those Jews who were converted by this Sermon, *What shall we do to be saved?* Which implies that St. Peter had told them Christs Death and Resurrection were in order to the Salvation of lost mankind: and therefore they desire to know what Method they must take to have the Benefit of that Salvation and Redemption; and accordingly he exhorts them to *Repent, and to be baptized every one of them in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, v. 38.* These Jews were before strangers to this, they had no persuasion concerning the Design of Christs Suffering, Dying, and Rising again, *viz.* that Salvation and Pardon of sins were to be obtain'd by them, and therefore the Apostle preaches these Truths to them. And that they are the *Principal Doctrines* in this Sermon appears from their being insisted upon so largely, from v. 23, to 36. but as for that *Other Article*, that *Jesus is the Messiah*, it is not expressly mention'd throughout the whole Sermon, only

only the substance of it is in ver. 36, after the other Grand Articles of Christs Passion and Dying and Rising had been amply discours'd of and urg'd. And yet our Bold Breeder up of Small Craft faces it out that that was the *Sole Proposition and the Sole Truth the Apostle labour'd to convince them of, and to bring them* 20. p. 270. and that the Others are no Fundamental Articles. Our new Theologue is for a *Messias* that neither *Suffer'd*, nor *died*, nor *rose again*.

I leave the Reader to judge of this, whilst I follow our *Travelling Tutor* to p. 281. &c. where we still find him perverting of *St. Luke's* Writing. He sets himself to misrepresent his History both of the *Gospel* and of the *Acts*, as if he had a particular pike against that Good Man, that Holy Writer, above all the rest.

From p. 209. to p. 299. he undertakes to set down the Contents of our Saviour's and the Apostle's Preaching, and thence to prove that *One Article only* was propounded to be believ'd to make men Christians. But our bold Undertaker falls very short of what he designed, as I shall make evident from the Texts he alleges. First, he quotes *Mat. 4. 23. Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in the Synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom, called in the 17th v. the Kingdom of heaven,* which is no other than the State of the Christian Church under the Gospel, with all the Great Benefits and Priviledges, as well as the Duties and Offices which appertain to it. This is the *Gospel of the Kingdom*, even the *kingdom* of

of *heaven*, for it is that Doctrine and Dispensation wherein Heaven and Happiness are freely offer'd to mankind, and whereby they may be made actual Partakers of them. This is that which Christ taught and preach'd, and thence our deep Logitian infers that he taught and preach'd but *One Article*, as if the doctrine of the *kingdom of heaven* contain'd in it no more. Next he quotes *Mat. 10. 7.* where our Lord enjoin'd his Apostles to preach, saying, *The kingdom of heaven is at hand.* And he adds *Luke 10. 9.* where our Saviour commands the Seventy Disciples to give and preach to the Inhabitants of some particular places in *Judea*, and to say unto them, *The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you.* Which is as much as to say, Go and preach the same Gospel that I my self have taught, for this is the Sum of what I have every where publish'd and preach'd, *Repent ye, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand, Mat. 4. 17.* Reform your lives, and embrace that Doctrine which approaches nearer and nearer unto you every day, and is more and more to be discover'd to the world. It is no less then the doctrine of the *Kingdom of God, i. e.* Gods spiritual Government of his Church under the reign of the *Messias* the Saviour and Redeemer: wherefore you must be careful to inform your selves concerning the Laws of this Spiritual Kingdom, and to know and believe them, as well as to practise them. If a Man can prove hence that there is but *One Article* in all Christianity to be assented to, to constitute a person a member of Christ, he hath a faculty of

of Proving which none ever heard of before.

Well, but why doth he not go on? He had undertaken to prove the One Article from the *Commission* given by our Saviour to his Apostles and his Disciples, and why then doth he not proceed, and quote *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* among his other Texts that he produces? This is worth the Readers taking notice of, for it will discover to him the Genius and Spirit of the man we are now dealing with. Though he had taken upon him to set down and rehearse the several particular *Commissions* our Saviour gave the Apostles and Disciples when he sent them to preach the Gospel yet he omits this most Solemn order of all, whereby they and their Successors were enjoyn'd to *teach all Nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things &c.* They were to convert all Nations to the Faith of the Gospel, and to make them Christs *Disciples* (for the word is *μαθητῶνας*) by baptizing them into the profession of the Holy *Trinity*; and consequently they were to be instructed in this doctrine, in order to their being made Christians: they must know and believe that in the Eternal Godhead there are Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; this is propounded as requisite in order to their being admitted and constituted *Disciples of Jesus*. If the *Vindicator* had not been conscious to himself that this is the True Sense and Import of the Text, it is certain he would have produc'd it among the other places: but  
(which

(which is dismal to consider) he stifles the inward sentiment of his Conscience, to secure his One Article; for he saw that the Article of the *Trinity* was plainly express'd in this *Commission*, and as plainly enjoyn'd to be believ'd as a Necessary Point in order to give a man the denomination of a *Disciple of Christ*, or a *True Christian*; and for this reason our False *Masker* conceals this place, even when he was pretending to give an account of those Texts which mentioned our Blessed Saviours *Commissions* to his Apostles. This shews what a Perfidious Scribe we have got, one that makes nothing of wilfully leaving out any Text of Scripture, to further his design and purpose and at other times he as wilfully perverts plain Texts to the same end. The consideration of which strange behaviour, will I doubt not, obtain me an Excuse among Impartial and Intelligent Readers for my manner of handling this Adversary, whose obstinate Hypocrisy and dissimulation call for no other than the severest Chastisements and Corrections: though I confess it is with no mean regret and reluctancy that I put my self upon this way of writing; but there is no help for it in the present case; he must of necessity be disciplined and taught, as *the men of Succoth, with Thorns and Briars*. I should not have undertaken this task upon my own private and personal account, because *Contempt*, and *Neglect* are the best Return in this case: but when I saw our Holy Religion endanger'd by his sacrilegious attempts of depriving us of the greatest part of it, and when I observ'd his  
Rude

Rude encroachments on the Profess'd Schools of Learning, I found it was a *Publick Cause*, and that every one, who would, had a right to engage in it, and to oppose him as a Common Foe, as a Proclaim'd Rebel, as an Out-Law, as a Pest of the Community, and to treat him accordingly.

I will stay a little to examine one ridiculous passage p. 304. I had offer'd to prove that there is more than that One Article, *Jesus is the Messias*, to be believ'd to make a man a Christian, by producing that place *Rom. 10.9. If thou shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him* (i. e. Christ Jesus) *from the dead, thou shalt be saved*: where the belief of *Christs Resurrection* is propounded as absolutely necessary to salvation: and if so, then *Jesus is the Messias* is not the Only Article, as he often inculcates. What is his Answer to this? *To believe the Resurrection of Christ*, saith he, *is in effect the same as to believe him to be the Messias, and so is put to express it.* And again p. 305. *Believing Christs Resurrection is put for believing him to be the Messias*: so that these which seem to be Two Articles are but one and the same. And if they be so, then why throughout all his Collection of places out of the *Evangelists* and *Acts* did he not mention all those Texts (which are very many) that speak of our Saviour's *Resurrection*, and why did he not reckon them to be the same with those that speak of *Jesus's being the Messias*? Why did he not all along tell us that *one is put to express the other*? The true Reason is because he thought of no such thing at that time, but

but hath invented it since, to shift off what I said.

This is such an other piece of Invention as that in his *First Vindication* p. 6. that he designed his *Treatise of the Reasonableness of Christianity chiefly for Infirm Christians, such as disbeliev'd or doubted of the Truth of Christianity*: and again in his *Second Vindication* p. 152. he saith, *he chiefly design'd his book for Deists.* (though by the way we may take notice of his Contradicting himself, for *Deists* are no *Christians*, and if he design'd his book chiefly for one, he cou'd not design it chiefly for the other.) And yet if you consult his whole *Treatise of the Reasonableness of Christianity*, you shall not find one syllable that intimates any such Design, though there, if any where, he was obliged to discover and declare it, that the Reader might not mistake the Intention of his book. This proves that what he hath since added in both his *Vindications* is mere Fiction and Sham, and he was forced to fly to this Asylum when I had laid open the mischief of his Papers. This may convince us that he will first assert and print any thing, and then afterwards he will (in his Snivelling way) come and Retract it, or glose it over with some pitiful Evasion. But where is the Probity, where is the Integrity of the Man all this while?

Nay, (to return to the Present Matter) it is plain that he designedly omitted those places which mention our Saviours *Resurrection*, because it was his perswasion that they belong not to this Proposition, *Jesus is the Messias.*  
He

He declares ( as you lately heard ) that in St. Peters Sermon, Christs *Resurrection* ( as well as his Sufferings and Death ) was brought in only by the bye, *and was not a Principal Article, was not principally aym'd at,* but that this Proposition *Jesus is the Messias* is the *sole Truth* the Apostle labour'd to bring them to the belief of: and lately we were told by him that the *Resurrection* of Christ is no more to be believ'd to make a man a Christian, than any Ordinary Truth or Proposition recorded in the New Testament.

Yet after all this, he palpably contradicts what he hath said, and in plain terms tells us that *Christs Resurrection* and *his being the Messias* are the very same, and *one is put to express the other.* Before he held them to be distinct, and so distinct, that where he found the one he could not find the other, as in several places of the New Testament that he consulted. The Resurrection of our Lord was not taken notice of by him as appertaining to the *Messiaship.* When St. Peter in the main part of his Sermon preached concerning Christs Resurrection, our Expositor told us that *it was made use of only as an Argument* to persuade them of this Fundamental Truth, that *Jesus is the Messias,* p. 269. and yet now all of a sudden this Proposition is *equivalent,* nay is the *same* with *Jesus rose from the dead.* There is no account in the world can be given of this, but that he will be saying something, though it be to his own apparent Confutation. See here the Influence of Company! It is a Common Topick, but the Reality of it could never

never be more evinced than in this Instance. Here we see how it tinctures mens Manners, and transforms them into the shapes of those they associate with. Here is one that hath spent his days among Talking and Gossiping people, and they have made him such a one as themselves: He hath learnt of them the knack of Perpetual Jabbering, and his Tongue will wag when the Sexton is covering him with Moulds. But if this were all, we might pass it off with a little mirth: But alas it is dismal and horrid to consider what a Profligate Writer shews his Head in the World, who is neither ashamed to contradict himself nor the Holy Writings of the Apostles: And so he brings a contempt on the things of God and Religion, and vacates the Authority of Scripture, only to gratify some of his Fraternity, who with himself have a design to smother the Chief Articles of our Religion, and to stifle the Christian Faith.

P. 344, 345, &c. he is mightily Concern'd ( if you will believe him ) that he should be thought to favour *Socinianism.* What Evidence I brought for it he labours to render invalid, but with little success. He would maintain forsooth, that though I have proved him a *Socinian,* yet he is no *Socinian;* and what if he be both? May not a man be a *Socinian* and no *Socinian,* as well as a *Physitian* and no *Physitian?* But he farther complains that *he is the first man that was ever found out to be at the same time a Socinian and a Factor for Rome,* p. 346. No, Sir, you are mistaken here ( as in all your other Points ) you are

not the *first man*, for there was a Jesuit in the late Reign (as a profess'd Socinian owns, in his *Exceptions of Mr. E. examin'd*, p. 46.) who publish'd a Paper entituled, *An Address*, &c. wherein he pretends to shew that the Scriptures commonly alledged for the *Incar-nation of the Son of God*, and for the *Trinity*, admit of an other sense. And this Paper was read by the Jesuite-Preacher in *Limestreet*, and zealously urged by him in his Pulpit. Whence it is evident that *Popish* Priests, when they see it makes for their Interest, cry up the *Socinian* Principles and Doctrines. A *Jesuite* can appear in all shapes and figures, as well as a *Vindicator*, and that is the reason that our *Vindicator* mention'd not this when he was enumerating the Properties of a *Jesuite*, for he knew well enough that he could assume the guise of a *Quaker*, or a *Socinian*, or any other Sect; and therefore a *Socinian* and a *Factor for Rome* are not inconsistent. Which proves that the *Vindicator* had no cause to complain of my coupling these Two together, and that it was as weakly as falsely said of him, that he was the *first man* in whom both these Denominations meet. *Socinianism* was first brought out of *Italy*, and thither it tends.

Our *Runnagate Tutor* being almost out of breath with Impertinent Nonsense and Re-peritions, begins to sit down, and take up with Quotations, p. 350: and of whom? Of *two Orthodox Prelates of our Church*. But wherever he mentions that word *Orthodox*, he intends it for a Jeer, so that those Worthy Persons he gives that Epithet to are much oblig'd

to

to him for his Buffoonry. But that is not all, they are two Prelates, he saith, *whom, when he follows Authorities, he shall prefer to Slichtingius and Socinus* (the good man thinks *Socinus* was after *Slichtingius*.) Here is the Honour that is done to those Eminent Men of our Church; he can only give them the preference to two Notorious Corrupters of our Christian Faith. What an impudent affront is this to the Ashes of the late Archbishop; and to the Right Reverend Bishop now living, from the Pen of this *Episcopus Puerorum*, this Contemptible Overseer of Hanging-Sleeves? *When he follows Authorities*, is as much as to say, *he never will*, for our Puny-Governor is *Authority* to himself. Thus he quotes those Excellent Prelates only to abuse them, and to distort their words, as may be seen in what he saith of them. And it is very observable that this man who scorns *Authorities*, yet brags in an other place that \* *he hath Great Authorities to justify him*: And in what? *viz.* that the Soul of Man is Material. Here our good Gentleman can depend upon *Authorities*, and call them *Great Ones*; when they shock the *Immortality* of Humane Souls, but in a Point of Orthodox Faith he laughs at *Authorities*.

This Ignorant Writer stands to what he said before, that [*the Son of God*] was a phrase that among the Jews in our Saviour's time was used for [*the Messias*]. p. 357. Which hath no foundation at all, and none but the man that talks of the *Mishna*, and never saw it,

G 2

would

---

\* Letter to the Bishop of Worcester, p. 69.

would have asserted any such thing. Mr. Selden, who, it is thought, was the better Antiquary and Judge in this matter, expressly tells us, that by [*the Son of God*] the Jews meant [*the Word of God*] (as he is called in the Chaldee Paraphrast) which was the same as if he had profess'd himself to be God. De Jure Nat. & Gent. l. 2. c. 12. For the Old Jews belief was (as several Good Authors have proved) that the Messias was God, or the Son of God, for they look'd upon the Son of God as Synonymous with God, when it is applied to the Messias. Rittangel, a Learned Writer, who had been a Jew, sufficiently proves this from the Jewish Writings. And from other Testimonies it might be proved that the Son of God was not a term only to express the Messias, but that it signified something more, viz. That Jesus is the Proper, Natural and Eternal Son of God, that he is One with the Father, as having the same Divine Nature and Essence. Thus in the strictest sense he is the Son of God; and the Jews in our Saviour's time understood this expression thus, otherwise they would not have attempted to stone him for Blasphemy, when he said he was the Son of God; which according to them was the same with being One with the Father, and making himself God, Joh. 10. 30, 33, 36. Whence it is evident that the Son of God denotes the Divinity of Christ, which the word Messias doth not, and consequently the Son of God and the Messias are not terms of the very same signification. And that place Acts 8. 37. I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son

Son of God, inefragably proves it, which I urged in my former Treatise; but when the Vindicator came to repeat what I had alledg'd, he leaves out the words of the Text, as the Reader may see, p. 370. which is an argument of his hating the Light. But as being ashamed (which is prodigious in him) of that Omiffion, he afterwards mentions the Text, and sweats to evade the force of it. My Argument ran thus, If the Eunuch, who was instructed by Philip in the Christian Faith, profess'd that he believed Jesus Christ or the Messias to be the Son of God, then that word Messias or Christ is not of the very same signification with the Son of God, but imports something else: But the Eunuch profess'd, &c. Therefore the word Messias is not of the same signification with the Son of God. The Minor is the Text: The Major is proved from this, that if the Son of God signified no more than the Messias, then the Eunuch's words are a downright Tautology, for they are as much as if he had said, I believe that the Messias is the Messias. A man would think there is some sense and reason in this way of Arguing. No, saith our Gentleman, I will not allow that there is any Sense in this, for the Tautology will be quite removed if we take [Christ] here for a proper Name, p. 374. Say you so, Good Mr. Vindicator! Then why may not your One Article [Jesus is the Messias] be reduced to this [Jesus is he whom we call the Messias, or whose Proper Name is Messiah?] What is the reason that you did not take the word Christ for a Proper Name in all those other places

places where you alledge that Name to signify his Office? And what is the reason that the word *Messias* in your Collection of Texts may not be thought to be the same? Unless your Pedantship will say that a *Greek* word, but not an *Hebrew* or *Syriack* one is capable of being a *Proper Name*? You see the strength of our Adversary. After so many years plodding and booking it he cannot afford any other then such weak insipid trash as this. Get thee gone, I say to thee, for a maker of poor thin *Physick-broth*.

P. 399. he thinks it *Prophane* that I say of him, that *he makes our Saviour a Comard*. But if I prove that he represents him as such, then the *Prophaneness* will lie at his own door. Though, it is true, our Saviour used great Caution at the first Preaching of the Gospel, and did not on all occasions and to all persons declare himself to be the *Messias*, yet he was not so Reserv'd and Timorous as this Writer would have us believe, for he hath the confidence to say in his *Reasonableness of Christianity* that Christ *made no other discovery of himself at the beginning of his Ministry but by Miracles and Circumlocutions, and general Discourses*, p. 59. And in an other place of that Book he saith he did this lest the *Sanhearim* should have laid hold on what he said, to have got him into their power, and thereby to take away his life, p. 62. And afterwards he saith, our Saviour would by no means *in expresse terms profess himself to be the Messias*, p. 72. and that for the same reason. Nay, he tells us that out of this wary and cautious principle he never

in

in the whole course of his Ministry, so much as to his Disciples, much less to the multitude, or the Rulers of the Jews, declared himself to be the *Messias* in expresse terms, p. 148. And in almost a hundred pages together, (*viz.* from p. 59. to p. 152.) he labours to instill this Notion into the minds of his Readers, that our Blessed Lord had not Courage enough to own himself to be the *Messias*, the views of *Danger* hindred him from letting the world know Who he was.

But how contrary is this to what we read in the Evangelical Writings? When the women of *Samaria* had mentioned the *Messias*, *John* 4. 25. Christ immediately thereupon said unto her, *I that speak unto thee am he*, i. e. the *Messias*. Here in plain and direct words he owns himself to be the *Messias*, and this was at the very entrance of his Ministry. Again, we are assured that *he went about all Galilee, preaching the Gospel of the Kingdom*, *Mat.* 4. 23. i. e. that the *Messias* was come, and that he himself was that *Messias*, for it was no more dangerous to proclaim himself to be the *Messias*, than to tell the Jews that the *Messias* was come, for they would soon know what Particular Person it was. Further, though our Saviour (as is particularly taken notice of by the Evangelists) shew'd his Prudence and Discretion in not exposing himself to unnecessary dangers by too great a freedom of speaking, yet at the beginning of his Ministry we find that he plainly, and without any reserve told the Jews that *God was his Father*, *John* 5. 17. or, which is equivalent, that he

G 4

was



was the *Son of God*, which is as much as if he had said, *he was God*; for so the Jews interpreted it in that place, for they said this was *making himself equal with God*, v. 18. He told them at the same time that *he had power to raise the dead*, v. 21. and that he is to be *Judg of the world at the last day*, v. 22, 27. that *all men ought to honour him as they honour the Father*, v. 23. that he gives *Eternal Life* to those that believe on him, v. 24. and more fully and amply in other expressions in that Chapter he publickly and expressly declares himself to be the *Messias* and the *Son of God*. And it is observable that he made this free, plain and open profession of himself, and his Divine Nature, and *Messiahship* at that very time when the *Jews persecuted him, and sought to slay him*, v. 16.

Judg then of the Truth and Consistency of what this Dabler in Scripture and Divinity saith of our Saviour, viz. That *in the whole course of his Ministry* he never expressly declared himself to be the *Messias*. Nay, (which makes it the more unaccountable and prodigious) he holds that Christ never all that time own'd himself to be the *Messias*, although according to him, there was no other Article of Faith propounded by Christ and the Apostles to be believ'd to make a man a Christian but this, that *Jesus is the Messias*. Judg of the truth of what he saith, viz. that our Saviour *always spoke to the Jews* (whether his own Apostles and Disciples, or others) *concerning himself in obscure and mystical terms*, p. 99. as being afraid to speak out, and standing in awe  
of

of the *Angry Jews, who sought to kill him*, p. 85. Is not this clearly confuted by what I have alledged out of the *Gospels*, and is it not further confuted by what we read in Mat. 10. 28, 32? where our Saviour disswades his Apostles from *fearing them that kill the body*, and requires it of them as their duty that they *confess him before men*, i. e. (as is most evident from comparing *John 9. 22.* with 12. 4.) that they *confess him to be the Messias*. And can we think that they were obliged to do this unless he had plainly told them that he was the *Messias*? But, according to this New Expositor, Christ exacted more of his Apostles than he dared to do himself; for he was Cautious and Fearful, and therefore would not confess himself to be the *Messias*; he had not Spirit and Valour enough to own that Character *in the whole course of his Ministry*, lest he should thereby be in *danger of his life*, as he expresses it. What is this but belying our Blessed Saviour, and *making him a Coward*? And who but a *Poltron*, a Cowardly Flincher from the Fundamental Articles of our Faith would entertain such a vile and impious thought of our Lord and Master?

It is pleasant to see p. 222. (which should indeed have been mention'd before) how this Imperious Dragger up of Youth handles the Antient Grave *Citizen* who dedicated a Book to him, and most submissively crouch'd to him. In stead of acknowledging his good will and respect to him, this Supercilious and Unmannerly *Well bred man* snibs him for his *forwardness*, and condemns him as a *System-Maker*,

Maker, though the poor man had rail'd in three or four places of his Pamphlet against all Systems. What a Magotted *Vindicator* is this?

Now our *Pilgrim* is approaching towards his journeys end, and therefore p 403. &c. spends his languid remains upon Mr. *Bold's* feeble *Vindication* of him; where he hath made his case worse (if it be possible) then it was, and involves him further in self-contradiction. But seeing the *Western Gentleman* was so loving and friendly to to the *Greed-hater*, this same *Greed-hater* was resolv'd, right or wrong, to assert and vindicate whatever that Gentleman said, it dropping from the pen of so Dear a Friend, who did what he could to help our lame *Vindicator* over the stile. Though afterwards he shews him a Dog-trick p. 440. where he snarls (but covertly) against him: he disapproves of Mr. *Bold's* indispensable necessity which he speaks of. But because he must not seem to fall out with him so soon after sworn friendship, he makes a Distinction between absolute and conditional necessity, and so compromises the matter. Now all is well again, and Mr. *Lock* and Mr. *Bold* are as Great as two Inkle-makers. Now the stile runs thus, Mr. *Bold* ~~and~~ I say p. 448. I follow Mr. *Bold's* order p. 449: Mr. *Bold's* reasoning is clear and strong p. 468. because he reasons for him. Now you'l find Mr. *Lock* vouching every syllable that Mr. *B.* saith, sense or nonsense: he swallows all down, and sordidly licks up his drive! (as he doth his own in his Loathsome Repetitions) and defiles and infects his Paper with it. Nay he solemnly engages for

for him for the future, I dare answer, saith he, for Mr. *Bold*, 418. (But have a care Sir, of satisfying; remember that, I pray) if he shall please to turn *Turk*, and read Lectures to me out of the *Alcoran*, I promise to attend to him.

Our *Strolling Tutor* pretends to tell us p. 451. what answering with ill language is call'd in his Country: but let him first prove that a *Vagrant* is of any Country.

There are several other Passages in this Authors Bundle of Sheets which I might reflect upon: but lest I should be thought to be too Severe and Unmerciful to him, I will here hold my hand. I hate to insult over a poor *Worm* of what sort or denomination so ever; otherwise I would here rise and uncase the Whole Bloated Pamphlet that is before us, and let the world further see what a miserable Arguer, what a poor Manager of Controversies we have got, and offer some other incontestable proofs of his design to erect a *New* and *Maimed Christianity* in opposition to the *Old Catholick* one. It is but some part of his Paper-Fardel that I have handled: perhaps when I have perused the rest, he may hear further from me. I deal with him as he doth with his Bantlings, I don't cram and gorg him, but give him a little at a time. I have thrice as much more to say to him about his *Vindication*, besides a Just Set of Animadversions on some other parts of his *Education*, whence (if I see Occasion) I shall make it appear that he is neither fit to teach *Children* nor *Men*. And I hope I shall do good service to Church and State in further unmasking of him.

*Brief Animadversions on a late  
Reply of Mr. Bold, of  
Steeple in Dorset-shire, to  
what I had writ against his  
Defence of the One Article.*

**T** Here is a necessity of making some Addition here, unless I should give the Reader the trouble of a Formal Answer to some thing that Mr. Bold (one of Mr. L's Profelytes) hath lately publish'd, and unless I should send it to the Press by it self. Which I find there is no reason to do, because some very *brief Animadversions* on that Author's feeble Attempt will serve the turn. It is the unhappiness of this Gentleman, who I think means well as to the main, that he hath espous'd a Groundless and Unscriptural Notion, and then thinks himself obliged to vindicate it. Good man, he is easily warped, as his best Friends complain and lament. They allow him to be serviceable in an honest Practical Discourse, but find him not able to discern the Merits of a Cause in Controversy, or, if he did, to manage it aright. If you will believe him, he is a man of a *Gold Phlegmatick*

*matick complexion*, p. 24. and he often boasts himself to be one of *Temper* and *Mildness*. But then he must mean it thus, that he comes sober and gentle to destroy our Religion, and to shatter Christianity, of which he hath given us sufficient proof in these as well as in his former papers.

Nay, we must not think him to be so *Phlegmatick* and *Mild* as he would persuade his Readers he is, for I assure you he comes on like a Smart Antagonist, and falls upon me without Mercy, as well as without Judgment. He complains of *Vineger in my Ink* p. 4. but let the Reader judg what *Gall* there is in his, when he charges me with *coarse treating*. Pref. p. 3. *weak and sorry stuff* p. 46. *jumbling* p. 24. *banter* p. 2. *imperious rambling* Pref. p. 16. Nay, he rises higher, and declares that he finds in my papers *Railing* p. 52. *sulphureous eruptions* p. 47. *Malignity* Pref. p. 4. nay (to consummate all) *Antichristianism*. Pref. p. 4. You see the man disgorges *choler*, in stead of *Phlegm*. He hath got heart of late from his new Friendship and League with the *Vindicator*, whose upstart Conceits he is resolv'd to defend, and especially the *One Article*, though it be with defiance of all the other parts of Christianity. Accordingly he declares with much confidence that the *belief of Jesus's being the Messiah is the ONLY Article indispensably necessary to make a man a Christian*, and (as the Consequence of that) that the belief of *more* is unnecessary. Pref. p. 4. Which is as much as if he should speak thus to his Auditors, "There are a great many  
"Mini-

“ Ministers of the Gospel that hold it is ne-  
 “ cessary to the making a *Christian* that  
 “ he should believe several Truths and Doc-  
 “ trines recorded in the New Testament, as  
 “ that *we are by nature the children of wrath,*  
 “ that we are freed from this wrath by the  
 “ Meritorious and All-sufficient Undertakings  
 “ of *Christ Jesus* who is both *God and Man* ;  
 “ that he gave himself a *Sacrifice* for us, and  
 “ satisfied Divine Justice by paying an Infinite  
 “ Price for us ; that hereby he hath purchased  
 “ Justification, Pardon of sins, and Eternal  
 “ Life for us ; that this Saviour and Redeem-  
 “ er rose from the dead, and is exalted unto  
 “ Glory, and will judg the quick and the dead  
 “ at his last appearing. But, my Friends, I  
 “ must tell you, those that preach these doc-  
 “ trines as necessary to be known and believ’d  
 “ in order to make men members of Christ  
 “ and of his Church, talk idly and impertinent-  
 “ ly, and are not at all to be attended to. For  
 “ it is my opinion, and I have preach’d to you,  
 “ and I have thrice printed it, that none of  
 “ those foresaid doctrines which either Jesus  
 “ Christ or his Apostles deliver’d, are neces-  
 “ sary to be believ’d to give you a Title to  
 “ Christianity. You and I may be true Chri-  
 “ stians though we are ignorant of every one  
 “ of those Doctrines before rehears’d, though  
 “ we know nothing of the nature and intent  
 “ of them, nay though we never heard of  
 “ them: for there is but *One Article of Faith,*  
 “ and no more, that is required to make us  
 “ Christians, and that is this, that *Jesus is the*  
 “ *Messias.* If you believe this, take it upon  
 “ my

“ my word, you need nothing more (I mean  
 “ as to matter of *Faith*) to make you True and  
 “ Living Members of Christ. This alone is  
 “ that which properly deserves the Name of  
 “ *Justifying Faith*, and is that Faith which  
 “ God will impute to a man for Righteous-  
 “ ness. I have been blamed by several of my  
 “ Brethren in the Ministry for preaching and  
 “ printing such doctrines as this, and they have  
 “ baffled me (as they think) out of the Holy  
 “ Scriptures, and have demonstrated that there  
 “ are sundry *other Points of Faith* that are re-  
 “ quired to be believ’d in order to the making  
 “ a man a Christian ; but I can’t be brought  
 “ to listen to what they say. Neither Church-  
 “ men nor Dissenters shall bring me off from  
 “ this persuasion. I will rather stick to Worthy  
 “ Mr. *Hobbs* and Mr. *Lock* then part with  
 “ my Opinion at the sollicitation of Thousands  
 “ of Divines and other Christians whom they  
 “ call *Orthodox.* I’m chiefly confirm’d in this  
 “ Notion by the latter of those Gentlemen  
 “ whom I named, who cruises up and down  
 “ the Countries to propagate this doctrine,  
 “ and I hope will take *Steeple* in his Circuit  
 “ very suddenly, and then he will further sa-  
 “ tisfy you (though I should not have used  
 “ that word *Satisfying* because it is so hateful  
 “ to him) and instruct you in that and some o-  
 “ ther matters relating to Religion, which no  
 “ Christian ear ever heard of before.

After Mr. *Bold* had asserted the *Darling*  
*Proposition*, he presents us with an other,  
 which is no less strange and monstrous, and  
 from whence we may guess at the Character  
 of

of the Man, who is Mr. L's humble admirer. His express words are these, Pref. p. 5. *A mans knowing that Jesus Christ hath revealed such a doctrine, brings him not under an Obligation to believe it, but he may, notwithstanding that, withhold his Assent.* This is the maxim of Mr. L's *New Christian*, but the Mischievous Ingredients of it are sufficient to shew the nature and design of this Writer: for though he will perhaps say that he delivers that afterwards which is contrary to the interpretation which I make of these words, yet the Answer is plain, that he makes nothing of Contradicting himself, and therefore this is no Plea. He can say, and unsay, as he thinks fit, of which I gave several Instances in my *Reflections* on what he writ before. This then is no excuse at all, but rather shews his *Weakness*, that he can't tell when he talks inconsistently; or his *Insincerity* and *Perverseness*, that he will make use of Contrarieties to serve his own ends. I know likewise he will say that he speaks this of those Doctrines the belief whereof doth not constitute a man a Christian, but this is a mere Evasion, and he can't possibly make use of it with any shadow of Sense; for if you ask him what those Doctrines are, he will tell you that they are those which I before specified, and reckon'd as *Fundamentals* of Christianity. But he denies them to be *such*, and he can't do otherwise; for if there be but *One* Article of Faith necessarily to be believ'd to make a man a Christian (which is the thing he so stiffly maintains) then all the rest are not necessary to be believ'd to make him so, or to denominate him to be *such*.  
Ha-

Having thus prevented and obviated the Cavils which he might start, I'll now very concisely present unto the Reader a few Remarks on that Proposition which I quoted out of Mr. B's last printed Papers, *viz.* that *I knowing that Christ hath reveal'd such or such a Doctrine, brings not a man under an obligation to believe it, but he may notwithstanding that withhold his assent.*

First, this baffles the *end* of Christ's revealing his doctrines to the Sons of men, for without doubt they were reveal'd for this very purpose, that we should yield assent to them. But this Gentleman tells you that there is no such thing, *Revelation* hath no affinity with *Assent*, and therefore this could not be the End and Design of that. And herein he follows the Patern sent him by a late Writer in his *Christianity not mysterious*, p. 38. *Divine Revelation, saith he, is not a motive of Assent, nor a ground of our persuasion, or a reason we have to believe a thing, as if we were to receive it only because reveal'd.*

Secondly, This separates Knowledge from Belief, and makes Religion, and even Christianity it self a mere Notional Speculative thing. We may according to this Wise Shaper of Christianity read the New Testament, and see what Christ and the Apostles deliver'd there as matter of Belief, but we are not under an obligation to believe what they delivered. We may, if we please, look into the *Gospel* and the *Acts* (but have a care of peeping into the *Epistles*) and thence stock our selves with Propositions, and furnish our  
H  
Brains

Brains with Knowledge, as well as our Tongues with something to talk of, but we are excused from yielding *Assent* to the truth of them. Such a monstrous Idea doth this Writer give us of that Sacred Institution of the Blessed Jesus.

Thirdly, This is bidding defiance to the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, for whoever refuses to *believe* those doctrines which are reveal'd in the Sacred Writings, doth in effect declare that those Writings are not divinely inspired. And yet Mr. L's Disciple assures his Reader that though Truths and Doctrines be reveal'd in the Writings of the New Testament, yet we are *not obliged* to give credit to them, and to profess our belief of them: which is no other then annulling the Authority of the Scriptures.

Fourthly, This Assertion destroys that very *One Article* which he contends for, for if the revealing of a Truth obliges us not to believe it, then we may withhold our Assent to this Proposition, *Jesus is the Messiah*, as well as to any Other; for seeing they are all equally reveal'd in the Scripture, we ought to make no difference. So that you see the poor *Foolish Builder* pulls down his own Structure with his own hands. The Beloved Article which he so much insists upon is ruined by what he himself asserts. This is the just Judgment of God on such audacious Innovators, and Depravers of Christianity: Whilest they are throwing down the Propositions which others with great reason assert, they demolish their own.

Fifthly

Fifthly and lastly, This wild Proposition of the *Replyer* is destructive of all *Reveal'd Religion*. Let there be never so many doctrines reveal'd to us by the Holy Spirit in the Divine Oracles, a Christian is *under no obligation* according to him to believe them, for all being alike *reveal'd* they may be equally disbeliev'd. This is the New Theology of our giddy Worshipper of that Idol Opinion of *One Article*. One would scarcely think that he should at this time of day have the confidence to talk after this rate, and to impose such dangerous and pernicious notions upon the world. Or, at least one would think that this Writer and his Fellow should not stare, and shew themselves so extraordinarily concern'd when we tell them that they are *Betrayers of Christianity*.

Having descanted on his Main Propositions, and seen what the ditmal Contents of them are, I'll look into some other things which are most obvious in his *Reply*. I expected he would have attempted to purge himself of those *Self-Contradictions* which I laid to his charge, and proved in the plainest manner imaginable from his own words, which I faithfully set down: but he, like his brother-Criminal, denies all, but gives no reason why he doth so. He follows the example of the *Vindicator*, and unmercifully *Repeats* what he had said before: And all the rest is studied Evasion, Subterfuge, Whiffing. It is in vain to mention all the Particulars; it shall suffice to propound to the Reader's view one of them, and from that let him guess at all the others.

I had been proving in my *Reflections* on Mr. B. the Absurdity of the Opinion of *One Article*, and had shew'd how he contradicted himself, one Instance whereof was this, that he had said, that *a True Christian is as much oblig'd to believe that the Holy Spirit is God, as to believe that Jesus is the Christ* (which are his own words) and yet he saith, *There is but that One Article [Jesus is the Messias] to be believ'd to make a man a Christian* Whence I infer'd (and whether justly or no, let the Reader judge) that he spoke things repugnant and contradictory; for if a True Christian be *as much oblig'd* to believe one as the other, then it is certain that a man can't be a True Christian without believing both, and if there be a necessity of believing both to make a man a True Christian, then the belief of one only is not enough. Now, mind what the *Replyer* saith to this, and how fallaciously and sophistically he discourfes, p. 19. *It is as necessary for me, saith he, to believe that Jesus was at Cana of Galilee, and turn'd Water into Wine there, as it is that he was crucified without the Gates of Jerusalem, because I have the same evidence for the one that I have for the other. But I can not say it is of as much Importance for a man to know the one, as it is to know the other; much less can I say that no man can be a Christian till he knows and believes that Jesus was at Cana in Galilee, &c.* Which is so extraneous and foreign, and every ways so impertinent and inconsistent, that if one did not know wih what Writer this Gentleman symbolizes, it might create astonishment to hear

hear such a senseless and incoherent application of these words: for whereas I had asserted that a man can't be a True Christian unless he believes other Articles and Doctrines, (*viz.* such as I have mention'd before) as well as that *One of Jesus's* being the *Christ*; and accordingly to disprove this he should have shew'd that *those Articles* are not as necessary to be believ'd as that *Single one* he mentions, he (not regarding the matter he was about) produces some Historical passages out of the New Testament, *viz.* Christ's being at *Cana of Galilee*, and turning *Water into Wine* there, &c. and then thinks (though one would think it is impossible he should) he hath effected what he undertook. But doth not any considerate man see that there is no comparison between these things which he alledges and those other before spoken of, between the belief of some *Historical Circumstances* and the belief of the *Grand Fundamental Points* of the Christian Religion? Is there not a vast difference between these *Inferiour Truths* and those that are of an *Higher nature*, even such as are of the *Essence of Christianity*, and have Immediate respect to the *Salvation of our Souls*? Though the belief of the former be not absolutely necessary to make a man a Christian, doth it follow thence that the belief of the latter is not necessarily requisite for that purpose? Who but the *Replyer* and the *Vindicator* (for he takes his part as to this very thing in his *Vindication*) could first imagine any such thing, and then publish it to the world? What Talent of Reasoning Mr. B.

had before he undertook this Cause of the *One Article*, I can't tell; but since I am sure he is a very poor Arguer, and makes out nothing of what he pretends to, but fills up his pages with weak, dilute stuff, yea without any dash of what is sprightly and generous.

And that he and his Cause run very low, is evident from what he saith, p. 24. in defence of his *One Article*. *The Notion*, saith he, *of One Article may induce those who embrace it, to esteem more Persons Christians than the other Notion can allow of. And thus far I fancy (and you say right, Good Sir, it is no more than a fancy) the advantage is on the former's side, for I conceive there is no hurt in letting Charity, as well as Patience, have its perfect work.* Thus he; and he is pleas'd to confess that *this is the suggestion that comes from a cold Phlegmatick temper.* If he means that it is very flat and dull, I think every body will agree with him. Tho truly we must grant that here are some footsteps of *Ingenuity* (such as it is) for here is set forth the *True Cause* why this doctrine of *One Single Article* is so vigorously urg'd at this day, and even upheld by Penions. Old *Reynard* would not say a syllable of this throughout his whole Treatise of the *Reasonableness of Christianity*, and his two *Vindications* of it. He thought it was too gross and broad, therefore the *Disssembler* conceal'd it. But *Unwary Mr. Bold*, who tells all he knows, acquaints us with the true and proper design of the setting up of *One Article*, and the furious appearing against all the rest. By this means, saith he, we shall have *more Christians* (such as they

they are) then ever were before. There are many that will imbrace *One Point of Christianity*, who will refuse to own the rest, so that we shall have *Christians* in abundance. But whether they be *True Christians*, or whether they be esteem'd to be such (that is his word) is not material: but we shall have the *Number* of these latter much increas'd and that's enough. And besides, saith he, we shall have more *Charity* (and *there is no hurt* in that:) when there is but *One Single Article* of *Christian Faith*, we shall all Agree, and what a fine world shall we have then?

Ay but, Sir, would it not be a better world if there were *no Article at all*, and then besure there could be no Contention? whereas now there is occasion for it, for some will not allow of the *One Article* you speak of. Therefore according to your own way of Arguing it were best to throw off that *One Article*, and with it all the other *Fundamental* and *Necessary* doctrines of our *Christan Faith*, and then it is certain we shall have no *Point of Faith* to fall out about, and *Charity* will ride in triumph, and yours and *Mr. L's Christianity* shall bear it company in the same *Triumphal Seat*. This is the force and strength of our *Author's Reasoning*, whatever he may pretend. Surely *Steeple* is well taught when such a one is their instructor. Who would have thought that there is such a *Pious Contriver* for Religion in any part of the *Kings dominions*? Who could have thought that *All the Fundamental Principles* of our Faith (except one) were to be cashier'd to make way for *Charity*?



And who can think that the *One Article* so much talk'd of will remain long without the rest? And, in a word, what man of sense and sobriety can think that these wild Notions are not spread abroad on purpose to subvert the Foundations of Christianity, and to bring in Infidelity, and to turn us out to the herd of *Deists* and next to *Atheists*? Let not Mr. *Bold* say that these are *Guesses* (as in one place I remember he saith I am a *Guesser*, because I am a *Critick*, which is as much sense according to his applying of it, as if one should say he is a *Conjurer* because he is *Rector of Steeple*.) No, Sir, here is no Conjecture for the thing that I say is plain and obvious, and depends upon natural and rational consequences, and we every day see more and more the truth of it.

As Dull and *Plegmatick* as he is, his Invention is ripe, witness that horrid Fiction and False Imputation p. 25. line 3, &c. But I must not stand upon these things.

Then he would argue from the use of the term *Christian* p. 25. that there is but *One Article*. which is so poor and mean that he deserves to (be what he is) Mr. *Lacks Second* in the present Combat. Yet he hath so good an opinion of this which he suggests, that he saith, *It may afford some light to this matter*. No, Sir, there is no such thing as *Light* here only a *Wooden Candle-stick*; I am loth to suppose any *Brass* about it, though one would wonder how he could have that face to offer any such thing as this to prove that there is but *One Article* to be believ'd to constitute a *Christian* man, which was the matter he undertook.

Our

Our *Mushrom-Scribe* is drawn to the dreggs, and in his next Paragraphs doth nothing but *Cant*. and *Hover* in *Obscure* and *Ambiguous* terms: but hath not a dram of Reason left, as the Reader cannot but own, if he had nothing else to do but to consult the pages.

Then he *Catechises* his Friends, p. 29, 30, 31. and makes sorry work of it, but at last it is observable how this *Wild Reasoner*, who had been all along in his *Reply* (as well as in his former Papers) endeavouring to assert the necessity of but *One Article* in Christianity, and opposing what I had said in behalf of *More Articles*, it is observable (I say) that at last he gives up the Cause, and meekly prostrates himself to what I had offered: *Let a man believe*, saith he, *never so many particular doctrines taught by Christ and his Apostles, that belief will prove no more but that he believes Jesus is the Messias*, p. 32. If the believing of many doctrines taught by Christ and his Apostles be the same with believing that *One doctrine*, why then hath he made all this stir? for if many will prove no more than one, then *vice versa*, one will prove to be many; and if his *One Article* be thus multiplied, than why doth he quarrel with me for asserting Many Articles?

But still there must be (whatever comes of it) but *One Article*, and he undertakes to prove it, p. 36. from *St. John's* words, *Who-soever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God*, 1 John 5. 1. *Which every one*, saith he, *I suppose will acknowledg to be as much as to say, a Christian*. And thence infers, *If the belief*  
of

of more Articles was absolutely necessary to make a person a Christian, it could not with truth be said, *Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.* Which is a farther proof of the Shallowness, or ( which is worse ) of the willful Obstinacy of this blind Worshiper of the Idol that Mr. *Hobbs* and Mr. *Lock* have set up: for any one that is moderately vers'd in this Epistle of St. *John* knows that it is a Collection of several Marks and Evidences whereby persons may examine and know whether they be True Believers, and Christians indeed; and among several others which he assigns this is one, that *they believe Jesus to be the Christ.* Now, can any one that is not very Weak or perverse infer hence, that the belief of *no other Article* but this is absolutely necessary to make a man a Christian? Is it not plain from other places in this Epistle that *Love to God and the brethren, keeping the Commandments, &c.* are Signs and Evidences of Regeneration, as well as *believing Jesus to be the Messias?* And why then upon the mentioning of this latter in the place forecited, must we conclude that none of those are absolutely necessary to make one a Christian or a Regenerate person? If we should follow Mr. *Bold's* way of Interpreting, then, when it is said in this Epistle, *Every one that doth righteousness is born of God,* ch. 2. v. 29. we must infer that *doing of righteousness,* without any *believing,* gives us a title to *Regeneration:* And when it is said, *Every one that loveth* ( which refers to *loving one another* in the same verse ) *is born of God,* ch. 4. v. 7. we

we must thence gather that *Brotherly Love* of it self, abstract from all *Believing,* and consequently from *believing that Jesus is the Messias,* is the only thing necessarily required of us to make us Christians; and so our Learned and Profound Arguer baffles himself, and ruins his own One Article.

Our Rambling Disputer tells us in the same place, that St. *John the Divine* was a more *Reverend Rector* than the Rector of Steeple: where, besides the Whimsical Conceitedness of the Stile, he humbly intimates that *he himself* is a *Reverend Rector,* for else he could not say, the other is *more Reverend.*

What he demands, p. 40 about those terms *the Son of God* and *the Messias,* I have answer'd in the foregoing Discourse.

I urged from Acts 8. 37. that *the Son of God* and *the Messias* are not terms of the same signification, because else the *Eunuch* could not say that he believ'd *Jesus Christ to be the Son of God.* To which he returns this fantastick Reply, *I think,* saith he, *they amount to somewhat more,* viz. that *Jesus Christ is The Christ.* Which hath not the least foundation in the *Original,* from whence only he can pretend to borrow it, and therefore we must look upon it as a mere Shuffle. And indeed afterwards he doth as good as confess it, for notwithstanding his *thinking* it to be a good Reply, he unthinks it, but puts us off with an other groundless Conceit, ( the same that the *Vindicator* had made use of ) viz. that *Jesus Christ* is used in the *New Testament* as a *Proper Name,* as if only his *being call'd Jesus or Christ* was the

sense of those places where the words *Jesus* and *Christ* are so often mention'd in Scripture.

At the conclusion of all, I must own myself obliged to this *Dorset-shire* Gentleman for any thing that he hath sai'd of me in some places of his last Papers that looks Respectfully and Civilly, and in a strain above what I expected or desired. Wherefore, abstracting from our present Debate, I am ready at all times to express the Deference which I owe to his Person and Office, and more over I assure him that I am in perfect Charity with him and all men, though there is no Consideration whatsoever can bribe me to a concealment of my dislike of his present Enterprize.

*Brief*

---

*Brief Reflections on a late pretended Answer of a Nameless Socinian to a Discourse, entitled, The Socinian Creed.*

**T**He *Double-column'd* Gentlemen begin to appear again, and one of them hath publish'd a Pamphlet which he calls at a venture *The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholick Church, &c.* And truly I am to own with great thankfulness the honour he doth me there of joyning me with Three Learned Prelates of our Church. I am bound to make some Return for this extraordinary kindness, and perhaps he may meet with it somewhere in this Paper. But this I must needs add that he is *too* lavish and excessive in his favours when he gives me the *Preferance* to those Eminent Persons both in his *Title* and his *Book*: for the First part of this Learned Scribe bears this Inscription, *An Answer to Mr. Edwards*, wherein the Nameless Author pretends to say something with relation to a Book which I lately committed to the publick view, entitled *The Socinian Creed*: in which I first gave a brief, but impartial Account of those Erroneous and Unsound Principles which are  
ge-

generally espous'd by the *Foreign and English Socinians*; and then I shew'd the proper Tendency of them to Irreligion and Atheism.

So that according to this Distribution of my Work, the *Socinian* Brother who undertook to answer it was obliged in the first place either to confess that those Principles and Tenents were owned by that Party of men both at home and abroad, or else to prove that they were not. And then, as to the Other Division of my Task, he was bound either to acknowledge that the *Socinian* Principles and Doctrines have a Tendency to Irreligion and Infidelity, or else he was under a necessity of shewing that they have no such thing. Any man of good reason and sense would expect these things from him, and accordingly let us see what this Anonymous Writer hath done, and thence gather whether he hath acted the part of an *Answerer*, which he took upon him.

As to the first Part it is plain before the Readers eyes that this Pamphleteer is so far from disowning most of those Articles and Doctrines which I fix'd upon the *Socinians*, and from charging me with wronging them in asserting that the *Foreign and English Socinians* defend these very Articles in their Writings, he is so far (I say) from this that in effect he acknowledges to the world that they are the very doctrines and sentiments of those persons, and that they are worded in that very manner as I set them down, and that the Authors whom I quoted deliver'd them in those very terms, and that I have not misrepresented any of them. Which undeniably appears from this,

this, that he undertakes not to invalidate any one of my References or Quotations. If I had in the least perverted the sense and meaning of any single *Socinian* Writer that I produced, if I had in any degree falsified in my Citation of them, I should most certainly have heard it from this Gentleman in this his last Effort, especially when he particularly mentions my *References* and *Quotations*, p. 3. Out of that vast number of them which I made use of he would not have failed to set down one Instance at least, if he could have met with it, of my injuring the *Racovian* Authors by falsely alledging their Writings.

But so it is, there is not one single Quotation or Reference, which I brought to prove and confirm what I avouched concerning the *Socinians*, that he excepts against; which most assuredly he would have done, if there had been the least ground imaginable for it. And 'tis certain that he had *Time* enough to do it, since I publish'd what I writ, if the thing had been any ways feasible: and I suppose it will be granted that he wanted not *Will* to effect it. So then from his not doing it, nor so much as attempting it we may conclude his utter Inability and hereby he doth as good as grant that the *Socinians* are guilty of All they stand charg'd with by me in the *Socinian Creed*. He lets the world know that I have done them right, and that I have father'd nothing upon them falsely. He vouches the Truth of my Collections, he asserts the faithfulness of my Testimonies and Proofs out of the Original Authors. By all which he arraigns

raigns and convicts himself, and stabs his own Cause. And yet this he calls an *Answer to me*. Let the Reader judg of the Consistency of these things, and thence form a suitable Idea of this Wild and Senseless Undertaker.

Then, as to the *other* Articles of the *Socinian Creed*, it is observable that he is loath to let the world know by a formal Confession from him that he and his Friends allow of those doctrines, and therefore he betakes himself to the wonted way of Shuffling, Equivocating and Dissembling; and indeed he performs this part to a Wonder, and almost exceeds the late *Vindicator* in this excellent faculty. It is pleasant to see how he higgles and dodges. says and unsays, hath neither regard to the Truth, nor to what he saith himself. But we must not think this strange, for that man will take the liberty to contradict himself who is Resolved to do so to others. Nay, it cannot escape the Reader's observation that this Anonymous Scribe, merely to avoid the Imputation of some Articles I fastned on the *Socinians*, ventures to renounce what the most Considerable and Staunch men of that Party, yea what the *Modern* and *Domestick Socinians* have in express terms asserted:

Of which I will give one instance (though there are several others: ) *He may for our parts, saith he, be Anathema that teaches or believes that doctrine, viz that there is no Merit in what Christ did or suffered, and that he made not Satisfaction for our sins* p. 7. Yet one of the First-Rate *Racovians* tells us that it was taught by *Socinus* and his brethren in plain and direct words

words, that \**the Opinion of those is false, absurd and pernicious who have feigned that there is any such thing as Merit in Christ*. And this Author himself speaking of Christ's *Merit and Satisfaction* pronounces them † *Fiction, a Deceitful opinion, erroneous and very dangerous*. And the *English Socinians* at this day ( of whom our present Penman without a Name is one ) declare their disbelief and abhorrence of this Perswasion, *viz.* that Christ *Merited and Satisfied* for us. In one of their late Prints they let us know that || *the Oblation which Christ made of himself was not made to the Justice of God, or by way of Reparation, but, as all other Sacrifices, ( viz. of Beasts ) by way of humble suit*. And ( which is more ) these men have scoffed at and ridiculed the *Merits and Satisfaction* of our Blessed Lord, as the Reader may satisfy himself in the *Letter of Resolution concerning the doctrine of the Trinity*, p. 7. And the *Antitrinitarian Scheme of Religion*, p. 18. and a *Letter to the Clergy of both Universities*, chap. 6. and 8. all which I have particularly and distinctly quoted in the account of the *Socinian Creed*. And it is well known that in several others of their Pamphlets they have derided and exposed the *Merit and Satisfaction* of our Saviour: and yet now they *Anathematize* those that do so.

Which, with abundance of other the like Instances in this last attempt of theirs, shews

I

a

\* *Smalc. cont. Frantz. Disput. 4* † *Homil 4. in 1. Johan. Catechism de morte Christi. Qu. 12.* || *The Antitrinitarian Scheme of Religion. p. 18.*

a Profligate sort of Writers they are. They are not afraid to call down a *Curse* upon their own heads: and with their *Execrations* they mix the most palpable and notorious *Falshoods*, and thereby convince us that they have abandoned all Faith and Integrity, that they are under an obstinate resolution to debauch their Understandings, to abuse their Reasons and Consciences, and to impose upon the world.

We must either say this of them, or else (which I would be most willing to believe) that they are disposed to a *Recantation*, and are inclin'd to relinquish several of those Articles which they stily maintain'd before. I hope it will be improv'd into a full sincere Renuntiation. However, I have gain'd this Point; that I have brought them to Retract in words at least, some of the Articles of their *Creed*. It is worthy of our Remark that whereas in some of their first Prints they answer'd very tamely to the name of *Socinians*, now this Gentleman throws off this Character, and will no longer bear that Badg: which shews that they are Changeable, and design some New model, and have a mind to have it graced with a New Title. Our Nameless Trimmer proclaim his *Agreement with the Catholick Church*, and very orthodoxly he would seem to talk concerning the *Incarnation of Christ* and some other *Doctrines*, p. 25, 26, &c. as if he were inclin'd to tack about, and leave the *Socinian* quarters. Whatever he intends, this is plain that he confutes himself and his Party, and then he calls it an *Answer*

*swer to me*. Indeed these are the best sort of *Answers* a man woud desire: and to say Truth, the Party cannot afford any other.

But behold the Inconsistent Folly and Stupidity of the Man! Though he frankly submits to my References and Citations, and even throws up some of the Articles of his own *Creed*, yet he is pleased to charge me with *Insamations* in the Title-page of his book. An Intelligent person would think that those Great and Undeniable Truths which I had asserted in my late Treatise are neither *Insamations* nor *Defamations*, they being founded upon Reason, Antiquity, and Scripture. Nor could the several members of the Inditement which I drew up against the *Socinians* deserve that Name which he uses, because he himself owns the greatest part of them to be True. Wherefore all that can be said is that *Insamations* is a dainty term that he is much taken with, and accordingly he resolv'd that it should come in some where, right or wrong, into his Papers; and where better than in the Front of them, to make up the *Raree Show*? But if we will attend to the true import and meaning of the word there, it is this, that the *Socinian* Doctrines are *Infamous*, and that I had rightly represented them as *such*, and that this Writer, who dare not shew his head, or subscribe his Name, is not able to disprove either of these things. Thus it is the deserved Lot of this sort of men that the more they write the more they expose themselves, and discover to world the Incoherence of their Assertions, the Vanity of their Pretences, the

Weakness of their Judgment, the Strength of their Prejudice, and above all the Badness of their Designs and Projects, which all Wise and good Men see and abhor.

Next, as to the Second Part of my late Discourse, it is to be observ'd that he makes no Reply to the imputation of that *Tendency to Irreligion and Atheism* which I so often urged, and as often proved against the men of *Racoviana*, and the very *English Unitarians*. And indeed I was not singular in this Impeachment of them, for I evinc'd it to be the persuasion of Others (of Great Judgment and Sagacity) that sundry of the *Socinian* Opinions have a natural Vergency to *Infidelity* and *Impiety*, and one that hath writ since, and professes to treat the Socinians with *Civility and Good Temper* (and would be so treated by them again, as he bespeaks their kindness in his *Preface*) is not shie of using this very language, but in plain and downright terms tells us that *\* the generall Principle on which the body of Socinianism turns is of that nature that it advances the most Absurd, and withal the most Impious and Blasphemous Proposition imaginable.* And in another place, *As from a Socinian it is easy to commence a Deist, so he that is once a Deist is in a hopesul way to be an Atheist whenever he pleases.* And afterwards thus, in his Address to the *Socinians*, *The Consequence of your Principle, (viz. That nothing is to be believ'd but what they can comprehend) leads you not only out of Christianity, but out of all Religion*

\* Mr. Norris's Account of Reason and Faith, p. 13.

*ligion whether Natural or Revealed, even beyond Deism, even into Atheism it self.* And again he tells them, that *their Principle of believing nothing but what they can comprehend directly leads to Atheism.* It seems then that though *Atheism* be voted by some a *Rude and Unmannerly* word, and though *Atheist* be thought to be an *Ungenteel* term, (wherefore the *Plausible and Modish* Stile of [*Deist*] is used, and is *\* a Name that gains reputation among all such as hate Religion, but know not how otherwise to distinguish themselves from profess'd Atheists, which they would by no means be taken for*) though, I say, the Title of *Atheist* be not modish and fine enough for some mens mouths, yet we see that this Gentleman, who † remonstrates with some Passion against that Rudeness of Stile which he espies in some Writers, and particularly engages before hand to shew himself *Civil* to the *Socinians*, yet boggles not in the least at this way of Expression, but with great freedom and boldness declares it to be his Opinion and Belief that these men are in the next capacity to be *Atheists*, and that their Principles and Doctrines directly lead to *Atheism*, as well as to *Impiety* and *Blasphemy*. And that we may know he is in good earnest, he repeats this over and over again. This is the very thing which I undertook to prove in my late Discourse (and I hope to the satisfaction of every unbiass'd Reader) by that plentiful Enumeration and Induction

\* Bishop of Worcester's Pref. to his Vind. of the Doctrine of the Trinity. † Pref. to the Account of Reason and Faith.

of Particulars which I offer'd, whence I demonstrated that a great number of the *Socinian Articles* naturally tend to the promoting, of Irreligion and Prophaneness, and even to the effacing of the Sense of a Deity.

But what saith our present Author to this, who hath taken upon him the Office of an *Answerer*? Why truly he Skulks, and hides his baffled head, and hath not one syllable to say for himself, or against me. This is a new kind of *Answerer*, a Silent one, because he is conscious to himself that nothing can be offer'd. It is not to be doubted that if the fore-said Charge could have been evaded any ways, he would have attempted it. Had there been any thing said by me against his Party which he could have disproved, questionless he would have undertaken it. Had there been any shew of Reason or Truth on his side, he would have let us know it. Had there been any Excuse to be invented, he would not have fail'd to publish it, and that with open Mouth. Wherefore all persons of Understanding must conclude that he acknowledges the Truth and Reality of what I objected to the *Socinians*, viz. that most of their Doctrines and Principles damp Religion, and nourish Vice, and foster Atheistical and Licentious Practises: which is the thing that makes *Socinianism* so Fashionable at this day, and gains it so many Profelytes.

And now from the whole what a Strange Prospect have we of the Undertaking, of this  
Dough-

Doughty Champion for the *Socinian Cause*? I appeal to the Reader whether his Incoherent and Shatter'd Pamphlet can be call'd an *Answer*, and consequently whether the Men of *Racovia*, who have much pretended to Grammar and Criticism, speak Properly, ly, and (which is a higher Consequence) whether they have not abjured all Modesty in obtruding such a piece of work upon the world. This shews that their business is to make a Noise, whether there be any Sense or significancy go along with it or no. They make a great stir, but effect nothing; they are very busy, but yet to no purpose. This we may truly say, Their Heads are a proof, against some Philosophers, that there may be *Motion* where there is *Emptiness*. I promis'd the Gentlemen before hand that if *any thing substantial in the way of Reply were offer'd* by them, I would not be backward to meet the Antwerer with a Rejoynder: but here is nothing that looks like it, he is so far from offering any thing of *Substance*, that he doth not so much as pretend to a *Shadow* of any thing that is of that nature. There is not one Proposition that I laid down which is shaken by him, and he hath not so much as started One Objection against all I writ, and yet he hath the Confidence and Effrontery to dub his Pamphlet an *Answer*.

But it may be this will end well, it seems to argue that the *Socinians* are drawn to the very dreggs, and have nothing to alledg in their behalf. This looks as if their Plenipotentiaries were inclined to a Treaty of Peace,  
and



and were forward to put an end to the Seven Years War between the *Unitarians* and *Trinitarians*. For what can we think else when all their Ammunition is spent, and they can fight no longer? This Champion who was chosen and cull'd out of the whole Host of the *Unitarians* to engage the Contrary Side, lets fall his Weapons. His Courage abates, and his Spirits flag and dwindle: He dares not grapple with the Arguments I propos'd, neither doth he produce any of his own. He raises no Exceptions against me: nor takes any notice of mine against him. Nay, which is Wondrous and Astonishing, his Invention is so barren that he can't coyn any new Cavils against what I deliver'd, nor rally up any old ones. Thus when they have no Forces to bring into the field, the War must needs cease. When they surrender their Garisons and Holds (as I have shew'd they do) and fairly give up the Cause, what can we conclude but that they are coming over to us?

And as for my self particularly, whatever the matter is, they are very Complaisant, and surely they intend in a short time to take me into their favour. For though this Infalible Judge is pleas'd to tell the world that I have writ some *trifling books* (those he means that I have writ against his Brethren of *Racovia*) and some *indifferent ones*, those I suppose which I have writ against a *Friend* of theirs (lately) yet out of abundant grace and goodwill, he vouchsafes to declare that somebody *has been serviceable to the Common Christianity by some Learned Books*, p. 17. (I wish I could say

say as much of our Author): and again, that *he hath writ divers Good Books, and one Excellent one*, p. 3. Though one would be loth to take a Disciple of *Socinus* upon his bare word, and though it would be immodest and vain-glorious to attribute or apply any such thing to my self, yet as it is the frank Testimony of an *Adversary*, who would not esteem it as a singular Mark of Favour? who would not resent these Obliging Kindnesses from an *Enemy*, especially when they are mixed with *Reflections*, as in the present case? for then it is a sign that the Approbation forced its way through Calumnies and Falshoods. In short, I perceive they have a mind to be Friends with me, they would have at least a Cessation of Arms, if I would agree to it.

On which occasion I will take leave to say, that I am most heartily Glad that I have appear'd in this Cause, maugre all the insults of the *Adversaries*; I thank the *Father of Lights* that he was pleas'd to dispose me to this Honourable Service, and in such a Juncture, when the whole *Posse* of the *Unitarians* and their *Allies* attack'd the Christian Faith with such Force and fury. When these *Granadiers* came on so fiercely, who could but expect an *Assault*? who was not sensible that Religion was invaded, and that Christianity it self was in extreme danger? It is a Comfortable Reflection to me that I have born up against the Bold Aggressors, and that I have, according to my mean powers, asserted and vindicated the Truth with that warmth and zeal which become every Christian Breast. And now I must

must tell them I scorn to flinch from so good a Cause as I have undertaken. and I will never submit to gratify the humour and genius of *Deists* and *Scepticks*, or any Well-Willers to *Racovia*. Though I am as great an Admirer and Lover of *Civility* and *Good Temper* as any Man, yet I will never be bribed to a faint-hearted Relinquishing of the Truth. No: I will by the Divine Aid, vindicate the Religion of the New Testament, and the Faith of the Christian Church in all ages, and that with open face. And particularly, as to what I last writ and publish'd, I will make it stand the shock of the most daring *Socinian* in *Christendom*.

But to let these Gentlemen see that I am no *Man of Contention*, I declare to them that I am not averse from complying with their Offers, if they be Sincere and in Good Earnest, and if they resolve not to violate their own Articles of Peace. I will forgive their *Colts teeth* (as this pleasant Gentleman words it) if for the future they use not (as they have done in most of their Writings) *those of the Bear*. And why indeed should I contend with these *Catholick* and *Orthodox* Men? for that is the Style now in their last Print. Who will fall out with those that profess *Agreement with the Catholick Church*? But especially the Title of *Orthodox* (which they so abhorr'd) is much courted by this Author, as the Reader cannot but observe. Which may be an occasion to us to think that these Persons are inclined to do something to deserve that *Name*. It is my hearty Prayer and Wish that they may shew

shew themselves to be of this number. And I promise them thus far to yield to the Terms of Peace, that if they renew not the Quarrel, and assault me not afresh, this shall be our Last Campagne, and so here is an End to our Debates and Rencounters.

---

ER.

---

---

BOOKS written by the Reverend  
Mr. John Edwards.

AN Enquiry into several Remarkable  
Texts of the Old and New Testament  
which contain some Difficulty in them, with  
a Probable Resolution of them, in two Vol. 8°.

A Discourse concerning the *Authority, Style*  
and *Perfection* of the Books of the Old and  
New Testament, with a Continued Illustration  
of several Difficult Texts throughout the  
whole Work. In three Vol. 8°.

Some Thoughts concerning the several  
Causes and Occasions of Atheism, especially  
in the Present Age, with some brief Reflecti-  
ons on Socinianism, and on a Late Book en-  
titled, *The Reasonableness of Christianity as deli-*  
*ver'd in the Scriptures* 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

A Demonstration of the *Existence and Pro-*  
*vidence* of God from the Contemplation of  
the visible Structure of the *Greater* and the  
*Lesser World*. In two Parts. The first shew-  
ing the Excellent Contrivance of the *Hea-*  
*vens, Earth, Sea, &c.* The second, the  
wonderful Formation of the Body of Man.  
8°. price 4 s.

*Socinianism Unmask'd*: A Discourse  
shewing the Unreasonableness of a Late Wri-  
ter's Opinion concerning the Necessity of on-  
ly *One Article of Christian Faith*, and of his  
other Assertions in his Late Book Entitled,  
*The Reasonableness of Christianity as deliver'd*  
in

---

E R R A T A.

Page 8. Line 29. read *and if those*, p. 11. l. 14. r. *Un-*  
*reasonably*, p. 12. l. penult. r. *which*, p. 13. l. 6. r. *num-*  
*bers*, l. 11. r. *nor the*, p. 19. l. 15. r. *him for*, p. 33. l. 22. r.  
*asserted*, p. 34. l. 27. r. *task*, l. 31. for *they* r. *you*, p. 38. l.  
21. r. *declare*, p. 39. l. 15. dele *the*, p. 42. l. 20. r. *more to*,  
p. 46. l. r. *peruse*, p. 56. l. 17. r. *owns*, p. 57. l. 31. r. *bandi-*  
*ed*, p. 64. l. 4. dele *and*, p. 75. l. 13. for *give* r. *to*, p. 94.  
l. 22. before *to* insert *it*.

in the *Scriptures*, and in his *Vindication* of it ; with a brief Reply to another ( Professed ) Socinian Writer. 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

*The Socinian Creed* : Or a Brief Account of the professed *Tenents* and *Doctrines* of the Forreign and English *Socinians* , wherein is shewed the Tendency of them to *Irreligion* and *Atheism*. With *Proper Antidotes* against them. 8°. price 3 s.

A Brief *Vindication* of the *Fundamental Articles* of the *Christian Faith*, as also of the *Clergy*, *Universities*, and *Publick Schools* from Mr. *Lock's* Reflections upon them. With some *Animadversions* on two other late Pamphlets, viz. of Mr. *Bold* and a Nameless *Socinian* Writer. 8°. price 1 s. 6 d.

Brief *Remarks* upon Mr. *Whiston's* *New Theory of the Earth* : and upon another Gentleman's *Objections* against some Passages in a *Discourse of the Existence and Providence of God*, relating to the *Copernican Hypothesis*. 8°. price 6 d.

## BOOKS

---

BOOKS Printed for Jonathan Robinfon, and John Wyat.

A Practical Exposition on the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer, in two Volumes, in Quarto.

The Vanity of the World, with other Sermons, in 8vo.

Sermons or Discourses on several Scriptures, in Four Volumes, in Octavo.

The Almost Christian discovered, in some Sermons on Acts 26. 28. All these written by the Right Reverend Father in God Ezekiel Hopkins, late Lord Bishop of London-derry.

Bishop Usher's Life and Letters. By Dr. Parr, in Folio.

—'s Body of Divinity, or the Sum and Substance of the Christian Religion, Folio.

—'s 22 Sermons on several Subjects, Folio.

Josephus's History of the Jews, Folio.

Dr. Bates's Harmony of the Divine Attributes, Octavo. 4th Edition, 1697.

Charron of Wisdom, in three Books.

All Dr. Antony Walker's Works, viz.

The Sinfulness and Danger of delaying Repentance.

The Vertuous Woman, or the Life of the Countess of Warwick.

The

The Vertuous Wife, or the Life of Mrs. *Eliz. Walker*.

His Sermons of Water-drinking, Preached at *Tunbridge wells*, &c.

The worthy Communicant, a Treatise shewing the due Order of Receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The 17th Edition. By *Jeremiah Dyke*. Newly reprinted 1697.

The Poor Doubting Christian drawn unto Christ. By *Thomas Hooker*.

*Ovid's Metamorphosis*, in *English Verse*. By *George Sandys*.

*Aesop's Fables* in Prose, with Cuts  
Solitude improved by divine Meditation.  
By *Nathaniel Ranew*, late Rector of *Felsted* in *Essex*.

Practical Discourses concerning Death and Heaven. By *Nathaniel Ranew*.

Correction, Instruction, or a Treatise of Afflictions. By *Tho. Case*.

The Principles of Christian Religion, with a brief Method of the Doctrine thereof. By Bishop *Usher*.

The sinfulness of Sin, and the fulness of Christ, In two Sermons. By *W. Bridge*.

*Brinsley's* Posing of the parts reprinted 1697.

Sir *Simon D'ews* Journal of all Queen *Elizabeths* Parliaments, *Folio*.

*Bacons* Historical and Political account of the Government of *England*.

F I N I S.