

A  
LETTER

TO A

FRIEND,

Occasioned by

Mr. *CHANDLER*'s

HISTORY

OF

PERSECUTION.

With a Postscript concerning his Answer  
to Dr. *BERRIMAN*.

---

---

LONDON,

Printed for *J. Brotherton* at the Bible in Cornhill; and  
sold by *A. Dod* without Temple-Bar. 1723.

A  
LETTER

TO A

FRIEND,

Occasioned by

Mr. CHANDLER'S

HISTORY

OF

PERSECUTION.

With a Postscript concerning his Answer  
to Dr. BERRIMAN.

---

---

LONDON,

Printed for J. Brotherton at the Bible in Cornhill; and  
sold by A. Dod without Temple-Bar. 1733.



A

# L E T T E R

To a F R I E N D, &c.

S I R,



A S T time I had the pleasure of your company, the discourse happening to turn upon Mr. *Chandler's* History of Persecution, we cou'd not but both of us be sorry, that a good argument had been spoil'd by his ill management of it, by the many hot passions he seems to be transported with, and his undigested notions of the whole matter. Tho', I presume, neither the *Reverend*, nor the *Honourable* his subscribers, will repent their generosity, when they read the *History of the Inquisition*, a very curious and elaborate performance, he has been at the pains of translating; yet that wretched hotch-potch, and heap of scandal he has rak'd up, as an *Introduction* to it, the sober and judicious part of them, I am apt to believe, cou'd wish had not been impos'd upon them: For they can't approve of his throwing dirt at all hazards, round a-

about him : Whilst he is pouring forth expressions of *love and tenderness*, he ransacks all that he can any ways come at for *scandal*, never minding whether in truth people do, or do not deserve his wrath; unless he fancies that his dressing them up in *bear-skins*, is enough to give him a pretence to destroy them with his tongue, having no power to do it otherwise.

I cannot blame you, Sir, that you desired to judge coolly of this matter. Tho' 'tis difficult not to grow warm, upon such a prevaricating way of procedure: To lanch out so immoderately, upon *Principles of Moderation*, is really not sufferable. You seem'd to take it so, as well as I; but not to be over-hasty in judging, you wou'd look further into the matter at your leisure, and in the mean time, desir'd me to commit to writing what pass'd between us upon this subject: Which, tho' the less capable of the two, I undertook shou'd be done, to the best of my abilities, tho' not in the very same expressions or order, for ours was a free conversation; such as it is, I leave it to you, to make what use of it you please.

I. First then, as to *Liberty and Persecution*, I did so far agree with this author, as you do, that there shou'd be no *civil punishment* inflicted on any man, for opinions that have no proper influence or tendency, to disturb the peace of the *state or commonwealth*. That therefore all sectaries, of whatsoever denomination, be left to their own thoughts about religion and worship, so far as they are willing to keep within reasonable bounds: Whereby we understood, that they may *use their liberty* in their own *churches, chapels, assemblies or meeting-places*; and there they may follow, if it is possible, and if they please, *neither discipline nor order*, or rather, as it is to be suppos'd, their *own order or discipline*, in the way they think best, each of them, for the preservation of their body intire, and a good understanding between all its members; that they should

should be willing also, that the same liberty they use themselves, others should not enjoy less than them; and that they should not grudge any other sect the privilege of acting as they think proper; and especially that which happens to be *uppermost* in a nation, and therefore goes by the name of a *national establishment*, or church as it is establish'd by law.

II. But if, as it seems, some would push *further* and intend that every one should every where teach, or act as he *thinks fit*, without any restraint, law, or controul, to hinder him, or abridge his liberty in any *church* or *meeting*, if he has a mind to be acknowledg'd a member of either, so far indeed they shan't have our concurrence; for we reckon that to be such a confusion, and wretched anarchy, as is no ways to be sought for, or thought of, as a thing *desirable*, among either men or christians. And, if I mistake not, Mr. *Chandler* himself must not allow of it, though all his *outcries* and *declaimings*, all his *rancour* and *bitterness*, all his *anger* and *malice* seem either to tend *that way*, or else to have his *Latitudinarian Cabal* lift up its head above all the now allow'd societies of religion, and prescribe to them how they ought to behave themselves, to please this *state faction* newly reviv'd.

III. To return. I do not for my part, nor do you, envy the church here or any where else, the *protection* of the *state*, or any of its *legal revenues*. What! if *dissenters* think themselves oblig'd to keep up their own congregations, and encourage their pastors, as they are able; is it not fit also that the establishment should be kept up by the *sovereign*, *magistracy*, or *nation*, that belong to it, or are members thereof; and that their clergy should be supported by all lawful and convenient means? Or is it to be understood, that there should be a *liberty* for those that happen to be *tolerated*, and none for those that are *approv'd* by the government?

That

That the magistrate should not meddle at *all* with religion, appears to me very strange, unless he is to have *none himself*; but if he *ought* to have any, that which is of his own *chusing*, he, to be sure, may *cherish* and *protect*. Otherwise, by being a *magistrate*, he would lose all that he had a right to, as a *private man*, all the liberty that every other member of the commonwealth, all subjects whatever, would have maintain'd inviolably as to and for themselves: Which I reckon to be a *wild fancy*, a *monstrous imagination*. Will any person say the magistrate, *as such*, must have no conscience but a *publick* one; or that all his business as a *magistrate*, precisely is, to keep every one's religion and conscience *free of all restraint*? I won't oppose this; for tho' the magistrate, in that relation, be not the church's *protector*, yet he that is a magistrate, *will* do it, and cannot *help* doing it, if he has any *zeal* for the cause.

IV. To this it may be objected, that such a scheme would, in most parts of the world, *establish iniquity by law*, and settle for ever, almost in *all* places, *idolatry* and *superstition*, *rites* and *ceremonies*, *trifles* and things *indifferent* in doctrine or practice; besides *creeds*, *subscriptions*, *oaths*, *ecclesiastical courts*; and I know not what. I'll own there would be room for this objection, if at the same time a *toleration* was not allowed to those that dissent from such an establish'd religion, or national society of christians. But if a *toleration* be allow'd (for upon this supposition we go here all along, none of us, I presume, the least inclining towards *popery* in its worse sense, or persecution for conscience sake) and if christians, so named, chuse all those either vanities or enormities, to be part of their religion, and their *own conscience*, tho' erroneous, *sticks* to it; will you take from them the *liberty* and *right*, to *keep up* and *support* that their particular society or church, so call'd, which they *chuse* to be of? For they

they agreeing in their unanimity or uniformity in those things, are no more willing to depart from it, or to be disturb'd in it, than the *others* in what they account their *liberty*.

V. Will the *Latitudinarian* then say, that *church* should come into *my notions*? If you can persuade people to come into them, let them; but if not; why they into *your notions*, any more than you into *theirs*? Is it because *yours* are *right*, *theirs* are *not*? Who shall be the *judge*? Not *they* for *you*; that you reject as *abominable*: Not *you* for *them*; for then all your fine speeches would come at last to *this*, that you set up *yourselves only* for a *rule* to others: Well then, *Holy Scripture*, mere *Revelation*, must be only hearken'd to; but this *Scripture*, this *Revelation*, happens to be understood in two *opposite*, or *different* senses, the one by the *church*, or prevailing party, the other by *you*. Here is the *knot*, gentlemen! So it is, says one, that fancies himself to be some *Alexander* or other, but *I'll cut it*: Very well, Sir, we have heard before of these *fine cutters*, but are not a jot the *better* for them. What they say, as well as we, is true, *viz.* That *private judgement*, being the last resort, is a *firm and sound foundation* of liberty of conscience. This is plain to any one's apprehension, but 'tis not so, when the question is about a decision between *contending parties*. For such a decision is a *publick judgment*, or a solemn declaration, made by those that shall come in, as judges or umpires, to moderate between the said parties, and to pronounce which of them teaches or acts otherwise than the society, to which they belong, did formerly, or does now actually approve, so that it indeed takes away a liberty of *teaching* or *doing* any otherwise than as it is *decided*. But nevertheless, it leaves whole and entire *liberty of conscience* it self to both parties, either those that assent, or those that do not. For we suppose all along that as full a *toleration*, as has been describ'd, is allow'd to those whose

*private*

*private* does not agree with the *publick* judgment. If such a restraint upon liberty is an *evil*, it is a *necessary evil*, an evil that can't be *avoided*, as long as there are men, whether ecclesiastical or secular, who don't always see things in the *same* light. And therefore, in both *church* and *state* contending parties there are, and I suppose will be, except all mens minds were exactly of the same make and mould: And decisions will ever follow, or even sometimes *preceed* contentions, to prevent them if possible before they break out to a high degree. Universal and constant experience *proves it*. It is so, and will be so. And when one goes about to suppose, that if we had all our desired dear liberty to play with, we might enjoy such a pleasure as never any *dreamer felt* (which I won't take upon me to deny) I really can't help looking upon this supposition as an *Utopian scheme*, a mere *Plato's* commonwealth, and as truly *visionary and romantick* as the imaginary castles in the air, of persons disorder'd in their senses \*.

VII. Nothing more like that *frantick notion*, than the fine *Raree-Show* of a church, of Mr. *Chandler's* framing, tho' he has it not, I know, out of his own brains; only, he waits to share in the  *blessings of a worthy and reverend Prelate* upon those that have contributed to so good a work †. Here then all sects and parties are brought into one peaceable and well compacted church or body. You'll hear a few of them enumerated by Mr. *Chandler* ‡, an eccho, it seems, or an interpreter, if you believe him, of the now Bishop of *L.* *Socinians, Arians, Athanasians, Sabellians, Pelagians, Arminians, Episcopalians, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, &c.* a goodly sight in very deed, and an exceeding *comfortable* one, to see 'em all *amicably* pack'd together! But believe you, if you can, that Mr. *Chandler* believes, that the

\* *Chandler's Introduction*, Page 3.  
was, Page 89, 105.

† Bishop of *Bangor* that  
‡ Page 104.

Bishop believes any such thing. *Credat Judæus Apella; non ego.*

VIII. I would not have a *Roman-Catholick* acquainted with this, as it is pretended to be an hypothesis or scheme of an *orthodox* Bishop. For then he would have reason sufficient to complain, that he is excluded from that blessed society, that has at the head of it the very scum of those that take upon them the name of christians; for that's his notion of them, if I be not greatly mistaken. However, that he is excluded is plain; unless he happens to be comprehended in Mr. *Chandler's*, &c. But if he is not, why is he not mention'd? It may be answer'd, because *Papists* allow of principles *destructive* of our civil constitution: That's true; but a *Roman-Catholick* is not always a *Papist*, at least then he ought to have been admitted, so far as he is only a *Roman-Catholick*, who, I think, agrees in all those fundamentals, that the *Socinians* themselves will come into, and therefore I do insist he should be intermix'd somewhere in that *buddle-puddle* of Mr. *Chandler's* *leger demain*, who fathers upon the good Bishop, what I dare say he abhors.

IX. For my part, I do not well see why the *Deists* themselves should not be compell'd to come in, that Mr. *Chandler's* house may be full; for they have no great objection to Christ as a *Moralist*, or one that teaches plain natural morality or religion. Indeed, that he should be a *teacher from God* for that purpose, they apprehend was not so very *needful*; but yet, if christians are willing to keep within the bounds of religion, as *natural*, I hardly think *Deists* would refuse to be reckon'd some of the *best* among them.

X. What then, will one say, would you not tolerate a *Socinian*? Tolerate! Ay, by all means: Let him have as ample and full liberty as any *other* dissenter: He shall have no hinderance from *me*. But I

must beg pardon, if I can't look upon him as a *brother*, in all the emphasis of that appellation; tho' I reckon him to be my *neighbour*, and am ready to do for him, as I would be done by. And when I reflect on the matter seriously, I can't apprehend how I could be receiv'd into the communion of *Socinians*, as a preacher or teacher, supposing that I, being among them, would teach or preach your *Athanasian creed*, I doubt they would not suffer it; however, if they would, I cannot for my life imagine how they could in very reason and conscience. And therefore, tho' I can well agree to be a member of the same *state* or *civil constitution* with any men, I must profess, I can't so far stretch my charity and conscience, as to be willing to be in one *church* or *ecclesiastical communion* with *Socinians* and *Athanasians* together. Here one in the morning would preach, Christ is a *mere man*; another in the afternoon, he is *very God*; and if, after having explain'd the positive part of the doctrine, they happen, as it can hardly fail, to go into the controverted or polemical part of it, what a fine work for edification must I be entertain'd with? What indeed, if it should happen to return every Sunday throughout the year? No, but you'll say, they shan't touch at all upon those points. That's very merry indeed; they will hold their tongues, won't they? for shut their mouths you cannot, upon your own principles.

XI. To be serious. Truth with love is christian preaching, what therefore God has *join'd together*, let not man *put asunder*. True doctrine then, as it is such, in my own private judgment and conscience, ought to be the basis, rule and measure of my love. Then as *men*, all will be indeed the objects of love, as being my *neighbours*; but as *religious Professors*, how is it possible or reasonable, that there should not be some difference at least, in the *degrees* of love, for and towards them. Is it

not

not a plain Apostolical precept? *Let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.* We cannot then but chuse to be in communion with those that *agree with us*, in what we look upon, with respect to fundamental truths, *as that faith that was once delivered to the saints.*

XII. Indeed, as to my self, I could wish with all my heart, that those things should not be impos'd, in order to christian communion, that are look'd upon as *indifferent*, or declar'd to be so by the Imposers themselves: What is taken to be such, should be left, methinks, as it is in its own nature. He that *eateth*, should not despise nor exclude him that *eateth not*; he that *kneels*, should, in my apprehension, let others *stand* or *sit* as they like. Tho' an *uniformity* in those matters *seems* more decent, yet being not at all *necessary*, nor even the *neglect* of it indecent *in it self* (for we see at prayers people in different postures without any scandal) I can't see any reason why such rigidness should be countenanc'd by *laws* and *pēnal-ties*: And therefore it would be kind and christian-like, I think, to leave every one so far free, as that he might follow his own way without reflecting upon another, for following his; and for ought I know of man's heart, it would be the proper way to bring them into an *uniformity of practice* in such things, by the very means of a *prevailing fashion and usage*: Only those that should still affect to be *singular*, would be apt to be ridicul'd for it, as he that wore *long pockets*, like those of our *grand-fires*.

XIII. But in those things that are reckoned to be of *necessity* in themselves, there is no room left for any *unbounded liberty* among christians united together in *one society, church or communion*. If there were, we might join with *Roman-Catholicks*, adoring the *host*, worshiping of *images*, &c. which I know not whether Mr. *Chandler* would allow; but I avow I cannot. And therefore unless you can so

mould the christian world now-a-days, as that it could *unite* in what christians take, respectively, to be the *foundations* of christian doctrine or worship, you may *declaim* and *rail* as long as you please; but you'll hardly bring in sensible men to have all their *fundamental principles* shaken and ruin'd, for the sake of a few of one sort of freethinkers, who look upon them as *no principles* at all, and yet would make up an *universal* church of members so much disunited, and adverse to one another.

XIV. Why so many broken pieces, or extracts of some one *charity-sermon* or other, should have been brought in with such an air, by the reverend the preacher in his *Remarks*, is not worth inquiring after. For I conceive his aim being not so much directed against our common adversaries the *Papists*, as against his *Fellow-Protestants*, and some of his *own brethren*, he should in true reasoning, methinks, have done his best endeavours to shew, how, by their principles or practice, they seem now-a-days to *violate* that their acknowledg'd duty, universal *charity* and *benevolence*: They being, as much as he well can be, against punishments of any sort, and all negative discouragements in the state for *religious opinions*; but yet do apprehend, they are oblig'd to have a care, that purity of *faith*, as well as *worship*, should be kept up in their own assemblies. Now had Mr. *Chandler* prov'd, that, by so doing, they blindly act against *that love*, that is so much recommended to us in the Gospels and Apostolical writings, he would have talk'd to the purpose; but not a word of that, at least, in a *direct* and *distinct* way or expression, that I can remember, throughout all this *Introduction*; which, to speak my mind freely, as I think I may, renders very probable what I have heard, since I have put pen to paper, that this Mr. *Chandler* is one, whose *judgment* is not taken to equal his *vivacity*. However, I must leave that to those that better know him  
or

or are acquainted with him, which I am not, tho' I have an esteem for his great parts.

XV. This I must needs say, that in Mr. *Chandler's History and Remarks*, there seems to be such a mixture of good and bad, such a confounding and huddling together, without distinction, the different principles of friends and foes, and in truth, of his *own* various apprehensions of things, that one is hardly able to make a consistent scheme thereof. Most certainly a *civil* toleration and an *ecclesiastical* one, are things distinct, tho' there be a resemblance and comparison between them. I readily grant that the *one* may be perfect and universal, without the *other*: The state or civil government, being only for this present mortal life, is grounded on mere *human* or *political* principles, that affect one's *natural* or *civil* interest: The church or kingdom of Christ is not of this world, but is founded upon *divine* and *religious* principles, it affects one's *supernatural* or *heavenly* interest. In the former, I ought to be ruled by the laws of the *land*, in the latter, by those of the *gospel*; they shou'd not interfere with one another. If I am a *good subject*, so far I am intitled to all the *privileges* of a *good subject*; if I am a *good christian*, so far also I have a right to all *his* *privileges*; all this is very true: But then if I join in society or communion with christians, Whom shall I be determin'd by in this church? Ask, I pray, whom you shou'd be determin'd by as a subject in the *state*, and the answer to this *last* question, will equally serve to the *first*. If you judge your private advantage not compatible with the laws of civil society, why then you must live by your self in a desert, or go into some country, where the laws and constitutions agree with your way of thinking. Wou'd you pull down all manner of law, society, and rule for your *own* sake only? No to be sure: This wou'd be wild with a *witness*; no such leveling

ling principles will be fit for any state whatsoever; you must be concluded by a majority, or be excluded society, I see no medium; and this observation may be applied to the other subject. If you do not like *church-communion*, you are free as to that, so far as that no body in this world can inflict upon you, by right, any civil punishment for this your opinion or practice: But if you have a mind to join in communion with any society of christians, to be sure you must *agree* with them, or *leave* them, and make a society of your *own*, constituted of those that *agree with you*; and even then you must be *ruled* one way or other, if any disagreement happens to be among your selves; and he that won't must be *expell'd*, it can't be help'd, how broad soever the principles of your society are.

For let it be form'd upon that very principle, that there be *no* order or rule at all; if so, even *this* is its order and its rule. So that if any wou'd introduce any thing into it, besides that *one* rule, without the concurrence of the *many*, there's an end of the society, upon its own principles, it will come to nought; what a fine fabrick this is, I will give you time to consider.

XVI. In the mean while, I may and will appeal to Mr. *Chandler* himself, if he is pleas'd to stand to his own decisions, as I think he ought; for his very words are, at his first setting out, *I will not indeed deny \* but that the appointing persons, whose peculiar office it shou'd be to minister in the external services of publick and social worship, is, when under proper regulations, of advantage to the decency and order of divine service.* What do you think he means by *proper regulations*, no regulations at all, or none that must be *followed*, or such as ought to be *regulated themselves* by every ones will or fancy? If

---

\* Page 3.

there be proper regulations to be had or imagin'd, I shou'd be glad to know what they are, or of what use, if *no* submission is due to them at all. Besides, here is an *appointing of persons to minister*, and whoever appoints them seems to be most naturally a judge of their ministration; and then here is also a *decency and order*, which I can't well reconcile with *no restraint at all* upon those that wou'd spoil it or deviate from it at pleasure. Some time after, he is heard preaching to nations, *not to enlarge the authority and jurisdiction of spiritual men, beyond the bounds of reason and revelation*, which is very wholesome advice, and 'tis most evident by his own *warning of nations*, that spiritual men have, or ought to have some *small degree* of authority and jurisdiction upon the very principles of reason, as well as revelation; so that, without spending his time in *declaiming*, he wou'd have better employ'd it, in giving us a *plain lecture* about what he takes to be *lawful authority and jurisdiction of spiritual men*, and the precise bounds thereof, so as we might know, once for all, how far we must or may either reject it, or submit to it: For to rail at random against *authority*, and call it *domineering over others faith and conscience*, and then to suppose there is to be *some* authority, without explaining *what this authority is*, appears to me somewhat like a certain *Prelate's* perplex'd answer to a *committee of latter times*, that did indeed make people *stare*, but never made them the *wiser*, nor ever wou'd, if they were to chew all their life-time upon that *Spiritual Man's* political cud.

XVII. That indeed Mr. *Candler* insists much upon a *minister's preaching, exhorting, giving good example*, and so on, I do freely acknowledge, and thank him for it; that being what a *true* clergyman, or ecclesiastical person, ought above *all* to mind and set his heart upon. But this does not take off the difficulty

ficulty in this matter, neither as to the several *members* of the society in general, nor as to the *ministers* in particular, that are the chief members of it; tho' they are not its *masters*, nor are they the society *it self*, and therefore are no less subject than others to its rules. Suppose then your clergy acting only, as it seems Mr. *Chandler* understands it, in the way of *mere* persuasion, and some of the hearers will not be persuaded, but set themselves up to disorder either the society it self, or its guides and representatives, which it has impower'd to act for it; is there then no way to oppose the disturbers, but by *preaching over and over again*, when the supposition plainly takes in, that that preaching is not minded at all by the *disorderly laicks*? What must be done in this case? You see *persuasion* will not remedy the evil, and if there is no remedy *besides* for it, the evil is *entail'd* upon society for ever, I mean, a society of *christians*, that never can be united on a *certain* foundation in any *social worship* at all; which is monstrous. For so you put them in a condition of not being able, in the nature of things, to do what, in the nature of things, they must and ought to do, *viz.* to *join* and *unite* together in *social worship*.

XVIII. Now as to *ministers*, we'll put a plain case. The two churches in *Great Britain*, tho' pretty much alike as to the *inner* parts of religion, are at a great distance as to *externals*: One has a *precomposed form* of prayer, that is read by the minister adorn'd with a *surplice*, the other wou'd have the minister use *conceived prayers*, and generally its done by him in a *cloak*, or some such like vestment. Wou'd you have him that officiates in the church of *Scotland*, appear with a *surplice* reading *common-prayer*; or, in the Church of *England*, one mounting the pulpit with his *cloak*, to say all there *without book*? For my part, I cou'd well endure it, as to  
the

the thing it self, that is of no great consideration: But, as it relates to *order*, I can't imagine how it cou'd be endur'd; I am sure it wou'd not: Nor wou'd any undertake it, but one *out of his senses*, or some *furious zealot*, who, to be sure, has no right to come and disturb others in the possession of their usages and customs. Such a one then is to be *check'd* for it; especially if he wou'd not refrain from his wild attempt. To this it may be said, a man that has his *wits about him*, shou'd not act in this manner: But shall not he preach against what he reckons to be an *abuse*, or *evil* in the church? Yes, he may and ought, but at his own *peril*, if his preaching is not *lik'd*: And this being sufficiently signified or insinuated to him, he must either forbear, if his conscience permits him, or go and preach to those that are or will be dispos'd to hear him. But that he shou'd persist where he is *not lik'd*, is an untoward pretension, or that the society must yield against her *own conviction* or her *quiet*, are absurdities to be *ridicul'd*, rather than answer'd.

XIX. If you'll give me leave, I wou'd further suppose, that there was neither church nor meeting, as there is amongst us, but a number or multitude of individuals, that singly, if possible, did profess christianity without any discipline or ministry at all, and suppose some of them inclinable to join in one religious society, upon laws agreed by them to be Christ's *own laws*, together with some *by-laws* of their own, not contrary or repugnant, as they presume to the others; wou'd it be proper for any one that is for *liberty*, to call them enemies of that liberty because of their *by-laws*, as they affect no body but themselves, that are willing to be bound by them? And suppose lastly, the great men of the nation, and the *Sovereign* himself to come into this society, and so give those *by-laws* the more credit, with regard to the members of that society: What

occasion of just and reasonable complaint this would give others, I cannot understand; and upon this footing, I must not find fault with the *act of uniformity*, as temper'd by the *act for toleration*, or that the *liturgy* in South-Britain, and a *directory*, I suppose, in the northern parts, be establish'd by the *act of union*, which may well stand without any infringement on the liberty of dissenters of any sort, either north or southward.

• XX. That one shou'd call *imprisoning, confiscating, hanging, &c.* by the odious name of *persecution*, you have my consent, as far as it will serve. In the state, the *man* ought to be regarded; not the *sectary* as such, and the man as far as he is, or may be *useful* to the state. That is so plain an opinion, that it wants no proof at all. No proof being a more clear evidence of the thing, than the thing it self is. If there are men that do not see it, they must be somewhat like those that do not see the sun at *noon-day*, and with them I have done for ever. But if by persecution, you mean not to be look'd upon as a *member of a church*, whose doctrines you don't believe, whose worship you won't practise, or whose discipline you can't submit to, as long as you may follow your *own* that you like *better*, or take to be the *only* true one, then in truth I am not of your opinion; I shall never be brought to call *persecution* what I think is as much the *result of liberty*, as any thing else. And for the very reason that I am for as *perfect a liberty* as can be had, I am for every society, as well as all individuals, enjoying and exercising their own full liberty towards and among themselves, so far as that their liberty does not break in upon the *civil state*, or acknowledg'd *publick good* of nations; therefore then, let the church or party *dominant* have its laws, statutes, or canons to be govern'd by, till that church or party think it convenient to alter them, or any part

part of them. Let those also, that do not like the *establishment*, set up *meetings* and there act as it seems best in their own eyes. And if a member in any church or meeting whatsoever does not *like* what is said or done there, and will break its peace and order, by quarrelling and contentions, 'tis very fit such opinionative men, that violate their neighbour's liberty and peace, shou'd be admonish'd either to *abstain* from doing so any more, or to *leave* the society, or, having forfeited their right to it, shou'd be *expell'd* it, as *wilful perturbators* of other mens liberty, peace and quiet. All this I reckon to be plain *common sense*, and warranted sufficiently by the gospel and all the writings of the new testament, more particularly by this general and short rule given by the holy apostle. ; *Let all things be done decently and in order.*

. XXI. But wou'd it not be better to have none of those *subscriptions, oaths, &c?* Supposing it wou'd, what of that? As long as it is thought fit by them, that judge those means *necessary* for the preservation of their society *entire*, is there any reason to prescribe to them, with hard speeches, to take away what they keep in their own defence? Here you have the church of *England*, that has a mind to be uniform as to its *government, articles, liturgy and discipline* : How shall that church, so constituted, be able to keep its constitution, without some security or other, from those that are admitted to the publick ministration and office in the said church; and also without some *rules, canons, or laws*, to oblige every one of her members to conform to that order? For to tell the church-men, they shou'd have *no laws* of that nature; that is as much as to say, those things they do well *like of*, they ought not to have a *liberty of liking*, which appears to me to be very absurd, especially as it comes from that quarter that pleads for *unbounded liberty*, the na-

ture of liberty being such, that that man is equally free that *binds*, as he that *looses* himself. If indeed you went about to give them *good reasons* why they shou'd not be in love with those things, they appear to you to be over fond of, I don't know but you might do something to the purpose. But to *scold* and *strike*, and mix heaven and hell together; to brand with the odious name of *persecution*, what is as far from it as heaven from hell it self, serves only to give a *mean opinion* of the man, as being somewhat *disorder'd in his senses*. Pray see how he raves on the subject, says he, *This manner of subscribing is infamous in its nature, and vindicable upon no principles of conscience and honour*. Is it so indeed? How then comes your *bleffing Prelate* to be so rigid in that way to his own dear bosom-friend and fellow-companion one Mr. J——? As Mr. *Whiston* has publickly declar'd to the world, in a pamphlet concerning the late *Dr. Clark*.

XXII. I am sorry that the *Test-act* does exclude the dissenters from publick employments, if they won't submit to take the sacrament. I never liked such a profanation, if I am allow'd to call it by its right name; and if I cou'd help it, the blame shou'd not lie upon any of those that are the *true sons* of the church. But so much of that has been said lately, that we may well leave it here without any farther disquisition.

XXIII. What I wou'd observe further is, how he has made *persecutors* of the *subscribing ministers* at *Salters-Hall*. Why so furious? A rumour was spread all over the city and suburbs, that the dissenting clergymen were most of them become *Arians*: To take off the odium of this injurious report, some very pious and learned men among them, thought the best expedient was to subscribe all in a body an article of the Church of *England*, and one of the *Westminster* catechism's questions and answers. This they pro-

propos'd in a *numerous assembly*, when, as it hap-  
 pened, some did not think fit to subscribe, others  
 did. And, in my apprehension, if the *last*, by sub-  
 scribing, did *persecute the first*, those *first*, by not  
 subscribing, did *persecute the last*. For who has  
 given one party the liberty of *not subscribing*, if the  
 other neither has nor ought to have that of *sub-*  
*scribing*. Is it only *one* party that is to have all the  
 liberty to *himself*? I am afraid there is something of  
 this in the matter. After all these sad outcries a-  
 gainst persecution, they will hardly signify any more  
 than if one shou'd say roundly; "I won't be persecu-  
 " ted *my self*, nor have *my liberty* abridg'd or dimi-  
 " nish'd in the least; but hark-ye, I will not be bound  
 " by the *same rule* of natural and christian equity,  
 " and I'll declare against *those* as *persecutors*, that  
 " think they have a right to be *as free* as my self, and  
 " do act accordingly". The various circumstances of  
 that affair I shall not meddle with, being little ac-  
 quainted with either party; only one thing I can't  
 but wonder at, and that is to see the detestable name  
 of *Inquisition* fastned, with relation to this business,  
 upon the principles of dissenters. For if the gen-  
 tlemen, that met at *Salters-Hall*, had *once* sub-  
 scrib'd the article abovemention'd, as 'tis presum'd  
 they had, I don't apprehend how it shou'd be against  
 their principles to subscribe a *second* time, unless  
 they reckon subscribing is like baptism, never to be  
*reiterated*. But as I never heard of this, it surprises  
 me to see the very *moderate Mr. Chandler* inveigh at  
 such a rate against his once *dear brethren*, upbraid  
 them for a *furious opposition*, call them *Zealots* for  
 their pains, and insinuate as if their zeal had been  
 meer hypocrisy, to serve their own *passions* and *in-*  
*terest*, in a most shameful and profane manner. — It  
 wou'd not be fit for me to imitate him, tho' it were  
*afar off*, otherwise it wou'd be pretty natural to ask  
 if this long scroll of an *Introduction* to the *History*  
*of the Inquisition*, has not partly been calculated to  
 serve

serve his *resentment and hatred*, in a manner so spiteful and unbecoming, against the *subscribing ministers*; some of which, and not the least worthy, are now lying quiet in their graves.

Tho' they seem indeed not to have much more cause to complain than *most* other sects and parties, either old or new: I'll beg leave to except the *Soci-nians*, whom he has not found in his heart to bring in for any share in the list of *persecutors*. But to have it fill'd up, all must be and are such to him, as have thought it their duty to exercise *mere christian discipline*, and for that only he sets them off in such black outrageous terms, as if they were, or had been, the most *unworthy of all mortals*. Does he really think the proper way to convince men is to *blacken* them, to *asperse and vilify* them? Or is it only to *please a gang* that attends him, that he acts and writes with the very same high spirit, he does not like in others? Happy they, his fulminations against them have neither civil nor church effect! For he has given cause sufficient to apprehend how he wou'd be inclin'd to act with others, if he was to have rule over them. Tho' they abhor persecution in the state, as much as he well can do, when reason guides him, yet because they are for maintaining, by *lawful christian means*, what they take to be true and *fundamental* doctrines in the church, they are defam'd by him as so many *incendiaries*, and *persecutors*, as the *plagues and curses of mankind*, for that their innoxious and at least *pardonable* error, by one that professes so much of *temper, moderation, charity, humanity, impartiality, peace, concord, social virtue, liberty, sincerity*, and what not, that the gentleman and his friends pay as so many compliments to themselves, and one another, *exclusively of all others*.

In the name of wonder, what wou'd they have? Must all mens minds be on the level with theirs,

or have the same latitude or straitness, what shall I call it? It's impossible in the nature of things. Our principles give them all the liberty they can desire, if in their senses, of *thinking, speaking, writing*, in matter and form as they best approve. Let all those that take on them the name of christians, nay, let all *Pagans, Mahometans, Deists, Infidels* enjoy the same liberty to the full, provided the foundations of civil society are not thereby *subverted or shaken*. What will you have more, gentlemen? Must all others, in order to please you, give up their opinions, or ways, tho' in nothing hurtful to you? If they are *out*, that's to *themselves*. 'Tis none of *your* business, if they value what you scoffingly call orthodoxy in them. Nor even is it any thing to you, if they won't admit you into their own assemblies, so long as they are willing you shou'd be wholly free to preach and publish without control, in your assemblies, and in print to the nation, and the whole world, what you may call truth or religion, altho' it happens to be the *greatest deviation from both*.

However, Sir, I must not forget what I promis'd you shou'd have as a sort of a *Supplement* to the History of Persecution. 'Tis as follows, in a short but curious abstract of *Socinus's* life \*. “ At that time  
 “ the opinion of *Francis Davids*, concerning the  
 “ power of Christ and the honour due to him,  
 “ caused a great disturbance in the churches of  
 “ *Transilvania*: And *Georgius Blandrata*, who was  
 “ very great with the prince there, try'd to find a  
 “ remedy to this evil. For that purpose, he call'd  
 “ *Socinus* from *Basil*, that he might bring over this  
 “ *Francis* from his scandalous and pernicious error.  
 “ That this might be done the more easily, lodg-  
 “ ings were hired at a very great rate that they

---

\* *Vita Socini, Aut. Sam. Przipcovio Eq. Polono. p. m. 19 & 20.*

“ might

“ might live together, and eat at the same table,  
 “ which they did for above three months. But  
 “ *Francis*, unwilling to recant, and preaching pub-  
 “ lickly his errors, was immediately, by the *Prince's*  
 “ order, cast into prison, wherein a little after, he  
 “ died”. Here then is the fact, and there follows a  
 sort of apology for *Socinus*; the thing having ex-  
 pos'd him very much. But, says his *Panegyrist*, he  
 surely cou'd not approve of it. (No indeed; un-  
 less *he too* happen'd to be a *Persecutor*) for, adds the  
*Polish Knight*, “ nothing cou'd more prejudice *Soci-*  
 “ *nus's* cause, than that the contrary opinion shou'd  
 “ be defended by that efficacious testimony of  
 “ *Francis's* dying for it, his death looking in the  
 “ eyes of all, like a *martyrdom*”. To some it  
 might even appear a very *base and horrid way* of  
 taking an adversary out of the world. However,  
 there seems to be somewhat in the circumstances  
 that is *very suspicious*. But we'll leave it as it stands;  
 a persecution there was by *Socinians* of all sorts, *Bat-*  
*tory* the prince of the country, *Blandrata* his favou-  
 rite, and the *blessed Socinus* himself.

I am, SIR, &c.



POST-

## P O S T S C R I P T.

SINCE I wrote this letter, an answer to Dr. *Berriman* by Mr *Chandler* is come to my hands. The Doctor had said, that 'tis plainly Mr. C.'s design under the odious name of persecution, to decry and vilify all legal establishments of religion. To this Mr. C. seems to answer in the way and manner of the *Culprits* at the *Old-Bayley*. He neither confesses, properly speaking, nor denies what he is accus'd of: But taking the advantages the law indeed does there allow, he pleads *not guilty*, and puts himself upon *all the equitable part of mankind*. This I would allow to be fair, if *that equitable part* did sit like a jury before one's eyes, ready to judge between the contending parties. But one may well doubt whether 'tis the fairest method among *scholars* and *divines*, those especially, that set themselves up for *patterns of sincerity*, and the most, if not the *only* impartial inquirers after truth: As to myself, he's very free to use his own liberty in making the best defence he is able; and as I hope I do somewhat belong to the *equitable part of mankind*, I think he should be heard in this his defence by so notable a jury, all of his own choosing.

We'll then suppose the judge should ask him, What have you to say for your self? His answer as to the accusation above, is, *First*, by asking the Doctor, *but did Mr. C. ever tell you so?* To which my reply would be, if allow'd to speak on the question, I suppose *not*. But whether Mr. C. told it the *Doctor* or no, is nothing to the purpose; if he has told it to *others* by word of mouth, or rather to the *world* in print; for this way the Doctor could as well know it, as if he had heard it from Mr. C.'s *own mouth*.

*Secondly*, He adds, *or were you ever in the inside of his heart?* Ridiculous! *Physically*, if I may use the

expression, he was not; but in a *moral* sense, why not? If a man says a thing, or gives it sufficiently to be understood by some outward sign, so that I may well perceive or judge that to be his opinion or thought, who will be so very dull as to apprehend, I might be *in the inside of his heart locally*, or so much given to cavilling as to ask, whether *I was in the inside of his heart?* But not to wrangle about words, hear him further.

*Thirdly*, Then, says he, *If not, you should not have begun with an assertion, that Mr. C. knows 'tis in his power to convince, I will not say you, but all the equitable part of mankind, of the untruth of.* Very well, he says the truth, the whole truth, and nothing *but* the truth, 'tis a full answer. He ought to be acquitted, and the court will allow him his plea against the Doctor: For the plain sense of the answer *seems* to be this. The Doctor is a *false accuser*. in his reference to the *Introduction*, wherein Mr. C. has affirm'd in terms or sense expressly, that he *allows* of an establishment of religion having the sanction of the law, *viz.* penalties annex'd to it. Indeed otherwise, 'tis impossible in the nature of things to have a law: A law without sanction, without a penalty, being of no use at all; 'tis no law. So common sense instructs us, so does Holy Scripture and all the legislators in the world, but especially our *own* legislature here in *England*. If then Mr. C. minds what he says, and does not equivocate, he must have asserted, one way or other, in his said *Introduction*, that the establishment he is for is such, that those that do not conform to it, should be liable to some penalty either of an ecclesiastical (not to say spiritual) or civil nature. But if by a legal establishment, he means somewhat that neither *is*, nor ever *was*, nor *can* be legal, that is to say, no establishment *at all*, then it appears his answer is trifling; and further I think needless to say, but refer all to the *jury*, the sensible judi-

judicious equitable Part of Mankind. Ay, but here Mr. Ch. wants to explain himself. Let him be heard;

Fourthly, says he, *I have indeed written against persecution. But does this vilify all legal establishments? Are then all legal establishments inseparably attended with persecution? If not, my writing against the latter is no proof that my Intention is to vilify the former.* Pray observe, he does not say all legal establishments are not inseparably attended, &c. but if not, viz. *Dato non concessio*: or 'tis a sort of an *argumentum ad hominem*, that indeed may put to shame, and silence one that is for an establishment, that enacts persecution properly so call'd, and yet dares not avow it. But I answer, persecution and a legal establishment may either be separated, or joined. We know of legal establishments that are inseparably attended with persecution, and those we abhor, whether at Rome or else where. *Tros Rutulus-ve fuat nullo discrimine habeto.* Away with persecution for conscience sake, whoever be the persecutor. So far indeed writing against what is really persecution, is not to write against all legal establishments, because there may be one or more attended only with such penalties on the violators of the law, as has nothing of persecution, I mean what in common acceptation by men of sense is so call'd, and that I think I have already shewed in my letter. But as Mr. C. calls that persecution, which is not persecution, his writing against it, is a proof that he vilifies all legal establishments inseparably attended, with what he brands with that infamous Name.

Fifthly, Mr. C. says, *I have also very freely censur'd all ecclesiastical tyranny, and declar'd against setting up the priests as lords of the heritage, and making them kings in the room of the Son of God, because whenever they have had their desir'd power, their language has been, "up israel to the prey," and their practice to "execute punishment upon the people to bind their*

“kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters  
 “of iron.” Here is declamation with a vengeance,  
 but all stale and trivial! It has been repeated over and  
 over by all the men of his stamp. And indeed as ma-  
 ny times exploded because of its wrong application:  
 So that it is become a confus’d sound, only fit to  
*stun the hearers*, but can make no impression upon  
*the equitable part of mankind*. No, they are never led  
 by *outcries and noise*, as when one without under-  
 standing bawls out *the Church*, another *Priest-craft*,  
 one the *great Diana*, another *Persecution*. But that  
 we may know for once, how to reason about the mat-  
 ter: Pray, Sir, be pleas’d to declare in plain terms  
 what you mean by *ecclesiastical tyranny*. Is it that  
 which was exercis’d by *popish priests* against *prote-  
 stants*, by the *high-church* against the *dissenters*, or  
 by some of the *last-mention’d*, when uppermost, against  
 their *adversaries*? Why should you not *speak out*, that  
 one may be appriz’d of your *meaning*? For if by *ec-  
 clesiastical tyranny*, you mean *true christian disci-  
 pline* (as you confound and mix together spiritual and  
 civil punishments, or such a just authority as Christ  
 has given to his church to keep it self pure, as much  
 as may be in this earthly state) then, Sir, when  
 you censure this, either authority or discipline, you  
 not only censure some *legal establishment*, but you  
 dare to censure the very *gospel establishment itself*;  
 nay, you go over *τὴ ἀμετρία τ’ ἀνθεκτικῆς*, to those very  
 men you do not like for their principles, I mean the  
*enemies of revelation*. Take heed then that you be  
 not transported with a *zeal without knowledge*. You  
 run into one extreme, for very *hatred* of the other.  
*incidit in scyllam cupiens vitare charybdim*. As to the  
 priests that are such as you describe, them I very  
 heartily give over to your wrath. But when Mr. C.  
 saith that *when ever &c. to bind their kings, &c.* I  
 wonder he mentions it here in *those terms*, which  
 have been taken long ago as a sort of proverb a-  
 mongst

mongst us, to be intended against some of his reputed brethren, tho', in my opinion, injuriously and falsely, as to most of them.

Sixthly, Mr. C. says, *I will ever protest whilst I have a pen to write, &c.* and so he may; no body, I reckon, will hinder him. The more paper he wastes, the more some body or other may be thankful to him; The question is, *Quid dignum feret tanto hic promissor biatu?*

Seventhly, But, says he, *what is there in all this to vilify all legal establishments?* Nothing at all, as to those whose clergy is not chargeable with any worldly dominion; for when men that have been call'd to instruct and rule others by a sound doctrine and christian discipline are encourag'd by the state or government, and have some privileges granted them, exclusively of such as do not care to submit to the establishment, I profess I can't see any more in it, than what is done every day and every where, in every family, club, or meeting, where generally you see them that are *useful*, more 'belov'd or employ'd than the *unruly* or *stubborn*, or that *appear* so to be in the eyes of those that have the sway over others, in the said societies: Common sense and universal experience sheweth this. The gospel has nothing against the use of that order, tho' much indeed against the *abuse* of it.

Now if Mr. *Chandler* does really approve of any such legal establishments, as have been mention'd, should he not have told us so in plain terms, instead of placing indiscriminately all those that like them among the *favourers of persecution*? But since he has not, it is, in my opinion, reasonable to conclude, that there never was a legal establishment so happy, as to deserve Mr. *Chandler's* approbation. That of his own framing is to be look'd for among the *clouds*; there it moves, till it happens to burst out in *thunder* and *lightning*; but there are none upon earth, he thinks,  
that

that have miss'd coming into the measures of persecutors, because of the very *law* they are govern'd by, how little soever it may differ from that order, which, in the nature of things, is inseparable from society and church-communion. Therefore since he asserts this in *sense*, if not in words, I dare affirm there is *something* at least, if not a great deal in all this he has written — to vilify all legal establishments.

*Eighthly*, Again says Mr. C. Point out a single passage of my Introduction from whence this can be inferr'd, as you, (Dr. Berriman) would not be esteem'd a false accuser. Very hard upon the Doctor! but I must leave it to him, who is well able to speak in his own justification. As to me, it is really a surprize that Mr. C. should ask a single passage to prove a point, that runs throughout his Introduction, and without which this Introduction has neither body nor soul, and is at most an empty sound in the whole of it, or a confus'd heap of nonsense. But he'll say,

*Ninthly*, If an establishment was made upon my good Lord of London's foundation ——— I know not a single dissenter in England that would be against it. IF, says he — and with such an IF, I myself could easily make Mr. C. to be the best writer that sets pen to paper. IF an establishment was made upon my good Lord of London's foundation: Who speaks this? Arrige aures, Pamphile! the Bishop of London Mr. C—'s good Lord? If so, then pray good Lord deliver us! 'Tis high time this good Lord should interpose so far, at least, as to have it declar'd to the world his name is abus'd; for that in honour and conscience he can't accept of this his ironically humble Servant, S. C.

Of the *thing it self*, I have said enough in my letter, only this I take leave to add here, that I don't believe there is any more truth in what he says further, that *not a single dissenter*, &c. This can't be true, and is not true to my certain knowledge.

What

What follows in the answer, is *work enough cut out for the Doctor*, as Mr. C. boldly expresses it. However, the former appears to me a *learned man*, and well acquainted with that part of ecclesiastical antiquity he treats of, tho', it may be, he has overlook'd some one passage or other in the historians. But this may be said in general, that being employ'd in *apologising* for those he speaks of, he seems to be less blameable for not mentioning some things, that might go *against* him, than Mr. C. who is their *accuser*, in imputing to them some very heinous crimes, they, for ought *appears*, are *not* chargeable with. Yet 'tis what he has done by perverting the true sense of *Eusebius* \*, *Socrates* †, and *Sozomen* ‡, and, if this should be neglected by the Doctor or his acquaintance, I can't say but some time or other, when I happen to be at leisure, I may chance to take Mr. C. to task about it.

\* Page 23. 28. of the Answer.

† Page 19.

‡ Page 8. 9. 25.

F I N I S.

