



SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

Most Faults on One Side :

O R, T H E

Shallow P O L I T I C K S,

Foolish A R G U I N G,

A N D

Villanous D E S I G N S

O F T H E

Author of a Late Pamphlet,

E N T I T U L ' D

Faults on Both Sides,

Consider'd and Expos'd.

In ANSWER to that Pamphlet :

S H E W I N G,

That the many Truths in Modern History, related by the Author of it, do not make Amends for his many Falshoods in *Fact*, and Fallacies in *Reasoning*.

Tam Ficti Praviq; tenax, quam Nuncia Veri. Virg.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *JOHN MORPHEW*, near
Stationers-Hall, 1711.

Ms. A. 9. 1. 1. 7. 1. 2

1871

The following is a list of the
 names of the persons who
 were present at the meeting
 held on the 1st day of
 the month of
 at the residence of
 the Rev. Mr. [Name]
 of the [Church]
 in the town of [Name]
 County of [Name]
 State of [Name]

A N

A N S W E R

T O

Faults on Both Sides.

I Should have have thrown away a few idle Hours upon this Pamphlet much sooner, but that I long waited in expectation of seeing it Answer'd by some of the *Whigs*; and being mannerly, was willing to give *Them* the *Precedence*. I had reason to believe they would take some notice of it; because the Author (tho' professedly of that Party) lays Crimes to their Charge which I did not think they would have own'd, tho' I knew 'em to be true. But to my great Astonishment, they are so far from answering it, that they extol it to the Skies, as an incomparable Piece. Bless us! that ever a Set of Men in this Nation should be so profligate, as to glory and triumph in a Book, which proves them to be the *worst set of Men* that ever was in *any Nation*. In order to carry on a Party-Design, they will freely own themselves to be as Infamous as any Body can make them. Well then; here is the great Difference:

A 2

The

The Pamphlet before me accuses both Us and Them of Crimes and Misdemeanors : We answer it, and They have nothing to say against it ; We disapprove of it, and They applaud it ; Whether We or They are more innocent, let our Auther himself consider.

His Performance is indeed an *extraordinary* one ; it is such a motly, party-colour'd, in-and-out Piece, that even this whimsical Age of Scribbling has not produc'd any thing like it. The Truth is, the *Whigs* are got into a *Net* ; and to wind themselves out of it, they are *wriggling* and *twisting*, and *turning* themselves into *all Shapes* ; and

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo ?

It is really a difficult Matter ; but *Virgil* answers *Horace's* Question :

----- *Quanto ille magis formas se vertit in omnes
Tanto, Nate, magis contende tenacia vincla.*

Hold 'em fast now you have 'em, notwithstanding their *Tricks* and *Doublings* ; unravel their *Fallacies*, pin 'em down to the *Point*, and force 'em to talk to the *Purpose*. Our Author, I warrant you, thinks himself *so Wise* ; and yet every Body sees thro' the *Shallownefs* of his *Politicks*. 'Tis true, he exposes the *Whigs* sufficiently ; but that's only a *Cover* to his main *Design*. Their *Management* has been *notorious* long since ; and he only *owns* what every Body *knew* before. But then the *Use* he would make of this seemingly *frank Acknowledgment*, is to make it believ'd, that he is *Impartial* in his *Account of Things* ;

Things; in order to have his Project more glibly swallow'd. And what is his Project? Truly, that wise one of a *Coalition*. Since the *Whigs* can no longer rule us *alone*, their next Endeavour is to come in for a *Share*; till by degrees they have inch'd *themselves in*, and worm'd *every Body else out*. This is apparently the Aim of our ingenious Letter-writer; who in spite of his *distinguishing* and *explaining*, discovers much of the *Republican*, shews himself a zealous Friend to the *Dissenters*, and a bitter Enemy to the *Church* and *Clergy*.

Now, forsooth, he is very free and *just* in his Censures, without any regard to a *Party*; but take notice, we had nothing of all this from him, when *Others* were in the Saddle; not a word about *Faults on both sides*, when *his own side* was *uppermost*. But just now on a sudden, upon the Alteration of the *Ministry* and *Parliament*, all that are in Court-Places are full of Faults, *The Heads and Leaders on both sides have always impos'd upon the Credulity of their respective Parties; in order to compass their own selfish Designs, at the Expence of the Peace and Tranquility of the Nation*

Title
Page.

This Pamphlet, he says, is written by way of *Answer to the Thoughts of an honest Tory*; meaning, I suppose, by an *elegant Metonymy*, the *Author* of a Book so call'd: For he begins with the Appellation of *SIR*; which I think cannot properly be apply'd to any *Thoughts* whatsoever. The *Thinker of those Thoughts* is himself an *Epistolary Author*; and he, I must own, who could write

such a Letter as *That*, was the fittest Person in the World to *receiv*e such a Letter as *This*.

His Correspondent, whom I am now examining, *begins* a little Unfortunatly. He is extremely concern'd lest the Gentleman to whom he writes, should happen to be on the *same side* with *himself*.

— *Timeo Danaos, says he, & dona ferentes?*

P. 1. YOUR Concessions are so large in OUR Favour, that you give me Cause to suspect you have only assum'd the Name of Tory; but indeed are a crafty Whig at the Bottom. So that He being a Whig is afraid the Other is a Whig: Which is altogether as good as Prince Prettyman's quarrelling with Prince Volcius, for not loving HIS Mistress. For as a Man seldom desires others to love the same Woman that he does; so he is seldom afraid of their loving the same Cause.

P. 2. He sagely observes, That the difference of Mens Opinions, in relation to Religion and Civil Government, are not so great as they are made to believe. Which may be true in relation to some Persons, and not to others; and yet the Difference in Opinions upon the whole may really be very great. He then proceeds to lay down the main Design of his Treatise, containing in Substance (tho' not in his own Words) That there was scarce ever any such Thing as an honest Man in an Office. An Undertaking perfectly new, and worthy of our Author's Modesty!

Ibid. The Original Cause of our destructive Divisions is next enquir'd into; and this, it seems, is primarily

rily the affecting a greater Power than the Constitution admits on the Part of the Crown; and the endeavouring to maintain the ancient Rights and Privileges of the Nation on the part of the People. So that the Crown is very apt to affect a greater Power **THAN THE CONSTITUTION ADMITS;** but not a word of this on the part of the People: They barely endeavour to maintain the ancient Rights and Privileges of the Nation. How highly is the Crown oblig'd to this Impartial Censurer of *Faults on both sides!* Who affirms all the Fault to be on *One side*, and that too in the Crown; which is just as true in Fact, as it is manly and decent in Behaviour.

With the same Equity and Truth, he lays all P. 6, 7. the Blame of the *Civil War* (as he calls it) upon the King; and, with an Impudence peculiar to the Writers of his Party, quotes my *Lord Clarendon's History* to justify that Assertion. When it is plain, from the Account given by that Noble Author; that before ever the War broke out, the King had made far more Satisfaction for the *Faults* committed on *his side*, than the most unreasonable of his Subjects could have expected.

Our Author's nice Distinction between a *Civil War* and a *Rebellion*, would have been spar'd, had he in the least regarded his *Bible*, or (which Perhaps he has a greater respect for) our *Acts of Parliament*. P. 8. After this, he goes on to make a Parallel between the Proceedings in *Forty One*, and the *late Revolution*. Whether he intends a *Complement* upon the *former*, or a *Scandal* upon the *latter*, I leave to others to determine.

Speaking of that Civil War, p. 7. he says, *Our Parliaments have had the Caution, that in the Acts pass'd after the Restoration, they would never give it the Name of a Rebellion.* Now, not to mention other Authorities, I have heard of a *Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to Almighty God for having put an end to The Great Rebellion, &c.* And I have been told that this Day of Thanksgiving was set apart by *Act of Parliament.* His abusing the Clergy for preaching *False Doctrine* about Government, only to *flatter Princes*, and get *Deaneries and Bishopricks*, is nothing but *Common-Place Scandal*; and the *Body of Parsons* may confute it by the same Argument which our Author says, *One Parson made use of to confute the Cardinal; Bellarmine thou Iyest.* The *Doctrine* he speaks of is *true*; and the *Reflection* he casts upon the Preachers, is *false*.

P. 45.

P. 12.

We shall never be well, he says, speaking of the *Constitution* of our Government, till some good *Patriots* shall be so happy as to find out such a *Temperament* as may make the *Crown easie*, and the *People secure*. Very fine! I always thought the *Constitution* of *Great Britain* the happiest in the *World*; but this Gentleman is of another *Opinion*, and roundly declares for an *Alteration*. I suppose he is the Author of another Pamphlet, taken notice of some time since; in which we find these remarkable Words, *I he will but stay till the end of this present Session of Parliament*, (meaning the late Parliament) *he'll find several new Powers annex'd to the Regal Office, and perhaps some made void and repeal'd*

The Divine
Rights of
the British
Nation.

peal'd for the publick Good. Whether he were the Writer of *That* Piece or no; he has said enough in *This*. If such an Author be not encourag'd, when will Merit be rewarded?

After the Restoration, he tells us, the Nation ran into an Excess of Loyalty. Now I think a Man can never be too Loyal; he, it seems, thinks otherwise. But then, *The poor Dissenters!* How tenderly he expresses himself! Poor Innocents! *They,* 'tis to be hop'd, did not run into an Excess of Loyalty; I dare swear there was no danger of *That*. But they were persecuted. ----- They were not tolerated with absolute Impunity, if he pleases, for some part of that Reign. I am sure they never fail'd to persecute the Church with far greater Severities, whenever it lay in their Power. But *the Popish Plot*, he is sure, was turn'd upon the Presbyterians. And yet 'tis manifest from the History of those times, that the *Presbyterian-Plot* was altogether as true and real as the *Popish*; nor is it in the least to be wonder'd at: Those two Factions, notwithstanding their Opposition, agree as lovingly as may be in their *Plotting Genius*, as well as in many other rare Qualities.

What he says about the Duke of York, and King Charles II's Time, is nothing to the Point; the Properties of *Whig* and *Tory* being quite alter'd since those Days: The Question is, how have Matters stood of late? In *This*, and the last Reign? Let any Body observe, whether even this Author has taken notice of one quarter of those Faults on the *Tory*-side, which he
has

has mention'd on the part of the *Whigs*? The former very likely, may have been guilty of *some*, as well as the *latter*; and there are undoubtedly bad Men of all Parties. But what is this to the Purpose? Is there an *Equality* in the Cases, or any thing like it? If there be not; whoever talks of *Faults on both sides*, either tells us a most notorious *Falshood*, or a very *Idle and impertinent Truth*.

When King James succeeded to the Crown, the *Tories* (if you'll believe our Author) deafen'd him with the Noise of their *Addresses*, stuffed with Expressions of the most extravagant Loyalty, and unlimited *Passive Obedience*. If they did, they acted imprudently, I think; there not being then the same Occasion for such Professions, as there has been of late. But this was at the beginning of his Reign. How went *Addresses*, when that Prince was actually overturning the Constitution? Why, the *Dissenters* were assuring him they would stand him by with their Lives and Fortunes; and wishing for *Windows into their Breasts*, that His Majesty might see the Sincerity of their Intentions. While the Members of the Church of England, both Clergy and Laity, were turn'd out of their Places, imprison'd, and so forth, for refusing to obey his unlawful Commands, and for bravely withstanding *Popery* and *Arbitrary Power*, which were breaking in like a Deluge upon us.

Had I been to have advis'd this Advocate for the *Dissenters*; he should, for their sakes, have pass'd over the State of Affairs, when *Liberty of Conscience*

Faults on Both Sides.

Conscience was granted by King James. Because it only reminds us, that when *Church-men* were turn'd out of Places, *Papists* and *Dissenters* were put in.

As to what he says p. 15. &c. that the Revolution was brought about chiefly by the *Tories*; his calling that Confederacy a *Plot*, by way of Complement, I suppose, upon the Revolution; and his Snear upon *their not resisting, or compelling, but only with Prayer and Tears, &c.* For a full Answer to this, and all other Objections of the like Nature, I refer the Reader to several Treatises, some of which already are, and others, to my Knowledge, shortly will be published; in which the Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, and the late Revolution, are vindicated from the Scandal which the *Whigs* and *Nonjurors* endeavour to fasten upon *Both*.

His Historical Account from p. 17. to p. 46. is most of it true; let the *Whigs* take it among them, and much good may it do them. Particularly, what he tells us about their pillaging the Nation, and raising vast private Estates by cheating the Publick; their wrong Measures in not carrying on the War by Sea, and yet beggaring, and almost ruining the Navy; their shameful Management of the Treasury, and Parliamentary Funds; their continual Briberies, and all manner of Corruptions; their intended standing Army; the Tricks and Artifices both of the *Junt*, and of the late *M---ry*; their ungrateful and unjust Usage of the Earl of *Peterborough*; their scandalous neglect of the War in *Spain*; or rather,

rather, their indefatigable *Care* and *Industry* to *perpetuate* it; the *Buliness* of the 28. or (as some say) 29000 Men, that *should have been there*; their *base* Design upon Mrs. M-----m, and their *villanous* one upon Mr. H-----y; the *Insolence* of a certain great Man about the *Disposal* of a Regiment; and their Design to make him G-----l for Life; their senseless and seditious *Clamours* against changing the *Ministry*, and dissolving the *Parliament*; their procuring the *Bank* and the *Dutch* to interpose with *Her Majesty* to prevent it; and lastly their traiterous and unheard of Attempts to hinder the *Supplies* of *Money*. and break the *Credit* of the *Nation*. In all these Things, I must own our Author is a very faithful *Historian*; and where does even *this Whig* lay one fifth part of these Crimes and *Misdemeanors* to the Charge of the *Tories*? But to make some amends for these unnecessary and imprudent Truths, there are various *Falshoods*, and other odd Things interspers'd thro' those very Pages. One may indeed apply to this Piece, with some Alteration, that Couplet in *Absalom* and *Achitophel*, about the *Popish-plot*:

*Some parts were true; but mixt and brew'd
with Lies,*

To puzzle all the Fools, and please the Wise.

To please them, I mean, so as to make them *laugh at it*; and despise the little *Contrivances* of this small *Politician*.

Speaking of the *Corruptions* of the *Whigs*, he tells us, pag 24 *That they were in their Actions
re.all*

really turn'd Tories, tho' they still affected to be accounted as good Whigs as ever. And p 25, acknowledging that the Tories did some good Things, he says, *Thus the Tories themselves became Whigs in Practice; may they never repent the Change.* So that it is taken for granted without any more ado, that the Whigs (as such) are in the Right; and that the Tories (as such) are in the Wrong; whereas I thought *That* had been the very Point in Controversy. Had this Author ever been at either of those Universities which his Party is so apt to vilify and despise; or had He made any Use of his Time there; he would have known, that this Blunder in Reasoning is call'd *Petitio Principii*, Anglice, *begging the Question*; and that it is an infallible Argument of Ignorance, and want of Sense in the Person that commits it.

Among the Faults of the Whigs in King William's Time, he reckons *their neglecting many deserving Men of their own Party (and even the extraordinary Mr. Johnson) that had been Sufferers in the late Reigns; and their never offering to take off the Sacramental Test, when 'twas in their Power.* To do the Whigs Justice, I think our Author wrongs 'em: He blames 'em for not being *wicked enough*; This indeed shews the Superiority of *his own* exalted Genius; but 'tis a Crime of which the Whigs are entirely *Innocent.* 'Twas not in their Power to take off the *Sacramental Test*; they would have done it, if they could; the King would not have consented to it; the Nation would have

have been in Confusion ; and tho' they had a Majority on their side, they did not dare to attempt it. As for the other Fault which he lays to their Charge ; the Reader is to understand (if he does not know it already) that this Mr. *Johnson*, for whose not being prefer'd, our Author is so much concern'd, was indeed (as he styles him) an *extraordinary* Person. He was one that had been whip'd from *Newgate* to *Aldgate*, for writing Sedition and Rebellion in King *James's* Reign. And *many Others*, it seems, were neglected as well as he. 'Tis true, I think *Titus Oates* was never prefer'd, tho' he was both Whip'd and Pillory'd for Perjury ; so that he likewise had been a *Sufferer*, and was certainly a *very deserving Man of their own Party*. If the *Other*, who was barely whip'd, should have been made a *Dean* ; this Man, who was both whip'd and pillory'd, surely ought to have been a *Bishop*. But here also the *Whigs* were guiltless. Can it be suppos'd that King *William*, or any other Prince upon Earth, would ever have promoted either of those *Worthies*, who were branded for Sedition, or Perjury ? He would never have done it upon any Consideration whatsoever ; no, not upon An Address from the House of Commons. There was a Talk indeed about a *Pension* bestow'd upon one of 'em ; but that's *Secret History*.

In the next Page, he is pleas'd to be so free with an *Honourable Gentleman* now in a *very high Post*, as to call him a *stanchold Whig*. What Authority he has to say so, I know not ; if he has

has none, Will that Great Man thank him for this Familiarity? especially when he presumes to print his Name at full length. I should think myself very impudent, should I dare to do so; and shall take care not to commit the Fault I am reprehending, *Pag. 33*. He is at it again: *Nor is it less worthy the Notice of the Whigs* (says he) *that this very Gentleman, if his Conduct should be impartially consider'd, it will be found that his Actions have shown him much more a true Whig, than his Adversaries.* Whether He be a true Whig or no, I am sure *this Sentence is not true Grammar*; but let that pass. Our Author is indeed very lavish in the Praises of that honourable Person; But for what? only for being a *Whig*; whereas I should think it Sauciness to call so Great a Man by either of the *Cant-Names* now in Fashion. Nor can I imagine that He, who upon so many Accounts deserves all *real Praise*, can ever think it an Honour to him to be so *unkindly and falsely* flatter'd; or that he can be prevail'd upon by any Consideration, much less by so *abusive* a Panegyrick, to link himself in Interest with a Faction of Men, who have not only always bespatter'd his *Reputation*, but have once had a fair Stroak at his Life.

But by what has that Gentleman shewn himself a *Whig*? Or what great Things has he perform'd in his *Whig-Capacity*? I don't find that this Author himself mentions any thing, except his Voting against the *Tack*; if that proves *Him* to be a *Whig*, I doubt it proves *too much*: And shews *many other* Gentlemen to be of that Party; whom

whom yet, I believe, this Writer wo'nt be willing to receive into his List of *Whigs*.

With the same wise Artifice he endeavours to wheedle a *certain Lady* of the Court, whom he calls a *modest, discreet, inoffensive, & virtuous Gentlewoman*. The *Whigs* (says he, p. 34.) are *perswaded to believe her to be the worst of Tories; tho' at the same time she is Marry'd to the Son of one of the best Whigs in the Nation*. So that our Author lays his Hand upon Her Head, stroaks her, tells her she's a *good Whig*, and gives her his Benediction. But both this Lady, and the Gentleman above-mention'd, are too *Wise* to be *complemented into Whigism*, especially when the Complement is so very bad a one, as only to tell them they are *Whigs already*. *Almost thou perswadest me to be a Whig*, is just the Reverse of, *Almost thou perswadest me to be a Christian*.

At the bottom of p. 25, he takes occasion to abuse King *William*. *The King himself* (says she) *had been too much inclin'd to make his Advantage of Party; tho' I believe without ever having had any Design to invade our Liberty*. He believes so, but is not at all *sure* of it; whereas I thought that *Glorious Asserter, Defender, and Rescuer* of our *Liberties*, was never *in the least suspected* of any Design to *invade* them. But our Author, it seems is of another Mind: I doubt he will not do so much in Honour of King *William*, as to admit him into the Number of his *good Whigs*.

What is most remarkable in this finder of *Faults on both sides*, is, his extraordinary Zeal
for

for one of the most abominable Faults, that can well be committed, *Occasional Conformity*. And so (says he, p. 27.) *this Noisie, Mischief-making Party-driving, Good-for-nothing-Bill, came to be utterly lost*; meaning the Bill to prevent that detestable *Hypocrisy* and *Prophanation of the Sacrament*. Now I assure him, I shall not argue with him upon this Point: The Man that appears in *such a Cause*, is fit to *dispute* with no Body: All the Use I make of it, is to desire the Reader to take notice, that he who *pleads for the Whigs, abuses the Church and Clergy*, and endeavours at a *Coalition in the Ministry*, does at the same time declare for *Occasional Conformity*; a Practice so scandalous, that few of the Dissenters themselves have Impudence enough to defend it. I never knew but *one Man* that justify'd it, and He was a B-----

Vide The
B— of
S—'s
Speech a-
bout Oc-
casional
Confor-
mity.

Tho' our Author is very complaisant to some certain Persons; I must entirely acquit him of *Flattery* to the *Queen*. He says, p. 31. that *An Answer to the Address* (meaning That about the *Spanish Affairs*) *was trim'd up in the Queen's Name to palliate, &c.* Her Majesty, we see, is very insignificant in his Opinion; but he rises in his Complement, p. 35. *The good Queen (may I say) submitted and yielded the Point to him.* Whether that *loftning Parenthesis (may I say)* relates to the Word *Good* which goes before it, or to the Word *Submitted*, which follows it, is left in doubt. According to the Rules of *true Construction*, it should belong to the *former*; but our Author knowing very lit-

tle of that matter, I can't say he had any such wicked Design. Take it therefore in the other Sense if you please; and then his saying, *The Queen submitted, and yielded the Point* to one of Her Subjects, is most impudent and undutiful; notwithstanding the *mollifying Expresssion* which prepares the way to it. Then every Body knows that the Word *Good* very often carries in it much more of *Contempt* than of *Reverence* or *Affection*. Whether it does not visibly do so in this very place; I leave to the determination of any good *Englishman*, that can construe *bad English*.

But the greatest Proof of this Respect for Her Majesty, is his pretending to *know Her Mind so perfectly well*, and to be so intimately acquainted with Her Royal Resolutions. Of this I shall produce two remarkable Instances, which, upon another Account likewise, I take to be the most illustrious Passages in this famous Work; because they discover the *very Soul* of this Author, the whole Drift and Design of his Book, which is plainly to bring about that *Coalition* which the *Whigs* are driving at. The first is in p. 36. *Nor is there The least Reason to Doubt but that all those of the Whig-Party, who shall abandon the ill Designs of the Junto, and heartily concur (according to their own Principle) in the promotion of the Publick Good, will be as freely admitted into Employments, and as well regarded as ever; nothing being more desir'd than a Coalition of the honestest Men of both sides, to ballance the over-*
grown

grown Power of the Ministers. Here indeed he speaks out ; But is there not *the least Reason to doubt* of all this ? *He, I confess,* has declar'd for a *Coalition* ; But when did *the Queen* declare so ? Then if we consider the *Reasonableness, Expediency,* or even *Possibility* of such a Project ; *Where shall we find these honestest Men of both Sides ?* And if they were all *freely admitted into Employments,* how would they *ballance the over-grown Power of the Ministers ?* They would then be *Ministers themselves ;* Would they not ? And so it seems, the *Ministers* must *ballance the over-grown Power of the Ministers.* This is certainly the *oddest Ballance* that ever was heard of : If the same Scale weighs against it self, Pray which Side will preponderate ? It cannot be said, that such Ministers would be mutual Checks upon each other ; for they are suppos'd to be all *honest Men,* to have thrown off *Party-Distinctions,* and to unite in one *common Design* of promoting the *Welfare and Prosperity of the Nation.* But suppose there be *no honest Men* on one of these Sides ; what shall we do then ? And yet That happens to be really the Case. They may be honest, very likely, *in some things ;* they may be just in *Buying and Selling ;* nay, for ought I know, they may be so consciencious as not to *Cheat at Cards ;* but with relation to the *Government,* or our *Constitution in Church and State,* they are *upon Principle dishonest,* and not fit to be trusted in the Administration of either.

Our Author indeed, thinks fit to affirm, that *The Principle of the Whigs is to concur in the promotion of the Publick Good*; but I dare say, three Parts in four of the Kingdom are sufficiently convinc'd of the contrary; and two Thirds even of his own Book, are a Confutation of that Maxim. Why therefore should such Men be joyn'd with those of opposite Principles in the Administration of Affairs: Common Reason tells us, that a *Coalition of Contrarieties* can tend to nothing but *Corruption*; and Common Experience assures us of the same Truth in the very Instance we are now speaking of. Her Majesty, no doubt, very well remembers, that such a Coalition had *well nigh ruin'd Her Royal Uncle*; and actually *did ruin Her Royal Grandfather*.

Our Author pursues his Argument with the same Confidence, and certain Knowledge of Her Majesty's Mind, p 43. *In the mean time* (says he) I dare assure them [the Dissenters] *that they have none of these things to fear, and that Her Majesty is as firmly resolv'd against all Extreams as they can wish; that She will bear equal Regard to Men that behave themselves well of either Side, and desires that the Names of Parties and Factions may be buried in Oblivion; and that we may have no other Mark of Distinction among us, than that of Knaves from honest Men; that they will find such of the Tories (as People still call them) as shall be admitted into the Ministry, will come into moderate Measures, and when any of them act otherwise, they will be*
laid

laid by; and that The Queen has Declar'd, as a Principle; She will always stand by, that She will never suffer her self to be prevail'd upon to make the Dissenters uneasy by an Occasional Conformity-Bill, or any thing like it; and that She will inviolably maintain the Toleration they now enjoy.

For a thorough-pac'd Writer, and one that will stick at nothing, let me recommend our Author to all my Country-men. What *Great Man* is he? One of the *Cabinet* to be sure; otherwise, How comes he to be so intimately acquainted with what Her Majesty *designs*, and what she has *declar'd*? Because I have not yet heard that She has publish'd a *Proclamation* declaring her Resolution never to allow of an *Occasional Bill*. For a little Scribbler of a Party to pretend to be partaker of *Royal Secrets*; is such Impudence, as *Whigism* it self can hardly parallel. But to consider a little more distinctly: Never were Truth and Falshood more blended and confounded, than they are in this precious Paragraph. Her Majesty is certainly *resolv'd against all Extremes*; but *All* are not *Extremes* which *some People* call so. She will undoubtedly bear equal regard to Men that behave themselves well of either Side: Yes; but the Mischief is, People of *one Side*, if they act according to their own Principles, cannot behave themselves well. She desires that *Names of Parties and Factions* may be buried in *Oblivion*: No doubt of it: but I suppose too, She will take proper Measures to have it done effectually:

And I believe it is not to be done by *crying down* the Words *Whig* and *Tory* in all the Market-Towns of *Great-Britain*, and at the same time encouraging Persons of opposite Principles, and being equally kind to Her Enemies and Her Friends, by kneading Inconsistencies, and endeavouring to reconcile Contradictions; which is the way to keep up Factions eternally, and perpetuate Quarrels and Confusions. The only way to put an end to Parties, is to promote None but Persons of *true Principles*; for then Those who are otherwise will soon cease to be a *Party*; or at least will be a very *insignificant* One, and not considerable enough to cause any Disturbance. To think of winning them over by Favours and Preferments, is a Project that always has been found ineffectual, and ever will be; 'tis not in their Nature to be conquer'd with Kindness; Power makes them Insolent, and Obligations only gives them an opportunity of shewing their Ingratitude: Nothing will content them but reigning alone, jussling out Those by whom themselves were brought in, and insulting and domineering even over Him or Her from whom their Authority is deriv'd. The only safe Method is to keep them at a distance, and put it out of their Power to do Mischief. 'Tis certainly better for Me to keep a *Fever* out of my Veins, than civilly to admit it, and then complement it with *Coolers*; which are of no use but only to enflame it, and render it more *out-ragious*.

I agree

I agree with our Author, that Her Majesty unquestionably desires to have *no Distinction among us, but that of Knaves and Honest Men*; but then I believe, She means not only such as are just or unjust in *Dealing*, and so forth; but by those Expressions She moreover understands *True and False Subjects*, and *True and False Church-men*. I lay no more Strels upon the Words *Whig* and *Tory*, than He does; but I lay a great deal upon the *Principles*, which are *really* as distinct and opposite, as *East* and *West*. To speak clearly therefore, Men are known by their *Actions*; and we hope and believe Her Majesty will never encourage Those (whether you call them *Whigs* or *Tories*, I care not) who have deny'd Her Title, condemn'd the Doctrines of the Scriptures, been more zealous for the Toleration than for the Constitution, have pillag'd the Publick to enrich Themselves, and invaded both the Prerogative of the Crown, and the Liberties of the Subject. I say, we believe it may be depended upon, that She will not promote those who have either *voted* for these Enormities, and *acted* in them; or *adhere to*, and *espouse the Interest* of Those that *did*. These Things are plain and visible; and 'tis a Jest to say that all the Difference lies in *Party Names*: Those Words no doubt, are us'd in a very loose Signification, and are often apply'd to Persons that don't deserve them: But still there is a real and visible distinction in Mens Principles and Practices, *whatever Names* are put upon

them; or whether they have *any Names* put upon them, or no.

Were there nothing else to be said against such a Coalition; Princes are always oblig'd in Honour to encourage and reward their truest Friends and most faithful Subjects. And there are always more than enough of Them, who have Abilities sufficient to fill all Places of Trust; and consequently there can be no *room left for others*.

But now comes the unconquerable Objection of all; insisted on by others, tho' not mention'd by our Author; That *a Prince must not reign only over a Party of his Subjects*. Reign over them? Are they not his Subjects, unless they are *Treasurers, Comptrollers, Stewards, and Secretaries of State* (He reigns over them, I think, while he gives them the common Benefits of Government, regulates them by Laws, secures them in their Liberties and Estates, and protects them from foreign Enemies: Nay he reigns over them while he *discountenances* them, and even *punishes* them. For is *prefering* and *advancing*, the only Act of Sovereignty? Are not Princes appointed for a *Terror to evil doers*. as well as for the *Praise of them that do well*? Does not God reign over Sinners, as well as good Men? Over Devils, as well as Angels? But in short, the Principle of our *Latitudinarians* is, that all ought to be equally encourag'd and rewarded; and that no Distinction is to be made between the *best* Subjects, and the *worst*.

As to what they talk about a Prince's reigning *in the hearts of all his Subjects*; there never yet was such a Prince in this World, and 'tis impossible there ever should be. As long as there are wicked Men in being, the most unexceptionable of Governours will never be lov'd by *all* whom he governs; and the only way for him to be lov'd by the *greatest part* is, to encourage the *best*; because then his Administration will be just and prosperous, and consequently the generality of his People will be easy and happy under the Influence of his Government.

This is plainly the true State of the Matter; This is *Sense and Reason*: Whereas the Scheme of the *Whigs* is nothing but *Fallacy and Amusement*, made up of *general Phrases*, with a *no distinct Signification*; and if it be *unravell'd*, and drawn out *Thread by Thread*, it appears to be perfect *Nonsense*. Whatever they talk about, they *entrench* themselves in the Words *Unity, Peace, Forbearance*, and the like; and then they think they are safe: Because by Vertue of those Sounds they can *throw Dust into Peoples Eyes*, and darken their Understandings. The Truth is, the great Fundamental Principle of the *Whigs*, is *Confusion*; not only in *Government* both of Church and State, but also in *Reasoning and Thinking*; They hate all *Order, Clearness, and Regularity*; they are for *buddling and jumbling* Ideas and Things as much as possible, and for destroying all *Distinction* even that of *Good and Evil, of Truth and Falshood*. In short, they are for *Coalition*

tion, *Latitudinarianism* and *Comprehension* in all things.

Such of the Tories (says our Author) *as shall be admitted into the Ministry, will come into moderate Measures; and when any of 'em act otherwise, they will be laid by.* Indeed! *moderate Measures!* That *Word*, it seems, is come to Town again. The *Whigs* first started it in 1703; and when it had done their Business, they discarded it, like *Ingrates*: Which was towards the latter end of the Year 1705. Not a *Word* about *Moderation*, when they had gain'd their Point, and were got uppermost. Now it comes into play again, for Reasons very easy to be discern'd. But that *Sham* won't take any more; indeed it won't: To be gull'd twice by the same *Word* is too much in Conscience; we have been bubbled by it *once*, and *that's fair*.

Will not the *Tories* then pursue *moderate Measures*? Yes, that they will; and 'twas always their Principle to do so. But what sort of *Moderation* is *Theirs*? In the first place, 'tis not *Whigish* or *Fanatical Moderation*; that is to say, it does not consist in *tearing* and *rending*; nor in the most outrageous *Malice* and *Injustice*. Then 'tis not such a *Moderation* as the *Whigs* would have us exercise; consisting in *Carelessness* and *Indifferency*, in giving Power to our *Enemies*, in *Coalition*, and *Comprehension*. But they will shew a *Moderation truly Christian*, and agreeable to the Principles both of the *Church* and *State* of *England*: They will immoveably stand by and defend our *Constitution* both *Ecclesiastical* and

Civil

Civil. which is entirely founded upon Principles of *Moderation*; and will discountenance All that are disaffected to either; They will join Dispassionateness, and Coolness of Temper, to Honesty, Wisdom, and Courage: They will carefully avoid all extremes, by being steadfastly Loyal to their Sovereign, zealous for the Liberties of their Country; and Religiously just to all Men. This, and This only is *Moderation*, truly so call'd; All, besides it, is *Cant* and *Delusion*.

That Her Majesty will inviolably maintain the *Toleration* (if by that Word our Author means The Indulgence by Law allow'd to Scrupulous Consciences) no body doubts; and we are all very willing the *Dissenters* should enjoy it, tho' by their Behaviour they don't deserve it. But for such a Writer as This, to affirm positively, publickly, and in Print, That Her Majesty has Declar'd She will never consent to an *Occasional Conformity Bill*, or any thing like it, to put a stop to the most scandalous and impious Abuses of a legal Indulgence that ever any profane harden'd Hypocrites were guilty of; nay to prevent many notorious Offences against the *Act of Exemption*: I say to affirm, that the Queen has declar'd This, is such Insolence as is undoubtedly criminal in the Eye of the Law, and ought to be punish'd, rather than answer'd.

Vide the
Queen's
Speech.

I never saw, nor heard of this Pamphlet, till a considerable time after the Dissolution of the late Parliament; and yet, it seems, it was written before it, if not publish'd; because our Author

thor speaks of that Dissolution, p. 46. as a Thing not yet done ; and tho' he was pleas'd freely to submit to the Wisdom of his Superiours (which was very kind) yet he knew also, that a great many good Men, equally zealous for their Queen and Country, would have been extremely gratify'd, if it could have been forborn. Oh! no doubt of it; a great many would have been extremely gratify'd; and Those who would have been so, were, I confess, Equally zealous for their Queen and Country; that is to say, they were full as zealous for one as for t'other. The Queen and Country would have been in a blessed Condition, if that good Parliament had sat once more; because from what They did do We may fairly collect what They would have done: And Those good Men who would have been so extremely gratify'd, are now, I am afraid, as extremely mortify'd. But he that as it will; This Gentleman did his best : And I must own that such an Author was very fit to be Advocate for such a Parliament.

P. 46.

The Number of the Whigs, He says, is made up for the most part of Men of Thought and Industry. I must acknowledge indeed, that they are very Thoughtful in contriving Mischief, and very Industrious in executing it. But there is another Set of Beings in the World, which is as famous for both these Qualifications as the Whigs : Out of These I question not but it is possible to select Five, who in Thought and Industry may be not inferior to the Junco,

But

But They understand their Principle; so do *ibid.*
 their Allies just now mention'd;---and are care-
 ful to preserve Liberty and Property---Yes; wit-
 ness the Impeachment of Dr. S----- But however,
 They are generally honest, well-meaning People, and *ibid.*
 intend the Publick Good. How true this is, may
 be inter'd from what I have said, and from the
 History of them, which has been given us by
 our Author himself

Having thus adjusted the Character of the
 Whigs, He proceeds to that of the Tories; the
 Generality of whom He takes to consist *ibid.*
 of a looser and less thoughtful sort of People. If
 He means looseness in Morals, or Principles,
 I utterly deny it; because for all manner of
 Lewdness and Debauchery in Practice (as well
 as Infidelity in Profession) there never was
 such a Crew of Profligates under the Sun, as
 the present Set of Whigs. But if he means Re-
 miseness and want of Diligence in promoting
 our Interest; I acknowledge We have not been
 half so industrious in a good Cause, as They
 have been in a bad One. That has really been
 our Fault; and

-----*Fas est & ab Hoste doceri;*

I hope we shall mend it for the future; and I
 thank our Author for this courteous Admoni-
 tion.

But he goes on; They (the Tories) look no fur-
 ther than the Out-side of Things, and take up with
 Notions they don't understand, condemning the very *ibid.*
 same things in Others which they have practis'd
 Themselves.

Themselves. All this is soon said; He says it is so, and I say it is not so; and then we are even: Which is all the Answer I shall give to this Objection.

But now make way there, stand clear; our Author is going to lay about him like a Madman: If He

Lord Ros-
common's
Essay.

(Like Virgil) seems to to trifle in a Line,
'Tis like a Warning-piece that gives the Sign;
To wake your Fancy, and prepare your Sight,
To reach the noble Height of some unusual Flight.

P. 47.

He bellows like a Fury; and Out-raves, and Out-scolds the *Review* or *Observer*. Immediately after the Words last quoted, he rises in his Stile thus; *They are mightily influenced by the High-flying Clergy, and Dance after their Pipe; and we see what a madness they are run into for the silencing an Incendiary. What a Noise do they make with their Nonsensical Addresses, and furious insolent Sermons? Ah! That Incendiary---* There it cuts---He'll never be forgiven. After all, this *Incendiary*, as it happens, has contributed more to the quieting and cooling of the Nation, than any Man in it; and I believe the Kingdom has not at any time in our Memory been more unanimous than it is now, by his opening People's Eyes, and giving them a right Notion of Persons and Principles; which is the *only way* to unite us one among another. So that if He be an *Incendiary*, He is one of Those who *quench with Fire*, instead of *burning*:

-----Com-

—— ——— *Compefcuit ignibus ignes,*

Ought to be his *Motto* ; and to be put on the other fide of that *ungracious Snuff-Box*, which has already given fo much Offence to the *Godly*.

Thofe *Addreffes*, likewise, will never be pardon'd by the *Faction* ; becaufe they greatly contributed to break the Neck of the *Whig-Interest*. But were they *Nonsenfical* Ones? For my part, I always took *Her Majesty* to be a Judge of *good Senfe* ; and ſhe receiv'd them with the higheft Approbation. But this is another of our Author's Complements upon the Queen ; and 'tis no wonder that thofe Men ſhould have no reſpect for *Her Judgment*, who have long ſince given us uncontestable Affurance that they have none for *Her Authority*.

The *furious insolent Sermons* come next to be confider'd : And here again the *Whigs* are ſtruck to the Heart. The Clergy (to their immortal Honour) behav'd themſelves, during the Tryal of *Dr. Sacheverell*, with the Courage and Conſtancy of Primitive Chriſtians: They preach'd the decry'd Doctrines ten times more than ever ; and, even when they expected nothing but to be undone, they deſpis'd the ridiculous Malice of their Perſecutors. This Behaviour of Theirs compleated the Ruin of the *Whig-Faction* ; but by what Figure our Author calls their Sermons *furious* and *insolent*, I know not ; unleſs it be for this Reason, becauſe they confounded the *Fury* and *Infelence* of their *Enemies*.

The

The truth on't is, the Clergy of the Church of *England* (who for Learning, Parts, and all sorts of fine Thinking and Writing, are the most considerable Body of Men this day in the World) are not to be crush'd by such an illiterate, Atheistical Party, as the *Whigs*; even when that Party is uppermost. And be it known to those Men; among whom a Rake passes for a Wit, a Farce-Writer for a Poet, an Oath for a Jest, and Blasphemy for an Argument; that if ever they think fit (should it please God, for our Sins, ever to suffer them to have a Majority again) I say, if ever they dare to fall upon a Clergy-man of the Church of *England*, especially such a one as Dr. *Sacheverell*, if such another can be met with; they will find to their Confusion, that they had much better have let him alone, and that They have only caught a Tartar with a Vengeance.

P. 47.

I am surpriz'd at our Author's Condescension in owning that the Queen has an *Hereditary Title*; tho' (to ballance that Goodness) he prefers Her Parliamentary Title before it. But, then he utterly denies that the House of *Hannover* has any Hereditary Right: That Family, (he says) can pretend to no Claim but by Act of Parliament. Now I declare, I am of another Opinion; and think that the Act of Settlement having excluded all Popish Successors, the House of *Hannover*, being next, succeeds in course by an *Hereditary Right*.

Ibid.

Speaking upon that Subject, He goes on thus: *If their own ignorant Partizans don't see,*

we know what the Contrivers intend by it : For *ibid.*
One of their own Writers has told us plainly,
that " Hereditary Right, and the natural Al-
legiance due to it, is a stubborn Thing. and
" will not bend even to an Act of Parliament,
" nor to a thousand Usurpations." This is
plain enough without a Comment. I am sure,
it is plain enough, that this Passage wants a
Comment : The Book here quoted was written,
as all the World knows, by a professed Jaco-
bite : And I appeal to any Man that is a Chri-
stian, Whether it be not Villany in our Author,
to call Him one of our Writers ? But a little
farther He is more copious upon the same Sub-
ject. For my own part, I am suspicious that the
NON-JURORS AND THE HIGH CHURCH *ibid.*
CLERGY (observe how They are coupled) *who*
think their Ecclesiastical Domination too much
clip'd by our present Constitution, are at the bot-
tom of all these Out-cries ; that, if possible, they
might stir up their giddy Devotees to bring in
the Pretender, with whom they may imagine
that they might make their own Terms. Such
false and malicious Suggestions as those above-men-
tioned, do indeed shew the true Spirit of Torisim:
These last Words, I am sure, may very well be
turn'd upon the Writer of 'em : Such false and
malicious Suggestions as His, do abundantly shew
the true Spirit of Whigism ; which is everlast-
ing Impudence, Lying, and Slander. In the
midst of these Clamours about Jacobitism for
twenty Years together, has there been one
Man of the Tories prov'd by any Action to be

in that Interest? And as for their Doctrines, and Professions, They declare that Her Majesty has an *Hereditary Right*, asserted and maintain'd by an *Act of Parliament*; that the Pretender *has no manner of Title*, and that 'tis damnable to resist the *present Government*. And is this the way to bring in the Pretender? No? if ever he comes here (which God forbid) the *Whigs* and *Fanaticks* will bring him: If there be any *Jacobitism* besides that of the *Nonjurors*, 'tis in *them*: They assert that the Pretender has *Legitimacy* and *Hereditary Right*, and that the present Government may be resisted upon some certain Occasions. Let any Body put those two Propositions together, and consider what is like to be the Product.

It cannot be urg'd by the *Whigs*, That We imitate Them in their groundless Calumnies, when we charge them with Republican and Rebellious Principles and Practices, and with Disaffection to the Church and Clergy: Because We produce our Evidence, and prove what We assert. Can They be Friends to the Church, who would not grant the same Security to the Universities of *Oxford* and *Cambridge*, as to those of *North-Brittain*? Who are for *branding* it's Doctrines, *altering* it's Discipline, and *denying* both it's divine and human *Authority*? Who, if they speak one Word for the Church, speak Ten for the Toleration; and are for justifying the *Dissenters* in the most scandalous Hypocrisie, only that they may entrust them with Power and Places? Are these true Friends

to the Church? Just as much as Those are to the State, who make it their Business to propagate the Principles of Resistance to Governours, and deny the Queen's Hereditary Title; all which, and much more, has very lately been done. So that our Author had no reason to ask those long Questions; *Why do they make such an Outcry against Rebellion, and Rebellious Principles, when (except the notorious Jacobites who herd with them, and what has lately appear'd on their own Side) the whole Nation is full of Duty, Loyalty, and hearty Affection to Her Majesty? To what end do they cry out against Republicans, when at this Day there is not The least Appearance of any Party that affects any Charge of the Establish'd Government? No? Not the least Appearance? Does not This very Pamphleteer gives us a New Name for our Form of Government, and think it would be fitter to call it a Regal Commonwealth? By the way, if He must have his beloved Substantive, methinks He might at least have allow'd Us the Adjective we take delight in, and have call'd it a Monarchical Commonwealth. That would have done rarely, But Regal being a shorter Word, is more easily struck off; and then Common-wealth, being a Substantive, is able to Stand by it self. To be serious; 'tis the Height of Presumption in our Finder of Faults, to pretend to introduce a New Name for the Constitution of the Government to which He is a Subject; his Affection to which He testifies in another Place, by say-*

ibid.

P. 51

P. 47.

ing that Those of the *Tories* whom He is pleas'd to acknowledge to be honest Men, have **A MORE THAN NEEDFUL** Concern for the Monarchy and Establish'd Church. His undutiful Expressions of Her Majesty, His Prejudice in favour of the Rebels against Her Royal Grandfather, and His plainly declaring for an Alteration in the Government, I have already taken notice of.

So that were there nothing but what is to be found in this Author, there would be *some Appearance*, at least, of a Party that affects such a Change. But besides this; Has not every Branch of Her Majesty's Royal Prerogative been lately struck at? Has not Her Right of making Peace and War been set aside by *Votes* and *Resolutions* about those *Matters*? Has not Her Power of appointing and displacing Her own Ministers, been attack'd? Have not the Directors of the *Bank* pretended to be *Her Directors*? And has not a *Foreign State* been prevail'd upon by some Body or other, to put the same Indignity upon Her? Has she not been *cur'd*, *rail'd at*, and almost *cur'd* by the *Whigs* and *Fanaticks*, for discarding the late Ministry, and dissolving the late Parliament? Have we not receiv'd various *Accounts*, from several Parts of the Kingdom, of Villains committed to *Goal* for speaking *Treason* upon that Occasion? And is it not well known that little Villains are apt to blab-out what They hear spoken by Great Ones? Lastly, To crown all, Has not the whole Strength and Power of the
Party

Party been exerted to stop the Supplies of Money for carrying on the War, and to ruin the Credit of the Nation? All these Things are publick and notorious to the World: And yet there is not *the least Appearance* of Disaffection to Her Majesty's Government; nor of *Rebellion*, or *Rebellious Principles*.

This Impudence of the *present Whigs*, is exactly like that of their Predecessors in 42, as it is related in my Lord *Clarendon's* History. The King had in his Declarations to the Two Houses, complain'd of the *Tumults* which render'd it unsafe for Him to continue any longer at *Whitehall*. To this those infamous Rebels having long declin'd to give any Answer; very fairly declar'd at last, that, truly, *They did not know of any Tumults there had been*. The King's Reply to it is so remarkable; that I dare say, I shall divert the Reader by transcribing the whole Passage, which runs thus.

“ His Majesty had complain'd in his De-
 “ claration, and, as often as He should have
 “ occasion to mention his Return, and Resi-
 “ dence near *London*, He should complain, of
 “ the barbarous and seditious Tumults at
 “ *Whitehall*, and *Westminster*; which indeed
 “ had been so full of Scandal to His Govern-
 “ ment, and Danger to His Person, that He
 “ should never think of His returning thither,
 “ till He had Justice for what was past, and
 “ Security for the time to come. And if there
 “ were so great a Necessity, or Desire of His
 “ Return, as was pretended; in all this time,

Lord Cla:
 rendon's
 Hist.
 Book 5.

“ upon so often pressing His Desires, and up-
 “ on Causes so notorious; He should at least
 “ have procured some Order for the future.
 “ But that Declaration told His Majesty He
 “ was upon the matter mistaken; the Resort
 “ of the Citizens to *Westminster* was as lawful,
 “ as the Resort of great Numbers every Day
 “ in the Term to the Ordinary Courts of Ju-
 “ stice. They knew no Tumults. Strange!
 “ Was the disorderly appearance of so many
 “ thousand People, with Staves and Swords,
 “ crying through the Streets, *Westminster-Hall*,
 “ the Passage between both Houses (insomuch
 “ as the Members could hardly pass to or fro).
 “ *No Bishops, down with the Bishops, No Tumults?*
 “ What Member was there of either House
 “ that saw not those Numbers, and heard not
 “ those Cries? And yet lawful Assemblies!
 “ Were not several Members of either House,
 “ assaulted, threaten’d, and evilly entreated?
 “ And yet no Tumults! Why made the House
 “ of Peers a Declaration, and sent it down
 “ to the House of Commons for the suppress-
 “ sing of Tumults, if there were no Tumults?
 “ And if there were any, why was not such a
 “ Declaration consented to, and published?
 “ When the Attempts were so visible, and
 “ Threats so loud to pull down the Abby at
 “ *Westminster*, had not His Majesty just Cause
 “ to apprehend that such People might conti-
 “ nue their Work to *Whitehall*? Yet no Tu-
 “ mults! What a strange time are We in,
 “ that a few impudent, malicious (to give them

“ no worse term) Men, should cast such a Mist
 “ of Error before the Eyes of both Houses of
 “ Parliament, as that they either could not,
 “ or would not see how manifestly they injured
 “ themselves, by maintaining those visible Un-
 “ truths. Had the *Whigs* in 1642. declar'd
 that there was not the least Appearance of a
 Tumult; They had equall'd the Modesty of the
Whigs in 1710.

Now we are talking of *Tumults*; those of the
Whigs who read this, (I know it as well as if
 I heard 'em) are ready with their Answer;
Ay, you may hold your Tongue about Tumults,
for Shame: Who rais'd those Tumults when Sache-
verell was try'd? Now because this is perpe-
 tually thrown in our Teeth, and our Author
 seems to hint at it in one place, and a Friend
 of His (whose Pamphlet I have just now seen,
 and with whom I shall speak a Word or two,
 before We part) takes notice of it directly;
 I shall give a full Answer to this Objection
once for all; and let us see who will get by it,
 the *Whigs*, or *We*.

Supple-
ments to
Faults on
Both
Sides.

I am fully persuaded that the *first Rising* of
the People with Shouts and Acclamations, in
 favour of Dr. *Sacke*verell, was occasion'd by no
 design'd Instigation of any Body whatsoever;
 but that it was purely owing to their own vo-
 luntary proper Motion, out of Affection to a
 Clergyman whom they saw in such Circum-
 stances. I must confess, I believe this is the
 first *Church-Mob* against the *Whigs* and *Dissen-*
ters that ever was heard of in *England*; and it

seems unaccountable how that part of the Commonalty of *Great Britain*, came to be in the Ecclesiastical Interest. Tho' it will appear less strange, if one considers that a vast Majority of the best Gentry, of the most wealthy Citizens, and of the most substantial Men in the Kingdom, were, and are zealous for the same Cause, and the same Principles. Take notice, I beseech you, that I don't mean the Principles of Rebellion or Sedition; and that I am not vindicating the Rabble in the Disorders they committed: But I mean the Principles of the Church of *England*, which they thought they lov'd, but did not understand. This Caution I judg'd necessary; considering what fair Interpretations the moderate Party always put upon the Words and actions of Those they don't love; nay, I doubt not but notwithstanding what I have said, I shall be represented as an Advocate for those Rioters; and 'tis well if some People don't swear I am one of them.— But let that pass. The *Whigs* seeing things run thus contrary to their own, and every Bodies Expectation, and Those upon whom they chiefly depended, express the utmost Abhorrence of Them, were, you may be sure, not a little mortify'd and amaz'd. In this surprizing Turn, what should they do? To change the Inclinations of the People on a suddain, was impacticable: Since therefore they could not *stop 'em*, the only way was to *push 'em forward*, to inflame 'em to commit some unlawful Extravagance, and then, lay the Scandal

Scandal of it upon the Doctor and his Friends. This, I verily believe, is the true State of that Matter: And I think I have sufficient Reason to say so.

For, in the first place, all the Town knows that several *Dissenters* were actually aiding and assisting at the Demolishing of the Meeting-Houses. Who those *Eight* were that had the good luck to be distinguish'd from their Brethren in Iniquity, by being deliver'd out of *Bridewel* between three and four in the Morning, is not altogether so well known, but 'tis perfectly understood who those *worthy Magistrates* were, that came in Person to fetch 'em out, and what sort of Principles they zealously favour and defend. How happy was it for some of those Criminals, that they chanc'd to be of the *Moderate Party*! To receive the Honour of so early a visit in *Bridewel* from *Men of that Quality*, and to be so soon set at Liberty, by those *impartial Dispensers of Justice*! While the poor *High-Church* Malefactors, put into Prison for the very same Action, were left in *Linbo*, to be either *whipt as Roiters*, or *hang'd as Traitors*!

Then, that they actually did make that use of these Disorders which I mention'd, is most notorious. The Doctor and his Friends bore the Blame of all: And away it went; *Ay, these are your Church Principles; Here's High-Church for you; This is the Loyalty of High Church; You may see now what these Men drive at; This is Passive Obedience; Tumults and Rebellion, and High-*

High Church is the Word. And so between the Villany of some, and the Folly of others, this Scandal stuck for some time, and may stick still for ought I know; and the profligate Scriblers of the Party took great Pains to improve it to the best Advantage. Not that there was ever the least Foundation for such a Lie; never the least Encouragement given by the Doctor or any of his Friends, to those *Tumults*, directly or indirectly: Tho' others had the Conscience to give out, that they had distributed Money among the Rabble. This, they said, would be prov'd: And prov'd it had certainly been, had it been true; but the want of that Circumstance spoil'd all: And the Persons accus'd, knowing their own Innocence, were perfectly unconcern'd at the Matter, and despis'd the impotent Malice of their Enemies.

So that tho' I can't tell you who *were* the the true Authors of these Disturbances, yet I am sure I can tell who *were not*; 'twas not Dr. *Sacheverell* nor his Friends, who abhor all such Proceedings; tho' the contrary has been most wickedly asserted, and that too by *some* whose Characters and Offices, one would think, should oblige them to have a more strict Regard to Truth and Justice. I must own, I have so favourable an Opinion of that Multitude which appear'd in *Lincoln-Inn-Fields*, and other Parts of the Town, as to think they had no ill Design against the Queen or the Church, but that on the contrary, they were zealous for *Both*, and thought they did them Service by pulling down

down Meeting-Houses. This indeed was a *Zeal not according to Knowledge*; the Action was most unjustifiable, and upon all accounts inconsistent with the Doctrine of that Church, which they thought they were defending. But every Body knows that when the People are willing to take the *Original Power* into their own Hands, whatever were the Principle of their first Rising, a Man may as well pretend to account for the Blowing of the Wind, or the Roaring of a Deluge, as for their Actions. This, at least, is my Opinion at present; and will be so till I am convinc'd of the contrary, by the most ingenious Author of *The Tale of a Tub*; when he shall be pleas'd to oblige the World with his accurate Treatise, entituled, a *Modest Vindication of the Proceedings of the Rabble in all Ages*.

Well, but, still 'tis plain the Doctor was the Cause, the Occasion of this Disturbance; 'twas *'long of him*, 'twas upon his Account, and so it ought to be laid at his Door. 'Tis thus that Thousands have reason'd upon this occasion; and even upon this Bottom, the Dr. has been curs'd and rail'd at with all the Rage imaginable. This, one would think, is very hard; to be arraign'd for being arraign'd is somewhat extraordinary. I shan't put such an Affront upon the Understanding of any Man of Sense, as to answer this Objection to Him: But as for those who argue in this manner; without expecting they should have Metaphysicks enough to distinguish between the several sorts of Causes, and call them by their hard Scholastic

lastick Names, I shall only put this plain Case to them. Suppose I were walking along *Cheapside*, meaning harm to no Body; and some ill-look'd surly Fellow, or other, not liking my Person, or my Principles, should be pleas'd to knock me down, or push me into the Channel. Upon this, as 'tis usual in such Cases, a Crowd gathers round us; and in that Crowd some Body else has his Toes trod upon, or his Shins broke. Now, according to this way of arguing, I ought to be knock'd down *again*, as being the Cause of it; whereas I should rather have imagin'd, that He who *began the Assault* upon me, was the only Person in fault, and the real Cause of both our Misfortunes. But to return to our Author.

He lays down this wise Aphorism, (*p. 48.*) That *all Good Men mean well*: That is to say, That *All Good Men are Good Men*; and I must entirely agree with Him. 'Tis true too (as He endeavours to prove) That many Quarrels and Animosities arise purely from Prejudice or Misunderstanding; and that very often People do not differ from one another, so much as They think they do. But notwithstanding all this, there is sometimes a *real* and a *very wide* Difference in the Sentiments and Principles of Men; and the way to *reconcile Persons*, is to *distinguish Things*, not to *confound* them.

His crude, inconsistent Reasoning about Loyalty and Passive Obedience, and the Difference between the *Whigs* and *Tories* in those Points, I pass over at present; having before refer'd

refer'd the Reader to the many unanswerable Treatises which are, and will be publish'd upon those Subjects.

His saying that *We attribute to our Kings* P. 52. *the same Powers which are taken by an absolute Monarch*, is a positive *Falshood in Fact*; and consequently is not capable of being confuted by *Reason*.

Our Religious Contests (says He) *are more about* P. 51. *Ceremonies, and Church-Discipline, than the Worship of God, which consists in Spirit and Truth; and therein I am afraid both Parties will be found too much wanting. I am afraid so too; but what is that to the purpose? Why, 'twas never intended to be to the purpose: This is what we commonly and properly call Cant; that is, a Set of very godly Words, signifying nothing to the matter in hand, and design'd not to inform, but to puzzle and confound. The whole Passage indeed, if examin'd, will appear to have no Meaning in't. The Worship of God consists in Spirit and Truth God is to be worship'd in Spirit and Truth, if He pleases; And what then? Does this exclude Ceremonies, and Church-Discipline? Because there ought to be an inward Worship, does it follow that there can't be an outward one? We agree pretty well, He grants, in the Worship of God which consists in Spirit: I am glad of it: But we have Contests about Ceremonies and Church-Discipline; I am sorry for't; but whose Fault is it? Our Contests are about Ceremonies, Discipline, and such Things: What should they be about, if We have*

have *any* Contests? Not about the *Faith* of Christianity, 'tis to be hop'd: In *That* all Christians agree. What would this Man have? Would he have us quarrel about *every thing*, even about the first Principles of Religion? Or would He have us *transfer* our Quarrels; agree in what we differ about, and differ about what We agree in? No, He will say; He would have us agree in every Thing. With all my Heart; That's the very Point we would gain. Why don't the *Dissenters* forsake their Schism, and communicate with the Establish'd Church? Do *We* separate from *Them*, or *They* from *Us*? They, most of 'em, own the Terms of our Communion to be Lawful: And if *Peace* (as *They* truly say) be so excellent a Thing, Why do *They* break it? Why do *They* causelessly rend the Church, and tear us in pieces with Quarrels and Factions? For the Distinctions of Parties into *Whig* and *Tory*, *High-Church* and *Low-Church*, are owing to their unreasonable Separation; and Men are said to be of *This* or *That* Party, according as *They* are more or less Favourers of the *Dissenters*. So that *They* are the Authors of all our Confusions; not only of their own Division from the Church, but of *our* Divisions one among another. Had We no *Dissenters*, We should have no *Whigs* or *Tories*.

I have taken to pieces this *senseless Latitudinarian Cant*, that every Body may see the wretched Folly and Emptiness of it. The Nonsense that has been talk'd and printed upon this Subject is indeed enough to amaze
one

one: I know of nothing more ridiculous and silly, unless it be the Project it recommends; which is a Comprehension in the Church, and a Coalition in the Ministry.

The System of Christianity, which our Author has oblig'd the World with, is, to be sure, extremely edifying; and comes in admirably well, after a Discourse upon *Funds* and *Bank-Stock*, Whether He understands *Trade*, or *Divinity* best, is not easy to determine. After I had read This, I knew the Prailes of *Peace*, or *Charity* could not be far off; and so it prov'd: For a *Whig* has but two Subjects to preach upon, *Peace*, and the *Christian Religion*: For this Reason, I suppose, because his Party consists of Those who are the greatest Enemies to *Both*. Those Subjects are undoubtedly very good ones; but they have had the Misfortune to be dishonour'd by the dullest, most illiterate, and most insipid Harangues, that *H-----* ever commended, or *K-----* ever utter'd.

The System which our Author has laid down, He thinks all Christians agree in; 'Tis at best, I think, a very imperfect one: But suppose All do agree in it; Why, therefore we must not contend about our Ceremonies, or Liturgy, nor even about Episcopacy, which we have prov'd to be Essential to the very Being of a Church. We agree, in the main, about the Doctrines of Religion; therefore we are to contend about Nothing, tho' of the utmost Consequence, next to Religion it self; but are oblig'd in Conscience to give up every Thing to
our

our Enemies. This is the meaning of all sanctify'd Talk in p. 52: from those Words *Yet such is the miserable Apostacy of professed Christians, &c.* to the bottom of the Page. Which I take notice of, that the unwary Reader may not be deluded by the pretended Piety of One, who (as we have abundantly shewn) endeavours to undermine both Church and State, and justifies the gross Corruptions that can well be committed. *Ecclesiastical Copacy* is much more than the *Shadow* of Religion: Indeed if *Men in contending for it, have the Vertue, Power, and Substance of Religion* they have much to answer for; but still they ought to contend for the former, tho' not to loose the Vertue, Power, and Substance of the latter. But who are They that are thus minimal? I appeal to any indifferent Person whether there has not been much more Force and Violence shewn by Those who attack the Church, than by those who defend it. And there is moreover this remarkable Difference, that the former commit a grievous Sin by Attacking; the latter do their Duty by Defending the former being the Aggressors, and the Authors of all our Confusions, are answerable for the Animosities of the latter, as well as for their own: As a Prince who enters into an unprovoked War, is guilty of all the Blood that is spilt both sides.

The truth of the Matter therefore is That the blame is to be laid upon those who unreasonably separate from our Church: They can

ese Divisions; *This is the real State of the
 ase*; All the rest is amusing Jargon, to con-
 und People's Understandings. For has there
 en the shadow of an Argument produc'd to
 e contrary? Yes; *God is to be worship'd in Spi-
 and Truth*: Some People swear and execrate for p.
 Church; *The End of Religion is the changing
 r deprav'd Nature, and Sanctifying the Soul*;
 ace is very desirable; few People live so good
 ves as they should do; they are hot, fu-
 us, outrageous, and so forth; from all
 igh 'tis as clear as the Sun, that we ought
 abandon the Defence of our Constitutinn,
 d fairly give it up to the Dissenters.

After this strain of Godliness and Divinity,
 returns to his raving against the Church and
 ergy with more Malice than ever. *How little
 this temper (meaning that of Charity) do we
 in the Conduct of many, who Pretend to be* p. 53:
*ministers of the Gospel of Peace, and yet fill their
 mons with Reviling, Slander, and Invidious, to
 up Mens Minds to Wrath and Discord?* To re-
 t all his Ribaldry is needless, and would be
 useous: In short, he tells us *They have no
 our of the things of God, that They are Wolves* *Ibid.*
*sheep's Cloathing, that They are of their Father
 Devil, and his Works they do.* He hates Rail-
 , you see; and therefore cannot but con-
 n it in others: And he has by this sufficient-
 hewn that *He is full of Meekness, Tenderness,* *Ibid.*
*ve and Compassion, and bears universal Charity
 Christians.* The Truth is, I scarce ever knew
 hie, or a Fanatick, go about to discharge all
 D the

the Malice that the Devil can put into the Heart of Man; but he Prefac'd it with a Discourse against Railing, and in praise of Charity and Moderation.

After all; were the *Reviling* and *Invectives* true, which our Author charges upon the *Clergy*, I should freely forgive him *his Own*. But who of them are guilty of these Crimes, or any thing like it? They Preach, if he pleases against *Rebellion, Hypocrisy, Atheism, and Infidelity*: And 'tis their Duty to express themselves upon such Subjects with *Warmth* and *Sharpness*: They have Authority to do it; they are commanded to do it; and the Primitive Christians, the Apostles, and our Saviour himself did it before them.

But they are, or (as this Writer says) *Pretend* to be the *Ministers of the Gospel of Peace*; and therefore ought to *Preach Peace* to the People. This Objection is perpetually in the Mouths of the *Whigs*, and 'tis impossible for any thing in Nature to be more ridiculous; tho' I have known it much urg'd by very *famous Speechmakers*, in very elaborate *Harangues*. Especially by *One*, who above all the rest was remarkable for his *Charity, Temper, and Moderation*, and his strict regard to *Justice*.

The Clergy then ought to *preach Peace*. So they do; but are they to *Preach nothing else*? The Gospel is call'd *the Gospel of Peace*, because it is design'd to *make Peace* between *God and Man*; not because there's no *Duty* in *Christianity*, but *Peace-making*: This, no doubt, is a most eminent and illustrious part of it, but it is not the
only

only thing contain'd in it. And now, suppose a Clergy-man upon the 30th of *January*, a Day set a-part by Act of Parliament, to deprecate God's Vengeance for the most horrid Rebellion and Murder that ever was recorded in History, should in the Spirit of Moderation take this Text: *Behold, how good and joyful a thing it is for Brethren to dwell together in Unity!* This, no doubt, would be extremely suitable to the occasion of the Day; and perfectly agreeable to the Commands of Authority. But *Peace, Peace*, is an excellent *Cant*, especially when it comes from the Mouths of those who are the *only Disturbers* of it. Besides; the Clergy do *Preach Peace*, while they *Preach* against *Rebellion*; and lay open the *Designs* of those who make this *Objection*. For nothing can contribute more to *Peace* and *Unity*, than to give the World a true *Notion* of *Them* and their *Principles*.

This naturally leads me to take notice of just such another *Objection*; which is commonly urg'd by that Party in the same *Breath* with the former. Whenever the Clergy preach the *Doctrine* of *Non-Resistance*, and the like; 'Tis said, that they have nothing to do with these *Matters*; that 'tis *Meddling in Politicks*, which lie out of their *Sphere*, and are not proper for the *Pulpit*. To which I reply in the first place: Granting it be so, did not Mr. *Hoadly* as much meddle in *Politicks*, as my Lord Bishop of *Exeter*, and Dr. *Sacheverell*? Or does the difference lie here, that it is *criminal* to preach *true Doctrine* upon these *Subjects*, and *meritorious* to Preach

there
 false? But besides; if by that Expression (*meddling in Politicks*) be meant presuming to settle the Constitution, or to dictate in Matters of State; most certainly the Clergy would be justly censurable for pretending to it: And who of them have taken upon them to determine in these Affairs? But if by that form of Speech be meant preaching upon those Duties of Christianity, which are of a Political Nature; we must insist upon it, that this is really their Province, and properly falls within the verge of their Cognizance. For ~~they~~ are not Vertues and Vices of a Political Nature, as well as of an Oeconomical, or of any other kind? And are not Loyalty and Rebellion of that Nature? These things are not Points of Politicks, but Points of Divinity. Ought not the Clergy therefore to recommend Obedience to Princes and Magistrates, as well as Obedience to Parents, or Obedience to Masters, or as any other Duty whatsoever? Is it not of the utmost Importance? Nay absolutely necessary? Is it not earnestly incited by Christ and his Apostles? And ought not the Ministers of the Gospel to imitate those Examples in their Preaching as well as in their Practice.

Nay, upon some certain Occasions, which every Body knows, they are commanded by Authority to preach upon these Subjects. And tho' That perhaps may be no Argument to the Whigs, yet it is a very good One to the True Church men.

But these High-flying Clergymen, he says, would place themselves above the reach of human Laws: They tell us they are Jure Divino, God's Heritage, a Royal Priesthood, &c. So they are in their Ecclesiastical Capacity, but do they therefore pretend to be above human Laws, or not to be Subjects to the Government? Not in the least: nor does this Slanderer himself believe one Word of it. But he thought it would fix a Scandal upon the Clergy; and that was enough for the present. He goes on. *We see they would be flying as high as Popery it self; if we would let 'em.* I answer, *Bellarmino*, Thou liest. But suppose they were for flying so high; how comes in that Clause, *If we would let 'em?* I dare say, this Scribler is not a Member of either House of Parliament. But he has rung the Changes upon *High-flying, Flying-high, High-flyers, &c.* and therein lies the great Strength of his Argument.

The next Sentence is very remarkable: *But tho' these glorious Titles (God's Inheritance, Royal Priesthood, &c.) are predicated of the Divine, Spiritual, Gospel-Church and Ministry; let not these Men be too forward to attribute them to themselves, 'till they first convince us that they have no Ambition to exceed the Bounds of the Gospel-Dispensation.* I would have this Passage engraven in Iron, or rather in Brass (because that Metal best becomes our Author) to be the Admiration and Amazement of all Posterity; for certainly such a complication of *Villany* and *Nonsense* was scarce ever heard of. *Every true Church and Ministry is,*

I think, a *Divine, Spiritual and Gospel-Church and Ministry*; tho' sundry temporal Appurtenances may without any Absurdity be annex'd thereunto. If therefore these *glorious Titles be predicated* of such a *Spiritual, &c. Church and Ministry*, they are predicated of *our Church and Ministry*. No, says this Author; *Let not these Men* (the *English Clergy*) *be too forward to attribute these glorious Titles to themselves, 'till they first convince us that they have no Ambition to exceed the Bounds of the Gospel-Dispensation.* What he means by *exceeding the Bounds of the Gospel-Dispensation*, will appear before we have done. But the Clergy, it seems, must not pretend to be Clergymen, unless they *first convince us that they have no Ambition, &c.* Why so? Suppose they should have such an Ambition, (as they have not) yet wou'd that vacate their Orders? Yes; our Author means *That*, if he means any thing. Here we plainly see what he aims at; and this is agreeable to his *Pretended Ministers of the Gospel* above-mention'd. And he is more exprels in these Words; *'Tis not Enough for them to tell us that they are the Successors of the Apostles; unless they shew us that they are acted by the same Spirit that dwelt in the Primitive Christians. 'Tis not enough; Enough, for what?* Their being the Successors of the Apostles is not enough, I confess, to prove that they are *good Men*; (there are other Arguments to prove *That*) but it is enough to prove them *true Ministers*.

Ibid.

After this, He says (to my great Astonishment) *We freely yield to them that the Offices of Christian Bishops, Pastors, &c. are of Divine Institution.* Certainly? That they are of Divine Institution, is very true; whether you own it or no: But by owning it, you contradict what you said just before; if you had any meaning in those Expressions. For if their Offices are by Divine Right; *Ambition*, or not *Living like the Primitive Christians* will never evacuate or annul them.

But now comes the Sum and Substance of his Ecclesiastical Doctrine. *Let them (the Clergy) distinguish with us between what is Divine, and what is but human in the Exercise and Appendices of those Offices; many Powers and Emoluments have been added to them, which were not known or thought on in the Days of the Apostles; such as Lordly Titles, Temporal Possessions, Jurisdictions and Immunities, with the divers Forms, Powers, Liturgies and Ceremonies of National Churches, and the Dominion of the Clergy over the Laity; these things may be useful to Religious Societies so far as they conduce to their Support, Decency and good Order; but are not indeed any part of true Spiritual Religion, no more than the Garment is a part of the Body; and may be enlarg'd or diminished, put on, or put off, as the differing circumstances of time and place, and the Inclinations of the Prince and People may require. In short, we ought to distinguish between the Political Churches of Nations; which are Subject to be set up and pull'd down, limited and reform'd by the Authority of the Christian Magistrate; and the invisible*

P. 53, 54.

Church of Christ, which consists of all such of the whole Body of Christians, who Worship God in Spirit and Truth, whose Powers and Privileges are are not Carnal, but Spiritual, and can never be alter'd or taken away; God grant that all Men of good-Will, of whatsoever Perswasion, may be found of this number, without which all our Zeal for the outward Forms of Religious Worship will stand us in no stead. In this I am sure all sincere Virtuous and Pious Christians agree with each other; and for the rest, they do but prophane the venerable Name of God, by their pretences to Religion; and if such should come to be made Legal Bishops and Pastors of Political Churches, they might yet have no part or portion in the Royal Priesthood or in God's Heritage.

Let them distinguish between what is Divine, and what is but Human, &c. Well; so we do. Many Powers and Emoluments have been added, such as Lordly Titles, Temporal Possessions, &c. They have so; and what then? Why, These things may be useful to Religious Societies, so far as they contribute to their Support, &c. May be useful so far as they contribute? &c. They Certainly are useful, I think, if they do contribute to the Support, Decency, and good Order of Religious Societies. But we are told, they are not indeed any part of true Spiritual Religion. How cleverly those Words True and Spiritual are put together? The Things here mention'd are not Spiritual Things indeed; But if they are not a part of Religion as it is Spiritual, They are some of 'em at least, (such as Liturgies, Forms, &c.) a part
of

of it, *as it is True*. For true Religion consists of an *inward* and *outward* Part; the One *Spiritual*, the other *Visible*. But he proceeds; and says, *These Things may be enlarg'd or diminish'd, put on, or off*. Suppose they may; to what purpose is this brought in here? And yet 'tis plain the whole Paragraph turns upon This, and the following Sentence; and 'tis as plain to perceive what our Author drives at. He says these Things may be *enlarg'd, or diminish'd, put on, or off*; because he would have them first *diminish'd, and then put off*: For they are *on* already; and I think 'tis pretty manifest from what we have prov'd, that he is not for *enlarging* them. This Alteration may be made, he says, *as the differing Circumstances of Time and Place, and the Inclination of the Prince and People may require*. For this (as well as for many other of his Doctrines) he is oblig'd to the Author of *The Rights of the Christian Church*. The *Prince and People* are to make these Changes; but not a word about the *Consent* and *Authority* of the Church it self; which by the Constitution of *England*, is essentially necessary. And immediately after, he says, that *Political Churches* (as he calls them) of *Nations* are *subject to be set up, and pull'd down, limited, and reform'd, by the Authority of the Civil Magistrate*. So there's an end of all Ecclesiastical Power and Jurisdiction.

By this time, I suppose, it is pretty plain, what this Writer means by the Clergy's *exceeding the Bounds of the Gospel-Dispensation*. The
Apostles

Apostles and first Christians had no Lands, Dignities, Lordships, &c. (for they had *Liturgies, Forms, and Ecclesiastical Discipline, and Power, tho' our Author does not know it*) therefore the Clergy *now* ought to pretend to none of those Temporalities; if they do, they forfeit their Spiritual Character. For so he tells us expressly in the Words above-cited. *Tho' those glorious Titles are predicated of the Divine, Spiritual Church; Let not these Men pretend to attribute them to themselves, unless they first convince us, that they have no Ambition to exceed the Bounds, &c.* Which exceeding the Bounds of the Gospel-Dispensation consists (as I have shewn) according to his Doctrine, in enjoying any of the Temporalities above-mention'd. So that they must either relinquish their Baronies, and Titles of Gentlemen, the Revenues of Bishopricks, Deaneries, Archdeaconries, and Parsonages; or they must lose their Orders, and cease to be Clergymen.

The Reader will pardon me for being so particular in disintangling the Fallacies of this Author, and repeating some of his Stuff several times over; since there is no other way to *unkennel a Sophister*, but to dislodge him from his intricate and perplex'd Sentences. Before I take leave of this Head, I cannot but admire the *Ignorance*, as well as *Malice* of the Man; who pretends to make a Parallel between *our Times, and those of the Apostles and First Christians*. Because *They* had not Dignities, and Revenues, when there was no National Church establish'd
and

and countenanc'd by the Civil Authority; and when Christians were entirely in a State of Persecution: Therefore those *Powers and Emoluments* are *improper*, nay *unlawful now*, at *this time*, when the Church is become a Part of the *National Constitution*. It's Enemies, We find, would freely own the *Spiritual Character* of its Ministers, were it not for those temporal *Appendixes*; and would readily acknowledge the Church to be *Apostolical*, were its Bishops and Clergy *as poor as the Apostles*.

I have now done with our Author; having, I think, given a full Answer to every Thing material that has been urg'd by Him. This I judg'd necessary to be done: For tho' I take Him to be a very *bad Writer*, and a very *bad Man*, yet it is plain He is *no Fool*. His Pamphlet is well enough contriv'd to do Mischief, and impose upon weak Minds: There is very little *Wit* or *Good Sense* in it; but there is somewhat of *Cunning*: An Art, which any one of an *ordinary Understanding*, of a *base Temper*, and of *dishonest Principles*, may very easily attain to.

If I have treated him with *Contempt* in some Places, and with *Severity* in others; I appeal to any unprejudic'd Person, whether *False Grammar*, and *False Sense*, will not justify the *former*; and whether the most bitter Malice, the most unjust Slander, and an Attempt to undermine our Constitution both in Church and State, do not righteously deserve the *latter*. If I have not *prov'd* what I have alledg'd,

ledg'd, I will ask His Pardon : If I *have*, I am sure no Stile can be too severe for Him. He is, not to be treated like a *Gentleman*, but like a *Common Enemy* to Goodness.

I have only to caution the Reader, that whereas I have us'd great *Plainness of Speech* concerning the *Whigs* : I would not be understood to mean every Body that has had *that Name put upon Him*. Many honest, and well-designing Persons, no doubt, have some time or other been *call'd Whigs*. For my part, I speak of *Things*, not of *Words* ; and by *Whigs* I mean Those who are guilty of the Practices, or espouse the Principles I have condemn'd : In short, all Those who approve of this Author's Performance, and have the Front to rejoice in so scandalous a Pamphlet.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE a considerable Part of the foregoing Answer was written, I met with another choice Piece of *Whigish* Eloquence, and Politicks; call'd a Supplement to the *Faults on Both Sides*, &c. Tho' I don't think my self oblig'd so much as to mention, or take notice of *all* the Dulness and Ribaldry which every Day flows from that Faction in great abundance, (I should be finely employ'd if I did) yet because *This* Pamphlet pretends to be related to *That* which I have been examining; I shall to far answer it, as to shew that it *does not deserve to be answer'd*. Or if it does, I will make the Author of it *answer Himself*, and He shall do it substantially. I will extract some of his remarkable Passages, and lay them in one View before the Eyes of the Reader; who will then be able to judge whether He is fit to be *answer'd any other way*; and will also plainly see what wretched *Tools of a Party* the *Whigs* are forc'd to work with.

The Passages refer'd to, shall be rank'd under the following Heads.

1. *False*

1. *False English and Nonsense.*
2. *The most impudent Lying and Slander, or villanous Falshoods in Fact, positively affirm'd without the least Pretence of Proof.*
3. *Abusing the Queen and Ministry, — and seditious and rebellious Principles.*

False English, and Nonsense.

P. 20. *That the People who they boast of having deluded, may see into the Party, and know a little what they are a doing.* P. 21. *Were the black Counsels of that Matter ravel'd into, doubt the Tory Party would find more Reason to blush, &c.* P. 48. *Nor has Things pass'd without some reciprocal Resentments on both Sides.* P. 57. *The invincible French Army was victoriously cut in pieces.* Ibid. *The People who complain of these Things, What can be suppos'd to please them?* Ibid. *No doubt He would have done his Devoir (meaning Endeavour) to have it so.* P. 66. *We have carry'd on the War at an Expence much superior to our Strength. i. e. We have done much more than we are able to do.* P. 70. *The Reflection of these Things.* Ibid. *If the Money'd Men should be prevented lending their Help:*

Lying, Impudence, and Slander:

P. 21. *With industrious Delays, they (the Tories) kept every thing back so long; that if possible, that little handful of valiant Protestants might be devoured, and Ireland be wholly restored to King James.*

James. P. 27. *When at last, none of these would serve their Purpose, to conquer the invincible Spirit of this Great Prince, they (The Tories) enter'd into the abhorr'd Project of Murther and Assassination: When this Plot first came to light, and the Persons concern'd appear'd to the World, our High-Church-Men were exceeding busy to throw it off from themselves; they were loath to bring the French King in, because he was their Friend; they would have hook'd the Papists in; but they, however averse to the Course of that Prince's Conquests, had preserv'd so much Regard to his Person, that they could not, as a Body, be brought into so bloody and dishonourable a Practice; so the Scandal of it lay wholly upon the Tories, even those that call themselves Churchmen, and speak loud for the Church of England: And when the Criminals, tho' owning the Fact, came to die, they were Absolv'd by Church of England Clergy-men, without owning it to be a Crime; and those Clergy-men received no Censure for it from the rest. N. B. Those who absolv'd them (as all the World knows) were profess'd Non-jurors; and them our Author ranks with the Tories, or High-Churchmen who have taken the Oaths.*

P. 36. *Several Hundreds, I might, I believe, say Thousands, who were profess'd Jacobites, came in at that time and took the Oaths.*

Steddy. *They did so; not that they were less Jacobites than they were before, but that they should by this be enabled to carry on their Cause with more Success: after which they tell us, they have the Pretenders Dispensation for, and his Ap-
probation*

probation of it, in particular, as what is for his particular Service on many accounts.

P. 41. This frighten'd many that had a True Zeal for Her Majesty's Person, and Concern for Her Safety, to think, that having reduc'd the Possession of the Crown to be only a Tenant for Life, they had then nothing to do, but to make the Lease as short as they could; and the whole Revolution, with all its Dependencies, such as Liberty, Law, Protestant Religion, Property of Estate, Toleration, and the like, lay at the Mercy of every Assassinator; a sort of People that Party hath never wanted, and which no Loyal Subject to Her Majesty, could think of without Horror.

P. 44. With more Openness, (I might have said Impudence) They (the Tories) assert the Right of the Pretender to be Hereditary and Indefeazable, and the Queen's Possession a meer Robbery and Usurpation.

His Ribaldry upon Dr. Sacheverell, p. 53, 54, 55. is so long, that it would be tedious to transcribe it; and so scandalous, that it would be offensive to any Gentleman, or any Christian to read it. There is no Answer to be given; but only to say, that every Particular is a direct Lie, and that Dr. Sacheverell is in Learning, Parts, Temper, and Morals, exactly the Reverse of that Character. One thing indeed, it is fit to mention more expressly. This infamous Scribler says, that the Doctor to move Compassion upon his Trial before the Lords, could protest his Loyalty to the Person of the Queen, and his Zeal for Her Interest; and drink on his
Knees

Knees to the Pretender, as his Lawful Sovereign in another Company. What does the unreasonable Villain mean? There is nothing to be said, but This; Let Him dare to own his Name, and He shall be immediately prosecuted for the Scandal.

P. 57. *The March into Bavaria was against the Will of the Party; they insulted and threatened the Duke of Marlborough upon it, and a certain Person of Figure swore by G---d it should cost him his Head.*

These are a few Sketches of this Writer's Talent at Lying and Scandal, without the least Proof so much as pretended to be offer'd. To transcribe all under this Head, would be to transcribe Nine Parts in Ten of the whole Book.

Abusing the Queen and Ministry; and Seditious and Rebellious Principles.

P. 47. 48. *This is the State of the Case upon the Administration of a New Ministry; who this New Ministry were, need not be repeated; you know them well enough; and both you and I know and have spoken it to his Honour, that Mr. H----, for whatever Reasons he has since mov'd in another Sphere, was the happy Instrument that freed the Nation from the Machiavilian Projects of that Party; and while he pursued the Measures, so happily begun in Conjunction with the Treasurer, the General, and others: the Affairs of this Nation, were under the best Influence, and went on in the most flourishing manner imaginable: And it was during this Conjunction, that most of the great*

Successes which I mention'd just now, were obtain'd.

Turn-Round. *That is very true; and this is the Reason why I said before, That I cannot believe that Gentleman has in his view the Restoring a High Tory Management; He can never be for building up that Fabrick of Folly and T——y, that he was so instrumental in pulling down: I am in great Hopes that he means honestly, and has something still in view, by which he will secure things upon the old Foot of Safety and Peace.*

Steddy. *I am Steddy still, and have no Opinion of that kind.*

P. 51, 52. *Speaking of the necessity of changing the Ministry and Parliament. Indeed I see no Necessity the Queen has been under. I must own, others may see it, tho' I do not; and therefore I will not say, as some do, that there was no Necessity at all. But I have waited long to hear what this Necessity is; and from whence it proceeds.*

Steddy. *All that I can see of Necessity, depends upon Her Majesty's being convinc'd that these new Men are faithful to Her, and more devoted to Her true Interest, more capable to support Her than the other.*

Turn-round. *Nay, that does not prove the Necessity; unless it were that They were only capable of supporting Her, and not the other.*

Steddy. *There is another Necessity which may have something in it (viz.) a Necessity on the High Tory side; (viz.) that whereas they had so behav'd and justly expos'd themselves to the Re-*
sentment

sentment of the Parliament and Ministry, that they must be sure to be ruin'd, if they continu'd; it was absolutely necessary to them to have one dissolv'd, and the other chang'd. But will any Min call it a Necessity upon the Sovereign, that She should dissolve a Parliament, faithful and dutiful Servants, and change Her whole Ministry to save Sacheverell from further Resentment, or to skreen that infamous Scribler, Abel Roper, from the Pillory, for abusing the House of Commons in Print; a Fellow Illiterate and Ignorant to a Proverb; and whose Pen, grown scandalous to themselves, is only made use of, for his daring to say any thing, without regard to Honour, the Reputation of Persons, or the Truth of Fact. Sure this can be no part of the Necessity.

Turn-Round. But they alledge, the Heat of Parties was come to that height, and the Animosity was so great, that there was an absolute Necessity to give Things a new Turn; that the Edge might be a little taken off on both Sides, that both Sides might be cool'd, the Fury abated, and Things brought to a Temper.

Steady. Then you are to suppose this new M---y are to bring Things to Temper. But will you first examine what Men of Temper are am'g them? Have they not thrown us all upon the Tories for Moderation, and upon the Men of Fire to cool our Heats? How can this bring us to Temper?

Turn-round. Why this is the very Thing I complain of; and for which, as you know I told you, I am come off from them; and yet I am still of Opinion, they will not pretend to the Measures

they took in the beginning of the Queen's Reign ; and that when they come to act, you will see them steer quite another Course.

Steddy, I find you are of the Opinion of the Review, That tho' they are Tories by Inclination, they must be Whigs by Office ; and that by the Necessity of the Constitution they must act upon Revolution Principles. I am in part of that Mind too ; but I cannot but think 'tis dangerous to have a Whig Constitution administred upon Tory Principles. There is a certain Necessity, that either the Constitution must restrain the Principle, or the Principle will destroy the Constitution.

P. 60. I am to be understood of the High-Tories ; these are the Men that have all along aimed at our Destruction ; these are the Men that have brought all our Distracti^ons upon us ; these are the Men that have often brought us to the brink of Ruin, and who will again, if ever they are cloath^{ed} with Power : And if any of these Men are put into Office, so far I think we are absolutely unsafe : This is what renders us uneasie, and frights us at the Apprehensions of Changes.

P. 61. Are not this New Ministry in more danger to deliver us up to a mad High-Tory Administration, than the other were ? Are they not bringing Tories into Places of Publick Trust and Employment ? This will lay us open to the Party that would ruin us all ; and in the End, if let loose, will ruin them too.

P. 69. I know what a certain Great Man and now Leader of this Management, has been pleas'd to publish to the World in Print, in his
 Essay

Essay upon Credit (*viz.*) That Credit depends not on the Ministry, nor on this or that Great Manager, but upon the Parliament, and upon a Just, Honourable, and Punctual Discharge of every Trust, and a fair Management. *And this is very true; But then it follows which I suppose the Right Honourable the Author did not forget, but Omitted, for good Reasons.*

P. 71, 72. *If there were any uneasinesses, any Errors, any Objection, they were not among the Incurables; they would have easily admitted a Remedy; and all our Party-Differences might have been accommodated among us without a Breach that should influence our Allies, touch our National Peace, and put new Hopes into a Desponding Enemy. These were my Thoughts upon the general Article, when I saw the first Removes; tho' I confess, I was sorry for it, yet I thought there might still be some room for the Re-establishing things; and that Men put in, as they had no Views before them, but what were laid on a moderate Management, would have brought in Men qualify'd for a Concurrence with such a Principle: But when a second and a third Trust was given, and I saw who followed to the Breach, and who enter'd Pell-Mell with the first; Then I gave up all, and despair'd. But I'll suppose for once, that I should be Glad to See, (*viz.*) That the New Managers shall proceed by moderate Measures and Schemes taken from the Resolution; but they shall carry an even Hand in their Steering*

ing between both Parties, and make no Breaches upon our Settlements, either Religious or Civil.

P. 74. I should be less concern'd if the Consequences were not to the Nation more than to the Ministry; they may fall, and few would pity them; but our Liberty, Religion, and Constitution must fall with them, and that is the Foundation of my Concern in it.

P. 15. O Steddy! Steddy! If my Grandfather Sir Anthony Steddy, and his Hundred Sons were alive now, these People durst not act so; but our Family is very much declined, and a great many of my Great Relations are dead King James cut off some of them; as William Lord Rus-
sel-Steddy, Arthur Earl of Essex Steddy, Algernon Sidney Steddy, and the like; these were Relations of mine, which if they had been alive now, these People could never have come in thus upon us; but they are gone, and there are very few of the Name now in being.

P. 25. If I am not misinform'd, they (the Scots) had Power by some of their Laws to pass it without Her Majesty's Assent.

Very many other Instances both of the Ignorance and Impudence of this Writer might be produc'd: But I will not tire the Reader I have done: And whether such an Author as This ought to be dealt with by Argument or by Punishment, I leave to my Betters to determine.



[Tzoff, Joseph]

1831/39



