



SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS

DOUGLAS
LIBRARY



QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

5275
BEST of ALL

BEING

The STUDENT'S Thanks

TO

Mr. HOADLY.

WHEREIN

Mr. HOADLY'S *Second Part*

OF HIS

Measures of Submission

Which he Intends soon to PUBLISH) is
fully ANSWER'D. If this does not stop it.

And the only *Original* of *Government* is fully De-
monstrated. And that is a *Law* to all Ages.

IN A

LETTER to Himself.

Which he is Desir'd to send, as an *Eye-Salve*,
to his *Under-spurleather* Mr. *Stoughton* the
State-Haranguer in *Ireland*.

The Third Edition.

LONDON Printed and Sold by the Bookfellers
of *London* and *Westminster*, 1710.

CONTENTS.

- A** *Very Civil Introduction* 5
- I. *Mr. Hoadly Catch'd in a Trap by Athaliah* 6
- II. *He argues against Female Government* 7
- III. *His Accusation perfectly Clears me* 8
- IV. *He puts off his Proof till another time* 10
- V. *He Stakes the Queens Title upon that Proof* 11
- VI. *He Sapps the Foundation of the Revolution. Wherein the Difference betwixt Resistance and Self-Defence* 12
- VII. *He denies her Majesty's Hereditary Right, which yet he cannot Deny.* 15
- VIII. *Befs of Bedlam's Advice to him about the Homilies. And why he undertook to Answer them* 16
- IX. *His Misfortune in Mistaking the Principle of the Revolution* 18
- X. *His Revolution-Principles Destroy the Revolution* *ibid*
- XI. *His Grand Point of the Patriarchal Scheme. Wherein I encourage him* 20
- XII. *I join Institution with Nature in the Original of Government* *ibid*
- XIII. *The King was before Subjects* 21
- XIV. *Mr. Lock's Nonsense in making the Mother Equal to the Father* *ibid*
Priority of Creation determines for the Husband, as also for the King 22
- XV. *Adam was a King and had the Supreme Civil Power* *ibid*

C O N T E N T S.

<p>XVI. <i>The Primogeniture settled by Institution as well as by Nature</i> 23</p> <p>XVII. <i>Mr. Hoadly's Dream of Multitudes Created, &c.</i> 24</p> <p>XVIII. <i>The first Institution of Government is a Law binding up on all Posterities</i> 25</p> <p>XIX. <i>The Case of Commonwealths, like that of Polygamy and Divorce</i> <i>ibid</i></p> <p><i>Commonwealths began by Rebellion. Yet Subjection due to them where none Claims a Better Right</i> 27</p> <p>XX. <i>An Unfair Way of Comparing Common-</i></p>	<p><i>wealths and Monarchies, by putting the Good of the One against the Evil of the Other</i> <i>ibid</i></p> <p>XXI. <i>No Error of Constitution can befall in a Monarchy, which has Ruin'd many Commonwealths</i> 29</p> <p>XXII. <i>By the People no body means any but Himself</i> 30</p> <p><i>Treason to Limit the Power of King and Parliament</i></p> <p>XXIII. <i>A fair Issue, and I take Leave</i> 31</p> <p><i>A Post-Script, of making me Answerable for De Foe</i> 32</p>
---	--

BEST

BEST of ALL.

BEING

The STUDENT'S Thanks

TO

Mr. HOADLY, &c.

SIR,

I Think it a singular Favour that you are pleas'd to take Notice of so Mean a Body as I, frequently thro' your *Humble Reply* to the Lord Bishop of *Exeter*, and in a whole *Postscript* to my self, tho' address'd to his Lordship.

I cannot in Modesty give you too many Thanks for your calling me so *Ingenious*, &c. And even that I have manag'd this *Argument* the Best, &c. Tho' you must imagine it has *Softned* me Wonderfully !

But

But like a *Welsh-Man's Hook*, you have a *Pull him to her* and a *Thrust him from her*. For you Toss me cruelly in your *Post-script* as an Enemy to the *Government*, &c. You're so *Sweet* and so *Sour*, makes me so *Glad* and so *Sorry*——

(I.) I happen'd to Name a Certain Lady call'd *Athaliah*, and you remembering, *I love my Love with an A*, will have this to be *Another Lady*. Now, Sir, tho' I'm a young *Student*, I can tell you so much, That whoever *Applies*, makes the *Scandal*. And if you imagin'd I had any such Thoughts in my Head, you shou'd have Thought again, that it was laying a *Trap* for you, and you shou'd not have stepp'd so cleverly into it! Thus poor *Observer* us'd to be *Catch'd*—— But he never gave so *Ingenious* a Reason as you do, to Vindicate—— Whom nobody Accus'd, for you say in the same Place, p. 70. That *Athaliah* had Reign'd but *Six Years*, and was enter'd into her *Seventh*; whereas—— hath Reign'd *Seven Years*, and is enter'd into her *Eighth*, Therefore it is plain they cou'd not be the *Same*!

And you wou'd draw in the *Bishop* too, your Opponent, and wou'd have him Guess whom I meant by *Athaliah* and the
King's

King's Son? But, Sir, there needs no *Guessing* in the Case, it is evident I meant *Joash*, as every one must think who reads the *Text* I quote. And if his *Lordship* thought as you do, I suppose he will be wiser than to tell it, and bring the *Application* upon himself!

It is a Strange thing, if one tell a Story as far off as *Adam* or *Noah*, or name any one that was not very Good in all the *Bible*, some will presently cry, Oh! This is certainly meant of—— And of—— who I think, are not much oblig'd to such *Vindicators!*

(II.) And as little for what you Assert, p. 50. That *Paternal Right* cannot descend to a *Daughter*. And therefore, That it is impossible a *Woman* should have it. And you Pawn her Majesty's Title upon your Argument against *Paternal Right*. So that if there be any such thing as *Paternal Right*, you in so many Words give up her Majesty for an *Usurper*. This is very *Daring!* But it is all your own. You cannot turn it upon me. For I never said or thought any such thing, nor will it follow from the Principle of *Paternal Right*, that a *Daughter* may not Succeed. So that the *Treason* you wou'd lay at my Door, comes home intirely to your own.

(III.) But you say (*ibid.*) *I beg Leave only to put this one Case before I conclude.*

Student. Ay, Sir! What you please. I know you will be Civil.

Hoadly. *This profess'd Non-juror —*

Stud. How Sir! Have a care what you say! What do you mean Sir?

Hoad. No Harm Sir, I only suppose it for Argument sake. For I can *Prove* nothing against you. Only my *Barber* told me you were such a one.

Stud. Well, provided there be no Harm in *Supposing*, go on. I wou'd not spoil your Fancy. What does this *profess'd Non-juror* say?

Hoad. *He is ever representing me as maintaining such Principles as are inconsistent with the Safety of all Governments.*

Hoad. Does he Represent you truly or not?

Hoad. That is not the Point now. For I am Charging him as an Enemy to the *Government* upon this very Account.

Stud. What! Because he Charges you to be so?

Hoad. Yes. For that very Reason, as you shall see.

Stud. Well, come on then. This will be a *Rarity!*

Hoad.

Hoad. Then let any one Judge, whether, if he truly thought my Principles destructive of the Government, he wou'd not rather permit me quietly to work for the Good of his Main Cause, than persecute me for doing real Service to his Master ?

Stud. Are these your Words ?

Hoad. Yes. My very Words.

Stud. Then let any one Judge whether you were *Asleep* or *Awake* when you Wrote this, if you meant it not in his Defence ? Else why wou'd he Persecute you for doing real Service to his Master ? If that were the Case. And if he sought the Destruction of the Government, wou'd he oppose your Principles because he thought them Destructive of the Government ? No Sir, he wou'd rather, as you say very well, have permitted you to have gone on Quietly with your Work, for the Good of his Main Cause. So that you have absolutely Acquitted him in the Face of the Sun, from having any Design against the Government, in his opposing your Principles. On the contrary, you have made it Plain, that he attack'd your Principles, because he thought them Destructive of the Government, which they must be, if they are Destructive of all Government, as he has plainly Prov'd the Principle of Resistance to be.

Hoad. But I will not believe he thinks *Resistance Destructive* of the *Government*, else he would not Oppose it, which is my Argument; the *One Case* which I have begg'd Leave to put before I conclude; and therefore you may be sure I thought there was something in it!

Stud. Was there ever any *Government* destroy'd, but by *Resistance*? And will not *Resistance* destroy any thing, if it be strong enough?

Hoad. But I know you *Mean* not as you *Say*. I go altogether by *Meanings*. As I knew what you *Meant* by *Athaliah* and the *King's Son*.

Stud. And as you knew the *Meaning* of the *Homilies* against *Resistance* to be expressly against the *Letter*, and for *Resistance*.

(IV.) *Hoad.* It is not time to come to the *Argument* yet. For I have told this *Student* of yours, p. 70. *What there is of ARGUMENT in his Book, mine will be the Labour to Examine and Consider Seriously, when I come more Largely to treat of some Points.* And I have told the *Bishop*, p. 48 of my *Humble Reply*.

“ I beg Leave here to Promise, since
 “ your Lordship hath given credit at
 “ least to some Branch or Branches of
 “ the *Patriarchal Scheme*, that a distinct
 “ Exami-

“ Examination of every *Branch* of that
 “ *Scheme*, as it hath been Mended and
 “ Labour’d, by the Latest and Ablest
 “ Hand that ever yet manag’d it, which
 “ hath lain by me for some time, shall
 “ be Publish’d in a *Second Part* of the
 “ *Measures of Submission*, which will soon
 “ follow these Papers; and in which the
 “ *Original of Civil Authority* shall be large-
 “ ly Discuss’d.

(V.) *Stud.* But, Sir, you still Repeat
 your *Principle of Resistance*, and take it as
 a thing you have fully Prov’d, when at
 the same time you ask further Time, and
 say the *Proof* is yet to come!

Especially you shou’d have had a Care
 of calling her *Majesty* an *Usurper*, if this
 your *future Proof* shou’d Fail! Because if
 you shou’d be call’d in Question for it,
 you would be Requir’d to shew *present*
Proof!

And may not you and I fairly argue
 the Point of *Paternal Right* and the *Ori-*
ginal of Government, without staking the
Title of the *Queen*, her *Crown*, and *Dig-*
nity, upon either of our *Performances*, let
 us have never so good an *Opinion* of our
 own Abilities? That is a Piece of Assu-
 rance I never durst venture upon! But,
 Sir, will you give me Leave to ask you a
 Question?

Hold.

Hoad. So it be not *Captious* or *Insuaring*.

(VI.) You shall Judge. Do you not Found the Queen's *Title* upon the Disposition of the *Crown* by the *Convention* to *K. Will.* and *Q. Mary,* &c?

Hoad. That's a fair Question. And I answer it as Frankly, That I do place it there, and no where else, as I shew at large in my *Humble Reply,* p. 26.

Stud. And do you not think, that they who wou'd overthrow the *Foundation* and the *Principles* upon which the *Revolution* stands, and Consequently the Queen's *Title,* do in Effect destroy her *Title*?

Hoad. Yes, most Certainly. That is my Argument against the *Bishop,* that by the *Principle* of *Non-Resistance,* he does by Necessary Consequence make her Majesty's *Title* only that of a *Successful Usurpation.*

Stud. Did the *Convention* go upon the Foot of *Resistance* or of *Abdication*?

Hoad. That's *Insuaring!* I will not answer you—

Stud. You must Answer it, or else you cannot tell what the *Foundation* or *Principle* of the *Revolution* is, nor Consequently what *Principle* does Contradict it.

Hoad. I say the *Revolution* went upon the Foot of *Resistance.*

Stud.

Stud. But did the *Convention* say so? You place the whole *Authority* and *Title* of the *Queen* upon the *Convention*. Therefore you must take the *Principle* of the *Convention*. And if you go *Contrary* to *That*, you *Overthrow* her *Majesty's Title*, by *Destroying* the *Foundation* of it.

Hoad. I know not what they mean by *Abdication*.

Stud. It is told you in the *Debates* which are *Printed*, that it was a *Free* and *Voluntary Renouncing* of the *Crown*. And it is *Plain* they went upon this *Foot* on purpose to *Avoid* that of *Resistance*. And they left the *Laws* against *Coercion* and *Resistance* standing in full *Force*, as they continue to this *Day*. As likewise the 30th of *January* and 29th of *May*, the *Subject* of which *Solemnities* are against *Resistance*.

Hoad. I am not well pleas'd they left these *Preaching Days* and these *Laws* standing. But I care not how they *Explain'd* *Abdication*, I am sure they Meant *Resistance*.

Stud. How! Against their own express *Words*! This is as you *Deal* with me. To make *Meanings* for me, let me say what I will to the *Contrary*. It is neither more nor less than giving them the *Lic*, and tell them they were—— And are you a *Revolution-man*, do you *Justifie*
the

the *Convention*, and run just Counter to them?

Hoad. I am sure the *Prince of Orange* came with the *Arms of Resistance*.

Stud. Did he tell you so? I am sure he told me the Contrary.

Hoad. Told you! How now, Mr. *Sauce-Box*, were you so Familiar with his *Highness*?

Stud. He told you so too, and all the World in his *Declarations*. That he came not with the *Arms of Resistance*, but only of *Self-Defence*.

Hoad. And what's the Difference?

Stud. You see the Difference plain, for his *Self* was *Defended*, and there was no *Resistance*.

Hoad. These are but small Matters in *Politicks*.

Stud. What! Will you give his *Highness* the *Lie* too, and say he did not mean *Sincerely*?

Hoad. I will Consider all these things in the *Second Part* of my *Measures of Submission*.

Stud. In the mean time you must give every Body Leave to say, that hitherto you have gone in direct Opposition to his *Highness*, to the *Convention*, and have Sapp'd the *Foundation* of the *Revolution*. These *Blots* stick till you have Wip'd them off,

off. Therefore I tell you of these things before-hand, that you may not forget them in your *Second Part*.

(VII.) And there too recollect your Thoughts concerning the Injury you have done her *Majesty*, in striving to Rob Her of Her *Hereditary Right*. Which you of all Men cannot deny; for her *Father* and *Elder Sister* were Dead before She came to the *Crown*, and you have dispos'd of the *Pretender*, as I told you in my Last. Therefore what have you to say against Her *Hereditary Right*? And how came you to Charge the *Bishop* with making Her *Title* an *Usurpation*? Upon whom did She *Usurp*? Tell if you can. Otherwise *Retract* and tell his *Lordship*, that however you may think amiss of his Doctrine of *Non-resistance*, yet it cou'd no ways Infer Her *Title* to be *only that of a Successful Usurpation*. You must either *Retract* this Charge, or *Justifie* it, by telling upon whom she did *Usurp*. You must *Cuff* your own *Ears* one way or the other. Unless you can fix it upon his *Lordship*, that he believes the *Pretender* to have the *Right*. And so use it only as an *Argumentum ad Hominem* to his *Lordship*— But now think of it: That will not do neither; for your Accusation against him is, his *Assuring the World*, that her *Majesty's*

ty's Title is only that of a Successful Usurpation. So that the *World* must be *Assur'd* too of the *Right* of the *Pretender*, before his *Lordship's* Doctrine cou'd Infer this Consequence as to them. And now have not you made a Fine Spot of Work on't, to suppose all the *World* (except your self) satisfy'd of the *Right* of the *Pretender*? Otherwise your self must confess that your whole *Argument* is a *Blunder*.

(VIII.) I have one thing more to tell you of, which is, that your *Answer* to the *Homilies* in the *Measures of Submission* is by no means Satisfactory. I forbear making my Animadversions upon it now, till I see how your *Second Part* may Mend the Matter. And I desire you wou'd consider that Part of the *Homily* I quote in my *Best Answer*, p. 16, 17. And if you can reconcile that with *Resistance*, I will yield that there is no *Meaning* in *Words*. But when Men come to this, it shews they are Forcing *Truth*, not Following it.

Therefore I think you shou'd not despise the Advice of your best Advocate *Bess of Bedlam*, who says, p. 19, 20. *That the Civil Power does still seem to give Countenance to these Doctrines (of Jure Divino and Non-resistance) by Continuing the Authority of the Book of Homilies.* And adds

Nor

Nor can it be said, that Clergy-Men may excuse themselves wholly from the Study of Politicks—— Since the 30th of January and 29th of May, are visible Encouragements to the Clergy, not only to deal in Politicks, but in such Politicks which seemingly are not of a Piece with the Revolution Principle. But all this notwithstanding, since the fifth Day of November is by Authority appointed to return thanks to God for our late happy Revolution, I humbly suppose that this may Justifie Brother BEN, or any Clergy-man, in owning and asserting the Principle upon which the Revolution was Form'd.

Here poor Bess was led astray by her Brother Ben, to Mistake the Principle upon which the Revolution was Form'd. But as to the Homilies, she wisely gives them up. For no Man in his Senses will Quote them for the Principle of Resistance.

Hoad. You mistake me. I did not Quote them for Resistance. But I was oblig'd to Answer them, and get Rid of them if I cou'd, because they seem so very Positive and Express against Resistance, that every Body takes them so. Then they have all the Authority both of Church and State that England can give them. They are Confirm'd by Act of Parliament and Enjoy'd upon the Clergy, under Pain of Deprivation, so that I my self have been Forc'd to Subscribe them. And to say I

did it against my *Conscience*, and so Run them down, wou'd not do at all. Therefore I was oblig'd to *Solve* them some How or other, and take off their Edge against *Resistance*. This is the true History of my Undertaking to Answer the *Homilies*. I thought I cou'd not otherwise Justifie the *Revolution*.

(IX.) *Stud.* And all this is come upon you for not Rightly Understanding the *Principle* of the *Revolution*. You took up the *Mobb-Story* that it was Founded upon *Resistance*; but Neglected the *Convention* and their Wise *Debates*, which gave it another Turn, and brought it to *Abdication*. And now you see the Reason why they did so. For if they had put it upon the Foot of *Resistance*, they had Manifestly gone Counter to the known *Laws* of the Land, and to the *Homilies* of the *Church*, which would Disoblige the *Clergy* not a Little. Now if you had been so Lucky as to have Consider'd this, and paid the least Regard to the *Declarations* of his *Highness*, or to the Honour of his *Memory*, you had sav'd your self all this Trouble, you might have Preach'd up the *Homilies* and *Non-resistance*, and yet have been as good a *Revolution-man* as any of them all!

(X.) And this has brought you under another *Inconvenience*, for which many

ny People blame you, *viz.* That when you come to the *Argument*, you Cry, this and this is against the *Revolution*, which makes up the Greatest Part of all your Books, and Affords you most Scope for Popular *Harangues*. But they say, this is Betraying the *Revolution*, as if it did not stand upon former *Principles*, but must have a *Set of Principles* for it self, which they call *Revolution Principles*.

Besides, you write to Convince *Gain-sayers*. Therefore you ought to let the *Anti-revolution* Men produce all their *Arguments*, that you may *Answer them*. But if instead of that you *Threaten* them, and Hunt the *Government* upon them, this will Harden them, and make them believe you have nothing to say for the *Revolution*. And this is no small Prejudice to the *Revolution*, when its Greatest *Champion* (your self, Sir,) has Recourse to these Sort of *Arms*!

You call me a *Non-Firor*, and say, p. 69. That I have given very *Just Ground of Loud Complaint*. But I know my own *Innocence* in this Matter, and it does not at all Affect me. But what is this to the *Argument*? You Answer with *Loud Complaints*! This is calling for *Help*! Wou'd not a little *Sober Reasoning* have done much better for the Honour of the *Revolution*, not to say *your own*?

(XI.) But the *Grand Point* you have Promis'd in your *Second Part* is, to Examine the *Patriarchal Scheme*, every *Branch* of it, and in which, you say, the *Original of Civil Authority* shall be Largely Discuss'd.

This gives me Suspicion. Because if you take the Right Method, I see not how you can be *Large* upon it. For it is nothing but to look how it Began in *Adam*, and the Account of that is very *Short*. Therefore if you Name any after *Adam*, I will Deny that to be the *Original*, and bring you back to *Adam*.

I give you this fair Warning, that you Stray not, but keep Close to the Point. I will Discover all my Strength to you, because I am as willing to be in the *Wrong* as in the *Right*. And if I am *Wrong*, I will own him my Benefactor who shall set me *Right*. So you have an Easie Adversary to deal with, to whom it is Equal to *Conquer*, or to be *Overcome*.

(XII.) Therefore in Order to the One or the Other, I now tell you, That tho' the *Original of Government*, as I understand it, was pursuant to the Dictate of *Nature*, yet I place it not altogether there, but Chiefly in the positive *Institution of God*, which Renders it Clear and Indisputable. Thus tho' ther were more Arguments from *Nature* for the Subjection

of *Eve* to *Adam*, than of any *Wife* to a *Husband* since, because she was made out of him, yet *God* left it not there, but said to her, *Gen. iii. 16. Thy desire shall be (or thou shalt be Subject) to thy Husband, and he shall Rule over thee.* Here is the first *Government* among Mankind. And what long time do's it take to tell this? What *Large Discourses* are Needful here? For can any shew another *Original*, or any *Government* before this?

(XIII.) And here we may observe, That the Common saying, of *Kings* being made for the *Subjects*, and not *Subjects* for *Kings*, was not so from the Beginning, for the first *Subject* was made for the Use and Benefit of the *King*; and it was for the Benefit of the *Subject* too, as it is still, to be *Obedient* to their *Governours*. But the *King* was *First*.

(XIV.) And cou'd *Eve* who was thus made *Subject* to *Adam*, have an Authority *Equal* with *Him* over their *Children*? I mention'd this, because the Celebrated *Mr. Lock* in his *Two (very Trifling) Discourses of Government*, Printed 1690. (and so Admir'd by the *Whigs*) Labours the Point (in *Odium* to *Monarchy*) that the Power of the *Wife* was *Equal* to that of her *Husband* over their *Children*, because it was said, Honour thy *Father* and *Mother*.

St. Paul lays Strefs upon *Adam* being *First Form'd*, then *Eve*, and thence Argues that the *Wife* ought not to *Usurp Authority* over the *Husband*, but to be in *Subjection*. 1 *Tim.* 11, 12, 13. That is, that things shou'd go according to the first *Original*. And the same *Argument* will hold as to *King* and *Subjects*, for the *King* was first formed, then his *Subjects*, therefore they ought not to *Usurp Authority* over *Him*, but to be in *Subjection*.

What Wretched Stuff then is all that *Chatter* which we hear of the *People* being the *Original* of *Government*, and *Chusing* the first *King*, prescribing him *Laws*, &c! One wou'd think these Men had never Read the three first *Chapters* of *Genesis*.

(XV.) I foresee here, That you will Except against my Calling *Adam* a *King*, and say, that he had no *Civil* Authority, only *Sponsal* as to his *Wife*, and *Paternal* over his *Children*; but that this was no *Civil* Government. Pray then, Sir, what *Government* was it? Was it only a *Spiritual* Government? For ther is no other, except what we call *Civil* Government, which Relates to *Temporal* Affairs. And for the word *King*, I mean no more by it than the *Supreme* Authority. And every *Authority* is *Supreme*, where ther is None *Superior*; and Extends to Every thing,

thing, even *Life* and *Death*, where it is not *Limited* by an *Higher* Authority. Therefore if a Man were with his *Family* in a Place where ther was no *Authority* over him and them, he wou'd be *King* in his *Family*, with Power of *Life* and *Death*, &c. Without which no *Government*, even of a *Family*, cou'd Subsist. For how otherwise cou'd the *Refractory* be *Reduc'd*, and the *Innocent* be *Protected*? This Authority was Exercis'd by *Judah* in his own *Family*, when he Condemn'd his *Daughter* to be *Burnt*. Gen. xxxviii. 24. And we cannot suppose that *Adam* had less *Authority*. Therefore he was *King* and Supreme *Civil* Governour, as well as *Father*. But because the first *King* was *Father* of all his *Subjects*, and they who *Succeeded* him did *Succeed* to his *Authority*, therefore *Kings* were call'd *Fathers* of their *Country*. And *Father* became a Name to Express *Authority*. Thus *Naaman's* Servants call'd him *Father* ii *Kin.* v. 13.

But Observe, I place this not wholly upon *Nature*, (tho' I think *Nature* alone wou'd do it) but I have Added the *Institution* of *God* to the *Original* of *Government*, to put the Matter out of *Dispute*.

(XVI.) Thus again, *Nature* Dictates *Pre-eminence* to the *Elder*. But *God* Determines it in Express Words, *Gen.* iv. 7. Where He says. to *Cain*, unto thee shall be
his

his (Abel's) Desire, (or as our Margin Reads it, he shall be Subject unto thee) and thou shalt Rule over him. And this notwithstanding that *Abel* was more Accepted of *God*. Which shews that *God* did not Found *Dominion* in *Grace*. And from this time the Right of the *Primogeniture* became the Current Notion of all the Earth. It is call'd the *Excellency of Dignity, and the Excellency of Power*. Gen. xlix. 3. And in the *Genealogy* of the *Patriarchs* before the *Flood*, Gen. v. None are Named but the *Eldest* of the *Eldest*, these only were the *Patriarchs* or *Governors*.

This is all the Notice we have of *Government* before the *Flood*. And we must Attribute it to the Particular *Providence* of *God* that we have so much of it in that very *Short* Account. For the *Original* and *Institution* of it is set down in *Emphatical* Words.

(XVII.) I hope what I have said will Prevail with you to think over again what you Re-Assert in your *Humble Reply*, p. 47. That there was a *Number of Men* before the *Institution of Civil Government*. And the *Supposition* you bring in presently upon it, of a *Multitude Created all at once*. And again, p. 51. of *Several Families flying from Tyranny* you know not *Whence*, and Arriving at a *Place* you know not *Where*, &c. For these *Supposes* are like
Dreams,

Dreams, and will not carry against *Fact*, especially the *Fact* of Holy *Scripture*, which tells us so particularly how the first *Government* was *Instituted*. And which the *Apostles* make a *Standard* to all after Ages.

(XVIII.) I wou'd recommend to you Bishop *Overal's Convocation-Book*, where you will see I have advanc'd no singular *Notion* of my own, but have follow'd the *Convocation* of the *Church of England*, in my *Deduction* of *Government* from *Adam*. Not only as a *Piece of History* for our *Curiosity*, or barely as a *Precedent*, left to our *Discretion* to follow or not ; but as an *Obligation* upon all *Christians*, to conform themselves to that *Original*. As also saith the *Scripture*, where that *Text* I before quoted *Gen. iii. 16.* of the *Subjection* of *Eve* to *Adam*, which is told there merely *Historically*, and without any future *Prospect* expressed in the *Words*, is call'd a *Law* and *Commandment* to us, *1 Cor. xiv. 34.* And the *Apostle* argues from the *first Formation* of *Adam*, as I before quoted *1 Tim. ii. 13.* So that we are ty'd down to the first *Institution* of *Government*, which we see here is given us as a *Rule*, and not barely as an *Example*. And we are not left at *Liberty* to *Cook*, *Mould*, or *Alter* it as we please.

(XIX.) Here I see an *Objection* coming full upon me, That at this rate there is no *Government* Lawful but *Monarchy*. To which I

say, that I am not oblig'd to *Answer* it. I have set down the *Law* plain. Let those who Break it *Answer* for themselves.

But I can shew a Case Parallel to this. Which you will find *Matth. xix. 3. to ver. 9.* Our Blessed *Saviour* argu'd, as his *Apostles* did after him, from the *first Formation* of *Man* and *Woman*, against *Divorce*, which will hold also against *Polygamy*, because there was but *One Man* and *One Woman* Created at the first. And when the *General Practice* was urg'd against this, he told them it was for the *Hardness* of their *Hearts* that this was *Permitted* them. But he reduc'd them back to the first *Institution*, with, *From the Beginning it was not so.* And this is what we say to the *Common-wealth Frame*, that *From the Beginning it was not so.* The first *Beginning* of it was among the *Heathen Greeks.* And shall we Prefer that to the *Institution* of *God* in *Holy Scripture!*

The *Deviations* from the first *Institution* of *Marriage* by *Polygamy* and *Divorce* Prevail'd more in the *World* than *Common-wealths* have done, which are at this *Day* but in a very small *Part* of it. Therefore if we *Must* recurr to the *Beginning* from the more *Universal* Custom, we *May* surely from the *Lesser.*

And if the *Practice* of *Patriarchs* and other *Holy Men* of *Old*, cannot Carry it as to *Polygamy*, nor the *Law* of *Moses* for *Di-*
vorce,

force, against the first *Institution*: Shall the less *Authentick* Practice of some in these latter Ages, as to *Government*, be thought of Force sufficient to Dissolve or Abrogate the first *Institution* in that Point?

The *Grecian Commonwealths* (the first in the World) began by *Mutiny* and *Rebellion*. And so have all since, that I know of, Unless *Venice* may be made an Exception, And is this more Acceptable to Us than the *Original* of *Monarchy*, by the *Institution* of God, and the Leading of the Law of *Nature*!

Yet I think Obedience is due to *Commonwealths* by their *Subjects*, even for *Conscience* sake, where the *Princes* from whom they *Revolted* have given up their *Claim*. Because *Possession* gives *Right* against all who have not a better *Right*. Such *Governments* are *Unlawfully Begotten*. But a *Bastard* is a *Man*, and has *Right* to his *Life*, and his *Lawful Acquisitions*, like another *Man*.

(XX.) Sir, If this should Prompt you to enter into a Comparison of *Commonwealths* and *Monarchies*, the *Conveniences* and *Inconveniences* of each, I desire one Piece of Justice from you, which is Observ'd by few that treat this Subject, and that is, to put the *Conveniences* of the One to the *Conveniences* of the Other, and so of the *Inconveniences*. But when the *Commonwealth-men* come upon this Comparison, they set forth the *Liberty*, *Property*, &c. which they con-

ceive the Advantages of the *Commonwealth-Frame*, and Oppose to this the Worst Side of *Monarchy*, and Run out upon the Excesses of *Tyrants*, which affords a Large Field for Popular *Eloquence*. This *Deceives* the Reader, who ought to consider the *Good* of the One with the *Good* of the Other, and not the *Good* of the One with the *Evil* of the Other.

Thus when you have Dressed your *Constitution* of a *Commonwealth* with all the Advantage you can, you ought to put into the other *Scale*, a *Wise*, *Just*, and *Prudent Prince*. Then see which will Preponderate.

On the other Hand, if you Expose the *Weakness* and *Mal-Administrations* of a *Prince*, then put in the other *Scale* the *Civil Wars* and *Confusions* that happen in *Commonwealths* through their *Mis-government*, as the Contests of *Marius* and *Sylla*, of *Cesar* and *Pompey*, &c. And then see whence most *Evils* come to the *People*. Take the Opinion of *Lucan* who Sung of the latter,

*Felices Arabes, Medique, Fœaque Tellus,
Quam sub perpetuis tenuerunt Fata Tyrannis,*

He, tho' a *Commonwealths-man*, and fond of the *Liberties* of the *People*, envy'd the *Eastern Nations*, who liv'd always under *Monarchy*, and felt not those *Convulsions* which the *Contest* of *Senators* occasion'd to the *Commonwealth* of *Rome*.

If you will Paint a *King* like a *Monster*, seeking to Destroy his *People*, that is, *Himself*; or Run *Mad* like *Nebuchadnezzar*: Then think on the other Side of the *Madness* of the *People*, which *David* compares to the *Raging* of the *Sea*: And see which is Worst?

The Voice of an *Angry King* is the *Roaring* of a *Lion*. But the *Voice* of the *People* set agog is the *Roaring* of the *Sea*. A *Lion* may Devour *Some* till his *Maw* be full, but the *Sea* breaking its *Bounds* overwhelms all at once.

If you will put *Extreme Cases*, put them on both Sides. A *King* cannot Ravish all the *Women*, nor *Eat* all the *Children* in the *Nation*. But when *Mob* is up, neither *Man*, *Woman*, nor *Child* is Safe!

(XXI.) But, Sir, I have another Consideration to give you. That in this Comparison you would make a Difference betwixt Errors in the *Administration*, and in the *Constitution*. Errors in *Administration* will be in all sorts of *Governments*, while in the Hands of *Men*. But Errors in *Constitution* are much more *Fatal*, and Harder to be Remedy'd. For Example, they who wou'd set up the *two Houses* of *Parliament* as Powers *Co-Ordinate* with the *King*, these make *three Sovereigns*. And if they happen to *Interfere*, or have different Thoughts concerning their *Respective Rights* (which is almost Impossible they shou'd not, Each being *Judge* for himself) then there's

no

no Remedy but the *Sword*, which cannot be sheath'd till *One* Conquers the other *Two*. As the *Commons* did in the late *Civil Wars*. And this was an Error in the *Constitution*, as they made it then, and as you make it now. But this is contrary to our *Constitution*, wherein the *King* (or *Queen*) is not one of the *three Estates*, but *Sovereign* to them all, which is Plain in our *Laws*.

Now, Sir, there can be no *Error* at all in the *Constitution* in *Monarchy*. No *Errors* can befall there but in the *Administration*, to which all other *Constitutions* are Liable. This I take to be a Remarkable *Difference*, and ought to be duely Weigh'd by you in the *Comparison*.

(XXII.) But, Sir, the Power of the *People* which you set up, is equally *Destructive* of *Commonwealths* as of *Monarchies*; for you put the *Last Resort* in the *People* in both *Constitutions*. And with that it is Utterly Impossible for any *Government* to subsist. For the *People* is *Every body*, that is, *No body*. And indeed when any one cries the *People*, he means only *Himself*. Because if another differs from Him, He runs him down, which is not *Allowing* him to be the *People*, and therefore that *Word* terminates only in *Himself*!

You likewise set the *People* above *Parliaments* as well as *Kings*. Which I think by fair *Construction* of *Law* is made *Treason*, by the Statute in the *Sixth* of her *Majesty's* Reign, entitul'd *An Act for the Preservation*
of

of her Majesty's Person, &c. For to Limit the Power of King and Parliament in one Case, is the same as in another.

(XXIII.) Sir, I have offer'd you these Considerations out of no Ill Will to you I assure you. I know of no other *Original of Government* than what I have told you. If I aim'd at that poor thing call'd *Victory*, I wou'd have *Conceal'd* my *Strength*, and lain in *Ambuscade* to Catch an *Advantage* in your *Second Part*. But now I have told you all, and let you see the Utmost I can say, to Prevent your falling into any Mistake. I have Discover'd all my *Mines*, for I intend no *Surprize*. And if you can shew me any other *Original of Government*, and as well Supported as what I have here laid down, I will Gladly be your Disciple, for I am sure I have no Worldly Interest to Byass me against it. And where Men are Indifferent to Truth, on whatever side it lies, it is Hard if a Common Understanding may not Apprehend it, in a Case of *Fact* so plain and short as this.

If what I have said has no Effect with you, but that in your *Second Part* you still pursue your former *Principles*, I have ventur'd to call this an *Answer* to it beforehand, because it is Impossible to find any other *Original of Government* than what I have set down, for there could be None before *Adam* among *Men*, Unless you have a
Fancy

Fancy for the *Pre-Adamites* (which is as Reasonable a Supposition, and as much *Fact* as the *Independent State of Nature*) and if you Name any *Institution of Government* since *Adam*, I will say, that it was Not the *Original*. So that I think my self Absolutely secure. And I cannot be Perswaded, but that when you have Consider'd it, you will be of the same Opinion with,

Your humble Servant.

POST-SCRIPT.

S I R,

I Love to follow your Example, and therefore bestow a Post-Script upon you. And I must Complain too. For in your Post-Script, p. 69. you Charge upon Me what I quote from Mr. De-Foe, as to the Computation of the Charge and Benefit of the Revolution, and the State of former Reigns. Sir, I do not use to borrow from that Author. And I have Faults enough of my own to Answer for. Wou'd it be Just to lay upon me what I quote from you, and Dispute against? But, Sir, I leave the Mending of all these things to your self. For you are more Concern'd in it than I am. And so, Sir, once more,

Your most ———

F I N I S.

